

KOMMISSION FÜR SPRACHEN UND KULTUREN SÜDASIENS
DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN

—
INSTITUT FÜR INDOLOGIE DER UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

WIENER ZEITSCHRIFT

FÜR DIE

KUNDE SÜDASIENS

UND

ARCHIV FÜR INDISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

Herausgegeben von

GERHARD OBERHAMMER

Band XXXVI
1992



VERLAG
DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
WIEN 1992

PRAKRITIC WORDFORMS IN THE R̥GVEDASAMHITĀ*

The Case of ɾ → $\begin{cases} a \\ i \\ u \end{cases}$

By Chlodwig H. Werba, Vienna

“assimilatio, hiatus et cerebralium atque aspiratarum praedilectio (iam) in Vedis magnas partes agunt”, thus referring to the “main laws of the Prakrit languages” ALBRECHT WEBER¹ was the first to assume that *vaidika śabdās* may be influenced by m(iddle)-i(ndo)a(ryan) phonetics. One year later, in the Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen of 1846 (p. 754), THEODOR BENFEY adopted a similar view for their morphophonemics. The philological and etymological research on the Vedic vocabulary carried on since then amply documented the validity of their opinion by bringing forth a wealth of Prakritic material from almost every Vedic text. Especially the oldest of them, the R̥gvedasamhitā (RV), proved to be a veritable storehouse of *padās* which may or must be explained *in toto* or *partim* on the basis of *mia.* sound changes, e.g. the *cvi*-information *ak(h)khalīkrītyā* (VII 103,3c) ‘making, i.e. pronouncing (words) in syllables’ which – as was detected by PAUL THIEME² – is based on *akkhala-*, the regular Māgadhī outcome of *akṣāra-*³, the Lsg. *kāté* (I 106,6b) ‘in the pit’ being developed from *karté* by the *mia.* rules

* This is a slightly revised version of a paper delivered to the honourable participants of the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference in Vienna on Friday, the 31st of August 1990, to vindicate the following rectification of the 46th stanza of Viśākhadatta’s *Mudrārākṣasa* (II 18, ed. A. HILLEBRANDT, p. 59,6–9; cf. Bhartṛhari’s *Śatakatrāya* 277): *ārabhyate na khalu vighnadhiyaiva dhīraiḥ, prārabhya vighnavihatā vīramanti madhyāḥ | vighnaiḥ punaḥ-punar api pratihanyamānāḥ, prārabdham uddhṛtadhiyo ’ham ivodvahanti ||*.

¹ In part II of his dissertation, *Yajurvedae specimen cum commentario*, published in Bratislava 1845 (*non vidi*), quoted by WEBER himself in his *Indische Studien II* (Berlin 1853) 87n.

² KZ 71 (1954) 198 = *Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. BUDDRUSS. [Glasenapp-Stiftung, Vol. 5]. Wiesbaden 1971, part 1, p. 138.

³ THIEME’s etymology was accepted by K. HOFFMANN (AZI I/176n.1), M. WITZEL (StII 10 [1984] 236f.), et al., whereas J. SCHINDLER (LuE 387n.7) remains sceptical (cf. EWAia I/44).

of assimilation and metathesis of quantities⁴, or *bhūt* as contraction of *bhuvat* in IV 43,4a⁵ and *śriyē* to be pronounced with Svarabhakti as */śriyē/* in X 45,8b, as the metre shows⁶.

Although at least five state-of-the-art reports have been published in the foregoing decades⁷ and G. V. DEVASTHALI made a promising collation of some Rgvedic data with the 8th *adhyāya* of the Siddhahemacandra in 1970⁸, what is still missing is a comprehensive survey of

⁴ Already realized by A. WEBER, *Indische Studien*, loc. cit. (cf. EWAia I/335f.).

⁵ *kā vāṃ bhūd ūpamātiḥ kāyā na(s)*, where *bhūt* – in accordance with the parallel *gamathas* ‘will you (two) come’ in *pāda* b – clearly functions as a subjunctive (: ‘will be’), although it is formally identical with the 3sg.Aor.Inj. of *√bhū*. That this is not a case of functional equivalence between injunctive and subjunctive, as K. HOFFMANN (IiV 221 and 245: “Vertauschbarkeit von Injunktiv und Konjunktiv”) does figure it out, but the result of a Prakritic contraction of the 3sg.Aor.Subj. *bhuvat*, which took place in the oral tradition prior to the establishment of the Śākalya recension, goes without saying, if one considers, that the metre (: *triṣṭubh* with early caesura) calls for two syllables instead of the monosyllabic *bhūt* (: – ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ – ◡ – ◡ –).

