

## Prolegomena to the analysis of *deśī* words in Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*

Andrea Drocco

The purpose of the present paper is to offer the necessary theoretical and methodological considerations for undertaking the analysis of the typology of the *deśī* class of Prakrit words starting from Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*, the most important lexicon, and almost the sole one, dealing with these specific words. The issues concerned the *deśī* words in Prakrit, as well as *tatsama* and *tadbhava* words, will be illustrated and analysed beginning with offering a review of the various scholars' position on this topic. At the same time, and this is the main goal of the paper, the typology of *deśī* words will be investigated, this in order to understand how the heterogeneity of this specific class of Prakrit words is constructed. In this manner, we will have the opportunity to see that the scope of the tripartite classification of Prakrit words in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* is to give a tool in the hands of Indian medieval authors for comparing/understanding and/or for teaching the words used in Prakrit by means of Sanskrit words. Thanks to the proposed analysis, we will have a clearer idea of what Prakrit really was and how the perspective on considering it changed at the beginning of the first millennium in India.

**Keywords:** Prakrit, *tadbhava*, *deśī*, Hemacandra, *Deśināmamālā*, lexicography.

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

During the second stage of development of the Indo-Aryan (IA) languages, normally known as Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA) and lasting around sixteen centuries (c. 600 BCE-1000 CE),<sup>2</sup> we can witness a number

<sup>1</sup> This paper is the English and totally revised and updated version of Drocco (2006), in Italian.

<sup>2</sup> Chatterji (1926: 17-20; 1960) divides the whole MIA period into four stages:

1. a first stage (600-200 BCE), represented by the MIA administrative language of the Aśoka edicts and by the language of the Theravāda Buddhist canon (Pāli);
2. a second stage (200 BCE-200 CE), understood as transitional and represented by the inscriptions composed in MIA language varieties and written in the Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī scripts;
3. a third stage (200-600 CE), represented by Prakrit (i.e. Mahārāṣṭrī) and Prakrit varieties (i.e. Śaurasenī, Māgadhī, Paisācī) used in dramatic literature and by the Ardhamāgadhī variety of the Jain Canon; and

of linguistic varieties being adopted as religious, administrative, scholarly and literary vehicles. In particular, certain varieties of MIA were chosen as religious languages for the canonical and extra-canonical Buddhist and Jain texts (cf. Pischel 1965: 11-25; Norman 1993; Ghatage 1996-: Vol. I, \*1-\*25, i-xxxiii). Other varieties were chosen as administrative languages for the court in some of the most important Indian kingdoms in the period just before and immediately after the beginning of the Christian era (Lienhard 1984: 82-83; Deshpande 1993: 15, 92; Ollett 2017) and thus can be seen used in the texts of some of the edicts and inscriptions found in a number of places across the Indian sub-continent (Hultzsch 1924; Mehendale 1948; Bloch 1950; Salomon 1998). Lastly, some varieties are known for their particular use in works that form part of Indian *kāvya* literature and classical drama (Katre 1964; Lienhard 1984; Boccali 2000).

While it is correct to say that some of these MIA varieties, and their corresponding textual traditions, were strongly influenced by Sanskrit, it is also true that some others—especially those whereby the large number of Jain MIA works has been composed—constitute an interesting source for the study of the linguistic peculiarities that substantially deviate from those forms normally considered as ‘close’ to the Sanskrit language. Interestingly, only the latter are described in grammars pertaining to one of these varieties, thus attributing to at least one of them the status of standard form (Bhayani 1988e: 155, 1988f: 219-222; Balbir 1989; Bhayani 1998b: 13, 23). As I will have the opportunity to show, this variety, and only this, is called ‘Prakrit’ by Prakrit grammarians and Prakrit/Sanskrit authors of rhetorical treatises. Traditionally, the anomalies of Prakrit that are not ‘close’ to Sanskrit are referred to as *deśī/deśya/deśaja* (hereafter simply *deśī*). They have been explained on the basis that the language of certain works is heavily characterized by a tendency to absorb words, forms and uses from the many spoken dialects (cf., for example, Alsdorf 1935-1937; Balbir 1989), which is exactly the situation with the texts written, especially, by the Jain authors. Consequently, these particular MIA texts—probably because they are dedicated to a broader audience—offer an unparalleled source for knowledge and insight into the *deśī* lexical material attested in Prakrit (Bhayani 1988e, 1988f, 1998a, 1998b; cf. also Salomon 1989: 285).<sup>3</sup>

---

4. a fourth stage (600-1000 CE), represented by the various forms of Apabhraṃśa. Masica (1991) adds as well to the second stage the MIA language of the Ceylon inscriptions and that linguistic variety known as ‘hybrid Buddhist Sanskrit,’ “[...] a Middle Indo-Aryan dialect in Sanskrit garb, vehicle of Mahayana Buddhist literature [...]” (Masica 1991: 52-53).

<sup>3</sup> I called here, provisionally, *deśī* the lexical material of the varieties of literary MIA other than Prakrit, even though, strictly speaking, this category of words is functional only for Prakrit. As regards the abundant use of non-standard vocabulary in Jain Sanskrit, a particular form of Sanskrit considerably influenced by literary MIA, see Sandesara and Thaker (1962).

As for the meaning and use of the term *deśī* in first millennium India, it is certainly true that Bühler's (ed.) (1878) acute, and in many respects pioneering, argumentations and recent works help us to improve our understanding of what this and other technical terms mean in the context of Prakrit grammatical tradition.<sup>4</sup> However, many aspects still remain to be studied regarding Prakrit *deśī* words. Among the most important I can mention:

1. the typology of *deśī* words;
2. the correct classification of a word as *tatsama* or *tadbhava*, originally reported in a Prakrit text and then used in a Sanskrit one, thus the biunivocal—and not univocal as normally thought<sup>5</sup>—relationship and influence between Sanskrit and Prakrit in pre-modern India (cf. Bubenik 1998, 2011; Kulikov 2013; Houben 2018);
3. the correct spelling and meaning of *deśī* words in different Prakrit texts;<sup>6</sup>
4. the possible evolution of *deśī* words in New Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages, with all the aspects related to the reasons of their evolution in some languages but not in others.

Therefore, as far as the points just listed are concerned, it is correct to argue that the Prakrit *deśī* class of words is partly an unexplored area of study. This can be the result of the fact that this kind of Prakrit words constitute still a complicated area of research. Indeed, despite their importance, since the observations of Bühler (ed.) (1878), Pischel (1877-80, 1880), Beames (1872-79), Hoernle (1880), and Bhandarkar (1914), to name only the best known, these words have been scarcely studied (Bhayani 1988a, 1998e: 143). Bhayani's work (1988a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1998f) represents an important exception in this respect, at least as regards point 3. above. The reason behind this state of things is that most of Prakrit texts are still subject to the analysis required to ascertain and authenticate the form and meaning of the *deśī* words reported in them, and to identify those recorded in other texts. This task is arduous, since most of the editions of Prakrit texts published so far do not include any word index.

When it comes to the study of the issues relating to the *deśī* element in Prakrit, the *Deśīnāmamālā*—the Prakrit lexicon drawn up by the Jain monk Hemacandra—undoubtedly represents an essential

---

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Drocco (2012) and Ollett (2017) as regards *deśī*; Kahrs (1992) with respect to the term *tadbhava*.

<sup>5</sup> In this respect it should be noted that Prakrit *tatsama* words are understood, almost always, as borrowings from Sanskrit (cf., e.g., Pollock 2007), not taking into account, consequently, the possibility that a *tatsama* may also be a loan from Prakrit (see below).

<sup>6</sup> On this matter see Pollock's important remarks (2006: 403).

source. Indeed, it is the most important lexicon of *deśī* words now available (Ramanujaswamy 1938: 6; Pischel 1965: 48-50; Shriyan 1969: 25-32; Upadhye 1978: 182; Bhayani 1988e: 162; Tieken 1992: 221; Ghatage 1996-: Vol. I, \*2-\*3). In most of his studies, Bhayani put forward the idea that a critical examination of the headwords recorded in this lexicon might lead on to several valuable lines of investigation. For this reason, starting from the analysis of the *Deśīnāmamālā*, the main aim of this study is to offer, on the one hand, a detailed overview of the studies regarding this text and the analysis of the meaning of the grammatical/lexicographical technical term *deśī* in the wider context of the traditional grammars of Prakrit in general, and of Hemacandra's works on Prakrit grammar and lexicography in particular, this, especially, in the face of the recent studies already mentioned (see note 4). On the other hand, the present study wants also to shed light on the typology of *deśī* words, that is to say on how the heterogeneity of this class of Prakrit words is composed. Following this kind of analysis, this will allow us to understand the possible consequences arising from the wrong interpretation of the meaning of the tripartite terminology in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* in establishing the reciprocal influences between Sanskrit and Prakrit and between these two literary languages and the other languages—not only those used for cultural purposes—throughout the MIA period. I think that, as a result, we will have a clearer view of the history of the Sanskrit language and of the various MIA administrative, religious and literary varieties, among the latter, in particular, of Prakrit.

I add that in one of my previous papers (Drocco 2012) I tried to understand and to account for the tripartite classification of Prakrit in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* according to the view of Sanskrit as an eternal language.<sup>7</sup> The goal of some of the ensuing sections is to start again and to continue part of the discussion, in order to give additional proofs and arguments. For this reason, I need to go through again some of the considerations which I have already addressed in the above said paper.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the meaning of the Sanskrit word *prākṛta* and its use to designate 'Prakrit' as one form of literary language during the second diachronic phase of IA linguistic evolution. Section 3 explores the relationship of this language to the Sanskrit language; in this section I also unpack the tripartite classification of Prakrit words as *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī*, focusing mainly on the latter. Section 4 presents Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā*, describing the configuration of the *deśī* words in the text here examined (section 4.2). Section 5 explains the tripartite classification in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* as a tool for comparing Prakrit with Sanskrit. Section 6 is devoted to describe how the heterogeneity of *deśī* words is constituted, therefore to present the various neologisms constituting this specific class of words of Prakrit lexicon. Finally, after providing two

---

<sup>7</sup> On this topic, see Deshpande (1993), Bronkhorst (1993), Aklujkar (1996), and the paper collected in Houben (ed. 1996a).

important remarks as proofs of my discussion (section 7), in section 8 the conclusions of the present study are advanced.

## 2. “Prakrit” as a specific literary variety among other Middle Indo-Aryan literary varieties

Although early Jains and Buddhists used various varieties of MIA to draw up their canonical texts, and starting from the reign of Aśoka Maurya (c. 268-232 BCE) we have a vast number of inscriptional records in MIA, the first grammatical descriptions that we have of any of these varieties used as literary, religious or administrative languages only stem from the beginning of the first millennium. It is important to note, as I have just remarked above, that these descriptions only concern one particular scholarly variety of MIA (i.e. Prakrit), and that they are present, to begin with, only in specific types of works, Sanskrit works on performing arts and poetics (Scharfe 1977: 191).<sup>8</sup> According to these works, Prakrit had to be learnt through formal instructions, and thus, following on from the first early descriptions just mentioned, further manuals of Prakrit grammar were composed at intervals (Bhayani 1988c: 155).<sup>9</sup>

The fact that out of the different varieties of MIA used for cultural purposes only one is described through a grammatical analysis, and that this analysis, in any Prakrit grammar we are in possess, is strictly linked to Sanskrit, can seem quite strange. This situation can only be understood by taking into account the particular use of the term ‘Prakrit’ to refer to this specific South Asian literary language of the first millennium CE and the meaning of the tripartite classification of Prakrit words into *tatsama*, *tadbhava*, and *deśī*. These topics have already been discussed in the past by some scholars,<sup>10</sup> and Ollett (2017) recently offered an interesting and detailed analysis on both of them. However, some questions still remain to be clarified. This is even more true taking into account the fact that although the meaning of the terms *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* now is, according to some, clear to almost all scholars,<sup>11</sup> many of them continue to use ‘Prakrit’ to refer to the entire MIA or even just to all its religious,

---

<sup>8</sup> On Harivṛddha, as a possible author of a Prakrit grammar composed in Prakrit see Pollock (2006: 102, note n. 61) and Ollett (2017). Pollock (2006: 102, note n. 61), following Nitti-Dolci (1972: 209) and von Hinüber (1986: 55), adds that “The prototype of Caṇḍa’s grammar may also have been in Prakrit.”

<sup>9</sup> On the works of Prakrit grammarians see, especially, Nitti-Dolci (1972).

<sup>10</sup> As for the use of the term “Prakrit” see, for example, Pisani (1957) and the works mentioned by Ollett (2017: 11-12). The meaning of the terms *tatsama*, *tadbhava*, and *deśī* according to modern scholars and traditional Indian grammarians and authors is the object of the subsequent sections.

<sup>11</sup> This is the view of one of the anonymous reviewers of this paper. Even though I fully agree with him, see my remarks in what follows.

administrative and literary varieties (see, e.g., Hock 2021 and in part also Hock 2016; Balbir 2017; Houben 2018). In doing so, not only the meaning and the purpose of the tripartite classification, but also the close interconnection between the latter and Prakrit is completely obscured, just as what the Indian grammarians actually understood by 'Prakrit' in first millennium India is obscured (for this last consideration see Ollett 2017: 13-14). In my opinion this is the result of the fact that even if the meaning of *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* is clearer with respect to the past, the relevance of its correct interpretation to understand the relationship and coexistence of Sanskrit and Prakrit in first millennium India and the role of the tripartite classification of Prakrit words in shaping this relationship and in excluding some MIA varieties from the denomination of Prakrit' (as, for example, Ardhamāgadhī, at least in the case of Hemacandra and Trivikrama; see Drocco forthcoming) are still not totally clear, this even taking into account the important works of Hock and Pandharipande (1976, 1978), Ollett (2017), Houben (2018) as well as those of Salomon (1989), Bubenik (1996, 1998) and Kulikov (2013).

In the light of these preliminary observations, it is correct to say that, as is well known, the English term Prakrit, as the proper name for a specific MIA literary variety, derives from the Sanskrit adjective *prākṛta* 'connected with an origin'—used as a proper noun—itself in turn derived from the Sanskrit noun *prakṛti* 'origin, base, nature' (see Monier-Williams 1899: 703). However, it is not so well known that although the adjective *prākṛta* generally carries a clear and precise meaning, this leads, as Norman pointed out (1996: 23-24), to a double interpretation.<sup>12</sup> Thus while *prākṛta* can mean 'having the nature of an origin' or 'original, natural,' it can also be understood as 'derived from an origin' or 'secondary.' In explaining his argument, Norman clearly follows Woolner (1928: 3), who recognized that two meanings could be attributed to the term *prākṛta*:

1. a precise meaning, referring to something that derives from one *prakṛti*, its basic, original form,
2. a more generic meaning, indicating all that is 'natural, vulgar, ordinary, provincial.'

Initially, according to Woolner (1928: 3), the term *prākṛta* was used with the second meaning to indicate the spoken language,<sup>13</sup> in contrast to the elaborate (*saṃskṛta*) and codified language, Sanskrit. However,

---

<sup>12</sup> On this topic see also Pollock (2006: 91) and the references of the primary sources he gives (2006: 91, note n. 38).

