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Leykam

Indo-Aryan 'six'<br>Alexander Lubotsky, Leiden

1. The onset of the Middle Indic word for 'six' and its family is a well-known crux of Indo-Aryan historical phonology. Whereas the Sanskrit forms always begin with $s$-, Pāli and the major Prākrits have $c h$ - in the words for 'six' and 'sixth', and $s$ elsewhere. The Middle Indic forms are conveniently listed in NORMAN 1992, the most important of which are given in the table below':

|  | Sanskrit | Pāli + major Prākrits | Northern Prākrits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'six' | sáat | cba | Niya ṣo, Aś. ṣaṣu |
| 'six' (in cmp.) | sát ${ }^{\circ}$ <br> solbáa '6-fold' | cba( 1$)^{\circ}$, except salāyatana 'six sense facilities' AMg. sadamga ' 6 const. parts' Inscr. (W) sanuvisa '26' | As. sa(d)- |
| 'sixth' | sastitáa- | chattha (ma) ${ }^{2}$ | Niya şodbama |
| 'sixteen' | sódaśa | solasa, sorasa, solasa ${ }^{3}$ | Gāndhārī sodasa |
| 'sixteenth' | sodasáá- | solasa ( ma), solasama | Khar. sodasa |
| 'sixty' | sastit | satthi( $m)^{4}$ |  |
| 'sixtieth' | sastitama- | satthitama, JM satthima | Khar. sastioaa |

The difference between the Northern Prākrits and the rest is also reflected in Modern Indo-Aryan languages, where the Dardic languages (Shina [Kohistan] ssva, GawarBati $s^{u} \bar{o}, \underline{s} \bar{o}^{u}$ ) and the Nuristani languages (Ashkun $\left.s ̣ u\right)$ continue the Northern form, whereas Hindi, Sindhi cha 'six', etc. continue the form of the other Prākrits.

Initial ch- in the MI word for 'six' is incompatible with $s$ - of Skt. șát. Therefore, scholars generally assume a deviating proto-form for MI ch-, viz. *ks(v)- (e.g. Hiersche 1964:98f., TURNER CDIAL:12803, HAMP 1978, von HinÜber 1986:167, NORMAN 1992:204, BERGER 1992:247, EMMERICK 1992:169), but this reconstruction can hardly be called a solution. First of all, it does not account for the difference in anlaut between cha 'six' and solasa 'sixteen', satthi( $m$ ) 'sixty', a problem which has never been discussed in the literature. If cha goes back to ${ }^{*} k s(v)$-, why don't we find initial ch-in the words for 'sixteen' and 'sixty'? Secondly, the reflex of

[^0]${ }^{*} k s$ in Middle Indic is different in the Eastern dialects, where it becomes $k k h$, and the Western dialects, where we find cch. There was a subsequent exchange of the forms between the dialects, mostly in favor of the $k k h$-forms, but in our word family all Middle Indic dialects show ch- (or $s$-), and it is not very probable that the numeral was borrowed ${ }^{5}$. Furthermore, in the North-Western dialects, the reflex of $k s$ is represented by a special sign ćh (e.g. Niya ćhetra< Skt. ksetra, BURROW 1937:18f.), but as we can see from the table, the word for 'six' in Niya is $s o$.
2. To my mind, it is precisely the opposition between $c h$ - in the word for 'six' and $s$ in the word for 'sixteen' that provides the key to the solution of the puzzle. In order to understand the nature of the processes which have led to these forms, we have to consider the fate of ${ }^{*} z$ in Indo-Aryan.
2.1. Indo-Iranian ${ }^{*} z$ is of twofold origin, viz. the 'ruki'-s before voiced stops and PIE palato-velars $\left(\hat{k}, \hat{g}, \hat{g}^{h}\right)$ before dentals (PIE ${ }^{*}-\hat{k} d^{(h)}-,^{*}-\hat{g}^{(h)} d^{(h)}$, ${ }^{*}-\hat{g}^{h} t->$ PIIr. ${ }^{*}-z d^{(h)}-$ ). In Sanskrit, ${ }^{*} Z$ normally disappears with compensatory lengthening of the preceding short vowel, cf.:

```
*izC > iC
nillá-m.n. `abode, nest'< < nizda-< PIE *ni-sd-o-;
mïlhá- 'contest, reward' < *mizḍha- < PIE *mis-d'(h)
síksa-, desiderative of \sah- 'to conquer', < *sizgz'ha-< PIE *si-sgg'-so-';
*uzC > \overline{u}C
dülábha- adj. 'hard to deceive'<*duz-dabha-< PIE *dus-d'eb'o-;
du\overline{llhí}\mathrm{ - adj. 'malevolent' < *duz-d}hiH-< PIE *dus-d}\mp@subsup{d}{}{h}iH-
```



```
ullhà-, ta-ptc. of \sqrt{ vah- 'to drive', < *uzdha- < PIE *ugg't-tó-;}{}\mathrm{ *}
* *rzC>\vec{r}
Vmrḑ- 'to be merciful' < *mrzd- (cf. Av. moražd- 'id.');
drlhá', ta-ptc. of V \rh- 'to fasten', < *drzd'a-;
```