⁶ *durmarṣam āyuh śriyē rucānāḥ |*, the anapaestic central portion of which corresponds to the cretic *urviyā* in *pāda* a and equally anapaestic *abhavat* and *janāyat* in c and d. The originality of the three syllables forming the 2nd part of the Vedic *triṣṭubh*-line in their anapaestic sequence (: ◡ ◡ –) was recently proven by J. GIPPERT, who demonstrated the existence of the same prosodic feature in the hendecasyllabic lines of Zaraḍuṣtra’s *Gāḍās* (*Zur Metrik der Gathas*. Sprache 32 [1986(88)] 257–275, esp. p. 261ff. and 273ff.).

⁷ I.e. J. WACKERNAGEL, *Altindische Grammatik I*. Göttingen 1896, *Introd.*, p. XVIIIff.; W. WÜST, *Indisch*. Berlin–Leipzig 1929, p. 42ff.; J. MANSION, *Esquisse d’une histoire de la langue Sanscrite*. Paris 1931, p. 129ff.; L. RENOUE, *Altindische Grammatik*. Introduction générale. Göttingen 1957, p. 54ff. and M. B. EMENEAU, *The Dialects of Old Indo-Aryan*. In: *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, edd. H. BIRNBAUM – J. PÜHVEL. Berkeley – Los Angeles 1966, p. (123–138) 129ff. (= *Sanskrit Studies of M.B. Emeneau*. Selected Papers, ed. B. A. VAN NOOTEN. Berkeley 1988, p. 111f.). See also the remarks of O. VON HINÜBER in his *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. [SbÖAW 467 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasians 20]. Wien 1986, p. 22f.

⁸ *Prakritism in the Rgveda*. [Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, No. 34]. Poona 1970 (p. 199–205). In contrast to DEVASTHALI, who defines his topic as those “variations in the language” of the RV which “closely correspond to some phenomena, which are found in the Prakrits”, and/or “can easily be described as the likely source . . . of their counterparts in the Prakrits” (p. 199), this article deals exclusively with Rgvedic words and names for the etymology of which the application of at least one *mia.* sound-change is required. With a much wider scope DEVASTHALI’s approach was taken up recently by T. Y. ELIZARENKOVA, *About Traces of a Prakrit Dialectal Basis in the Language of the Rgveda*. In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, éd.

the *mia.* ‘Lautgesetze’, which left their traces in the RV. Such a survey would have to include not only a complete list of all positive instances of a given law defining its scope and possible restrictions, but also the ratio of their distribution over the ten *maṇḍalas* and an inventory of doubtful cases. Its importance for Vedic etymology in general and for the history of the RV in particular is illustrated in the following by means of one of the earliest laws of Common *Mia.*: the change of *r-sonans* into a short vowel⁹ first taken into consideration by ALBRECHT WEBER¹⁰.

(I) r → a

(A) Old Etymologies:

1. *ogaṇá-* ‘powerful’ (X 89,15b *māhi vrādhanta ogaṇása indra*) ← **ogrṇá-* (H. KERN – K. HOFFMANN; cf. EWAia I/276f.): ved. (SV, YV) *úgaṇa(s)-* (: *ugrá-*), pii. **Háṇj-as-/Háṇg-(a)r-* (> *yav. aogara*); cf. *ambhr-ṇá-* (: *ámbras-*) and *a-lātr-ṇá-* (: **rāt[a]r-/rātrī-*).

