

zurecht auf „jene Lexeme, die in der vedischen Literatur – oder allenfalls bei alten Grammatikern wie Pāṇini oder Patañjali – erstmals belegt sind“ (p. 2), reduziert wird (soviel gegen die Skepsis von F. B. J. KUIPER in IJ 28 [1985] 207), zeigen, haben die ‚Überlegungen‘ in den vergangenen 3 Jahren nichts von ihrer Aktualität eingebüßt und werden diese als Vorstudie und *prastāvanā* zu dem trotz mangelnder Unterstützung von indologischer Seite (s. p. 148) begonnenen *mahākarma* sicher über Jahre hinaus beibehalten.

Ähnliches gilt *mutatis mutandis* von 9 weiteren Beiträgen, die – wie der Mayrhofer – im Entstehen begriffene etymologische Wörterbücher zum Gegenstand haben (z. B. B. Schleraths ‚Stand und Aufgaben der iranischen Lexikographie‘ [pp. 229–242] zu einem neuen für den Indoiranisten unentbehrlichen und für den Vedologen zumindest interessanten Avesta-Wörterbuch), so daß man dem Herausgeber für seine bleibende Leistung einen ordentlichen Satz anstelle einer nur linksbündig getippten Druckvorlage gewünscht hätte.

Ch. H. Werba

Hinüber, Oskar von: *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. [SbÖAW 467 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20]. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986. 209 p. öS 350,—/DM 50,—.

The pioneering works of PISCHEL (1900) on Pkt. and Apa. and GEIGER (1916) on P. have in many respects been overtaken by the developments in MI studies since then. Since the publication of these works a considerable amount of new material has become known and available, such as the Aśoka-inscriptions, Gāndhārī-Pkt. and BHS, which has led to a great number of subsequent studies. However, most of these studies were scattered over all kinds of publications of various and different interests. We may therefore be grateful to professor von Hinüber who has in this historical grammar for the first time brought together and evaluated practically all the results, problems, uncertainties and controversies of the last century in the field of MI. In doing so the author has restricted himself to early MI, thus leaving out, except for occasional references, Apa., as this would have meant including NIA as well.

The book opens with a survey of the primary sources, inscriptional and literary, and with an indication of their meaning for the study of MI. The actual historical grammar part is divided into separate chapters for the sound system, the nominal system and the verbal system. MI syntax is not dealt with separately. This is amply compensated by extensive information on those linguistic problems related to the transmission of the texts concerned, which in the case of many Buddhist texts took place outside India. Furthermore, considerable attention is paid to those peculiarities (or anomalies) related to the literary or artificial aspect of the language and to the processes involved in the creation of these artificial forms.

In so far as the book represents the actual state of affairs in MI studies, it also testifies to their lacunae. Thus comparatively little progress can be noted, even in such essentials as editions, translations, dictionaries and grammatical studies, in the field of Amg. and that of the literary Pkts. At the same time the development of the MI sound system appears to have been studied in much greater detail than either its nominal or its verbal system. Furthermore, statistical studies are lacking altogether, so that the direction of the drift of certain developments within a specific body of texts remains difficult to determine exactly. The book closes with three indexes, of subject matter and of selected categories of words and of text passages, which together with the detailed table of contents at the beginning of the book make the material easily accessible.