2.2. In a similar fashion, we expect short $a$ to be lengthened in this position, but in reality we find three different reflexes, viz. $\bar{a}, o$ and $e$ (cf. WACKERNAGEL 1896:37ff., 44f.).

[^1]2.2.1. The most frequent reflex is $\bar{a}$ (i.e. ${ }^{*} a z C>\bar{a} C$ ):

```
ví tālhi (RV 10.180.2) 2sg. impv. \(\sqrt{ }\) taks- 'to fashion' < \({ }^{*} \operatorname{taz} d^{h} i<\) PIE *tetk- \(d^{\prime \prime}\);
sáthar-m. (RV 7.56.23) 'conqueror' < \({ }^{*}\) sazư \(d^{h}\) ar- \(<\) PIE \({ }^{*}\) seg \(g^{h}\)-ter-;
á-sālha- adj. 'unconquerable' \(<{ }^{*}\)-sazd \(d^{h} a^{8}<\) PIE \({ }^{*}\)-seg \({ }^{h}\)-to- \({ }^{9}\);
```



```
    'strengthens') \({ }^{11}\).
```

2.2.2. The reflex $o\left({ }^{*} a z C>o C\right)$ is found in derivatives of the root $\sqrt{ }$ vah- 'to drive' (PIE *ue $\hat{g}^{h}$-) and in derivatives of sáṣ- ' 6 ', cf.
volham, volhấm 2,3 du. impv. root aor. $\sqrt{ }$ vah- 'to drive' (cf. NARTEN 1964:240, fn. 727); infinitives vólhave, ánu právolhum $<{ }^{*}$ vazd $d^{h} u-<$ PIE ${ }^{*} u e g^{h}-t u$-;
vólhar-m. 'driving (horse)' ${ }^{*}{ }^{*}$ vazd ${ }^{h}$ ar- $<$ PIE *ueg ${ }^{\text {h}}$-ter-;
ṣódaśá (TS+) ‘sixteen' < *svaz-daśa (cf. Av. xšuuas̆ ‘six’, xšuuaš. dasa- ‘sixteenth’), AV+ sodaśá- 'the sixteenth', AV+ şodasín-(AVS 11.7.11 = AVP 16.83.1, AVP 17.29.16) adj. 'the one of sixteen', sodaśarcá- (AVŚ 19.23.13) adj. 'consisting of sixteen verses';
şolhă (RV 3.55.18) adv. ‘sixfold' ${ }^{12}$.
Since the $o$ reflex of ${ }^{*}$ az only occurs after $v$, it is likely to be conditioned by this sound. For sódaśa, etc. we can then assume the following chain of developments: ${ }^{*}{ }^{s}$ vazad ${ }^{\circ}>{ }^{*}{ }^{*} \operatorname{siod} d^{\circ}>\operatorname{sod}^{\circ}$. The loss of $-V$ - is not unexpected considering the Sanskrit tendency to drop post-consonantal $v$ in labial environment, cf. ksip- 'to throw, fling', kșiprá- ‘quick' < ${ }^{*} k s$ sıip- (cf. Av. xšuuaēßa- 'quickly moving', xšuuißra- 'quick'); śiti-pád-' 'with white feet', śiti-prṣthá- 'with white back' < *śviti-C $C_{\mathrm{la} .}$ (cf. śvitrá'white', śvity-áñc- 'whitish', etc.; DEBRUNNER 1938) ${ }^{13}$.
In order to understand the $v$-coloring from a phonetic point of view, it should be borne in mind that Sanskrit $a$ was a middle vowel, approximately a shwa (HOFFMANN 1976:552f.), which was sensible to the phonetic environment. In the position before $r$ or ${ }^{*}$, it was realized as [ e ], and when it was compensatorily lengthened to [ e :], the result merged with long $\bar{a}$ (cf. also the sandhi rule $-a r r->-\bar{a} r-$ ). The development ${ }^{*}$ vaz $C>o C$ implies that * vaz $C$ was pronounced as [vozC]. When ${ }^{*} z$ disappeared, [ 0 ] was lengthened to $[0:]$ and later merged with the phoneme $/ o /$. For the sake of completeness, I can add that before ${ }^{*} Z$, the realization of the shwa was more fronted, and the lengthening yielded $e\left([ə z \mathrm{D}]>[ə: \mathrm{D}]>e D\right.$, cf. edhi ${ }^{\prime}$ be!' < $\left.{ }^{*} a z d^{\prime \prime} i\right)$.
2.2.3. The only example of ${ }^{*} a Z C>e C$ is 3 sg. impv. trnédhu from $\sqrt{ }(s)$ trrh- 'to crush' $<{ }^{*}$ trnaz $d^{h} u<$ PIE ${ }^{*}(s) t r-n-e \hat{g}^{h}-t u$, attested in AVŚ $8.8 .11=$ AVP 16.30.1, AVP $9.6 .3^{14}$. As already indicated by MARSH 1941:47 and RENOU 1952:30, $e$ of the impe-