<sup>13</sup> Even though Woolner does not give evidences to his statement, it is a fact that Prakrit words appear more 'natural' (*prākṛta*) (see what mentioned in the next note) and, according to some Sanskrit authors, also 'vulgar,' 'corrupted' (*apabhraṃśa/vibhraṣṭa*, see below the correspondence of the two terms *vibhraṣṭa* and *tadbhava* in the context of the tripartite classification of Prakrit words), thus having a negative connotation, despite being part of a literary vehicle such as Prakrit. On this issue see also the conclusion of this paper.

the same scholar also highlights the fact that the position taken on this subject by the Prakrit grammarians was entirely different. By attributing to the term *prākṛta* its more accurate and original meaning as ‘derived from an origin’ and therefore ‘secondary,’ the grammarians thought that Sanskrit was the original form (*prakṛti*), from which Prakrit originated.<sup>14</sup> This idea—to be discussed in detail in this paper—is reflected in a statement by Hemacandra in his important Prakrit grammar:<sup>15</sup>

*prakṛtiḥ samskṛtam / tatra bhavam tata āgatam vā prākṛtam [...]*  
*Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana I, 1* (Vaidya (ed.) 1980)

‘Sanskrit is the base; what originates in it or comes from it is base-derived.’ (transl. Pischel 1965: 1)

It is perhaps for these reasons—that is, because of its literary use alongside Sanskrit and, theoretically, its strict dependence/connection on/with it—that Prakrit was described using clear grammatical rules to explain how the Prakrit words and the Prakrit grammatical features used in the literature are connected to their corresponding Sanskrit words and Sanskrit features, respectively. That is why, starting from the fact that it is this variety of MIA, among the others used for cultural purposes, that is commonly referred to as ‘Prakrit’ by traditional Indian grammarians and authors of rhetorical treatises, I am quite convinced that the term ‘Prakrit,’ in its narrow sense (as defined by Ollett 2017: 14), must be considered a technical term of the Indian grammatical tradition and Indian rhetorical works exactly like the terms *tadbhava* and *deśī* with whom it is tightly associated because only this sense “[...] maps closely onto what premodern Indians meant by the word.” A word whose appearance “[...] as a language name and the literature it designates marks a major turning-point in the cultural history of language in India—a turning-point that is completely obscured if we continue to equate ‘Prakrit’ with ‘Middle Indic.’” (Ollett 2017: 14, emphasis added).

<sup>14</sup> For the different position taken by the Indian poet Vākpati (VIIIth century CE), who considers Prakrit to be the mother of all languages, including Sanskrit, see Scharfe (1977: 191). Similarly, it is well-known Namisādhu’s view (Namisādhu was a Jaina Śvetāmbara author) commenting Rudraṭa’s *Kāvyaḷamkāra*, where he clearly states that Sanskrit is derived from Prakrit (see, for example, Bronkhorst 1993).

<sup>15</sup> For other statements similar to that of Hemacandra, and for the identity of the languages normally included under the name *prākṛta* (i.e., Prakrit), see Pischel (1965: 1-3), Scharfe (1977: 191) and Nitti-Dolci (1972).



### 3. Prakrit and the tripartite classification in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī*

Taking into consideration, on the one hand, the traditional interpretation of the term *prākṛta* to mean one definite MIA scholarly variety, and, on the other, the use of Prakrit as a literary language alongside Sanskrit, it is easier to understand (but see below) what is known in the literature as the tripartite classification of the Prakrit lexicon employed by Indian grammarians and authors of rhetorical works.

To be more precise, with regard to the vocabulary and grammar of Prakrit, Sanskrit works on poetics and the Prakrit grammars made in fact a three-fold classification of the words and grammatical features of the linguistic variety that they described (see Pischel 1965: 7, among others). The explicit goal of these works is to explain Prakrit starting from Sanskrit. Then, starting from the knowledge of Prakrit, they explain other varieties, which must be considered indeed as varieties, perhaps regional, of Prakrit and not as different Prakrits (but see Ollett 2017: 135-139).

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, in chapter XVII, provides us, perhaps, with the oldest pieces of Prakrit grammar, dealing, in the first fragment, with phonemic rules for the conversion of Sanskrit words into Prakrit (Pischel 1965: 40-41; Nitti-Dolci 1972: 61; Scharfe 1977: 191). In addition to these rules, it is possible to say, from the sources now available, that Bharata is the first author to divide Prakrit words into the aforementioned three classes:

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

'And it (i.e., Prakrit) should be known in a summary manner in connection with the dramatic representation, as being of three kinds:

[that consisting of] words common [with Sanskrit], [that having] corrupt words, or [that with the words of] indigenous origin.' (transl. Nitti-Dolci 1972: 71)

According to Nitti-Dolci, the adjectives *samāna*, *vibhraṣṭa* and *deśī* used by Bharata should be understood as the equivalents of the three categories of words named *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī/deśya*, respectively. In fact, compared to the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the terms employed by the majority of Prakrit grammarians and/or by the authors of Sanskrit/Prakrit rhetorical treatises are slightly different.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Both Pollock (2006) and Ollett (2017) translate *vibhraṣṭa* as 'Sanskrit-derived.' Even though Prakrit *vibhraṣṭa* words can be considered the future *tadbhava* words, actually they are proto-*tadbhava* words only as regards their form and meaning. As a matter of fact, the judgment, negative, given to the *vibhraṣṭa* words by Sanskrit authors like Bharata is different from that, positive, given to the *tadbhava* words by Sanskrit authors like Daṇḍin. On this topic see my conclusions to the present paper.



More specifically, in accordance with these authors, a Prakrit word could be (Beames 1872-1879; Pischel 1965: 6-7; Chatterji 1926, 1960, 1983: 98-100; Bhayani 1998c: 48):<sup>17</sup>

- *saṃskṛtasama* ‘the same as Sanskrit,’ commonly referred to as *tatsama* ‘the same as that,’ but also as *tattulya* ‘equal to that’ and *samānaśabda* ‘the same word (as that),’
- *saṃskṛtabhava* ‘of the nature of Sanskrit,’ commonly referred to as *tadbhava* ‘of the nature of that,’ but also as *saṃskṛtayoni* ‘the origin is (in) *saṃskṛta*,’ *tajja* ‘born out of that’ and *vibhraṣṭa* ‘fallen, corrupt, deteriorated,’ but also ‘separated,’
- *deśya*, *deśī* or *deśaja* ‘country-born,’ i.e. ‘local, regional,’ but also referred to as *deśīprasiddha* ‘famous in the country’ and *deśīmata* ‘known in the country.’

The earliest reference to the subdivision of Prakrit words using the tripartite classification of *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* seems to be in Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa* (Kahrs 1992: 227; Pollock 2006: 93, 93 note n. 46), from nearly the end of the VIIth century:<sup>18</sup>

*saṃskṛtaṃ nāma daivī vāg anvākyātā maharṣibhiḥ /*  
*tadbhavas tatsamo deśīty anekāḥ prākṛtakramaḥ //*  
*Kāvyādarśa* 1.33 (Böhtlingk (ed.) 1890)

‘Sanskrit is the divine language analysed by the great sages;  
 Prakrit moves in three ways: derived, identical and regional [word and forms].’  
 (transl. Scharfe 2002: 309, note 42)

To be more specific (but see below):

<sup>17</sup> Bhayani’s work (1998c) has been particularly valuable in this analysis. Starting from some statements made by the Buddhist monk Ratnaśrījñāna and relating to the Prakrit works of the obscure author Harivṛddha—of which no trace remains—he reports that as well as the tripartite classification in vogue among Prakrit authors and grammarians, there was also a quadripartite classification, in which, in addition to the well-known terms *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī*, the word *sāmānya* (Prakrit *sāmaṇṇa*) was also present. The latter term, based on our current knowledge, would seem to indicate those words common to all varieties of Prakrit, albeit for a more correct interpretation, using the words of Bhayani himself (1998c: 48), “[...] we shall have to wait for a clear understanding of Sāmānya Prakrit and Sāmānya Apabhraṃśa till the time we recover Harivṛddha’s work on Prakrit.” Recently Ollett (2017: 158-159) focused the attention on this term adding that “H. C. Bhayani (1973) was the first to notice this distinction, although he did not quite understand the significance of *sāmaṇṇa*” (Ollett 2017: 252).

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion of the use of the various terminologies relating to the threefold division of Prakrit words, which “[...] emerge as a cornerstone of Indian philological thought [...]” (Pollock 2006: 93), see Kahrs (1992), but also Pischel (1965: 7). On the different conceptual scheme of categories used to organize difference among the varieties of Prakrit in Bhoja’s *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, see Pollock (2006: 107-108).

- *tatsama* Prakrit words have the same Sanskrit form and meaning; they can be direct literary borrowings from Sanskrit, but this is not always the case;
- *tadbhava* words are connected to Sanskrit words through the grammatical rules of 'transformation' explained in the most important Prakrit grammars; consequently, *tadbhava* words differ from Sanskrit in their formal shape, but, as in the case of *tatsama*, must have the same meaning as their corresponding Sanskrit word;
- *deśī* words are those words for which no evident correspondent can be found in Sanskrit; for this reason they are regarded as regional words, thus not linked with Sanskrit.

As anticipated, it is the purpose of the present paper to offer an updated overview of what is behind the meaning of this last sentence in the context of the Indian literary production and Indian grammatical tradition of the first millennium CE. In particular this means that in what follows I attempt to understand what, in practical terms, the absence of link with Sanskrit entails with respect to Prakrit lexicon. This can help us to better understand what Prakrit really was for the Indian authors of first millennium India. As we will see, this interpretation and the use of the term 'Prakrit' as language designation by these authors is quite different from what we can find in modern scholars' works, even the most recent ones (cf. e.g. Balbir 2017), although Ollett's recent work (2017) has provided solid arguments to clarify the issue in detail.

I already pointed out that many texts written by Jain authors allow us to study the lexical material attested in Prakrit and not linked to the Sanskrit tradition. While this lexical material, that is the *deśī* lexical material of Prakrit remains in part still underexplored, we are in a good position for analysing it, if we consider that two of the basic and most important sources for our knowledge of this material are the Prakrit grammar and the Prakrit *deśī* lexicon, the latter named *Deśināmamālā*, written by the

Jain monk and polymath Hemacandra Sūri (Bhayani 1988a: 3-9, 1988b: 104-105; Pischel 1965: 47-50; Shriyan 1969: 26).<sup>19</sup> Both these texts are available in good editions nowadays.<sup>20</sup>

The Prakrit grammar of Hemacandra constitutes the eighth section of his grammar, *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*,<sup>21</sup> the first seven sections of which are devoted to the Sanskrit language (Nitti-Dolci 1972: chapter 5; Scharfe 1977: 169; Pischel 1965: 47-48). The *Deśināmamālā*, on the other hand, is one of four *koṣas*, dictionaries, written by this author. The other three are:

- the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamālā*,
- the *Anekārthasaṃgraha*, dealing with Sanskrit synonyms and Sanskrit homonyms, respectively; and, finally,
- the *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa*, on botanical terms (Vogel 1979: 336-345).

#### 4. Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*

Even though already discussed by other scholars (see Bühler 1874, Pischel 1880, Ramanujaswamy 1938; cf. also Vogel 1979), some introductory words on the editorial history of the work here analysed are in order.

Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā* was first brought to public notice by Bühler (1874: 17-21) in the second volume of the well-known Indological journal, *Indian Antiquary*. At his request (October 1877), Pischel prepared the first edition of the work, published with critical notes in 1880. For this first edition, nine manuscripts were used. A second edition (1938), based mainly on Pischel's original, was prepared by Ramanujaswamy, drawing on three other manuscripts in addition to those used by Pischel. This edition also included an extensive introduction, a glossary with English meanings for the *deśi* words

---

<sup>19</sup> Hemacandra (c. 1087 CE to c. 1173 CE) lived in Gujarat under the Chalukya king Jayasiṃha-Siddharāja. A brief account of Hemacandra's life is given by Vogel (1979) (see also Scharfe 1977), while Bühler (1889) provides a thorough biography. In traditional Indian texts, Hemacandra's life is narrated in part in Jayasiṃha's *Kumārapālacarita*, Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, Rāja Śekhara's *Prabandakoṣa* and Prabhacandra's *Prabhāvakaṇṭha*. Hemacandra, in addition to being the author of several literary and related works (e.g. the *Kumārapāla-carita*, a poem in Sanskrit and Prakrit describing the deeds of the Chalukya king, Kumārapāla; the *Triṣaṣṭi-salākāpuruṣa-carita*, a grandiose epic poem divided into ten books containing the biography of Mahāvīra and other holy Jain men; the *Upadeśamālā*, which provides teachings, in more than 500 *gāthā*, on about twenty religious subjects; the *Chando'nuśāsana*, on Prakrit metrics; and the *Kāvya'nuśāsana*, dealing with various themes relating to poetics), is known above all as a grammarian. Pischel (1965: 47) considers him the most important of the Prakrit grammarians. Nevertheless, as I have already mentioned, Hemacandra's fame is also and above all linked to his activity as a lexicographer.

<sup>20</sup> However, see, on this point, the important arguments advanced by Bhayani (1988b).

<sup>21</sup> *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana* (*adhyāya* 8); references are to the edition by Vaidya (1980).

treated by Hemacandra and, lastly, three appendices.<sup>22</sup> The work itself was also published in 1931 and 1948 by Banerjī and Doshi, respectively.

The title *Deśīnāmamālā* was not supplied by Hemacandra himself, who instead, in the last verse (*Deśīnāmamālā* VIII, 77), entitles his work *Rayañāvalī* (Sanskrit *Ratnāvalī*) and/or *Deśīśabdasaṃgraha*.<sup>23</sup> It was Pischel, in the first edition (1880), who gave the text the name we know it by today, following the title provided by the best manuscripts (those classified with the letters A and E), and also on the basis that *Rayañāvalī* was, in his opinion, a not very informative name, in contrast to *Deśīnāmamālā* (Pischel (ed.) 1880, mentioned in Ramanujaswamy (ed.) 1938: 31).

#### 4.1. The importance of Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* in the realm of Prakrit lexicography

Before dealing with the features which, according to Hemacandra, allow a word to be classified as *deśī*, it is necessary to indicate why Hemacandra's work is so important. Its value derives in part from its almost unique status within the panorama of medieval Indian lexicography. This does not mean that this text is anomalous, that is, foreign to the Prakrit lexicographic tradition of the time (Pischel 1965: 47-50). On the contrary, it seems to be an integral part of a wide range of Prakrit grammatical and lexicographical works that are, as in the case of Sanskrit, dependent on a specific Indian tradition of language and speech studies (cf. Vogel 1979). The fact that Hemacandra was not the only author to prepare a Prakrit lexicon of *deśī* words can be gathered, as we will see later, from his own observations. Nonetheless, even if we must consider the *Deśīnāmamālā* as an integral part of a broad Prakrit lexicographic tradition, it is essential to emphasise that Hemacandra's text represents our only available *deśī* vocabulary (Pischel 1965: 48-50; Bhayani 1988e: 162-165; Tieken 1992: 221; Shriyan 1969:

---

<sup>22</sup> The first appendix collects all the words regarded as *deśī* by the other Prakrit lexicographers, but classified as *tatsama* or *tadbhava* by Hemacandra. In the second appendix, Ramanujaswamy provides a list of *dhātvādeśas* or 'verbal substitutes,' prepared on the basis of what Hemacandra himself says in the commentary on *Deśīnāmamālā* and in his Prakrit grammar. The last appendix deals separately with interjections and other particles which, like the *dhātvādeśas*, had been analysed by Hemacandra in his grammar. In the last two appendices, Ramanujaswamy does not pay any particular attention to going back to the Sanskrit word from which the respective Prakrit forms are derived.