An "Überblick" as offered by von Hinüber cannot be expected to treat each and every detail of MI or to reconsider all the material found in PISCHEL's or GEIGER's grammar – nor does the author claim to do so. It is not always clear, however, according to what criterion some phenomena have not been included. A case in point is, for instance, the raising of the *e* in *diara* "brother-in-law" beside *de(v)ara*, for which, see CDIAL 6546 and lately my own publication on the subject of Hāla's Sattasaī (Leiden, 1983), pp. 249f., in which reference is made to possibly another instance of the same phenomenon in *vianā* "pain" beside *veanā* (from Skt *vedanā*). Not included either is the development in MI of *-jj-* (skt. *-jy-*, *-dy-*) into *-cc-* seen in certain verb stems. R. L. TURNER ($\sqrt{\text{sañj}}$ in Middle and New Indoaryan. IL 25 [1964] 56f. = Collected Papers, pp. 399–401) explains this unvoicing in, for instance, *raccai* (*rajyate*) analogically after the pair *siccai* (*sicyate*): *sitta* (*sikta*), starting from the past participle *ratta*. The reason why this particular development is not discussed may lie in the fact that the grammarian Hemacandra treats of it as if it were typical of Apa. (IV 422, 423) and that as such it would fall outside the scope of the book. However, instances of the unvoicing are already found in M. *saccava-* "to aim, to decorate" and *vacca-* "to go", both common verbs in a text like Hāla's Sattasaī, and possibly also in P.; see PTSD s. vv. *saccāpeti* and *sacceti*. Though I do not intend to offer an alternative explanation here, I should like to draw attention to two facts which in my opinion should be taken into account in such an explanation. In the first place in NIA instances of the unvoicing are mainly restricted to the languages of the North-West and adjacent areas sometimes including the Hindi-speaking area (e.g. CDIAL 8737, 9528, 10583), and to Ōriyā in the East (e.g. 10503). In the second place, as far as NIA is concerned, the unvoicing is apparently not restricted to verb stems but it is also found in nouns (e.g. 6290, 7778).

The total number of such "omissions" is, however, small. In fact much of the strength of the book lies precisely in the fact that its author consistently keeps to the main developments among the enormous amount of details. As such the book will not only prove very useful to the specialist but could also excellently serve as an up-to-date introduction to the study of MI and MI texts, which in fact was hitherto missing.

The following remarks are therefore not meant to diminish the book's worth; rather they serve as occasional supplements to the material provided.

In § 10 von Hinüber traces the earliest instance of Pkt. *tūha* "bathing place" to Hemacandra's Kumārapālapratibodha (12th century). *tūha* is, however, found already in Hāla's Sattasaī (1st to 3rd century); see Gāthās 58 and 189 (ed. A. WEBER, AKM, VII 4, 1881).

Generally in MI the diphthongs have been lost indeed (§ 107). Pischel (§ 61) has noted several instances where *-ai-* (*-ai-*) has been retained. Of these M. *kaiava* "deceit" (Sattasaī, ed. A. WEBER, Gāthās 85, 124, 156 and 368; $\cup\cup\cup\cup$) deserves special mention as it has survived in Marāṭhī *kaivāḍ*. BLOCH (as quoted in CDIAL 3477) explains *-ai-* in *kaivāḍ* as a sanskritization, which, however, is an unlikely explanation for *kaiava* in the Sattasaī.

In § 162ff. the author discusses the initial consonants. He does not come back on the fact that in certain words the initial plosive following a vowel could be lost in MI: e.g. *a* (*ca*), *uṇa* (*puṇa*), *u* (*tu*) and *ira* (*kira*). In the Sattasaī yet a few other instances have been isolated: *e* "you" and "they" (beside *de* and *te*), *i* (beside *vi* and *pi*) and *ā* (beside *dā* and *tā*); see TIEKEN, Hāla's Sattasaī, pp. 209f.

To the instances of the spontaneous cerebralization, discussed in § 196 may be added P. *kaṭhati* "boils", for which see VON HINÜBER, ILJ 21 (1979) 21–26. I should like to draw attention to the possibility that the cerebralization of the

original dental plosive in this word as well as in the semantically related Pkt. *dadḍha* (*dʰ*) “burnt, cursed” is expressive of fear or horror (see also TIEKEN, Hāla’s Sattasaī, p. 263).

According to von Hinüber (§ 209) in P, no traces of the development of *-m-* into *-v-* could be traced. In this connection I should like to draw attention to P. *pamhutṭha* “forgotten” from *pra-mṛṣ*. Compare also M. *pamhusa-* “to forget” and “to wipe out”, from *pra-mṛṣ* and *pra-mṛś* respectively. The spelling *-mh-* (for *-mm-*, see § 242) may represent a strengthened pronunciation counteracting a fricativized pronunciation of the intervocalic *-m-*. In this particular case it is to be noted that the *-m-* was the initial consonant of the verb stem which, as a result of the pronunciation of *-m-* as *-v-* or ultimately of its loss, would have become practically unrecognizable.

