

GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT OF CONJUNCTS BY PRAKRIT GRAMMARIANS VARARUCI AND HEMACANDRA

Harshit Mishra¹

Abstract

The primary purpose of this research paper is to highlight the gradual development in the treatment of conjuncts in Prakrit grammar. There was a time difference of minimum seven centuries between the two significant grammarians of Prakrit – Vararuci and Hemacandra. However, literary growth also took place during this period, due to which new words were also used in literature. For this reason, there are possibilities for Hemacandra's grammar to be more detailed and refined. Keeping this point in mind, this research paper studies verbatim and non-verbatim similarities between both the grammarians, and highlights Hemacandra's new ligature-related formulae.

Keywords: Prakrit grammar, conjunct, saṃyuktākṣara, Hemacandra, Vararuci

Introduction

Rājasekhara in his *Kāvyaṃimānsā* (2.5) says: “Just as the flow of a river is thin in the beginning and gradually expands as it progresses, in the same way, the scriptures also start as small and then gradually expand; such scriptures are to be respected by all.”² Similarly, the grammatical tradition of India is very ancient, but it systematically starts with Paṇini. In due course of time, different grammatical traditions developed, and they made significant impact on their successors. It was not limited to Sanskrit as was happening with all Indian languages and Prakrit is one of them.

The Prakrit grammatical tradition has significantly influenced the development of Indian linguistics. Vararuci and Hemacandra are well-known among the grammarians who helped the advancement of this tradition. They approached Prakrit literature in the light of the rules of Sanskrit grammar and built schematic correspondences to help further authors derive words from Sanskrit to Prakrit. It assisted Prakrit enthusiasts to learn the language with ease.

Vararuci, the author of *Prākṛta-Prakāśa*, is one of the oldest grammarians in the tradition of Prakrit grammar. He is often confused with Kātyāyana and vice versa. S. R. Banerjee has given a detailed account on the matter and concludes that these two persons are different (Banerjee 3-4). Regarding the date of Vararuci, Banerjee mentions: “it is better to take 3rd to 5th century AD” (Banerjee 5).

There is a total of 509 sūtras divided in 12 sections in alphabetical order. In the third section, through 66 sūtras, Vararuci has discussed conjuncts in detail. Four ancient commentaries reveal the fame of this book. These are: (1) *Manoramā* by Bhāmaha, (2) *Prākṛta Mañjarī* by

¹ Fellow, Bhagavan Mahavira Prakrit Fellowship 2023-24, International School of Jain Studies, Pune;
Email: harshitmishra87155@gmail.com

² *sarītāmiva pravāhāstucchāḥ prathamam yathottaram vipulāḥ |
ye śāstrasamārambhā bhavanti lokasya te vandyāḥ || (Kāvyaṃimānsā 2.5)*

Kātyāyana, (3) *Prākṛta Sañjīvanī* by Vasantarāja, and (4) *Subodhinī Tīkā* by Sadānanda. *Prākṛta Mañjarī* by Kātyāyana is only a transformation of Bhāmaha's *Manoramā* commentary in verse form. The approach of dealing with conjuncts by Vararuci in this research paper is mainly based on Bhāmaha's *Manoramā* commentary.

Among the Prakrit scholars, the name of Hemacandra is the most popular who lived from 1088 to 1172. He has written a grammatical treasure *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana*. He named the book after the name of king Siddharāja Jaisimha. The eighth chapter of this book is dedicated to Prakrit grammar while the first seven chapters deal with Sanskrit grammar. Hemcandra has also written an auto-commentary named *Tattva Prakāśikā* on this which helps understanding the sūtras. Other commentaries have also been written on this, such as *Hema-Prākṛta-Vṛtti-Dhṛṇḍhikā* by Udaya Saubhāgya Gaṇi and *Avacūri* by Narendra Candra Sūri. There are four sections with a total of 1119 sūtras in the eighth section that deals with Prakrit. This paper refers to 115 sūtras from the second section of this chapter that treat conjunct in different ways.

This paper implies a contrast in the temporal discrepancy between the two grammarians. The time that passed between Vararuci and Hemacandra is nearly seven centuries. Hemacandra's Grammar would inevitably have advanced due to the literary development till his era. The proposed research studies the evolution of the treatment of conjunct consonants in *Prākṛta Prakāśa* by Vararuci and *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana* by Hemacandra.

