XIV

THE PRAKṚIT VIBHĀSAS

By SIR GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., M.R.A.S.

PISCHEL, in §§ 3, 4, and 5 of his Prakrit Grammar, refers very briefly to the Vibhāṣās of the Prakrit grammarians. In § 3 he quotes Mārkaṇḍēya's (Intr., 4) division of the Prakrits into *Bhāṣā*, *Vibhāṣā*, *Apabhraṃśa*, and *Paiśāca*, his division of the Vibhāṣās into *Śākārī*, *Cāṇḍālī*, *Śābarī*, *Ābhīrikā*, and *Ṭakkī* (not *Śākkī*, as written by Pischel), and his rejection of *Audhrī* (Pischel, *Odrī*) and *Drāviḍī*. In § 4 he says, "Rāmatarkavāgiśa observes that the *vibhāṣāḥ* cannot be called Apabhraṃśa, if they are used in dramatic works and the like." He repeats the latter statement in § 5, and this is all that he says on the subject. Nowhere does he say what the term *vibhāṣā* means. The present paper is an attempt to supply this deficiency.¹

It will be advisable to begin by ascertaining what the word means when used as a technical term by Sanskrit grammarians. According to Pāṇini I, i, 44, it means "option". A verse is quoted from the Sārasvata in the Laghu Kaumudī on Pāṇini III, iii, 113,² in explanation of the word *bahulam* when applied to a grammatical rule. It runs as follows:—

*kyacit pravṛttiḥ kvacid apravṛttiḥ
kvacid vibhāṣā kvacid anyad eva
vidhēr vidhānam bahudhā samīkṣya
catur-vidham bāhulakam vadanti.*

Ballantyne's (No. 823) translation of this is as

¹ I must here record my indebtedness to Dr. Thomas, who has been kind enough to read through the proofs of this paper, and whose suggestions have enabled me to clear up obscure points that baffled my unaided efforts.

² The verse is quoted by Pischel in his translation of Hēmacandra, i, 2, in quite different connexion. He seems to have forgotten it when dealing with Vibhāṣās in his Prakrit Grammar.

follows: "Seeing that the application of certain rules is various, they specify four varieties [under the term *bahulam*], viz., sometimes they are applied [when there was no express rule for their application]; sometimes they are not applied [in spite of an express rule for their application]; sometimes [*vibhāṣā*] they are optionally employed or not; and sometimes there is some other result [licence permitted by the rule]." As Ballantyne wrote his translation in Benares, we may safely assume that his rendering of the word *vibhāṣā*, as the optional application or non-application of a rule, represents the meaning traditionally understood by Vaiyākaraṇas of the present day.

So far for Sanskrit grammarians. Prakrit grammarians employ the above rule in the same sense, for the Sārasvata verse is quoted with approval by Mārkaṇḍeya (iv, 64).¹ We therefore conclude that, primarily, a Vibhāṣā is a form of Prakrit in which the rules of the Standard or of some other dialect are applied or not at option. Let us now see what further information we can gain from those who have written on the subject.² We commence with Bharata.

Bharata (xvii, 49) says,³ "the base languages born amid (1) Śākāras, (2) Abhīras, (3) Caṇḍālas, (4) Śābaras, (5) Draviḍas, (6) Auḍras, and those of (7) Foresters are described, in a dramatic work, as 'Vibhāṣā'." Further on he says [53], "the (1) Śākāra language is used by Śākāras, Śakas, etc. (?).⁴ (3) Caṇḍālī (*sic*) is to be used

¹ Rāma-śarman, in the *Prākṛta-kalpataru*, continually uses *vibhāṣā* as the equivalent of *vā*.

² It may be stated that Vararuci, Hēmacandra, and Lakṣmīdhara are all silent regarding it.

³ The verse, as we shall see, is quoted both by Pṛthvidhara and by Mārkaṇḍeya, and I emend the corrupt text of the Kāvya-mālā edition to agree with what they give.

⁴ There is something wrong with the text here. I give, for Śākārī, what seems to me to have probably been the meaning of the original. As in 49, I correct *śabarāṇām* to *śakārāṇām*. The syntactical connexion of the rest of the line is doubtful.

among people of the Pukkasa¹ and similar castes. [54] The (4) Śābara language is to be used by charcoal-burners, hunters, and those who live by implements of wood; and the (7) Vānaukasī (Forester's) dialect is sometimes employed by the same persons. [55] The (2) Ābhīrī or the (4) Śābarī is employed by those who dwell in hamlets for stabling cows, horses, goats, and sheep, and the (5) Drāviḍī amongst Draviḍas and the like." It will be observed that, in the text as we have it at present, there is no description of No. 6, the language of the Auḍras.

Prthvidhara prefaces his commentary on the Mṛcchakaṭikā with an account of the various dialects employed in the play. The whole will be found on pp. 494 ff. of Godabole's edition. I extract from it the following information, relevant to our subject. He begins by including Vibhāṣās under the general class of Apabhraṃśa, thus differing from the writers to be subsequently quoted. He says that there are four languages falling under the head of Apabhraṃśa, viz. Śākārī (*sic*), Cāṇḍālī, Śābarī, and that of the Ṭakka² country. As no Śābara appears in the play, no example of Śābarī is to be found in it. He then quotes Bharata xvii, 48, for a list of the Prakrits, and 49 for a list of the Apabhraṃśa dialects. The latter is given by him as follows, and this text is certainly, so far as the names go, more correct than that found in the Kāvya-mālā edition of Bharata:—

*ŚākārĀbhīra-Cāṇḍāla-Śābara-DrāviḍŌdra-jāḥ
hīnā vanē-carāṇām ca vibhāṣāḥ sapta kīrtitāḥ*

"There are seven base Vibhāṣās, viz. those born amid Śākāras, Abhīras, Cāṇḍālas, Śābaras, Drāviḍas, in Uḍra (Orissa), and that of Foresters." Vibhāṣās are languages

¹ Or *Pukkasa*, the offspring of a Niṣāda on a Śūdra woman. See Manu, x, 18.

² Godabole prints "Ḍhakka", but the alternative reading "Ṭakka" is that which should be adopted. See JRAS. 1913, pp. 882-3.