C. CAILLAT. [Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Fasc. 55]. Paris 1989, p. 1–16.

⁹ The elimination of the *oia.* phoneme /r/ is governed by the following rules: (1) the context-free *r → a*, its scope being restricted by 4 context-sensitive ones,

(2) $r \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} i \\ u \end{bmatrix} / _ \S \begin{bmatrix} i \\ u \end{bmatrix}$, (3) $r \rightarrow i / _ \begin{bmatrix} + \text{cons} \\ + \text{pal} \end{bmatrix}$, (4) $r \rightarrow i / \# \# \begin{bmatrix} + \text{sib} \\ + \text{pal} \end{bmatrix}$ —

and (5) $r \rightarrow u / \begin{bmatrix} + \text{cons} \\ + \text{lab} \end{bmatrix} _$. As it often happens in the *mia.* material that analogy brings confusion into the three outputs of these five rules, their investigation and description was by no means an easy task. The merit to have carried it out belongs to HERMANN BERGER who published his epoch-making findings as first part of his *Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre*. [Münchener Indologische Studien 1]. München 1955, p. 19ff. (cf. VON HINÜBER, op. cit. [n. 7], p. 78ff.).

¹⁰ Loc. cit. (n. 1). Of the 28 items being given in the following list six (nos. 4, 5, 16, 18, 22 and 23) have met with the – more or less reluctant – approval of F. B. J. KUIPER in his booklet *Aryans in the Rigveda* ([Leiden Studies in Indo-European 1]. Amsterdam–Atlanta 1991, p. 28, 79, 80), which was written to disprove “the 19th century theory” of “Prakritisms in the RV” (p. 2), substituting them – as far as possible – by ‘Dravidisms’ and ‘Mundaisms’. The remaining 21 (: 14 is left unmentioned) are treated as non-indo-aryan, with the exception of 9 (s. p. 29f.) featuring in KUIPER’s concluding list of “The Foreign Elements in the Rigvedic Vocabulary” (p. 89–93, nos. 1–383): 1 = 61, 2 = 70/252, 3 = 157, 6 = 332, 7 = 85, 8 = 251, 10 = 103, 11 = 137, 12 = 156, 13 = 172–174, 15 = 365, 17 = 98, 19 = 41, 20 = 213, 21 = 230, 24 = 212, 25 = 47, 26 = 239, 27 = 279/(278), 28 = 244.

2. *kāṇva-* PN (I²⁵, V¹, VIII³¹, X⁴; *kāṇvā-* VIII⁷; *kāṇvāyanās* VIII 55,4a; *prāskanva-* I², VIII³) ← **kṛṇvā-* 'acting (magically)' (K. HOFFMANN; cf. EWAia I/293): oir. **kərnu-a°* (→ op. *karnuvaka-*); cf. *hinu-á-* (: *hinó-*).
3. *gaṇá-* m. 'flock' (I¹², II³, III⁶, IV², V¹², VI⁴, VII³, VIII⁵, IX³, X⁸; *gāṇyā* III 7,5d) ← **grṇá-* < pia. **Hgrná-* (A. FICK; cf. EWAia I/458f.), derived from the pie. root *h₂ger* 'to flock, to gather' (: gr. ἀγέρ°) the initial laryngeal of which may have caused the lengthening of the *u* in the compound (PN) *ráhūgaṇās* (I 78,5a) ← **raghūgrṇa-*; cf. *ghṛṇá-* (from the pia. root **g^har*).
4. *durhāṇā-* 'bad(ly) anger(ed)' (adj. I 38,6b *nīrtir durhāṇā vadhīt* – subst. I 121,14a *vāṃ no asyā ind_ara durhāṇāyāḥ*; *durhāṇāvān* VIII²; *durhāṇāyuvam* IV 30,8c; *durhāṇāyatás* X 134,2a) ← *durhṛṇ°* (J. NARTEN, MSS 41 [1982] 140) in *durhṛṇāyū-* (I¹, VII¹) and *durhṛṇāyatás* (SV).
5. *vikaṭa-* 'deformed, monstrous' (X 155,1a *árāyi kāṇe vikaṭe*) ← *vikṛta-* (Sāyaṇa – CH. BARTHOLOMAE; cf. KEWA III/201) used from the RV (I¹, II¹) onwards.
6. *śakaṭi-* 'wagon' (X 146,3d *śakaṭir iva sarjati*), fem. of (omg.) *śakaṭa-* (ChU +) ← **sákrta-* (K. L. JANERT; s. W. F. KNOBL, JNIBS 6 [1981] 24ff., 34–42): ved. (TS +) *káṭa-* (EWAia I/290).