In Prakrit, a conjunct has two consonants of the same class. When a Sanskrit conjunct with consonant sounds of different classes is seen, it can be treated in three ways: substitution with a consonant, elision of a member of the conjunct, and augmentation of a vowel. Apart from these, a conjunct is also created by the dualization of a simple consonant. These four are the ways to find or treat a conjunct consonant from Sanskrit words in Prakrit. Both Vararuci and Hemacandra use these four treatments. These can be analyzed from the following two viewpoints:

- 1) Treatment of conjuncts with verbatim similarity in the sūtras
- 2) Treatment of conjuncts with partial similarity in the sūtras

Verbatim Similarity in the Sūtras

Among the sūtras given by both Vararuci and Hemacandra, there are many sūtras with verbatim similarities. Although there are differences in the examples compiled in the commentary of the sūtras, their respective functions remain the same. The fact cannot be avoided that Vararuci only wrote the sūtras and the four commentators compiled the examples in their commentaries later on. On the other hand, Hemacandra wrote the auto-commentary and gave the examples himself.

While treating the conjuncts, Vararuci enlists his sūtras according to the treatment of the conjuncts. In his third chapter, he first gives eight sūtras for the elision of a member of a conjunct and started it as *saṃyuktavarṇaprakaraṇam*; 41 sūtras for the substitution of conjuncts to simple consonants and called it *yuktasya*; nine sūtras for dualization of simple consonants and called it *dvitvavidhiḥ*; and nine sūtras for augmentation of a vowel for a conjunct and called it *viprakaṛṣaḥ*.

Hemacandra also presents his sūtras according to the treatment of the conjuncts. Unlike Vararuci, Hemacandra gives only one section-heading rule for the complete sub-section for all the treatments of conjunct-consonants. First, he treats the conjuncts by substitution in 75 sūtras (8.2.2-76) followed by elision of a member of the conjunct in 12 sūtras (8.2.77-88). He then gives 11 sūtras (8.2.89-99) for the dualization of a consonant, and then 16 sūtras (8.2.100-115) for insertion of a vowel for breaking a conjunct. Making his grammar more systematic, Hemacandra uses a strategy for the substitution of conjuncts for simple consonants where he compiles the sūtras according to the alphabetical outcome. Precisely, while substituting a conjunct consonant for a simple consonant, the outcome is the consonant in the order of *k*, *kh*, *g*, and so on. Considering the antiquity of Vararuci's grammar, this paper addresses the sequence of the sections dealing with conjunct consonants in *Prākṛta Prakāśa*.

For elision, both scholars state the sūtra 'adho ma-na-yām' (Vararuci 3.2; Hemacandra 8.2.78) saying that if 'm', 'n', or 'y' is to be elided if it is the lower member of the conjunct. To explain this, Vararuci has compiled seven examples, and Hemacandra has given nine. Among these, only *raśmiḥ* and *yugmam* are analogous and the rest are different.

The next verbatim similar sūtra in both the grammars is 'sthāṇāvahare' (Vararuci 3.15; Hemacandra 8.2.7) according to which the conjunct 'sth' of the word *sthāṇu* is substituted to 'kh' making it *khānū* in Prakrit (*sthāṇu* > *khānū*).

kārṣāpaṇaḥ becomes *kāhāvaṇo* in Prakrit by substituting conjunct 'rṣ' to 'h' by the sūtra 'kārṣāpaṇe' (Vararuci 3.39; Hemacandra 8.2.71).

kārṣāpaṇaḥ > *kāhāvaṇo* (bronze coin)

Interestingly, instead of eliding 'n' from the conjunct 'nm', both the grammarians substitute 'nm' to 'm' by the sūtra 'nmo maḥ' (Vararuci 3.43; Hemacandra 8.2.61), which changes *janmaḥ* to *jammo* and *manmatha* to *vammaho* in Prakrit. Hemacandra gives an additional example of *manmanam* becoming *mammaṇam*.

janmaḥ > *jammo* (birth)

manmatha > *vammaho* (Kāmadeva or God of love)

manmanam > *mammaṇam* (confidential whisper)