(*bhāṣāḥ*) of manifold sorts (*vividhāḥ*). They are “base”, because they are used by base characters. By “the language of Foresters” is meant the forms of speech collected under the head of “*Ṭakka-bhāṣā*”. In this play . . . among the speakers of *Apābhraṃśa*, the brother-in-law of the king (the *Śākāra*) speaks the *Śākārī* (*sic*) dialect. The two *Caṇḍālas* speak the *Caṇḍālī* (*sic*) dialect, and *Māthura*, the gambler, speaks the *Ṭakka* dialect. . . . In *Śākārī* (*sic*) and *Cāṇḍālī* (*sic*) the palatal *ś* is used [instead of *s* or *ṣ*], and *l* is used in place of *r*. In the *Ṭakka Vibhāṣā* the letter *v* [*ʔu*] is common [cf. *Mārk.* xvi, 3, below], and owing to the frequent employment of Sanskrit words, both dental *s* and palatal *ś* are found in it. [There is also the following verse about *Śākārī* :—]

*apārtham akramam vyartham punar-uktaṃ hatōpamam
lōka-nyāya-viruddham ca śākāra-vacanam viduḥ.*

“They know the language of the *Śākāra* as containing words without meaning, words used in wrong order or with wrong meanings, tautology, mangled similes, and as unidiomatic.”¹ They call a king’s left-handed brother-in-law “*Śākāra*”, because his language is full of the letter *ś* (*śa-kāra*).²

We have further information on the subject of the *Vibhāṣās* in the third *Śākhā*, or main section, of the *Prākṛta-kalpataru* of *Rāma-śarman* (*Tarkavāgiśa*). Our knowledge of this work is confined to the one very incorrect MS. (No. 1106) in the India Office Library. It is described at some length by Lassen (*Institutiones L. Pr.*, pp. 19 ff. and App.), but the section here devoted to the *Vibhāṣās* is vitiated by the fact that the corresponding leaves of the MS. are in the wrong order and wrongly numbered, and that this was not recognized by Lassen.³ His account of the *Vibhāṣās* on pp. 21 ff. and

¹ A very similar verse is given by *Mārkaṇḍēya*. See p. 503 below.

² Wrong. See S. Lévi, *Théâtre Indien*, p. 361.

³ The correct order of these pages of the MS. is 39b, 40b, 40a, 41a.

in App. 1 ff. is therefore quite incorrect. So far as I can make it out, the following should be the text of the passage. I give only the verses describing each dialect in general terms. The verses giving details are so doubtful in their readings that it would not be safe to attempt their emendation. This is of little consequence, as all that Rāma-śarman says is also said by Mārkaṇḍeya, with numerous examples, and the account of the latter will subsequently be given in full. As a preliminary, I give first, as well as I can make it out, the concluding verse of the second Śākhā, immediately preceding the account of the Vibhāsās. It deals with Dākṣiṇātya—a minor Prakrit dialect, not a Vibhāsā. This is requisite, as the dialect is referred to later on in this paper in connexion with Takkī. Unfortunately, the MS. is here very incorrect, with more than one scribal blunder, and with at least two lacunæ. My restoration is doubtful, though the sense, as testified by Mārkaṇḍeya, is certain. In order to show this, I also quote the corresponding passage of the latter. Rāma-śarman's metre is here the *Svāgatā* (— ◡ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ — —). Letters inserted to fill up lacunæ are enclosed in square brackets. Other emendations are not indicated.

*dākṣiṇ[āty]a-pada-samm[i]litaṃ yat
saṃskṛtādi-[kavi]bhīṣ churitaṃ ca
svādu-sāram (?) amṛtād api kāvyaṃ
dākṣiṇātyaṃ iti tat kathayanti.*

“They call a poem, sweeter in its essence even than nectar, intermingled with words of the South, and overlaid with Sanskrit [(?) by poets composing in that]¹ and other languages, ‘Dākṣiṇātya.’”

Mārkaṇḍeya (Comm. to xii, 38) says:—

No rule regarding Dākṣiṇātyā, and no example of it

¹ The use of *kavibhiḥ* here is awkward. What is wanted to fill the lacuna is some word meaning “words” rather than “poets”.

exists. All that we know about it is what is said by Niruddha-bhaṭṭa, viz. :—

*dākṣiṇātya-padālambi saṃskṛtāṅgam vijṛmbhitam
kāvyam pīyūṣa-niṣyandi dākṣiṇātyam itṛitam.*

“A nectar-dropping poem, which is manifested as having its body Sanskrit, but depending on words of the South, is called ‘Dākṣiṇātya’.”

From the above it is evident that Rāma-śarman’s verse is only a reproduction of Niruddha-bhaṭṭa’s in another metre.

We can now discuss the section of the Prākṛta-kalpataru dealing with the Vibhāṣās.

*Atō vibhāṣā navadhā niruktā[h]
Śākārikī prāg anuśisyatē ’tra
madādi-yuktō niravāci rājñah
śyālāḥ śakāraś capalō ’bhi-[? ’ti-]mūrkhah. 1.
śākārikī tasya vacō vibhāṣā
nind[yāgama-nyāya(?)]-kalādi-hīnā
asyās tu siddhiḥ khalu Māgadhītaḥ
ścō vātra duṣprēkṣa-sadrēkṣayōḥ syāt. 2.*

[After describing the Dākṣiṇātya, he goes on :—]

1. After this, the Vibhāṣās are defined as ninefold. Here Śākārikī is first taught. A Śakāra has been defined as the brother-in-law of a king, haughty and overweening, ill-mannered, and an exceeding fool.

2. The Śākārikī-vibhāṣā is the language used by him, vile, breaking the rules of grammatical construction, and void of elegance.¹ Its basis is to be found in Māgadhī.

[He then begins his description of the peculiarities of this Vibhāṣā :—In the words *duṣprēkṣa*- and *sadrēkṣa*-, *ścō* is

¹ There are some words here the reading of which is doubtful. They are evidently adjectives describing the dialect. Cf. Pṛthvidhara on *Mṛcchakaṭikā* (as quoted above). “Words are used having no meaning, in wrong order, in wrong meanings, with repetitions, and with confusion of metaphor.” The MS. appears to read *nindāgamanāyāśakalādi-hīnā*.

optionally (substituted for *kṣ*), and so on to the end of verse 9. Verse 10 is:—]

Cāṇḍalikêti *prathitā vibhāṣā*
pravakṣyātē cātra yathōpadēsam
ēṣā tu samsidhyati Śaurasēnī-
Māgadhy-upaśēṣa(sic)-vaśēna samyak. 10.

The Vibhāṣā, known as Cāṇḍalikī, will now be described as it has been taught. Correctly speaking, it is based partly on Śaurasēnī and partly on Māgadhi. [He then goes on to describe the peculiarities of this Vibhāṣā, ending with verse 15. He does not say who speaks it.]

athōcyātē samprati Śābarī yām
purōditā Māgadhi-kāva sūtē
aṅgārika-vyādha-vahitra-kāṣṭhō-
pajivinām vāci niyujyātē 'sau. 16.

Next, we proceed to describe Śābarī, which the formerly mentioned Māgadhi alone produces. It is employed in the language of charcoal-burners, hunters, (?) boatmen, and those who live by wood-cutting. [Mārkaṇḍeya, xv, 1, 2, says it is based on Cāṇḍālī, but sometimes goes back to the original Śaurasēnī and Māgadhi of that dialect.] [The author goes on to verse 21 with a description of this Vibhāṣā. He then says:—]

ēkāva sā Māgadhi-kātra bhāṣā
vibhidhyātē pātra¹-vibhēdatas tu
Ābhīrikā-Drāviḍikā *Āutkalī ca*
Vānaukasī-Māndurikēti *nāmnā.* 22.

Moreover, there is only the Māgadhi Bhāṣā already mentioned, but, according to the characters [employing it], it has been subdivided into different varieties, named respectively Ābhīrikā, Drāviḍikā, Āutkalī (or Audrī), the Speech of Foresters, and the Speech of Ostlers.

¹ The MS. has *dātra*, which, at a friend's suggestion, I have corrected to *pātra*.