(B) New Etymologies:

7. *kavāṣa-* PN (VII 18, 12a *ádha śrutām kavāṣam vṛddhām apśú*) ← **kavāvaṣa-* (cf. I 163,10b *śūraṇāsas* ← **śūraṇāṇ°* [J. WACKERNAGEL, KZ 67 (1942) 174 = Kleine Schriften. Göttingen 21969, I/390]) ← **kavā-ṛṣa(n)-* 'belittling the male ones': cf. ved. (RV) *kavāri-* / *kavāsakhá-* (AzI II/412f.), yav. (PN) *kauuārasman-* (EWAia I/326), and, for the accent, ved. (PN) *trasādasyu-*.
8. *prámaganda-* PN (III 53,14c *ā no bhara prámagandasya védas*) ← **prámrgāda-* (for *ā* → *an/*___D cf. PN *puruśánti-* [I¹, IX¹] ← **puruśāti-*), i.e. *prá* (cf. Nir. VI 32) + **mrgādá-* 'deer-eater': cf. ved. (RV +) *āmād-*, (AV +) *annādá-* (s. G. DUNKEL, Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald, Tübingen 1987, p. 91ff.).

(C) Further Evidence:

9. *kákāṭa-* n. 'back of the head, neck (?)' (VI 28,4a *ná tā árva reṇúkakāto aśnute*) ← *kīkāṭa-* (M. MAYRHOFER, EWAia I/388) occurring in AV IX 12,1: cf. ved. (AV X 2,8b) *kakāṭikā-* (with the variant *kṛk°*) > pkt. *kīyāḍiyā-*.
10. *kíkāṭa-* EN (III 53,14a *kīṃ te kṛṇvanti kíkāṭeṣu gāvas*)* ← **kínkṛta-* (Yāska – Sāyaṇa) *kīṃ kṛiyābhīr iti* (Nir. VI 32), a (popular) etymology

which already the author of the *ṛc* might have had in mind; but cf. EWAia I/355.

11. *kévata-* 'pit' (VI 54,7b *mākm̄ sámśāri kévate*) ← **kévṛta-* (F. K. JOHANSSON; cf. EWAia I/400) continuing a pie. **káivṛt-* which may be connected with gr. *καλατα* (NApl.) < pie. **káivṛt°* as its heteroclitic variant; but the R̥gvedic hapax could, by means of spontaneous cerebralization (cf. e.g. X 146,2a *āghātibhis* ← **āghāti°*), also have arisen from oia. **káivata-*, either to be identified with gr. *καετῶ-* or formed as *párvata-* (s. AzI I/336f.).

12. *gāṅgā-* RN (X 75,5a *imām me gaṅge yamune sarasvati*; *gāṅg, yās* VI 45,31c) ← **gr̥ṅgā-* (W. WÜST; cf. KEWA III/692); but without a satisfying explanation of its formation (cf. *gārgara-*) this etymon seems much inferior to the old *gāṅgā gamanāt* (Nir. IX 26; cf. EWAia I/457).

13. *jāthāra-* n. 'belly' (I³, II², III⁷, V², VI², VIII¹, IX⁸, X⁵; *jātharasya* I 112,17a; *jāthālasya* I 182,6c) ← **jṛthāra-* (Ch. BARTHOLOMAE; s. E. POLOMÉ, Sanskrit and World Culture. Berlin 1986, p. 287) < pii. **jṛtH°* which may stem from a pie. **g^l-t(á)h₂-* and thereby be connected with germ. (goth.) *kilp°* 'child' (*kilpei* 'womb') < pie. **g^l-t°* (cf. III 29,14d *yád ásurasya jāthārād ājāyata*); but cf. EWAia I/565.

14. *vratāti-* f. 'creeper' (VIII 40,6b *vratāter iva guṣpítām*) being a hybrid substitute for **vatāti-* (cf. I 122,10b *gūrtáśravās* for **gūrtásavās*, i.e. oia. **gūrtásavHās*, forming the cadence of a *triṣṭubh*-line) ← **vṛtāti-* (P. TEDESCO; KEWA III/277f.); but as long as a reason for the increment of the *r* is lacking, the assumption of a metathesis *ar* (: **vartāti-*) → *ra* remains unrefutable.

