

Version July 27,1987  
 (published Paris 1989)  
 {Maps excluded}

M. Witzel, Cambridge, Mass.

## TRACING THE VEDIC DIALECTS

To F.B.J. Kuiper  
 on his 80th birthday

1. INTRODUCTION
2. Materials for this study
3. Discussion of the materials
  
4. PARAMETERS
  - 4.1. Geography
  - 4.2. Time
    - 4.2.1 Internal chronology of the texts
      2. Development of the ritual
      3. Development of thought
      4. Absolute dates
      5. Relative chronology
  - 4.3. Linguistic chronology
    - 4.3.1 Ṛgvedic Sanskrit
      2. Mantra language
      3. Saṃhitā prose
      4. Brāhmaṇa prose
      5. Sūtra language
      6. Yajñagāthās, Pāṇini's bhāṣā, Epic, Classical Skt.
  
5. ESTABLISHING A PATTERN
  - 5.0 Procedure, maps
    1. Gen. fem. sg. -ai
    2. Narrative impf. and perf.
    3. Perf. in traditional formulas
    4. Infinitives in -toḥ
    5. Absolute -tvī

## 6. TYPICAL ŚĀKHĀ DIFFERENCES

- 6.1. -ch-, -śch-, -cch-
- 6.2. kś/ khy
- 6.3. "Ṛgvedic" ḷ-
- 6.4. -jm- > -ym-
- 6.5. súvar/svâr, anaptyxis
- 6.6. Late developments: nom. yuvām, 3rd sg.dugdhe
- 6.7. Sandhi -e/o a-

## 7. FEATURES OF SYNTAX AND STYLE

- 7.1. khalu
- 7.2. svid
- 7.3. Some other particles
- 7.4. spr̥dh : sam.yat

## 8. SOME INDIVIDUAL CASES

- 8.1. purūvasu: purovasu
- 8.2. A case of religious belief: punarmṛtyu-
- 8.3. An unauspicious word: pāpa-

## 9. THE RELATION WITH EARLY MIDDLE INDIAN

- 9.1. Vedic ḷ-
- 9.2. Nom.pl.m. -āsaḥ; te devāḥ;
- 9.3. Instr.pl.-ebhiḥ > aiḥ;
- 9.4. Gen.fem.sg. -ai
- 9.5. Preterite
- 9.6. Subjunctive
- 9.7. Precative -eṣ(ma)
- 9.8. Infinitives
- 9.10. hi ṣma/ha vai
- 9.11. sa in initial position

## 10. CONCLUSIONS

- 10.1. Dialects and centres of innovation
- 10.2. Three centres: Kurukṣetra, Pañcāla, (Kosala-)Videha
- 10.3. Successive waves of immigration
- 10.4. Vedic dialects and archeology
- 10.5. Dating the Vedas

## 10.6. Conclusion and prospects

## § 1. INTRODUCTION

It is believed, and quite generally so, that the Vedic language had no dialects. One usually admits that the archaic poetic language of the Ṛgveda is a mixture of many dialects which had influenced each other. On the other hand, the educated speech of post-Ṛgvedic times, found in the prose texts, the so-called Brāhmaṇas, is regarded as the contemporary, the living language of the priests and other well-educated men, while the rest of the population spoke various degrees of early Middle-Indian, i.e., archaic Prākṛts. But this is as far as one will go.<sup>1</sup> My contention will be that even this standard North Indian Koine, "Vedic," which does not seem to have regional variations at all, shows traces of the local dialects-- if only one looks carefully enough.

Until now, this has not been done, chiefly because the language is apparently uniform in all the texts. There are, as has been noted from time to time, a few words or phrases, like the famous ŚB quotation, he 'lavo he 'lavo, spoken by the Asuras, which is believed to be from an early Eastern 'Prākṛt' for: he (a)rayaḥ.<sup>2</sup>

But otherwise, the sound system and even the phonetical variants of one particular phoneme are the same, the Sandhis show little variation, the forms of the noun and verb system seem to be the same throughout the texts, and the same applies to the syntax.

If there are "Vedic Variants," they are usually attributed to matters of style or described as late (or post-Vedic) influence of Prākṛt on the Vedic texts.<sup>3</sup>

Actually, this does not, if one reads the texts carefully, agree with the testimony of the Vedic texts themselves; there are a number of very clear statements indicating that the Vedic people noticed and thought about regional differences in speech:

---

<sup>1</sup> F.Edgerton, *Dialectic phonetics in the Veda: Evidence from the Vedic variants*, in *Studies in honour of Hermann Collitz*, Baltimore (The John Hopkins Press), 1930, p.25-36; - M.B.Emeneau, *The dialects of Old Indo-Aryan*, in: *Ancient Indo-European dialects*, ed. H.Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1966, p. 123-138.

<sup>2</sup> Thieme, *Pāṇini and the Veda*, notes the closeness of Pāṇ.'s bhāṣā and KS, see p. 17,76,80; cf. below, ann. 65, 239, 280; cf. now Cardona, *Pāṇini. A survey of research*, Delhi 1980, p.238 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Bloomfield-Edgerton, *Vedic Variants*, treat only the Mantras belonging to the so-called Mantra language, see below § 4.2.2; cf. Oertel, *Kasusvariationen*, SB Aakd. München 1937-1939. Especially Renou and Caland regarded many of the variations in grammar to be treated below, as mere variations in the style of Vedic viz. of the various Vedic schools.

- \* the better speech of the Northerners: KB 7.6<sup>4</sup>
- \* the higher tones of the Kurus, Pañcālas: ŚBM 3.2.3.15; or Kurus, Mahāvṛṣas: ŚBK 4.2.3.15 uttarāhi/°hai)<sup>5</sup>
- \* the son of a king of Kosala speaks "like the Easterners": JB 1.338 = ed.Caland §115
- \* nyagrodha bowls = "nyubja" in Kurukṣetra: AB 7.30
- \* the names of Agni/Rudra in the East viz. West: Śarva with the Easterners, Bhava with the Bāhīkas: ŚB 1.7.3.8, cf. 6.1.3.11-15
- \* The Pañcala use kuśa instead of darbha, also in the names of their kings (Keśin)<sup>6</sup>

Such clearly mentioned local peculiarities must, of course, be distinguished from social levels of language:

- \* the gods, Gandharvas, Asuras, and men speak differently, ŚB 10.6.4.1
- \* so do the gods on one hand (rātrīm) and the author of the passage in question (rātrim), MS 1.5.12:81.3-4
- \* the dīkṣita has his own language<sup>7</sup>
- \* so have the Vrātyas (cf. H. Falk, Bruderschaft)
- \* note the difference in the language of women: they speak candratara,<sup>8</sup> probably "more clearly", with higher pitch; at RV 10.145.2, a woman uses the younger (and more popular) kuru instead of kṛṇu.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See Weber, Lit.Gesch.p.49, Ind. St. II,309; cf.Thieme, Pāṇ. and the Veda 80; cf. TS 5.3.4.4 with tr. Keith, cf. below ann. 20.

<sup>5</sup> About this, author, forthc.

<sup>6</sup> Most of these passages have been noticed by W. Rau, Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien, Wiesbaden 1957, p.18. Cf. AV 12.1.45, 'everywhere on Earth there are men of different speech and customs'; and yatra-āryā vāg vadati KA 8.9 "where the Aryan speech is spoken" (cf. the similar expression in O.Pers. DB IV 89: āriya- "Aryan language"), cf. AA 3.2.5; -- the Pañcala use kuśa instead of darbha, apparently to denote their kings, in succession to Keśin Dārbhya, who, according to BŚS, was called Śirṣaṇya Kuśa after performing the Apaciti sacrifice, see JB 2.100 §133, BŚS 18.38, PB 19.8. Yet, apparently, this usage is also found in everyday language, see ŚBK 1.2.3.9 kuśā but darbha in the parallel version ŚBM 2.2.3.11. This passage underlines what will be said below, §4.1., about the homeland of ŚBK as neighbouring the Pañcala area. Passages like TS 7.5.9.2: "all forms of speech they speak" (at a Sattrā), have to be understood, with H.Falk, (Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel, Freiburg 1986), differently, in terms of the ritual in question. For later texts, see Patañjali, I p.9, line 25, on dātra, hammatī, śavati, and the various words for cow, (cf. also Pkt. goṇā, gopatalikā).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the names of Keśin Dārbhya; also the various designations of the horse: haya, vājin, arvan, aśva ŚB 10.6.4.1 etc.; cf. W. Rau., Staat, p. 18.

<sup>8</sup> See KS 30.1:181.15, - but only at night!

All of these features, however, have either been largely neglected, or have at least never been investigated in the context of Vedic dialects. Another reason why one does not have an idea how there could have existed dialects in Vedic is that one does not really know when the texts were composed or where. Without an area of composition (or redaction) for a Vedic text, there are, of course, no dialects.

In fact, the Vedic texts seem to have been composed at an unknown time in an unknown area (of N. India); in other words, even after some 150 years of studying the texts, a dark mist still covers the whole Vedic period, which makes it very difficult to make out who did what, where, and at what time. The only point usually admitted is the relative chronology of the texts (see below § 4.2.1, 4.2.5), and even in this area there is no general agreement. I believe that we can finally move a few steps further. I have tried to localise as many texts as possible in the Fel. Vol. Eggermont (Louvain 1986/7). The absolute dates of the texts remain in balance, if we do not take refuge in external evidence like the Mitanni agreement of ca. 1380 B.C., which mentions the Vedic gods, or the often discussed date of the Buddha and the age of the older Upaniṣads.

The results are summarised in the maps and in the tables provided below where the texts are dated according to the linguistic developments found in them.<sup>10</sup>

On this basis, we can observe a number of dialect divergencies in the post Ṛgvedic (i.e. Middle Vedic) texts. I refrain here, to a large extent, from dealing with the RV, as this text is clearly much older and limited to the Panjab and its surroundings. The AV knows all of the N. Indian plains of the Ganges-Yamunā doab / Uttar Pradesh. Mantra language in general can be distinguished both from Ṛgvedic as well as from the prose of the Yajurveda Saṃhitās and of the Brāhmaṇas.

The various levels of development of the Vedic language are briefly described below (§ 4.3): When we arrange the data according to these levels and to the geographical position mentioned in the maps, we arrive at a few striking results:

---

<sup>9</sup> See K. Hoffmann, Aufs. p. 581; the two other cases of RV kur- are 'popular' forms as well.

<sup>10</sup> See: Wackernagel, Ai.Gr.I, and the add. of L.Renou; Renou, Histoire de la langue Sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956; K.Hoffmann, Inj., and: Aufs., passim; see especially, J.Narten, Die Sprache 14 ; cf. also Gonda, Old Indian, Leiden 1971 and OLZ 1977, 205-207; cf. author, WZKS 24, p.22-24.

\* 1st: there are regional differences in Vedic (as will be described in detail in the main part of this paper).<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately, this has not been followed up so far.

\* 2nd: these regional differences are not static throughout the Vedic period, but many of them show developments both in time and space: certain local peculiarities -- often innovations! -- spread to the next level of texts. They do not always do so in an Eastern direction, as one might think, with a view to the history of settlement of N. India, but also in other directions. When a larger number of such quickly spreading innovations are compared, a few centres of innovation emerge. It will be interesting to see where they are situated and what could have been the reasons for the diffusion of innovations.<sup>12</sup>

\* 3rd: when one studies these variations and their spread in space and time, the surprising result is a correspondence of the geographical area of some Vedic schools (śākhās) with that of certain Vedic tribes and with some archeologically attested cultures. This, ultimately, allows to date the texts for the first time (see below, § 10.5).

If some of the features mentioned above are local peculiarities, i.e., dialect characteristics, then the question arises: is there a relationship with the various early Middle Indian dialects and with the other Prākṛts? The recent book of O.v. Hinüber on early Middle Indian provides, as far as features common to Vedic and Middle Indian have been identified until now, an ample discussion of the relationship between Vedic and the Prākṛts.<sup>13</sup> The point has been discussed earlier by M.B.Emeneau. He concentrates, however, on the

<sup>11</sup> P.Thieme is, as far as I can see, the first who has noticed that such regional differences are clearly mirrored in Pāṇini's knowledge of Vedic texts, and that Pāṇ. is very close to (N)W texts, KS and PS, see Pāṇ. and the Veda, p.75; cf. now Cardona, Pāṇ., p. 238 sq.; cf. also K.Hoffmann, Aufs. p.470, about dialect differences in the caste language of the Brahmins.

<sup>12</sup> If true, this alone should be sufficient to disperse the doubts of Caland, Renou regarding the use of linguistic criteria, found in various Vedic texts, for determining the relative dates of these texts, as summed up by Minard, Trois Enigmes II, §717-727. For the spread of the Vedic tribes and their culture to the East, see Rau, Staat, p.12 (where the data are not used for this purpose, cf. author, Fel. Vol. Eggermont); for the movement towards the South, see MS 4.7.9:104.14 "people move southwards, conquering," ŚB 2.3.2.2 on Naḍa Naiṣadha who daily carries Yama (death) southwards, cf. also ŚB 5.3.3.3 : one gets food in the South; Brāhmaṇic splendour is found in the North, cf. above (ann. 6) on the best speech, KB 7.6. Cf. finally, JB 2.352 "one brahmin follows the other": tasmād brāhmaṇo brahmaṇsyānuvaro bhavati.

<sup>13</sup> O.v. Hinüber, Das altere Mittelindisch im Überblick. SB Akad. Wien 1986, § 7-11.

similarities between the Ṛgveda and Pāli. Such discussions must, I think, be supplemented by the type of evidence to be presented in detail in this paper; one has to collect items mainly from the texts that precede the Pkt.s, i. e., from the Middle and Late Vedic texts, and cannot directly compare the Ṛgveda with the later Prākṛts. It is the Middle Vedic period that saw the diffusion of Old Indian and of early forms of Middle Indian all over Northern and Western India.<sup>14</sup> The RV territory, however, still was restricted to the Panjab and its immediate surroundings.

## § 2. MATERIALS FOR THIS STUDY

It is not always easy to select materials that are accessible for such a study. Whatever criteria one wishes to employ for the selection, at present only some easily accessible materials can be used, like those contained in Vishva Bandhu's Vedic Word Concordance (VPK), Wackernagel's *Altindische Grammatik*, and the grammars of Whitney and Renou, those found in the introductions to text editions, etc. This means that a thorough investigation can only be made of the words listed alphabetically in VPK, such as the spread of a particular word, or of a combination of two words (especially in the case of particles), which is already much more time-consuming. A comprehensive study of a particular case ending or of a verb form is not possible with this tool. Unless one finds the time to read all the texts for the present purpose only, one either has to restrict oneself to an impressionistic test (as, for example, with the exact number of cases of certain verb or noun endings), or one has to rely on the grammatical descriptions and the occasional statistical counts (which, however, do not always include all major Vedic texts). The lack and the unavailability of complete data will occasionally be felt in the sequel.

For example, some materials, like the occurrence in the texts of the opt. in -īta of thematic verbs,<sup>15</sup> are not easily accessible so long as complete lists of such forms do not exist. These data will, in the future, have to be found in computer-based data systems which will easily allow one to trace, select as per

<sup>14</sup> Panjab to the borders on Bengal, and South to Gujarat and, apparently Vidarbha (Berar, N.Maharashtra, acc. to JB ).

<sup>15</sup> On -īta, see below ann. 22; see Renou BSL 41 p.11 sqq., and K.Hoffmann, Aufs.371; Aufrecht, ed. AB p.429, Wackernagel, Ai.Gr., I, German ed. p. XXX = Renou, intro. p. 14, with ann. 198, further: II.1, p.89; Keith, ed. AA p.172.; Keith, transl. AB, p.46, KB p.75; also in BSS, see Caland, Über BSS, p. 42 "Die meisten also im späteren Teile des Werkes"; and in BhSS 9.5.3, 10.7.15, 5.16.18, see ed. Kashikar, p. LX; for the DhS, see S.K.Bharadwaj, Linguistic Study of the Dharmasūtras, Rohtak 1982, p. 119 sqq..



chapter, per text or text level, those forms necessary for a certain investigation.<sup>16</sup>

Preference should, of course, be given to those items of the language which change automatically in the course of time, like sounds, certain grammatical categories (disappearance of forms like the injunctive, subjunctive), and new formations (like the periphrastic aor.).

Furthermore, a clear distinction must be made between (metric or prose) Mantras and the actual prose text of the YV Saṃhitās, the Brāhmaṇas, and some later texts. The Mantras (of the AV, SV, YV, and later RV texts) are usually more archaic than the surrounding prose, but they have undergone a separate change which is not always directly linked to linguistic development alone, but often due to the oral tradition of the texts; by Vedic times, perseverance has taken place. The Mantras, therefore, have to be treated not only as a separate level in Vedic, but even require their own type of philology.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, it will (often) be better to avoid this particular stage of Vedic as a starting point for investigations of the kind undertaken here. In any case, one must present the materials concerned in several steps: e.g., YV Mantras, followed by YV Saṃhitā prose, YV Brāhmaṇa prose, (see below, § 4.2.2 sqq.).

As for the practical problem of procedure in the selection and presentation of the material, one may either use that of chronological order, i.e., listing peculiarities from the RV, then the AV, the YV prose, the Brāhmaṇas, etc.; or one may start with an area-wise arrangement of the facts regardless of text level. The best results, however, will be gained by a combination of both criteria when various single peculiarities are studied both in time and space, as, for example, the use of a combination of two particles or the occurrence of a particular infinitive form. Certain developments are best visible when viewed in both dimensions, that of time and geographical spread. This method has been followed in the sequel.

As for the criteria to be used in this study, a few remarks have to be added.

\* Phonetic peculiarities are to be used with caution. One has to separate the Vedic ones among them from such later developments as the changes effected by the transmitters and redactors of the texts (e.g.,

---

<sup>16</sup> Earlier statistics help occasionally, notably those of Whitney and his school: see Whitney's and Avery's statistical accounts in JAOS.

<sup>17</sup> See especially the treatment of Mantra variants in J.Narten's and K. Hoffmann's works, and cf., already Oldenberg, ZDMG, 42, p. 246 and Keith, TS transl. p. CLIX sqq.

RV ḷ- for older -ḍ-; MS,RV -ch-, KS -śch- ), and these, again, have to be distinguished from later medieval developments which affected the form of texts, like MS ñch for correct Vedic cch < t+ś or Vāj. viṣṇu for viṣṇu, ppra for pra, etc.

Certain other medieval peculiarities of recitation and writing, which at first sight may appear Vedic, as the many variations of Sandhi of Anunāsika (written ṁ in this study) + y,r,l,v,ś,ṣ,s,h, again have to be disregarded; they are, at least in part, local medieval habits. Cf. also cases like avarundhe < avarunddhe; yaṃ na/yan na, (i.e., either yam o r yad in both cases); or -ḥ sC / -s sC, partly > -s C, etc. and medieval Prātiśākhya influence.<sup>18</sup>

There remain the real Vedic peculiarities, like the changes in the occurrence and distribution in the texts of r/l or a confusion of s/ś, etc., which are very difficult to trace without a computer data base.<sup>19</sup>

Another useful criterion may be that of accent, if the conclusions of P. Kiparsky are to be accepted.<sup>20</sup>

\* Declension and conjugation provide numerous examples of local variations, often innovations, like the new ending of the nom./acc. ntr. pl. in -āni. Such peculiarities have to be distinguished from general developments like the disappearance of whole categories (injunctive, subjunctive) in Middle viz. post-Vedic; the state of these losses may differ as per text.<sup>21</sup>

Other examples of this type are the loss of the modi of the aorist in middle Vedic, the loss of the R̥gvedic case ending in -ebhiḥ, etc. Some other materials are, again, inaccessible for the time being, like the exact distribution and

<sup>18</sup> Cf. author in WZKS 23/24; StII 1; 8/9; VI. Suppl.Bd. ZDMG, 1985.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Ved.Var I, p.134 -154, where only Mantra texts are dealt with.

