

[CHECK RE S-Hacheck needed in some places (Avestan forms, FN 13)]

Sanskrit **prádúr** and Old Indic Dialectology*

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University

The Sanskrit adverb **prádúr** 'forth to view; forth, in sight' is attested first in the Artharva Veda and found subsequently in Classical Sanskrit. Its use is restricted to cooccurrence with the roots $\sqrt{\text{as-}}$ 'be' or $\sqrt{\text{bhu-}}$ 'become' to give a verb phrase meaning 'become manifest; be visible; appear; exist' or $\sqrt{\text{kr-}}$ 'make' to give a verb phrase with the sense 'make manifest; reveal', though it can also occur in compounds with derivatives of these roots (e.g. **prádurbháva-** 'becoming visible; manifestation; appearance'). Despite some discussion in the literature, this word is without a good etymology. Two suggestions have been made that are worthy of serious consideration,¹ that of Monier-Williams (1899: s.v.), accepted also by MacDonnell (1916: §184b), connecting **prádúr** with **dvár-** 'door' and that of Mayrhofer (1959: s.v.) connecting it ultimately with **prátar** 'in the early morning; tomorrow'.

Monier-Williams is somewhat inexplicit regarding the formal details of his proposal, but essentially he sees in **prádúr** a form **dur-** which must be taken to represent an archaic zero-grade case-form, presumably an endingless locative, of **dvár-**, combined with the lexical prefix, **pra-**, in its lengthened form **prá-**. Semantically therefore, in the development he posits for the Sanskrit form, a basic meaning "out of doors" went ultimately to "in sight" presumably via a stage where the form meant something like "out in the open", all of which are steps that seem to be reasonable and plausible semantic developments. Moreover, this etymology receives some support from the occurrence of other Indo-European adverbs, some apparently quite old, formed from the lexical stem 'door', most notably Arcadian Greek $\kappa\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ -da 'outside', which shows traces of root noun inflection, but possibly also Hittite **andurza** '(on the) inside; indoors' (see Joseph (to appear) for discussion with relevant literature).

Nonetheless, Monier-Williams' account is not without some difficulties. In particular, as an isolated derivative of 'door', **prádúr** would have to show the same specifically Indic--and consequently relatively late --alteration of the initial ***dh-** of the Indo-European proto-form (cf. Greek $\kappa\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ 'door', English **door**, Latin **fo-reS**, all pointing to ***dh-**) to an initial **d-**, a reshaping usually attributed to influence from **dvá** 'two' (so Pokorny (1959: s.v.), (Mayrhofer 1957: s.v.)),

that is shown by the base noun 'door', even though isolated extraparadigmatic forms typically retain older shapes of morphs. It is significant also that the meaning 'in sight' does not show an obvious link with 'door', so that the substitution of **d** for expected ***dh** in 'door' would have to be assumed to have occurred in the derivative when the semantic connection with 'door' was still fresh, not a difficult assumption but certainly a gratuitous one forced upon us in this account.

In Mayrhofer's view, on the other hand, **prádúr** is to be connected with Páli **pātu(r)**- 'in sight; evident', a form which can presuppose an early Indic ***prátur**, and ultimately therefore with Sanskrit **prátar** 'in the early morning; tomorrow'. For this analysis to work, though, it must be assumed that **prádúr** came into Sanskrit as a dialect borrowing, from a vernacular form in which the original *-**t**- was weakened to **-d-** (what Mayrhofer calls a "volkssprachlicher Erweichung der Tenuis"). While the vocalism (**-u(r)**) in the final syllable could indeed indicate a Prákritic origin, if it represents an ablaut variant of the suffix found in **prátar**, there is conflicting evidence regarding the treatment of intervocalic **t**, especially at as early a stage in the Prákrits as would be required for **prádúr** to be available in period of the Atharva Veda. In particular, as is evident from the discussion in Pischel (1879: §192, 202-4), while it is true that by the time of the attested Prákrits, many of the Prákrit dialects attest a development of intervocalic **t** to **d**,² there are also instances in which intervocalic **t** is "often doubled, if it originally stood before an accented vowel" (§194), as in Ardhamágadhi-**nijjitta** for Sanskrit **nirjitá**- 'conquered; claimed', as well as cases in which intervocalic **t** remains, as in (Cu-liká)paicáci- **khata** for Sanskrit **ghr̥ṣṭa**- 'ghee' (Pischel §191). Overall, therefore, it seems that the developments with intervocalic **t** are far from uniform in all the Prákrits, suggesting that these particular outcomes of original **t** in this position constitute a relatively late phenomenon, and thus are not easily attributable to the Old Indic period. It is interesting, moreover, though not necessarily telling, to note that the attested Prákrit form of **prádúr** is **páu**, as in the compound **páubbhavithá** (Pischel §517, cf. Sanskrit **prádurbháva**- cited above), with what can be taken as an instance of the frequent loss of medial **d** (cf. **maan̥za**- corresponding to Sanskrit **madana**- 'passion, love', Pischel §186).³

