EUGENIUSZ SŁUSZKIEWICZ

SOME REMARKS ON SANSKRIT SYNONYMS

In a review in Wostok[1] of Andrzej Gawroński's Notes sur les sources de quelques drames indiens (1922), S. Oldenburg fully approved, on the whole, of the author's views, but strongly opposed Gawroński's opinion that Sanskrit was a dead language. Oldenburg himself considered Sanskrit to be a highly developed literary language and would have assented to Gawroński's opinion only in so far as it concerned a relatively late period; yet he did not indicate precisely which one he meant. It is beyond all question that Gawroński well knew not only M. Winternitz's view on Sanskrit as a "fettered language"[2], but also H. Jacobi's paper Was ist Sanskrit[3], referred to by Oldenburg. When he treated Sanskrit as a dead language within a certain period (unfortunately, I cannot name its duration), he undoubtedly was in a position to adduce sound arguments. I do not intend to take this subject up here, and thus shall content myself with referring to some authorities whose opinions more or less agree with that of Winternitz. Let us begin with J. Mansion: "(...) sans doute, du temps de Pāṇini, l'ancien indien était une langue vivante, dont on usait dans des milieux brahmaniques assez fermes. En fixant les limites précises de cette langue vis-à-vis du védique d'une part, vis-à-vis du prâcrit de l'autre, le grand grammairien l'a coulée dans un moule rigide, ce qui a contribué à lui donner le caractère, sinon d'une langue morte, du moins d'un langage en grande partie artificiel. Néanmoins cet idiome artificiel a été pendant des siècles la langue parlée de l'élite de l'Inde"[4]. In somewhat other words, as A. B. Keith puts it, "Sanskrit was the language of science"[5] and "As the passage of time made Sanskrit more and more a language of culture, it reveals in increasing measure a lack of delicate sensibility to idiomatic use of words, such as is engendered by usage in a living speech more closely in touch with ordinary life"[6]. Winternitz's view is approved by R. Hauschild[7], who, following F. Altheim, defines Sanskrit as "eine archaisierende, durch Regeln

normalisierte Kunstsprache, die allgemeine Geltung beansprucht und gewinnt, die die lebenden Mundarten in den Hintergrund drängt"[8]. I should like to add the following statement of L. Renou: "S'il y a en effet un usage artificiel du sanskrit classique, avec les *kāvya* tardifs, il ne manque pas, en revanche, de textes qui comportent une expression linguistique aussi directe, aussi saine, que n'importe quelle littérature"[9].

I believe that the above opinions suffice to show that the problem is rather difficult and somewhat complicated, which justifies circumspection and even doubt concerning Oldenburg's view. Ciceronian Latin remains today, at least in large measure, the means of communication between European philologists, yet this fact does not render it a living language. The role played by Sanskrit in India was not unlike that of mediaeval Latin, as was that of Hebrew among the Jews during a great many centuries[10]. And when Oldenburg refers to Jacobi's paper and to G. Bühler's view that many an Indian scholar knew Sanskrit to perfection ("amazingly fine knowledge and understanding"), I must recall Gawroński's citation: "The most laborious student of a dead language is not alive to all the nice shades of meaning, which are plain even to the uninstructed when a language is living. Even to a Mahā-Paṇḍita in these days the sound of *bhavatē* is not at all so disagreeable as that of *hoela* is to the genuine Marāṭhā peasant" (R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar's statement; cited p. 16). Furthermore, it will probably not be out of place to mention that Gawroński himself thought it possible to rejuvenate old Sanskrit by instilling a new spirit into it: in the Preface to his own translation of fragments of Aśvaghoṣa's epics he observes that while reading his stanzas, inspired with a new, powerful sentiment, unknown to the "divine language", one is overwhelmed by impressions like those one feels when reading some of Sarbiewski's strophes, written in Catullus' and Horace's metres, yet conveying profounder emotions[11]. Moreover, Gawroński insists on the fact that Sanskrit was used in India on a scale far larger than Latin was during the Renaissance and subsequent centuries; in his judgement, this fact alone, in addition to the influence of living idioms, approximates Sanskrit to living languages[12]. In view of these considerations, Gawroński and Oldenburg appear to differ less than would seem to be the case at the first blush.