<sup>20</sup> For a further discussion, see author, forthc.; note the higher tones of the Kurus at ŚB vs. ŚBM 3.2.3.15 tasmād atrottarāhi vāg vadati Kuru-Pañcālatra; ŚBK 4.2.3.15 tasmād atrauttarāhai vāg vadatīy āhuḥ Kuru-Pañcāleṣu ca Kuru-Mahāvarṣeṣv iti. Note that the Kāṇvas do not mention the Pañcālas, probably because their territory partly overlaps that of the Pañcālas (see §4.1). - Note that pathyā svasti in ŚB and KB = North, but = East in MS; in KS, KpS, TS, AB = all directions? This is important in the context of the eastward movement of the IA tribes. JB, s.v., has no comparable sentences; cf. ann. 4 and 6.

<sup>21</sup> See note Renou, Monographies skts.I: for example, the subjunctive is rarer in KB; or subj. is found in ŚBK where ŚBM has the future in ŚBM, see Caland ŚBK, p.73. This indicates that subj. was on the way out in t h i s function, but cf., on the other hand, the large increase of the number of hypercharacterised subj. in ŚB; see below, §9.6.

occurrence of the opt. in *-īta* (AB,KB, Up.s, BŚS, other Sūtras, later language, cf.O.v.H, Überblick, § 444 ).<sup>22</sup>

\* Syntax provides some useful materials as well, especially the varying use of particles, the persistent occurrence of tmesis even in some of the later texts (Śrautasūtras: BŚS ), etc.

\* Typical expressions (phrases) and stereotype sentences again can be used as evidence, e.g., phrases like *ya evam veda: ya evaṁvidvān*, or such stereotype sentences that had become traditional by the time of the YV-Saṁhitās, like *devāś ca-asurāś ca saṁyattā āsan :: ..°ca-aspardhanta*.<sup>23</sup>

\* However, typical examples of the style of a particular Vedic text or school should be treated with caution or should be avoided. One can only study the spread of such features as a fashion among fellow speakers of a learned language, comparable to such modernisms as *chairman > chair(person)*, *user friendly*, etc. On the other hand, the sudden diffusion of a certain particle may reflect the actually spoken general language (cf. recent German also 'thus' or Dutch *dus* 'thus' at the beginning of nearly every other sentence in not so precise, colloquial speech, or Japanese (speaker's name) *desu-kedo...<keredomo* "though," in answering the telephone.<sup>24</sup>

Typical examples in Vedic are the spread of *khalu* or *svid*, or of the various combinations of (u) (ha) (vai), or phrases like *eṣā...sthiṭḥ; brahmavādino vadanti*, etc.

<sup>22</sup> So far attested at: AB 3.19.10, 3.45.7, 4.7.3, 6.21.12 (thus also in the older parts of AB!); KB 4.4, 19.10, KU 3.8, ChU 6.14.1; PrU 5.1; BŚS very frequent, BhŚS, etc.; note also *-iyuḥ* for *-īyuḥ* in AB,KB.--- Could this be an Eastern development: KB < AB < BŚS, due to the e- preterite, see O.v. Hinüber, Überblick § 445 and MSS 36 p. 39 sqq.? In that case, did one want to make a distinction of forms with e-pret. from the forms in *-ī/-i-* of the Opt.? Cf. analogical forms, O.v. Hinüber, §435: TB *sanem* instead of *saneyam*, Pāli *labhe* (cf. Renou, Gramm. Skte.§282); cf. also the confusion arising in late Vedic of forms with the augment *a-* (meaning "vorzeitig,"/ "pluperfect" value), and the other pret. forms, see below, § 5.2). - Bronkhorst, in his treatment of Śvetaketu, makes wrong use of some of these data; he simply attributes the usage of *-īta* in various texts to the same synchronic level (ĀpDhS = AB,KB!), without paying any attention to the problems of textual layers, problems of composition of the texts, redactional activity, dialect spread, and geographical distribution (AB,KB, Taitt. Sūtras: BŚS, ĀpŚS, BhŚS, etc.). Pure 'diachronic' treatment and speculation, especially with texts of unknown date and unknown authors, is fruitless.

<sup>23</sup> See author in WZKS 23.

<sup>24</sup> "this is XY, though...." which carries no meaning whatsoever, except to leave the caller, psychologically, room to state what he/she wants.

\* Finally, the occurrence of rare words and their diffusion in the various areas of Vedic Sanskrit can be studied.

Examples of all of these categories will be found in the sequel.

### § 3. DISCUSSION OF THE MATERIALS

A problem in this context is<sup>25</sup> the definition of 'dialect'. When the situation of Old Indo-Aryan is compared with that of the Old (and Middle) Iranian languages and dialects, Vedic appears to be a uniform language. It is the educated speech of the Brahmins, socially separated from popular speech, only traces of which appear since the RV in such forms as *jyotiṣ*, words with 'popular' l, etc.<sup>26</sup>

This applies especially to the post-RV texts, i.e., the Middle Vedic texts. The earliest occurrence of Middle Indian inscriptions (Aśoka +) and texts (Pāli canon +) shows that popular speech existed in various dialects, the earlier forms of which must have concurred with Vedic Sanskrit.<sup>27</sup>

Their influence can occasionally be traced (see above §1 ), yet even though some such 'popular' elements do occur, the question is: how many of them possibly can appear in the texts? Popular and local forms generally are avoided in poetry and in learned 'theological' discussions, like that of the Brāhmaṇa texts. An exception is provided, as is well known, by the two Artharvaveda Saṃhitās which contain a great number of rare or otherwise unknown words, like the names of various sorts of snakes etc., but these texts, too, have been reformulated by priestly poets.

Yet even given such influence from the more popular forms of Vedic, from other Old Indian dialects (lost to us), and from the early forms of Middle Indian occasionally visible in the texts, Vedic seemed to be too uniform, and the cases of divergence from the norm to be too few, to justify a division of Vedic Sanskrit into various dialects. Below, I will try, on the basis of examples from various categories of grammar and style mentioned above, to show that this can indeed be done.

<sup>25</sup> As has also been felt by many participants in this conference.

<sup>26</sup> Summed up O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, § 7-12.

<sup>27</sup> This has been noticed from time to time, see the summary by O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, § 7-9.

Furthermore, the comparatively great unity of Vedic Koine was reinforced continuously by the specialists of Vedic ritual, the Brahmins (cf. names like Caraka, or the wandering pupil, brahmacārin), who travelled over wide areas, like the Kuru-Pañcāla Brahmins found in the East at Janaka's court but also in the Panjab, in the Madra country. They thereby contributed to the levelling of certain dialect features, as well as to the diffusion of prestigious forms of certain areas of innovation.

In spite of this, the language of the North had a prestige of its own during the late Brāhmaṇa period; people went there to study it or liked to listen to Northern speakers.<sup>28</sup>

When variations occur in the Vedic texts, they can both reflect the locally underlying forms as well as represent such more or less widely spread prestigious forms of, e.g., the Kuru-Pañcāla or the Northern language. These features have to be distinguished from the special features of a particular Vedic school which has carried certain peculiarities of phonetic nature through its whole canon, e.g., Taittirīya súvar for 'normal' Vedic svàr, or Kapiṣṭhala yunaymi for the usual yunajmi (see below).

In order to distinguish such forms from general and 'real' Vedic ones, one has to study the tradition of the texts in question as per school, from the late Vedic period to the Middle Ages, and has, then, slowly to "peel off" the various layers of textual changes like: medieval writing mistakes (MS ñch < cch, i.e. Maitr. [t ch])<sup>29</sup>; medieval pronunciation and school habits like viṣṣṇu < viṣṇu in ŚB; influences of the Prātiśākhya and of late Vedic orthoepic diaskeuasis. Finally, one has to establish the authentic form of a text (as opposed to its original form at the time of composition of the text in question, i.e., during the Vedic period).<sup>30</sup>

In the sequel, I will try to show that there was something like a Vedic Koine, but that this "educated Sanskrit" of the Brahmin community, which they used, as it is attested for Uddālaka Āruṇi,<sup>31</sup> in their disputations, from Madra (Panjab) to Videha (Bihar), existed in many local varieties based on the various forms of Old Indo-Aryan and of the underlying Prākṛt dialects spoken in the particular area. Unfortunately, we have access to only o n e

<sup>28</sup> See KB 7.6, and cf. Thieme, Pāṇ. and the Veda.

<sup>29</sup> See Lubotsky, IJ 25

<sup>30</sup> For the doubling of consonant in ŚB, VS viṣṣṇu, ppra, etc. see Indian editions and some of the MSS; this probably goes back to Prātiśākhya influence; apparently, Uvaṭa on this topic has been misunderstood by medieval scholars.

<sup>31</sup> See ŚB 11 and BAU

testimony that does not form part of the Vedic canon and yet is closely linked to it, namely Pāṇini's grammar which records many instances of his local North-Western educated speech, the "bhāṣā," the probable predecessor of the Middle Indian Gandhārī.<sup>32</sup>

One could, however, study colloquial late Vedic as comparable to Pāṇini's bhāṣā, notably some text portions found in ChU 6.<sup>33</sup>

#### § 4. PARAMETERS

In order to achieve any meaningful progress with regard to the problem of post-RV, i.e., Middle and Late Vedic dialects, one has to take into account the parameters of time and place. The texts in question must be dated, in one way or another, by a firm relative chronology or otherwise; secondly, they have to be "put on the map" or localised. Strict separation of parameters is, of course, necessary in order to avoid circular argumentation.

The generally prevailing lack of observation concerning the area in which a certain text was composed or redacted, and the resulting lack of insight about the general geographical spread of Middle Vedic as a whole-- the communis opinio does not vouch for much more than "Northern India" or "the Kuru-Pañcāla area"-- has been another reason for the lack of understanding of the various dialects of Vedic. Without 'homelands' for the various Vedic schools, and without areas of composition or redaction of the various texts, a study of dialects and dialect geography cannot, of course, be made.

We can now proceed a few steps further, I believe, and consequently, I have tried to localise as many texts as possible (see Fel. Vol. Eggermont).

#### § 4.1. PARAMETER OF GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

By this, the geographical location of the various texts or schools is meant. As has been mentioned before, Ved)c texts have hardly been localised so far, and

---

<sup>32</sup> Note that in one case Pāṇini has a comparatively late form: 6.2.70 maireya < madireya :: \*madirā-, which even in Gandhārī would be possible only much later (see, in this volume, the article of G.Fussman). Does maireya come from another Prākṛt dialect? cf.O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p. 94 §170.

<sup>33</sup> See K.Hofmann, Aufs., and P. Tedesco, Language 19, p. 12. Note that bhal- explained by Tedesco from smar- points to non-Eastern origin of this section: there is no anaptyxis, see O.v. Hinüber, Überblick §243

the geographical data contained in them have only scarcely been studied and have even less been put to use. K.Mylius, in his studies on the ŚB and the geographical milieu of Vedic texts, is an exception. A few tentative localisations had already been made by Weber, Caland, and others.<sup>34</sup>

### SUMMARY OF LOCALISATION:

**RV** Panjab and surroundings, max. extension: Kabul River to Ganges

**PS** Western N.India, up to Kāśī (Benares)

**ŚS** Central N.India, up to Aṅga

**YV-Mantras:** their centre is Kurukṣetra: "the rivers flow west- and eastwards"

**Caraka:** an old,lost school, probably between KS,MS, Vādh, Vāj. terr.

**KS** E.Panjab/Kurukṣetra: "rivers flow westwards"; early eastward expansion, see KS 26.2:123.17; Arrian, Anabasis 5.21-22, locates the Kathaíoi in the doab of Ravi and Beas/Satlej

**KpS** dto., Megasthenes/Arrian, Indikē, 4.8 at the confluence of Ravi (and Chenab?),

**MS** Kurukṣetra, with southward expansion, see MS 4.7.9:104.14

**TS** Pañcāla country (Uttar Pradesh= U.P.)

**VSK** Kosala (E. Uttar Pradesh), probably excluding the Vatsa country between Gaṅgā and Sarayū

**VSM** Videha (N.Bihar), later also S.of the Ganges, on the Andomatis (Tons? South of Allahabad), see Arrian, Indikē 4.4

**ABo** = AB 1-5: older part: E.Panjab,"rivers flow westwards"

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Keith, TS tr. XCII, RV-Br. tr. 44 sq.; Minard, *Trois enigmes I* §549b (general movement to the East; ŚB is Eastern) sums up the earlier views of Weber, etc.; the earlier results are also summarised and compared with Pāṇini by P.Thieme, *Pāṇ. and the Veda*, p.75: N. = KS, W. = MS, S. = TS ("surely...TS was yet being read in the North"); these locations which, with the exception of TS, would be correct for the first few centuries A.D. have to be altered now, as will be mentioned below. (TS is Southern (i.e. Malva, etc.) , viz. already S.Indian in the post-Chr. era.) See especially: K.Mylius, *Geographische Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgegend des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, Wiss. Zs.K.M.Univ.Leipzig, 14/4,1969, p.759-61; *Das geographische Milieu der mittelvedischen Literatur*, Fs. Ruben (Neue Indienkunde), Berlin 1970, p.421-31. However, E. Brucker, *Die spatvedische Kulturepoche nach den Quellen der Śrauta-, Gṛhya- und Dharmasūtras. Der Siedlungsraum*. Wiesbaden 1980, treats a period too extensive to be of use here; he also includes some quite early material (AV)! Cf. now, author, *On the location of Vedic texts and Schools*, Felic. Vol. Eggermont, ed. G.Pollet, Louvain, forthc. 1987(?). Here, only the results of that investigation are presented without discussion.

**ABn = AB 6-8: later part: Videha, knowledge of the whole of N. India, even Aṅga and Kalinga, Andhra**

**AA = dto.**

**PB Kuru country near Kurukṣetra; later in the East? (recited with bhāṣika acc. until the time before Śabara)**

**KB Pañcāla contry (U.P.), cooperation with Baudhāyana (BŚS 2.5)**

**KA already knows of a Magadhavāsin Brāhmaṇa**

**TB/TA Pañcāla country**

**VādhB. Pañcāla country, on the Gaṅgā**

**BaudhB Brāhmaṇa portions of BŚS, in the Vatsa country between Gaṅgā and Sarayū**

**JB } "where the rivers flow northwards": area between Gaṅgā, the**

**JUB } Vindhya, Rajasthan desert, the sea: Matsya, Baghelkhand, Malva Eastern border unclear**

**ŚBK Kosala: W. boundary with the Kuru-Pañcālas is the "Sadānīrā", cf. ann. 6**

**ŚBM 6-10 = ŚBK 7-12, imported from the West (Śaṅḍilya country, UP?)<sup>35</sup>**

**ŚBM 11-13 < ŚBK: "7 rivers flow westw., 2 rivers eastw." ŚBM 13.8.4.2**

**ŚBM Videha: (W. boundary with Kosalas is the "Sadānīrā), see VSM!**

**GB late compilation, Anubrāhmaṇa of the lost Paipp.Br.= area of PS?**

**Up.s : same area as their schools: AitU, KU, JUB; ChU = more to the East than PB: "rivers lfow eastw. and westw."; BAUK=ŚBK, BAUM=ŚBM,**

**ĀŚS Videha**

**ŚŚS Pañcāla**

**LŚS probably in Lāṭī, S.Gujarat**

**JŚS =JB area**

**BŚS =BaudhB: in the Vatsa country between Gaṅgā and Sarayū**

**VādhŚS =VādhB: Pañcāla country on the Gaṅgā**

**BhārŚS Pañcāla country, on the Yamunā,**

**ĀpŚS Pañcāla country, opposite of the Matsya**

**HirŚS Pañcāla country, on the Gaṅgā**

**VaikhŚS a late text, probably S. Indian**

**A note on the maps:**

-----

<sup>35</sup> See Jaina texts on Saṅḍilla country which J.C. Jain, Life in ancient India as depicted in the Jain canons, Bombay 1947, locates North of Kāśī.



The boundaries of various school territories are, of course, approximate. Note, however, that the great rivers usually function as boundaries, as, for example, the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā. It is, however, important to keep in mind that the rivers have changed their courses frequently since antiquity. Especially in the Panjab and in Bihar, many rivers had a more Eastern course than nowadays. Therefore, the river (e.g., Beas) may be the same, but its actual course, and, therefore, the dialect boundary referred to in Pāṇini, would lie somewhat further towards the East. This is especially visible in Bihar; the whole of Videha should be placed a few hundred km further towards the East, as both the Kosi and the "Sadānīrā" have changed their courses considerably.<sup>36</sup>

These restrictions applied, one can, in many cases, be fairly certain about the actual boundaries of the tribes, cf. the statement of ŚB about the Sadānīrā as the boundary of the Kuru-Pañcāla and Kosala-Videha (ŚBK), viz. that of the Kosalas and Videhas (ŚBM). The territory of a Vedic school mostly coincides with that of a particular tribe; this is a point not really noticed so far. (It helps to explain the confusion in Arrian about the Indian "tribes," the Kambistoloi, Madyandinoi of the Indike and the Kathaioi of the Anabasis.) The boundaries on the maps thus are fairly authentic.

In a few cases, we simply do not know. For example, the exact boundary between the Kurus and Pañcālas cannot be established on the basis of the Vedic texts alone. Again, the boundary between the Kaṭha and the Taitt. territory is not clear at all; it should coincide more or less with the boundary between the Kuru and the Pañcāla, which in itself is unknown. The same applies to the Taitt./Vājasaneyi border; most probably it was formed by the Sadānīrā river which divided the Kuru-Pañcālas from the Kosala-Videhas (acc. to ŚBK) or the Kosalas from the Videhas (acc. to ŚBM). The river itself has not been identified with certainty.<sup>37</sup> The solution depends on which one of the ŚB versions is to be taken as authoritative. Again, the Eastern border of the Jaim. territory is unclear; probably the jungle territories of N. Madhya Pradesh should be excluded, thus a large part of the land to the South of the Ganges and to the East of the Chambal (=Hvṛṇinī?), i.e., the area inhabited by Śaphala and Cedi (modern Bundelkhaṇḍ, Baghelkhaṇḍ).

<sup>36</sup> See R.L. Singh, *India: A Regional Geography*, Varanasi 1971, 194-195; N.D. Guhati, in B.C. Law, *Mountains and Rivers*, Calcutta 1968, p.348 sqq., cf. O.v. Hinüber, *Arrian*, p. 1098.

<sup>37</sup> See R. Salomon, *Adyar Libr. Bull.* 42, 1978, p.32 sqq.; he regards the Gaṇḍakībāhu (Chotī Gaṇḍak) as the original Sadānīrā, (on the basis of the ŚBM passage)

Consequently, the "area," for example, of the Taitt. school should be regarded as its *s p h e r e o f i n f l u e n c e*, with a centre and a (more or less wide) margin surrounding it. It is important to remember, in this context, that the Brahmins travelled all over Northern India, cf. the Kuru-Pañcāla Brahmins at Janaka's court, or Uddālaka in the Madra country.

## § 4.2. PARAMETER OF TIME

By this parameter, the development of Vedic Sanskrit in time is intended, i.e. the slow change in the phonology and the grammatical forms of Vedic. The (slow) accumulation of text masses, and that of the relative chronology of texts, both of which are useful as additional arguments, are not included under this heading, as they cannot be established with the same degree of certainty. As they are, however, valuable for counter-checking the evidence, they are introduced here, be it in a brief form.

### § 4.2.1. The criterion of text formation

This criterion has been used very little so far in Vedic studies, outside of the ŚB (and AB). However, even a very brief look at the texts, which will be classified below as the level 3, the Yajurveda Saṃhitās, teaches that a number of safe conclusions can be made from a brief comparison of the contents of these texts.