[^2]rative tṛ̣édhu can be secondary, taken from imperatives like edhí, dehí, dhehí. To be sure, these imperatives are 2 sg . and not 3 sg ., but $-e$ - of the 2 sg . imperatives went beyond its original limits, as appears from 2pl. impv. dhetana (RV 8.67.5; 10.37.12) beside the regular dhattana. From the imperative, $e$-vocalism spread to the other forms (cf. n. 14).
2.3. The distribution of the three reflexes of short $a$ before $z C$ can be formulated as follows: the normal reflex is $\bar{a}$, whereas $o$ is conditioned by the preceding $v ; e$-vocalism of trnedhu is probably secondary. This distribution is by no means a novel one. Already in the 19th century, Benfey, Havet and Bloomfield (cf. Wackernagel 1896:39) assumed that the $o$-vocalism is due to the preceding $v$, but since they combined this observation with the theory that this $o$ directly continues PIE ${ }^{*} o$, their position was generally ignored ${ }^{15}$. More recently, in 1952, RENOU gave the same distribution in his Grammaire de la langue védique ${ }^{16}$, but even then this view did not find its way into the scholarly literature, where it is commonly held that the normal reflex of a before $\underset{\sim}{C}$ is $o^{17}$.
3. Now we can return to the word for 'six'. The development of the words for 'sixteen' and 'sixfold', discussed above, suggests that the Proto-Indo-Aryan forms were: *svát '6’, *sváz-ḍasa > ṣódaśa ‘sixteen', *ṣvaz-ḍhắ> soọhá ‘sixfold'. My contention is that this system perfectly accounts for all attested forms both in Sanskrit and Middle Indic. The only difference is that ${ }^{*}$ svát was preserved in the dialect which formed the basis of Middle Indic, whereas Sanskrit has analogically removed the $-v$ There are various reasons for this analogical development. First of all, in şódaśa and solháa, - $v$ - was phonetically lost. Further, the ordinal must have played an important role. As was suggested by Hoffmann (1965:253f. $=1975: 189 \mathrm{f}$.), the Indo-Iranian form of the ordinal 'sixth' was *šušt'aa, which was replaced by sastháa- in Indo-Aryan on the basis of (*) pakthá- 'fifth'. The ordinal sasthhá- is then responsible for the absence of $-v$ - in the word for 'sixty' (Skt. șastí, Pāli satthi, see below) and in Skt. sát.

In the Proto-MI, however, the analogical removal of $-v$ - in the word for 'six' did not take place. It has been indicated long ago (e.g. TURNER CDIAL:12803) that Niya so and the reflexes in the Nuristani and Dardic languages directly point to *ssat́, but it remained unnoticed that this form also directly accounts for initial ch- in Middle Indic. There is important evidence that ${ }^{s} S V$ regularly gives MI $c h$ (cf. BERGER 1955: 81 ff .), viz. mātuḥsvasr- f. 'mother's sister' > Pāli mātucchā-, Pkt. māucc(h)ā-(next to māus(s)ī-, māussiā-, māsiā- with restored anlaut of the word for 'sister', CDIAL