Since I am here going to deal with synonyms, another opinion of Gawroński's is particularly to be stressed, viz. that in a dead language syn-

onyms differ from each other m u c h l e s s /spaced by me — E.S./ than in a living one; furthermore he wrote that p e r h a p s /spaced as before/ there is no work in Classical Sanskrit where *jāyā* could not be replaced by *bhāryā* and vice versa, although classical writers very well knew their etymology and repeated it to the point of boredom. In Gawroński's judgement this phenomenon was occasioned by the fact that in a dead language there is no marked delimitation of the "ton affectif"[13]. It seems evident that this pronouncement is not so categorical as Oldenburg's formulation of his view.

I am very much set on showing that Gawroński is not alone in his opinion. In 1956 Renou writes as follows: "Le Mahābhārata connaissait déjà cent huit noms (chiffre consacré) du soleil, III 3 16; le *kāvya* puise dans ce répertoire, en négligeant le seul mot *sūrya* qui était la dénomination la plus directe. On fouille surtout dans les lexiques généraux ou spéciaux (botanique, médecine), qui fournissent des masses de synonymes, dans le Hastyāyurveda pour les noms de l'éléphant (onze noms sont donnés avec étymologie, Mātaṅgal. I 31-34), dans la Rasavidyā pour les noms de l'or et du mercure (42 noms de l'or, 33 du mercure dans le Rājanighaṇṭu); on a relevé 250 noms pour la "prostituée", dont une partie il est vrai n'appartient pas au domaine du *kāvya* /footnote 3 refers to L. Sternbach's papers/. Le goût des synonymes, si marqué dans les gloses et les paraphrases des commentaires littéraires, est responsable du nivellement des nuances, fâcheusement sensible chez les poètes secondaires et parfois même chez les plus grands. Qu'on pense au nombre de mots venus des domaines sémantiques les plus divers, qui ont abouti, en fin de composé, à signifier «masse», ou, pour mieux dire, à tenir lieu de pluriel collectif. Il est rare que la poétique enseigne à spécialiser les vocables /here are several nouns denoting divers sounds — E.S./. Pour combien de verbes les dhātuvṛtti se bornent à donner pour glose «gatau», autrement dit «verbe de mouvement»![14]" I should like to cite shorter statements of two other scholars. T. Burrow[15] gives a number of synonymical names of animals (elephant, cat, dog, etc.), Indo-Aryan and non-Indo-Aryan; incidentally, it is to be supposed that the latter category must have been affected with some degree of foreignism, at least for a time. Renou's above information may be supplemented by adding that R. F. G. Müller, a historian of medicine who stood in clear opposition to philologists, mentions Indian

lists of medicinal plants often giving about half a hundred synonyms for one and the same plant, and cites 10 denominations of sickness in general[16]. But to return to Renou himself, it seems to me that his judgement concerning "le goût des synonymes", valuable, as it is, does not explain the real cause (or reason) of the phenomenon or at least does not explain it fully, as fully as Gawroński did. His view, however, is all the more remarkable since he does not refer to that of Gawroński, whom he mentions thrice (see p. 240), but only as the author of the thesis examining the interrelation of the Daśakumāracarita and the Mṛcchakaṭika.