Both scholars use optional dualization in the case of the compound by the sūtra 'samāse vā' (Vararuci 3.57; Hemacandra 8.2.97) due to which *naḍīgrāmaḥ* becomes *naḍiggāmo* or *naḍigāmo*, *kusumaprakaraḥ* is substituted to *kusumappayaro* or *kusumapayaro*, *devastuti* is substituted to *devatthuī* or *devathuī*, and *ālānastambhaḥ* becomes *āṇāla-kkhambho* or *āṇālakhambho* in Prakrit.

naḍīgrāmaḥ > *naḍiggāmo* / *naḍigāmo* (village on the bank of river)

kusumaprakaraḥ > *kusumappayaro* / *kusumapayaro* (bunch of flowers)

devastuti > *devatthuī* / *devathuī* (eulogy of gods)

ālānastambhaḥ > *āṇālakkhambho* / *āṇālakhambho* (a pillar to tie an elephant)

Similarly, in the process of anaptyxis, both scholars treat the conjunct 'jy' in 'jyā' using the sūtra 'jyāyāmīt' (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.66; Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.115) in the same

manner. They both use this sūtra to add *ī* right before the final consonant, due to which *jyā* becomes *jīyā*.

jyā > *jīyā* (line)

This sūtra also marks the end of the segment of dealing with conjunct consonants.

In this way, there is a word-for-word similarity in six sūtras of Vararuci and Hemacandra.

Partial Similarity in the Sūtras

This point is very important from the viewpoint of the gradual development of conjuncts. Vararuci and Hemacandra present this group of sūtras similarly, but it appears that due to more literary creations by the time of Hemacandra, he constructed the sūtras a little differently and also gave an expansion to the examples.

When it comes to the elision of the upper member (first consonant) in conjuncts, Vararuci gives the first sūtra of his chapter on conjunct consonants as ‘*upari lopaḥ ka-ga-ḍa-ta-da-pa-ṣa-sām*’ to elide the consonants ‘k’, ‘g’, ‘ṭ’, ‘ḍ’, ‘t’, ‘d’, ‘p’, ‘ṣ’, and ‘s’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.1) whereas Hemacandra gives the first sūtra after dealing with substitution of conjunct consonants as ‘*ka-ga-ṭa-ḍa-ta-da-pa-śa-ṣa-sa-ṣk-ṣpāmūrdhvaṃ luk*’ for the same purpose (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.77). Hemacandra elides four more consonants – ‘t’, ‘ś’, ‘ṣk’, and ‘ṣp’ – than Vararuci as the upper member of the conjunct. The examples given by Hemacandra for these four conjuncts are not treated by Vararuci in any of the sūtras. Although it is hard to believe that these words did not exist in the time of Vararuci, we can assume that he did not find them in the texts that he made the base for his sūtras.

Vararuci presents ‘*sarvatra lavarām*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.3) for the universal elision of the consonants *l*, *v*, and *r* in the conjuncts. Hemacandra writes an extension to this sūtra and gives ‘*sarvatra la-ba-rāmavandre*’³ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.79) and excludes the word ‘*vandra*’ from the elision of *r*. Probably, Vararuci would not have found the use of the word *vandra* by that time. Vararuci also eliminates *r* in *dra* by the sūtra ‘*dre ro vā*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.4). Hemacandra does the same with the sūtra ‘*dre ro na vā*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.80). Here, the word *na* does not change the meaning of sūtra.

Vararuci eliminates ‘ñ’ in the conjunct ‘jñ’ by the sūtra ‘*sarvajñatulyeṣu ñaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.5) due to which *sarvajña* becomes *savvajjo* whereas Hemacandra does the same with the sūtra ‘*jño ñaḥ*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.83) but keeps it optional in the auto commentary due to which *savvaññū* is also the optional form. Hemacandra also adds nine other examples of *sarvajña*-like words adding one more word where the sūtra is not applicable.

In the next sūtra (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.6) ‘*śmaśruśmaśānāyorādeḥ*’, Vararuci eliminates ‘ś’ in the conjunct ‘śm’. Hemacandra just reconstructs the formula and gives the sūtra ‘*ādeḥ śmaśru-śmaśāne*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.86). Similarly, Vararuci’s next sūtra (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.7) is ‘*madhyāhne hasya*’ to which Hemacandra gives ‘*madhyāhne haḥ*’ (Siddha-

³ ‘v’ and ‘b’ are considered to be the same in both Sanskrit and Prakrit.

hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.84) for the elision of the consonant ‘h’ in the conjunct ‘hn’ of the word *madhyāhna*. But in the respective commentary, Hemacandra states its use to be optional giving two optional forms – *majjhanno*, *majjhanho* whereas the *Manoramā* commentary of *Prākṛta Prakāśa* (3.7) does not double the remainder ‘n’ and gives the form *majjhaṇo*.

