

investigated in the first part of the book. In regard to them, there exists in contemporary Chinese (as opposed to the ancient, classical language) a clear distinction between singular and plural, which is comparable in its operation to the usage of Indo-European languages.

This work constitutes an important and extremely valuable step forward in Chinese grammatical research. It will be of use to others working in this field and provides them with an admirable example. At the same time it transcends the narrower limits of its subject and must be regarded as a rich source both of information and of inspiration for language study as a whole.

Professor Dr. Werner Eichhorn

KIELHORN, FRANZ

### Grammar of the Sanskrit Language

[“Grammatik der Sanskrit-Sprache”]

Wiesbaden: Verlag Franz Steiner, 1965; 238 p., DM 30.—

There is no shortage of good grammars of Sanskrit in western literature on India. What nevertheless justifies this new printing of the German translation of this work by Kielhorn, first published in 1870, but long since out of print, is its completeness in presentation of the material, as well as the clarity of its construction which was largely possible because the author – in contrast to e. g. Whitney’s large grammar – restricted himself completely to the post-Vedic “classical” language. An essential difference from other western grammars of Sanskrit also consists in that the author has systematically used the rich indigenous traditions of the Indians, but has translated them from the Indian method of representation, which is unintelligible to the European user without special preliminary training, into western grammatical means of expression. Yet, precisely because of this, it can hardly be recommended to a beginner, but in the modern view only to one advanced in the study of Sanskrit who has already acquired a firm picture of the resources and use of the grammatical categories of Sanskrit. In Kielhorn’s time, it was quite natural to lean heavily on the native doctrines in the presentation of the complicated system. Today, it is virtually certain that forms have been constructed after Pāṇini in the strict Indian system of thought which never existed in the language. Kielhorn’s grammar is in fact full of such forms in the presentation of verbal morphology, particularly in the denominative (*kr̥ṣṇati* “behaves as does Kṛṣṇa”, *rājānati* “behaves as a king”, etc., p. 169) and in the desiderative (*ārṇuṇviṣati* “wishes to cover”), for which it is difficult to imagine that they are all quite by chance not recorded in the literature. On the other hand, the book gives a first lively impression of the way in which Sanskrit was regarded in India and, vice versa, it can be

imagined that it facilitates the transfer to the European form of expression and presentation for the Indian trained in traditional grammar. This was perhaps one of the main reasons why it always enjoyed such a great reputation in India itself.

Professor Dr. Hermann Berger

KLEINER, GERHARD

### **Ancient Miletus**

["Alt-Milet"]

Wiesbaden: Verlag Franz Steiner, 1966; 26 p., 21 tabl., DM 9.—

The present director of the German excavations in Miletus, Prof. G. Kleiner, gives in this work a short, but meaty survey of the results and findings of the latest excavating campaigns as well as of their scientific importance. Whereas the earlier German excavations of 1903–1908 were aimed principally at investigating Hellenistic and Roman Miletus, interest upon resumption of studies in 1938 and, after the War, since 1955 has been concentrated upon the archaic city and its forerunners. — After a short sketch of the history of the excavations as well as of the geographical conditions for the change in position of the ancient city, the author discusses in historical order, the various archaeological strata bearing witness to continuous settlement, particularly in the region of the Temple of Athena. The oldest testimony is a huge fortification wall, dated in the 13th century B. C. from ceramic fragments found with it, which must have surrounded a Mycenaean settlement of considerable proportions, the beginning of which, to judge from the findings of probably Minoan pottery, extends back to the 16th and 17th century B. C. In the post-Mycenaean period this wall near the Temple of Athena was built over by a small circular sanctuary, which probably belonged to a Carian settlement, over which there was built in the 7th–6th century B. C. a small rectangular building in whose ashes interesting small findings came to light (a griffon head of bronze, relief fittings of a harness, etc.). Thorough investigations were also devoted to the earlier Temple of Athena, the ground-plan of which still corresponds completely to the Mycenaean megaron type, which however — as shown by additional findings (terra cotta head with helmet, relief disc from the centre of a circular shield, etc.) — is to be dated in the 7th century B. C. Remains of walls and house-like structures from the archaic period were also established at other places within the excavation area. Likewise, numerous ceramic fragments from the 8th and 7th century B. C. were found. A few curving sections of walls probably belong to buildings from the epoch of Carian settlement of the city which is testified to by Herodotus and which, according to the excavators, in addition is also documented by findings of a characteristic non-