15. *sānkā-* 'fight (?)' (VI 75,5c *iṣudhīḥ sānkāḥ pṛtanās ca sárvas*) ← **sṛnkā-* (W. WÜST; cf. KEWA III/416); but not to mention the problem of wordformation, the semantic analysis given by WÜST of ved. (KaU) *sṛnkā-* – which he assumes to be the same word – does not bear closer examination (s. H. W. BODEWITZ, WZKS 29 [1985] 13ff.).

(II) ṛ → i

(A) Old Etymologies:

16. *kitavá-* 'gambler' (II¹, V¹, X 34⁴) ← **kṛtavá-* (Yāska – J. WACKERNAGEL; cf. EWAia I/350f.), a possessive derivative in °*vá-* (for Yāska's gloss *kṛtavān* [Nir. V 22] cf. p. *kitavā* [J VI/228, 19]) from *kṛtá-*, the best/winning 'course' in the game of dice.

17. *kimādin-* a certain fiend (VII 104², X¹) ← **kṛmādin-* (J. CHARPENTIER – J. SCHINDLER; cf. EWAia I/351f.), an °*in*-derivative of **kṛmi-Hd-á-* 'worm-eat-er': cf. *śva-ghn=in-*.

18. *śīthirā-* 'loose, slack' (V¹, VI¹, VII²) ← **śrithirā-* (TH. ZACHARIAE; cf. KEWA III/336), derived from the root *śrath^h*: ved. (YV +) *śīthilā-*.

(B) A New Etymology:

19. *itātas* 'of right, rightly' (X 171, 1a *t_vvām tyām itāto rātham*) ← **rtātas*: cf. ved. (RV +) *rtāt*, *rténa*. In the brahmanical tradition this form was re-interpreted as G(Ab)sg. of a PN *itant-* (s. EWAia I/187).

(C) Further Evidence:

20. *niṇ_(i)yá-* 'secret' (I³, IV², VII³, IX¹, X¹) replacing *mia. *niñña-* < oia. **nṛnyá-* (A. MELLETT, Anekāśiṣyasuhrtpañditaviracitanibandhaḥ Karnapūjagranthaḥ. Opstellen geschreven ter Eere van Dr. H. Kern. Leiden 1903, p. 121f. – W. WÜST, ABORI 58–59 [1978] 418ff.): cf. ved. (RV IV 5,8b) *niṇīk*, a hapax which is explained either as being derived therefrom (W. WÜST, *ibid.* 420) or as the result of a contamination of *ninyām* and **n_vyāk* (L. RENOUE, Études védiques et pāṇinéennes XIII [Paris 1964] 97); but neither a suffix **nya-* (s. KEWA II/161) nor a *n*-formation of **n(a)r* is found anywhere else.

21. *pīthīnas-* PN (VI 26,6c *t_vvām rajīm pīthīnase daśasyān*) ← **pīthīnas-* (M. MAYRHOFER, KEWA II/275): cf. the Rgvedic PNs *pīthā-* and *tjūnas-* ('having a straight nose').

(III) *ṛ* → *u*

(A) Old Etymologies:

22. *kuru* 'do' (X²; *kurmās* X 51,7a) ← *kṛṇu* (J. WACKERNAGEL; cf. AZI II/584) occurring 8 times in the RV.

23. *mūhur* 'at once' (I², V¹, VI¹, VII¹, VIII², X⁴; *muhūrtā-* III²) ← **mūhur* (J. BLOCH; cf. KEWA II/661): cf. *muhukā-* (IV³, including 20,9b where, instead of *mūhu kā*, + *muhukā* is to be read) derived from *pii. *mrj^hú-* (> *yav. mərəzu-*), in analogy to which a *pie. NAsg. *mrég^h-ur* could easily have been transformed into *pii. *mīj^hur*.

(B) A New Etymology:

24. *nicumpuṇá-* (VIII 93,22c *apām jāgmir nicumpuṇás*) replacing *mia. *nicimpuṇa-* < oia. **nityamprṇá-* 'constantly filling': cf. ved. (RV V 44,12a) *sadāprṇá-*.

(C) Further Evidence:

25. *udumbalá-* epithet of Yama's dogs (X 14,12a *urūṇasāv asutīpā udumbalāu*) either to be derived from the tree name *udumbāra-* ←

**rdūb°* (Ch. H. WERBA in EWAia I/217), meaning 'reddish' (s. M. WITZEL, IJ 25 [1983] 239f.) or ← **rdur-b°* 'with hurting force' (?): cf. ved. (RV) *rdūdāra-* and *yav. arəduš-* resp.