While dealing with the substitutions of the conjuncts, Vararuci substitutes ‘sth’ to ‘th’, instead of eliding ‘ś’, by the sūtra ‘*śṣya thah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.10) while Hemacandra gives a refined sūtra as ‘*śṣyānuṣṭreṣṭāsamdaṣṭe*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.34) and adds more examples with exceptions as *uṣṭra*, *iṣṭa* and *samdaṣṭa*. Vararuci substitutes the conjunct *sth* to *th* by the sūtra ‘*asthini*’ (Vararuci 3.11) while Hemacandra gives the sūtra ‘*tho’sthi-visamsthule*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.32) for the same operation and adds one more word to the sūtra. Vararuci substitutes the conjunct ‘st’ to ‘th’ by the sūtra ‘*stasya thah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.12) and also elaborates the next sūtra ‘*na stambe*’ to exclude the word *stamba* from the treatment (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.13) while Hemacandra composes both of these instructions in the sūtra ‘*stasya tho’samasta-stambe*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.45). For substitution of ‘st’ to ‘kh’, Vararuci devises his next sūtra as ‘*stambhe khah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.14) while Hemacandra devises ‘*stambhe sto vā*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.8) and makes the operation optional giving two forms for the word *stambhaḥ* as *khambho* and *thambho* (pillar). Also, Vararuci substitutes ‘sph’ to ‘kh’ with ‘*sphoṭake ca*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.16) while Hemacandra gives the sūtra ‘*kṣvetakādau*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.6) where he gives the word *kṣvetaka* in the sūtra and *sphoṭaka* in the auto commentary for the same operation. He keeps the sūtra’s meaning the same but expands its scope.

Vararuci substitutes the conjunct *ry* and also *yy* and *ny* in the words *śayyā* and *abhimanyu* to *j* by the sūtra ‘*ryaśayyābhimanyuṣu jah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.17) while Hemacandra adds the conjunct ‘dy’ to be changed to ‘j’ by the sūtra ‘*dya-yya-ryām jah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.24) excluding ‘ny’ which he handles by the next sūtra ‘*abhimanyau ja-ñjau vā*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.25).

Vararuci also substitutes ‘ry’ for ‘r’ in the prescribed five words by the sūtra ‘*tūryya-dhairyya-saundaryāścaryya-paryyanteṣu rah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.18). To this, Hemacandra changes the words and gives the sūtra ‘*brahmacarya-tūrya-saundaryā-śauṇḍīrye ryo rah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.63). Vararuci also gives the next sūtra as ‘*sūryye vā*’ for an optional change of ‘ry’ to ‘r’ in the word *sūrya* (Prākṛta Prakāśa 2.19) while Hemacandra prescribes his next sūtra ‘*dhairye vā*’ for the same situation (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.64).

Vararuci substitutes the conjunct ‘ry’ by ‘ria’ in words like *caurya* (stealing) with the sūtra ‘*cauryasameṣu riam*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.20) and does not say anything about the word *āścaryya* (astonishment, surprise). For this, Hemacandra develops two sūtras ‘*āścarye*’ and ‘*ato riāra-rijja-rīam*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.66-67) for treating ‘ry’ in the word *āścaryya* only and substitutes it for ‘ria’, ‘rijja’, ‘ara’, and ‘rīa’. Again, Vararuci substitutes ‘ry’ for ‘l’ in the sūtra ‘*paryyasta-paryyāṇa-saukumāryyeṣu lah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.21) and Hemacandra does the same in the sūtra ‘*paryasta-paryāṇa-saukumārye llah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.68) and doubles ‘l’ for the change.