<sup>23</sup> *iha rayañāvaliṅāmo desisaddāṇa saṃgaho eso /*

*vāyaraṇasesaleso raio sirihemacandamuṇivaiṅā // (Deśīnāmamālā VIII, 77)*

The denomination of the work with the name *Deśīśabdasaṃgraha* can also be found at the beginning of the work:

*ṅīsesadesiparimalapallaviakuūhalāulatteṇa /*

*viraijjai desīsaddasaṃgaho vaṅṅakamasuhao // (Deśīnāmamālā I, 2)*

25-32; Ghatage 1996-: Vol. I, \*2-\*3),<sup>24</sup> other than Dhanapāla's *Pāiyalacchī Nāmamālā* (Bühler (ed.) 1878), which is considerably less comprehensive (cf. Vogel 1979: 322; Pischel 1965: 47; Ramanujaswamy (ed.) 1938: 6, 8).

The importance of Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā* also stems, though, from the particular methodology used for classification, and the organization of the lexical material described (Ramanujaswamy (ed.) 1938; Pischel 1965: 8-9, 48-50; Shriyan 1969: 29-31; Bhayani 1988e: 164-165; Ghatage 1996-: Vol. I, \*2-\*3). This work has a total of 783 *āryā* stanzas, divided into eight *vargas*. Each word is placed within a specific *varga*, according to its initial letter. Thus, following the order of the *nāgarī* script, in the first *varga*, the vowels are treated, in the second, the guttural consonants, and then, in successive *vargas*, the palatal, cerebral, dental, and labial consonants, respectively, followed by the semivowels, and finally the sibilants and the aspirate. Each *varga* is further subdivided into many sections, according to the number of sounds within the class in question. In each section, the words with only one meaning (*ekārtha* words) and those with more than one meaning (*anekārtha* words) are illustrated. All the words are then listed, again following the order of the *nāgarī* writing script, as in Sanskrit, and taking into account increasing numbers of syllables. Words of different lengths are grouped together here and there if they are synonymous. Hemacandra gives the meaning, or meanings, of the different *deśī* words recorded through the aid of a corresponding Prakrit non-*deśī* word. Perhaps since this was not sufficiently exhaustive for a correct interpretation of the various *deśī* words under analysis, Hemacandra added to the text of the *Deśināmamālā* a Sanskrit commentary, written by himself. In this commentary, each *deśī* word recorded is explained using a Sanskrit synonym. Sometimes, within the same commentary, the reasons prompting the author to omit and/or include certain words, or to adopt a certain spelling and/or meaning, are also recorded.

---

<sup>24</sup> As Bhayani (1988e) has pointed out, many *deśī* words are attested in the Jain canon (even though I don't know if it is correct to speak of *deśī* words for a MIA language used for cultural purposes other than Prakrit, and the language of the Jain Canon (i.e. Ardhamāgadhī (= Ārṣa)) is not considered Prakrit, at least by Hemacandra and Trivikrama; on this matter see Drocco, to appear), as well as in *Vasudevahindī* and *Kuvalayamālā*, works which are both in Prakrit. Similar considerations apply to some of the most important texts written in Apabhraṃśa, such as Svayambhū's *Paumacariya*, Puṣpadanta's *Mahāpurāṇa* and Śāntisūri's *Puhavicandacariya*. With regard to the first of these three texts, Bhayani has provided an index of the *deśī* words it contains in his editions of 1953 and 1960. On Puṣpadanta's *Mahāpurāṇa*, it is important to mention the excellent work of Shriyan (1969). The index of the *deśī* words (about eight hundred) reported in Śāntisūri's *Puhavicandacariya*, and drawn up on the basis of the edition of this work by Muni Ramnikvijaya (1972), is by the same author. Bhayani (1988e: 175-176, notes n. 4 and 5) adds that many *deśī* words are also mentioned in Dhāhila's *Paumasiri-cariya*, in Sādhāraṇa's *Vilāsavaikahā*, in *Karakaṇḍa-cariya* and in Vīra's *Jambūsami-cariya*, in Causupannisamahāya's *Śīlāṅka* and in *Ākhyānakamaṇikośavṛtti* by Āmradeva. For the exact details of these works, I refer the reader to Bhayani (1988e: 175-176).

A particular place in the organization of the lexical material included in the *Deśīnāmamālā* (or rather, in its commentary) is occupied by the *dhātuvādeśas*, or 'verbal substitutes' (cf. Pischel 1965: 7-9; Ramanujaswamy 1938: 5-7), which, although not deriving from Sanskrit, can assume suffixes and endings typical of this language. Hemacandra excludes these from the *Deśīnāmamālā* itself, and therefore does not mention them in the verses that form the body of the work. However, following what must have been the common practice of many Prakrit lexicographers, the *dhātuvādeśas* are included in the explanatory glosses of the commentary on the *Deśīnāmamālā*, after the corresponding words with the same number of syllables, and together with the indeclinables and all those particles already treated in his grammar.

#### 4.2. What makes a word *deśī*? Insights from Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā*

In order now to understand the importance of this text, it must be asked, "What is a *deśī* word for the Indian grammarians or at least for Hemacandra?," "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?" To answer all these questions, it is necessary to consider what might be the best interpretation of the term *deśī* in the context of the Prakrit tripartite classification found in the various Prakrit grammars, and as a consequence of this, to determine the true significance of these grammars and of the *Deśīnāmamālā*. Although this topic has been a subject of study for many Indologists, not everyone agrees on the exact answer to the question, "What makes a word *deśī*?" even in terms of what is being referred to by the medieval Indian grammarians and rhetoricians.<sup>25</sup>

Starting from Shriyan's (1969: 9-23) careful exposition of this topic, we can argue, to begin with, that in the Indian classical tradition, with reference to languages and/or language features the term *deśī* had been understood to have two different meanings, depending on whether it refers to i) a language variety, or ii) a Prakrit word (cf. Tagare 1948: 7). In the first case, it was mainly used to:

1. indicate a particular local spoken dialect/language,
2. indicate a particular linguistic variety of Prakrit, or
3. as a synonym for Apabhraṃśa.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> In doing this, I refer to the following studies: Kahrs (1992), Drocco (2006, 2012), and Ollett (2017).

<sup>26</sup> Even in this case see Tagare (1948) and Shriyan (1969).

Concerning the second use, and still following the synthesis of Shriyan (1969: 32-44), we can say that the tradition of modern Indological studies, referring back to the work of the Indian grammarians on Prakrit, considers as *deśī* any Prakrit word that is not linked with the Sanskrit tradition, and thus as precisely the opposite of a *tadbhava* word. But how should this ‘link’ with the Sanskrit tradition be understood? It is not easy to answer this question, because there is no general consensus on the issue. However, it is important to understand and to keep in mind what correctly this link consist of, in order to study the various types of *deśī* words and as a consequence to grasp the real nature of Prakrit (on which, as already said at the beginning, see Ollett 2017).

Starting from the term *tadbhava*, the exact opposite of *deśī*, it is correct to say that in the indigenous context, for example, the prevailing interpretation of this term among modern scholars is that of ‘derived from Sanskrit.’<sup>27</sup> This sense, as Kahrs (1992: 255-227) and other authors have pointed out (e.g. Masica 1991: 65-67), has largely been interpreted from a Western perspective, meaning that the ‘derivation’ of Prakrit *tadbhava* words from Sanskrit—that is to say, the ‘link’ between Sanskrit and Prakrit—has been understood as a process of ‘historical derivation,’ and explained in terms of the concept of ‘changes over time’ (cf. Kahrs 1992; Drocco 2012). Perhaps it is for this reason that, in modern times, the tripartite terminology of *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* has also been used in the context of IA historical linguistics. From here, it is easy to see how authors like Beames (1872-79: 13-17) and Hoernle (1880: xxxviii-xxxix) were able to distinguish between what they called ‘early’ and ‘old’ *tadbhavas*, terming the latter *semi-tatsamas*. We can presume that the use of ‘early’ and ‘old’ by these authors is another indication of the use of the historical approach in discussing the tripartite classification of Prakrit words. Moreover, it is probably on the basis of this approach that the entire tripartite terminology, originally made by ancient Indian grammarians only in relation to Prakrit words, has come to be used in discussions of modern IA languages (cf. Masica 1991: 65). Thus Kellogg, for example, in his *A grammar of the Hindi language*, writes: “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” (Kellogg 1893: 42; cf. also Chatterji 1926: 189-192; Hoernle 1880: xxxviii-xl; Grierson 1927: 127-128; Caracchi 2002: 21; Tiwari 1960: xlv-xlv).

---

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Nitti-Dolci (1972: viii), Macdonell (1893: s. v.) in his Sanskrit-English dictionary, Scharfe (1977: 186) and, more recently, Pollock (2006: 108, 368-369, 401). Pischel’s translation of the term *tadbhava* (1965: 7) is ‘originated from that.’ whereas Beames (1872-79: 11) and Kellogg (1893: 42) translate this term as ‘of the nature of it.’ Even though they do not use the term ‘derived,’ whose meaning lends itself more to a historical interpretation, actually they also understood the term *tadbhava* according to historical principles (cf. Kahrs 2012).



What, then, about *deśī*? Modern Western and Indian scholars who have examined the problem of this category of words, exactly as for the *tadbhava* category, have between them expressed very different views, and a considerable amount of confusion thus prevails regarding the nature and character of the meaning of this particular term (Tagare 1948: 7; Shriyan 1969: 9). In my opinion, this confusion is closely connected with the above said assumption of ‘changes over time’ concerning Prakrit *tadbhava* words, and starting from this also with a misunderstanding not only of the term ‘Prakrit,’ but also of the term ‘Sanskrit.’ As a matter of fact, I can say that traditionally a good part of scholars have been inclined to identify *tadbhava* words with words inherited (i.e. ‘derived’) from Old Indo-Aryan (hereafter 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.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, and more explicitly, behind this interpretation of the specular *tadbhava-deśī* terms two different misunderstandings are at work:

- the wrong ‘historical interpretation’ (i.e. ‘changes over time’) of the term *tadbhava* as pointed out and clearly explained by Kahrs (1992) (cf. also Turner 1960);<sup>29</sup>
- the misuse not only of the term ‘Prakrit’ but also of the term ‘Sanskrit’ as language designations, to mean the entire MIA (see Jacobi 1886) and OIA, respectively, that is to say all the languages, attested and unattested, of MIA and OIA (as, for example, in many of Chatterji’s works, such as 1926, 1960, 1983).<sup>30</sup>

Beginning with these assumptions and concerning the second point, it is not easy to understand the different phases through which the two kinds of identifications just said have been made (as for Prakrit see Ollett 2017 already mentioned above). It seems to me that in the majority of cases the term *saṃskṛta*, present in the word *saṃskṛtabhava* and implicit in *tadbhava*, has been understood to include not only

---

<sup>28</sup> 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 [...],” the second of which includes “[...] 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). Cf. also Bryant, who writes: “[...] 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).

<sup>29</sup> Ollett, in following Houben (1994) and referring to Kahrs (1992), states that “This is not to say that premodern Indians were incapable of thinking about their language practices in historical terms, as some have argued” (2017: 155).

<sup>30</sup> It is worth mentioning that Chatterji (1983) highlights what he calls a ‘traditional interpretation’ and a ‘modern interpretation’ of the terms *tatsama*, *tadbhava*, and *deśī*. Interestingly, in some of his other works on the subject (1926, 1960) he does not do this sort of clarification and he mentions only the ‘modern interpretation’ as if it were the only possible interpretation.

classical Sanskrit, but also Vedic,<sup>31</sup> and/or the whole OIA stage in the history of IA languages,<sup>32</sup> involving in this way old popular IA languages, of which we have only limited 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 frequently used not only to refer to all varieties of literary MIA as well as those used as religious and administrative vehicles (except Pāli language), but also to cover the whole MIA stage itself, and through this the entire MIA scholarly and colloquial/popular repertoire.<sup>33</sup>

The process that equates the whole OIA with Sanskrit and the whole MIA with Prakrit gives as a result a meaning which is, as already said at the beginning of the present paper referring to Drocco (2016) and Ollett (2017), radically broader compared with the meaning understood by first millennium Indian authors and, for this reason, overshadow not only the cultural/literary identity of Prakrit but also its linguistic specificity in comparison to the other MIA linguistic varieties, I mean the various MIA varieties used for cultural/administrative purpose.

It is important to stress that as a consequence of these two misunderstandings

1. changes over time,
2. OIA = Sanskrit and MIA = Prakrit—if a Prakrit *tadbhava* word is a MIA word derived from Sanskrit and, moreover, Sanskrit is equal to the whole OIA,

it follows naturally that a Prakrit *deśī* word is a MIA word not derived from OIA, i.e. a non-IA word.<sup>34</sup>

This is even more the case if all those MIA words created or built up with roots and affixes derived from

---

<sup>31</sup> On the use by some scholars of the name ‘Sanskrit’ for various forms of Vedic as well, see Thieme (1994), Wezler (1996: 346, note n. 73), and Pollock (2006). Not all scholars agree with this usage (for example, Mayrhofer, 1986-). Cf. also Aklujkar (1996: 70, n. 18).

<sup>32</sup> See, for example, the following phrases from Chatterji (1983: 99): “The great fact of the presence of Sanskrit or OIA [...]” “We generally have our main or basic references to OIA or Sanskrit [...]” and “Taking Sanskrit as being loosely the equivalent of OIA, [...]”

<sup>33</sup> As Chatterji writes: “Thus words like *deva*, [...] might be as much an inherited element in Prakrit or MIA [...]” (1983: 98). Cf. also Norman (1990: 64, 67, 1996: 92). It is quite interesting that even Kahrs, dealing with the interpretation of the technical term *tadbhava* in the context of Indian grammatical tradition, speaks of “[...] *prākṛta* or Middle Indo-Aryan words [...]” (Kahrs 1992: 225), as if ‘Prakrit’ and ‘Middle Indo-Aryan’ were synonymous.

<sup>34</sup> As already pointed out at the beginning, if it is true that most scholars no longer consider the term *deśī* as a synonym of non-IA and the term *tadbhava* according to an historical interpretation, it is equally true that, as far as I know, the reasons that led several scholars in the past to reach these two conclusions have not yet been sufficiently explored. The same is true for how we came to consider OIA as equal to Sanskrit.