The multitude of Sanskrit synonyms is also mentioned by W. W. Iwanov & W. N. Toporov[17]. In their opinion long series of synonyms originate around basic terms that form centers of a large number of semantic fields and connect the lexical system of Sanskrit with the sign systems of the domains of religion, philosophy, literature, and art of Ancient India (such being the case, the structure of the lexical system can afford, to their minds, great help in inquiries concerning the role of various phenomena in the life of Indian society; e.g. the existence of nearly 20 denominations of the elephant is to be explained in the large context of cultural history[18]). As if intent upon supplementing the views of these two scholars, J. Syrkin analyses the stylistic role of selected synonyms, viz. names of some definite animals used in Pūrṇabhadra's Pañcatantra (ed. by J. Hertel, HOS Vols. XI-XIII, 1908 and 1912)[19]. Eschewing the problematic aid afforded by Indian synonymic dictionaries (since they ignore semantic nuances), the author deals with the names of the elephant, the jackal, the cat, the owl, and the bee, for these are, in his judgement, the most characteristic groups of synonyms in that text. One can roughly summarize the author's conclusions as follows: 1) more than once we can find a close connection between the etymological meaning of the synonym in question and the contents of the context; 2) some synonyms show one or more emotional connotations, e.g., that of contempt; 3) stanzas being frequently thrown in, it is possible to find several pairs of synonyms, one of which is employed more often in prose, whereas the other is used predominantly in verse (some terms, however, appear in strophes only, which may happen for the sake of rhythm, metri causa); 4) sometimes the choice of a synonym may be a result of such factors as pun, alliteration, etc.; 5) it happens that

certain synonyms form the first member of a compound, which may have resulted from definite considerations. But the author himself concludes his reasoning with the reservation that his observations and deductions, based on a text which is not very comprehensive, require corroboration by other, similar studies. Finally, he proposes a comparison of the PT with collections of fables from other literatures (names of animals as found in Lafontaine, Krylov, and so on), since such a procedure would, in his opinion, help to establish the general regularities of the language of fables as well as specific characteristics of the synonymy of various languages.

Confining myself to the subject proper of the present paper, I should like to indicate my sceptic attitude towards Syrkin's deductions concerning emotional connotation, at least in general. Such feelings are more or less subjective and certainty or quasi-certainty can be obtained only under particularly favourable circumstances, e.g., when the respective synonym (as *kāka* or *dhvāṅkṣa* or *paśu*) is, sometimes or often, really used in a figurative sense, clearly negative. However useful the author's paper is, further researches are indeed necessary. The role of etymology has been mentioned by Gawroński as well (cf. above), although only briefly, since it is evident. Gawroński, however, stresses a fact which Oldenburg passed over in silence; namely, that his remarks on synonyms can be applied, mutatis mutandis, on a more or less large scale to all linguistic categories and that the reason his choice fell on synonyms was just that there was an abundance of them, which enables us to ascertain without much trouble the great degree of freedom they are treated with; in his opinion that freedom can be accounted for by the faintness of our emotional relationship to a language that is learnt artificially[20]. This reminds me of Mansion's observation: "(...) on croit deviner que, pour Patañjali, la correction est chose apprise et que les *çiṣṭas* sont, non pas ceux auxquels le bel usage est chose naturelle, mais ceux qui l'ont appris dans les *çāstras*."[21] To return to what I was saying, the conclusion to be drawn from Gawroński's reasoning is to my mind as follows: in order to judge Gawroński's assertion equitably we must examine not only the use of synonyms, but also the treatment of other linguistic elements, esp. in late Sanskrit (for the relativity of this designation see above). It is to be regretted that Gawroński contented himself with illustrating his thesis by means of synonyms. The examination of the emotional aspect of linguistic

elements is not as easy as shelling peas, since, in V. Zvegincev's judgement, expressive and emotional elements of the language associate with objects themselves and/or with phenomena of objective reality and do not belong to words[22]. To my mind, relative assurance, as far as we are concerned with synonyms, can be obtained only in particular cases in which their meaning changes in a peculiar or significant manner[23].