[^3]10001); pituḥsvasr-- f. 'father's sister' > Pāli pitucchā-, Pkt. piucc(h)ā-, piucchī-(next to piussiyā-, piusiā-, CDIAL 8177). The phonetic development of *sv presumably went through ${ }^{*} t s v>{ }^{*} t s>{ }^{*} c h$. The reflex of ${ }^{*} S v$ thus merged with that of ${ }^{*} k s$ in some dialects, which may explain forms like Khowār choi, the initial ch of which is a normal reflex of *ks (von HINÜBER 1986:67,167) ${ }^{18}$.
4. A final detail to be taken care of is the initial $s$-in some Middle Indic words of the 'six' family. The Aśokan forms (loc.pl.) sasu, șaşu (= sasu), sa(d)- in saḍuvisati '26', sapamnā ‘56', āsaṃmāsika- 'up to six months' and Inscr. (W) saṇuvisa '26' must be due to a different treatment of ${ }^{*}{ }_{S V}$ (e.g. ${ }^{*}{ }_{S S-}>{ }^{*} S S->s$-). Pāli salāyatana (next to chalāyatana) 'six sense facilities' and AMg. sadamga ‘six constituent parts' (vs. Pāli chalanga-) are borrowings from an Eastern dialect ${ }^{19}$.
More problematic is Päli satthi, AMg. satṭhi(ṃ), etc. 'sixty', which cannot be separated from Sanskrit ssastí. How can we account for the fact that there is no ${ }^{*} s v$ - in this word? Let us compare the "paradigms" of ' 6 ' in Sanskrit and the proto-form of Middle Indic:

|  | Sanskrit | Proto-Middle-Indic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| '6' | sạt | ${ }^{*}$ svat |
| '6th' | sasththá- | ${ }^{*}$ svastotha- |
| '16' | sódaśa | *sodaśa |
| '60' | sasti- | ${ }^{*}$ sastst |

The most likely scenario which would explain both systems seems to be the following:

```
Proto-Indo-Iranian *šuaćs ‘6’ \(\underset{\downarrow}{ }{ }^{*}\) š̌uštHa- ‘6th' - *šuašti '60'
    \({ }^{*}\) svats \(-{ }^{*}\) ṣustha- - \({ }^{*}\) ṣasṭti
    \(\downarrow\)
    *svat - *sasṭtha- (cf. §3) - *ssvast!
    \(\downarrow\)
    Proto-Indo-Aryan *svat - *sasṭha- - *sasțti
    Skt. sát - saststhá- - sasțti- Proto-MI *svat - *ṣvaștha- - *sasṭi.
```

[^4]In other words, Sanskrit has removed the $-v$ - in the word for 'six' by analogy with the ordinal '6th', whereas Proto-MI has levelled the paradigm in the opposite direction.
5. The explanation of Middle Indic cha proposed above is of some importance for the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European word for 'six'. Since the Indo-Aryan reflexes can be accounted for without recourse to the initial cluster ${ }^{*} k s$-, there is no reason for reconstructing it for the proto-language. Avestan xšuuaš and other Iranian forms show the regular development of initial ${ }^{s}$ š- to $x \check{s}$ - (cf. PIE ${ }^{*} \hat{g}_{n e h}^{3}{ }_{3}->$ PIIr. *źnā$>$ Ir. *šnā̄-> Av. xšnā- 'to know'), so that we can reconstruct Proto-Indo-Iranian ${ }^{*}$ súuaćs. The assimilation of the initial ${ }^{*}$ s- to ${ }^{c}$ s- must then be dated at least to the common Indo-Iranian stage ${ }^{20}$.

## Bibiography

Allen, W.S.:
1962 Sandhi. The theoretical, phonetic, and historical bases of word-junction in Sanskrit. (= Janua linguarum XVII). 's-Gravenhage.
BERGER, H.:
1955 Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre (Münchener Indologische Studien, 1). München.
1992 Modern Indo-Aryan. In: Indo-European numerals, ed. J. Gvozdanović. Berlin - New York, p. 243-287.
Burrow, T.:
1937 The language of the Kharosṭhi documents from Chinese Turkestan. Cambridge.
1973 The Sanskrit language. London.
Debrunner, A.:
1938 Indoiranisches. In: Indogermanische Forschungen 56, p. 171-177.
1957 Nachträge zu J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, Band I. Göttingen.
Emmerick, R.E.:
1992 Old Indian. In: Indo-European numerals, ed. J. Gvozdanović. Berlin - New York, p. 163-198.
Hamp, E.P.:
1978 Indo-European ' 6 '. In: Linguistic and literary studies in honor of Archibald Hill, III: Historical and comparative linguistics, edd. M.A. Jazayery, E.C. Polomé, W. Winter (Trends in Linguistics 9). The Hague - Paris - New York.
Hiersche, R.:
1964 Untersuchungen zur Frage der Tenues Aspiratae im Indogermanischen. Wiesbaden. von Hinüber, O.:
1986 Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. (Sitzungsberichte der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 467. Band.) Wien.

