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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 Asoka-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 prof. 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, inscriptive 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 Pktts. 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 diára “brother-in-law” beside de(ov)ara, for which, see CDIAL 6546 and lately my own publication on the subject of Hála’s Sattasaí (Leiden, 1983), pp. 249f., in which reference is made to possibly another instance of the same phenomenon in višā “pain” beside većā (from Skt vedā). Not included either is the development in MI of -jj- (skt. -jy-, -dy-) into -cc- seen in certain verb stems. R. L. Turner (śaṅi in Middle and New Indoarvan. IL 25 [1964] 56f. = Collected Papers, pp. 399–401) explains this unvoicing in, for instance, raccāi (rajye) analogically after the pair siccāi (sicyate): sitta (sikta), starting from the past participle rattā. 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. sacceva- “to aim, to decorate” and sacce- “to go”, both common verbs in a text like Hála’s Sattasaí, and possibly also in P.; see PTSD s.v. saccāpi 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 Qriyā 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 Kūmarāрапālapatibodha (12th century). tūha is, however, found already in Hála’s Sattasaí (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 -āi- (-āi-) has been retained. Of these M. kaivala “deceit” (Sattasaí, ed. A. Weber, Gāthās 85, 124, 156 and 368; \(\forall\forall\forall\forall\)) deserves special mention as it has survived in Marāṭhī kaivā. Bloch (as quoted in CDIAL 3477) explains -āi- in kaivā as a sanskritization, which, however, is an unlikely explanation for kaivala in the Sattasaí.

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), uṣa (punā), u (tu) and ira (kira). In the Sattasaí yet a few other instances have been isolated: e “you” and “they” (beside de and te), i (beside vi and pi) and a (beside dā and lā); see Tiekén, Hála’s Sattasaí, pp. 209f.

To the instances of the spontaneous cerebralization, discussed in § 196 may be added P. kathati “boils”, for which see von Hinüber, IIJ 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. dadha (dā) “burnt, cursed” is expressive of fear or horror (see also TIeken, Hāla’s Sattasaṅ, 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. *pamhuṭṭha “forgotten” from pra-mṛṣ. Compare also M. *pamhusa- “to forget” and “to wipe out”, from pra-mṛṣ and pra-mṛṣ respectively. The spelling -nah- (for -mam-, see § 242) may represent a strengthened pronunciation counteracting a fricative 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 tebhō, Sāyāda 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 Sattasaṅ, p. 168. In the Sattasaṅ 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.

āśāṃnāśike mentioned in § 399 is not found in Dhauli or Jangada but in Delhi-Tīrā, 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 saṅha in the Ka., Ma. and Sh. versions of the thirteenth rock-edict (Q), while the relevant part is unfortunately lost in the Girnār version. (saudyātana in the Devānīrā[ which also has chat “] and Ratnāgiri-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. saudyātana, supposedly retained in the text as a technical term (CPD II, p. 130, beside chat”, 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 -ās, which is not found in the Aśoka-inscriptions (see § 312 and 315).

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

The omission of the cerebralization in P. agamātha or Amg. viharāththa (§ 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 absolutive ending in -(t)am discussed in § 498 for P. -(t)-, in M. Pkt, see Sattasaṅ (ed. A. WEBER), Gāthās 297, 298, 307 (all bhānīṇa), 360 and 364 (mottam), and 595 (valīmaṇ).

As I have shown elsewhere (WZKS 30 [1986] 5–25) our understanding of the early canonical Jain 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 puthavam. The word is found only once, in Āyāraṅgasutta (JĀS), Sūtra 236: anāhāra tvaṭṭējī katho tattta hiyāsae / nātivālām uvacare mānuṣāṃ vi (pi?) puthavam //, found in a passage describing the way a monk fasts himself
to death. In the Tīkā commentary putṭhavām is glossed with sṛṣṭo. According to Pischel (§ 569) and Schubring (AKM 12, 4, 1910, p. 108a) putṭhavām represents sṛṣṭavān, which, contrary to normal usage, would have a passive meaning here. As such it is mentioned by von Hüüber in § 494. This interpretation of putṭhavām 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 Sutta. This putṭho has been glossed with sṛṣṭa as well. Skt. sṛṣṭa (sṛṣ-) however, regularly becomes phusā (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 Sattasai are concerned, pusa- is merely a Ms. variant of phusa-. phusa- in the Sattasai has the specialised meaning “to wipe”. The instances of pusa- in the Ms. of this text could well be explained as “emendations” of original phusa- under the influence of the standard gloss prōnch-. putṭho in the Sutta under consideration should, however, rather be the locative of Pkt. putṭi “back” (see von Hüüber § 327 and for Pkt. putṭi beside Skt. pṛṣṭha, Tieken, Hāla’s Sattasai, p. 203). uvacara- (Skt. upacary-) would have here the specialised meaning “to tend medically”, while putṭhavām would stand for pṛṣṭhakam “back”, showing a rare instance of the glide -v- (§ 171). A possible translation of the Sutta is: “He should lie down without food, he should remain there on his back. He should not excessively (nātivelaṁ) treat his back (putṭhavām) with medicines (mānussehīm)”. The verse contains at least one other word which would deserve further study. This is mānussa, for which in this context I tentatively suggest a meaning “medicine”, on the basis of mānyuṣi (beside asuri or dāviri) cikilisā.
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