All YV Saṃhitās follow a similar pattern: those (Kṛṣṇa YV) texts which mix Mantras and Brāhmaṇas usually start with the Mantras of the New and Full Moon and of the Soma rituals. One can, therefore, ask whether this is not the oldest core of YV ritual. Interestingly, the Brāhmaṇa portions dealing with these two rituals in the Saṃhitās are found only as appendices to the treatment of other rituals.<sup>38</sup>

The mantras of these texts are partly derived from the RV, i.e., before the redaction of this text; many variants, similar to those found in AV and SV, are found (see Oldenberg, Prolegomena). Other mantras, especially the short prose sentences which accompany every action in the ritual, are "new," i.e., post-Rgvedic, at least in the form they are recorded in the YV. However, they resemble each other closely enough in all schools allow to suppose a common

---

<sup>38</sup> I will treat this in detail in: *The Veda in Kashmir*, forthc.; for the time being, see author, *Das Kāṭha Āraṇyaka*, diss. Erlangen 1972, introd.; cf. already Oldenberg, *Prolegomena on the small Mantra Saṃhitās dealing with the New and Full Moon sacrifice, The Soma ritual, the Agnicayana*, etc. in TS, MS.

**origin. It can also be noted that as far as the form and the development of Mantras are concerned, the YV often forms a block opposite the two AV texts (ŚS,PS) and opposite the SV (JS, Kauth. / Rāṇ. SV); each of these Vedas forms a block of their own. Therefore, an Ur-YV, as well as Ur-AV and Ur-SV, could be reconstructed, as far as the form of the mantras is concerned. The actual contents and the order of the contents of these reconstructed texts are open to discussion.<sup>39</sup>**

**The evidence to be extracted from the development of ritual could also be used as additional evidence.**

### **§ 4.2.2. The development of ritual**

**This also is of importance for an understanding of the origins and the development of Vedic texts and schools. The post-Ṛgvedic period is characterised by the emergence and the continuing importance of the Adhvaryu priests and their texts. The myths make the Adhvaryus late-comers to the ritual; their prototype are the Aśvin.<sup>40</sup>**

**At some period following the RV, a number of Mantras from the RV and others from an unknown, separate priestly tradition were joined to form the corpus of the Adhvaryus, the main "acting" priests. Apparently, Ṛgvedic hymns had such a high prestige already that they were necessarily incorporated into the YV texts, to enhance the status of the Adhvaryu ritual. In a way, the Adhvaryus formed their own small Saṃhitās: Dārśapaurṇamāsa/Soma Saṃhitā and the rest of the rituals in separate small Saṃhitās constituting the Mantra portion of MS, KS, TS (cf. Oldenberg, Prolegomena). This goes hand in hand with the development of the Ṛgvedic hotṛ ("pouurer (of ghee)" > "reciter of Ṛgvedic hymns". All of this restructuring of post-RV ritual necessitated a complex re-arrangement of texts, rituals, and priestly functions; it took place between the end of the Ṛgvedic period and the collection of the YV Mantras, as well as the emergence of early, but lost, Brāhmaṇa-like prose texts, (see K.Hoffmann, Aufs. p.509 sqq.), and, in my opinion, in Kurukṣetra under the early Kuru kings (like Parikṣit and Janamejaya Pārikṣita).<sup>41</sup>**

<sup>39</sup> Cf. author on AV, in Prolegomena to the AV, forthc., and StII 8/9 on the Caraka texts.

<sup>40</sup> The ideology behind this myth will be treated separately; cf., for the time being, author, FS.W.Rau, esp. ann. 104.

<sup>41</sup> See author, The realm of the Kurus, forthc.

While the stage was set at that time and the YV Mantras, as well as the lost Br., were composed, the ritual developed for a long time afterwards, all through the YV Saṃhitā and the Brāhmaṇa periods. It culminated with the reformulation of all rituals in Brāhmaṇa form in ŚB and, at about the same time, in Sūtra form in BŚS.

The stages of this development can be followed; however, we know too little yet about its starting point, i.e, the Ṛgvedic ritual, and about the relative age of the various YV texts (e.g., the age of the Vājapeya section in MS, KS, TS, etc.), to allow this criterion to be used in this investigation. It will be of more use in the future for counter-checking, when the several sets of dialect traits will have been worked out.<sup>42</sup>

### § 4.2.3 The development of thought

The development of thought during the various periods of Vedic literature cannot (yet) be used as parameter; we still know too little about it. A particular idea may be early, but it may appear only in a late text, or it may be late, but has been inserted into an earlier text by the redactors. (Note some passages on punarmṛtyu, below § 8.2 .) For the time being, therefore, it will be best to use only such data that are not susceptible to later manipulation (like insertions) or to doubts as to their priority in time (like the development of certain ideas, of the ritual, etc.).<sup>43</sup>

### § 4.2.4 Absolute dates

---

<sup>42</sup> It has to be noted that a proper procedure for evaluating the growth of the classical Śrauta ritual has not evolved yet; cf., for the time being, the review of Gonda, The Mantras of the Sautrāmaṇī..., in *Kratylos* 26, 1982/3, p. 80 sqq. A better procedure would include: (1.) the establishment of the nature of RV ritual viz. of its traces in the text; (2.) a separate study of the YV Mantras, the order and contents of which is often more archaic than that of the Br. portions; (3.) a comparison of the various YV Saṃhitā prose texts with the earlier material; (4.) a study of further developments in the Br.s and the early Sūtras (VādhŚS, BŚS).

<sup>43</sup> A typical example is the idea of rebirth: is it old, Ṛgvedic, or only Upaniṣadic? Cf., for the time being, author, 31st CISHAAN, Tokyo 1983.

The absolute date of the texts remains in balance,<sup>44</sup> if we do not want to use external evidence like the Mitanni agreement of ca. 1380 B.C., which mentions the major Vedic gods, or the occurrence of iron<sup>45</sup> (first attested in AV), or the frequently discussed date of the Buddha (who died ca. 480 or 380 BC?)<sup>46</sup> and the age of the older Upaniṣads, which is usually linked to this date. (The exact date is, however, not a serious problem in the present context.) Patañjali (ca.150 B.C.) presupposes the bulk of Vedic literature, as does his predecessor, Kātyāyana, to a great extent. What Pāṇini knew of Vedic texts has already been established by P. Thieme, - without the practical indexes one can use nowadays (if one is only patient enough to do so). Even Pāṇini knows of younger Brāhmaṇas and quotes the words upaniṣad and sūtra, which are attested to in the sense of "literary genre" only in late Brāhmaṇa and Up. texts (cf. below §10.5) .

#### § 4.2.5. Relative chronology

Another way of approaching the objective parameter, 'time,' is to establish the relative chronology of the texts. This has, in fact, been attempted since the beginning of Vedic studies, and has resulted in a number of relative chronologies of the texts which are still valuable. Even the old (originally quite provisional) scheme of Max Mueller still carries some weight and is useful to some extent. He more or less followed the traditional Indian system and divided the Vedic texts into four levels, that of the Saṃhitās, Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, and Sūtras. Today, we know that this is too simplified (see below on the linguistic development). Furthermore, various texts are "misclassified" that way, even by contemporary Vedic scholars.<sup>47</sup>

Especially illustrative and worthy of mention are the following cases: most Upaniṣads are technically in fact part of the Āraṇyakas of the schools that they are attributed to, see author, JNRC I. Or, e.g., TA is a composite text

<sup>44</sup> The latest summary in: Mylius, Zur absoluten Datierung der mittelvedischen Literatur, Festschrift Ruben, Berlin 1970, p.421-31; cf. also W. Rau, Zur ind. Altertumskunde.

<sup>45</sup> Note that the first occurrence of Iron in the AV forms a date ad quem (or post quem) for the Mantras of the AV, at ca. 1150 B.C., see author, Persica 10, p.92, with ann. 122-124; for a collection of data found in Vedic texts which may be compared with archeological finds, see various works by W.Rau, all quoted in his last book on the subject, Zur ind. Altertumskunde, Akad. Mainz, Wiesbaden 1983.

<sup>46</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, summing up the discussion, § 6; see H.Bechert, The date of the Buddha reconsidered, Ind. Taur. 10, 29-36.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Gonda, The ritual Sutras, p.471, 496; cf. Minard, Trois énigmes, II §717 sqq.

with the very young TA 1 < KaṭhB, another KaṭhB piece (TA 2), some older Mantra and Brāhmaṇa chapters (TA 3-6, among which 4-5 form the actual Taitt.Ar. treating the pravargya ritual), and finally the older Upaniṣads (TA 7-9= TU 1-3) and the younger MahUp. (TA 10). Therefore, this text can neither be classified as Br. nor as Ar. nor as Up. Notably, VādhB (Anvākhyāna) is still treated as if it were part of the Śrautasūtra of this rare school (in spite of StII, p. 75 sqq.). In fact, it is a sort of Anubrāhmaṇa of the Taitt. school. To this category should be added: some parts of KaṭhB (in fragments), the Br. portions of BŚS (18), ŚŚS (a parallel of AB 7), and GB (Anubr.of the lost Paipp.Br.). MS 4 9 should be treated together with TA 4-5, ŚB 14.1-3 and KathĀ as the Āraṇyakas of these schools. Note that MS 4.9 even has some ity eke quotations! As is well known, VS agrees with ŚB only up to Ch. 25, the rest are various, partly Up.-like, additions, notably the Īśa Up. in VS 40. Here we find a YV Saṃhitā and its Upaniṣad in one "book." Note that according to Caland, parts of VS are abstracted from ŚB only.<sup>48</sup>

When speaking about such categories as "Saṃh.prose," etc., the parts of the texts mentioned above should be lined up with their proper text level. Some texts are put in the group representing the genre (BŚS in the Sūtra section rather than in the late Br. period). I list the Vedic texts in the following, up-to-date scheme.<sup>49</sup>

R̥gvedic texts

Sāmavedic texts

RV

R̥gveda Saṃhitā (Śākala)

(Bāṣkala Saṃhitā,  
Māṇḍukeya Saṃh.,  
lost)

Sāmaveda Saṃhitā

SV(K) = SV(R) SVJ

Kauthuma Rāṇāyanīya Jaiminīya  
Śākha Śākha Śākha

RVKh

R̥gveda Khilāni  
(Śākha unclear)

<sup>48</sup> See AO 10, p.132, cf. below, ann. 91

<sup>49</sup> Only a few later texts, like the many Pariśiṣtas, the later Up.s, and some Sutras are excluded from the list; the vertical order of the texts is roughly representative of the time of their composition.

perhaps Māṇḍ.)

<b>AB</b> Aitareya-Br. 1-5 old ----- 6-8 new	<b>KB</b> Kauṣītaki- Br.	<b>PB</b> Pañcaviṃśa-Br. (=Tāṇḍya-Br., Mahā-Br.) <b>ṢB</b> Ṣaḍviṃśa -Br. (=TāṇḍBr.,26)	<b>JB</b> Jaiminīya-Br.
<b>AA</b> Aitareya-Ār. contains:	<b>KA</b> Kauṣītaki- Ār. conts.:	<b>ChU</b> Chāndogya-Up.	<b>JUB</b> Jaiminīya- Upaniṣad- Brāhmaṇa, contains: Kena-Up.
<b>Ait.Up.</b> Aitareya-Up.	<b>KU</b> Kauṣ.Up.	<b>MB</b> Mantra-Brāhmaṇa	

-----  
**SŪTRAS:**                      **Maśaka-Kalpa Sūtra**  
   **Kṣudra Sūtra**

<b>AŚS</b> Āśvalāyana- Śrautasūtra	<b>ŚŚS</b> Śāṅkhāyana- Śr.S.	<b>LŚS</b> Lāṭyāyana- Śr.S.	<b>DŚS</b> Drāhyāyana- Śr.S.	<b>JŚS</b> Jaiminīya- Śr.S.
--	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

<b>AGS</b> Āśv.Gṛhya- sūtra	<b>KauṣGS</b> Śāmbavya GS	<b>ŚGS</b> GS	<b>GGs/KauthS/DGS/KhādGS</b> Gobhila- Kauthuma- Drāhyāyana- Khādira-GS	<b>JGS</b> Jaim.GS
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------	--	-----------------------

<b>VāsDhS</b> Vāsiṣṭha Dharmasūtra	<b>GautDhS</b> Gautama DhS.
--	-----------------------------------

various Pariśiṣṭas

---

Yajurvedic texts

Atharvavedic texts

MS	KS	KpS	TS	VS(M)	VS(K)	AV,ŚS	PS
Mai- trā- yañi Saṃhitā	Kaṭha- S. Kapi- ṣṭhala S.	Kaṭha-Taitti- rīya S. S.		Vājasa- saneyi Mādh- yandina S. (40= ĪśaUp)	Vāj. Kāṇva S. S.	Śaunaka S. (=vulgate)	Paippalāda S.
	KaṭhB	KpBr	TB	ŚB(M)	ŚBK		*Paipp.Br.
-no text- frag.	Kaṭha Br. one frag.	only 1-3.9 frag.	Taitt. Brāhm. TB 3.10 -12 from	Śatapatha (Kāṇva) old 1-5 Eastern 6-10 Western 11-13 add.	Śatapatha (Mādhy.) > 1- 7 = 7- 12 < 13-15		-no text-
	KaṭhB						
man- tras MS 4.9	KaṭhA Kaṭha- in Āraṇyaka MS 4.9		TA Taitt. 1-2 < KaṭhB 3-6 =Ār. ----- 7-9 = TU Taitt. Upaniṣad ----- 10 = MNU Mahānārāyaṇa-Up.	14.1-3 = Āraṇyaka ----- 14.4-9 = Up. BAUM Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad ----- 10 = MNU Mahānārāyaṇa-Up.	= 16.1-3 = 16.3-- BAUK		adopted <----GB Gopatha Br. mostly adopted from other Br.texts (Praṇava Up = GB 1.1-16-30 is post-Pāṇinean, as such later than KauśS)
-----							
MŚS Mānava Śrauta Sūtra Vārāha Śr.S.	VārŚS (almost compl. lost)	*KaṭhŚS Baudhā- yana Śr.S.	BŚS Vādh. Bh. vāja ŚS Vādhūla ŚrS (uned.)	Bh. Bhārad- vāja ŚS Āpastamba ŚrS	Āp. Hi- raṇya- keśiŚrS. Vaikhānasa ŚrS (very late)	VkhŚS KŚS Kātyā- yana ŚrS	VaitS *ĀgŚS- Āgastya ŚrS (lost) Vaitāna S.



MGS VārGS KGS/LGS BGS \*VādhGS BhGS ĀpGS HGS VkhGS PGS  
/ĀgGS

Mān.Vār -Gṛhya śūtra	Kaṭha/ Laugākṣi- GS	Baudh.Vādh. GS	ĀgGS GS	Bhār. Āp. Sūtra GS	GS	Hir. GS	Vaikh. GS	Pāraskara GS
----------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------------	----	------------	--------------	-----------------

KauśS \*PaithGS  
(probably  
surviving  
in Orissa)

*Mānava- Dharma Sūtra	*Kaṭh. DhS	Baudh. DhS	Āp DhS	Vaikhanasa DhS
-----------------------------	---------------	---------------	-----------	-------------------

Manu- Smṛti Various	Viṣṇu- Smṛti Pariśiṣṭas	Vādhūla- Smṛti	Yājñavalkya- Smṛti	Sumantu- DhS (frag.)
---------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------

---

#### LATE UPANIṢADS:

MU Maitr. - Upaniṣad Up.	KU Kaṭha- Up.	MNU Mahānārāyaṇa- Up.	IU Īśa- Up.	various AV-Up.s Prašna, Māṇḍ.- etc. Up.s
--------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	--

---

#### § 4.3. LINGUISTICALLY ATTESTED LEVELS OF VEDIC

Only a thorough interpretation of the linguistic changes which occur in the bulk of Vedic literature will provide an independent system of checking the data gained from internal/relative chronology. Such an investigation results in at least five levels of development of the Vedic language.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>50</sup> See J. Narten, Sprache 14, p.115., ann. 13; cf. K. Hoffmann, Aufs., Index s.v. Vedisch: Chronologisches (p.702); Minard, Trois enigmes, on textual chron.: I, §231 (gen.-ai, vāva);

### § 4.3.1. ṚGVEDA

The Ṛgvedic language stands apart from the following stages in many respects, and is perhaps better characterised as the last stage of a long period of Indo-Aryan poetry than as the beginning of Vedic literature. Many words that occur in RV have cognates or direct correspondences in Avesta, while these no longer appear in post-Ṛgvedic texts. Another point of interest is the development of the so-called cerebrals, the retroflex sounds, which abound in book 8 but are rare in books 3, 4, and 5. A chronology of the various Ṛgvedic books has been attempted by W. Wüst and others; most valuable, again, will be an evaluation of the linguistic data, such as the frequency of the injunctive which disappears quickly in post-Ṛgvedic texts.<sup>51</sup>

Other observations agree with a gradual linguistic change and the appearance of innovations within the various books (see below, § 5.4 on -toḥ). The appearance of the verb forms *kuru*, *karoti* for normal Ṛgvedic *kr̥ṇu*, *kr̥ṇoti*, for example, is such an innovation. From the AV onwards, *kr̥ṇoti*, *kr̥ṇumaḥ* is only found in older, RV Mantras, while the texts themselves use *karoti*, *kurmaḥ*. Not insignificantly, the allegro forms *kur-*, *kar-* are used in colloquial speech or by the wives of the gods, even in the RV itself.<sup>52</sup>

### § 4.3.2. MANTRA LANGUAGE.

This level includes the Mantras (in verse) and the prose texts of the Atharvaveda (PS,ŚS), the Ṛgvedakhilāni (RVKh), the SāmavedaSamhitā (= RV, including some 75 new Mantras), and the Mantras of the Yajurveda (both verse and prose). These texts constitute a separate type of Vedic, largely unstudied and unrecognised as a distinct entity. These texts have come down in part from the RV, but have been altered considerably during

---

§ 597b (subjunctive acc. to Renou); cf. also, author, WZKS 24, p. 22-26 and Fel.Vol.Eggermont.

<sup>51</sup> See in general, Wackernagel, Ai. Gr.I and Renou, introd. gen. with additions; - K.Hoffmann's statistics, Injunktiv, which closely agree with the results of Wüst (who had based himself on quite different data). According to both, the books of the Ṛgveda are arranged in this way:

W.Wüst (see below,§5.4): 9 4| 3,5,7| 2,6| 8 10

K.Hoffmann, Inj., p. 36: 4-6-2-1-7-5-10-3-9-8.

Arnold, Vedic Metre, p.16 sqq. cf. p.48, has a somewhat differing estimate of the age of the books; this is based, however, on a development (partly, supposed) of the Vedic metre only (see p. 19 sqq.).

<sup>52</sup> For the various forms of the verb *kr̥*, see K.Hoffmann, Aufs.575.

the period of the "free floating" mantra tradition, either by gradual linguistic change, unnoticed by the transmitters, or by misunderstanding and subsequent re-interpretation (perseveration). In the AV, the YV, and the SV, the Mantras have first been collected and gradually codified by a process of orthoepic diaskeuasis. They have lead a life of their own, conserving a particular fixed form within the tradition of a particular Vedic school. Sometimes parts of such texts were taken over by other schools, and then changed according to their requirements of ritual, etc. In such cases, the texts were partly changed according to the peculiarities of the new school, and partly not at all.

The Mantras may differ considerably from the surrounding text<sup>53</sup> which, in the YV Saṃhitās, belongs already to the next level, to that of Saṃhitā prose. This type of language, which is first found at AV (ŚS 15, PS(Or) 18,27-43) and in the Nivids and Praiṣas of the RVKh, is the oldest Indian prose; it is characterised by a number of developments which separate it from the language of the RV by a considerable margin of style and also of time, the exact extent of which is still unknown. RV 1o already shows some developments (kuru for kṛṇu, the many sorcery hymns, etc.) which link it to the AV; these developments, however, had taken place completely by the time of the AV and YV Mantras. The loss of a whole catagory of the verb system, that of the injunctive, is apparent in the AV and YV Mantras. In AV, only some 50 forms<sup>54</sup> still show a contemporary, 'living' use of this category. The same applies to the allegro forms of kṛ; only the "popular" forms (karomi, kurmaḥ, etc.) are found in non-RV contexts.<sup>55</sup> A shibboleth is the replacement of viśva-- "all" by "sarva" which now comes to mean both "whole" and "all."