[^5]Hintze, A.:
1994 Der Zamyād-Yašt: Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Wiesbaden.
Hoffmann, K.:
1965 Zu den altiranischen Bruchzahlen. In: Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung 79, p. 247-254.
1975 Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik, ed. J. Narten. Band 1. Wiesbaden.
1976 Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik, ed. J. Narten. Band 2. Wiesbaden.
INSLER, S.:
1968 Sanskrit ípsati and írtsati. In: Indogermanische Forschungen 73, p. 57-66.
LUBOTSKY, A.:
1994 RV. ávidhat. In: Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich, edd. George E. Dunkel, Gisela Meyer, Salvatore Scarlata, Christian Seidl. Wiesbaden, p. 201-206.
MARSH, G.H.:
1941 The voiced sibilants in Sanskrit. In: Journal of the American Oriental Society 61, p. 45-50.
NARTEN, J.:
1964 Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda. Wiesbaden.
NORMAN, K.R.:
1992 Middle Indo-Aryan. In: Indo-European numerals, ed. J. Gvozdanović. Berlin - New York, p. 199-241.
Renou, L.:
1952 Grammaire de la langue védique. Lyon - Paris.
Sheth, H.D.T.:
1963 A comprehensive Prakrit-Hindi dictionary Pāia-sadda-mahaṇnavo. Varanasi.
Sakamoto-Goto, J.:
1988 Die mittelindische Lautentwicklung von $v$ in Konsonantengruppen mit Verschlusslaut bzw. Zischlaut. In: Indo-Iranian Journal 31, p. 87-109.
TURNER, R.L.. CDIAL:
1966 A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages. London.
Thumb, A. - Hauschild, R.:
1958 Handbuch des Sanskrit. Heidelberg.
Wackernagel. J.:
1896 Altindische Grammatik I, Lautlehre. Göttingen.


[^0]:    ' Abbreviations are: AitB $=$ Aitareya-Brāhmana, AMg. $=$ Ardhamāgadhī, Av. $=$ Avestan. $\mathrm{AV}=$ Atharvaveda. AVP $=$ Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, AVS $=$ Atharvaveda-Śaunakīya, Aś. $=$ Aśskan inscriptions, Inscr. $(\mathbf{W})=$ Western Inscriptional Präkrits, JB = Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa, JM = Jaina-Māhārāstrī̄, Khar. = Kharosṭhi inscriptions, $\mathrm{MI}=$ Middle Indic, $\mathrm{PB}=$ Pañcavimśa-Brāhmana. $\mathrm{PIE}=$ Proto-Indo-European. PIIr. $=$ Proto-Indo-Iranian. $R V=$ Rgveda. Śaur. = Śaurasenī, SB $=$ Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, TS $=$ Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, Yt $=$ Yasht.
    2 The variant sattha given by NORMAN, is "nicht zu belegen" (VON HINÜBER 1986:171).
    ${ }^{3}$ The forms chaddasa 'sixteen', chaddasahā 'sixteen times', quoted by SHETH 1963, are clearly based on cha 'six'.

    + Śaur. chattim is "either a wrong reading, or by analogy with cha ${ }^{\circ}$ six" (NORMAN 1992:213).

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ Note that, for instance, in Kālsī (an Eastern dialect), where we find the form sasu, the reflex of ${ }^{*} k s$ is ( $k$ )kh: lukha<Skt. v̧rksa-, khudaka < Skt. kşudraka-(von Hinüber 1986:114).
    ${ }^{-}$Vs. the desiderative siksa-from $\sqrt{ }$ sak- 'to be able' with a short vowel. Long $\bar{I}$ in siksa- shows that the loss of $z$ with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel was anterior to devoicing of ${ }^{*} Z^{h}$ to $s$ (DEBRUNNER 1957:28). INSLER 1968 argued that desideratives with a monosyllabic stem (like dips-, dits-, siks-) have been formed analogically on the basis of the zero grade of the perfect stem, cf. sek-ur : sik-sati, debh-úr : dip-sati. $\bar{a} p-i \bar{r}$ : ïpsati In his opinion, sik-sati was made after sāh-vâms-, and dik-sati after dāss-váms-. Even if the mechanism proposed by INSLER was operative at some stage, there must have been a starting point for the long vowel desideratives, where the development was phonetically regular. Such a starting point was probably siksati, which is the only such formation attested in the RV. Another regular formation was the desiderative diksa- < *didksefrom the root $\downarrow$ dās'- 'to honour' (for the development see Lubotsky 1994:203f.). The finite forms appear since the Brāhmaṇas, but dikssitá-and dikksá- are found in the AV.
    Written short in the texts, but being metrically long.