*Ābhīrikāyām aparaṁ viśeṣaṁ
vadanti kēcit tam iha bravīmi
asyās tu siddhiḥ khalu Śābarītaḥ
śa-ṣau punar dantya-sa-kāra eva. 23.*

Some people say that there is another kind of Ābhīrikā, and that I now proceed to tell:—They say that it is to be derived from Śābarī, and that the letters ś and ṣ are to be pronounced as a dental s. [The author then, in verses 24–6, tells what other authorities say about this Vibhāṣā. He says nothing more about the other Vibhāṣās mentioned in verse 22. He then goes on:—]

*Ṭākkī vibhāṣāṁ khalu tām vadāmi
yā dyūtakārdḍika-dhūrta-vācyā
a[nyā] punar Drāviḍa-bhāṣayādi
praviśya[tē] yatra, na lakṣma tasyāḥ. 27.*

I now, forsooth, mention the Ṭākkī Vibhāṣā, which is to be spoken by gamblers and other knaves. Another kind [of Ṭākkī] is infected by Drāviḍa and other bhāṣās. It has no special characteristics. Cf. Mārkaṇḍeya, xvi, 2, below.

(The next half-verse is very corrupt. It seems to read as follows:—)

*syāt sakārāt Saṁskṛta-Śaurasēnyōs
tu siddhir asyād bahala padāntē.*

This I correct to:—

*syāt samkarāt Saṁskṛta-Śaurasēnyōs
tu siddhir, ut syād bahulam padāntē.*

This Vibhāṣā is formed from a mixture of Sanskrit and Śaurasēnī. It often has *u* at the end of a word. [This agrees with Mārkaṇḍeya xvi, 1, 3. In the rest of this verse, and in verses 29, 30, he gives further particulars of this Vibhāṣā, and then goes on:—]

*Śakārōdra-Draviḍādi-vācō
'pabhramśatām yadyapi samśrayanti
syān nātakādau yadi samprayōgō
nūntāsv apabhramśatayā tathēṣṭaḥ. 31.*

Although the languages of the Śākāra, of Udra (i.e. Ōdra), of Draviḍa, and of others approach the nature of Apabhraṃśa; nevertheless, if their use is in plays or in similar works, that use is not prescribed on the ground of their falling under the head of Apabhraṃśa. [This verse is quoted by Lassen (p. 21), and the reading *tathēṣṭah*, given above, is doubtful. Lassen reads *tathāṣā*, which he corrects to *tathāṣah*, but, whatever was intended, I do not think that his suggestion is borne out by the MS. A remark to the same effect is made by Mārkaṇḍeya in regard to Ṭakkī, as quoted below.]

This concludes Rāma-sarman's account of the Vibhāṣās. According to him there are nine, viz. :—

1. Śākārikī.	
2. Cāṇḍalikā.	
3. Śābarī.	
4. Ābhīrikā	} These five are only
forms of Māgadhi.
5. Drāviḍikā	
6. Autkalī or Audrī	
7. The Speech of Foresters	
8. The Speech of Ostlers	
9. Ṭakkī, which is liable to be mixed with Drāviḍikā.	

He adds that even if a Vibhāṣā can be classed as a form of Apabhraṃśa, it is a Vibhāṣā, and not an Apabhraṃśa, if it is employed in drama.

Our next authority is Mārkaṇḍeya Kavindra's *Prākṛta-sarvasva*. A good edition of this work has been published, and with the help of this and of five MSS. which are at my disposal, I am able to translate nearly the whole of the portions dealing with the Vibhāṣās.

In the commentary to verse 2 of the Introduction, the author quotes Bharata xvii, 49, as follows :—

*ŚākārĀbhīra-Cāṇḍāla-Śābara-DrāviḍĀudhrajāḥ*¹
hīnā vanēcarāṇām ca vibhāṣā nāṭakāśrayāḥ

¹ Sic. We should expect *Audrajāḥ*, but Mārkaṇḍeya, who was himself a native of Orissa, always spells it as above.

“The base speeches of the following people, and of foresters, are called ‘Vibhāṣās’, which appear only in dramatic works :—

Those borne amid—

1. Śākāra.
2. Abhira.
3. Cāṇḍāla.
4. Śābara.
5. Drāviḍa.
6. Auḍhra.”

He does not consider the language of Foresters as a distinct dialect, for, as we shall immediately see, he limits the number in this list to six.

He criticizes this list in the 4th verse, saying : “The real Vibhāṣās are not six, but only five in number, viz. Śākārī, Cāṇḍālī, Śābarī, Ābhīrī, and Ṭakkī.” In the commentary on this he says : “It is implied that Auḍhri is to be excluded, because its inherent character is to be found in that form of Śābarī which imitates the language of the Ōḍhra country.”¹ But, it will be objected, why is Drāviḍī excluded, and Ṭakkī substituted for it? Ṭakkī is included in accordance with the following verse :—

*Ṭakka-dēśīya-bhāṣāyām drśyatē Drāviḍī tathā
atrāṇvāyam viśeṣo ’sti Dravidēnādr̥tā param.*²

“Drāviḍī also is observed in the language of the Ṭakka country. Here there is only this peculiarity, that it is particularly honoured by the Draviḍa [? school of writers].” By thus declaring that the inherent character of Drāviḍī is to be found in Ṭakkī, we gather that the existence of Ṭakkī is established.

¹ It may be noted that at the present day there is a Muṇḍā language called Savara, spoken in the south of the Orissa country. See *Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. iv, pp. 217 ff.

² The same verse is quoted in the comm. to xvi, 2 ; but the second line runs :—

tatra cāyam viśeṣo ’sti Drāviḍair ādr̥tā param.

So far for his Introduction. He deals with each Vibhāṣā separately in Pādas xiii–xvi of his work, of which I now proceed to give a full translation:—

Here begin the Vibhāṣās. Accordingly, the first of all, the Śākārī is now taught.

xiii. Śākārī. मागध्याः शाकारी । १ ।

Śākārī is based on Māgadhi. This Śākārī is the language of a Śākāra.

*rājñō 'nūdhā¹-bhrātā śyālas tv aiśvarya-sampannaḥ
mada-mūrkhataābhimānī śākāra iti duṣkulīnaḥ syāt.*

“Possessed of pride, folly, and vanity, one of low family, raised (by the connexion) to power, the brother of the unmarried (concubine), and (in so far) the brother-in-law of a king, is called a Śākāra.”

Where there is no special rule, this dialect is to be considered to be the same as Māgadhi.

चस्य शो वा सदृचदुष्प्रेवे । २ ।

In the words *sadr̥kṣa-*, like, and *duṣprekṣa-*, difficult to behold, *kṣ* is optionally pronounced as *śc*. Thus [nom. sing.] *śaliścē*, *duppeścē*. On the other hand, we may also have the regular *śalicchē*, *duppecchē*.

चिण्टो टिचश् इत्येके । ३ ।

Instead of [the Māgadhi] *sciṇṭadi* [= *tiṣṭhati*, he stands],² according to some authorities, we have *yciśadi*. [Cf. xii, 7, 32, for the Mg. forms. By xii, 21, in Mg., *y* is prefixed to *c* and *j*.]

