CONCLUSION
Sanskrit is to be considered as a living language during the period between MBh and K and so naturally it must have undergone changes. But since both MBh and K are commentaries on Asī, how far such changes occurred to the language during the period between MBh and K can be brought to light through the study of these works? The answer is positive. It would not have been possible for us to trace the development of the language of this intermediary period, if MBh and K had delimited their scope to the interpretation of the sutras based on the language of P's period only. But both MBh and K do not make such a restriction and they ably describe the language of their period.

The representation of the language in MBh and K

A good number of evidences can be cited to show that both MBh and K represent the language of their period and the following are only a few amongst them.
The Istis or desiderata given in MBh are Ptj's own additions to Kty's Vts and through them it became possible for Ptj to accommodate many of the changes observed in the Sanskrit language during his period. The proverbial expressions pointed out and the references to matters of every day life given in MBh furnish us valuable hints on the conditions of life, thought and language at the time of Ptj. Some of the Karikās (a category of statements) included in MBh embody the rules of Kty while others deviate from them even by enlarging and criticising the Kty Vts. Thus they also stand testimony to the fact that in MBh Ptj has accommodated the changes developed in the Sanskrit language of his period. With regard to the usage of words, the forms discussed in MBh give us specific insight into the sense and contexts of occurrence prevalent at the time of MBh. In short, MBh amply represents the Sanskrit language of its period.

The most noteworthy method adopted by K to extend the sphere of the rules of Āṣṭi was to make them apply, where at first sight they would seem to be inapplicable. Some of the additions and exceptions laid down by K pertain to words
relating to the words of everyday life. Since they are of common use and frequent occurrence in the daily routine, it may seem strange that they are unobserved by Kty or Ptj. This may either be due to oversight or due to the fact that by straining ingenuity, some of these at least, could be considered as coming within the scope of Pāṇini sūtras themselves. Anyway, the very fact that such words are being considered in K shows that the language of its period is being treated in K.

The variant readings pointed out in K are significant since many of the variations for which we do not find a source elsewhere indicate that changes have come about in the language during the period and such changes have also dealt with in K. With regard to interpretation, K has an independent approach and so naturally has many differences with other grammatical works. K gives us a comprehensive interpretation of Aṣṭ sūtras. In some cases we get from K explicit statements of the altered usages either newly added or otherwise broadened or narrowed or completely lost in the rules of P. Some of these examples given in K are newly
evolved forms due to natural linguistic changes and they also substantiate the fact that K has adequately described the language of its period.

In order to extend the sphere of the rules of P, K adopts some highly intelligent, interpretative and technical devices. These devices clearly reveal that the interpretation of P's rules by K is dependent and regulated by the actual usage of the language and this also proves that the language of their period has been efficiently dealt with by the authors of K.

The chief developments

The written records are considered to be the most authentic source material for depicting the historical development of any language. Since both MBh and K are grammatical treatises their value in this respect is much more. From the discussions given in the previous chapters, it is evident that the Sanskrit language had undergone changes during the period between MBh and K. It is observed that changes have occurred to the phonological, grammatical and
lexical systems. Since all the changes observed are already discussed with the help of variant readings of the śūtras and the vārtikas of both the texts, only a few examples are cited here.

Phonological change

Though much variations are not observed in the phonological inventory during the period between MBh and K the length of r might have been developed during this period. This is clear from the Vt in K "śkāralvādibhyah ktinnīstāvadbhavati iti vaktavyam" under the śūtra strīyām ktīn (3-3-94) which is omitted by Ptj. As for the phonological shapes of the forms, the changes observed in K do not point to any regular phonetic change affecting the language as a whole. But instances are in abundance to show that during the period between MBh and K some of the words had been affected by sporadic sound changes. A few such examples are given below:

The forms noticed in K tvatkapitṛkāḥ, asvaprapatāniyam and kāvātā under the sutras 1-1-29, 5-1-111 and 3-2-54 vary from those of MBh. The reading in MBh is tvakatpitṛkāḥ and
The sūtra 3-2-54 is not cited in MBh but in the original reading of P the form is kapāta. Thus the forms tvatkapitrkah is an example for metathesis, asvapraptanīyam is due to the devoicing of d and the form kavāta shows a change from p to v. Similarly khuraṇasah and kharaṇasah are the forms noticed in K while Ptj accepts khuraṇaḥ and khaṇaḥ (5-4-118). K gives the form saraśādam while Ptj cites saracāpam (2-2-34). Kharindhamah and kharindhayah are the forms given in MBh while K gives them as kharindhamah and kharindhayah (3-2-30). Svairinī and svairam are noticed in K while Ptj gives svairah and svairī (6-1-89). Srad is the form noticed by Ptj while K reads srad (6-1-98). Instead of prothā given in MBh, K gives pāntha (1-4-57). MBh gives prauhah while K sanctions only prauḍhayah (6-1-89).

Grammatical change

It is quite natural that some grammatical peculiarities too might have developed by the time of K which are not noticed by Kty or Ptj. A few such examples are given below:
The prohibition of the genitive case with regard to future passive participles of those verbs which govern the two objects as in kṛṣṭavā gramam śākhā devadattena, netavyā gramamajā devadattena (2-3-71). The employment of the affix kyan after the words romantha and tapas when they are used as the objects of the action of repeating and performing as kīto romantham vartayati (3-1-15) and the force of dative applied to instrumental when immoral conduct is implied as dāsyā or vṛṣalyā samprayacchate (1-3-55). All these are additional grammatical peculiarities observed in K.

It is probable that a few of such additional grammatical peculiarities observed in K might have existed at the time of MBh also and that they might have been unobserved by Ptj. But a large majority of such peculiarities cannot be considered as due to such accidental omissions in MBh. Hence one can rightly infer that many of these additional grammatical peculiarities, though not all, observed in K represent the development of Sanskrit language during the intermediary period between MBh and K.

Certain grammatical changes already taken place at the time of K is clear from the readings of the sūtras.
themselves. The readings pointed out in K otah siti (7-3-71) and dandādibhyo yah (5-1-66) differ from the readings of Ptj who reads otah śyani and dandādibhyo yat. The reading lyapi laghupūrvasya of MBh is changed to laghupūrvāt (6-4-56) where MBh accepts the genitive case while K accepts the ablative case.

Lexical change

The meaning of some of the words has narrowed down and for some others the meaning has expanded. There are also instances in which the old meaning of a lexical item is completely changed and it denotes a new sense at the time of K. Similarly some of the lexical items which are prevalent at the time of MBh have to be considered as obsolete by the time of K. Also some new lexical items have entered into the language of which some are originated from internal sources while others crept into Sanskrit as loan words from other languages.

(a) Semantic contraction of lexical items

The word tantra according to Ptj means 'extension' in contexts like āstīrṇam tantram, protam tantram. Here
tantra means vitānam (1-4-54). This specialised meaning of tantra is not noticed by the authors of K.

No special meaning is noticed in K for the word Devānampriya while at the time of Ptj the sense of deva is mūrkha 'fool' (2-4-56) which is clear from Kaiyāṭa's Pāṇḍīpa. The meaning of svakaraṇa according to MBh is to accept or to make one's own what was not previously his own. But according to K the word means pāṇigrahaṇa - meaning marriage (1-3-56) which of course is a contraction of the former meaning.

(b) Semantic expansion of lexical items

The meanings given in MBh for the word prakāra is 'likeness' only, while K gives the meanings likeness and differentiation (5-3-29, 8-1-12, 5-3-69). Similarly naksatra in the sense of jyotis (heavenly bodies), phalegrahih in the sense of vrksah (tree), antarena in the sense of vina (without), vata in the sense of roga (disease) etc. are the additional meanings noticed by the authors of K.
(c) Replacement of an old sense by a new one

There are instances in which an old meaning denoted by a lexical item is replaced by a new one which can even be completely unrelated to the former. The type mentioned in this group does not fall under semantic extension or semantic contraction since no broadening or shortening of the sense is observed. For example, the meaning noticed in MBh for अस्कर्या is something which is not usual, i.e. "rare" (6-1-147). K considers अस्कर्या in the sense of अधभृता which shows that the sense 'rare' prevalent at the time of MBh for अस्कर्या had been replaced by the sense 'surprise' at the time of K.