A survival in MI of the ending *-ebhyaḥ*, not mentioned by von Hinüber (§ 317), is found in the pronoun *tebbho*, Sūyagaḍa 1.1.1.8 (see WZKS 30 [1986] 22).

For statistical material on the nasalization of final vowels (§ 320 and 113) I may refer to TIEKEN, Hāla’s Sattasaī, p. 168. In the Sattasaī only one instance of the nasalization of a final *-u* is found, namely in Gāthā 77, which, however, probably is a later addition to the text.

āsaṃmāsike mentioned in § 399 is not found in Dhauri or Jaugaḍa but in Delhi-Tōprā, the fifth pillar-edict (C). On the basis of the Aśoka-inscriptions alone it would not seem possible to draw the conclusion, as done by von Hinüber, that the initial *sa-* in the word for the number “six” is typical of the Eastern languages, in the sense that in the Western languages a different form is found. The only other instance of the word in these inscriptions is *ṣaṣu* in the Ka., Ma. and Sh. versions of the thirteenth rock-edict (Q), while the relevant part is unfortunately lost in the Gīrnār version. (*ṣaḍāyatana* in the Devnīmori [which also has *chal*°] and Ratnagiri-inscriptions referred to in § 399 would seem to be a sanskritization, in view of the retroflex sibilant.) The only evidence for the Eastern origin of the initial *sa-* would then in fact be P. *salāyatana*, supposedly retained in the text as a technical term (CPD II, p. 130, beside *chal*°, op. cit., p. 129). Such circumstantial evidence has been accepted in other cases as well, as, for instance, in the case of the plur. ending *-āse*, which is not found in the Aśoka-inscriptions (see § 312 and 315).

M. *kāmamhe* (§ 423), the 1st pers. plur. medium, for which the author refers to Hāla’s Sattasaī (ed. A. WEBER), Gāthā 417, is found not as is claimed in some Mss., but only in one, namely S. All the other Mss. read *kāmemo*, which therefore has to be reconstructed for the archetype Ms. *kāmamhe* in S is consequently not relevant for M. Pkt.

The omission of the cerebralization in P. *agamittha* or Aṃg. *viharittha* (§ 487) is probably another instance of “the phonetic weakness of terminational elements in Indo-aryan”, observed by R. L. TURNER (JRAS 1927/2, pp. 227–39 = Collected Papers, pp. 291–300).

For instances of the absolute ending in *-(t)um* discussed in § 498 for P. (*-tu*), in M. Pkt, see Sattasaī (ed. A. WEBER), Gāthās 297, 298, 307 (all *bhaṇium*), 360 and 364 (*mottum*), and 595 (*valium*).

As I have shown elsewhere (WZKS 30 [1986] 5–25) our understanding of the early canonical Jaina texts is still very poor. It is mostly based on information gleaned from the commentaries, which, however, abound in *ad hoc* solutions and fanciful derivations, many of which have found their way into Pischel’s grammar and subsequently have proved difficult to get rid off. A case in point is the word *puṭṭhavaṃ*. The word is found only once, in Āyāraṅgasutta (JĀS), Sūtra 236: *aṇāhāro tvaṭṭejjā puṭṭho tattha hiyāsae | ṇāṭivelam uvacare māṇussehiṃ vi (pi?) puṭṭhavaṃ ||*, found in a passage describing the way a monk fasts himself