¹ All the MSS. are corrupt here, reading 'nūdhō. The reading 'nūdhā is vouched for by the *Sāhitya-darpana*, 81, from which the verse is quoted. The translation above is Ballantyne's.

² Passages in square brackets are not in the original, but are added by me. This includes all Sanskrit equivalents of Prakrit words or sentences.

त्यक्वौ क्वापि प्रकृत्यापि । ४ ।

The [Prakrit] conjuncts *tth* and *kkh* sometimes remain unchanged [instead of becoming *sth* and *sk*, as in *Māgadhi* (xii, 7, 4)]. Thus, *atthānagadē paṇḍidē via vakkhānāim kalēdi* [*arthānugataḥ paṇḍita iva vyākhyānāni karōti*], he explains like a Paṇḍit who understands the meaning [or possibly *arthānāgataḥ*, like a Paṇḍit who does not understand, or *āsthānagataḥ*, like a Paṇḍit in an assembly].

को बडलम् । ५ ।

The otiose suffix *-ka-* is common, as in *ēsukē dāsīkē puttakē* [*ēsa dāsyāḥ putrah*], this son of a slave-girl.

वर्णानां विकारलोपागमाश्च स्युः । ६ ।

Letters are often changed, elided, or added. Thus:—
ēsē maṇaśśē kavīṇō śaliścē [*ēsa manuṣyaḥ kavēḥ sadṛkṣaḥ* (xiii, 2)], this man is like a poet.

kāmēṇa ḍajjhadi khu mē haḍakē tavaśśi [*kāmēṇa dahyatē mē hrdayam tapasvī* (Mṛcch., Godabole, p. 26, l., 11)], my pitiable heart is burnt by love. [The printed text of the play gives slightly different readings.]

vibbhīsaṇē puliśē [*vibhīsaṇaḥ puruṣaḥ*], a blustering man. In these passages we should properly have *maṇaśśē*, *haḍakkē*, and *vihīsaṇē*.

सुप्तिङ्विभक्तिलिङ्गव्यत्यासाः स्वरविकर्षश्च । ७ ।

Declensional terminations are wrongly used, one for another, and so also conjugational terminations and genders. Vowels also are pulled apart [i.e. diphthongs are separated into their components]. Thus:—

(a) Confusion of declensional terminations:—

tumaṁ pattaṇaṁ ściṇṭa [*tvaṁ pattaṇaṁ* (accusative for locative) *tiṣṭha*], stay thou in the city; *hakkē ghalēṇa paśāmi* [*ahaṁ grhēṇa* (instrumental for accusative or locative) *praviśāmi*], I enter the house. [The same also occurs in *Māgadhi* (xii, 36).]

(b) Confusion of conjugational terminations :—

śē vi āśchanti [sō 'pi āgacchanti (3rd person plural for 3rd person singular)], he also comes ; *tumam pi āśchāmi* [*tvam api āgacchāmi* (1st person singular for 2nd person singular)], thou also comest ; *hakkē vi āśchaśi* [*aham api āgacchasi* (2nd pers. sg. for 1st)], I also come.

(c) Confusion of gender :—

savvē mahilā puliśē tti kilidam [*sarvē* (masculine plural for feminine plural) *mahilāḥ puruṣa* (for *puruṣāḥ*) *iti krīḍitam* (neuter singular for feminine plural)], all the women sported in the character of men ; *iśthikā haśidē* [*strī hasitaḥ* (masculine for feminine)], the woman laughed.

(d) Pulling apart of vowels :—

śaīlinī [for Mg. Pr. *śēlinī*, Skr. *svairinī*], a wanton woman ; *mīaīndō* [for Skr. *mṛgēndraḥ*], a lion ; *aśchāuhiṇī* [for Skr. *akṣauhiṇī*], a complete army.

लोपः सुपां क्वचित्स्यात् । ८ ।

Declensional terminations are sometimes dropped. Thus :—

ghala vaśaśi [*grhē* (here the termination of the locative is dropped) *vasaśi*], thou dwellest at home ; *phullanti puppha pādava-paridō mahukaṁ pianti bhamala-ulā* [*phullanti puspāni pādapa-paritō madhu pibanti bhramara-kulāni* (here the case termination of *puppha* has been dropped, and *kula-* is treated like a masculine)], the flowers around the shrubs bloom, and the swarms of bees sip nectar. Here, although the dropping and interchange of declensional terminations is also allowed in Māgadhi [by xii, 36], we gather, from the repetition of the rule, that [substitutions such as *vaśca-* for *vrkṣa-* and others enjoined by xii, 19 ff., do not apply to Śākārī, but that] only [the regular Māgadhi substitute, in which e.g. by xii, 4, Prakrit *kḥ* becomes *śk*, viz.] *luśka-*,

for Prakrit *rukṣha-*, Sanskrit *vrkṣa-*, and so on, is to be employed. [In other words, while the general rules for Māgadhi are to be followed, special rules laid down for special words are not to be followed.] Thus, we have in the Mṛcchakaṭa [sic] *palahuda-bhamalā lavanti luṣkē* [*parabhṛta-bhramarāḥ ruvanti vrkṣē*], the cuckoos and the bees sing in the trees. [Here *luṣkē* represents the Śaurasēni *rukṣhē*, with the regular Māgadhi change of *r* to *l* and of *kkh* to *śk*. According to Mārkaṇḍeya's grammatical system, the various forms of Māgadhi are derived, not from Sanskrit, but from Śaurasēni. The passage quoted does not occur in any of the Śākāri speeches in either Stenzler's or Godabole's edition of the Mṛcchakatikā.]

युक्तापूर्वा गुरुश्च न वा । ९ ।

Contrary to the rules of prosody, a vowel is optionally not long [by position] before a conjunct consonant, as in :—

ēśe kṣhu rāāi¹ vagghe vva sahāva-vīlē
[*ēṣa kṣhalu rājatē vyāghra iva svabhāva-vīrah*],

he, forsooth, by nature a hero, shines glorious like a tiger. [Here, the metre is *Vasantatilaka* (— — — — —), and] the *va* of the word *vagghe* must be scanned as short [although by the ordinary rules of prosody it is long by position]. •

Under the precept "*bahulam*", viz. that the rules of Prakrit grammar are not universal, but have exceptions, we account for such irregular forms as *paṅgaṇē ghalam* [Śaurasēni *paṅguṇō gharam*; Sanskrit *paṅgōr grham*], the house of the lame man, and others, which will be found each in its proper place as it occurs. Moreover :—

¹ The MSS. vary amidst *rāmpa*, *rāmpa*, *rāā*, and *rāmya*. All these, except *rāā*, are impossible in Prakrit. The printed edition suggests *rāāi*, which suits the metre and gives good sense. I therefore adopt it.