Gawroński's view, as well as my own, is fully supported, I believe, by the following statements of Daniel H. H. Ingalls: "Sanskrit not only has an enormous vocabulary; it has also a larger choice of synonyms than any other language I know. In a natural language there are probably no synonyms. Of course, one can go to a thesaurus and find what are called synonyms: /here English synonyms are given — E.S./ dwelling, residence, tenement, abode (...). The poetic words for house in Sanskrit — and Sanskrit has far more words for this object than English — differ chiefly in sound and etymology. They are not bound to a particular social or emotional situation: /here Sanskrit examples are given and dealt with — E.S./ *veśman, sadman, vastya, nilaya, ālaya* (...). The learnedness of the language has divorced its words from the emotional responses of everyday life." The second quotation from Ingalls reads thus: "While Sanskrit distinguishes, it is true, between poetic words and matter-of-fact words it achieves within each of these categories an extraordinary degree of synonymity." Footnote 4 explains that difference as follows: "Thus in *kāvya* one seldom finds the simple words *strī* and *nārī* 'woman'. Women are there transformed into charmers, damsels and gazelle-eyed beauties (*vilāsinī, yoṣit, mṛgākṣī*, and so on)." That distinction illustrates the artificiality of Sanskrit, yet all the same it is connected with "an extraordinary degree of synonymity". Sanskrit as well "furnished no subconscious symbols for the impressions which we receive in childhood nor for the emotions which form /so correctly, not «from» — E.S./ our character in early adolescence".[24] Nevertheless, Ingalls states quite pointedly: "I do not mean that Sanskrit was a dead language."[25] I must confess that this opinion does not seem conclusive to me, all the more since Ingalls himself affirms that: "For common words like 'king' or 'rain-cloud' or 'mistress' two or three hundred synonyms will be listed, and these are all interchangeable (....) Just as there exists a vast number of synonyms for almost any word the poet may wish to use, so also there exist synonymous constructions. On examinations

for elementary Sanskrit I used to ask students to express in Sanskrit the sentence "You must fetch the horse" in ten different ways. Actually, one can do it in fifteen ways or so /here details are given — E.S./. What I would emphasize is that, while these constructions differ formally, emotionally they are identical and completely interchangeable. In a natural language that would be quite impossible." Yet, if a language is s o e x t r e m e l y artificial, can it be a living one? And I must recall that the enormously "free use of a vast store of alleged synonyms" (Keith, 1.cit.) is only o n e striking characteristic of Sanskrit proper (cf. supra, p. 235).

N o t e s

[1]Восток, 1925.

[2]Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, I, 1909, p. 41 (and A History of Indian Literature, I, 1927, p. 44).

[3]Scientia, 1913.

[4]Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue sanscrite, 1931, p. 153.

[5]A History of Sanskrit Literature, 1920; reprinted 1948, p. 8.

[6]Ib., p. 26.

[7]Handbuch des Sanskrit, I, 1958.

[8]Op.cit., pp. 101 ff.

[9]Histoire de la langue sanskrite, 1956, p. 82.

[10]Cf. Winternitz, 1.c., but also Keith, op.cit. (repr.), p. 11 & 13; as also B. W. Lockwood, Sprachen als ideologischer Überbau. Wissenschaftl. Annalen, Jg. 5, H. 12, 1956, p. 934.

[11]Aświaghosza. Wybrane pieśni epiczne (new, enlarged ed.) 1966, p. 4 & 7-8.

[12]Notes sur les sources de quelques drames indiens, 1921, p. 8.

[13]Op.cit., p. 16: "Mais le poète sanscrit classique, parlant de l'éléphant p.ex., se servira pêle-mêle des mots *gaja, nāga, vāraṇa, hastin, dantin, karin, dvipa, dvirada, stamberama*, etc.; pareillement, pour nommer l'abeille, il n'a qu'à choisir à volonté entre des mots comme *ali, bhṁga, bhramara, madhulih, madhuvrata, ṣaṭpada, dvirepha*... Et de même dans mille autres cas. N u l l e d i f f é r e n c e d e t o n a f f e c t i f a p p r é c i a b l e n e d i s t i n g u e c e s m o t s /spaced by A.G./, différence ressentie si fort et si distinctement dans les langues vivantes, quoique des expressions telles que *dvirada* ou *ṣaṭpada* so/ie/nt pour le moins tout aussi caractéristiques que *kłapouch* ou *langohr* /f.-n.l explains Polish *kłapouch*: "Littéralement 'animal aux oreilles pendantes', comparez Lambakarṇa, nom propre d'âne dans les fables sanscrites./. De là, une latitude énorme dans l'emploi des synonymes en sanscrit, et qui va quelquefois fort loin. Par ex. le mot *mugdha*, participe passé de *muh*, signifie 'bête, naïf'. Quoi d'étonnant