### § 4.3.3. SAṂHITĀ-PROSE.

This type of Vedic is again separated from Mantra type Vedic by a number of developments. Again, a certain amount of time was necessary to effect this change. During this intervening period, the first prose texts explaining the ritual were composed, but they have not come down to us, except for some rare fragments.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Oldenberg, ZDMG 42, p. 246, cf. Keith, TS transl. p. CLIX sqq.

<sup>54</sup> See K.Hoffmann, Injunktiv, p. 36, 106

<sup>55</sup> See K. Hoffmann, Aufs. p. 575 sqq.

<sup>56</sup> See K.Hoffmann, Der Mantra yan navam ait, Aufs. p.509 sqq. and cf. the contents of the lost Caraka-Saṃhitā, StII 8/9 which predated MS,KS.

Thus, while the Mantras had already reached a shaky equilibrium and a certain sanctity, their explanations were developed gradually, to be collected and codified at first in the extant YV Saṃhitās. There they take the form of Brāhmaṇa style explanations and discussions (which are not to be confused with the Brāhmaṇas, the next level of texts). The developments which characterise the YV-Saṃh.s are: the complete loss of the injunctive as a living category; the modi of the aorist (subjunctive, optative, imperative) disappear; of those, only the inj. with mā and the precative remain.<sup>57</sup> Another innovation is the development of periphrastic aorist forms, both for the aor. ind. as, very rarely, for the aor. precative. These forms were so curious to Pāṇini that he made a list of those he knew from the Vedic texts current in his time and his area of North-Western India.<sup>58</sup>

The many tales occurring in the YV-Saṃh.s are told in the imperfect only. The imperfect expresses, as it is well known, the past action longer separated from the time of the narrator, while the aor. expresses the immediate past (just as taught by Pāṇini, 3.2110 sqq.).

#### § 4.3.4. BRĀHMAṆA PROSE.

This level of texts comprises the Brāhmaṇas proper, i.e., those of the RV, YV, SV and AV. Actually, it should be divided into two sub-levels, that of the earlier and that of the later Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand, the older Upaniṣads (like BAU, ChU, JUB) should be included here, as well as the Vādhūla-Anvākhyānas and some of the oldest Śrauta Sūtras, like Baudhāyana, Vādhūla, and parts of the ŚŚS and JSS. The exact classification of all of these texts is still a problem, one which has largely been unnoticed.

One should, perhaps, establish yet another sub-level for the Anu-Brāhmaṇas. Among these are the Vādh.Br (Anvākhyāna), the Gopatha-Br. (as Anubr. of the lost Paipp.Br.), and the later parts of the KaṭhB, which has come down to us only in fragments.

Typical for the Brāhmaṇa level of texts is the complete loss of the periphrastic aorist, interesting in view of Pāṇini's (relative) date. Compounds like yat-kāma- "having a particular wish" occur for the first time, and adverbs like sāyam "in the evening" are used as a base to form new

<sup>57</sup> No modi of aor., only precative: K.Hoffmann, Aufs., p.469, 502, 587.

<sup>58</sup> On the periphr. aor., see K.Hoffmann, p. 469 ann. 5; Pāṇ.'s collection is important for his date post quem, for he lived after the period of the YV Saṃh.prose; for his lower limit, see below, ann. 102, 358.

ones in other case forms: *sāyāt, sāye*.<sup>59</sup> In another late Br. text, *ŚB*, a large number of the so-called hyper-characterised subjunctives occur.<sup>60</sup> Finally, some of the later portions of the older Upaniṣads (ChU 6) show the considerable influence of a more popular form of spoken Sanskrit.<sup>61</sup>

### § 4.3.5 SŪTRA LANGUAGE

This last level of Vedic comprises the bulk of the Śrauta and Gr̥hya Sūtras. In some of them, the content rather than the language is Vedic. The Upaniṣads that are later than BAU, ChU, JUB, KauṣU, TU, AitU also belong here (i.e., texts like the Kaṭh U, Maitr.U, etc.). Late Up.s (of Sectarian origin) have to be excluded, of course, since they are definitely post-Vedic.<sup>62</sup>

The change from late Vedic to early classical Sanskrit must be investigated separately, as well as the similar forms occurring in Epic Sanskrit. What language did the authors of the Sūtras have in mind? Certainly, the grammar of these texts has been 'corrected' later on, to some extent, according to Pāṇini's rules, as these texts were regarded only as the work of human authors, as Smṛti, in opposition to the revealed texts, Śruti; however, even some earlier forms of Vedic, e.g., RV Sandhi, were changed by later redactors. - Some of the Upaniṣads, like the famous Kaṭhopaniṣad, exhibit a larger number of forms based on Middle Vedic, like a pronunciation [bhoti] for bhavati, as the metre indicates.

### § 4.3.6 EPIC, PĀṆINEAN SKT., OTHER DIALECTS

Finally, after the last level of Vedic, there is Epic Sanskrit, with its loss of the subjunctive, the complete breakdown of the Vedic verb system, etc.<sup>63</sup> Its

<sup>59</sup> On *yatkāma-*, see K.Hoffmann, Aufs.133 sq.; on *sāyam*, p.344, ann. 2.

<sup>60</sup> See K. Hoffmann, Aufs. p. 30-31, and cf. the investigation by L. Renou, Monogr. Skt.; for *ŚB*, cf. also Minard, Trois enigmes I § 2, who sums up the "stylistic/linguistic differences" of its 14 books.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. P. Tedesco Lg.19, p. 12 sqq.: *smāryase > (ni.)bhālayase*.

<sup>62</sup> For the Muṇḍ.Up., see R. Salomon, WZKS 25,1981, p. 91 sqq.; and the same, in another article of the present volume. Cf. also Epic forms like *vṛṇute < vṛṇoti* in later Up.s: KU, MaṇḍU, ŚvetU, see J.Narten, Sprache 14, p.127. Cf. further the Vedic viz. post-Vedic features in four newly publ. Up.s: N. Tsuji in Fs. Belvalkar.

<sup>63</sup> See Holtzmann's gramm. investigation of the Mahābhārata and K. Meenakshi, Epic Syntax. New Delhi (Mehar Chand) 1983, pp.XI, 231; cf. Review of H.H. Hock in IJ (forthcoming).

relationship to Pāṇini's Sanskrit (especially his local dialect, bhāṣā), as well as to that of early Classical Sanskrit, and to the various types of Vedic language that were enumerated above, remains open. A probable link between Classical Sanskrit, Epic, and Vedic could be sought in the language of the so-called Yajñagāthās found in texts like AB and ŚB.<sup>64</sup>

They differ from Vedic in many ways. First of all, their different character is known to the Vedic texts themselves. For example, at AB 7.18, the priests answer to Śruti stanzas used in the Rājāsūya with om̐, but with tathā after a non-Śruti stanza. The content of the many Yajñagāthās is a historical one; they tell about the deeds of kings who had offered the Aśvamedha sacrifice, etc. In this regard, they look like predecessors of the Epic, especially when they speak about the Pārikṣitas.

Both in their type of metre (Anuṣṭubh/Śloka), as well as in content, they stand apart from Vedic texts, but were, nevertheless, incorporated into the Vedic canon. Secondly, their position with regard to the Pāṇinean grammar has to be investigated: how do they compare with Pāṇini's bhāṣā? Regarding this local, educated form of Sanskrit, one can expect, prima facie, a North-Western dialect which is the same or similar to the language of the North praised by such texts as KB 7.6. A closer study reveals that his bhāṣā is a highly archaic, isolated language which is still very close to Vedic.<sup>65</sup> It is isolated from the rest of Northern India by the Panjab, which even at that time was desert-like, certainly more than the modern well-irrigated Panjab, cf. the various histories of Alexander's campaign. It was inhabited by-- apparently-- fierce tribes (cf. the Malloi, Oxydrakai, etc.), who were regarded by the Vedic Indians of the Kuru-Pañcāla land as "Bāhika"<sup>66</sup> -- 'outsiders'.<sup>67</sup> Still, while isolated, Pāṇini knows of the peculiarities of the Central and Eastern forms of Skt., and quotes Eastern grammarians; he is much better informed, however, about the particularities of the dialects of his area and the

<sup>64</sup> See P. Horsch, Die ved. Gāthā- u. Ślokaliteratur, Bern 1966; cf. Renou, Histoire de la langue Skt., p. 38 and Fs. Weller, p. 528 sqq.(cf. ann. 357).

<sup>65</sup> See P.Thieme, Pāṇ. and the Veda, p.76, cf. p.17, 80.

<sup>66</sup> Patañjali calls them gau-: "The Bāhika is an ox," see A.Wezler, Paribhāṣā, p.248 sq.; cf. StII 10, p.234; this nickname may have been derived from the designation of one of the Panjabi neighbours of the Kurus, the Mahāvṛṣa ( note vṛṣa 'bull'; cf. the name of the main wife of the king mahiṣī).

<sup>67</sup> Such names are revealing. Note that the West is bāhika, the East asurya (ŚB), the SE with its Muṇḍa tribes is udantya "foreign," the South has the foreign looking tribe Maraṭa (PS; cf. Kīkaṭa already in RV); the extreme North (Himalayas) is inhabited by the Kirāta. The Kuru-Pañcālas form the Centre. Cf. also the Majjh.Nikāya on such border peoples like the Yona, Kamboja, tr. p. 149.

immediate surrounding dialects, cf. for example, his remark on the names of wells (!) North of the Beas!<sup>68</sup>

His bhāṣā as the (Northern) language of the learned can be expected to be similar to that of the bards who composed the Yajñagāthās; this is certainly so as far as Sandhi is concerned, but not so in flexion. Pāṇini still knows the subjunctive, and the precativ with almost Ṛgvedic forms, while the later Brāhmaṇas and Yajñagāthās do not.<sup>69</sup>

#### § 4.3.7 THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION IN MIDDLE/LATE VEDIC:

The overall linguistic situation, therefore, might have looked like this during the late Vedic period:

UDĪCYA	MADHYAMĀ DIŚ	PRĀCYA
--------	--------------	--------

---

NORTH(WEST):	WEST:	CENTRE (and SOUTH):	EAST:
--------------	-------	---------------------	-------

antiquated

high/ (Ṛ g v e d a )

literary

Skt. M a n t r a l a n g u a g e : AV,SV,RVKh,YV mantras)

contem-

porary Middle/Late V e d i c d i a l e c t s

high/lit.

Skt. (YV Saṃhitā prose/ Brāhmaṇas/ Upaniṣads / Early Sūtras)

educ. Pāṇ.'s

Skt. Bhāṣā colloquial Vedic of ChU & other dialogues

(later, Patañjali, Mahābhāṣya)

"B a r d i c" S k t. of (yajña-) G ā t h ā s

\*B a r d i c S k t. of (pre-) Epic

<sup>68</sup> Pāṇ. 4.2.74, see P.Thieme, Pāṇ.and the Veda, p. 77.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. on KB 7.6 and the language of the North, see P.Thieme, Pāṇ. and the Veda p.80; cf. the comments on the Yajñagāthās by Renou, Fs. Weller, p. 534: partly non-Vedic, partly non-Pāṇinean.

pop.  
speech

P r ā k ṛ t d i a l e c t s

Varṇu Panjab:	Kurukṣetra:	Pañcala:	Eastern: he 'lavo =
dial. Bhava=	nyubja,	kuṣā (=darbha)	"Asurya" speech, Śarva
Rudra	auśānasa		= Rudra

---

non- I.A. lg.s	W: IRANIAN: Kamboja ~Y.Avestan	N: K i r ā t a lg.s (early Tib.-Burm.?) SW: Kīkaṭa, Niṣāda (cf. Nahalī substrates!)	SE: M u ṇ ḍ a (Puṇḍra, Kaliṅga...)
	W: DRAVIDIAN: ~Brahui	S: D r a v i d i a n lg.s (Andhra, etc.)	

---

The exact source(s) of "Classical Sanskrit" remain(s) open. It can be suspected that it is based on the Bardic language, akin to that of the Yajñagāthās, with influences from the Colloquial/Educated Skt. of late Vedic, resulting in something like the language of Patañjali, ca. 150 B.C. To approach a solution, the Gāthā language, the Epic, and the educated speech of Patañjali would have to be compared thoroughly.

Against this background sketched so far, we can now begin to observe and register some of the divergencies in the Middle Vedic texts. I largely refrain from dealing with the Ṛgvedic evidence as this text is clearly much older and also geographically limited to the Panjab and its immediate surroundings. A Mantra text like the AV knows of the N. Indian plains of the doab/ U.P.; Mantra language in general still have as their centre the area "where the rivers flow westwards and eastwards," i.e., the Kuru country on the Beas, Sarasvatī and the Yamunā (see Fel. Vol. Eggermont).

The following investigation first deals with a few typical divergencies found in the various texts which tend to establish a dialect pattern (§ 5-6); then more cases typically distinguishing one text or school from another are adduced (§ 6-7), and this is enlarged upon by the study of some individual words, and by additional materials taken from syntax and style. Finally, the relationship of Vedic dialects with the early Prākṛts is investigated (§9).



\*\*\*\*\*

## § 5 ESTABLISHING A PATTERN

### §5.0. Introduction

In the preceding paragraphs, the various parameters necessary for this study have been discussed at length. The aim of the following sections will be to trace, with the help of a few lucid examples, the outlines of the various Vedic dialectal areas, of some of their peculiarities, as well as their mutual influence upon each other. This treatment will include a brief study of the developments in time and space of several of these dialects. It will be seen that certain dialectal traits are found only in a small area in earlier texts, but in a much wider area in later texts; in short, the material indicates the typical case of a consistent diffusion of dialect features from one or more centres of innovation to adjacent areas.

This presupposes that (a) there are centres of innovation, and (b) that such innovation spreads to other areas. In dialect studies, such a claim is, of course, readily accepted, but in the general context of linguistic variations in Vedic, it has yet to be proved. Therefore, I will proceed here in the following way:

First of all, I will try to show that certain peculiarities are to be found only in some Vedic texts, i.e., in a certain geographical area only (see the maps).

Secondly, some of these typical deviations from "normal" Vedic show up in other areas, in a following linguistic level, and then, usually, in areas adjacent to the original area of this peculiarity. This means, of course, that the particular innovation has spread further, beyond its original home.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> There are, however, some curious developments, which do not fit this straightforward pattern. Usually the Kāṇvas do not agree with their immediate (Western or Eastern) neighbours, but form a "bloc de résistance" that agrees with the Westernmost schools (KS, etc.). Often it will be seen that certain developments or changes have "jumped" the central Taitt. area and reappear with the Kāṇvas; for more on this topic, see below, *passim*. - Cf. the problem of the spread of certain dialect features only within one or sometimes two Vedas, with the exclusion of the scholas of other Vedas occupying the same territory, see §10.2, end.

### A note on the size of the texts:

-----

A calculation of the size of the various texts has been made in akṣaras, on the basis of a few typical pages per text, and taking into account the relation of prose :: verses;<sup>71</sup> in a second stage, the size of the various Vedic texts has been compared in percentage to that of the RV which is set at 100%:

---

RV <sup>72</sup>	397.265 akṣaras	RV = 100 %
ŚS	176.389	ŚS = 44.44 %
PS	274.560	PS = 69.11 %
MS	392.619	MS = 98.83 %
KS	337.808	KS = 85.03 %
TS	281.569	TS = 70.87 %

---

<sup>71</sup> Some of the texts that have been printed interspersed with commentary only (like TA, TB) have been difficult to calculate. Also, the exact relation of Mantras :: prose is difficult to estimate. The percentages given here should therefore be taken with caution; it will be better to rely, for the moment, on the absolute figures of occurrences of a particular phenomenon; the exact percentages will have to be recalculated once a computer data base of the various Vedic texts is available, and exact figures can be obtained more easily.

<sup>72</sup> Note the various new abbreviations introduced here for the convenience of distinguishing various levels of texts:

PSk = PS calculated here acc. to ed. Raghu Vira, i.e. without some parts of PS 18 (Yama hymns).

MSp + MS Saṃhitā prose (different from Mantra portions)

KSa = Aśvamedha portion of KS (book V, perhaps < TS)

ABo = AB older part: 1-5

ABn = AB newer part: 6-8

TBk = TB, Kāṭhaka portion: TB 3.10-12

TAk = TA, Kāṭhaka portion: TA 1-2

JBa = JB, Agnihotra portion: JB 1.1-65, younger than the rest

JBc = JB in ed. Caland (Auswahl)

ŚBMo = older portion: ŚBM 1-5

ŚBKo = older portion: ŚBK 1-7

ŚBMw = Western (Śaṅḍilya) portion: ŚBM 6-10

ŚBMn = newer portion (originally < ŚBK): ŚBM 11-13

ŚBMa = Āraṇyaka portion: ŚBM 14.1-3

ŚBMu = Upaniṣad portion: ŚBM 14.4-9

VādhB = Brāhmaṇa (Anvākhyāna) portions of the so-called Vādhūla Sūtra, which actually consist of at least two separate texts, the VādhB and the actual VādhŚS, see StII 1, p. 75 sqq.

BŚSb = Brāhmaṇa portion of BŚS= book 18 (and some section in 17); ŚŚSb + Br. portions = 15.17-27, occasionally Br. portions in other ŚS, too (not used here).

VSM 96.120 VSM= 24.19 %  
 VSK 94.231 VSK= 23.71 %

AB 137.413 AB = 34.59 %  
 ABo 1-5: 92.002 ABo= 23.15 %  
 ABn 6-8: 45.411 ABn= 11.43 %  
 AA 29.896 AA = 7.52 %  
 KB 112.320 KB = 28.27 %

@KA

TB 285.474 TB = 72.10 %  
 TBk 26.918 TBk= 6.77 %  
 TA 207.658? TA = 52.27 %?  
 TA 1-6: 169.470? TA1-6:42.65 %?

ŚBM 608.800 ŚB = 153.23 %

<book 1: 95 pp. 6: 70.5 11: 54  
 2: 67 7: 54 12: 54.5  
 3: 105.5 8: 61 13: 52  
 4: 77 9: 52.5 14.1-3: 27.5  
 5: 58 10: 50 14.4-9: 63 pp. >

ŚBKo 1-7: 278.888 ŚBKo 1-7 70.20 %

ŚBMo 1-5: 260.337 ŚBMo 65.53 %  
 ŚBMw 6-10 186.116 ŚBMw 46.84 %  
 <ŚBM 10 32.331 ŚBM 10 8.13 % >  
 ŚBMn 11-13 103.811 ŚBMn 26.12 %  
 ŚBMa 14.1-3 17.787 ŚBMa 4.47 %  
 ŚBMu (BAU) 40.787 BAUM 10.26 %  
 ŚBKu (BAU 67.144 BAUK 16.90 %

JB 430.920 JB 108.47 %  
 JBc 87.127 JBc 20.41 %  
 JBa 1.1-65: 24.360 JBa 6.13 %  
 PB 130.124 PB 32.75 %

ChU 65.296 ChU 16.43 %  
 JUB 63.448 JUB 15.97 %

---

### §5.1. The spread of the gen.fem.sg. in -ai:

It is well known<sup>73</sup> that in Brāhmaṇa texts the gen./abl. sg. of fem. nouns in -ā, -ī is not formed with -(ā)yāḥ but in -(ā)yai, viz. of -i not in -eḥ but -ai.

The reason for this development does not so much seem to be based on a shift in syntactical usage, e.g., because the Gen. takes dative function<sup>74</sup> (Speyer, Ved.Syntax, § 71),<sup>75</sup> but rather, the homonym form will be due to a collapse of forms into a homonym shape under certain Sandhi conditions.