(d) Obsolete lexical items

It is to be noted that certain lexical items current during the period of MBh have become obsolete during the days of K. For example, the form प्रावहा is not noticed by the authors of K is clear from the reading of the Vṛtta pradūḥodhyeṣaiṣyeṣu (6-1-89). But Kty and Ptj have used the form and hence we can assume that it might have become
obsolete at the time of K. Kty and Ptj sanction the forms pruṣṭayate and pluṣṭayate through the Vt ataṭṭasīkakotāpotā-soṭaprūṣṭaplustakāṣṭāgraṇaḥam karttavyam (3-1-17). These forms are absent in K since it reads the Vt by omitting the words pruṣṭa and pluṣṭa. Therefore we can say that these forms definitely existed at the time of Kty and Ptj but not so during the days of K.

(e) New additions to the vocabulary from internal sources

The additional forms noticed in K which are not found in MBh also indicate the development of Sanskrit language during that period. The following are a few such examples which belong to this category: yāmyam (4-1-85), udarambharih (3-2-26), bhrājiśnu (3-2-138), dhrsnak (3-2-172), haimantikam (4-3-22), pāripārvikāh (4-4-29), turīya (2-2-3) and bhagandharah (3-2-41). Words of this sort might have originated purely from the internal sources.

(f) Loan words

Like any other language Sanskrit is also not devoid of loan words. For example, a few loan words from Dravidian are given here. mainikah 'fisherman' occurs in MBh 1-1-68.
kulāla 'pot maker' under 5-4-36 and kūḍa 'bowl shaped vessel' (3-1-130) occur in MBh and K. By the time of K some additional loan words too might have found their place in Sanskrit. For example māṇiḥ in the sense of 'bell' is used in K (1-1-11) but is absent in MBh.

Usages

K also gives due significance for the usages of forms. guru in its plural form guravah is used though referring to one person when following a form of yusmad as in tvam me guruḥ, yūyam me guravah etc. is noted by K alone under 1-2-59.

Under 2-1-33 while discussing the example kākapeyā nadī, K states that this example is applicable both in praise and in censure i.e. kākapeyā nadī can mean that the water in the river is so full that a crow can drink water even from the bank and also that the water in it is so shallow as can be drunk only by a crow, first indicating praise and then censure. This particular usage is not noticed in MBh. This also clearly reveals the fact that the language had much more developed at the time of K than what it was at the time of MBh.
Some of the Vedic forms applied to Bhaṣā in K may indicate the fact that they might have got currency in the language at the time of K. The following are such examples: The usage of samīdha (1-2-6), sakhī, aśiśvī (4-1-62), akrandī (7-4-65), dāśvān, sāhvan, mīdhvān (6-1-12) and girīśa (3-2-15).

However, there are a few observations in K which do not conform to the weighty evidence of established usage. For example, the word viśrāma (7-3-34) which it declares as incorrect is used by poets like Kālidāsa, Murāri, Bhāravi etc. viśrāmam labhatām ca (Sākuntala II-6), viśrāmo ārdayasya (UR I-39), tamṛśimmanuṣyalokapraveśavīśrāmasākhinām (AR I-10). Similarly, the form paripanthi according to K is used in Vedas only (5-2-89). But this is wrong because we find usages like nabhāviṣyam aham tatra yadi tat paripanthini (Māl-Mādh.IX-50) and tayorna vāṣam āgacchet tau hyasya paripanthināv (Gītā III-34). Likewise the forms tulā and upama according to K cannot be used with the instrumental (2-3-72) but this is against the usages like tulām yadārohati dantavāsasā (KS V-34), tulām samāruroha (RV VIII-15), sphuṭopamam bhūtisitena sambhunā (Sva.I-4). Under 3-1-82 pān in the sense of vyavahāra.
(in the sense of contract) is not admitted in K which accepts only the sense of stuti (praise). This means that pañ used in the sense of vyavahāra was not known to the authors of K. But pañ is found used in this sense in Bhaṭṭikāvyā is pointed out by Haradatta.

Barring a few observations of this sort, the corpus in K gives ample insight into the structure of Sanskrit language of its days and hence the changes which are observed in K from MBh mainly represent the development of Sanskrit language during the period between Mahābhāṣya and Kāṣṭikā.