*vyartham tv apārtham punarukti-rūpi
 hatōpamam cāsadrśōpamam ca
 pratyakṣa-lōkādi-virōdhi cānya-
 nyāya-pratīpam ca śākāra-vākyam.*¹

“Containing words with wrong meanings or with no meanings, tautological, with mangled similes or with similes that are no similes at all, contradicting ocular evidence, convention, etc., and in other respects unidiomatic, is the speech of the Śākāra.” By “wrong meaning” is meant “not in agreement in sense with the words preceding or following”. “With no meaning” implies both words [with meaning] which when used together give no meaning, and also words altogether devoid of meaning. So also the Mahārṣi Bharata has said :—

*āgama-līṅga-vihīnam viparītaṁ nyāya-dēśa-kālādēh
 mada-mūrkhataḥbhīmānādyāśvayāt syāc chakāra-
 vacanam.*

“The speech of the Śākāra, owing to his power accompanied by pride, folly, and vanity, is wanting in signs of inflexion or gender, and is opposed to the idiom of country or period. [Cf. the quotation from the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* on p. 499 *ante*. I have not traced this verse in the printed editions of Bharata. The Śākāra is described in xxiv, 105 (*Kāvyamālā* ed.), and his gait in xiii, 147 (Grosset, cf. *Kāvyamālā* ed., xii, 130).] Merely as examples, the following are quoted :—

[Much of what follows is quite incomprehensible to me, and even where I attempt to give Sanskrit equivalents to the Prakrit, I do so only with great hesitation. In the first place, as we shall see from the various readings,²

¹ Compare the similar verse quoted by Pṛthivīdhara, p. 492 *ante*.

² My authorities for the text are as follows :—P. is the text printed in Vizagapatam in 1912. O. is a MS. written in the Oriyā character, which has been kindly lent to me by Paṇḍit Sadāśiva Miśra, of Puri. Hn. and Hb. are two independent copies, in the Nāgarī and Bengali

the text is far from certain, and in the second place the language is designedly incorrect and intended to be more or less nonsense. Even if the text were certainly established, there would still, therefore, be the widest room for conjecture, for Mārkaṇḍēya has given no clue as to what he intended the meaning to be. Moreover, there is no context to guide us. The passages evidently come from some dramatic work which I have failed to identify. Other extracts, apparently from the same play, occur in the preceding sūtras. One passage, quoted in sūtra 6, does occur in the Mṛcchakaṭikā, but in sūtra 8 another, stated by Mārkaṇḍēya to come from that play, has not been found in either of the printed editions consulted by me. Before giving these samples of the speech of the Śakāra, I must here express my acknowledgments to Dr. Thomas and to Dr. Barnett, who have given me much kind help in my endeavours to elucidate the many difficulties that have presented themselves.*]

1. *hakkē paṅgukē paggalē¹ vaṇṇami ṇaṁ vandēmi* [*aham paṅgur vātulaḥ; vaṇṇē ṇaṁ vandē*], I am lame and (?) mad; I extol him in a hymn.

[¹ P. inserts here *vaṇṇadhā atthikē*, which is not authorized by any of my MSS. P. also marks the whole with a query. I cannot equate *paggalē* with any Sanskrit word. *Pudgala* suggests itself, but the meaning is hardly suitable. The reading is borne out by all MSS. I suggest that it is a Dēśya word connected with the Hindi *pāgal*, mad, the derivation of which is unknown. I take

characters respectively, of the MS. No. 1555 in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. They have been kindly lent to me by Dr. Hoernle. Ox. is the Bodleian Wilson MS. No. 158b. Io. is the India Office Mackenzie, No. 70. Ox. and Io. are both written in the Nāgari character, and are both evidently copies of the same original.

* As I am at present engaged on the preparation of a critical edition of Mārkaṇḍēya's grammar, I shall be grateful to any reader who may suggest, either in the pages of the Journal or to me direct, explanations of these difficult passages.

vaṇṇami as intended for *vaṇṇammi* [Skr. *varṇē*], in the sense of *gīta-kramē*].

2. *laṅgē talaṅgē śakalaṅkalīṅgē*¹ [*raṅgēt taraṅgaḥ sakalaṅkalīṅgaḥ*], let the wave, accompanied by the moon, toss.

[¹ P. separates *śakalaṁ kalīṅgē*. The words seem to me to make better sense, as written above. *Kalaṅka-līṅgaḥ*, he whose distinguishing marks are dark spots, = the moon. The MSS., of course, do not separate any words.]

3. *ēṣā pāśakaśāsīkā*¹ *maśakikā makḥōśīkā sāṇīkā*² (?).

[¹ O. -*sāṇīkā*. ² P. *māśīkā*, O. *sāṇīkā* or *śāsīkā*. Others *sāṇīkā*. The word-division is that of P. I do not venture to give a Sanskrit equivalent or translation of this passage. It seems to be equivalent at the beginning to *ēṣā pāśakaśāsīkā*. Numerous conjectures can be, and have been, made for the rest.]

4. *udḍenti ēṣē gaganē mahāgaā*¹

*luskēśu bukkanti*² *pulāṇamaścā*.

[*udḍīyante ēṣē gaganē mahāgaājāḥ, vṛkṣēṣu bukkanti purāṇa-matsyāḥ*], these great elephants are flying in the sky, and old fishes are howling in the trees.

[¹ So P. All others *mahāṇa* (= *asmākam*), which, if the metre is *Indravajrā*, suits the verse better, but gives little sense. The employment of *mahāgaā* gives one short syllable too many. If, however, we read the first syllable of *udḍenti* short, as we are entitled to do by sūtra 9, the first line becomes a *Vamśastha*, and is correct with *mahāgaā*. The two lines then become *upajāti*. ² So P.; O. Hnb. *dukkadri* or (Hnb.) *°dri*. Ox. *vakaḍi*, Io. *bukadri*.]

5. *alēlē puggalē*¹ *puggaē*² *ścayāgga*³ *idha ṇugga idō*⁴ *yaggudha*⁵ *śugēṇa*⁶ *geṇhaśu geṇha*⁷ (?).

[Here, again, I do not venture to give a Sanskrit equivalent or translation. The text, as given above, is

simply a copy of P. ¹ O. Hnb. *alēālē yuggalē*. ² O. *yuggaē*, Hnb. *yugmaē*. P. Ox. Io. as above. ³ O. *śyaycāgga* (?), Hnb. *śahayugma*, Ox. *ścapgugga* (?), P. Io. as above. ⁴ O. Ox. Io. *idhatyuggaīdō*, Hnb. *vetyīggaīdō*. ⁵ O. Io. *yjaggadha*, P. Ox. *yaggadha*, Hnb. *yugmadha*. ⁶ P. Ox. Io. *śugēṇa*. O. either *śugēṇa* or *śucōṇa* (not clear), Hnb. *śucōṇa*. ⁷ O. *geṇhaśuggēṇa*, Hnb. *geṇhaśugmēṇa*, Ox. Io. *geṇhaśugēṇa*.]

6. *ēdē*¹ *ōṇa*² *kulaṃgamahahaliṇā*³ *gaanē*⁴ *pajjalamti*⁵ [*ētē punaḥ kuraṅga-mahāharinaḥ gaganē prajvalanti*], but these antelopes and great deer shine forth in the sky.

[¹ Hn. *tradō*, Hb. *ēdō*. ² P. *uṇa*. ³ P. O. Hnb. *mahaliṇā*. Ox. Io. as above. ⁴ Ox. Io. *gaṇē*. ⁵ O. Hnb. *ajjalitti*, Ox. Io. *ajjalamti*.]