qu'il s'applique le plus fréquemment aux j e u n e s filles? Mais il s'ensuit que tel et tel poète, p.ex. Bhavabhūti, l'applique tout à fait couramment aux fleurs dans le sens de 'jeune, frais'. En polonais, en français ou dans une autre langue vivante, une licence pareille serait d'une affectation impossible et ridiculiserait l'auteur, à moins qu'il n'appartînt à la chapelle futuriste. Mais en sanscrit, pas trace d'affectation, ou du moins rien d'extraordinaire. C'est que le sanscrit est une langue morte et nul ton affectif v i v e m e n t r e s s e n t i e t d i s t i n c t e m e n t d é l i m i t é n'en souligne les mots. C'est à quoi pensait à peu près M. Bhāṇḍārkar, quand il fit observer dans la préface de son Second Book of Sanskrit /...; cf. above, p. 234/. — Incidentally, the fact that Syrkin /see below, n. 19 / chose names of animals, inter alia those of the elephant and the bee, raises the question whether he did so in order to show that Gawroński was not quite right. Yet, since he does not quote the Notes of G. (nor even Oldenburg's review), I can only venture a guess.

[14] Op.cit., p. 173-174. Note particularly the "nivellement des nuances" and cf. also: "The fact that Sanskrit was not a normal living language presented him with the temptation to which none of the later dramatists rises superior, of the free use of the vast store of alleged synonyms presented by the lexica /here a f.-n. referring to Gawroński, [Notes sur] Les sources(...), pp. 1 ff./, freed from any inconvenient necessity, such as exists in every living language, of using words only in that precise nuance which every synonym possesses in a living dialect." (Keith, The Sanskrit Drama, 1924, p. 283). — I should like to emphasize that my present paper is concerned only with Sanskrit proper. I readily admit that in Vedic, esp. its early phase, there may have been, and certainly were, numerous cases where synonyms were not wholly equivalent and interchangeable without any difference in meaning (or nuance), howsoever slight it might be. "A thorough examination of semantically related terms proves indeed to be very fruitful. Whereas, for instance, lexicographers are inclined to give "earth" as the first translation of *bhū́-*, *bhū́man-*, *bhū́mi-*, *pṛthivī́-*, *medinī-*, a closer investigation of the text places reveals interesting differences, the soil being distinguished from the broad space to live in etc. /f.-n. 7: G. Tucci, in Eranos-Jahrbuch, 22, p. 323 ff./. *Bhúvana-* indicating the whole aggregate of what has come, and is coming, into being is, in the Veda, widely distinct from *loka-* »a place of rest and safety in universal extensity (....)», although both words are translated by 'world'" /f.-n.1 refers to Gonda's paper and separate publication/. "The sense of words such as *śulká-* (..) and *krayá-* 'purchase' could be stated more exactly /f.-n.2 refers to another paper of Gonda/ (...)." Furthermore: "It may be recalled that even in those cases in which some words deriving from the same root are semantically hardly distinct from one another, their stylistic or formular value may be worth examining very closely" /f.-n. 3: a reference to Renou's Paper "Les noms pour 'don' dans le Ṛgveda"/. All this is to be found in J. Gonda, Old Indian (Handbuch der Orientalistik, II. Abt., I. Bd., Die indischen Sprachen, I. Abschnitt), 1971, pp. 177-178. Moreover: "The ideas expressed by the terms *ṛta-* and *satya-* are (...) complementary rather than identical: (....) they have a different semantic kernel and range of application" (etc.; p. 191/192) and: "Often also minor semantic differences between so called synonyms — which as a matter of fact are rare — are blurred out and left by their compilers to their successors to be investigated into" (p. 220). But it must be borne in mind that Sanskrit differed essentially from Vedic: "Scholars are agreed that this /i.e. Vedic — E.S./ language in the