OIA are also included in the category of *tadbhava* (as in Chatterji 1983: 101). It is perhaps for this reason that in modern Indological studies, the combination of the term *deśī* with the non-IA lexical element of Prakrit is quite frequent, even in this case almost as if the two terms were synonymous. The following is indeed a statement along these lines advanced by Chatterji (1926: 191):<sup>35</sup>

The term *Deśī* in its present-day application [*sic!*] embraces a numerous class of words which cannot be traced to Aryan roots and which obviously were derived from the pre-Aryan languages of the country, Dravidian and Kol (emphasis added)

Consider, however, what Tagare has to say (1948: 7):

[...] *Deśī* as applied to a word implies a word non-derivable from Sk., expressing thereby the limits of the philological studies of the author who classes it thus. [...] *The identification of Deśī with non-Aryan elements in IA is a hasty conclusion of Caldwell and his followers, [...]* [emphasis added]

As for Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā*, there are certainly words in this text which probably derive from non-IA languages, such as Dravidian and Munda languages (see below). However, if it is true that a large number of words of non-IA origin are mentioned in this text, it is also true that there are many words that can undoubtedly be traced back to the original OIA lexicon, but not necessarily Sanskritic. In this regard, it is important to emphasize here that the misinterpretation of the traditional terms *tadbhava* and *deśī* adopted by modern scholars has definitely influenced their opinions of Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* text and their, and not only their, interpretation of the term 'Prakrit' as language designation, albeit Bühler and Pischel's important remarks on Hemacandra's use of the term *deśī* when the *Deśīnāmamālā* work was discovered in the second half of the XIX century.<sup>36</sup> In fact, it is fairly evident that if we understand *deśī* as synonymous with non-IA, the question arises of whether or not Hemacandra has fallen into error. Indeed, many Indologists who have advanced observations on the *Deśīnāmamālā* have concluded that Hemacandra's text, despite being a worthy work and unique in the pantheon of Prakrit lexicography (see above), is nevertheless full of errors regarding the correct interpretation of a Prakrit word as *deśī*. This, according to the same scholars, is due to the fact that, as already mentioned above, a large number of words reported in the *Deśīnāmamālā* are originally connected with IA lexical material. The first linguists who studied this *koṣa* suggested this conclusion,

---

<sup>35</sup> For other opinions on this topic, in part divergent, see the views reported by Shriyan (1969: 32-44).

<sup>36</sup> Bühler (ed.) (1878), in particular, proposed interesting suggestions on how must be understood the category of *deśī* words in Prakrit starting from Hemacandra's detailed definition.

and over the years, other scholars have supported the thesis. Summarising what has been discussed so far, it is helpful to quote the following statement by Vaidya (1926-27: 67):

[...] DNM [*Deśināmamālā*] as a lexicon of *deśī* words remains incomplete; on the other hand, many of the so called *deśī* words could be traced to their Sanskrit originals; and further, if we are prepared to apply some of the recognised philological processes, free exercise of the science of Semantics [...] *I think over 75 per cent words in DNM would cease to be deśī* [emphasis added]

The following quotation is the opinion of Chatterji (1960: 92):

A good many *Deśī* words are just inherited Aryan words in MIA, *only the carelessness of some early grammarian has failed to identify them as Tadbhavas. Such words are not too few in a work like the Deśināmamālā* [emphasis added]

Somewhat similar observations have been advanced more recently by Norman (1990: 62):

In recent years two works have appeared which have served to enable scholars to assess accurately the extent of the non-Aryan element in DNM [*Deśināmamālā*]. [...] [N]evertheless, it seems clear that the majority of words in DNM [*Deśināmamālā*] must be considered as being of IA origin. This was noted long ago by Bühler in the introduction to his edition of *Pāiyalacchīnāmamālā* [...].

We can now understand why Chatterji in his *Indo-Aryan and Hindi* clearly states “The *deśī* element in MIA is another absorbing and frequently baffling topic” (1960: 92).

Although the opinions of many of the scholars who have studied the *Deśināmamālā* are sometimes excessive, if not (as we will see) totally unfounded, it is undoubtedly true that, setting aside the *deśī* words deriving from non-IA sources and those rare occurrences of genuine *tatsama* and/or *tadbhava* (understood to be included due to Hemacandra’s error), the *Deśināmamālā* still contains a great number of words whose classification as *deśī* by the author must be explained. This last observation needs to be assessed in order to carry out my analysis. Indeed, given the position of the majority of modern scholars, we should now ask, which is Hemacandra’s opinion as regards the interpretation of the term *deśī* provided by other Prakrit grammarians? It is only within this context that we can understand the importance of Hemacandra’s *Deśināmamālā*. As a matter of fact, the unique nature of the *Deśināmamālā* is perhaps linked to the reasons that led the author to compile his text. These had to do—according to his own testimony—with the scarcity and inaccuracy of the correct spelling and classification of the *deśī* words reported in the many previous Prakrit lexicons (of which we have no examples left, except for the *Pāiyalacchī* mentioned previously). This situation triggered a great confusion with regard to *deśī*

expressions and words, which was probably attributable not only to the compilers' lexicons themselves, but also to their uncertain manuscript tradition. It was precisely the desire to correct the errors of the previous Prakrit lexicographers and to provide a model for those who would follow him that led Hemacandra to the compilation of a new *deśī* vocabulary, as he indicates in the last chapter of his work (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary VIII, 12; cf. also Pollock 2006: 403 who mentions other Hemacandra's statements attested in the *Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary I, 2 and I, 47). As a consequence, Hemacandra starts his *Deśīnāmamālā* by providing, in verses 3-4 of the first *varga*, a clear definition of what he means by the term *deśī*, while explaining at the same time the purpose of his work:

*je lakkhaṇe ṇa siddhā ṇa pasiddhā sakkayāhihāṇesu /*  
*ṇa ya gaṇṇalakkhaṇāsattisaṃbhavā te iha ṇibaddhā //*

*desavisesapasiddhī bhaṇṇamāṇā aṇantayā hunti /*  
*tamhā aṇāipāipayaṭṭabhāsāvisesao deśī //*  
*Deśīnāmamālā* I, 3-4 (Ramanujaswamy (ed.) 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 *gaṇṇī 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 (transl. Bühler 1874: 18-19).

With the purpose of explaining in depth the various features that a word needs to have in order to be classified as *deśī* by Hemacandra, it is important to emphasise that the author considers as *deśī*, first of all, any possible Prakrit word that is not treated in his Prakrit grammar, the aforementioned *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*. That is to say, a Prakrit word is recognized as *deśī* if, for it, the rules of 'transformation' from Sanskrit to Prakrit as reported in this grammar are not applicable. Moreover, according to Hemacandra, a Prakrit word must also be understood as *deśī* if, even though the aforementioned rules of 'transformation' can be applied, the resulting corresponding form is not attested in Sanskrit literary texts or in Sanskrit lexicons.<sup>37</sup> Finally, in the *Deśīnāmamālā* are also included all those Prakrit words which, though deriving from corresponding Sanskrit forms according to the

---

<sup>37</sup> As I will say later, according to this principle it is likely that Hemacandra considered as *deśī* some Prakrit words that actually possessed a corresponding Sanskrit form, but whose attestation in the literature was unknown to the author, perhaps due to their scarce relevance or diffusion in literary production of the time.

rules explained in the *Siddhahemaśābdānuśāsana*, do not show semantic correspondence with those forms, except through the process of *gauṇī lakṣaṇā*.<sup>38</sup>

Still focusing on the initial verses of the *Deśīnāmamālā*, in addition to providing the rules just mentioned for the exact determination of what he regards as a *deśī* word, Hemacandra imposes a limit on his work. He adds that his enumeration of *deśī* words is limited to those words that occur most frequently in the ancient Prakrit literature. Thus, the author does not take into consideration all the words used in the spoken languages. Hemacandra's observations in his commentary further demonstrate this, in fact:<sup>39</sup>

*deśaviśeṣā mahārāṣṭravidarbhābhīrādayasteṣu prasiddhā / magā paścat / nikkulā jitaḥ / ukkhuruhaṃcio  
utkṣiptaḥ / preyaṃḍo dhūrtāḥ / hiṃgo jāraḥ / viḍḍo prapañcaḥ daḍhamūḍho mūrkhā ekagrāhī  
ityevamādayaḥ śabdā yadducyeraṃstadā deśaviśeṣānāmanantatvāt puruṣāyeṣeṇāpi na sarvasaṃgrahaḥ  
syāt / tasmādanādipravṛttapṛākṛtabhāṣāviśeṣa evāyaṃ deśīśabdenocyata iti nātivyaṅgītiḥ / yadāha /*

*vācaspaterapi matirna prabhavati divyayugasahasreṇa /  
deśeṣu ye prasiddhāstāñśabdān sarvataḥ samucchetum //  
Deśīnāmamālā, commentary I, 4 (Ramanujaswamy 1938).*

They are not simply the words used in particular places such as Maharashtra, Vidharbha, among the Ābhiras, and so on. If that were what was meant [by *deśī*], it would be an impossible task to collect these words even over an entire lifetime. What we mean by the word *deśī* is instead [the lexicon of] a specific language, namely, Prakrit, such as is used from time immemorial.

<sup>38</sup> Indian theorists have classified the meaning (*artha*) of a word (both Sanskrit and Prakrit) into three distinct categories:

1. *abhidhā* 'power, literal sense, primary meaning of a word;'
2. *lakṣaṇā* 'use of one word for another with a similar meaning,' i.e., 'indirect or figurative sense of a word;'
3. *vyāñjanā* 'the ability to suggest another meaning in addition to the literal meaning.'

For an in-depth study of *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā* and *vyāñjanā*, see Kunjunni Raja (1977: 17-94, 229-273, 275-315, respectively). Hemacandra in his definition of the term *deśī*, however, mentions a certain type of *lakṣaṇā*, or metaphorical use of a word; more precisely he refers to *gauṇī lakṣaṇā*. The various Indian authors, who have treated the theories regarding the meaning that a word can possess, have enumerated different types of *lakṣaṇā*, mainly divided into two classes. According to these authors, the relationship that exists between the primary and the indirect meaning of a word can be one of similarity, or some sort of relationship other than similarity: in the first situation, we will have a case of *gauṇī vṛtti* or *gauṇī lakṣaṇā*, while in the second, a case of *śuddhā* ('pure') *lakṣaṇā*. To quote the words of Kunjunni Raja (1977: 241) "[...] 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 classification of the different types of *lakṣaṇā*, see Kunjunni Raja (1977: 256-257), and for an in-depth analysis of *gauṇī lakṣaṇā* (or *gauṇī vṛtti*), see again Kunjunni Raja (1977: 242-245). For further discussion on this point, see Pollock (2006: 403-405).

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion on this point, see Pollock (2006: 403-405).

Even (Brahmā) Vācaspati, the Lord of Speech himself, does not possess the skill to collect all the words that are used in all regions, not if he had a thousand cosmic cycles to try (transl. Pollock 2006: 403).

To sum up, if we carefully want to analyse the typology of the words covered by Hemacandra's definition of *deśīśabda*, it is possible to show that *deśī*, with its literal meaning of 'born in the country,' has been used by this author to collect in his *deśīkoṣa*, with regard to Prakrit:

1. words which can be related to words found in Sanskrit (with the same meaning), but only by postulating phonological changes not described in his Prakrit grammar;
2. words which differ only in meaning from Prakrit words whose relationship with correspondent Sanskrit words, according to Hemacandra, is unquestioned, and which therefore presumably represent some kind of semantic change;
3. any word which cannot be traced back to a corresponding Sanskrit one.

We can note that according to Hemacandra, *deśī* words are not all non-IA words. This situation in turn reflects the way the term *deśī*, when used to mean a language variety (see above), was never related only to non-IA languages by ancient Indian authors, who spoke rather about *Saṃskṛta*, *Prākṛta*, *Bhāṣās*, *Vibhāṣās*, *Apabhraṃśa* and *Deśabhāṣās* (Grierson 1913, 1918; Pischel 1965: 1-3). Although it is not possible to talk in any detail here about the exact meaning of the last five terms, since the Indian grammarians differ from one another on this issue (Pischel 1965: 1; Nitti-Dolci 1972 and again Grierson 1913, 1918; more recently, Ollett 2017), it seems that the lists of languages cited under the categories of *vibhāṣā* and *deśabhāṣā* include especially, and perhaps only (but this is still unproven), IA languages.<sup>40</sup>

##### 5. The tripartite classification in *tatsama tadbhava* and *deśī* as a tool to compare Prakrit with Sanskrit

Now that we have set out modern scholars' views on the meaning of the term *deśī*, and at the same time examined Hemacandra's definition of what a *deśī* Prakrit word is and, lastly, the unique nature of his *deśī* lexicon, are we now in a better position to conduct a proper investigation to evaluate the

---

<sup>40</sup> 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 *Deśabhāṣās* mentioned in Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśana* (cf. Pollock 2006: 95, 299), and discussed and exemplified in the *Mānasollāsa* (cf. 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 also possible to find some information about sixteen *Deśabhāṣās* cited by name in Uddyotana Sūri's *Kuvalayamālā*, and examined in part by Master (1950, 1951) and Upadhye (1965).



consistency of the position taken by Hemacandra, and above all, to understand the real nature of the Prakrit lexical material classified (at least by Hemacandra) as *deśī*? Certainly, from the introductory verses of the *Deśīnāmamālā* and a critical consultation of Hemacandra's Prakrit grammar, we have evidence that the classification of Prakrit words as *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* was not interpreted by this author (unlike most of the scholars who dealt with this subject so far) in historical/etymological terms (cf. Drocco 2006). Rather, following a valuable suggestion made by certain authors (see, among others, Turner 1960: 47-49; Masica 1991: 64-67; Deshpande 1993: 73-74), this tripartite classification can be viewed instead as offering a comparison between the lexicons of two different languages, one of which is being held up as a point of reference. But pursuing a point raised in Drocco (2012: 126), what does this consideration mean?

From the point of view of IA historical linguistics, the *deśī* class of Prakrit words is certainly an interesting class of words, in particular because it is in this group of words that we have to search words of IE origin not recorded in Sanskrit and words of non-IA origin, with all that this means from the point of view of historical<sup>41</sup> and contact linguistics.<sup>42</sup>

Nevertheless, it is from the sociolinguistic point of view that it is, undeniable, difficult to answer the aforementioned question comprehensively. In making the attempt, however, it needs to be remembered that a fundamental characteristic which a Prakrit word must possess in order to be classified as *deśī* is, according to Hemacandra, the non-occurrence of a corresponding words in the Sanskrit language, according to the rules of transformation explained by Hemacandra in his Prakrit Grammar.

The conclusions from this are manifold. For example, a specific Prakrit word could be a *deśī* word for one author, but a *tadbhava* or *tatsama* for another author, depending on:

1. the period in which the comparison between the Sanskrit and Prakrit lexicons is being made. In this respect, a Prakrit word could be a *deśī* word for Hemacandra, who died during the second half of the XIIth century, but not for the Prakrit grammarian Trivikrama, who lived during the XIIIth century.<sup>43</sup> This could be the case if the particular Prakrit word taken into consideration had been included in a Sanskrit text, as a loanword from Prakrit, after Hemacandra's death, thus becoming, but only from that moment, a *tadbhava* or *tatsama*,

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf., among others, Emeneau (1966), Norman (1985), and Witzel (1989).

<sup>42</sup> See, for example, Bloch (1934, 1930), Emeneau (1980), and Masica (1976, 2001).

<sup>43</sup> On the date of Trivikrama, see Nitti-Dolci (1972: 187-188).

2. the knowledge of the Sanskrit lexicon and/or what must be considered as being part of the Sanskrit lexicon by the different Prakrit grammarians; on this point, it is important to remember that according to Hemacandra the words which constitute the Sanskrit lexicon are perhaps those discussed in his dictionary of Sanskrit synonyms, *Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamālā* (see 3. above), even if further research is needed to determine the accuracy of this statement,<sup>44</sup>
3. the means of the comparison, i.e. the rules set out in the various Prakrit grammars; thus a word can be classified by Hemacandra as *deśī* even if it is connected with a Sanskrit model, if that connection depends on applying phonological rules of “transformation” not described in his grammar (albeit their mention in other Prakrit grammars).