7. *hakkē paṇḍidē*, *ṇaṇṇa yjāṇamī*,¹ *śaddam*² *kadhēmi*, *śaddam*² *pucchāmi* [*aham paṇḍitaḥ, ndnyaj jānāmi śabdam kathayāmi, śabdam pucchāmi*], I am a paṇḍit, I know nothing else, I speak a word, I ask a word.

[¹ P. *śaddam yjōāmi*, O. *ṇaṇṇaṇayjāṇamī*, Hnb. *ṇaṇṇa-ymāṇamī*, Ox. *ṇaṇṇamṇayāṇamī*, Io. *ṇaṇṇamīyāṇamī*. ² Hnb. *śabdam*.]

In the above examples [the various irregularities] are to be understood as each occurs. [That is to say, no general rules can be laid down, and as each irregularity is met with it must be disposed of on its own merits.]

Now begins Cāṇḍālī.

xiv. Cāṇḍālī.

चाण्डाली मागधीशौरसेनीभ्यां प्रायशो भवेत् । १ ।

Cāṇḍālī is generally based on Māgadhī and Śaurasēnī. Thus, *ēśē ycolē sūlam ālōvidum lāinā ānaśtē* [*ēśa cōraḥ sūlam ārōpayitum rājñādjñaptaḥ*], this thief has been ordered by the king to be impaled.

गौरवे संबोधने सावत ओत्वं विधीयते । २ ।

In respectful address, the vocative of *a*-bases ends in *ō*. Thus, *ayjō bhaṣṭālakō, hakkē paṇamāmi* [*ārya bhaṭṭāraka, aham paṇamāmi*], noble sir, I bow.

असंबुद्धौ च कोऽप्याह । ३ ।

Also, according to Bhagīratha-vardhamāna, the same termination is used in the nominative singular of *a*-bases. Here there is no question of respect. Thus, *ēśō puliśō* [*ēṣa puruṣaḥ*], this man. From the use of the word *ca*, and, in the sūtra, we gather that the Māgadhi terminations *i* and *ē* [xii, 26] may also be used.

जस एत्थात्स्त्रियामपि । ४ ।

This refers only to pronouns and the like. The nominative plural of pronouns ends in *ē*, whether masculine or feminine. Thus, *yjē iṣṭhikā* [*yāḥ striyaḥ*], what women ; *yjē puliśā* [*yē puruṣāḥ*], what men.

डसः शः स्यात् । ५ ।

The termination of the genitive singular feminine is *śa*, not *i*, *ē*, *a*, or *ā* [as ordained by v, 28]. [In other words it is the same as in the masculine.] Thus, [just as we have in the masculine] *aggiśśa śihākā* [*agnēḥ śikhā*], a flame of fire, [so we have in the feminine] *buddhiśśa vadḍhimā* [*buddhēr vṛddhiḥ*], an increase of wisdom.

म्मिश्च डेः स्यात् । ६ ।

The locative singular ends in *mmi*, as well as in *ē*. Thus, *ghalammi* or *ghalē* [*grhē*], in a house ; *vaṇammi* [*vanē*], in the forest.

टुट्ठोपरि न शः क्वचित् ॥ ७ ॥

[In Māgadhi, Śaurasēni *ṭṭ* and *ṭṭh* become *ṣṭ* and *ṣṭh* respectively (xii, 7).] This sometimes does not occur in Cāṇḍālī. Thus, *peṭṭam pūlēsi kaṭṭhēna* [*pēṭam pūrayasi kaṣṭēna*], thou fillest the bag with difficulty.

क्व इत्रः स्यात् । ८ ।

The only termination of the gerundive is *ia*. Thus, *alalē kukkulaṁ genhīa āśca* [*arē-rē kukkuraṁ grhītvā-gaccha*], hulloa ! bring the dog here.

इह प्रायो ग्राम्यशब्दार्थपार्थवम् । ९ ।

In Cāṇḍālī there is a wide use of rustic words and meanings. Thus, *ayja maē maśāṇē hiṇḍantēṇa mahantē kaṇṇari kaṇaa-khaṇḍakē laddhē. Taṁ haśkē vikkiṇia maddham kiṇia peṭṭam pūlaiśśam* [*adya mayā śmaśāṇē hiṇḍamānēna mahān kaṇṇakaḥ* (for *kaṇṇikā*) *kanaka-khaṇḍakō labdhah. tad aham vikrīya mādhvam krītvā peṭam pūrayiṣyāmi*], to-day, while walking about in the cemetery, I found a large piece of gold, an earring. I shall sell it, and, having bought sweetmeats, fill my bag with them.

In this dialect, as in Śākārī [xiii, 7], we find elisions of declensional terminations and interchange of cases, etc.

Now begins Śābarī.

xv. Śābarī. चाण्डाव्याः शाबरीसिद्धिः । १ ।

Śābarī is based on Cāṇḍālī.

तन्मूलेभ्यः क्वचित्क्वचित् । २ ।

And sometimes it is based directly on Śaurasēni and Māgadhi, on which Cāṇḍālī itself is based.

अतः सावेदितौ च । ३ ।

The nominative singular of *a*-bases, whether masculine or neuter, ends in *ē* or *i*. Thus, *māṇuṣi* or *māṇuṣē* [*mānuṣah*], a man; *vaṇi* or *vaṇē* [*vanam*], a forest. From the use of the word *ca*, and, in the sūtra, we gather that we may also have the Prakritic forms *māṇuṣō* and *vaṇam*.

आत्स्यात्संबुद्धौ गौरवे सदा । ४ ।

The respectful vocative always ends in *ā* [and not in *ō*, as in Cāṇḍālī]. Thus, *ajjā vandāmi* [*ārya, vandē*], Sir,

I offer reverence. But when not respectful, we have *ēhi*, *lē ycelakē*, *ēhi* [*ēhi*, *rē cēṭaka*, *ēhi*], come, O servant, come.

हके स्यादहमित्यर्थे । ५ ।

The only form of the pronoun of the 1st person is *hakē*, as in *hakē āaē* [*aham āgataḥ*], I am come.

भवेतामिहिमी च ऊः । ६ ।

For the locative singular, besides the usual *ē*, we may have the termination *i* or the termination *him*. Thus, *vaṇi* (or *vaṇahim* or *vaṇē*) *gaccha* [*vaṇē gaccha*], go into the forest.

केरके केन्नको वा स्यात् । ७ ।

For the genitival suffix *kēraka-* we may optionally substitute *kēaka-*. Thus, *amha-kēakam* (or *amha-kēlakam*) *dhanam* [*asmadīyam dhanam*], our wealth.

सर्वमन्यत्तु पूर्ववत् । ८ ।

In other respects Śābarī is like the preceding Vibhāṣās. Thus it elides declensional terminations, interchanges cases, changes, elides, or inserts letters, and employs rustic expressions.

Audhri. शाबर्यामिवौद्री योगात्तद्देशशौरसेन्यादेः । ९ ।

If we add local words of the Ōdhra country and of Śaurasēnī, etc., to Śābarī, and only to Śābarī, we get the Audhri dialect.¹ Thus, [metre *Dōhā*]—

dēva jasōdānandana kara māi karuṇā-lēśa
ettikē jamaūacchaūi piṭṭai savva-kilēśa.

