



## ISJS NEWSLETTER

Vol#09 | Issue#04 | No.#02 | April 2026

### Speak Up

#### YATHADARSHANAM: MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

**Dr. Anahita Hoose**

Former Bhagwan Mahavira Prakrit Fellow, ISJS

[anahita.hoose@gmail.com](mailto:anahita.hoose@gmail.com)

Most people with a serious interest in Jain studies have heard of Ācārya Hemacandra (1089-1172), renowned for his contributions to diverse areas of scholarship. It was at ISJS, while studying Prakrit in 2023-24 on a Bhagwan Mahavira Fellowship to Study Prakrit in India, that I became deeply familiar with Hemacandra's work as a grammarian. Hemacandra is the author of the *Siddha-hema-śabdānuśāna*, a substantial work that describes the grammar of both Sanskrit (in the first seven *adhyāyas*) and Prakrit (in the eighth *adhyāya*). At ISJS, I read the whole Prakrit section, getting to know the conventions Hemacandra uses. This experience, together with my prior training in modern linguistics (the scientific study of language), inspired a conference presentation that I gave a year later, at the June 2025 meeting of the World Sanskrit conference.

Hemacandra describes several Prakrit speech varieties through 1,119 Sanskrit sutras. The first 930 describe Māhārāṣṭrī through sutras encoding deviations from Sanskrit. For example, the sutra *no ṇaḥ 'n > ṇ'* (8.1.228), together with Hemacandra's auto-commentary, tells us that Māhārāṣṭrī *ṇ* corresponds to Sanskrit *n* in specific contexts. Māhārāṣṭrī is the baseline with reference to which Hemacandra describes Śaurasenī, Māgadhī, Paiśācī, Cūlikā-Paiśācī and Apabhraṃśa in the remaining sutras. Ardha-Māgadhī forms are also cited in the *adhyāya*.

Hemacandra notes exceptions to many rules. Variation is so rampant that the second sutra consists of the word *bahulam* 'variously applicable'. In the commentary, Hemacandra states that this sutra's authority holds for the remainder of the text and explains that any of the rules to follow may apply, not apply, apply optionally, or be replaced by a different process. Despite the comprehensive nature of this meta-rule, *bahulam* recurs in the auto-commentary to four other sutras, and *bahulādhikārāt* 'due to the authority of *bahulam*' appears in the auto-commentary to at least 28 more; there are also three occurrences of *bāhulakāt* 'due to



diversity'. Another relevant term is *yathādarśanam* 'according to usage', which indicates that observed usage is the only available guide to where a rule applies.

I argued in my presentation that at least some variation is due to linguistic facts uncovered since Hemacandra's time and that insights drawn from the modern science of linguistics can reveal regularity where Hemacandra could only report variation. While I discussed multiple examples at the World Sanskrit Conference, for the purposes of this short report I will limit myself to one.

The sutra *kagacajatadapayavāṃ prāyo luk* 'dropping of *k, g, c, j, t, d, p, y* and *v* generally [occurs]' (8.1.177) encodes a prominent difference between Sanskrit and Prakrit. Unlike in Sanskrit, single consonants that stand between vowels are dropped in Prakrit. Thus, the Māhārāṣṭrī equivalent of Sanskrit *lokaḥ* 'world' is *loo*, with no *k*. As the commentary states, this change normally occurs within words. Hemacandra states, however, that word-initial consonants are sometimes also dropped. His first two examples are *so uṇa < sa punar* 'he, however' and *so a < sa ca* 'and he'. Neither phrase seems to meet the normal criteria for consonant deletion, since each deleted consonant is word-initial. Hemacandra suggests no explanation for this, and the reader is left to attribute it to *bahulam*.

Modern linguistics recognises two conceptually distinct units that both roughly correspond to a pre-theoretical understanding of a word, the grammatical word and the phonological word. The phonological word, as the name suggests, belongs to the phonological component of a language's grammar, which concerns sound patterns. The phonological word 'features in a hierarchy of phonological units, established on phonological criteria' (Aikhenvald et al., 'The Essence of "Word"', 2020: 2). It is larger than a syllable, but smaller than an intonation group, which may contain multiple words. Meanwhile, the grammatical word 'features in a hierarchy of grammatical units, established on grammatical criteria' and is intermediate between the morpheme, the smallest unit to have a meaning, and the phrase. The syntactic component of a grammar, which involves the structure of phrases and sentences, is concerned with the ordering of grammatical words.

While most grammatical words are phonological words and vice versa, there are exceptions in both directions. A single grammatical word can consist of multiple phonological words, and a single phonological word can consist of multiple grammatical words, as when one or more are clitics. A clitic is 'a morpheme capable of forming an independent grammatical word, without being able to stand on its own as a phonological word' (Aikhenvald et al., 'The Essence of "Word"', 2020: 12). Such units form phonological words with their hosts, which they may precede or follow. For example, English *the* is usually a clitic, preceding its hosts. *The man* is a single phonological word formed from the combination of the clitic article with its

host, *man*. Another modern example is Hindi *bhī* ‘too’. In *ham bhī gaye* ‘we too went,’ *ham bhī* ‘we too’ is a phonological word, while *bhī* alone is not.

Now let us turn our consideration back to the exceptions cited in the commentary to *kagacajatadapayavāṃ prāyo luk*. Both *sa punar* and *sa ca* are combinations of the pronoun *sa* ‘that’ with a second element. Both second elements, *punar* ‘however’ and *ca* ‘and’, are clitics. More specifically, both are enclitic, meaning that they follow their hosts. This is why neither ever stands at the beginning of a clause. Thus, *sa ca*, a sequence of two *grammatical* words, is only one *phonological* word. The same is true of *sa punar*. I contend that the rule encoded by *kagacajatadapayavāṃ prāyo luk* deletes intervocalic consonants within phonological words, rather than grammatical words. Given this assumption, the deletion of *p* in *sa punar* and *c* in *sa ca* ceases to be exceptional, since neither stands at the beginning of a phonological word.

I must conclude with an acknowledgement that linguistic facts can explain away only a fraction of the variation that confronts both us and Hemacandra in the jungle of Prakrit. One must assume that many divergent forms attested originally belonged to different dialects. My goal for this project is merely to draw attention to one small source of illumination that an interdisciplinary approach can provide. Further research may uncover more cases where linguistics can reveal order amid the chaos.

\*\*\*