As a result, according to Hemacandra the Prakrit *deśī* class also—perhaps especially—includes those words which, even though typically inherited from Sanskrit from the point of view of historical linguistics, are esteemed as too ‘far’ from this language as regards their phonological shape as well as their meanings, and thus classified as ‘inappropriate’ to be part of Prakrit. And what is intriguing is that this last judgement is not objective and unanimous. On the contrary it depends on the grammarians we are taking into consideration.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, it should be assumed that as regards first millennium India we face with a true ‘language question’ (cf. the well-known Italian *questione della lingua*)<sup>46</sup> concerning the nature of what must be considered the ‘pure’ Prakrit (‘pure’ in comparison with the other MIA varieties used for cultural purposes, ‘pure’ because esteemed as the variety of literary MIA closest to the Sanskrit language and, for this reason, worthy to be part of the prestigious – ‘eternal’ according to Kahrs (1992)—sphere of Sanskrit).

## 6. The heterogeneity of *deśī* words

Now, if we really follow Hemacandra's definition of what he regards as a *deśī* word, we are in a better position to understand why Pischel (1965: 7-8) writes that in the category of *deśī* words, “[...] the Indians

---

<sup>44</sup> To my knowledge, for example, there is not any study dealing with a comparison between Hemacandra and Amara's famous Sanskrit lexicons.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Bühler's important words in the introduction of his edition of Dhanapāla's *Pāyīlacchī Nāmamālā* (Bühler 1878).

<sup>46</sup> *La questione della lingua* refers to a significant dispute that arose in late medieval and Renaissance Italy regarding the appropriate linguistic conventions to be utilized in the written form of the Italian language. Since the progression of the latter did not align with the emergence of a national spoken language, the various Italian authors had to learn the written language through literary imitation. The absence of a unified spoken language to serve as a foundation for literary expression led to an extended and contentious discussion about what the standard literary language ought to be.

include very heterogeneous elements [...]” (cf. also Shriyan 1969: 44; Norman 1990: 64-65). This is because this specific category of words used in Prakrit literature can include:<sup>47</sup>

- words of ancient IA or even Indo-European origin which, although not used as words in the OIA literary languages (i.e. Vedic and/or Sanskrit)—because regarded, for example, as too vulgar—were later inherited or borrowed by some varieties of literary MIA, and thus perhaps also by Prakrit.<sup>48</sup> The same is true for those inherited words which happen to descend from OIA dialects other than that on which Sanskrit was based (Burrow 1955; Emeneau 1966; Masica 1991: 67; Norman 1992b). It is a fact that literary MIA has undoubtedly evolved from OIA but—as can be deduced from what has just been mentioned, and has already been highlighted by authors such as Bloch (1934: 14-15; 1930), Burrow (1955: 45-47), and above all Emeneau (1966), as well as more recently by Witzel (1989)—talking about OIA in general is not the same as talking about Vedic and Sanskrit, because these languages represent only two of the many languages of OIA.<sup>49</sup> Moreover, in terms of any evolutionary pattern, the MIA literary varieties known so far present evident analogies with Vedic rather than with Sanskrit, though in many cases the forms of MIA seem to have evolved (probably) from the spoken forms of this language (see Pischel 1965: 4-6; Emeneau 1966; Hinüber 1986: paragraphs 7-11; Witzel 1989).<sup>50</sup> As regards the IA/IE non-Vedic/non-Sanskrit words, Norman (1992b: 115) does not consider them to be real lexical innovations, but inherited words that have evolved diachronically only at a low level, and that have corresponding forms in IE languages other than Sanskrit. An example mentioned by this author and present in *Deśināmamālā* is the *deśī* word *chāsī* (*Deśināmamālā* III, 26), reported by Hemacandra with the meaning of ‘whey,’ but by Norman (1992b: 118) with that of ‘cheese.’ According to Norman, this *deśī* word must be connected to the Latin *caseus* (cf. also Alsdorf 1937: 39). Similar factors may also be relevant to Prakrit words that are still obscure in origin or that reveal irregular phonological changes, such as the *deśī* word *lugga* ‘broken,’ which should be placed side by side, according to Norman (1990: 65), with Sanskrit *rugna-*,

---

<sup>47</sup> On the typology of the various *deśī* words—alongside many examples—reported by Hemacandra and on their possible manners of classification, see Vaidya (1926-27), Shriyan (1969), Norman (1990), Bhayani (1988b, 1988c, 1998e, 1998f) and Drocco (2006).

<sup>48</sup> For some examples of this kind of words, see the study, albeit now dated, by Gray (1940). See also Norman (1992b) and the recent study by Zoller (2016).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. also Norman (1992a: 225-231, 1992b: 116), Elizarenkova (1989), Pinault (1989) and Pirart (1989).

<sup>50</sup> With respect to the non-Sanskrit features that can be found in the various MIA literary varieties, see Bloch (1934: 14-15; 1930, 1920), Burrow (1955: 45-47) and the excellent data supplied by Norman (1989, 1992a: 225-243, 1992b: 115-125); and see again the references given in the previous note.

deriving from the Sanskrit root *ruj-* (cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 882). The word *lugga* could indeed be derived from a hypothetical root *\*luj-*, a variant of the Sanskrit root just mentioned, according to the well-known *-r-/-l-* alternation present in IA.<sup>51</sup>

- genuine loanwords from non-IA languages of India, such as the Prakrit words *aṇṇī* ‘wife’s or husband’s brother,’ ‘husband’s sister,’ ‘paternal aunt’ (*Deśīnāmamālā* I, 51) and *ciccī* ‘fire’ (*Deśīnāmamālā* III, 10), which are probably linked to original Dravidian forms. This hypothesis can be proven by:
  - a. the wide presence in modern Dravidian languages of comparable words with a similar meaning,
  - b. the total absence of words in OIA that allow us to postulate the existence of a genetic relationship between them,
  - c. the occasional (and in some cases missed) development of NIA words derived from these words.<sup>52</sup>

Similar observations are also valid for other words classified as *deśī* by Hemacandra. For instance, *pulli* ‘tiger, lion’ (*Deśīnāmamālā* VI, 79), *kaṛaḍa* ‘tiger’ (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 55), *ūra* ‘village’ (*Deśīnāmamālā* I, 143), *cuṃcua* ‘garland for the head’ (*Deśīnāmamālā* III, 16) and, as Norman has pointed out (1990: 63), *gutti*

---

<sup>51</sup> In the ancient verses of *Ṛgveda*, the use of *-r-* is almost exclusive; in this text, there are very few words that contain the liquid *-l-*. In classical Sanskrit, *-r-* is still dominant, although in a less exclusive way than in the (Early) Vedic; as a consequence, both *-r-* and *-l-* are present in Sanskrit. The same phenomenon occurs also in Pāli and in the various varieties of Prakrit and of scholarly MIA, where the change of *-r-* into *-l-* is very common. Sometimes, both in Pāli and in Sanskrit, there is the presence of double forms (e.g. Pāli *lohita*, *rohita*, ‘red’): in some cases, the classical Sanskrit used different meanings for these duplicates. Eastern MIA varieties show the predominance of *-l-*, and, contrary to the Western varieties, have totally absorbed the *-r-*. This fact is documented by the epigraphy. In particular, the Aśoka inscriptions found in the Ganges basin and on the Odisha coast show almost exclusively *-l-*. The fact that in classical Sanskrit and in Pāli there is the presence of both liquids, and that in the Eastern varieties there is the presence of only *-l-*, with the complete exclusion of *-r-*, suggests that the liquid *-l-* did not disappear in OIA only to reappear later, but rather, that it survived only at the spoken dialect level. Its extreme rarity in *Ṛgveda* is an index of style with respect to dialects, while its rare use in classical Sanskrit clearly shows a distinction from the spoken language, as desired by the Brahmanic tradition. For an in-depth discussion of this question, see, among others, Bloch (1934), Chatterji (1960: 51, 1983: 67-69), Pischel (1965: 210-212) and Geiger (1969: 88-89).

<sup>52</sup> Regarding the Prakrit word *aṇṇī*, consider the Tamil words *aṇṇai* ‘mother’, *annai*, *tannai* ‘elder sister’ and Parji *aṇṇa* ‘father’s sister’ (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 6, n. 53). As regards the Prakrit word *ciccī*, consider the Tamil word *kiccu* ‘fire’, the Kannaḍa words *kiccu*, *kircu* ‘fire’, the Telugu word *ciccu* ‘fire, flame’, and so on (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 106, n. 1272).

‘garland’ (*Deśināmamālā* II, 101), *koṇḍiya* ‘one who creates hatred between the inhabitants of the village’ (*Deśināmamālā* II, 48), and many others,<sup>53</sup>

- all loanwords from non-Indian languages such as Greek, Arabic and Persian, introduced to India by the intellectual and cultural exchange with foreign dynasties; these loanwords, according to Hemacandra’s primary feature for a Prakrit word to be a *deśī* word (see above), must be considered as *deśī*,<sup>54</sup>
- all those words that can be classified as pure neologisms (cf. Norman 1990, 1992b), which are generally complex, coined by putting together *deśī* and Sanskrit elements, or which, though built up from elements regarded separately as pure *tadbhavas*, never existed as such in Sanskrit, probably because they were created in Prakrit without following the rules of the *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana* (Bühler 1878: 11-12), or because they are simply specific Prakrit new words. These neologisms are clearly part of the group of Prakrit words regarded as *deśī* by Hemacandra, even though they cannot be attributed to a non-IA source. Consequently, according to Hemacandra, new compounds exclusive to Prakrit, even if formed using elements that have an attested Sanskrit counterpart, are to be considered *deśī*. The same is true for new derivatives formed from ancient words through the addition of suffixes or prefixes (a situation characteristic of Prakrit), but for which no analogous Sanskrit form is attested. Typical examples of Prakrit compounds considered as *deśī* by Hemacandra are the words *vāsavāla* ‘dog’ (*Deśināmamālā* VII, 60)

---

<sup>53</sup> As regards the *deśī* word *pulli*, the following modern Dravidian forms can be taken into account: Tamil *puli*, *pul* ‘tiger’, Malayalam *puli* ‘tiger’, Kannada *puli* ‘tiger’ (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 285, n. 3532). In Tamil, *kaṛaṭi* has the semantic value of ‘Indian black bear’ and ‘juggling bear’ (only the meaning ‘bear’ is attested in the other most important Dravidian languages, such as Kannada, Malayalam and Telugu), while the words *kṛāḍi*, *krāṇḍi* of the Dravidian Kui language and the word *keḍiak* of the Dravidian Kolami language carry the meaning of ‘tiger, leopard, hyena’ (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 89, n. 1059). The *deśī* word *ūra* can be compared with Tamil *ūr* ‘village, city’, Malayalam *ūr* ‘village, city’, Kannada *ūr* ‘village, city’, Telugu *ūru* ‘village, city’, and so on (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 57, n. 643), while the correspondent Dravidian forms of the *deśī* word *gutti* are Tamil *kottu* ‘bunch’, Malayalam *kottu* ‘bunch of leaves, of flowers’, Kannada *gutti*, *gudi* ‘bunch of fruits or flowers’, etc. (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 141, n.1741). The *deśī* word *koṇḍiya* has strong analogies with the Tamil *koṇṭi*, *koṇṭiyam* ‘gossip’, Kannada *koṇḍeya*, *koṇḍe*, *koṇḍega* ‘slander’, and so on (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 149, n. 1865), while *cuṃcua* ‘garland for the head’ can be compared with Kannada *cuṃcu* ‘hair wrapped around the forehead’ (Burrow & Emeneau 1961: 169, n. 2180).

<sup>54</sup> Even if words of this type should be classified as *deśī* according to Hemacandra, Chatterji (1983: 101) suggests that they must be distinguished from words borrowed from the alloglot element, as they can be traced back to that lexical material of the MIA defined as *videśī* ‘foreign’. Some of these words, albeit only a few, were borrowed from Sanskrit and subsequently inherited from MIA, while others (the majority) were borrowed directly from MIA and in some cases, while remaining alive only at the dialectal level, evolved into the different NIA languages. Words of this type were borrowed from the Iranian, Greek, Bactrian and other languages and dialects of Central Asia, as well as from the languages and dialects of the Chinese, Turks and Huns. All these populations, which arrived in India at different times and in different ways, entered the country after the various MIA languages had fully developed (Chatterji 1983: 101-102, 105-106).

and *sairavasaha* 'bull free to roam' (*Deśīnāmamālā* VIII, 21). These are both new Prakrit coinages, not occurring in Sanskrit as such, but formed on the basis of original Sanskrit words. The first of them has been coined from the Sanskrit words *vāsa* (m.) 'dwelling house' and *pāla* 'protector, keeper' (literally: 'protector of the dwelling'), while the second is a neologism formed from the Sanskrit words *svaira* 'free, independent, who goes where he likes' and *vṛṣabha* (m.) 'bull, male' (literally: 'free bull, who goes where he likes'). With respect to derivatives I can mention, for example, the Prakrit word *goṇikka* 'herd of cows' (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 97) formed starting from the original Prakrit word *goṇa* 'witness; ox' (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 104) with the addition of the Prakrit suffix *-ikka*. Both words, *goṇikka* and *goṇa*, are enumerated in the *Deśīnāmamālā* as *deśī*, as they are not attested in Sanskrit forms corresponding to them. The same applies to the Prakrit word *ucchilla* 'hole' (*Deśīnāmamālā* I, 95) derived from the original Prakrit word *chilla* 'hole, den, hut; opening in an enclosure' (*Deśīnāmamālā* III, 35) with the addition of the Sanskrit prefix *ut-*,

- words that are phonologically linked to a corresponding Sanskrit form according to the 'transformation' rules explained by Hemacandra in his *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*, but whose Prakrit meaning is not attested in Sanskrit. This reflects the fact that although Hemacandra's attention is evidently focused on the form of the words that he treats, when assigning Prakrit words to the *deśī* category, as has already been noted, he also gives considerable importance to the meaning of the words involved. This is an important factor for understanding the real nature of the *deśī* class of Prakrit words, especially because it has never been taken into consideration by previous scholars who have made observations on and/or criticised the *Deśīnāmamālā*. An example, demonstrating the consistency of the position taken by Hemacandra, is represented by the Prakrit word *rattaccha* 'tiger; wild goose' (*Deśīnāmamālā* VII, 13) and 'buffalo' (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary VII, 13). The author is aware of the derivation of *rattaccha* from the Sanskrit *raktākṣa* as regards the form of this word. However, taking into consideration the semantic aspect, for the meaning of 'buffalo,' already attested in Sanskrit, *rattaccha* is recognized by Hemacandra as a *tadbhava* word. In contrast, for the meanings of 'tiger' and 'wild goose,' peculiar to Prakrit (i.e., not attested in Sanskrit), *rattaccha* is classified as a *deśī* word. This is demonstrated by the fact that only the meanings of 'wild goose' and 'tiger' are given in the text of the work:

*haṃṣe vagghe rattaccho raijoajahaṅṣesu railakkhaṃ /*  
*daiṅṅirantarasoḥiasaṅṅāhapaliesu rāho vi // 13 //*  
*Deśīnāmamālā* VII, 13 (emphasis added).