[*dēva, yaśōdā-nandana, kuru mayi karuṇā-lēśam*
*ihatyaḥ janmataḥ asmi iti (?)*² *pīdayati sarva-klēśaḥ.*]

“O divine son of Yaśōdā, pity me a little; as a result of birth I am a dweller in this world, and therefore every kind of misery tortures me.”

¹ Regarding the spelling of the word *Audhri*, see footnote on p. 497.

² The Sanskrit equivalent of *jamaūacchaūi* is very doubtful. What is given here has been suggested to me by a friend to whom I submitted the passage.

Ābhīrī. आभीर्यथेवं स्यात् त्क इच्च उच्चो नात्यपभ्रंशः । १० ।

Ābhīrī also is the same as Śābarī, except that the gerundive ends in *ia* or *ua*, and that it is not very corrupt. Thus, *gaścia* or *gadua* [*gatvā*], having gone; *paḍhia* or *paḍhua* [*paṭhitvā*], having read.

Now begins Ṭakkī.

xvi. **Ṭakkī.** टाक्की स्यात्संस्कृतं शौरसेनी चान्योन्यमिश्रिते । १ ।

Ṭakkī is a mutual mixture of Sanskrit and Śaurasēnī. It is the language of gamesters, merchants, and others of the sort. Thus, it is said:—

*prayujyatē nāṭakādaṁ dyūtādi-vyavahāribhiḥ
vaṇigbhir hīna-dēhaiś ca tad āhuḥ ṭakka-bhāṣitam.*

“The speech of Ṭakka is that which is employed in plays and the like by professional gamblers and by merchants of lowly position.”

Moreover:—

हरिश्चन्द्रस्त्रिमां भाषामपभ्रंश इतीच्छति ।

अपभ्रंशो हि विद्वज्जिर्नाटकादौ प्रयुज्यते ॥ २ ॥

But Hariścandra considers this to be an Apabhraṁśa, because [as he maintains] Apabhraṁśa is used by the skilled in dramatic compositions. People consider this as referring to Drāviḍī also. For it is said:—

*ṭakka-dēśīya-bhāṣāyām drśyatē Drāviḍī tathā
tatra cāyam viśeṣō 'sti Drāviḍair ādrtā param.*

“Drāviḍī appears also in the language of the Ṭakka country. Its specialty in this respect is that it is particularly honoured by Drāviḍas.”¹

उत्थात्पदान्ते वज्रलम् । ३ ।

The vowel *u* is in many cases added at the end of a word, but not always. [This is the ordinary termination in Apabhraṁśa of the nominative singular of *a*-bases.] Thus:—

¹ Cf. another version of these lines on p. 498.

rāu asama-samarāṅka-mallu
maṇa-maṇōhara-dēha-sōhu
sakala-śāstrāstra-vidyā-pravīṇu
 [*rājā asama-samarāṅka-mallah*
madana-manōhara-dēha-śōbhah
sakala-śāstrāstra-vidyā-pravīṇah].

“ A king, an unequalled champion in the fight, illustrious with a form as beautiful as that of the god of love, skilled with knowledge of every arm and weapon.”

As this termination is “not always” added, we have *bhaṇai vāṇi kavirāa* [not *kavirāu*] [*bhaṇati vāṇīm kavirājah*], the poet laureate utters poetry.

ए च टः । ४ ।

The termination of the instrumental singular is also *ē*, as in *khaggē* (or *khaggēṇa*) *paharasi* [*khadgēṇa praharasi*], thou smitest with a sword.

हं ऊमौ भ्यसः । ५ ।

The termination of the dative-ablative plural is *ham* or *hum*. Thus, *rukkhaham paḍidu* [*vrkṣēbhyaḥ patitah*], fallen from the trees; *gharahum calidu* [*grhēbhyaś calitah*], gone from the houses. By the precept *bahulam*, “not always,” we also may have *rukkhāhimtō*, *gharēsūmtō*.

आमो वा । ३ ।

The same terminations may optionally be used for the genitive plural, as in *bamhaṇaham* (or *bamhaṇahum* or *bamhaṇānam*) *dhaṇu* [*brāhmaṇānām dhanam*], the wealth of the Brāhmaṇas.

हं किमादेः स्थात्प्राग्दीर्घश्च विधीयते । ७ ।

In the case of *kim* and other [pronouns], this optional termination, *ham*, of the genitive plural has the penultimate vowel lengthened. Thus, *kāham* [*kēṣām*], of whom? *jāham* [*yēṣām*], of whom; *tāham* [*tēṣām*], of them; *ēdāham* [*ētēṣām*], of these; *imāham* [*ēṣām*], of these; where we also may have *kānam*, *jānam*, and so on.

त्वमित्यर्थे तुङ्ग भवेत् । ८ ।

The pronoun of the 2nd person is *tunga*, as in *tunga sarva-vidyā-pravīṇu* [*tvam sarva-vidyā-pravīṇah*], thou art skilled in all knowledge.

अहमर्थे ऽम्मिङ्ममाः । ९ ।

The 1st personal pronoun is *ammi*, *hum*, or *mama*. Thus, *ammi* (*hum* or *mama*) *paṇḍidu* [*aham paṇḍitaḥ*], I am a learned man.

ममेत्यर्थे मङ्गं च स्यात् । १० ।

The genitive of this pronoun of the 1st person may be *mahum*, as well as [the regular] *mama*. Thus *mahum* (or *mama*) *gharu sundaru* [*mama gṛham sundaram*], my house is beautiful.

यथा जिघ । ११ ।

The word *yathā* becomes *jidha*, as well as the regular *jahā*. Thus, *jidha* (or *jahā*) *bhaṇasi* [*yathā bhaṇasi*], as thou sayest.

तथा तिघ । १२ ।

Similarly *tathā*, so, becomes *tidha*, as well as *tahā*.

दिङ्मात्रमुक्तमन्त्रेयं शेषं शिष्टप्रयोगतः । १३ ।

What has been said is [to be taken as] a mere indication [of the general character of the dialect]. The rest is to be learnt from the practice of good writers.