26. *pūnya-* 'good, auspicious' (II¹, VII¹) ← **pūnya-* (J. WACKERNAGEL; cf. KEWA II/303): cf. 24; but its derivation is still open to question.

27. *busá-* 'mist, (drizzling) rain (?)' (X 27,24c *āvīḥ s_vvāḥ kṛṇutē gūhate busám*) ← **brśá-* (Ch. BARTHOLOMAE, ZDMG 50 [1896] 712) / ← **brśá-* ← *vṛśá-* (P. TEDESCO; cf. KEWA II/440); but on the one hand there does not exist any parallel to a change *v(r) → b(u)* / # __ (TEDESCO's explanation of *bundá-* [VIII³] as continuing an oia. **vrddhá-* [Lg 22 (1946) 190] is utterly arbitrary), on the other **brśá-* lacks an (indo-) aryan etymology (cf. KEWA II/440f.).

28. *śácipūjana* Vsg. (VIII 17,12a *śácigo ś.*) of (omg.) **śácipūjana-* (the first syllable of which was lengthened due to the stress of the vocative accent; s. P. THIEME, MSS 44 [1985] 248ff.) ← **śáciprñcana-* (P. THIEME; cf. KEWA II/320f.) 'having hospitality with him': cf. ved. (RV +) *sáci(°)*. The cited Pāda may therefore be translated as follows: 'O You, whom cows, whom hospitality accompanies'.

Appendix: Evidence to be discarded

1. *āñjas(ā)* / *añjasīna-* 'quick(ly), direct(ly)' ← **iñjas(°)* (K. F. GELDER; s. EWAia I/54f.) vs. oia. **iñja-* > *mia. (p.) iñja-* (cf. 19) and ved. *āñjas-*.

2. *ánva-/ánvī-* 'fine, tiny (hole/finger)' ← **iñv°* (E. KUHN; s. EWAia I/55f.) vs. oia. **iñv°* > *mia. *iñv°* (cf. p. *iñ-*, 19) and oia. **(H)ánu-*.

3. *kátuka-* 'pungent' ← **kítu°* (J. SCHMIDT; s. EWAia I/290) vs. oia. **kítu°* > *mia. *kuṭu°* (cf. p. *mudu-*, 22–23) and oia. **kátu°* (cf. gr. κεντέω).

4. *kúta-* '?' ← **kṛta-* (Yaska – A. WEBER; cf. EWAia I/361) vs. oia. *kṛtá-* > *mia. (aś. +) kaṭa-* (cf. 5–6) and oia. **kúta-* (cf. *yav. kutaka-*).

5. *kūṇāru-* '?' ← **kīṇā°* (J. WACKERNAGEL, Altindische Grammatik I. Göttingen 1896, p. 21) vs. oia. **kīṇā°* > *mia. *kaṇā°* (cf. 3–4).

6. *jálhu-* 'dull (?)' ← **jádhu-* (J. WACKERNAGEL; cf. V. CVETKO, Acta Neophilologica 14 [1981] 109) vs. oia. **jádhu-* > *mia. *judhu-* (cf. p. *mudu-*, 22–23) and oia. **jádhu-* 'needy', which may be explained as being derived from the *pii. root *j^(h)adh^h* 'beg' (> oir. *jad*).

7. *talít-* 'adjacent' ← **trdít-* (Ch. BARTHOLOMAE; cf. EWAia I/615f.) vs. oia. **trdít-* > *mia. *tidít-* (cf. p. *kittima-*, 17–18.21).

8. *paní-* ← **prní-* (A. HILLEBRANDT – J. WACKERNAGEL; cf. KEWA II/195) vs. oia. **prní-* > *mia. *pīni-* (cf. p. *pitthi-*, 21) and oia. **paní-* 'toiling, base (?)' (cf. gr. πένομαι, etc.).