By the sūtras ‘*rtasya ṭah*’ and ‘*pattane*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.22-23), Vararuci substitutes the conjuncts ‘rt’ and ‘tt’ to ‘ṭ’ while Hemacandra gives only one sūtra ‘*vṛtta-pravyṛtta-mṛttikā-pattana-kadarthite ṭah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.29) citing all the necessary words for the purpose. Negating this tendency in *dhūrta* etc. words, Vararuci prohibits the above-said substitution by the sūtra ‘*na dhūrtādiṣu*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.24) to which Hemacandra gives more examples in the auto-commentary and devises the sūtra as ‘*rtasyādhūrtādau*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.30). Vararuci substitutes conjunct ‘rt’ to ‘ḍ’ by the sūtra ‘*gartte ḍah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.25) while Hemacandra has given sutra ‘*garte ḍah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.35) giving the outcome as *gaḍḍo* in Prakrit of Sanskrit word *gartaḥ/garttaḥ* (pit).

For the conjunct ‘rd’, Vararuci substitutes it to ‘ḍ’ by sūtra ‘*gardabha-sammarda-vitardi-viccharḍiṣu rdasya*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.26). Hemacandra does the same by the sūtras ‘*garte ḍah*’⁴ and ‘*sammarda-vitardi-viccharḍa-cchardi-kaparda-mardite rdasya*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.35-36) with some more examples. To substitute ‘dy’ and ‘hy’ for ‘jh’, Vararuci gives the sūtras ‘*dhyahyor jhaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.28). Following the same operation, Hemacandra offers the sūtra ‘*sādhvas-dhya-hyām jhaḥ*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.26) but with more examples than Vararuci.

Vararuci’s sūtra ‘*ṣkaskakṣām khaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.29) substitutes the conjuncts ‘ṣk’, ‘sk’, and ‘kṣ’ for ‘kh’ which is implemented by Hemacandra only for the conjuncts ‘ṣk’ and ‘sk’ by the sūtra ‘*ṣka-skayor nāmni*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.4) and gives a few more sūtras for ‘kṣ’.

For substitution of ‘kṣ’ to ‘ch’, Vararuci gives the sūtra ‘*akṣyādiṣu chaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.30) and Hemacandra gives ‘*cho’kṣyādau*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.17). For the same treatment in the words *kṣamā*, *vṛkṣa*, and *kṣana*, Vararuci gives his next sūtra ‘*kṣmā-vṛkṣa-kṣaṇeṣu vā*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.31) while Hemacandra makes it optional in his next sūtra ‘*kṣamāyām kau*’ adding *kau* which means only if it means earth (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.18).

By the next sūtra ‘*śma-pakṣma-vismayeṣu mhaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3. 32), Vararuci substitutes the conjuncts ‘śm’, ‘kṣm’ and ‘sm’ to ‘mh’. Hemacandra adds two more conjuncts ‘śm’ and ‘hm’ in the sūtra ‘*pakṣma-śma-śma-sma-hmām mhaḥ*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.74). Both grammarians give consecutive sūtras for a similar substitution. For the conjuncts ‘hn’, ‘sn’, ‘ṣṇ’, ‘kṣṇ’, ‘śn’ and ‘kṣm’ to ‘ṇh’, Vararuci gives the sūtra ‘*hna-sna-ṣṇa-kṣṇa-śnām ṇhaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.33). Hemacandra adds two new conjuncts ‘hṇ’ and ‘kṣṇ’ in his next sūtra ‘*sūkṣma-śna-ṣṇa-sna-hna-hṇa-kṣṇām ṇhaḥ*’ for the same operation (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.75). As an exception in the word *cihna*, ‘hn’ is substituted to ‘ndh’ for which Vararuci gives the next sūtra ‘*cihne ndhaḥ*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.34) while Hemacandra makes it optional by the sūtra ‘*cihne ndho vā*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.50). Vararuci

⁴ The tendency to double the consonant after half ‘r’ is found in early Sanskrit and old Hindi texts, like *karmma*. Due to this, *garṭta* is found in Vararuci’s sūtra and *garta* in Hemacandra’s sūtra.