Furthermore, whatever the relationship is between **prádúr** and **pātu(r)**, the semantic connection with **prátar** is not so strong as to be completely convincing. Consequently, it could well be the case that even if a "Volkssprache" must be invoked here, the development was instead from an original *-**d-** to a secondary **-t-** via a hypercorrection (what Mayrhofer usually calls a "Hypersanskritismus"; see Pischel §190 and Lee 1986 for some discussion). Mayrhofer's analysis, therefore, while perhaps an improvement on Monier-Williams', is not as well-motivated semantically as one would desire and does not unambiguously point to a proto-form with *-**t-**.

Thus although both of the proposed etymologies have some attractive aspects, neither one is wholly satisfactory. Accordingly, it is reasonable to look for alternative etymologies, and in this paper, such an alternative is proposed.

As noted above, even under Mayrhofer's analysis of **prádúr**, it cannot be ruled out that the proto-form contained a ***-d-**; similarly, the connections proposed by both Monier-Williams and Fay presuppose an original ***-d-**. The alternative to be suggested here builds on this possibility, finding another--better supported--source for **prádúr** with a medial ***-d-** as a starting point. As it happens, moreover, this alternative has potential significance for the question of the dialectology of Old Indic.

In particular, the well-attested Indo-European root ***derk'-** 'see' (Greek *de%orkomai* 'see (clearly)', etc.) can be invoked here in the analysis of **prádúr**. Of immediate relevance is the fact that the Sanskrit continuation of ***derk'-**, namely the root $\sqrt{\text{dr}\text{ṣ}}\text{-}$, when combined with the preverb **pra-** has the meaning 'become visible; be seen; appear', exactly the range of meanings found in the most typical use of **prádúr** (i.e., with $\sqrt{\text{as-}}$ or $\sqrt{\text{bhu-}}$). Moreover, it is clear that the root ***derk'-** participated in apparently quite old adverbial formation processes involving combinations of a preverb with a root. This property of ***derk'-** is shown by the Greek adverb *u{po%odra* '(looking) from beneath; with a scowl; (looking) sternly, grimly', which derives from ***upo-drṣk'** and is found only in the Homeric formula *u}po%odra i}dwŶn*, which apparently is metrically archaic since it always occurs just before the penthemimeral caesura.⁴ While there are admittedly some problems with the details of the phonological development of *u{po%odra* from ***upo-drṣk'** with regard to the outcome of the syllabic resonant, there is general agreement on the proto-form for this adverb (see Chantraine 1968: s.v.). Sanskrit **prádúr**, therefore, can be taken to derive from an Indo-European adverbial ***pro--drṣk'**, where the first part is a lengthened form of ***pro**, as required independently by Attic Greek *prw-pe%orusi* 'two years ago' (versus *pro-pe%orusi* elsewhere in Greek), Latin **pro-** 'before; in front of', etc. This etymology requires only the assumption that word-final ***-rṣk'#** somehow yielded Sanskrit **-ur#**. As it happens, several possibilities exist to account for this development, all of which are based on the phonetic similarity of the Sanskrit sibilants and all of which are of some broader interest.