Conversely, in the commentary Hemacandra also mentions the meaning of ‘buffalo,’ specifying however that this meaning, and only this meaning, is typical of Sanskrit:

*rattaccho haṃso vyāghraśca / mahiṣe tu saṃskṛtabhavaṃ /  
Deśināmamālā, commentary VII, 13 (emphasis added).*

Hemacandra’s consistency in respecting his rules for the correct interpretation of the term *deśi* is further confirmed by the fact that in the *Deśināmamālā*, if only in the commentary, there are many words that the author classifies as *tatsamas* or *tadbhavas*,<sup>55</sup> even though, as he explains, previous Prakrit lexicographers had understood them as *deśi*. This is the case, for example, with the words *undura* ‘mouse, rat’ (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary I, 102) and *guluñcha* ‘cluster’ (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary II, 92) which are clearly connected to Sanskrit by Hemacandra as *tatsama* words. Similar observations apply to the Prakrit word *pāmaro* ‘man of a large family’ (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VI, 41), also clearly understood to be a *tatsama* word.<sup>56</sup> The Prakrit words *pavitto* ‘grass kuśa’ (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VI, 14) and *payaro* ‘arrow’ (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VI, 14) are linked to Sanskrit as *tadbhava* words, since they derive, according to Hemacandra, from the Sanskrit words *pavitra* and *pradara* with the same meaning, respectively.<sup>57</sup> The same is true for the Prakrit word *davviaro* ‘snake,’ to be traced back, according to the author, to the Sanskrit *darvikara*.<sup>58</sup>

These kinds of examples are quite numerous. Nevertheless, they do not represent the only peculiarity of *Deśināmamālā*. The scrupulousness of Hemacandra’s description and cataloguing is in fact further confirmed by the attention he pays to the dialectal variants of many of the recorded Prakrit words. Some of the most characteristic examples are the Prakrit words *rikkha* and *riccha*, both classified as *tadbhavas* by Hemacandra (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VII, 6), because linked to the same Sanskrit word *ṛkṣa*, but with a different phonological output.<sup>59</sup> Similarly, the non-*deśi* Prakrit word *rojha* ‘a type

<sup>55</sup> As already mentioned (note n. 22), all these words have been collected by Ramanujaswamy in appendix I of the second edition of the *Deśināmamālā*; in this appendix, 213 Prakrit words are listed.

<sup>56</sup> [...] *unduraucayaśabdāvākhunivācakau saṃskṛtasamaḥ / [...]* (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary I, 102). [...] *atra guluñcho guñcha iti saṃskṛtasamaḥ / [...]* (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary II, 92). For the attestation in Sanskrit of the words *undura* ‘mouse, rat’ and *guluñcha* ‘cluster’ see Monier-Williams (1899: 193, 360, respectively); *atra pāmaro kuṭumbīti saṃskṛtasamaḥ / [...]* (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VI, 41). For the attestation in Sanskrit of the word *pāmaro*, see Monier-Williams (1899: 619).

<sup>57</sup> *atra / pavitto darbhaḥ / payaro śaraḥ / iti pavitrapradaraśabdabhavaḥ / [...]* (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VI, 14). For the attestation in Sanskrit of the words *pavitra* and *pradara*, see Monier-Williams (1899: 611, 680 respectively).

<sup>58</sup> *atra / davviaro sarpa iti darvikaraśabdabhavaḥ / [...]* (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary V, 37). For the attestation in Sanskrit of the word *darvikara*, see Monier-Williams (1899: 470).

<sup>59</sup> *rikkho tathā riccho vṛddhaḥ / ṛkṣavācakau tu*



of deer; white-hoofed antelope' (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary VII, 12) is mentioned along with its variant with the same meaning, *rohia* (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary VII, 12).<sup>60</sup>

In some cases, however, words apparently deriving from the same source are correctly connected by Hemacandra to different Sanskrit words. Typical examples are the *deśī* words *kulha* (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 34) and *kolhua* (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 65), both with the semantic value of 'jackal,' which are classified by Hemacandra as independent words.<sup>61</sup>

---

*ikkharicchaśabdāvṛkṣaśabdabhavau* / (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary VII, 6)

In reporting the Prakrit words *rikha* and *riccha*, deriving, as has been said, from the Sanskrit word *ṛkṣa*, we note the MIA bivalent result in *-kkh-* and *-cch-* of the Sanskrit consonant group *-kṣ-*, which in the view of Bubenik (1996: 49), "[...] is difficult to describe diatopically and diachronically." A greater understanding of the bivalent MIA outcome of this Sanskrit consonant group is provided by the comparative studies carried out by Tagare (1948: 87-92), where different ideas are made available for a diachronic and diatopic study. In addition to the discussion in Tagare, see Pischel (1965: 258-260), Geiger (1969: 99-100) and Masica (1991: 460).

<sup>60</sup> *rojho rohia ityanyonyaparyāvṛśyavācakau* / (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary VII, 12)

This case too can be seen as an interesting example of Prakrit duplication. According to the commonly accepted hypothesis, the Prakrit word *rohia* derives from the Sanskrit *rohita*, since the fall of the voiceless dental plosive in the intervocalic position is recognized as a regular norm of Prakrit phonetics. The same phenomenon occurs in Apabhraṃśa, although Hemacandra's indications in this regard point out that an intervocalic *-t-* can also be voiced, thereby changing into *-d-*. Tagare (1948) is of the same opinion, even if he reports that an intervocalic *-t-* falls in the majority of cases in literary Apabhraṃśa, and only rarely changes into *-d-*. The more regular and affirmed transformation would therefore lead to Sanskrit *rohita* > Prakrit *rohia* (for the outcome of the Sanskrit voiceless dental plosive *-t-* in Prakrit, see Pischel (1965: 163), while for the outcome in Apabhraṃśa, see Tagare (1948: 78-81) and again Pischel (1965: 166)). The Prakrit word *rojha* is instead a variant of *rohia*, probably due to diachronic reasons. In fact, after the voiceless dental plosive is dropped in intervocalic position, the semivowel *-y-* is inserted in its place, especially in Ardhamāgadhī, Mahārāṣṭrī and Jain Śāurasenī (concerning the insertion of the semivowel *-y-* instead of the plosive *-t-*, see Pischel (1965: 163-164)). Later, with the drop of the vowel *-i-*, the resulting cluster *-hy-* is changed into the palatal consonant cluster *-jhh-*, as in many other Prakrit words (for the change of the consonant cluster *-hy-* into *-jhh-*, see the material provided in Pischel 1965: 267).

<sup>61</sup> *kukkhī kucchī kulho a siāle poṭṭale kuṃṭī* /

*kuṃbhī śimantāi kuddaṃ bahu mañjari kuṃṭī* // (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 34)

[...] *kulho śṛgālah* / [...] (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary II, 34)

*koso kosumbhajalahisu kolio tantuvāyalūasu* /

*acchuṇivīlaṇajantammi kolhuo taha siālammi* // (*Deśīnāmamālā* II, 65)

[...] *kolhuo ikṣunipīḍanayantraṃ śṛgālašca* // (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary II, 65)

The Prakrit words *kulha*, *kolhua* 'jackal' could be seen as two variants derived from the same Sanskrit word. However, on the basis of the two verses of the *Deśīnāmamālā* just quoted, it can be observed that Hemacandra classifies them as independent words. Pischel (1965) is of the same opinion, as he considers *kulha* to be the MIA outcome of the Sanskrit *kroṣṭī*, and *kolhua* the MIA outcome of the Sanskrit *kroṣṭuka*. This hypothesis is undoubtedly the most plausible, even if we can note that both original words present the consonant group *kro-*, which would therefore have had to evolve in two different ways. In the passage from OIA to MIA, this consonant group is in fact simplified by means of the drop of *-r-*. In the case of *kolhua*, the vowel *-o-* is kept, while in the case of *kulha*, the *-o-* is changed into *-u-*, following some analogous cases occurring mainly in Mahārāṣṭrī, Ardhamāgadhī and Jain Mahārāṣṭrī, where the same change occurs before a consonant cluster (see Pischel 1965: 90-91). It is

To sum up, based on what has been said so far, it can be seen that the criteria followed by Hemacandra in his cataloguing attest to the existence of a clear lexicographic project. In addition to this, though, and what makes the *Deśināmamālā* of extreme interest, and in a certain sense provides a further guarantee of its validity, is the frequent quotation by Hemacandra of the opinion of other lexicographers, from which he, in some cases, differs. This happens with reference not only to the proposed form of the *deśī* word under consideration, but also, in some cases, to its semantic value. Hemacandra mentions the names of eight authors of Prakrit *deśī koṣas*. We know only a few of these, and the works attributed to them have not come down to us.<sup>62</sup>

In more than one case, our author points out how, in his opinion, his predecessors committed inaccuracies, and how difficult it was for him to determine the meaning of several words. For example, in commenting on the *deśī* word *bhamāso* ‘a type of grass that looks like sugar cane’ (*Deśināmamālā* VI, 101), Hemacandra informs us that the Prakrit lexicographer Dhanapāla<sup>63</sup> reports for this word the form *bhamaso*:

*bhamāso iksusaṭṭaśatṛṇam / bhamaso iti dhanapālah / [...]*

*Deśināmamālā*, commentary VI, 101.

---

important to add that Mayrhofer (1956-: vol. I, 281) believes that the Sanskrit word *krōṣṭuka* is a Prakritism deriving from the original Sanskrit form *krōṣṭr* (m.).

<sup>62</sup> Among the different authors of *deśīkoṣas* mentioned in *Deśināmamālā* we find: Abhimānacihna, mentioned by Hemacandra five times, four in agreement with his interpretations (I, 144; VI, 93; VIII, 12, 17), and one in disagreement (VII, 1); Gopāla, mentioned five times in agreement with Hemacandra (VI, 58, 72; VII, 76; VIII, 1, 17), five times in disagreement regarding the form of the word analysed (I, 25, 45; III, 47; VI, 26; VII, 2), once with regard to the meaning (II, 82), and twice in disagreement on both the form and the meaning (I, 31; VIII, 67); Devarāja, mentioned three times in the *Deśināmamālā*, two of these in agreement with Hemacandra’s interpretation (VI, 72; VIII, 17), once with some divergence (VI, 58); Droṇa, mentioned once in accordance with Hemacandra’s opinion (VIII, 17), twice in disagreement regarding the form (I, 18, 50), and once regarding the meaning (VI, 7); Dhanapāla, author of a Prakrit lexicon, mentioned by Hemacandra once in agreement with his hypotheses (VIII, 17), twice with a divergence on the form of the words (IV, 30; VI, 101), and twice with a divergence on the meaning (I, 141; III, 22); and Pādaliptācārya who wrote a *koṣa* of *deśī* words (I, 2) (on Pādaliptācārya, also known as Paliṭṭa, see Ollett 2018). It seems that Hemacandra wrote the *Deśināmamālā* following the work of the latter author, and also following Rāhukala’s lexicon, which is mentioned in the *Deśināmamālā* only once (IV, 4). Hemacandra is supposed to have followed many of Rāhukala’s views in drafting the *Deśināmamālā*. Silānka is also the author of a *deśīkoṣa*, of which, however, we know nothing; he is mentioned three times in the *Deśināmamālā* (II, 20; VI, 96; VIII, 40). For a discussion of the *koṣa* authors mentioned by Hemacandra in the *Deśināmamālā*, see Ramanujaswamy (1938: 12-14), Pischel (1965: 49-50) and Vaidya (1926-27: 64-67).

<sup>63</sup> I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer of this paper who pointed out that the citations from Dhanapāla given in the examples are not actually found in the *Pāiyalacchī*, which raises the sticky question of Hēmacandra referring to a *dēśīkoṣa* by ‘Dhanapāla’ that apparently is different from the surviving *deśīkoṣa* by ‘Dhanapāla.’

Similarly, in discussing the *deśī* word *ūsāiaṃ* (*Deśīnāmamālā* I, 141), Hemacandra informs us that the meaning to be attributed to this is that of 'scattered' (Sanskrit *vikṣiptam*), and not that of 'launched, thrown' (Sanskrit *utkṣiptam*), as claimed instead by Dhanapāla:

[...] *ūsāiaṃ vikṣiptam / ūsāiaṃ utkṣiptamiti dhanapālah / [...]*  
*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary I, 141.

## 7. The tripartite classification in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* vs. an historical approach to Prakrit

Before moving on to the conclusions, two remarks are in order.

First, in order to explain that for Prakrit grammarians, or at least for Hemacandra, *deśī* is not synonymous with non-IA and/or has a precise meaning—even if including an heterogeneous class of words—we must note that, as shown above, not all Prakrit words of non-IA etymology are to be regarded as *deśī* words. This might seem quite strange, because a word of non-IA origin reported in a Prakrit text should certainly be classified as a *deśī* word as it is not linked to a corresponding Sanskrit word. However, the tripartite classification in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* does not exclude the possibility that a word of non-IA origin attested in Sanskrit is also attested in Prakrit and this invalidates its classification as a *deśī* word. This is the case, for example, of the words inherited from Sanskrit, with or without the necessary phonological changes, but actually of ancient Dravidian or Munda origin before the differentiation between the OIA and MIA languages and thus inherited, as 'new OIA words,' by MIA and possibly also by Prakrit; these words should be understood as genuine *tatsama* or *tadbhava*. Among the most significant examples of this type of words, I can mention the Prakrit word *undura*, classified as *tatsama* by Hemacandra,<sup>64</sup> probably because it occurs with the same form and meaning in Sanskrit (see Monier-Williams 1899: 193), but according to authoritative studies

---

<sup>64</sup> This is the verse of the *Deśīnāmamālā* relating to the Prakrit word *undura*, where, as can be seen, it is not quoted together with the other *deśī* words:

*khiṇṇe uvvāuttampiā ya hāsammi ullevo /*  
*ubbhuggopphaṇḍolā calammi mūḍhammi ummaiaṃ // (Deśīnāmamālā I, 102)*

On the contrary, this word is mentioned by Hemacandra in the commentary, where it is explicitly stated that it is a *tatsama*:  
[...] *unduraucayaśabdāvākhunivivācakau saṃskṛtasamau / [...]* (*Deśīnāmamālā*, commentary I, 102)

(cf. Kuiper 1948: 27; Mayrhofer 1956: vol. I, 105; Turner 1966: 98, n. 2095), etymologically deriving from a non-IA source.<sup>65</sup>

Another example that can be understood similar to the previous one concerns the Prakrit word *ghoḍa* ‘horse’ classified as *tadbhava* by Hemacandra, as it is linked to the Sanskrit word *ghoṭa*, and having the same meaning,<sup>66</sup> even though it too, according to Mayrhofer (1956-: vol. I, 361-362), Turner (1966: 244, n. 4516) and Chatterji (1983: 115-116), has a Dravidian etymology.<sup>67</sup> In this case, however, we don’t know, at the current state of knowledge, if this word has been used for the first time in a Prakrit or in a Sanskrit work.