substitutes the conjuncts ‘sp’ and ‘sp’ for ‘ph’ in his next two consecutive sūtras respectively i.e., ‘*śpasya phah*’ and ‘*śpasya sarvatra sthitasya*’ and gives a follow-up sūtra for substitution of ‘sp’ for ‘si’ as ‘*si ca*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.35-37) but Hemacandra offers only one sūtra for this operation i.e., ‘*śpa-spayoh phah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.53). Vararuci also substitutes the conjunct ‘sp’ for ‘h’ in his next sūtra ‘*vāṣpe’sruṇi hah*’ excluding the word *aśruṇi* (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.38) and Hemacandra does the same in the sūtra ‘*bāṣpe ho’sruṇi*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.70). For conjuncts ‘śc’, ‘ts’, and ‘ps’, Vararuci substitutes them for ‘ch’ by the sūtra ‘*ścatsapsām चाह*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.40). Instead, Hemacandra offers the sūtra ‘*hrasvāt thya-śca-tsa-psāmaniścale*’ for this purpose, expanding its scope and excluding the word ‘*niścalah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.21). Further treating the conjunct ‘śc’, Vararuci substitutes it for ‘ñch’ by the next sūtra ‘*vṛścike ñchah*’ only while deriving the word *vṛścikaḥ* (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.41). Hemacandra gives the sūtra ‘*vṛścike śceñrcurvā*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.16) and substitutes ‘śc’ for ‘ñc’, and not ‘ñch’.

In the next sūtra, Vararuci prohibits the conjunct ‘ts’ from becoming ‘ch’ in the words *utsuka* and *utsava* with the sūtra ‘*notsukotsavayoh*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.42) and Hemacandra does the same in the sūtra ‘*sāmarthyotsukotsave vā*’ making it optional (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.22).

For conjuncts ‘mn’, ‘jñ’, and ‘ñc’, Vararuci offers the substitution for ‘ṇ’ in words *pañcāśat* and *pañcadaśa* in the sūtra ‘*mnajñapañcāśatpañcadaśeṣu ṇah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.44). Hemacandra gives two sūtras for this operation as ‘*mnajñorṇah*’ and ‘*pañcāśatpañcadaśa-datte*’ and also adds a new example ‘*dattam*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.42-43). By his next sūtra ‘*tālavṛnte ṇtah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.45), Vararuci substitutes the conjuncts ‘nt’ for ‘ṇt’ and by ‘*bhindipāle ṇdah*’, ‘nd’ for ‘ṇd’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.46). Hemacandra, on the other hand, gives the sūtras ‘*vṛnte ṇtah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.31) and ‘*kandarikā bhindipāle ṇdah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.38) for the same purposes. One may say that the word *kandarikā* was probably not prevalent in literature at the time of Vararuci.

Vararuci optionally substitutes the conjunct ‘hv’ for ‘bh’ and ‘h’ by the next sūtra ‘*vihvale bhahau vā*’ in the word *vihvalah* (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.47). Hemacandra gives two sūtras, ‘*hvo bho vā*’ for substitution of ‘hv’ for ‘bh’ and ‘h’ optionally and ‘*vā vihvale vau vāśca*’ for the word ‘*vihvalah*’ (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.57-58). For substitution of conjuncts ‘tm’ and ‘km’ for ‘p’, Vararuci gives two sūtras respectively as ‘*ātmani pah*’ and ‘*kyasya*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.48-49). To this, Hemacandra gives the sūtras ‘*bhasmātmanoḥ po vā*’ and ‘*dma kmoh*’ for the same purpose (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.51-52). Moreover, he adds another conjunct ‘sm’ in the word *bhasman* and the conjunct ‘ḍm’ respectively.

This analysis explains that the method of both scholars is almost the same, although the number of conjuncts and number of examples by Hemacandra is more than that of Vararuci.

Vararuci further deals with the section on dualization. As always, there is only the difference in the sutra structure of both grammarians. The sūtras by Vararuci ‘*śeṣādeśayordvitvamanādaḥ*’ and ‘*vargeṣu yujah pūrvah*’ (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.50-51) are adopted by Hemacandra as ‘*anādaḥ śeṣādesayordvitvam*’ and ‘*dvitīya-turyorupari pūrvah*’

(Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.89-90). According to Vararuci's sūtra 'nīdādiṣu' and 'sevādiṣu ca' (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.52, 58), dualization is accepted in some words like *nīda* and *sevā* to which Hemacandra gives the sūtra 'tailādau' for dualization in words like *taila* as a regular change and 'sevādau vā' as optional in words like *sevā* (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 88.2.98-99).

In words *āmram* and *tāmram*, Vararuci elides 'r' and doubles the remainder 'm' by adding 'b' as the first member of the conjunct by the sūtra 'āmratāmrayorbah' (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.53). Hemacandra gives the sūtra 'tāmramre mbah' by substituting 'mr' for 'mb' (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.56).

