MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

HAMM-(GATAU)

The Prakrit Grammarians discuss at considerable length what they call *dhātva-ādēśas*.¹ As a grammatical term, *ādēśa* means “substitute”, and a *dhātva-ādēśa* is the Prakrit verbal root which is to be, or may be, substituted for a Sanskrit verbal root. Thus, according to Hc. iv, 60, the Prakrit root *hō-* is one of the *ādēśas* for the Sanskrit root *bhū-*, so that one of the Prakrit equivalents of *bhavati* is *hōi*.

Prakrit roots may be looked upon as falling under one of four classes, viz. :—

(1) Those which are identical with the corresponding Sanskrit roots. Such a root is *cal-*, which is identical in both languages, so that Sanskrit *calati* = Prakrit *calai*. As nothing can be substituted for itself, such a Prakrit root is not an *ādēśa*.

(2) Those which are regularly derived, according to the ordinary phonetic rules, from the corresponding Sanskrit forms. Thus, the Sanskrit root *pīḍ-* becomes *pīl-* in Prakrit, under the phonetic rule that Sanskrit medial *ḍ* becomes Prakrit *l*, and the Sanskrit *pīḍayati* becomes Prakrit *pīlēi*. Again, such a root cannot properly be called an *ādēśa*, for there is no substitution, but only development.²

(3) Those which cannot be connected with any corresponding Sanskrit roots by any admitted phonetic rule. Thus, an *ādēśa* for the Sanskrit root *cal-* is *call-*, with the *l* doubled, so that the Sanskrit *calati* may be represented by

¹ Vararuci (Vr.), viii; Kramadīśvara (KI.), latter half of the *Tiṇanta-kārya*; Rāma-sarman (Tarkavāgīśa) (RT.), I, viii; Mārkaṇḍeya (MK.), vii; Hēmacandra (Hc.), iv, 1-259; Trivikrama, latter half of ii, 4.

² Grammarians are sometimes careless in this respect. Thus RT. I, viii, 27, gives *kīl-* as an *ādēśa* of *kriḍ-*, and (41) *pīl-* as an *ādēśa* of *pīḍ-*. This was quite unnecessary, and the words are ignored, as *ādēśas*, by other grammarians.

callai, as well as by the *calai* mentioned under head (1). These are all true *ādēśas*, and a great number are borrowed *dēśya* words, and cannot be referred to Sanskrit at all.¹

(4) Those which are regularly derived from Sanskrit roots, but which have slightly changed their meaning, and which are therefore, in Prakrit, equated with and substituted for some other Sanskrit root which has a meaning more nearly akin to the acquired meaning of the Prakrit word. Being substitutes, these are also properly called *ādēśas*. As an example we may take the Sanskrit compounded root *prêkṣ-*. The literal meaning of this is "to look at". In Prakrit it becomes quite regularly *pecch-*, but this has acquired the meaning of "seeing" in a more general sense, and is hence divorced by the grammarians from the root *prêkṣ-*, and is given as an *ādēśa* for the much more general Sanskrit root *drś-*. There is no reason for assuming, as is sometimes done, that this ascription to *drś-* is a blunder of the grammarians. It would be absurd to suppose that scholars like Hēmacandra or Mārkaṇḍēya were ignorant of the manifest etymological connexion between *pecch-* and *prêkṣ-*. They were certainly fully aware of it, and when they deliberately equated *pecch-* with *drś-*, and not with *prêkṣ-*, they did so because there had been a change of meaning. This is well brought out by a remark of Mārkaṇḍēya when dealing with the Śaurasēni dialect (ix, 112). There are two equally possible Prakrit forms of the word *prêkṣ-*. One is *pecch-* and the other is *pekkh-*. In ix, 112, Mk. differentiates these two forms. He says that *pecch-* is an *ādēśa* for *drś-*, but that *pekkh-* is the equivalent of *prêkṣ-*.² In other words, while the form *pekkh-* still retains the slightly specialized connotation of *prêkṣ-*, the form *pecch-* has, in Prakrit, acquired the wider connotation of "seeing" in general.

¹ As an example:—Hc. gives 930 *ādēśas*. Of these 327 are quoted in the *Dēśināmamālā* as *dēśya* words.

² But see Hultzsch in *ZDMG.*, lxvi, 1912, p. 719. It will be observed that here I venture to differ from that eminent scholar.

We thus see that *ādēśas* are confined to the last two classes of Prakrit roots. They cannot belong to the first or second.

All the above somewhat trite remarks are introductory to the consideration of one Prakrit root, which illustrates in a striking manner the difference between the grammatical schools of eastern and western India.

The eastern grammarians give *ā-hamm-* as an *ādēśa* for *ā-gam-* (RT. I, viii, 34; Mk. vii, 140). To them, therefore, as this is clearly put as a substitute, there is no Sanskrit root *hamm-(gatau)*. To the Easterners, *ā-hamm-* is a borrowed *dēśya* word.

Hēmacandra (iv, 162) recognizes this Prakrit root, but combats the statement of the Easterners, and denies that it is an *ādēśa* of *gam-*, or, indeed, any substitute at all. On the contrary, he puts it in the first class of the Prakrit roots given above, and equates it with a Sanskrit root *hamm-(gatau)*. As this root does appear in the Dhātupāṭha, Hēmacandra appears to be right, and the Easterners do not seem to have a leg to stand on. But Patañjali vindicates them. In his preface to the Mahābhāṣya, he treats of Sanskrit words which are used only locally. One of these is this very root *hamm-*,¹ which he says is used only in Surāṣṭra, i.e. in the very tract of country in which Hēmacandra lived and worked. It is evidently a *dēśya* word, introduced into Sanskrit in the West, but in the East still a *dēśya* word, and only a *dēśya* word, and there properly treated as an *ādēśa* for *gam-*.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

CAMBERLEY.

21st June, 1921.

THE PLAYS OF BHĀSA

I am unable to concur with Dr. Barnett's appreciation (*supra*, pp. 587–9) of Mr. A. Banerji's article (pp. 367 sqq.) concerning Bhāsa. In 1920, when I had the pleasure of meeting the discoverer and editor of the plays, Mahāmahopādhyāya

¹ Kielhorn, p. 9, l. 26.