Second, in order to provide further evidence that the tripartite classification of Prakrit words in *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* need not be analysed taking into consideration their possible origin from a purely historical-linguistic perspective, it is important to look at the reciprocal influences between Sanskrit and Prakrit and between these literary languages and the other non literary languages throughout the MIA period. In following this line of approach, a correct analysis of the relationship between Sanskrit and Prakrit in this period must be provided,<sup>68</sup> clarifying, at the same, what is meant

---

<sup>65</sup> More precisely, the Sanskrit word *undura* ‘mouse’ is compared by Mayrhofer (1956-: vol. I, 105) with a word from Sora (a Munda language, of the Austro-Asiatic language family, spoken in India), *guntūr* ‘rat’, while Kuiper (1948: 27) compares the same word also with the Sora word *kentūr* ‘bat’, arguing that, in this language, ‘mouse, rat’ and ‘bat’ are often denominated with the same words. As regards the NIA evolution of the *tatsama undura* ‘mouse, rat’, see Turner (1966: 98, n. 2095).

<sup>66</sup> Below, I quote the verse from the *Deśināmamālā* relating to the Prakrit word *ghoḍa* where, as can be seen, it is not referred to together with the other *deśī* words:

*ghorī salahaviseṣe ghoṣālī sarayavallibheammi /*

*ghaṭṭo kusumbharatte sariātūhammi vaṃṣe a // (Deśināmamālā II, 111)*

On the contrary, the word *ghoḍa* is mentioned by Hemacandra in the commentary:

*[...] atra ghoḍo aśva iti ghoṭaśabdabhavaḥ / [...]* (*Deśināmamālā*, commentary II, 111)

<sup>67</sup> Mayrhofer (1956-: vol. I, 361-362) postulates a Dravidian origin for the Sanskrit word *ghoṭa*. On this matter he mentions the Tamil words *kutirai*, the Kannada word *kudurè* and the Telugu word *gurramu*, all deriving from a probable reconstructed form *\*gudr*. Mayrhofer (1956-: vol. I, 361-362) also proposes a comparison with the Gadaba word *krutā* ‘horse’ and the Savara word *kurtā* ‘horse’ (Gadaba and Savara are two Munda languages). For the citation of other Dravidian words analogous to those mentioned above, see Burrow and Emeneau (1961: 117, n.1423), and regarding the evolution in NIA of the Prakrit word *ghoḍa* ‘horse’, see the material provided in Turner (1966: 244, no. 4516).

<sup>68</sup> As already pointed out by some scholars (see, among others, Burrow 1955: 374, 386-387; Bloch 1934: 14; Chatterji 1960: 67-68), Sanskrit, in the course of its history (to which reference has been made at the start of this paper), has undergone a constant evolution with an evident lexical enrichment. Indeed, Aśvaghōṣa and Kālidāsa’s texts testify to uses and forms that go beyond what Pāṇini describes in his grammar. Through the hyper-Sanskritization of MIA forms, these innovations, part of the Sanskrit lexical enrichment, demonstrate the influence of a regional dialect that has become politically and culturally prestigious in a given period. The same kind of deviations occur in the epic Sanskrit of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* (Oberlies 2003). It is also worth mentioning in this regard the following observations of Salomon (1989: 277): “[...] in reality there is much in the literary and textual history of Sanskrit to suggest that, *in terms of practical reality* as opposed to linguistic ideals,

by 'Sanskrit' and 'Prakrit.'<sup>69</sup> In this regard, I mention here an example which, originally reported by Deshpande (1993: 74), can help to clarify the argument that has just been made, although it does not actually involve a *deśī* word.

The corresponding Pāli and Prakrit words of the Sanskrit word *gr̥ha* 'house' are *gaha* and *giha*, *gaha*, respectively (Turner 1966: 227, n. 4240). It is important to point out that in Prakrit the word *geha*, with the same meaning of *gr̥ha*, is also attested; this form is not deriving from Sanskrit *gr̥ha*, but, as pointed out by Mayrhofer (1956: Band I, 345), from an unattested OIA word *\*gedha*. Mayrhofer's hypothesis seems to be supported by the fact that deriving *geha* from *gr̥ha* suggests an atypical phonological change from OIA to MIA ("Lautlich kaum aus *gr̥hah* zu entwickeln, wie vielfach versucht wurde, Falsch;" Mayrhofer 1956: Band I, 345). Therefore, *geha* can be classified as a MIA colloquial form occurring in Prakrit literature, 'colloquial,' because not corresponding to a Sanskrit word, but to a OIA non-Sanskritic form.<sup>70</sup> Interestingly, as suggested by Deshpande (1993: 74), *geha* was later borrowed by Sanskrit, from Prakrit, as a word of dialectal origin, that is to say as a colloquial MIA word, becoming thus part of Sanskrit lexicon through the mediation of Prakrit. Assuming Sanskrit, erroneously, as a synonym of OIA, *geha* can be understood as a Prakrit *tadbhava* word (because, after all, an IA word) as a consequence of the fact that is derived, historically, from an unattested 'Sanskrit' (OIA = Sanskrit) word *\*gedha*. Nevertheless, as we have seen, *\*gedha* is in no way to be identified, if attested, as a Sanskrit word. It is certainly a possible OIA word, but non part of Sanskrit lexicon. Actually, *geha* is a *tatsama* word, since it is found with an identical form and the same meaning in Sanskrit texts, but even in this case further clarifications are required. Normally, from the point of view of historical linguistics, Sanskrit, as an OIA language, is considered as a most ancient language as compared to Prakrit, a MIA literary language, and thus as a previous language in terms of chronology. Consequently, if a word with the same meaning and form occur in both languages, normally this word in Prakrit is considered as a loanword from Sanskrit. As a matter of fact, *tatsama* words are normally classified as Sanskrit borrowings (see, e.g., Pollock 2006). However, as has been shown in tracing the 'history' of the word in question, the direction of the loan turns out to be the opposite way round, since it is Sanskrit that has incorporated in its lexicon a word whose form and meaning are previously attested in Prakrit. For this

---

Sanskrit and Prakrit were, at least in early times, not so much separate and irreconcilable opposites as the poles of a dialect spectrum [...]"'. On this topic, see also Deshpande (1993).

<sup>69</sup> For example, the majority of scholars uses the term "Sanskrit" to indicate also what is actually the Vedic language: cf. Houben (1996b: 10), Thieme (1994) and Wezler (1996: 346, note no. 73). On the contrary, Mayrhofer (1986-) seems to behave differently in his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*.

<sup>70</sup> Monier-Williams (1899: 363) speaks of a corrupted form from *gr̥ha*.

reason, it is my belief that *geha*, in Prakrit, can be classified as *tatsama* purely and exclusively on the basis of the fact that in Sanskrit there is a word with the same form and the same meaning, regardless of what the real history and origin of that word is.

## 8. Conclusion

Thanks to his clear definition of *deśī*, Hemacandra has imposed his superiority and originality over the *deśī* lexicographers who preceded him (cf. Ramanujaswamy 1938; Pischel 1965: 8-9, 48-50; Shriyan 1969: 29-31), and perhaps this is what accounts for the unique nature of his work in the context of *deśī* lexicons.

As already mentioned at the start, in the explanation of the purpose of the present paper, we can understand now why Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā* is an incomparable text for study, and for aiding our understanding not only of the exact meaning of the tripartite classification of the Prakrit lexicon, and thus of the term *deśī*, but also of the heterogeneity of the *deśī* Prakrit class of words. In this regard I have shown how *deśī* 'regional/local' is used by Hemacandra with respect to the Prakrit lexicon to indicate the 'new' lexical material specific to a particular MIA literary variety, that is to say Prakrit. Within this material are sometimes certainly included words borrowed from alloglot groups of South-Asia, but also all those independent neologisms for which there is no loan relationship between the Prakrit element classified as *deśī* and a possible Sanskrit model. Taking into consideration all these suggestions and following the conclusions of one of my previous papers (cf. Drocco 2012), this means that the division into *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśī* was probably a tool in the hands of Indian authors, offering them the unique scope to compare the Prakrit lexicon with the Sanskrit one, in a period when these two varieties were used side by side as literary vehicles, even if, between them, Sanskrit had achieved the dominance. Actually, it is likely that this tripartite classification of Prakrit words was used by these authors only for composing their works, beginning with the consultation of Prakrit grammars and *deśīkoṣas*. Thanks to these grammars, it was possible for them not only to compose new works using 'standard' Prakrit variety, building on their previous knowledge of Sanskrit, but also, at the same time, to understand the ancient Prakrit texts. All this was achieved with the simple application of real rules of 'transformation,' such as those explained in the Prakrit grammars, by means of which a Sanskrit word, the only one probably present in the cultural background of the author, was literally 'transformed/translated' into a Prakrit word. It is for this reason that Prakrit grammarians argued that 'Prakrit originates from Sanskrit.' As a matter of fact, it does 'originate' from Sanskrit, not as a result of a historical linguistic process, but rather through a rule, the latter working as a sort of 'linguistic/language equation,' an equation that can also be used in reverse, thus for generating a new



Sanskrit word starting from the new Prakrit one. For all the new words or for all the new meanings of ancient Sanskrit words, in both cases specific to Prakrit, the different *deśīkoṣas*, among which the *Deśīnāmamālā* was and still is the most important, came to the aid of the Indian author.

In this way, starting from the premise that Prakrit has to be analyzed from within the larger system of Sanskrit grammar and lexicography (see above), the tripartite system just outlined makes it possible to understand the dependence on and the closeness with Sanskrit, and the degree of this dependence/closeness, of a particular Prakrit text by analysing its lexicon, since not all authors used lexical material connected or not connected with Sanskrit to the same extent. While it is true that, in some cases, the author's origin and/or his cultural milieu could be a decisive factor here, as well as the period and/or circumstances in which he composed his work, in other cases, the specific variety of language used, closer or not to Prakrit, and the aims behind the text were more important. For example, the use of Prakrit for some of the characters in Sanskrit dramas first came about through a constant reference to the Sanskrit tradition. Consequently, in such texts, the use of *tatsama* and *tadbhava* is predominant, although we cannot exclude the attestation, albeit rare, of some *deśī* words.

In a nutshell, therefore, and in line with the opinion of the majority of scholars, it can be said with near certainty that Prakrit can be considered the most artificial of the various MIA varieties used as literary, religious and administrative vehicles. Even though Prakrit shows some similarity with spoken forms showing thus typical 'dialectal/colloquial' features, testifying in this respect to its diachronic and diatopic variability<sup>71</sup> (cf. Tagare 1948; Pischel 1965; Bubenik 1998, 2003), it no longer has any strong connection with spoken languages (Pischel 1965: 4; Chatterji 1983), because it is deeply dependent on and close with Sanskrit, even as if it were a form of the latter. I believe that now we are in a better position to understand why Bhayani maintains that "Literary Mahārāṣṭrī (i.e. Prakrit; AD) was in that regard rather a colloquialized and stylized form of Sanskrit [...]" (Bhayani 1998d: 29-30).

I conclude by saying that the close relationship of Sanskrit and Prakrit, as if they were two specular varieties of the same language, can also explain the change related to the terms used in the tripartite terminology—I mean the terminological change concerning the term *tadbhava* previously named *vibhraṣṭa*—and reported as an essential part, that is at the underpinning of the grammatical description of Prakrit. Although Pollock (2006) and Ollett (2017), also referring to previous scholars (as, for example, Nitti-Dolci 1972), have discussed Bharata's work and the meaning of the tripartite classification in great detail and at length, it seems to me that the possible motivations for this

---

<sup>71</sup> This is equally valid for the final form of MIA, Apabhraṃśa; in this regard see, for example, Pischel (1965), Tagare (1948) and Bubenik (1998).



terminological change have not been explored by any scholar so far. I firmly believe that this change is strictly correlated with a change of perspective towards the Prakrit language. What this terminological change tell us is that at the beginning of and/or before the process that gradually transformed Sanskrit as a cosmopolitan language (see Pollock 2007), Prakrit was seen as something outside the Sanskrit sphere. Afterwards, on the contrary, it became part of the ‘world of Sanskrit’ (‘eternal world of Sanskrit’ according to Kahrs 1992) thanks, above all, Prakrit grammarians’ works, whose beginning was inaugurated by Bharata. Actually, the latter saw Prakrit as something still outside the ‘Sanskrit tradition,’ perhaps because he was located at the outset of the above said cosmopolitan change concerning Sanskrit. This is not the case, however, for the subsequent Prakrit grammarians. To understand the cultural milieu and the socio-political dynamics behind this change of perspective on Prakrit can be a good topic for future researchs.

## References

- Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1936. “The Vasudevahiṇḍi, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* Vol. 8/2-3 (Indian and Iranian Studies: Presented to George Abraham Grierson on His Eighty-Fifth Birthday, 7th January): 319-33.
- Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1937. *Apabhraṃśa Studien*. Leipzig: Universität Leipzig.
- Aklujkar, Ashok. 1996. “The early history of Sanskrit as supreme language.” In: *Ideology and status of Sanskrit: contributions to the history of the Sanskrit language*, edited by Jan E. M. Houben, 59-85. Leiden–New York, NY–Köln: Brill.
- Balbir, Nalini. 1989. “Morphological evidence for dialectal variety in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī.” In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 503-525. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.
- Balbir, Nalini. 2017. “Extended grammars: from Sanskrit to Middle Indo-Aryan with Reference to verb-description.” *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 39/2: 21-44.
- 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.
- Bhandarkar, Ramkrishna Gopal. 1914. *Wilson Philological Lectures on Sanskrit and the derived Languages, delivered in 1877*. Bombay: Mrs. Radhabai Atmaram Sagoon.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1973. “Some Further Light on Harivṛddha, and His Novel Classification of Literary Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa.” *Vidyā (Humanities Section)* 16/1: 1-6.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1988a. *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*. Ahmedabad: Kalikāla Sarvajña Śrī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṇ Saṃskār Nidhi.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1998a. *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhramsha Studies*. Ahmedabad: Parshva Publication.

- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1988b. "Studies in the *Deśīnāmamālā*." In: *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 1-95. Ahmedabad: Kalikāla Sarvajña Srī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṇ Saṃskār Nidhi.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1988c. "Some Variant Readings in Hemacandra's *Deśīnāmamālā*." In: *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 96-103. Ahmedabad: Kalikāla Sarvajña Srī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṇ Saṃskār Nidhi.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1988d. "Origins of Multiple Meanings of *Deśya* Words." In: *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 104-113. Ahmedabad: Kalikāla Sarvajña Srī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṇ Saṃskār Nidhi.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1988e. "Importance of Jain Literature for the Study of *Deśya* Prakrit." In: *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 155-176. Ahmedabad: Kalikāla Sarvajña Srī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṇ Saṃskār Nidhi.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1988f. "Linguistic Peculiarities of *Lilāvati-Sāra* of Jinaratna." In: *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 219-240. Ahmedabad: Kalikāla Sarvajña Srī Hemacandrācārya Navam Janma Śatābdī Smṛti Śikṣaṇ Saṃskār Nidhi.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1998b. "The Prakrit of the *Nāṇapaṇcamikahā*." In: *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 13-25. Ahmedabad: Parshva Publication.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1998c. "A novel classification of literary Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa." In: *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 44-49. Ahmedabad: Parshva Publication.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1998d. "The rise of Apabhraṃśa as a literary language." In: *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 26-34. Ahmedabad: Parshva Publication.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1998e. "Lexicological and exegetical notes. Notes on some words from some Prakrit and Sanskrit Texts." In: *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 134-160. Ahmedabad: Parshva Publication.
- Bhayani, Harivallabh Chunilal. 1998f. "Notes on some prakrit words." In: *Indological Studies (Vol. 2). Literary and Performing Arts. Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies*, edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani, 161-234. Ahmedabad: Parshva Publication.
- Bloch, Jules. 1920. *La formation de la langue marathe*. Paris: E. Champion.
- Bloch, Jules. 1930. "Some problems of Indo-Aryan philology." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 5: 719-56.
- Bloch, Jules. 1934. *L'indo-aryen du véda au temps moderne*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Bloch, Jules. 1950. *Les inscriptions d'Asoka*. Paris : Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- Boccali, Giuliano. 2000. "La letteratura classica." In: *Le letterature dell'India*, edited by Giuliani Boccali, Stefano Piano and Saverio Sani, 383-552. Torino: UTET.

- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1993. "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit: The Original Language." In: *Aspects of Buddhist Sanskrit. Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Language of Sanskrit Buddhist Texts, Oct. 1-5, 1991* (Samyag-vāk Series 6), edited by Kameshwar Nath Mishra, 396-423. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Bryant, Edwin Francis. 1999. "Linguistic Substrata and the Indigenous Aryan debate." In: *Aryan and non-Aryan in South Asia: Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology*, edited by Johannes Bronkhorst and Madhav Murlidhar Deshpande, 59-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bubenik, Vit. 1996. *The Structure and Development of Middle Indo-Aryan Dialects*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bubenik, Vit. 1998. *A Historical Syntax of Late Middle Indo-Aryan (Apabhraṃśa)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bubenik, Vit. 2001. "On the actualization of the passive-to-ergative shift in Pre-Islamic India." In: *Actualization. Linguistic Change in Progress*, edited by Henning Andersen, 95-118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bühler, Johann Georg. 1874. "The Deśīśabdasaṅgraha of Hemacandra." *Indian Antiquary* 2: 17-21.
- Bühler, Johann Georg (ed.). 1878. *The Pāyīalachchhī Nāmamālā: A Prakrit Kosha by Dhanapāla*. Göttingen: Peppmüller.
- Bühler, Johann Georg. 1889. *Ueber das Leben des Jaina Monches Hemacandra, des Schulers des Devachandra aus der Vajrasākhā*. Wien: F. Tempsky.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1955. *The Sanskrit Language*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau 1961. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press.
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau 1972. 'A reconsideration of Fortunatov's law.' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35: 531-545.
- Caracchi, Pinuccia. 2002. *Grammatica Hindī* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Torino: Magnanelli.
- 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.
- Choudhary, Gulab Chandra. 1954. *Political History of Northern India from Jain sources (C. 650 A.D. to 1300 A.D.)*. Amritsar: Sohanlal Jaindharma Pracharak Samiti.
- Deshpande, Madhav Murlidhar. 1993. *Sanskrit & Prakrit, Sociolinguistic Issues*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- D'Onza Chiodo, Mariangela and Emanuela Panattoni. 1980-81. "Kuḍḍa-rājan and allied terms: a set of Dravidian loan-words in Pāli." *Indologica Taurinensia* 8/9: 147-162.
- Drocco, Andrea. 2006. "La Deśīnāmamālā di Hemacandra e la tipologia dei vocaboli deśī nei prakriti." In: *Roads to Knowledge: Hermeneutical and Lexical Probes*, edited by Alessandro Monti and Sara Bianchi, 61-99. Alessandria: dell'Orso.
- Drocco, Andrea. 2012. "Eternal Sanskrit and the meaning of the tripartite Prakrit terminology 'tatsama', 'tadbhava' and 'deshi.'" *Linguistica e Filologia* 32: 119-136.

- Drocco, Andrea. forthcoming. "Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the language of the Jain Canon according to Hemacandra." *Annali di Ca' Foscari Serie Orientale* 61.
- Elizarenkova, Tatiana. 1989. "About traces of a prakrit dialectal basis in the language of the Ṛgveda." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 1-33. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1966. "The dialects of Old Indo-Aryan." In: *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, edited by Henrik Birnbaum and Jaan Puhvel, 123-138. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1980. *Language and linguistic area: essays by Murray B. Emeneau*. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1985-86. "Sanskrit and Dravidian." *Indologica Taurinensia* 13: 61-71.
- Geiger, Wilhelm. 1969 (reprint). *Pāli Literature and Language*. New Delhi: Oriental Book reprint (authorised English translation by Batakrishna Ghosh; orig.: 1916. *Pāli iteratur und Sprache*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner).
- Ghatage, Amrit Madhav (ed.). 1996-. *A Comprehensive and Critical Dictionary of the Prakrit Languages with Special reference to Jain Literature*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Gray, Louis Herbert. 1940. "Fifteen prākṛit-indo-european etymologies." *Journal of American Oriental Society* 60/3: 361-369.
- Grierson, George Abraham. 1913. "Apabhraṃśa according to Mārkaṇḍeya and 'Dhakkī' Prākṛit." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 875-883.
- Grierson, George Abraham. 1918. "The Prākṛit 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.
- Hinüber von, Oskar. 1986. *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Wien: SB Akad.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 2016. "Indo-Aryan." In: *The Languages and Linguistics of South Asia*, edited by Hans Henrich Hock and Elena Bashir, 18-50. Berlin-Boston, MA: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 2021. *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (3rd Edition). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hock, Hans Henrich and Rajeshwari Pandharipande. 1976. "The sociolinguistic position of Sanskrit in pre-Muslim South Asia." *Studies in Language Learning* 1/2: 106-138.
- Hock, Hans Henrich and Rajeshwari Pandharipande. 1978. "Sanskrit in the pre-Islamic context of South Asia." In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 16: *Aspects of sociolinguistics in South Asia*, edited by Braj B. Kachru and S. N. Sridhar, 11-25. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hoernle, August Friedrich Rudolf. *A Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian (Aryo-Indian) Languages*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.
- Houben, Jan. E. M. 1994. "Early Indian Authors and Linguistic Change (Postscript to: Bhartṛhari's Familiarity with Jainism)." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 75: 255-256.
- Houben, Jan. E. M. (ed.). 1996. *Ideology and status of Sanskrit: contributions to the history of the Sanskrit language*. Leiden-New York, NY-Köln: Brill.

- Houben, Jan. E. M. 1996. "Introduction: towards a social history of the Sanskrit Language." In: *Ideology and status of Sanskrit: contributions to the history of the Sanskrit language*. edited by Jan E. M. Houben, 1-13. Leiden–New York, NY–Köln: Brill.
- Houben, Jan. E. M. 2018. "Linguistic Paradox and Diglossia: the emergence of Sanskrit and Sanskritic language in Ancient India." *Open Linguistics, Historical Sociolinguistic Philology* 4/1: 1-18.
- Hultzsch, Eugen Julius Theodor. 1924. *Inscriptions of Aśoka* (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 1). New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India (reprinted 1991).
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1886. *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Mâhârâshtrî*. Leipzig: Birzel
- Kahrs, Eivind. 1992. "What is a tadbhava word?" *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35/2-3: 225-249.
- Katre, Sumitra Mangesh. 1943. "The Influence of Popular Dialects on Sanskrit." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 24: 9-26.
- Katre, Sumitra Mangesh. 1964. *Prakrit languages and their contribution to Indian culture*. Poona: Deccan College (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- Kellogg, Henry Salomon. 1893. *A grammar of the Hindi language*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. (second edition, revised and enlarged).
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1948. *Proto-Muṇḍā Words in Sanskrit*. Amsterdam: Verhandeling der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks Deel LI, No.3.
- Kulikov, Leonid. "Language vs. grammatical tradition in Ancient India: How real was Pāṇinian Sanskrit?" *Folia Linguistica Historica* 34/1: 59-91.
- Kunjunni Raja, Kumarapuram. 1977. *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre (reprint of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- Lienhard, Siegfried. 1984. *A History of Classical Poetry Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Masica, Colin Paul. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Masica, Colin Paul. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Masica, Colin Paul. 2001. "The Definition and Significance of Linguistic Areas: Methods, Pitfalls, and Possibilities (with Special Reference to the Validity of South Asia as a Linguistic Area)." In: *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, edited by Rajendra Singh and Probal Dasgupta, 205-268. Berlin–New York, NY: De Gruyter Mouton.
- 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. 1956-. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.



- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986-. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag.
- Mehendale, Madhukar Anant. 1948. *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate & Research Institute.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nitti-Dolci, Luigia. 1972. *The Prākṛta Grammarians*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (translated from the French by Prabhakara Jha).
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1989. "Dialect forms in Pāli." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 369-392. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1990. "Notes on some *deśī* words." In: Kenneth Roy Norman (1990-1996). *Collected Papers*, voll. 1-6. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, vol. 1: 63-67.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1992a. "The origin of Pāli and its position among the Indo-European languages." In: Kenneth Roy Norman. 1990-1996. *Collected Papers*, voll. 1-6. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, vol. 3: 225-243.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1992b. "The Dialectal Variety of Middle Indo-Aryan." In: Kenneth Roy Norman. 1990-1996. *Collected Papers*, voll. 1-6. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, vol. 3: 115-125.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1993. "The Pāli Language and Scriptures." In: Kenneth Roy Norman. 1990-1996. *Collected Papers*, voll. 1-6. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, vol. 4: 92-123.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1995. "Dialect variation in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan." In: *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia. Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity*, edited by George Erdosy, 278-292. Berlin–München–Boston, MA: Walter De Gruyter.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1996. "The development of the Middle Indo-Aryan dialects." In: Kenneth Roy Norman. 1990-1996. *Collected Papers*, voll. 1-6. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, vol. 6: 88-121.
- Oberlies, Thomas. 2003. *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Berlin–New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ollett, Andrew. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Ollett, Andrew. 2018. "The Taraṅgavatī and History of Prakrit Literature." In: *Jaina Studies. Select Papers presented in the 'Jaina Studies' Section at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference, Bangkok (Thailand), and the 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto (Japan)*, edited by Nalini Balbir and Peter Flügel, 129-164. New Delhi: DK Publishers Distributors.
- Pinault, Georges Jean. 1989. "Reflets dialectaux en védique ancien." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 35-96. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.
- Pirart, Eric. 1989. "Avestique et dialectologie rgvédique." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 19-33. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.

- Pisani, Vittore. 1957. "On the Origin of *Prākṛtam* and *Pāli* as Language Designations." In: *Felicitations Volume Presented to Professor Sripad Krishna Belvalkar, 185-191*. Benares [Varanasi]: M. B. Dass.
- Pischel, Richard. 1877-80. *Hemacandra's grammatik der prākritisprachen* (Siddhahemacandram adhyāya 8). Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Pischel, Richard. 1880 (1938). *Deśināmamālā of Hemacandra. Introduction, and critical notes*. In: *Deśināmamālā of Hemacandra. Introduction, critical notes, and glossary*, edited by Paravastu Venkata Ramanujaswamy. 1938: 27-31. Poona. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (reprint of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 1989).
- Pischel, Richard. 1965. *A Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition, translated from German by Subhandra Jha).
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ramanujaswamy, Paravastu Venkata (ed.). 1938. *Deśināmamālā of Hemacandra. Introduction, critical notes, and glossary*. Poona. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (reprint of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 1989).
- Salomon, Richard. 1989. "Linguistic variability in post-Vedic Sanskrit." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 275-294. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.
- Salomon, Richard. 1998. *A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. New York, NY–Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sandesara, Bhogilal Jayachandbhai and Jayant P. Thaker. 1962. *Lexicographical Studies in 'Jaina Sanskrit.'* Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Sastri, Kallidaikurichi Aiyah Nilakanta. 1975. *A History of South India, From prehistoric times to the fall of Vijayanagar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (4<sup>th</sup> edition).
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 1977. *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 5, Fasc. 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 2002. *Education in Ancient India*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Sen, Sukumar K. 1960. *A Comparative Grammar of Middle Indo-Aryan*. Poona: Deccan College.
- Shastri, Ajay Mitra. 1999. *The Age of the Sātavāhanas*. New Delhi: Aryan Books International.
- Shriyan, Ratna Nagesha. 1969. *A critical study of the deśya and rare words from Puṣpadanta's Mahāpurāṇa and his other Apabhraṃśa works*. Ahmedabad: Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidyamandira.
- Tagare, Ganesh Vasudev. 1948. *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṃśa*. Poona. (Dissertation, 5; 1987 ed., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Thieme, Paul. 1955. "Review of *The Sanskrit Language* by T. Burrow." *Language* 31: 428-457.
- Thieme, Paul. 1994. "On M. Mayrhofer's Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57: 321-328.



- Tieken, Herman. 1992. "Hāla's Sattasaī as a source of pseudo-Deśī words." *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 10: 221-267.
- Tiwari, Udai Narain. 1960. *The origin and development of Bhojpuri*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1960. *Some problems of sound change in Indo-Aryan*. Poona: University of Poona (Gune Lectures).
- Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Upadhye, Ādinātha Neminātha. 1965. "Languages and Dialects used in the Kuvalayamālā." *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda* 14: 317-325.
- Upadhye, Ādinātha Neminātha. 1978. "Prakrit Language and Literature." In: *The Cultural Heritage of India*, vol. 5: *Languages and Literatures* (second edition), Calcutta: The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, pp. 164-183.
- Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakṣmaṇa. 1926-27. "Observations on Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 8: 63-71.
- Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakṣmaṇa (ed.). 1980. *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana (adhyāya 8)*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- Vogel, Claus. 1979. *Indian Lexicography. A History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 5, Fasc. 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wezler, Albrecht. "Do you speak Sanskrit? On a class of Sanskrit texts composed in the Late Middle Ages." In: *Ideology and status of Sanskrit: contributions to the history of the Sanskrit language*, edited by Jan E. M. Houben, 327-346. Leiden–New York, NY–Köln: Brill.
- Witzel, Michael. 1989. "Tracing the Vedic dialects." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, edited by Colette Caillat, 97-265. Paris: Collège de France et Institut de Civilisation indienne.
- Witzel, Michael. 1999. "Aryan and non-Aryan Names in Vedic India. Data for the linguistic situation, c. 1900-500 B.C." In: *Aryan and non-Aryan in South Asia: Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology*, edited by Johannes Bronkhorst and Madhav Murlidhar Deshpande, 337-404. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woolner, Alfred Cooper. 1928 *Introduction to Prakrit* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition; reprint: 1996. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Zoller, Claus Peter. 2016. "Outer and Inner Indo-Aryan, and northern India as an ancient linguistic area." *Acta Orientalia* 77: 71-132.

Andrea Drocco is Associate professor in the Department of Asian and North African Studies at Ca' Foscari University of Venice. His main field of investigation is Indo-Aryan linguistics, with particular reference to the diachronic change of some syntactic and morphosyntactic peculiarities of Hindī developed since the 16th century. At the same time, he has also devoted attention to some aspects of the Indian lexicon in its historical evolution and to the Prakrit grammatical tradition. He is currently dealing with the history of the Hindī language through the texts that most represent the diachronic evolution of that language, placing special emphasis on the analysis of its standardization process that occurred during the 19th and 20th centuries.

Andrea can be contacted at: [andrea.drocco@unive.it](mailto:andrea.drocco@unive.it)