Both grammarians agree that there is no dualization of the letters 'r' and 'h'. For this, Vararuci gives the sūtra 'na-rahoh' (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.54) and Hemacandra gives the sūtra 'ra-hoh' (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.93) as his previous sūtra was negating dualization in another case⁵. There is a similarity in meaning between the two, but there is a difference in the examples.

Anaptyxis is another practice for treating the conjunct where a vowel is inserted in between the conjunct and the broken consonants are not doubled. In his next and final section, Vararuci offers some sūtras which are, like Hemacandra, specific to the words given in them. His first sūtra 'kliṣṭa-śliṣṭa-ratna-kriyā-śārṅgeṣu tatsvaravat pūrvasya' (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.60) mentions that in the given words, the preceding vowel of a conjunct is inserted within the conjunct. Such a sūtra is not found in Hemacandra grammar which rather proposes specific vowels in the given words.

His next sūtra 'kṛṣṇe vā' where he prescribes to insert its preceding vowel 'a' and optionally allows the change of *kṛṣṇaḥ* to *kaṅho* (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.61), while Hemacandra in the sūtra 'kṛṣṇe varṇe vā' inserts both 'a' and 'i' to the word *kṛṣṇaḥ* making it *kaṣaṇo* and *kaṣiṇo* optionally and instructs that for this change, the word *kṛṣṇa* should mean 'color' whereas *kaṅho* is specifically for *kṛṣṇa* meaning *viṣṇu* (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.110). Similarly, Vararuci gives the sūtra 'iḥ-śrī-hrī-kṛīta-klānta-kleśa-mlāna-svapna-harṣa-sparśārha-garveṣu' for augmentation of 'i' before the final consonant (Prākṛta Prakāśa). To this, Hemacandra gives different examples in the sūtra 'rha-śrī-hrī-kṛtsna-kriyā-diṣṭyāsvit' (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.104).

Vararuci gives the sūtras 'aḥ kṣmā-ślāghayoh' and 'snehe vā' for augmentation of 'a' before the final consonant of the conjunct (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.63-64). Hemacandra does the same in 'kṣmā-ślāghā-ratnentyavyañjanāt' and 'snehāgnyorvā' by adding more words – *ratna* and *agni* – in both the sūtras making the second sūtra optional (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.101-102). Similarly, while augmenting 'u' before the final consonant of the conjunct, Vararuci offers the next sūtra 'uḥ padma-tanvī-sameṣu' (Prākṛta Prakāśa 3.65). Hemacandra's 'uccārhati', 'padma-chadma-mūrkhā-dvāre vā' and 'tanvī tulyeṣu' prescribe the same treatment (Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana 8.2.111-113). Hemacandra's list of examples has more

⁵ 'na dīrghānusvārāt' meaning 'no doubling of a remainder or substituted consonant, if it comes after a long vowel and nasal'.

words than Vararuci's, and he also gives one obligatory and one optional sūtra for such operations.

Hemacandra's contribution to new conjuncts

According to the above analysis, it can be concluded that there was definitely a literary enrichment in the gap of centuries between Vararuci and Hemacandra during which the literary corpus expanded, and this allowed Hemacandra to further refine his grammar and insert new examples. This gives us an opportunity to prepare a list of those conjuncts that are not in *Prākṛta Prakāśa* but are found in *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsanam*. The following is a list of those conjuncts that are treated by Hemacandra in a regular manner without any optional form, and are not found in Vararuci's grammar:

<i>st > th / ṭ</i>	<i>tha-ṭhavaspande</i> (8.2.9)
<i>tt / tv > c</i>	<i>śulke ṅgo vā</i> (8.2.11)
<i>sp > ch</i>	<i>spṛhāyām</i> (8.2.23)
<i>ndha > jhā</i>	<i>indhau jhā</i> (8.2.28)
<i>bdh > ḍh</i>	<i>stabdhe ṭha-ḍhau</i> (8.2.39)
<i>gdh > ḍh</i>	<i>dagdha-vidagdha-vṛddhi-vṛdde ḍhaḥ</i> (8.2.40)
<i>ts > th</i>	<i>votsāhe tho hśca raḥ</i> (8.2.48)
<i>śl > l</i>	<i>āśliṣṭe la-dhau</i> (8.2.49)
<i>st > th / ṭ</i>	<i>pariyaste tha-tau</i> (8.2.47)
<i>śm > ph</i>	<i>bhīṣme śmaḥ</i> (8.2.54)
<i>rdhv > bh</i>	<i>vordhve</i> (8.2.59)
<i>śm > mbh</i>	<i>kaśmīre mbho vā</i> (8.2.60)
<i>rya > ria / ara / rijja / rīa</i>	<i>ato riyāra-rijja-rīam</i> (8.2.67)