With this, Mārkaṇḍeya's account of the Vibhāṣās is concluded. It will be observed that he says that Tākki is the same as the Drāviḍi Vibhāṣā. This can only mean that Drāviḍi is an Indo-Aryan, not a Dravidian, language. In another part of his Grammar he mentions several forms of Apabhraṁśa with names, such as Kāliṅgī, Kārṇāṭī, or Pāṇḍyā, which led Pischel (Gram., § 4) to assume that the term "Apabhraṁśa" included vernaculars of non-Aryan origin ; but I have shown (JRAS. 1913, pp. 875 ff.)

that he is mistaken in this conclusion, and that such terms indicate merely the various forms taken by standard Apabhraṃśa when spoken as a second language in Dravidian countries, much as the modern Hindōstānī of the Deccan differs from that spoken in Lucknow. Mārkaṇḍēya's account of the Drāviḍi Vibhāṣā is evidently much to the same effect. He says that Ṭakkī is called Drāviḍi because it is much honoured by Drāviḍas. It is therefore important to ascertain exactly what Ṭakkī is. He describes it as the language of the Ṭakka country in the northern Panjāb, but he cannot mean that it was not spoken anywhere else. On the stage, which pretends to represent actual conditions, it was allotted, not to natives of that country, but to members of certain professions, whatever their nationality. This gives a clue towards understanding the statement that it was honoured by Drāviḍas, and an explanation will be found if we consider the nature of the language. In the first place, it is said to have been the language of professional gamesters and of small merchants. These were just the two great classes of the population whose business would take them far from their homes, and who possessed a certain amount of education. Reputable or not, they belonged to what we should call the middle classes. Fairly well-to-do, in pursuit of their callings, they went about, using what must have been the current colloquial of the Aryan semi-gentility of the greater part of India. The nature of the language showed that this was exactly the position that it was suited to fill. It was a mixture of Śaurasēnī and Sanskrit, with a touch of Apabhraṃśa. Of all the Prakrits, Śaurasēnī was that which was most closely allied in its grammar to Sanskrit, and which was cumbered with the fewest *dēśya*, or local, vulgar words. These semi-genteel folk, to show off the smattering of education that they had received, would interlard this Prakrit with as many *tatsamas*, or Sanskrit words, as

they could remember, and would occasionally, by a lapse of dignity, drop into the Apabhraṃśa of the common folk. We learn from the grammarians that the people of the Takka country, which included within its borders the important city of Śākala and which was not far to the west of Śūrasēna, used this Sanskritized Śaurasēnī as their vernacular; but this by no means meant that it was not also current elsewhere, although this semi-genteel language, in the mouths of people who had never in their lives been near Takka, thus acquired the name of Tākki.

Amongst the people who spoke Tākki, other than the Takkas and the professional classes just mentioned, the Drāviḍas are mentioned as especially affecting it. Why was their preference so marked? This question leads us to the consideration of another very similar language also spoken in southern India—the Dākṣiṇātyā, described *ante* on pp. 493 ff. This is not classed as a Vibhāṣā, but as a variety of Māgadhi Prakrit. As a fact, it bears to that Prakrit very much the same relation that Tākki bears to Śaurasēnī. The only real points of difference are that it does not occasionally drop into Apabhraṃśa, and that it is not a Vibhāṣā, because it is used in poetry, not in the drama. It is not a character-dialect, and, instead of using Apabhraṃśa forms, it ekes out its vocabulary with the help of southern words, while at the same time, like Tākki, it is largely influenced by Sanskrit. We thus have two Aryan languages spoken in southern India—one based on Māgadhi, and used in poetry, and the other based on Śaurasēnī, and used as a favourite *lingua franca*. Both were there foreign languages, one of polite literature and the other of travellers. All this time Sanskrit was the learned language of the educated and of literature, and Dravidians, when speaking an Aryan language, would naturally endeavour to approach it as nearly as possible. It is for this reason that we find them, as Mārkaṇḍeya's authority says, specially honouring

Takkī. It was a comparatively high form of Prakrit, and was much mixed with Sanskrit words.

We can now return to the meaning of the word "Vibhāṣā". We have seen that, as a technical term of grammar, it meant "option", and this, to a certain extent, indicates the meaning of the word as applied to dialects. A Vibhāṣā is an optional form of a standard dialect used for certain purposes. It is "optional" because, while certain peculiarities are laid down for each, these peculiarities are not necessarily always in evidence, and, except in a few special cases, the standard forms may always be used in their place. Each Vibhāṣā is more or less a mixed form of speech, in which the extent of the mixture fluctuates. As Pṛthvīdhara says, it is a language "of manifold sorts". It is unnecessary to give particular instances. Anyone who reads through Mārkaṇḍēya's account will acknowledge that this is the general character.

But this by no means exhausts the ideas connoted by the word. The preposition *vi* has many meanings. One of these, when it is prefixed to a noun, is impropriety, as in *vi-janman-*, of base birth. The same idea is also present in the word *vi-bhāṣā*. It is expressly declared to be a *hīnā*, or base, language. This meaning of Vibhāṣā is not given in any of the dictionaries, Indian or European, that I have consulted, but I have no hesitation in considering that, like that of option, it also underlies the use of the word.¹

Further, a Vibhāṣā is not a literary dialect. It is presented only in plays, and there only in connexion with particular characters. It is, in short, a character-dialect of the stage—corresponding to the mangled

¹ Another meaning of *vi* has been suggested to me, which may also influence the connotation of the word as indicating a form of Prakrit. *Vi-bhāṣā* may mean "a minor *bhāṣā*", in accordance with the use of *bhāva* and *vibhāva* in rhetoric.

language used on our stage by, say, a drunken man, a peasant, or a foreigner. When the French hero of "Ici on parle Français" says, "Sare, I vill box your eye", he is talking Vibhāṣā. It is not a dialect in the strict sense of the term, for it is not the local form of speech used in any particular part of the country, but is more of an argot, without being exactly slang.

A Vibhāṣā differs from Apabhraṃśa in not being a literary language. The boundary between the two is fluctuating. For instance, we have seen that Hariścandra would class Ṭakkī as an Apabhraṃśa. His argument seems to be that Ṭakkī has the character of Apabhraṃśa [compare the nominative singular in *u*], and that to maintain that it is a Vibhāṣā because it appears only in plays is irrelevant, for Apabhraṃśa is also used in plays. Probably, at the back of his mind was the fact that, although in the drama Ṭakkī is a character-dialect, outside the theatre it was widely used as a *lingua franca*, and therefore should be classed as a form of Apabhraṃśa. Mārkaṇḍeya so far agrees with Hariścandra as to admit the existence also of a Ṭakka Apabhraṃśa, just as he admits that of Audhra, Ābhira, and Drāviḍa forms of Apabhraṃśa. As I have shown elsewhere (JRAS. 1913, pp. 875 ff.), these names do not indicate the vernaculars of the countries referred to. They indicate merely the slight changes occurring in the language of speakers of standard Apabhraṃśa who happen to be living in those countries. They are not character-dialects, like the Vibhāṣās, but local deviations from a standard, similar, as I have said, to the Deccan variety of Hindōstānī. Hence, though the names may be the same, it does not follow that they are identical with the corresponding Vibhāṣās.

Finally, Vibhāṣās fall into two classes. One is composed of Śākārī, Cāṇḍālī, Śābarī, Audhrī, and Ābhīrī. These are all degradations—levellings down—of Māgadhī,

or of Saurasēnī, or of both. They are spoken by uneducated persons, who are represented as despicable, or else as of some despised caste. The other division consists of Ṭakkī (including Drāviḍī). So far from this being a degraded form of speech, it represents a levelling up. Its speakers are semi-educated people, who are trying to "talk fine". If they occasionally drop into vulgar idioms, it is due to their want of education, not to their intention.

To sum up. A Vibhāṣā is a corrupt form of one or more standard Prakrit dialects, which is used only in stage-plays, and is there allotted to special characters. The corruption may be either down-grade or up-grade, and may consist in solecisms, or in a mixture of dialects, but in every case it is represented on the stage as a corruption personal to the speaker, and nothing more.