centuries to follow did not undergo a natural development" and also: "in many linguistic points, generally speaking, there is a line of cleavage between the Veda and the Sanskrit of later times" (Gonda, ib., p. 15 & 16). To return to the synonyms: the combination *śuddhaḥ pūtaḥ* 'pure and clean' (Chānd.Up. 5,10,10, cited by Gonda, Stylistic Repetition in the Veda, 1959, p. 336) may comprise two synonyms only partially identical in meaning, but it seems totally certain that, e.g., in *patyau jīvati kuṇḍaḥ syān / mṛte bhartari golakaḥ* (Manu 3,174, cited ib. p. 398) *pati* and *bhartṛ* are wholly equivalent, notwithstanding their different etymology (there can be no two ways about it, exactly as was the case with *jāyā* and *bhāryā* according to A.G.'s statement, cf. above, p. 235). Cf. also, for the language of the Rigveda: "(...) to denote objects or concepts the poets often had the choice of a wealth of 'synonyms' — thus a 'horse' may be called *aśva, arvat, atya, haya, sapti, vājin*; the fine semantic differences between these, so essential for a complete understanding of the texts, are however as a rule difficult to determine" (the above synonyms are culled from various books of the Rigveda, referred to in f.-n. 56). Jan Gonda, Vedic Literature. A History of Indian Literature. Edited by Jan Gonda. Volume I, Fasc. 1, Wiesbaden 1975, p. 219.

[15] The Sanskrit Language, 1955, p. 374. For the role of emotional relation to synonyms of foreign origin in a living language see A. Gawroński, Szkice językoznawcze (i.e. Linguistic Sketches), 1928, pp. 59-69. Incidentally, I have quoted above, in f.-n. 13, his argumentation in extenso, since his study published in 1921 is not very likely to be found in many libraries.

[16] RO XXX,2, 1967, pp. 95-113, viz. 112 ff.

[17] Санскрит, 1966.

[18] Op.cit., pp. 128 ff.

[19] О некоторых особенностях санскритской синонимики (История и культура древней Индии , 1963, стр. 268-281). I think it advisable to point out some errors, esp. printing errors. The word *divāṇḍha* (p. 274 below, p. 275 thrice and p. 278 once) is to be written °*ṇdha*, as once p. 275 (in the middle; an oversight?); inversely *mandūka* (p. 278) ought to be written °*ṇḍūka*; besides, read: *gajarāja* (p. 270, line 5 from below), *citram* (p. 271, line 4 fr.b.), *ārūḍhaḥ* (p. 272 in the middle), *pṛṣṭhā*° (p. 274 below the m.). Other corrections: 1) since the author follows the almost general European practice of giving the themes, not the Nom.Sg., *śvā* (p. 269 & 278) is to be written *śvan* and *-m* is to be cancelled in *hastimāṁsam* (p. 270 in the m.; cf. *hastiyāśva* immediately before); 2) the etymology *mātaṁga* (presumedly a derivative, as the vṛddhi shows) < *matam* + *ga*, apparently 'moving (roaming) at will' is only a "popular" one; obviously, the author could not yet avail himself of the respective instalment (16th, 1962) of M. Mayrhofer's Kurzgef. etym. Wörterb. d. Altind., referred to by him 11 times (p. 280), but already in 1925 J. Przyluski derived that word from Austro-Asiatic, which Mayrhofer, p. 562 f., enthusiastically approved ("glanzvolle Deutung") and corroborated by adducing several semantic parallels. For Indian "popular etymology" see, e.g., Gonda, Stylistic Repetition..., p. 369, and Old Indian, pp. 55, 198, 203. Gonda uses also the term "reinterpretation" (p. 55) and a Polish linguist, Dr. W. Cienkowski, has proposed to replace "popular etymology" by "etymological reinterpretation" (cf. his habilitation thesis Teoria etymologii ludowej, 1972; see also my review in the monthly Poradnik Językowy, 1976, fasc. 2, pp. 70-81).