9. **pānīphaṇat*- 'springing' ← **phṛṇat*- (A. MEILLET; cf. KEWA II/390) vs. oia. **phṛṇa*° > mia. **phṛṇa*° (cf. p. *phusa*-).
10. *pīṅgā*- a musical instrument ← **pīṅgā*- (W. WÜST; cf. KEWA III/757) vs. oia. **pīṅgā*- > mia. **puṅgā*- (cf. p. *puṭṭha*-, 26.28).
11. *vanīj*- 'merchant' ← **vṛṇīj*- (J. WACKERNAGEL, op. cit. [s.v. 5], p. 192) vs. oia. **vṛṇīj*- > mia. **vinīj*- (cf. p. *vicchika*-, 17-18.21) and oia. **vanīj*- (KEWA III/130f.).
12. *sāktu*- 'groats' ← **sṛktu*- (W. WÜST; cf. KEWA III/411) vs. oia. **sṛktu*- > mia. **suttu*-.

Abbreviations

AzI	KARL HOFFMANN, Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Vols. 1-2, ed. J. NARTEN. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1975-1976; Vol. 3, edd. S. GLAUCH - R. PLATH - S. ZIEGLER. Ibid. 1992.
EWAia	MANFRED MAYRHOFER, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Vol. I-. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1986ff.
IiV	KARL HOFFMANN, Der Injunktiv im Veda. Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1967.
KEWA	MANFRED MAYRHOFER, Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen / A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary. Vol. I-IV. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1956(51)-1980.
LuE	Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Wien, 24.-29. September 1978, edd. M. MAYRHOFER - M. PETERS - O. E. PFEIFFER. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1980.

EINE DISSIMILATIONSREGEL IN DEN AŚOKA-INSCHRIFTEN

(Ein kleiner Beitrag zur Sprachgeographie Indiens)

Von Thomas Oberlies, Würzburg

Seit langer Zeit werden die im Pali erscheinenden Adverbien *pure* und *suve* auf Grund des auslautenden °e als „Magadhismen“ betrachtet. Gegen diese gängige Anschauung hat zuerst HERMANN BERGER, Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre, München 1955, p. 15, Einwände erhoben: „Wenn z. B. statt des nach den Pali-Lautgesetzen zu erwartenden **puro* < *purah* in der Überlieferung konsequent *pure* erscheint, so kann man diese Form nicht kurzerhand für einen Überrest aus der Ostsprache erklären, denn es ist nicht einzusehen, warum die Pali-Übersetzer gerade bei diesem einen, so gewöhnlichen Wort die Übertragung in die entsprechende westliche Form versäumt haben sollten, während ihnen bei anderen Adverbien (*tato*, *bahuso* usw.) dasselbe Versehen niemals passiert wäre.“ BERGER sieht, einem Vorschlag Karl Hoffmanns folgend, in diesen Formen Analogiebildungen zu Adverbien wie *agge* (BERGER, loc. cit., p. 15 n. 5: „In Wirklichkeit liegt eine analogische Umbildung vor: der Auslaut von *pure* hat sich nach dem synonymen *agge* gerichtet [K. Hoffmann, Vorlesung].“). HEINZ BECHERT (in: Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung, Göttingen 1980, p. 31) nahm das Problem noch einmal kurz auf, sich BERGER und HOFFMANN anschließend. Zuletzt äußerte sich O. VON HINÜBER, Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick, Wien 1986, p. 89f., der, beide Erklärungen verbindend, wieder zur alten Erklärung zurückkehrte: „... eine östliche Form ... wie P *pure* oder *suve* : skt. *śvaḥ* ... , die sich nach *agge* und anderen Beispielen in das System der Adverbien einfügen ließ, und die daher nicht umgesetzt wurde“ (vgl. auch NORMAN [brieflich] apud BECHERT, op. cit., p. 31 n. 3).

Das Problem liegt m. E. in der von BERGER selbst zitierten Form (Aśoka / Pali) *tato*. In den Aśoka-Inschriften entwickelt sich das auslautende °as von *tatas* nie zu °e: man erwartete zumindest auf den östlichen Aśoka-Inschriften **tate*, das doch in amg. *tae* fortlebt (Uvāsa-gadaśāo § 185-198, Uttarajjhayaṇasutta, Vipākaśruta 1.1.5 [PSM s.v.]). Es ist folglich zunächst einmal das Verhältnis *pure/pule/suve* : *tato* in den Aśoka-Inschriften zu klären.

Anders als BLOCH, der das auslautende °o des „östlichen“ *tato* damit erklären will, daß das Wort „faisait nécessairement groupe avec le mot