[^2]:    ${ }^{*}$ With the assimilation *-s->-s-.
    ${ }^{4}$ The epic and classic forms sodha- and sodhar- are secondary, formed by analogy with wodhar-. etc.. for which see below.
    ${ }^{10}$ Attestation in the RV are: ní-bālha-(1.106.6), bālha-sítvan-(1.122.10), bālhé adv. 'strongly' (1.181.7).
    11 MARSH (1941:47) claimed that the normal reflex of ${ }^{*}{ }_{a z} C$ is $o$, so that he had to explain away all examples of $\bar{a}$. He did this by positing lengthened grade in tā̆lhi and säadh-and declaring bādháa- of unclear etymology. which is of course ad hoc.
    12 In later texts restored to șaḍhhá (SB), ṣatdhā ( $\mathbf{P B}$ ).
    13 I have to admit, however, that I have been unable to find another example of the sound change ${ }^{*} \mathrm{CvO}->\mathrm{Co}$ -
    ${ }^{14}$ In later Vedic texts we only find a hapax 3sg. trnedhi (JB 2.271). 1sg. trnehmi is a form invented by the grammarians. From this root, the RV only attests participles trlhá- (with metrically long $r$ ) and tunhat

[^3]:    (10.102.4).

    15 Cf. WACKERNAGEL's conclusion: "für $a z ̌$ findet sich eo und ausserdem $\bar{a}[\ldots]$, ohne dass die Ratio erkennbar wäre" (p. 38).
    ${ }^{16}$ p. 30: "La forme isolé tṛ̣edhui (...) de TRH atteste un traitement vocalique conforme à celui de edhí dehí. en sorte que vódhave peut en définitive devoir son timbre radical à la précédence de la consonne $v$ ".
    17 Compare, for instance, Thumb - HAUSChild 1958:300 (" $a$ [wird] zu $\bar{o}$, seltener zu $\bar{a} "$ ). Allen 1962:72 n. 8 (regular reflex of $a z C$ is $o C$, i.e. "șazdaśa > șavḍśa". and "for two rare cases of simple lengthening of the vowel (tädhi, sädha-) see p. 94 n63", where these two cases are only mentioned without further adstruction), BURROW 1973:95 ("a preceding short a may be either lengthened [exx.], turned to $o$ [exx.], or turned to e [ex.]"), etc.

[^4]:    ${ }^{18}$ The difference in the treatment of ${ }^{*} v$ between Niya and the other Prākrits is in line with the usual behaviour of $S v$ clusters: they are normally preserved in Niya (BuRROW 1937:21) and some other inscriptional Prākrits. while in other Middle Indic dialects they become a geminate ss, simplified in anlaut (cf. SAKAMOTO-GOTO 1988:95 for the evidence).
    ${ }^{19}$ Cf. von HINÜBER 1986:167, who points to cchalāyatana of the Devnimori inscription vs. sadayatana of the Ratnagiri inscription.

[^5]:    ${ }^{211}$ The relationship between Skt. sát. Middle Indic cha(t) and Avestan xšuuaš is reminiscent of that between Skt. śépa- 'tail. penis', Prākrit and Pāli cheppā ‘tail' (< ${ }^{*}$-pyā-, cf. AV śepyàvant- 'tailed') and Av. xšuuaēpā- (Yt. 19.40) 'tail', which is likely to be cognate (for a discussion of this word see Hintze 1994:216f.). The Iranian and Middle Indic words point to *suaipā-, whereas $u$ may have been lost in Sanskrit due to dissimilation. In order to combine this form with Skt. sépa- we can either reconstruct PIIr. "pcuaipa- or assume that the word for 'tail' is a loan word (cf. also AitB sépha-m. 'scrotum').