First, a comment on the matter of phonetic similarity is necessary. It is clear that the sibilants--dental **s**, palatal **ṣ**, and retroflex **ṣṣ--**are distinct phonemes in Sanskrit, as shown by contrasting roots such as $\sqrt{\text{sap-}}$ 'serve' versus $\sqrt{\text{ṣap-}}$ 'curse' and $\sqrt{\text{vi-ṣ-}}$ 'be master of' versus $\sqrt{\text{isṣ-}}$ 'move'. At the same time, though, there are indications that these sounds were not phonetically all that distinct from one another. For example, as Whitney (1889: 22) notes, "the very near relationship of **sṣ** and **ṣ** is attested by their euphonic treatment, which is to a considerable extent the same". Moreover, there is

evidence of similarity from various sporadic assimilations that occurred involving sequences of sibilants; thus, while **çaça-** 'hare' from earlier ***ças-a-** (from PIE ***k'as-o-**, cf. German **Hase**) and **çvaçura-** 'father-in-law' from earlier ***swaçura-** (from PIE ***swek'uro-**, cf. Greek **e{kuro}**) show an original ***s** assimilating to--and therefore suggesting a basic similarity with--the palatal sibilant **ç**, even more significant is the family of **çus>-ka-** 'dry' from earlier ***sus>-ka-** (from ***sus-ko-**, cf. Avestan **huska-**, Lithuanian **saûs-as**, etc.), in which an original ***s** has become the palatal **ç** in the proximity of the retroflex sibilant.

Given this similarity, and given the fact that inherited ***-r>s** became **-ur** directly, as shown by the genitive singular of kinship terms such as **mátur** 'mother's' from ***mátr>-s** (cf. Avestan **átars**, genitive singular of 'fire' for a parallel genitive from ***-r>-s**), the simplest assumption to make here is that ***-r>k'** ultimately became **-ur** as a regular sound change, presumably through ***-r>ç**. There would thus have been a neutralization of the palatal and dental sibilants in final position after **-r>-**. This development, if correct, would provide the first unambiguous instance of the outcome of final ***-r>k'** in Sanskrit. Cases such as the neuter nominative/accusative forms in **-r>k** of adjectives derived from **√dr>ç-**, which would ostensibly be from an asigmatic ***-dr>k'#/**, e.g. **i—dr>k** 'of this sort', are actually inconclusive in this regard; most likely they show analogical influence from the nonneuter and therefore originally sigmatic nominative **-dr>k**, which derives from ***-dr>k'-s** and therefore represents a different proto-language sequence from the one at issue here.

Similarly, it is well-known that there are some Vedic forms that appear to show an outcome of **-s#** from ***-k'-s**, a development which would make ***-dr>k'-s** to ***-dr>s--** from which **-dur** would have developed regularly--a distinct possibility. Especially noteworthy here is **puro-dás** 'sacrificial cake', if from ***puro-dáç-s**. This form, however, can be discounted since, as MacDonnell (1916: §28a, n. 2) points out, "the *s* is probably due to the analogy of nominatives like **más moon**, **dravin>o-dá-s wealth-giver**, etc." Moreover, a pre-form ***-dr>k'-s** for the adverbial **-dur** is not well motivated morphologically for Sanskrit, for two reasons. First, the Indo-European adverbial ***-s** of such forms as Greek **me%ocri** 'as far as, until' (variant of **me%ocri**) or Latin **cis** 'on this side' (from the deictic stem ***ki-**) is attested in Sanskrit primarily (though relevant here may also be **avas** 'downwards' and **nis** 'out, forth, away')⁵ in the multiplicative numerals such as **dvis** 'twice' or **tris** 'thrice'.⁶ Second, the external sandhi of **prádúr** is such that it is best treated synchronically as having no suffix; Pán>ini 8.3.41 credits the fact that **prádúr** becomes **prádu:s>** before **k** and **p** to the absence of a suffix in this form.⁷