**Sandhi forms:** The last sounds of the endings are, respectively:

	-ā	-ī		-i
gen./abl. °ās + vowel	> āy + V <sup>76</sup> :	-āyās -yās		-es
dat. °ai + vowel	> āy + V :	-āyai -yai		-aye <sup>77</sup>

While this trait is usually thought to be limited to the Brāhmaṇa texts, and to occur first in TS,<sup>78</sup> the first few traces of this development can already be found in the Mantras of a few Saṃhitā texts.<sup>79</sup> In fact, the first two instances of a gen. asyai occur in the AV (Śaun.); AV 3.25.6 and 4.5.6 have this form in all available MSS, while the corresponding passages, PS 4.6.6 and RV 7.55.5, have sarve. Is this a late change, affecting only AVŚ? One can compare also RVKh 2.6.18, a (later) appendix to the older part of the Śrīsūkta; see Scheftelowitz, RVKhil., p. 78.

<sup>73</sup> See Caland, On a paragraph of Vaidic Syntax, AO 5,1926, p. 49-51; he does not, however, regard this peculiarity as having chronological value, cf. tr. PB p.XIX; see in detail, Wack.-Debr.III, §15d,p.39; p.135; §68 a.; p.150 §75a; Caland, Über BSS p.45; Oertel KZ 63, p.206; cf. Whitney, Skt.Gram., § 364d, 307h,336g,363c; McDonnell, Ved. Gr. for Students, p.88, ann.2, p.89, ann.1; Bloomfield, Ved. Var. III, p. 57 (cf. 61-62); Keith, TS introd. p.145; Minard, Trois enigmes I, §231a; "no chron. value"; also O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p.150 §334. The same applies, of course, to the u-stems which are not taken into account here: see Wack.Debr.,Ai.Gr. p.150 §75; dhenoḥ ŚBK 4.1.2.12, but dhenvai ŚBM 3.1.2.21; also of fem. stems in -ū: vadhvai in ĀpMP, see Ved. Var.III §144; cf. Wack.-Debr.III 1 §97 sq

<sup>74</sup> For abl. fem. -ās in dative function, see Edgerton, Ved.Var.III 39-40, §15d in mantras; Oertel KZ 63,206: PB 18.5.9 prajāyāḥ; ŚB 14.9.4.18 = BAUK 6.4.19 itarasyaḥ; in KS, MS rarely -ās as dative.

<sup>75</sup> asya is often used "as instr.": Speijer, Ved. Syntax, §69 asya bhavati, JB 1.46.1 asya spaṣṭam syāt, ŚB 6.2.2.39 tad asya-atrāptam bhavati.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Wack.I, §338, §285 b,A); for the older Sandhi with -y-, see below §6.7.

<sup>77</sup> Note also that, for ex., the i-stems never use -aye as gen./abl.

<sup>78</sup> By Brāhmaṇa, most scholars erroneously or, at least, vaguely, intend the Brāhmaṇa (prose) sections of the YV Saṃhitās (level 3) and the Brāhmaṇas proper (level 4).

<sup>79</sup> Materials (complete for the older texts?) in Wack-Debr., Ai Gr., III, 1 p. 40 §15.

In addition to these stray findings, the first group of cases occurs in another Mantra text, namely in the Mantras of TS, the text of a central North Indian school, of level 2 but not in the parallel versions of MS, KS; TS 1.1.13.3 reads (note -ai for the abl., pā with abl.): pāhī prāsityai / dúriṣṭyai / duradmanyái / dúscaritād, but KS 1.12 and KpS 1.12 read praśityāḥ, duriṣṭyāḥ, duradmanyāḥ; MS 1.1.13 lacks the mantra.<sup>80</sup>

While MS is somewhat older than KS, this Saṃhitā generally does not agree with TS in the usage of -ai; KS, in fact, participates only in the late book V, the Aśvamedha chapters, which Bhavde regards as having been taken over from the Taitt. school in a wholesale fashion.<sup>81</sup>

Interestingly, such forms also occur in the Padapāṭha of the Ṛgveda at 3.53.20: dative á avasái á, for Saṃhitāpāṭha gen. á avasā á, and vice versa, dative -yai understood as gen. -yāḥ in: vadhrimatyá a° at 1.117.24, and viśpālāyā a° at 1.118.8. The Padapāṭha is generally thought to have been composed by Śākalya, during the later Brāhmaṇa period.<sup>82</sup>

This distribution of the evidence thus leads to the surmise that these forms are indeed later intrusions into the Mantra texts, with the exception of the Taitt. texts, as will be seen presently. In the next two text levels, that of YV Saṃh. prose (lv.3) and Brāhmaṇa prose (lv.4), the evidence clearly points toward the Taittirīyas as the originators, or at least as the centre of the diffusion of this phenomenon.

The case of AB is more complicated. It is well known that books 6-8 of this text are later. However, the distribution of -ai vs. -āḥ does not completely agree with these divisions. Aufrecht, ed. AB, p.427, mentions: -ai in the younger books 7.27, 8.2, add: 8.15, but also twice in the older books where one would not expect the form: at 1.27, 4.27. On the other hand, the Western form in -āḥ appears, as expected, in the Western books 1.9, 1.23, 3.14, 4.10, but also in the Eastern books 6.3, 6.32, 7.27. (For an explanation, see below.)

<sup>80</sup> The older texts, like KS, etc., have -ās: KS 1.12:7.20, and in the parallel passage, MS. - Cf. -yai in: TB 3.3.9.9, VS 2.20, ŚBM 1.9.9.20. - The list of cases of (-a)yāi of ā and ī stems, viz. -yai of i stems, provided for TS by Keith, TS tr. p. CXLV sq. contains, upon checking, no example from a Mantra portion.

<sup>81</sup> See his dissertation, Die Yajus des Asvamedha, Bonn, p. 55 sq.; cf. Edgerton, Ved. Var. §143: KSa ādityai pājasyam < TS.

<sup>82</sup> Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p.380 sq., 491 sq., 510; see below, on this person, ann.97. Note the same tendency as in RV Pp. to use -ai for the gen. in the Padapāṭha of MS, see Ved. Var. III §152, which may be indicative of an earlier date than usually assumed for this text; also in TS-pp., see Keith, TS transl., p. CXLV.

On the whole, the picture is as follows:

Forms in:	-ai	-(āy)āḥ
v.3: TS: 15		MS,KS (KS Aśv.-ai 1x) <sup>83</sup>
lv.4: AB: partly (see above)	AB (partly)	
KB	-ai	
TB,TA	-ai	
VādhB	-ai <sup>84</sup>	
BŚS	-ai <sup>85</sup>	
BhŚS	-ai <sup>86</sup>	
ĀpŚS	-ai <sup>87</sup>	
JB	-ai	
JŚS	-ai <sup>88</sup>	
		ŚBM,VSM: ŚBK,VSK -āḥ <sup>89</sup>
PB (once 1.5.3 not < KpS)	PB	
ChU (mixed) <sup>90</sup>		

By way of exception, the case of the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā must be mentioned separately. Here the distribution is as follows: VSM -ai 20x VSK -āḥ in all cases. The Kāṇvas align themselves here, for the first time, with the more Western dialects represented by MS, KS, and PB. A note of caution must be voiced, however. The evidence for VS seems to point to a Mantra time usage of -ai forms in VSM. However, Caland<sup>91</sup> has indicated that VS may have received its final redaction no earlier than the time of ŚB; at least a part of VS was actually extracted from ŚB.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>83</sup> In ādityai pājasvam, see Ved. Var. III §143; MS has -āḥ in the same Mantra; note that Bhava, Die Yajus des Aśvamedha, holds that KSa stems from TS.

<sup>84</sup> For example, 4 §28b dikṣāyāi, etc.

<sup>85</sup> For example: etasyai 2.11; see Caland, Über BŚS, p. 45: etasyai, chāgāyāi etc.; abl.: uttarāyāi śroneḥ, etc.

<sup>86</sup> See Kashikar, ed. BhŚS, p. LX.

<sup>87</sup> See Garbe, ed. ĀpŚS III, p. VI, cf. Keith, tr. TS p. CXLVI.

<sup>88</sup> See Gaastra, ed. JŚS, p. 26.

<sup>89</sup> Caland, ed. ŚBK, introd. p.37: dhenvoḥ ŚBK, dhenvai ŚBM; cf. ann. 91

<sup>90</sup> For example, 4.17.8 asyāḥ... vidyāyā, 3.1.2 tasyai; for the Up., see Fürst, KZ 47, 14 sqq.

<sup>91</sup> Caland, AO 10, 132 sq., see ann. 48.

<sup>92</sup> On a few divergent Kāṇva forms in -ai see Edgerton, Ved.Var.III, §137 sqq.

Therefore, the occurrence of -ai forms in VSM, which at first glance seems to be early, may in fact only be due to the redaction of the text. This can show the way to an understanding of the few occurrences in the Padapāṭha and AVŚ as well; the Śaunaka version of the Atharvaveda has a more Eastern homeland than the Paippalāda text.<sup>93</sup> ŚS may very well have been influenced by the Taitt. forms predominant in Central N. India (Pañcāla country).<sup>94</sup>

The cases in Śākalya's Padapāṭha of the Ṛgveda and in AB may find a similar explanation. The older portions of AB (1-5) were composed in the West, in an area close to that of the Kaṭha, "where the rivers flow westwards most copiously." This portion contains a reference to the Śākala ritual at 3.43. The younger portion of AB, however, indicates a very close connection with the East and even with the SE non-Indo-Aryan tribes, like the Puṇḍra, etc. Śākalya must belong to the late Br. period, i.e., to the time of the composition of AB 6-8, as his mention in ŚB 11 and 14 indicates. Śākalya, a member of the group of Aitareyin ritualists (called Śākala at AB 3.43), and King Janaka's Hotṛ, Aśvala, who has given his name to the Śrautasūtra of this school, the ĀsvŚS, were prominent Ṛgvedins of this school in the East.<sup>95</sup>

It can be seen that the sudden appearance and predominance of the Aitareya Ṛgvedins in the East replaces an older Eastern RV. That this Eastern text was a reality is evident from the statement of ŚB 11.5.1.10 about the Purūravas hymn having only 15 stanzas, as opposed to the extant Śākala version with 18.

The residence of Śākalya in the East, at King Janaka's court in Videha, makes it possible that the Central/Eastern forms of the Taitt./Vāj. have influenced Śākalya's grammar just as they apparently have intruded into AB 6-8 and, at the time of redaction, even two times into AB 1-5.<sup>96</sup>

Apparently, the RV was redacted, and the Padapāṭha was composed, by Śākalya (and his school, the Aitareyins) during the late Br. period in Eastern India. We must return to this interesting person later on.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>93</sup> See Fel. Vol. Eggermont.

<sup>94</sup> Or by the few divergent Kāṇva forms if they indeed are as early as the redaction of ŚS.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. the Saggala of the Greeks, see author, Fel. Vol. Eggermont; Śākala ritual at AB 3.43; for Pāli Assalāyana, cf. Mylius, Fs. Ruben.

<sup>96</sup> See ann. 222.

<sup>97</sup> In this connection, note that Pāṇini knows of the Eastern grammarians and of Śākalya, but also about the Vṛji, later on a confederation of Videha tribes otherwise first known in the Pāli sources (as Vajji/Vṛjji). The Vṛji (sic 4.2.131) of Pāṇ.'s time, however, still seem to reside in the Panjab, as they are mentioned together with the Madra, see below, ann. 320.

If this is correct, then the 2 forms in -ai in the e a r l y part of AB have to be explained as redactional tampering. The occurrences in AB 6-8 do not surprise, as this part of the text was already composed in Eastern India. That an intrusion of later forms into AB 1-5 is due to redactional changes, made while/after assembling and collecting the whole text, may be indicated also by the fact that AB has a few forms of the optative in -īya of -a verbs, which otherwise constitute a late development (see below).

The result of this investigation may be summarised as follows:

1. The origin and first emergence of the gen. fem. in -ai instead of -āyāḥ occurred with the Taittirīyas. This took place as early as the late Mantra period, and is clearly evident in the Saṃhitā prose of TS.<sup>98</sup>
2. A diffusion of this particularity to some neighbouring schools occurred at a comparatively later period. KS Aśv. is late, post Saṃhitā; RV-Padapāṭha is a late Br. creation; the few cases of AVŚ may be late intrusions into the text.
3. The phenomenon spread to whole dialect areas only during the Brāhmaṇa period:
  - Eastwards to the Mādhyandina Vājasaneyins
  - To the Southeast, to the Baudhāyana school of the Taitt.
  - Southwards to the Jaiminīyas
4. Not all neighbouring areas are affected. Notably, the Kāṇvas form a pièce de résistance between the Central Taittirīyas and the more Eastern Mādhyandina.

Secondly, the Baudhāyanas are of interest. Caland has pointed out that Bodhayana (or Baudhayana) had originally been a Kāṇva, who later became a Taittirīya, and subsequently the first Sūtrakāra. If this is true, he must also

<sup>98</sup> Note that Pāṇini knows of Tittiri as promulgator of mantras (\*tena proktam, 4.3.101 sq.), but does not mention the fem. gen. in -ai. As usual in his grammar, this could either mean that he did not know of the gen. in -ai, i.e., it had not yet developed at all, and that the occurrences in the Mantras of TS are due to later changes, or it could mean that Pāṇini did not accept these forms as good (Vedic) Sanskrit. He certainly should have mentioned the earlier occurrences in the older part of AB, as he knew the text, and it was composed and transmitted near the Beas, an area where P. even teaches the names of wells! - The forms in -ai therefore are most probably post-Pāṇinean - at least in AB (TS may be a different case altogether, see above) -, and were introduced into AB 1-5 only at the time of redaction of the text in E.India.



have changed this dialect.<sup>99</sup> We know that even a Kosala prince should not speak like the Easterners (see above §1); in the case of Bodhāyana, this would mean that a Brahmin from Kosala should also emulate the speech of the Kuru-Pañcāla Brahmins, in this case, that of the Pañcāla Taittirīyas.<sup>100</sup>

While the origin and the spread of the gen.in -ai<sup>101</sup> is a good example of the influence of a centrally located innovative area, the following case, that of the spread of the narrative perfect, is a late phenomenon that began in the East and subsequently moved westwards very haltingly, so that it did not reach Pāṇini at all, but still affected, in late Vedic, the Western Kaṭha and Maitr. texts.<sup>102</sup>

### §5.2. The spread of the narrative perfect:<sup>103</sup>

Since Whitney's investigation<sup>104</sup> into the use of the imperfect and perfect in the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, we know that the older texts, i.e., the Yajurveda Saṃhitās and some of the Brāhmaṇas, use the imperfect to tell stories, legends, etc., a feature corresponding to Pāṇini's rules (3.2.110 sqq.). However, the younger Brāhmaṇas, especially the ŚB, tell such stories in the perfect tense.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Note: precisely as he had to codify both the Taitt. and the Vāj. material, or at least had to compare and reconcile them.

<sup>100</sup> Or rather, his disciples and redactors used this dialect. BŚS often quotes Baudhāyana; this means, of course, that the text was redacted by his pupils viz. his school of ritual.

<sup>101</sup> Earlier scholars were not convinced that -ai could be used for purposes of dating the texts, see, Caland, tr. PB, p. XIX, ann.1 "no criterion of posterity or priority" [of PB vs. JB]; cf. AO 5, p.51; similarly on the use of the imperfect vs. perfect, PB tr. p. XX; cf. Renou, above ann. 12.

<sup>102</sup> Note: This is important for Pāṇini's date! He cannot be of the late KaṭhB period; cf. ann. 358.

<sup>103</sup> See Delbrück, impf. + vai, perf. + ha, see also Oldenberg, Prosa; Keith, AA transl. p.60, 172.

<sup>104</sup> Whitney, PAOS May 1891 (JAOS 15), and: On the narrative use of imperfect and perfect in the Brāhmaṇas, TAPA 23, pp. 5-34; Keith, introd. to transl. of TS, RV Br., AA.

<sup>105</sup> The older texts (MS, KS, KpS, TS, TB, TA, AB 1-5; ŚB 6-10, KaṭhB) have preserved the use of the imperfect, while the younger texts make use of the perfect (ChU, BAU, ŚB 1-5, 11-14; AB 6-8; Vādh.B., as well as a few very late portions in such texts as the KaṭhB = TB 3.10.11). Cf. Keith, transl. of TS, p. CLIII sq., transl. of Ṛgveda-Br., p. 85 sqq.; Oldenberg, Zur Geschichte der altindischen Prosa. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der prosaisch-poetischen Erzählung. Abh. d. Kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Gött., Phil.-Hist.Kl.Bd.XV Nro.6, Berlin 1917, p.25 ssq.

Ratio of imperf./perf. acc. to Whitney:<sup>106</sup>

MS 2237

35

KS (unedited  
at the time,  
similar to MS)TS 1900  
27ŚBMo(1-5) 1107<sup>107</sup>  
941-----  
(6-9) 1504 }

TBk 1426 148 } 1823

25 (10) 319 } 254

106 }

-----  
TAK & 5 (11) 198 }

136 258 }

4 (12) 123 } 453

ABO(1-5)

KB 263 65 } 349

929 149 (13) 132 }

27 26 }

KāṭhB JB 4998 (14) 250  
(TBk,TAk)<sup>108</sup> 1145 (a,u)<sup>109</sup> 337  
JUB 544  
200ChU 72 VādhB 51 ch. impf. ABn 151  
319<sup>110</sup> 19 ch. perf. (6-8) 239<sup>106</sup> Cf. Keith, tr. TS, p. XCVII, CI, CII, and RV Br., p.86.<sup>107</sup> Caland, ed. ŚBK, p. 70, counts 205 perfects in ŚBK where ŚBM has impf.; and 77 impf. in ŚBK where ŚBM has perf. Altogether, the Kāṇva books (1-7) have 1265 perf., as against 993 imp. in the corresponding Mādhy. books (1-5). Cf. also Minard, Enigmes I, § 118, 168b, 441c; II, §140, 163b, 180, 717, 147b, 474a.<sup>108</sup> Note that KāṭhB (in Kāṭhakaśaṃkalanam, ed. Sūrya Kanta, Lahore 1943, repr. Delhi) generally still uses the impf. as narr. tense, as does KāṭhA; it is only these late chapters (dealing with some special forms of the Agnicayana) which employ the narr. perf.<sup>109</sup> The ratio would be higher if the Up. (BAU) would have been counted separately; note, however, that even the Ar. (ŚB 14.1-3) already employs the narr. perf.



Taken at face value, these statistics seem to indicate that a number of texts, namely PB, TS, MS,<sup>113</sup> the older AB (1-5), and even the Brāhmaṇa texts of the Taittirīyas (TB, TĀ), have virtually no narrative perfects.<sup>114</sup>

Obviously there has been a linguistic development; imperfect has been replaced by perfect. This probably developed from the normal usage of the perfect, e.g., stating the outcome of an event/action: "this has happened/been done," i.e., "now it is like this or that." Note especially the use of the perfect in such sentences as "XY has said the following," in MS, KS (see above).<sup>115</sup>

Oldenberg, (Prosa, p. 25 sqq.) pointed out the use of the perfect in narrative prose in combination with the particle ha. This agrees with one of the functions of the perfect, namely to state facts, and with the occurrence of the perfect in texts otherwise relating in the past tense (MS, KS, TS). He believes (ann. 2) that the change to a usage relating in the perfect tense had its origin in a wish to indicate, during a narration, the (present) r e s u l t of one action, or, in fact, one after another (which required the perfect in the YV Saṃhitās).<sup>116</sup>

Notably, all of these texts which use the imperfect in narrative sequences are of a clearly Western origin, except for TS-TB-TĀ, which stem from the central area (Pañcāla). Interestingly, ŚB 6-10, i.e., books which have been known, since Weber's investigation in middle of the last century, to have been imported from a more Western area to Eastern India, show a very low percentage of perfects as well, especially when compared to the Eastern books 1-5.

