Preface

Students of Sanskrit can choose among several good manuals, for example those by Deshpande (2007), Egenes (2011, 2012), Goldman and Goldman (2011), Harding Maurer (2009), Otter (2017), Ruppel (2017), or Stiehl (2011). Whichever they may choose, learning Sanskrit is a daunting task. Indeed, the author of one of those text books, Robert Goldman[1], mentions "the intricacies and frustrations of *sandhi* and the other terrors of Sanskrit" inflicted on successive student generations. This book has been written in order to reduce these terrors of Sanskrit.

This book is *not* an alternative textbook for learning Sanskrit. Instead, it is to accompany these textbooks and written in the hope to make Sanskrit learning easier by explaining words and grammatical forms from an Indo-European point of view. Consider, for example Old Indian *ad* which means "to eat", but is also historically related to both English (abbreviated by E) *eat* and New High German (NHG) *essen*. There was an Indo-European root $^*ed$ that branched out into all these words over some millennia. Even E *tooth* and NHG *Zahn* stem from $^*ed$ (or, taking the laryngeal perspective, $^*h_1ed$). Cross connections of this and other sorts might be as interesting for the Sanskrit newbie as for the more advanced student of Sanskrit.

I may well fail in my endeavour to bring Sanskrit and Indo-European studies closer to each other once again. After all, Jakob Wackernagel (1896, p. LXXIV), who wrote "Altindische Grammatik" more than hundred years ago, had a similar aim in mind:

> "[...] the author would be pleased if he succeeded [....] in re-establishing the ties – loosened in recent decades – between linguistics and Sanskrit philology"[2]

While Wackernagel did put together the (in his time) state-of-the-art Indo-European outlook on Old Indic, he did not manage to influence language teaching, at least when judged from modern textbooks of Sanskrit. A case in point is Deshpande (2007, back cover), who hopes to simplify "the process of learning Sanskrit, by dissociating this language-learning process from the heavy burdens imposed, both by the tradition of Indo-European linguistics and the tradition of indigenous Sanskrit grammarians in India." In my mind, the Indo-European perspective should be seen as helpful, rather than an extra burden. In this vein, this manual has a clear didactic purpose. It has been written to help the author and his fellow students to make the best didactic use of the Indo-European perspective on Sanskrit.

[1] Goldman and Goldman (2011, p. xix)

[2] "[...] der Verfasser würde sich freuen, wenn es ihm gelänge [...] die in den letzten Jahrzehnten gelockerten Bande zwischen Sprachwissenschaft und Sanskritphilologie wieder fester zu knüpfen"

However, readers interested in the current state-of-the-art Indo-Aryan or Indo-European phonology and morphology will not find this book best suited. They had better turn to new Wackernagels (of sorts) that have been written by Goto (2013), Kobayashi (2004), and Kümmel (2014). While my book may be considered a new Burrow (3rd edition, 1973), its purpose is mainly and predominantly a didactic one.

The knowledge of other Indo-European languages is not necessary. In particular, knowledge of Latin and Old Greek is not vital. Instead, Latin or Old Greek words found in Modern English are often cited. The focus is on Sanskrit, but briefly Middle Indic languages are also addressed. While Vedic grammar is ignored, Vedic vocabulary is occasionally mentioned. Accents (important in Vedic) are regularly ignored. German words, and more rarely and unsystematically, French, Italian, or Irish words are adduced. The reasons for including words are often rather subjective.

Thanks and apologies for not citing appropriately are due to the above-mentioned authors and also to many other authors[3] of textbooks/grammars/dictionaries/articles. Brugmann (2009, p. V)'s excuse holds true here also: "The procedure of stating in every single instance the authors dealing with them, and the first originator of the opinion I presented, seemed to me on the one hand not to be required by the purpose of the book, but on the other hand excluded due to lack of space."[4] This general practice is sometimes disregarded. I would be grateful if I am not asked for the general rule underlying these exceptions.

Heartfelt thanks are due, of course, to Sadananda Das, my Leipzig Sanskrit teacher and friend whose perfect command of Sanskrit is well beyond reach even after studying 10 Sanskrit textbooks and 5 manuals on Sanskrit as an Indo-European Language. Katharina Lotzen undertook the laborious work of producing the index. Maria Näther and Alexander Singer proved very efficient with LaTex and Lyx. Tyler Neill offered constructive criticism. Jan Warzok carefully read a later version.

Ideally, and borrowing from Kobayashi (2004, p. 1), the current author enjoys, and hopes that other (more or less advanced) learners of Sanskrit may also enjoy, "a conspiracy-like tendency behind apparently unrelated phenomena".

Leipzig, April 2023 Harald Wiese

[3] In many different ways, Beekes (1995, 2010), Brugmann (2009), Burrow (2001), Clackson (2007), Dudenredaktion (2006), Dunkel (2014a,b), Fortson IV (2004), Hock (1991), Kluge (2002), Kroonen (2013), Kulikov (2017), Lazzeroni (1998), Lubotsky (1995, 2018), Macdonell (2010), Rix (2001), Schmitt-Brandt (1998), Sihler (1995, 2000), Szemerenyi (1989), de Vaan (2008), Watkins (1998), Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft (1997), Wiese (2010), Ziegler (2012), and, of course, Mayrhofer (1978, 1992, 1996) have been useful. With respect to Middle Indic, I have benefitted from Hinüber (1986), Masica (1991), Oberlies (2003), and Woolner (1996). Alas, I could not benefit from Lubotsky's eagerly awaited Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Indo-Iranian.

[4] "Bei jeder Einzelheit anzugeben, wer über dieselbe gehandelt habe und wer der erste Urheber der von mir vorgetragenen Auffassung sei, schien mir einerseits durch den Zweck des Buches nicht geboten, andererseits aber wiederum durch die Raumverhältnisse ausgeschlossen."