Thus a simple sound-change explanation for ***-r>k'(s)** to **-ur** is possible but difficult to assume. Another possible source for the development of ***-r>k'#/** to **-ur** is through the

reinterpretation of a superficially ambiguous sibilant in a context in which neutralization of the sibilants would have occurred. In particular, the sequence */-k' - t-/ regularly yielded **-sʑtʑ-**, as in **drʑsʑtʑa-** 'having been seen', from ***drʑk'-tó-**, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that this development was originally present in external sandhi as well as internal sandhi. This sequence would thus have merged in the environment of **-rʑ-** with the outcome of earlier */-s - t-/ , since ***s** regularly became the retroflex **sʑ** after **-rʑ-** and **t** became retroflex **tʑ** after a retroflex consonant. One can hypothesize, then, that the phonetic sequence [prádrʑsʑ # tʑ-] (assuming an originally wider range of cooccurrence for the adverbial from what is attested later) was reanalyzed by some speakers as being underlyingly /prádrʑs # t-/ , with dental **s**, instead of /prádrʑç # t-/ , with the palatal **ç**.⁸ At that point, the regular development of /-rʑs#/ as exemplified above with **mátur** would have led to the attested **prádúr**.

While these possibilities cannot be dismissed, one further set of facts concerning the Indic sibilants must be taken into consideration, for they provide an important backdrop to any account of the developments with sibilants and **-r-** in question here. In particular, within Indic the sibilants show various interchanges, especially involving **ç** and **s** and especially adjacent to sonorants. This sibilant "confusion" is found in later Sanskrit in a large number of roots and words, as with variant roots such as $\sqrt{\text{sri}}$ —**v-**/ $\sqrt{\text{çri}}$ —**v-** 'fail', $\sqrt{\text{çrambh}}$ —/ $\sqrt{\text{srambh}}$ 'be careless, negligent', $\sqrt{\text{sram}}$ —**s-**/ $\sqrt{\text{çram}}$ —**s-** 'loosen, let hang', and others,⁹ or by-forms such as **syála-**/**çyála-** 'wife's brother'. It is possible that this sibilant interchange could be a by-product of the phonetic similarity mentioned earlier, but more likely perhaps is that it is the result of hypercorrection, given that in at least some dialects of Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA), the earlier Indic three-way sibilant contrast is reduced due to mergers. Whatever the cause, though, this situation means that a final sequence ***-rʑç#** could have been changed to or reinterpreted as **-rʑs#**, from which **-ur** would have resulted.

What makes this especially attractive with regard to the proposed ***-rʑk'** to **-ur** development for **prádúr** is that this sibilant interchange is not limited to later Sanskrit. Occasional instances are found earlier as well, and particularly noteworthy is the occurrence in the Rig Veda (1.127.3) of a participle **çruvat-** 'dissolving, melting', an apparent variant of **sruvat-** from the root $\sqrt{\text{sru}}$ 'flow'.¹⁰ Therefore, the processes that led to the interchange of **ç** and **s** were available at an early enough period to have played a role in the passage of ***pro-drʑk'#** to ***prádrʑç** to ***prádrʑs**, and ultimately to **prádúr**. If this account is correct, **prádúr** would provide another important, and early, example of this interesting phenomenon, and as such would have potentially great significance for the question of the dialects of early Indic and the sociolinguistic relationships among them.

In particular, it would have to be assumed that in a dialect of Old Indic that was not the main dialect in the Vedic period, the sibilants **ç** and **s** merged at least in final position after **-r̥-**, and that this dialect provided **prádúr**. What makes such an assumption potentially so interesting for Vedic dialectology are several interrelated facts. First, as noted above, later Indic, i.e. MIA, underwent sibilant mergers. Second, dialects that were forerunners to the attested MIA languages were around in Vedic times and provided some input to the extant Vedic literature (cf. Emeneau 1966 for discussion with references, where these dialects are ultimately called Proto-Middle-Indo-Aryan).¹¹ Third, these Old Indic non-Rig Vedic dialects were certainly of lower sociolinguistic status than the main Vedic dialect, in the same way that the MIA dialects were lower sociolinguistically than Classical Sanskrit. Putting all of these facts together, and adding in as well the observation that the one Vedic occurrence of **prádúr** is in the stylistically lower Atharva Veda, it is not unreasonable to suppose that a Proto-MIA dialect with sibilant "confusion"--presumably the one in Proto-MIA that provided the starting point for the later MIA dialects with mergers of the sibilants--is responsible for giving a form ***prádr̥s** (from earlier ***prádr̥ç**) which yielded attested **prádúr**.