The Eastern parts of ŚB clearly constitute the area of the usage of the narrative perfect. However, the nearly equal distribution of perfects and imperfects in the earlier books of ŚBM (1-5) indicates that even these texts

<sup>113</sup> KS unfortunately has not been counted, but judging from experience, I think that KS comes very close to MS/TS cf. the perfects: 31.2 :3.8 tad u ha smāhur Dārteyāḥ <> MS 4.1.3:5.4, KpS 47.2; KS 32.2:20.19 atha ha smāha Kapivano Bhauvāyanaḥ; KS 25.7:112.7 atha ha smāha-Argalaḥ Kāhoḍiḥ (cf. Kahoda); KS 26.10:135.3 atha ha smāha Āruṇa Aupaveśiḥ; KS 34.17:47.2 etad dha vā uvāca Vāsiṣṭhaḥ; KS 26.9, end: uvāca Śyāparṇas Sāyakāyano 'ṣaḍham Kaiśinam...(The Kuntis conquer the Pañcālas).

<sup>114</sup> I quote part of the following section from my article in the Fs. U. Schneider.

<sup>115</sup> Unless one wants to be especially archaic, cf. the development of the use of tenses in recent modern German. While the brothers Grimm, adapting folktales, still use, together with North (Low) German and Dutch the past tense actively, colloquial modern High German largely avoids this tense and uses perfect instead.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Oldenberg, Prosa, p. 27 ann. 2, on the preference for sa hovāca, te hocuḥ, etc.; cf. Delbrück, Syntax: impf. + vai; Whitney, TAPA 23.

were composed on the basis of an earlier version using the imperfect. It was only by the time of the assembly of the materials and the actual composition of this Brāhmaṇa (during the late Br. period), that the usual narrative tense became the perfect, at least in the East.

Yet the use of the perfect can be found in the Centre as well. KB, a text of the Pañcālas, and closely related in ritual to the Baudhāyanas, shows the perfect prominently, though a little less in degree (56%) when compared to the typically Eastern books 1-5 of ŚB (85%). It is interesting to note, however, that although KB contains more or less the same material as AB 1-5, albeit in reformulated form (a situation similar to the relationship of MS/KS:TS, PB:JB, etc.), it differs greatly in its use of the perfect from the older parts of AB.<sup>117</sup>

If one therefore surmises an origin of the narrative perfect in the East at the time of the Brāhmaṇa prose (level 4), then it is obvious that this usage had spread to the Central area by the time of the late Brāhmaṇa (KB), and had also heavily affected an originally Central, and subsequently Southern, text, JB, which varies to a great extent in the use of the narrative tenses.

It must be noted here that JB is based on a mostly lost text, Śātyāyana Br., which was composed in the (Kuru-) Pañcāla area.<sup>118</sup> Some indications of an originally Central, rather than Southern, location of JB are:

- It has both the traditional formulas about the contest<sup>119</sup> of the gods and the Asuras (devāś cāsurāś ca saṃyattā āsan / āsuḥ :: aspardhanta/ paspṛdhire).
- It fluctuates in the use of the tenses of narration.<sup>120</sup>
- It prefers (Central) ha (vai) to (Eastern) u hai vai; but there are cases of u ha vai as well.
- It shows the (early) Central (and late Eastern) genitive fem. in -ai.
- It has the (late) North-Western and Eastern Central ḷ- for -ḍ- (RV of Śākalya's time,

<sup>117</sup> Why is there a difference between TB, TĀ, and KB, although they belong to the same geographical area? Was the formulation of KB late, like VādhB, or are Taitt. texts intentionally traditional, cf., the use of suvar instead of svar, etc., see Kuiper IIJ 30.1 and § 6.5; see the summary on this and related topics, below §10.2 .

<sup>118</sup> See Festschr. Eggermont; cf. Caland, tr. PB, p. XVIII: "Perhaps the original Śātyāyanaka... was taken over by the Jaiminīyas...."

<sup>119</sup> See author in Festschrift U. Schneider, Freiburg 1987 and Fel. Vol.Eggermont.

<sup>120</sup> Caland, in: Over en uit het JB, p. 20; similarly, Oldenberg on the Brāhmaṇas as a 7hole, Prosa p.27: "bald werden bestimmter(e) oder unbestimmter(e) Motivierungen der Tempuswahl sichtbar, bald verschwimmt alles." See already Whitney, TAPA 23, summary

AB, KS, KpS, JS, JB, VSK, ŚBK, see below § 6.3).

All of these features taken together make JB a very interesting text, both from a literary as well as from a linguistic viewpoint, but this has not really been noticed as yet. Indeed, there are many cases in JB where even stock phrases like "the gods and the Asuras were in conflict / contested," are related in the perfect tense; in other cases, the impf. has been retained. This later overlay resulted in an almost irregular usage of the perfect/imperfect.<sup>121</sup> The figure for JB is: 23.41 % of perfects compared to impf., which places this text, as expected for an originally Central, now Southern text, between ŚBMw (14%), and the late KaṭhB (28%); note that a later text of the Jaim. school, their Ar./Up., JUB, has already 36% of perf., while the Central KB has 56% and the Ar./Up. of the Kauth., ChU, has an unprecedented 443% (which makes it either very late or points to a composition in the (Central) Eastern area; note the supposed movement of parts of the Kauth. towards Videha.)<sup>122</sup>

That the visualisation of the westward and southward diffusion of the narrative perfect is indeed correct is proved by the further expansion of this usage. It is only the v e r y late Brāhmaṇa/Upaniṣad texts of areas that had not been affected earlier that take over this phenomenon. In the Kaṭha school, it is found only in the (late) parts of KaṭhB, i.e., those preserved in TB 3.10 (the so-called Kāṭhaka section).<sup>123</sup> Furthermore, it is found in the Upaniṣad-like Sāmaveda texts, ChU and JUB, in such late Brāhmaṇas as that of the Vādhūlas (the Anvākyānas), in the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Sūtras (BŚS and ŚŚS), in the composite version of MU, in KaṭhB, and lastly, and most extraordinarily, in the later part of the Aitareya Br. (AB 6-8).

This text requires further discussion. It has long been known that the original AB contained only pañcikās 1-5, and that the rest, AB 6-8, (note the name 'pañcikā!') is a later addition. These chapters deal with materials not contained in the parallel text, KB, i.e., the rituals concerning the king, like the "coronation" ( the unction ceremonies of the Rājasūya and Abhiṣeka) and the duties of the royal priest (purohita). Also, the geographical horizon of AB 6-8 is much wider than that of AB 1-5, which clearly was composed in the West, in the Kurukṣetra area.

<sup>121</sup> Interchange impf. ⇔ perf is studied, in some detail by Whitney, TAPA 23; cf. further, author, Fs.W.Rau; AB 2.1 āyaṃs, abibhyur KB 6.15; JB 1.42 (Varuṇa speaks), see Bodewitz, tr.JB 1.1-65, p.108, ann. 22 (Oertel).

<sup>122</sup> But see ChU bhal- from smar which points to a Western/Central origin of this passage, see above, ann.33.

<sup>123</sup> Note that especially those chapters of KaṭhB that deal with the late Br. concept of a second death, punarmṛtyu, are affected; see below, § 8.2 !

If one compares this with such details as the prominence of the Aśvala Hotṛ at Janaka's court (in BĀU, ŚB), the emergence of the Āśvalāyana Sūtra in the East (cf. the Pāli texts on Assalāyana), or the detailed knowledge in the later AB of the udantya tribes (Śabara and other Muṇḍa peoples),<sup>124</sup> it is evident that this portion of the text was composed in Eastern India.

If all of this is correct, the extraordinary percentage of narrative perfects-- 1.5 times that of the imperfects-- is not surprising. The Eastern Aitareyins have adjusted to Eastern dialect features and have, in this respect, followed the lead of the Vājasaneyins in their later books.

While the diffusion of the narrative perfect had reached the Western territories of the Kaṭha school by the time of the late Brāhmaṇas, this development largely excluded such Western texts as the comparatively late PB (0.76 %, but KaṭhB > TBk 28.9 %) and did not reach Pāṇini's bhāṣā (in the extreme North-West).

The exceptional position of PB is surprising. It has been mentioned already that this text is a very brief, short-hand summary of the Brāhmaṇa teaching of the Sāmavedins. When PB is compared with JB, the same relationship surfaces as that between the short-hand version of tales and discussions in TS versus the longer, detailed ones in MS/KS. When judging the nature of PB, one can therefore suspect that PB is a comparatively later text, a reformulation made on the basis of older material (as preserved in JB). Unfortunately, one cannot support this with independent textual evidence, as older materials of the Kauthuma/Rāṇāyanīya school of the Sāmaveda do not survive.

However, grammar is again an impartial judge. There are a number of clearly late forms to be found in PB which show beyond doubt that PB is very young when compared to the rest of the Brāhmaṇa texts.<sup>125</sup>

The use of the imperfect in PB therefore must be a mannerism of the Kauthumas; they apparently wanted to preserve the old-fashioned narrative

<sup>124</sup> Note that these tribes are, for the first time, made part of an Indo-Aryan realm; in the Śunaḥṣepa story of AB 8.18, this is expressed in the guise of their origin as sons of the Ṛṣi Viśvāmitra. Though they still are looked down upon, their inclusion into the power base of the Magadha kingdom would agree with the politics of the future empire.

<sup>125</sup> Pers. pronoun yuvām, etc. for Vedic yuvam, see Caland, introd. PB.XX; Wack.III.2 p. 463, Aufrecht, AB, p.428, Caland, Over en uit het JB, p.16 sqq. Further material, below §6.6

style of their Brāhmaṇa, just as the Taittirīyas did in their Āraṇyaka. But they did not or could not pay attention to such small details as the correct length of vowels in pronouns (nom. avam / acc. avām, etc.) and let the younger forms slip in.<sup>126</sup>

Lastly, it must be noted that although the spread of the narrative perfect has reached the Kaṭha and Maitr. schools at the time of the composition of their latest texts (parts of KaṭhB, MU, and quite surprisingly, ChU), this usage has not made the 'jump' over the Bāhīka territory of the Panjab; Pāṇini still teaches the older Vedic use of tenses (3.2.11o sqq.).<sup>127</sup>

In short, what becomes noticeable is a continuum of usages of the narrative imperfect and perfect, stretching from the easternmost texts to the westernmost of Pāṇini. The centre of innovation and subsequent diffusion of the narrative perfect clearly lies in the East; at the time of the Saṃhitās (MS, KS, TS), there is no evidence for its use in this function, and the older Brāhmaṇas do not show it (AB 1-5; TB). By the time of the later Brāhmaṇas, however, the spread has set in: ŚB, TB 3.10, KB, JB, KaṭhB, MU, etc. The extreme North-West (Pāṇ.) is not reached.<sup>128</sup>

To sum up the evidence in percentages (rounded off):

Use of the perfect in:

	Western texts	Central	E.Centre	Eastern
--	---------------	---------	----------	---------

---

early:	(KS) <sup>129</sup>			
(Saṃh. level 3)	MS 1 %		TS 1 %	

<sup>126</sup> Such as dugdhe, tanūm etc., see Caland tr. PB. p. XIX sq. and cf. below § 6.6. Note that Caland, again, does not regard the use of the impf. vs. perf. as a useful criterion for establishing the priority of JB vs. PB, see tr. PB, p. XX; he was hindered, however, by the usual handicap of Vedic scholars, namely their lack of knowledge on the geographical localisation of the texts and an only limited view of the various levels of Vedic language, see above ann. 12.

<sup>127</sup> See above § 5.2; note that Oldenberg, Prosa, p.25, saw a progressive development in the use of the perfect in narration from TS - AB 1-5 - (parts of) ŚB .

<sup>128</sup> The usage of the narrative perfect goes together with that of the particle ha, see Oldenberg, Prosa, ann. 105.

<sup>129</sup> Unfortunately, countings for the Kaṭhas and Kāṇvas (but cf. Caland, ed. ŚBK, p. 70 sq.; see below, ann. 107), Vādh., Baudh. etc. are still missing.



early Brāhm. (lv.4)	ABo 3 %	TB 2 %		
		(TĀ 3 %)		
later Br.,		JB 23 %		
		JUB 29 %		
Up.s,		KB 56 %	ŚBw 14 %	
			ŚBKo 153 %?	ŚBo 85 %
				ŚBn 77 %
early Sūtras (lv.4)			VādhB mixed	
			BŚS "	
		ŚŚS		ŚBa/u 134%
	KaṭhB 36%			ABn 158%
	PB < 1%			
	ChU 443%		(ChU 443 %)	

---

\*\*\*

It must also be mentioned that there is, in some later Vedic texts, some confusion in the use of the perf./impf. This indicates that the authors/redactors were not entirely sure any more about the use of both tenses. This is most typical for JB, but it also occurs in texts like ŚBM and ŚBK. Several theories have been advanced to explain the apparent confusion. A detailed discussion can be found in the Festschr. U. Schneider.<sup>130</sup>

Whitney (TAPA 23, p.19 sqq.) stressed the fact that speeches relating something about the past which are inserted into a story told in the perfect, usually (though not without exception) use the impf. (ŚB, JB, etc.). Caland thought that JB exhibits a 'hierarchical' or 'mythological' imperfect which was used in order to relate happenings in the mythical past, while those of a more recent (pseudo-) historical past were to be told in the perfect. (Caland, Over en uit het JB, p.20.)

Oldenberg (Prosa, p.25 sq.) observed that the imperfect is used when the speaker wants to recall a personal remembrance. In my opinion, most if not all such cases can be subsumed under a category "pluperfect" meaning (vorzeitig), as has first been observed by Caland: He noticed that ŚB (K, M) shows signs of confusion in the usage of the aor. and the perfect, see intr. ed.

<sup>130</sup> In the rest of this section, I again quote from the notes of my article contributed to the Fs. U. Schneider, which deal with the frame story of the Cyavana legend in JB and ŚB.

ŚBK, p. 71 sqq., p.70 sqq., with this interesting observation on the functions of tenses in ŚBK: original use in ŚB of the impf., found at the end of a tale told in the perf., "in pluperfect meaning." However, this "still requires special investigation."<sup>131</sup>

In my opinion, this comes close to the use of the impf. in JB; a mythological, hierarchical (or historical) past is intended. It is summed up in impf.: "this or that had happened at that time...." However, even this assumption does not explain all the usages of the impf. in JB. We have to reckon with the retention of an older usage of a narrative imperfect in parts of the text. The older formulation made at the time of the composition of the Śāṭyāyana Br., which preceded JB, has survived frequently, so that in some stories there is a gradual "slip" towards the perfect, and a sudden reversion to the imperfect in other parts of the same story; see, for example, the Cyavana legend of JB.<sup>132</sup>

The later destiny of the various past tenses can be summed up briefly.<sup>133</sup> The development is connected with the emergence of the post-Vedic Epic and "classical" Skt. (other than Pāṇini's North-Eastern bhāṣā). It is known that Epic / Class. Skt. did not directly develop from (a particular) Vedic dialect, but that various regional features were intermingled.

In this case, the Eastern feature (typical is ŚBM, AB 6-8), with an opposition aorist : perfect, is fused with the Central/Western one (TB, AB 1-5) with a retention of the older opposition aorist : imperfect : perfect, and the Southern one (JB) with a new opposition aor. : perf.<sup>134</sup>

Probably this development in later Vedic and in Epic/Class. Skt. is only the effect of a complete restructuring of the tense system which took place at the same time in popular speech, i.e., Prākṛt.<sup>135</sup> The beginnings of this restructuring are visible in the YV Saṃhitās (loss of the modi of the aor. and

<sup>131</sup> See Whitney, TAPA 23 p.25-26, Minard I §168 b note 471a.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. author in: Fs. U. Schneider, cf. also Whitney, TAPA 23, p. 22 with examples of such "slips" in ŚB 12.9.3.7 sqq.; - cf. also the conditional in Pāli; and some missing augments in AB, KB, see Keith, RV Br. p. 74; on the other hand, some unwarranted augments are inserted in other texts, cf. C. Caillat, Fs. Schneider, cf. ann. 290; cf. further, van Daalen, Valmīki's Sanskrit, p. 83 sq.; S.K. Bharadwaj, Ling. Stud. in the DhS, Rohtak 1982, p. 122; Satyavrat, The Rāmāyaṇa, a linguistic study, Delhi 1964, p. 223 sq.; E.D. Kulkarni, ABORI 24, p. 83-97.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. the notes in my article in the Festschr. U. Schneider.

<sup>134</sup> JB, however, has many instances of the impf. for ancient legends or for the summing up of an ancient happening/distant personal remembrance.

<sup>135</sup> For this purpose, the grammar of the so-called Yajñgāthās should be scrutinised. How far do they differ from the later Epic and from Pāṇini?

development of the precative); the aor. as one of the past tenses develops, in Saṃhitā Prose, a periphrastical aor. (see K.Hoffmann, Aufs. 469, ann. 6), which then disappears in the Brāhmaṇas.

At this moment, actual restructuring of the use of the past tenses sets in (see above). A distinction is made between the value of the augmented forms (impf., aor., conditional) in "pluperfect meaning" (vorzeitig) and the unaugmented forms (perf., pres., future, subj., opt., imp.).<sup>136</sup>

The effects of this development are to be seen clearly by the time of early Middle Indian. Subsequently, the perf. is found only in a few remnant forms of Pāli; it has almost disappeared in Middle Indian. The impf. is extinct, except for a few remnants in Pāli which have been classified with the aorists.<sup>137</sup> In a situation where both the perfect and impf. tenses disappear, it is not surprising that the aor.<sup>138</sup> has survived in Middle Indian, i.e., in Pāli, (more rarely in A.-Mg. and in a few cases in J.-Māh.)<sup>139</sup>

In late Vedic, the aorist had retained its function, i.e., relating something that has happened immediately before the present. Apparently it also relates (the effect of) a recent happening leading up to the present; see, for example, ŚB 1.4.1.8-19: aśakata or ŚB 1.4.10-18, ŚBK 2.3.4.8-15: the conversation between Videgha and Gotama, which recapitulates their journey in the aorist. Is this an indication that, in the East, personal experiences, whether recent or not, could be told in the aorist? (Cf. also Weller, Śunaḥśepa, Ber.d. Sachs. Akad., Bd. 102.3, p. 72). Contrast this with the opposite situation in some Vedic texts and in Pāli (pers. experience in impf., past events in aor.), according to Oldenberg, Prosa, p.25. Perhaps this, too, was a regional feature at the time of the late Brāhmaṇas. This, however, can only be decided after careful study of similar occurrence.

### §5.3 The use of narrative perfect in traditional formulas

<sup>136</sup> Note that there is no functional distinction between augmented and unaugmented forms in Pāli, but that this is a remnant of older forms only, regulated acc. to the length of the form and its origin in one of the aor. types; but cf. now C. Caillat, in Fs. U. Schneider, see above ann. 132.

<sup>137</sup> āsīt > āsī, see O.v. Hinüber, Überblick §479; cf. also Oldenberg, Prosa, p. 25 ann. 2, who compares a similar distribution for Pāli: avoca (relating an event of the past) / avaca (personal remembrance).

<sup>138</sup> Which even in late Vedic is mainly used in a preterite function (i.e., to tell recent events), and thus separate from impf/perf.

<sup>139</sup> O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p.192 § 477-488, esp. § 478.

The results of the last section can now be counter-checked with the evidence provided by some of the formulaic sentences so frequently found in the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, notably, the standard phrase: "The gods and the Asuras were in contest...."

This means that materials are discussed now which could be understood as a mere matter of style. It will be seen, however, that even in such traditional formulas, the gradual development of the Vedic language asserts itself. These sentences provide useful indications as to the tenacity of the hieratic language of the Brahmins on one hand, and the general changes in Old Indo-Aryan and the underlying Middle Indo-Aryan (Prākṛt) on the other.