[20]"La cause de cette liberté repose dans la faiblesse du rapport affectif qui nous unit à une lahgue morte apprise artificiellement" (op.cit., p. 17).

[21]Op.cit., p. 152.

[22]Semazjologia (Polish translation, 1962), p. 251.

[23]Cf. also the same author's statement: "Universal word-terms have the least degree of emotional and expressive connotation" (op.cit., p. 250).

[24]An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry (HOS, Vol. 44, 1965), pp. 6-8.

[25]L.cit.

P o s t s c r i p t. My foregoing remarks and quotations are not at all intended for those "advocating the cause of Hindi or Hindustani as the language and literature of India" or "the cause of provincial languages without any reference to Sanskrit, the grand-mother of provincial dialects through Prakrit and Apabhramsa" (Dr. B. Bhattacharya, Sanskrit Culture in a Changing World, Baroda 1950, p. 94). In my paper I am trying only to take a peep at a remote period of the history of Sanskrit. I know, of course, that "continued and periodical onslaughts of foreigners like the Achemenids, the Greeks (....) Pathans and Moguls could not succeed in destroying Indian culture or its background of Sanskrit language and literature. Many of the foreign tribes (...) were absorbed in the mighty ocean of Indian society, and Indian Culture, based on Sanskrit, stands as a rock firm as ever. The extensive Sanskrit literature with a continuous development of more than 3000 years is a record of the cultural activities of the Indian society of different historical periods in divers branches of human knowledge (.....) No civilized country can even dream of destroying this priceless national wealth /i.e. ten lakhs of MSS from different parts of India — E.S./" (ib., p. 98 ff.). Moreover: "In the present age also the Sanskrit language is a living language, and its literature is studied eagerly in schools, colleges, universities and in Sanskrit Ṭols and Pāṭhaśālās" (ib., p. 82), although "Sanskrit is now passing through a crisis in its long and chequered history (....) just at a time when India broke down the shackles of foreign domination and became free" (p. 93). And in Hajime Nakamura's very useful booklet A Companion to Contemporary Sanskrit (Delhi, 1973, VI + 74 pp.) the Preface informs: "Sanskrit is not a dead language, but a living language and since the independence of India it has gained its ground in that country. There is a strong movement to make Sanskrit the national language of India and Sanskrit education compulsory, although it has not been approved

by others" (p. III). Nevertheless, and pace Prof. Nakamura, whom I highly esteem (cf. my review in RO XXXIII,2, 1970, pp. 161 ff.), I hold the view that Sanskrit was not a truly living language over a period of many centuries (cf. my paper above) and that it can at most be galvanized, on a more or less limited scale (Nakamura's assertion, viz. naming Sanskrit "a living language", seems to me an *atiśayokti*). In my opinion, Sanskrit will never be in a position to replace Hindi, let alone the 14 other Indo-Aryan languages. And I should like to cite a statement by A. Meillet that supports Gawroński's view: "Une langue morte sert malaisément de support à une littérature originale; elle rend mal les sentiments intimes". On the other hand: "Pour toutes les choses de la pensée, le latin a fourni de mots les langues modernes de l'Europe. Empruntés ici, traduits ailleurs, ces termes sont au fond les mêmes partout. C'est à l'emploi commun du latin que l'Europe doit d'avoir gardé quelque unité qu'il y a entre les parlers usuels" (Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine, 4^{e} édition, 1938, p. 283).