This explanation for **prádúr** cannot be proven definitively, but it draws on a documented, if not fully understood, phenomenon (namely the **sruvat-/çruvat-** sibilant confusion),^{12, 13} involves plausible semantic connections, and is morphologically well-motivated. The occurrence of **prádúr** in Sanskrit would still be a result of dialect borrowing, as in Mayrhofer's account, but the process which is associated with the dialect in question can, due to the occurrence of **sruvat-/çruvat-**, be dated more safely to the early Vedic period, unlike the **t/d** interchange involved in Mayrhofer's account.

Footnotes

*I would like to thank Henry Hoenigswald and Jay Jasanoff for comments on some of the ideas contained herein. Note that for typographical ease, I use < **ç** > for the palatal sibilant more usually transcribed now as < **s** >. Proto-Indo-European palatal stops are marked with an apostrophe, e.g. ***k'** for the voiceless palatal stop.

1. We follow Mayrhofer (s.v.) here in rejecting out of hand Fay's (1919: 206) suggestion of a segmentation ***pro-d-u(d)s** and a connection therefore of **prádúr** with the families of Latin **pro-d-** 'forth' (as in **pro-d-eo-** 'go forth') and German **aus** 'out', etc. Mayrhofer terms this proposal "ganz abwegig".

2. In addition, there are cases in which intervocalic **t** is lost, or perhaps more accurately becomes **y** (see Pischel §186-7), though these could be developments from a weakened **d**.

3. Admittedly, though, the developments with medial **d** are also not uniform--aspiration to **dh** occurs rarely, and cerebralization to a retroflex consonant is quite common; moreover, medial consonant loss also seemingly occurs with **t**, as noted in footnote 2.

4. Relevant also for the archaic nature of *uṣpodra* is the attestation of a root noun from ***derk'-** with the same preverb, in Sanskrit **upa-dr̥ṣ-** 'look, aspect, appearance'.

5. It is not clear if **nis** has any internal structure, since a connection with the preverb **ni-** 'down, back, in, into' is unlikely. Similarly, **avas** need not have an original ***-s**, though it is usually taken as such (see Mayrhofer s.v.); since a variant form **avar** with **-r** occurs (once only, at RV 1.133.6) which has support from Avestan **avarə**, the **-s** could be the result of a reinterpretation of a sandhi variant **avah̥**.

6. A very suggestive form is the Hellenistic Greek *uṣpodra* 'looking from beneath; grimly', attested only from 3rd century B.C. (e.g. in Callimachus), a late variant of Homeric *uṣpodra*. If not simply a late creation within Greek, perhaps modeled on other adverbials in **-ax**, e.g. *ojda* 'by biting with the teeth', *uṣpodra* would seemingly be from ***upo-dr̥k'-s**, and as such would be a tantalizing possible parallel to a preform for **-dur** in ***-dr̥k'-s**. It seems best, however, to discount this possibility; *uṣpodra* is probably not significant given its late date of attestation and possible analogical source, and in any case, the development of ***-k's#** to Sanskrit **-s#** is not very certain, as discussed above.

7. This synchronic account could of course be the result of a reinterpretation of the underlying form of the adverb (see footnote 8).

8. The restructuring of an underlying form based on a sandhi form is evident in the compound **aho-rátrá-** 'day and night', in which the **-o-** is due to the reinterpretation of **ahah̥** as being from **/ahas-/** instead of the presumed etymologically correct **/ahar-/**.

9. A search through Palsule 1955 turned up 16 roots in which **s** and **ṣ** interchange, in both directions (**s** for etymological **ṣ** and vice-versa), as well as one (**s̥vas̥k-/svask-** 'move, go') with an interchange of **s** and **s̥**. While not intended to be an exhaustive count (note that variant lexical items, such as **syála-/ṣyála-**, are not covered in the *dhātupāt*), these numbers are indicative of the range of the phenomenon in question.