The use of the perfect tense in narrative passages during the late Brāhmaṇa period affected even the traditional sentence, "The gods and the Asuras were in contest," which begins so many tales. It is found in the following versions: devāś cāsurāś ca aspr̥dhanta/saṃyattā āsan:: ... paspr̥dhire, saṃyattā āsuḥ<sup>140</sup>

This phrase occurs in the oldest Saṃhitā texts (MS, KS, TS), and there it is invariably told in the imperfect, which is normal for narrative passages in these early texts. However, there is a slight difference in style; MS uses the old Indo-European word spr̥dh,<sup>141</sup> while KS and TS use sam.yat, lit. "to form a line (as in battle)."<sup>142</sup>

MS: devāś cāsurāś cāspr̥dhanta  
 KS: devāś cāsurāś ca saṃyattā āsan  
 TS: " " " " "

Later texts change even this standard phrase to perfect tense:

ŚBMo 1-5 devāś cāsurāś ca paspr̥dhire  
 n 11-14 " " "  
 KB devāś cāsurāś ca saṃyattā āsur  
 ABn 6-8 " " " saṃyettire

<sup>140</sup> Note that other school particularities of style are retained as far as word usage is concerned, see below, §§ 7-8.

<sup>141</sup> Engl. sport, German (sich) spurten, cf. in Iranian, GAv. spərəd Y 53.4

<sup>142</sup> Note the case in the Saṃh., where the gods search for the hidden Agni. They take each others' hands, form a 'police line'; see P.Thieme, Mon. Nyberg, 431 sqq.: "to take a firm position".

It is interesting to note that the late Aitareyins (AB 6-8) have retained their school particularity of style, the idiom *sam.yat*, and have not followed the Eastern style of using *spr̥dh*. On the other hand, however, they have conformed with later linguistic development, namely the characteristic use of the narrative perfect, and have changed the tense of the sentence accordingly. In order to underline the identity of their school, retention of such special features as the use of *sam.yat* was necessary, but the change to perfect was probably involuntary and automatic. In the present context, it is important to note that standard phrases were used time and again to begin telling newly reformulated myths or newly invented stories about the gods; these stories, though following the old pattern, were constantly changed to suit the discussion intended, or to fit the demonstration of a particular point of ritual.

The remainder of the texts agree with this scheme in a way parallel to the general use of tenses, described in the last section. In the following table, the typical phrases are given:<sup>143</sup>

Western texts	Central	E. Centre	Eastern
<b>SAM.YAT/SPRDH</b>	<b>SAM.YAT</b>		<b>SPRDH</b>
early KS <i>saṁyattā āsan</i> Saṁh. MS <i>asphardanta</i>	TS <i>saṁyattā āsan</i>		
early ABo <i>saṁyattā āsan</i> Brāhm.	TB <i>saṁyattā āsan</i> (in TBk!) TĀ <i>saṁyattā āsan</i>		
later Br. & Up.s early Sūtras	KB <i>saṁ<sup>o</sup> āsuḥ</i>  JB mixed VādhB "		ŚBKo <i>asphardanta</i> ŚBMw <i>asphardanta</i> ŚBMo <i>pasphṛdire</i> ŚBMn <i>pasphṛdire</i>
	BŚS " ŚŚS <i>pasphṛdire</i> ChU -		ŚBu <i>pasphṛdhire</i>
KaṭhB mixed PB <i>saṁyattā āsan/</i> <i>asphardanta</i>			ABn <i>saṁyētire</i>

<sup>143</sup> For the distribution of *sam.yat* and *spr̥dh*, see S.Lévy, *Doctrine du sacrifice*, p. 44, ann. 1, with partial references.

---

<b>note JB:</b>	<b>VādhB:</b>
saṃyattā āsan	saṃyattā āsan
asphardanta	saṃyetre
saṃyetre	
pasphṛdire	

---

The absolute number of cases of sam.yat vs. spr̥dh is given below before the abbreviation of the text, followed by the number of cases of impf. vs. perf.

---

s.y/sp. i./p.

---

early: 16/4 KS 20/0 15/4 TS 19/0  
 Saṃh. 5/20 MS 25/0

early 6/3 AB 7/2  
 Brāhm. 4/2 ABo 6/0 14/2 TB 16/0

later 1/1 KB 2/0  
 1/25 ŚBKo 26/0

Brāhṇ., 0/16 ŚBMo 1/15

8/36 JB 44/0 0/ 5 ŚBMw 5/0

Up.s, 3/ 2 JUB 4/1 1/ 6 ŚBMn 6/1  
 0/ 2 ŚBMu 2/0

early VādhB 51/14<sup>144</sup>  
 Sūtras 2/ 1 BŚSb 0/3<sup>145</sup>

ChU 3/10

KaṭhB 6/7

(= TBk)

0/7 PB 7/0

1/3 ŚB 4/0

MU 3/ 0<sup>146</sup>

2/1 ABn 1/2

---

<sup>144</sup> The figures of VādhB do not refer to the absolute number of cases but to the number of stories/sections; of these 14 stories using the perfect, 3 are dealing with the gods; 51 stories use the impf., 5 have mixed tenses. The relation of sam.yat/spr̥dh is not counted here.

<sup>145</sup> In BŚS 18.22-49, where many stories are found (3 means number of stories with perf.).

While the two preceding investigations, that into the gen. fem. in -ai and the one into the diffusion of the narrative perfect, were confined to the post-Ṛgvedic texts, the following sections allow one to trace the development of certain particular features back to the Ṛgveda, as well as down to the latest levels of Vedic language and texts.

#### §5.4 Infinitives in -toḥ

The infinitive in -toḥ is found 11 times in the RV, while in the next level of texts, the Mantra language of the YV Saṃhitās, it is found 16 times (in both KS and MS, though both texts differ only marginally in size from the RV.)

With the RV text calculated = 100 % and the MS text at 88% of the RV text, the 16 cases of MS come to 101 % in comparison to RV's 11 = 100%. The use of -tos has thus decreased by more than half at the time of ŚS (40%), but this seems to be conditioned by special factors, perhaps of location, as PS has 108%. This infinitive then gains prominence again in the older YV Saṃhitā of the Kaṭhas (171%) and increase further with the Taitirīyas.

---

RV 11x <sup>147</sup> 100 %	PS 7? 108%	ŚS 2? 40%
KS 16 171%		
MS 16 101%	TS 19: 141%	
	TB 11: 138%	
	TA 2: 142%	ŚBKo 7    ŚBMo 13: 180%
AB 20: 289% (ABo 7:274%) (+īśvara)	KB 5: 160%	KA 1: VādhB 2    ŚBMw 3: 58%
PB 7: 194%	JB 30: 92%	ŚBMn 7: 243%

---

<sup>146</sup> For the relationship of sprdh and sam.yat, see below, § 7.4 .

<sup>147</sup> Avery, JAOS X, 1876, p.219 sqq, counts 12 cases for RV.

JUB 2: 3%

ŚBMa/u 0  
 ŚB total 27:160%<sup>148</sup>

(ABn 9: 697%!)  
 (+ īśvara)

However, according, to Oertel, KZ 65, 1938, p.55 sqq., 66: īśvara- + inf. in -tos is found as follows:

KS 16

KpS 5

MS 16

AB 16

(ABo 7)

AA 4

TS 19

TB 11

TA 2

KA 1

JB 30

ŚBK 13

ŚBMo 18<sup>149</sup>(ŚBMn 5)

<sup>148</sup> According to Renou, Monogr. Skts. II, p.37 §37;

In ŚS there are apparently only two cases, janitoḥ 19.56.2, and aitoḥ 12.3.55-60; see Renou, Mon.Skt. II §28; the number of occurrences in PS will probably increase, as the Sandhi is not always separated in my provisional, computer-based dict. ab ultimo. For these infinitives, see esp.: Minard, Enigmes II, § 727b, acc. to Renou, Monogr. Skts. II (1937), §39: -tos becomes less frequent in this order: MS--> KS (KpS) TS TB AB JB <!> ŚB PB KB GB; -tavai: less ŚB --> PB; -tum increases from: MS---> TS TB KS JB AB KB PB ... (big interval)... ŚB; cf. Wack.2.2 § 470 sqq: -toḥ: Br.Ār, but rare in Sūtras, -tave: rare in Br., tavai < tave vai?, -tum is classical (partly -tavai: MIA); McDonell, Gramm. §582, in RV -tave: 30x, -tavai 12, -tum 5, -tos 6+3; but acc. to Avery, Verb forms, RV 12x; -- for the Mantra language, see McDonell, §585.4: -tave RV, AV, TS, VS, -tavai RV, AV; Delbr., Syntax, p.427: -tavai MS, TS, AB, ŚB, -tave ŚB 2x; -tum MS, TS, AB, ŚB, PB, -am MS, TS, AB, ŚB, PB; -tos MS, TS, AB, ŚB, PB; - Aufrecht, AB p.430: -tos 15x, -tavai 2; but acc.to Avery: AB 0.

<sup>149</sup> Brunnhofer, Ueber das gegenseitige Verhältnis der beiden kânḍagruppen des Çatapatha-brâhmaṇa nach massgabe der in ihnen verwendeten infinitivformen, Beitr.z.Kd.d.idg.Sprachen X, p. 252, counts 10 cases for ŚBM 1-5. His conclusion on the division of the text is correct; he wants to join ŚBM 1-5 + 11-13, as opposed to the Śāṅḍilya part 6-10. Cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. XIII, 266-268, Vorles. über ind.lit., 2nd ed., p. 146 sq.; Caland, introd. ŚBK, thinks that ŚBM 11-13 is a separate work, originally stemming from the Kāṇvas.



## JUB 2

PB 7

(ABn 9)

The increase in the number of infinitives in -toḥ is clear, especially if the later Taitt. texts are included. TS/TB, the materials of which belong to the same strata as KS, have 30 cases of Taitt.S. + Br., as against 16 in KS. A similar increase is seen in JB/JUB (92+113%!), and the Eastern books of ŚB participate in this spread of -toḥ. The Western books of ś, however have a low figure (58%). A comparison of the first books of both the Kāṇva and the Mādhyandina versions of ŚB is instructive. Both texts agree with each other almost word for word, except for small deviations of vocabulary and in matters of style (ŚBM 1-5 = ŚBK 1-7). But ŚBK has only 7 cases (142%) against 13 in ŚBM (180%). Again, the extreme East goes together with the Centre, while the Kāṇvas deviate and tend to agree with the texts of the West (in this case, the Western books of ŚB).

The pattern of diffusion can now be described as follows. From a first attestation in RV stanzas (100%), the usage of -toḥ has been reduced by half in some Mantra texts. Note that the Western PS has 108 % while the Central ŚS has only 40%; the percentage holds in part of the early mixed Mantra/Saṃh. prose texts (MS 101). Later Saṃhitā Mantra/prose texts show a steady increase: KS 171%, TS 141% (+TB 138%). The centre of expansion of this form seems to lie in the Kaṭha territory; the neighbouring Aitareyins agree with this; they show more strongly (289%) and even the late PB has 194 %. From the Taittirīyas, the tendency spread southwards towards the Jaiminīyas, be it modestly: (JB 92%, JUB 113%), and the neighbouring (Pañcāla) Kauṣitakis again agree with the Taitt.s (160%).<sup>150</sup>

While the early books of the Mādhy.ŚB strongly participate in the usage (180%),<sup>151</sup> the Kāṇvas, as usual, make an exception (142%) and tend to agree with the Western Śāṅḍilya school (ŚBMw 58%, cf. the neighbouring JB, based on a Central Śāṅḍilya.Br., with only 92 %, also: MS 101 %, ŚS 40%).

Later texts like TĀ 2x, KĀ 1x, drastically reduce the usage of the inf. in -toḥ. But the Ait. school continues to use this inf. Just as the late AB (-toḥ + īsvara) scores 679%, so does AA (-toḥ) with 483%. This seems to be a phenomenon

<sup>150</sup> Perhaps this indicates the late time of composition of this Br., cf. the similar figures for JUB, the late ŚBMn and especially ABn..

<sup>151</sup> A text of later redaction, PB, also belongs here, with 194 %. The non-occurrence of -toḥ in the Ar. and Up. of ŚBM is unexpected.

limited to this school which began in the earlier, Western part of AB with nearly 300 % and continues in the Eastern, younger texts.

The diffusion of -toḥ is thus limited to the Saṃhita and Brāhmaṇa period, with a preponderance of cases in the Kuru, Pañcāla and Videha area. The Southern Kuru (MS), the Eastern Central (Kosala) and the Southern areas do not participate that strongly.

#### Excursus:

-----  
 The distribution of -toḥ in the various parts of the RV is of interest; the forms are given according to McDonell, Vedic Gr., § 587.<sup>152</sup> In order to compare this with another significant factor for dating the RV books, the frequency of injunctives is given below, in decreasing order, as the usage disappears; only some 50 new cases surface by the time of the AV.<sup>153</sup>

---

RV book: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

---

-toḥ: 3x 3 3 - - 1 1 - - 1

---

Or, arranged according to the probable age of the various books of RV, according to the investigation by W. Wüst, and measured by the frequency of injunctives (decreasing order):

---

acc.to Wüst<sup>154</sup>: 9 4 || 3,5,7, || 2, 6 || 8 10  
 (older >younger)

---

inj. in books: 4 6 2 7/1 5 || 10 3 9 8

in %: 11.3 10.6 9.2 8.5 7.7 8.08 5.9 5.6 5.5

---



---

-toḥ: none: 4/5/8/9 || few:2/3 | decreases> 6/7/1/10

---

<sup>152</sup> Among these, 2 x īse + dat. inf.: īse..dātoḥ, 7.4.6, īse ...yotoḥ 6.18.11.

<sup>153</sup> See K. Hoffmann, Injunktiv, p. 110.

<sup>154</sup> Stilgeschichte und Chronologie des Ṛgveda; for the inj., see K.Hoffmann, Inj. p.36, which is based on the count made by Avery, JAOS XI, p.361; cf. also Arnold, Vedic Metre and Klein, Towards a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda.

This result is interesting insofar as it tends to underline, on one hand, what we already know; the family books of the RV (RV 2-8) are the oldest parts of the text and usually show the same or similar particularities, while the large books 1 and 10 are later additions. Book 9 is a special case because of its character as 'song book' accompanying the Soma sacrifices.

In addition to these well-known characteristics, it is important to note that books 3 and 8 take a special position. They seem to be later and are, in any case, less archaic than the rest, frequently even innovative. In my opinion, these books of the Viśvāmitra (RV 3) and the Kāṇvas (RV 8) are contemporary with the immigration into Kurukṣetra of the Bharatas under the Sudās family. Note especially RV 3. 53 (but cf. the Bhāradvāja composition 6.47!) More investigations into this matter are necessary, especially concerning the relative age of various hymns within the collections of their respective families as surviving in the various RV books.<sup>155</sup>

## §6 TYPICAL ŚĀKHĀ DIFFERENCES

§6.0. The preceding sections have indicated, I hope, that some peculiarities of dialect development can be traced throughout the Vedic period, right down from the RV, which itself is, of course, a collection of hymns by various authors and clans and reflects the traditions of many tribes across several centuries. The above materials also tend to indicate that there were centres of innovation, i.e. the areas occupied by the Taitirīyas (TS) and Vājasaneyins (ŚB).

I will now turn to phonetic peculiarities of some major texts which have so far largely been disregarded. They have, it is true, been noticed for more than a hundred years and figure as such in the standard accounts of the language. However, they have not been placed in their proper context and perspective, as they were regarded to be phenomena limited to the text transmission of a particular Vedic school, or even to a particular text.

It is here, unfortunately, that the unsatisfactory state of Vedic text editions comes fully to bear. Although the editions, mostly made in the second half of

---

<sup>155</sup> This agrees with the opinion of S. Insler who noticed the special innovative role of the Kāṇvas in RV (personal comm.).

the last century, record some of the phenomena, they have tended to establish a uniform Sanskrit text, recognisably Vedic, but close in its "orthography" to the MSS of classical Sanskrit of the standard Northern tradition of Benares and Poona.

This is misleading. Nearly all Vedic texts have, because of the whims of the editors, been normalised to such an extent that it became unlikely that other scholars paid attention to or even recognised many of the particular traits of a particular Vedic school. In the same manner, of course, the traits which agree in several schools were often not detected. What is almost universally accepted, however, is the misconception of Vedic as a uniform language. This is, in itself, not surprising; the texts appear to have no phonetic differences (see above). What is usually not taken into account, however, is that the texts were only made to look uniform by the late Vedic diaskeuasis and canonisation of the redactors which often comes close to the norms of classical Skt., as first codified in Pāṇini's grammar. In spite of this normalising tendency, made worse by that of the modern editors, a considerable number of school divergencies can be recognised, some of which will be treated in the sequel. It will be seen that many of these śākhā peculiarities do, in fact, form a pattern, and are part and parcel of the major Vedic dialects.

### §6.1 -ch-, -śch-, -cch-

One such item is the spelling of the long palatal affricate. In classical Sanskrit, it is written and printed cch, and this is also the pronunciation (in Vedic recitation) and, consequently, the spelling found in most schools. However, as is well known, the Ṛgvedic MSS usually write ch, e.g., gachati instead of classical gacchati, see Aufrecht, preface to RV, 2nd ed., p.VI.

This is not all. The Maitrāyaṇi school participates in this trait. Schroeder mentioned the spelling in the preface to his edition, p. XLIII, but normalised to some extent (e.g., in the Sandhi case -t + ch- > cch). The writing ch is also found in the Vulgate of the Atharvaveda,<sup>156</sup> usually called the Śaunaka-Saṃhitā, see Lanman in: Whitney, AV transl., p. CXXV.<sup>157</sup>

<sup>156</sup> Also in cases like -t ś- > cch, in ŚS written -ch-; cf. also Allan, Sandhi, p. 92.

<sup>157</sup> Finally, Ms. C of JB (see ed. L.Chandra JB II, p. XVI) usually writes gachati, etc. This is a ca. 300 years old palm leaf Ms. from Kerala (Burnell No. 421 = Keith Cat. no.4353).

The origin of the cluster *ch* is known from such forms as *gachati*:<sup>158</sup> Ṛgvedic metre indicates that *-ch-* was measured long, and was therefore pronounced as a cluster, probably something like [śś / śc]<sup>159</sup>. Interestingly, this is almost the same spelling that the close relative of the Maitrāyaṇīya, that is the Kaṭha school, employs in its MSS: śch. Schroeder (introd. to KS) misunderstood the evidence; he thought it to be a writing mistake as in the original Kashmirian MSS of KS, written in Śāradā script; both *-śch-* and *-cch-* look quite similar. However, the writing *-śch-* is consistent in Kashmirian texts. It is found also outside KS, in KaṭhB, KaṭhĀ, etc., and notably so in the Kashmirian MS of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā; it regularly occurs even in MSS of classical Skt. texts that stem from Kashmir. The written evidence<sup>160</sup> reflects a much older stage of pronunciation, that of medieval Veda recitation.<sup>161</sup> The pronunciation of *-(c)ch-* as [śch] is not the present day pronunciation of this cluster, nor was it the medieval Kashmirian one; *c* is pronounced as [ts] and śch as [ts<sup>h</sup>].<sup>162</sup>

The outcome of a survey of the distribution of this feature, therefore, is that the older texts and schools (RV, PS, MS, KS) show the remnants of an older pronunciation of the cluster, which was later written and pronounced *-cch-*. In all of these schools, the particular pronunciation was fixed early enough to persist even in the face of the overwhelming pressure of classical Skt., Pāṇinean grammar, and the habits of other, neighbouring Veda schools. I conclude, therefore, that the Ṛgvedic, Mantra time, and apparently the Western Saṃhitā prose, pronunciation of the cluster was [śch] or something akin to it, like [śc, śś]. It is noteworthy that the survival of this feature is a regional one.

The Śākalya Śākhā of the Ṛgveda shows a close connection with the Aitareya school, the older homeland of which was the Eastern Panjab (see §4.1). The Kaṭha school occupied roughly the same territory as the Aitareyins; PS is equally a Western text, when compared to the Śaunaka version of the Atharvaveda, and the Maitrāyaṇīyas settled in the same area, though apparently somewhat to the South of Kurukṣetra.