to death. In the *Ṭikā* commentary *putṭhavaṃ* is glossed with *spr̥ṣto*. According to PISCHEL (§ 569) and SCHUBRING (AKM 12, 4, 1910, p. 108a) *putṭhavaṃ* represents *spr̥ṣtavān*, which, contrary to normal usage, would have a passive meaning here. As such it is mentioned by von Hinüber in § 494. This interpretation of *putṭhavaṃ* is, however, hardly tenable. The following alternative explanation, which has already been referred to in J. BRONKHORST, *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*, ANIS 28, 1986, p. 40, esp. notes 7 and 8, also includes *putṭho* in the same Sūtra. This *putṭho* has been glossed with *spr̥ṣta* as well. Skt. *spr̥ṣta* (*spr̥ś-*), however, regularly becomes *phutṭha* (*phusa-*), which indeed occasionally is found with an unaspirated *p-* (PISCHEL § 311 and 486). The form *pusa-* obviously requires a more thorough explanation than can be offered here. It should suffice to mention that as far as the instances in the *Sattasaī* are concerned, *pusa-* is merely a Ms. variant of *phusa-*. *phusa-* in the *Sattasaī* has the specialised meaning "to wipe". The instances of *pusa-* in the Mss. of this text could well be explained as "emendations" of original *phusa-* under the influence of the standard gloss *proñch-*. *putṭho* in the Sūtra under consideration should, however, rather be the locative of Pkt. *putṭhi* "back" (see von Hinüber § 327 and for Pkt. *putṭhi* beside Skt. *pr̥ṣtha*, TIEKEN, *Hāla's Sattasaī*, p. 203). *uvacara-* (Skt. *upacar-*) would have here the specialised meaning "to tend medically", while *putṭhavaṃ* would stand for *pr̥ṣṭhakam* "back", showing a rare instance of the glide *-v-* (§ 171). A possible translation of the Sūtra is: "He should lie down without food, he should remain there on his back. He should not excessively (*ṇāṭivelam*) treat his back (*putṭhavaṃ*) with medicines (*māṇussehiṃ*)". The verse contains at least one other word which would deserve further study. This is *māṇussa*, for which in this context I tentatively suggest a meaning "medicine", on the basis of *māṇuṣī* (beside *āsurī* or *daivī*) *cikitsā*.

H. Tiekens

Bollée, Willem B.: *The Pādas of the Suttanipāta* with Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajjhāyā, Dasaveyāliya, and Isibhāsiyāim. [Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 7]. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikation, 1980. VI + 116 p. DM 24,—.
 Id.: *Reverse Index of the Dhammapada, Suttanipāta, Thera- and Therīgāthā Pādas* with Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajjhāyā, Dasaveyāliya, and Isibhāsiyāim. [SII, Monographie 8]. Ibid., 1983. IV + 262 p. DM 43,—.

Im Vergleich mit den übrigen mittelindischen Sprachen oder den anderen Sprachen des Buddhismus ist der Wortschatz wenigstens des Pāli-Kanons durch Wörterbücher und Indices wie etwa die Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance einigermaßen erschlossen. Dagegen sind Versverzeichnisse noch immer selten, obwohl ihr Wert für Studien über Sprachgeschichte/Textstruktur längst erkannt ist. Bereits R. O. Franke (1862–1928) legte umfangreiche, nur in Auszügen veröffentlichte Sammlungen für Verskonkordanzen an zur Vorbereitung für seine nie fertiggestellte Grammatik des Pāli im Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Allein ein Versindex zu Th und Thī von W. STEDE erschien im JPTS 1927 und zum Dhp von S. CHAUDHURI (A Concordance to the Dhammapada. JOIB 4 [1954/5] 248–260), der in der Bibliographie zum „Reverse Index“ nachzutragen ist.

Besonderes Merkmal der beiden vorliegenden Indices ist der Verweis auf Parallelen aus Jaina-Texten, die für die Beurteilung von metrischen Fragen ebenso bedeutsam sind wie für die religions- und geistesgeschichtliche Einordnung der in den Versen ausgedrückten Gedanken. So lassen sich etwa durch den Vergleich mit der Jaina-Tradition kunstsprachliche Tendenzen im Pāli erkennen: z. B.: *brūhi*, Sn 508c: amg. *būhi*, Pādas of the Sn, S. 2 oder *kasitvāna*, Sn