10. It must be pointed out that some Sanskritists (so Böhtlingk and Roth in their dictionary) and native grammarians account for **ṣruvat-** by positing a different root **√ṣru-** (distinct from **√ṣru-** 'hear'); Whitney (1885: s.v. **√sru-**), however, treats them as variants of the same root, the account

followed here. There is no comparative evidence from within Indo-European to support the assumption of a different root $\sqrt{\text{cru-}}$; while a $*\text{krew-}$ is to be found in Pokorny 1959, with a meaning 'collapse; tumble; fall' that is compatible with that of cruvat- , the occurrence of a velar **k-** in all the Baltic reflexes of this root (e.g. Old Prussian **kru-t** 'fall') speaks against a connection with cru- , since a palatal $*\text{k'}$ is required for the Sanskrit form.

11. Among the evidence for an admixture in Vedic of Proto-MIA dialect are words with MIA phonology such as **iha** 'here' (with Prakritic **h** for $*\text{dh}$) and **kitava-** 'gambler' (from $*\text{kr}\bar{\text{z}}\text{tava-}$ 'the one associated with the **kr̥zta-** 'throw of dice') with Prakritic **i** from $*\text{r}\bar{\text{z}}$, and occasional wholesale lexical replacements, as with **kim** 'what' for "pure" Vedic **kad**.

12. Admittedly, though, in $\text{cruvat-}/\text{sruvat-}$, the interchange is in the direction of ç from earlier **s** whereas in **prádúr**, it would have to be in the direction of **s** from earlier ç .

13. Of possible relevance here also is the Old Persian situation with unexpected instances of **-st-** for **-st-** from PIE $*\text{-k'-t-}$, as in **rásta-** 'straight, right' as opposed to Avestan **rásta-/rasta-** 'directed'. Kent (1953: §93) feels that the **-st-** is "probably analogical to the **-st-** of dental stems". However, given the fact that original $*\text{s}$ was maintained before $*\text{t}$ (as in **astiy** 'he is' from $*\text{es-ti}$), some sort of sibilant "confusion" may be at work here, and this may have been motivated by dialectal influences, inasmuch as the regular outcome of $*\text{k'}$ in Median was **s** (though no relevant forms with $*\text{-k'-t-}$ are cited for Median). The Iranian situation deserves closer attention, and it is mentioned here only as a possible parallel to what has been proposed for Indic.

References

- Chantraine, Pierre. 1968 et seq. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots. Paris: Editions Klincksieck.
- Emeneau, Murray. 1966. "The Dialects of Old Indo-Aryan", in H. Birnbaum & J. Puhvel (eds.) Ancient Indo-European Dialects. Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics held at the University of California, Los Angeles April 25-27, 1963, pp. 123-138. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fay, Edwin W. 1919. "Notes on Indo-Iranian Words", Journal of the American Oriental Society 39.206-7.
- Joseph, Brian D. To appear. "Hittite **andurza** and the Indo-Hittite Hypothesis", to appear in Y. Arbeitman (ed.) The Anatolian Connexion: Memorial Offerings for Charles Carter in Anatolian and other Asian Minor Languages.

- Kent, Roland G. 1953. Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon. New Haven: American Oriental Society (American Oriental Series 33).
- Lee, Gina M. 1986. "Diglossia in Ancient India", in B. Joseph, ed., Studies on Language Change (Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics 34), pp. 151-164. Columbus, OH: Department of Linguistics, The Ohio State University.
- MacDonnell, Arthur A. 1916/1971. A Vedic Grammar for Students. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956 et seq. Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1899/1976. Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press (1976 Indian Edition by Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi).
- Palsule, Gajanan B. 1955. A Concordance of Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas (with Index of Meanings). Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute (Deccan College Dissertation Series 14).
- Pischel, R. 1879/1965. Comparative Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages. Translated from the German by Subhadra Jhā. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern: Francke Verlag.
- Whitney, William D. 1885. Sanskrit Grammar. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (second edition, reprinted).
- Whitney, William D. 1889. The Root-Forms, Verbs, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel (reprinted 1945 by the American Oriental Society as Volume 30, American Oriental Series).