The following is a list of those conjuncts for which Hemacandra gives alternative changes and are not mentioned by Vararuci:

<i>kṣ > kh / ch / jh</i>	<i>kṣaḥ khaḥ kvacittu cha-jhau</i> (8.2.3)
<i>tt / ṣṭ / gṇ / tv > k</i>	<i>śkta-mukta-dṣṭa-rugṇa-mṛdutve ko vā</i> (8.2.2)
<i>ṣk / sk > kh</i>	<i>śuṣka-skande vā</i> (8.2.5)
<i>kt > g</i>	<i>rakte go vā</i> (8.2.10)

lk > ṅg	<i>śulke ṅgo vā</i> (8.2.11)
tt / tv > c	<i>kṛiti-catvare caḥ</i> (8.2.12)
ty > c	<i>tyocaitye</i> (8.2.13)
kṣ > ch	<i>ṛkṣe vā & kṣṇa utsave</i> (8.2.19-20)
dhv > jh	<i>dhvaje vā</i> (8.2.27)
sty / rth > ṭh	<i>styāna-chaturthārthe vā</i> (8.2.33)
rd > ḍ	<i>gardabhe vā</i> (8.2.37)
st > th	<i>stave vā</i> (8.2.46)
ṣm > ph	<i>śleṣamaṇi vā</i> (8.2.55)
gm > m	<i>gmo vā</i> (8.2.62)
sp > s	<i>bṛhaspti-vanaspatyoḥ so vā</i> (8.2.69)
kh / kṣ / rth > h	<i>duḥkh-dakṣiṇa-tūrthe vā</i> (8.2.72)
ṣm > h	<i>kūṣmāṇḍyām ṣmo lastu ṇḍo vā</i> (8.2.73)

In all, Vararuci has collected 275 examples of words in his section of conjuncts while Hemacandra has collected 586 examples. The difference in numbers points to the development of the Prakrit language itself, supported by the expansion of its literary corpus.

Conclusion

The comparative study of grammar of Vararuci and Hemacandra in the light of treatment of conjuncts brings out some significant facts before us. In nutshell, there are four tendencies which are visible through this discussion:

1. There are six aphorisms which are similar in verbatim. Only variation is in the number of examples.
2. Similarly, there is partial similarity in 57 sūtras regarding the treatment of conjunct in the text of Vararuci and Hemacandra. However, the variation in number of examples remains in these sūtras also.
3. A very important phenomena is found which is very crucial from the grammatical viewpoint. There are also 17 sūtras wherein Vararuci has prescribed the substitution of Sanskrit conjunct in Prakrit as regular. But in some cases Hemacandra has provided option. This tendency shows that at the time of Vararuci only one substitution was available but at the time of Hemacandra variations were also used.
4. It is seen that in Hemacandra 14 conjuncts are found which are not available in the text of Vararuci. It is indicative of the fact that Hemacandra has a large number of literary

texts at his disposal than Vararuci. This also shows the growth of Prakrit with the passage of time.

Thus, the grammar of the Prakrit language has become more enriched, and the increase in the use of new conjuncts in literature over the centuries is one important aspect of this development. It is such evidence one can approach when comparing the similarities and differences between the works of Vararuci and Hemacandra.

It may be concluded that the comparative study of the two grammarians of different age has to provide some interesting and important factors to a student of grammar. This paper may pay wave for comparative study among the different grammarians and also on the different aspects of Prakrit.

References

- Banerjee, Satya Ranjan. *The Prākṛta-Prakāśa of Vararuci*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1975.
- Hemacandra. *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāsana*. Ed. P. L. Vaidya. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1980.
- Rājaśekhara. *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* Ed. K.N. Sharma. Patna: Bihar Rajabhasha Parishad, 2010.
- Vararuci. *Prākṛta Prakāśa*. Ed. Baladeva Upadhyaya. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, 1996.