This limits the occurrence of this phenomenon to the West of the area of Middle Vedic texts and schools. In fact, it is a Kuru peculiarity, since all the

<sup>158</sup> \*gm-skʷe-ti, probably via > gae-ścæ-ti.

<sup>159</sup> This cannot be the same pronunciation as in *hāriścandra-* < *hariś candraḥ*, RV 9.66.26.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. also Wack. I,153 sqq. Nachtr. ad 158,28, ad 154,13.

<sup>161</sup> Cf. O.v. Hinüber, Überblick. on *c/śc*, §192-3; *yc, yj* in Mg.

<sup>162</sup> Note also that the medieval Nepalese MSS hardly exhibit the writing *ch*, but always write *cch* as a ligature, even in cases where a word begins in *ch-* (and is not preceded by vowel).

texts mentioned are located in the area of the Kuru tribe and not in that of the Pañcālas or that of other, more Eastern tribes, like the Kosalas.

## §6.2 kś :: khy

The distribution of the pronunciation [kś] for the etymologically correct and otherwise universally accepted [khy] is a Kuru peculiarity as well;<sup>163</sup> it is also an innovative one that represents a change from a cluster with palatal semivowel to one with palatal fricative. The change has affected only one group of texts: the Yajurvedic texts of the Kurus. Among the printed texts, only the Kaṭha and Maitrāyaṇīya schools participate. The Carakas, however, are said to have shared this trait as well. This lost Yajurveda śākhā is very close to the texts of the Kaṭha school, though it is representative of a separate, and apparently older, stage of development of the Yajurveda. Unfortunately, the texts of this school have been lost, except for some quotations in various Vedic and post-Vedic texts.<sup>164</sup> The innovation has not spread beyond the area of these Yajurveda texts belonging to the Kuru tribe. Even the Pañcāla texts (TS, KB, etc.) do not participate.<sup>165</sup> It is also remarkable that the innovation is limited stratigraphically to just one type of text, in this case, the YV. The local RV, AV, and SV texts (AB, PS, PB) do not participate. However, a similar phenomenon was observed in the case of the attestation of the inf. -toḥ in the RV-Br., see above §5.4. There as well, the RV-Br. do not completely share the local developments of the Yajurvedins. AB participates to slightly more than half of the percentage of the Kaṭha school living in the same area, but KB has a minimal amount, ca. 10% of the cases when compared to the Taitt. school of the same area. This may be attributed to the later stage of the texts, when compared to the YV Saṃhitās, but note that a Western SV-Br., the late PB, still has 20%. As these developments run counter to the usual areal spread of a dialect phenomenon, it will be instructive to pay attention to this in the following cases.<sup>166</sup>

<sup>163</sup> KS, KpS, MS, Carakas, see StII 8/9 p. 209 and Schroeder, ed. MS I p. XLIII, Wack., Ai. Gr. I, 209.20 and additions p.116; for KpS, see J.Narten, Sprache 14, p.122: aor. akśat; cf. also Ved. Var.II § 190.

<sup>164</sup> For the geographic position of the Carakas, see IJ 26. For the school in general, see StII 7 and 8/9.

<sup>165</sup> Is it also not known to Pāṇini, cf. 3.2.7, 3.1.52, 8.1.57, 2.4.54

<sup>166</sup> Cf. the summary in § 10.2.

The distribution of *kś* also indicates that a peculiarity can originate in a relatively small area (as with the lost Caraka-Sāṃhitā or with the Maitrāyaṇīyas). It can influence other areas as well (Kaṭha school), but does not equally spread throughout the whole Brahmin community; *kś* is limited to YV of the Kurus. Apparently, contact between the various schools of different Vedas was not very extensive at this early period. The reason for the limited diffusion of this phenomenon must have been the discussion of ritualistic details within one Veda. Schools like the Aitareyins and the Kauṣītakis faced similar issues, or among the Yajurvedins, the Maitr. and Kaṭhas, as opposed to those of the Atharvaveda or Sāmavedin schools.<sup>167</sup>

While this may look like the spread of a particular style of speech, the origin of these peculiarities is still local, and the spread is centrifugal. The "force" of the change, and therefore the area of diffusion, differs from case to case, as is well known in dialect studies. In the present case, the innovation could not spread beyond the Kuru area, nor did it affect texts of the next, i.e., the Brāhmaṇa, level. That means that we must recognise this peculiarity as an isolated feature of the early Saṃhitā prose speech of the Kurus.<sup>168</sup>

### §6.3 "Ṛgvedic" -ḷ-

The preceding sections have dealt with old, regional features of the Kuru area which developed in the time of Saṃhitā prose or even earlier. On the other hand, the so-called Rgvedic -ḷ- is generally regarded as a late feature; this can be exemplified briefly, as is usually done, by referring to the two forms *īḷe* and *īḍya-* in Śākalya's Padapāṭha text: -ḷ- occurs only in intervocalic position, thus not in cases where the Middle/Late Vedic pronunciation of the group -ḍiy- had already become -ḍy- (cf. below: § 6.5 *súvar* > *svàr*, *śreṣṭha-* < \**śraiiṣṭha-*, etc.). It is only at this late stage that the change *ḍ* > *ḷ* took place. The distribution of this feature is not limited to the

<sup>167</sup> Similar developments can be noticed in the use of RV mantras as well. Again, the various śākhās of a Veda tend to band together against the texts of other Vedas. See e.g., PS 7.4 = MS 2.10.4, KS 18.5, TS 4.6.4, cf. RV 10.103, SV 2.1219, or PS 9.5 ~ ŚS 19.6, RV 10.90, etc. (with parallels). This is important for an understanding of the early activities of the Kuru Brahmins. They composed and varied hymns in the Kurukṣetra area, and this was further diversified once the schools of the more distant lands emerged.

<sup>168</sup> Note also the words restricted to MS and KS, i.e., cases where even the other old YV Saṃhitā, TS, does not participate, as it is the product of the Pañcāla area; see the list of Schroeder, ZDMG 33, p. 189 sqq. This must be reinvestigated, yet it still contains many such words, like *veśatvá* and others, which outside of MS/Kps/KS are only recorded by Pāṇini.

**Ṛgveda, nor to its Brāhmaṇa texts (where it is found in AB, AĀ, and also in KB). It also occurs in a number of texts where this usually is not realised at all.**

**First of all, in the Kaṭha school, in KS, KaṭhB, KaṭhĀ. The manuscripts of these texts (especially the Śāradā MSS) apply a special symbol, a small diacritic triangular mark, which is attached to the akṣara for -ḍ-. The editor, L.v.Schroeder, has neglected this and has thereby misrepresented the phonetic status of this school to this very day.<sup>169</sup>**

**The Kāpiṣṭhala sub-school of the Kaṭhas has three cases of ḷ-/ḷh- in its single continuous MS; see ed. Raghu Vira, introd., repr. p. VII, Oertel, SB München, 1934, p.17: samūḷham 2.4, mṛḷayanta 3.8, dūḷabho 5.2 (in Caland's MS, Utrecht Univ. Libr.?).**

**Paippalāda school: both the Kashmiri PS (with a diacritic) and the Oriya PS with a special letter used for intervocalic ḷ- (now found in Maraṭhī, Oriya etc.) exhibit the retroflex ḷ- instead of the usually printed -ḍ-.**

**The Jaiminīya school: JS, JB, JUB, sporadically also JGS, JŚS equally show the retroflex ḷ- instead of -ḍ-.<sup>170</sup>**

**The Kāṇva school: VSK, ŚBK. Here the evidence is not so clear, as the MSS often writes this sound as normal dental -l-; cf. however, Caland on the occurrence of ḷ- even in MSS of BĀU, (ed. ŚBK, p.467).<sup>171</sup>**

**The development from retroflex ḷ- to dental -l- is not unknown, cf. Lüder's treatment of this sound change, Phil. Ind., p. 546 sqq., (and cf. Balkan Gypsy phrāl <\*bhrāḍā- < \*bhrādā < bhrātā)<sup>172</sup>**

**A development of the Saṃhitā and early Brāhmaṇa period, the change from -ḍ- > ḷ- first occurred in the Panjab (KS, AB 1-5) and subsequently spread eastwards into the Central area (only KB!), perhaps also to the Central \*Śātyāyana Br. of SV which developed into the Southern JB; the new sound also made the usual "Kāṇva jump" to Kosala. Note that the Central Taitt.,**

<sup>169</sup> Also misrepresented by Scheftelowitz, ed. RVKh, p.47; cf. however, WZKS 23, p. 16; and author, Das Kaṭha Āraṇyaka, diss. Erlangen 1972, partial print Erlangen/Kathmandu 1974.

<sup>170</sup> See Burnell, Jaim. Arṣ. Br. p. IX; Caland, JS 33, cf. W. Rau, MSS 42, p.187 sqq.

<sup>171</sup> See also, Renou, JA 1948, p. 34, Lüders, Phil. Ind. p. 550 sq.

<sup>172</sup> See further, O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p. §198 sqq.



the SW Maitr., and the Kauth. SV (PB) are not affected, nor are the Eastern texts like VSM, ŚBM, and the (Central/E.) AV (Śaun.) reached.<sup>173</sup>

The distribution thus is as follows:

---

<b>Kaṭha Paippalādin</b>			
<b>Kap.?</b>	<b>Aitareyin</b>	<b>Kauṣītaki</b>	<b>Kāṇva</b>
<b>Śākala RV?</b>			<b>Eastern Ait.</b>
			<b>Śākala RV</b>
	<b>Jaiminiya</b>		

---

The development of **l-** is therefore a typical regional feature which spread outwards only to a limited extent. The interesting factor here is that even the late (Eastern) AB and AA have taken over this Western trait. It is also found in Śākalya's RV text which otherwise exhibits a typical Central/ Eastern feature (like the fem.gen. -ai, see above §5.1).

\*\*\*\*\*

We may safely attribute the origin of this peculiarity to the post-Ṛgvedic period, and its original area to the territory of the Kuru tribe. From there it spread to some outlying schools, the later attested Eastern ones of which had emigrated from the Kuru heartland (Kāṇva, Aitareyin, Śākala, perhaps some Kauthuma).

#### §6.4 -jm- > -ym

---

<sup>173</sup> It is remarkable that the Taittirīyas have not taken over the Kaṭha **-l-** in their loans from the Kaṭha school, TB 3.10-12 and TA 1-2. On the other hand, they have not introduced their typical form **suvar** in these texts. Is this perhaps evidence enough to assume that the diffusion of **-l-** is later than the introduction of the Kāṭhaka-Cayanas into the Tait. School? Note that even an old text like the BŚS has these special cayanas (BŚS 19, TB 3.10-12, TA 1). On the other hand, TA is so late that it has a number of traits otherwise known only from the Purāṇas, cf. the name of the Veda compiler Vaiśampāyana, a Vātsyāyana, etc.see MSS 30, p. 180 ann.13. Does this mean that these Cayanas are very late? Or is it simply that their formulation is late? In that case, their introduction into BŚS, ĀpŚS, etc., must also be very late, an interpolation in fact. This is unlikely. Have they been introduced into BŚS later than into TB/TA? But what about the style of BŚS in these cayanas? BŚS copies TA I more or less word for word; the text seems to be as old as BŚS in its redacted form.

The remarkable change of -jm- > -ym-, which occurs in a number of Vedic texts, is little known, and, if so, thought to be limited to the Kapiṣṭhalas, a sub-school of the Kāṭhas which has come down to us only in a very fragmentary state.<sup>174</sup>

The peculiarity of a change from -jm- to -ym- (ajman > ayman, yunajmi > yunaymi, etc.) is found only in a sub-school of the Kāṭhas, the Kapiṣṭhala-Kāṭhas (KpS); the so-called Caraka-Kāṭhas (KS) do not exhibit this trait.<sup>175</sup> The homeland of the Kap. school seems to be close to that of the Kāṭhas (in E. Panjab); in the 3rd cent., BC., the Kapiṣṭhalas (Kambistoloi) were found, according to Arrian, Indikē, in Panjab, at the confluence of the Panjab rivers with the Ravi.

The change -jm- > -ym- must be comparatively old. It has already been taken over into the first book of the PB, which contains a small Mantrasaṃhitā of this SV school.<sup>176</sup> Almost all of these Mantras have been taken over from KpS, which indicates that both schools were in close proximity during the period that PB was redacted.<sup>177</sup> This relationship was also known some early grammarians like Candra, who uses the compound Kāṭha-Kauthumāḥ,<sup>178</sup> just as Pāṇini used Kāṭha and Caraka in one rule. We therefore have to look for the origin of the trait during a few centuries before or after C.E. and in an area not too far from W.Panjab/Rajasthan.

However, a few cases of this rather strange development occur in other texts as well. There are traces in Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (cf. author, StII 8/9, 175) and MS 1.3.14 and MŚS 2.4.4.9 (corrected by van Gelder to pṛṇacmi, but var. have: -pm-, -ṣm-).<sup>179</sup> Furthermore, even the Vulgate of the AV (usually known as the "Śaunaka") version, i.e., in the form of the text found all over

<sup>174</sup> Only parts of its Saṃhitā, virtually identical with KS, and a very short fragment of some late parts of its Brāhmaṇa, have been found so far. These fragments (see ed. Raghu Vira, and cf. Schroeder, ed. MS p. XXXVII sqq.) correspond to the Kāṭhaka portion of TB (3.12) which has been taken over from KathB.

<sup>175</sup> See introd., ed. Raghu Vira, p.V; Oertel, on KpS in ŚB München 1934, p.29, Schroeder, ed. MS I p. XVIII.

<sup>176</sup> See Caland, transl. PB XXIV; Parpola, LŚS transl.p.77 sqq., esp. p.88 (PB 1 < RV,AV, YV, esp. from Kāṭha school). LŚS 2.12.12 also has -ym- in a hapax mantra. - Parpola, LŚS tr. p. 88, points out that the Mantra chapter of PB has been added later on, but before the composition of LŚS. (In the context of a possible redaction of PB in the East see ann. 97, 233, 334, this would mean an intermediate stage, in the West, unless the chapter came from the Prācyā-Kāṭhas.)

<sup>177</sup> Cf. however, ann. 125 on the late Vedic date of the text; it contains some classical forms like tanūm, dugdhe, etc.; cf. also ann. 250, 125.

<sup>178</sup> See Parpola, transl. LŚS/DŚS p.88.

<sup>179</sup> For pṛṇaymi MS 1.3.14, see StII 8/9 p. 175; cf. Oertel, SB Akad.München 1934

N. India., and also its Sūtra, the Kauśika Sūtra, have a few of these cases. KauśS 42.17 ajmaḥ > aymaḥ, 64.17 anajmi > anaymi,<sup>180</sup>. Both texts, interestingly, can be traced back to a Gujarat tradition of the Middle Ages. - Occasionally, -ym-, is also found in the Or. version of PS (18.76.4: maymani).<sup>181</sup> Finally, another addition can be made from Nepal, where I once saw this trait in an Agnihotra Paddhati belonging to the Vājasaneyi school.<sup>182</sup>

How does this all add up? The few cases in MS, MŚS, PS, ŚS and KauśS can all be traced back to medieval Gujarat. PB and the other Kauthuma texts are also prominently found in Gujarat. It is unlikely, however, that the substitution of -jm- by -ym- in PB I had much of an impact on the other schools (Śaun., Paipp., Maitr.). Even if one evokes the Moḍha Brahmins of Gujarat who were caturvedins (and of whom I have indeed seen SV, MS, and AV MSS), this cannot readily explain the diffusion of the feature to all the texts mentioned above.

The medieval homeland of the Kapiṣṭhalas is still unknown, but may have been Gujarat. The school has not thus far been traced anywhere in India; I suspect that its medieval home lies in Gujarat/Maharashtra (or Orissa/Andhra), as the only extensive MS of this text shows a peculiarity common to these areas, i.e., pronouncing and therefore also writing the sound -ṛ- as [ru]. The MS is written in Devanāgarī; Gujarat or Maharashtra thus would be the preferred choice.<sup>183</sup> Then there is a similarity in Sandhi between MS and KpS, i.e., -as/-e before accented vowel > - ā in MS, occasionally only in KpS. This indicates a Maitr. influence on KpS transmission, either in recitation or, more probably, in writing. This again supports a Gujarat homeland for the medieval KpS. Modern evidence tends to confirm this.<sup>184</sup> If, at a certain time, KpS/KpB was one of the major Yajurveda traditions in

<sup>180</sup> Cf. also y/j change in: 120.1 samajyāyan > samayyāyam, 133.6 yajñe > jajñe; see Bloomfield, p. LXI.

<sup>181</sup> The reason is that PS originally stems from Gujarat, at a time of 800/1000 AD, cf. author, ZDMG, VI. Suppl.band, 1985, p. 265 sqq.

<sup>182</sup> See StII 8/9 p.209, but note Brāhmaṇo Gurjaradeśād āgataḥ in a colophon of another MS from Nepal, 13th cent., see author, in: Formen kulturellen Wandels... = Nepalica 2., ed. B.Kölver, St. Augustin 1986, p. 1987, ann.2.

<sup>183</sup> The only other manuscript of KpS, from the former Ft. William at Calcutta, is also written in Nāgarī, as is the manuscript, which I unfortunately was not allowed to film at the Benares Skt.Univ. during three visits in 1972/73, of a so-called Kāpiṣṭhala Gṛhyasūtra.

<sup>184</sup> See the letter no. 14 by Kanhaiyālāl Bhāīsaṅkar Dave of Pātāṇ (N. Gujarat), in Dr. Yaśavant Khuśāl Deśpāṇḍe, Vedaśākhā Vānmay āṇi Carak Brāhmaṇyācāṃ Itihās, Nāgpur 1961, app.2, p.26. Someone should investigate the Kap. and other (Yajur-) Vedic traditions of Gujarat (Dave mentions: Kaṭha, Kapiṣṭhala, Maitr., Caraka).

Gujarat, then the occasional intrusion of a peculiar trait of KpS/PB I into the other Gujarati traditions (MS, PS, ŚS) would not be too surprising.

Even the singular Nepalese case can perhaps be explained in the same way. There existed, just as with Kashmir, a connection in trade and religious affairs between Gujarat and Nepal. A 13th-century MS from Nepal mentions in its colophona a brāhmaṇo Gurjaradeśād āgataḥ; the Jainas, too, seem to have had some relation with Nepal.<sup>185</sup> It may be that some such Brahmin brought with him the Paddhati concerned; Vāj. texts have indeed existed in Gujarat since at least the 6th cent. AD.<sup>186</sup>

To sum up: the early development of this trait is noticeable with the Kapiṣṭhalas; the pronunciation spread, well before the end of the Vedic period, to the neighbouring Kauthuma school and its late Vedic Brāhmaṇa text, PB.<sup>187</sup>

It is only in medieval Gujarat (the probable habitat of the Kap. school) that the substitutional cluster -ym- sporadically influenced other texts as well. Note that the occurrences of -ym- in these texts (PS, ŚS, MS, MŚS, KauśS) are very sporadic. That the other texts were indeed influenced is explainable by the particular state of affairs in Gujarat with regard to the transmission of the Veda by, among some 100 other Vaidika and non-Vaidik Brahmin groups, the Moḍhas who are Cāturvedins.<sup>188</sup>

This example is useful as a warning post; occurrence of a particular trait in a number of texts may not indiscriminately be taken as a Vedic development. Every peculiarity of this sort must be investigated, both comparatively and historically, down to the Middle Ages and sometimes beyond. This underlines the necessity of studying the transmission of the various texts more closely than it has been done thus far.<sup>189</sup>

Excursus:  
-----

<sup>185</sup> Cf. also E.Bender, "The Nepal Connection," forthc. (Lecture at the Int. Conference-Seminar of Nepalese Studies, organised by S. Lienhard at Stockholm, June 1987)

<sup>186</sup> See the copper plate inscr., cf. author, Beitr.z. Südasienforsch. 104.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. also the similar development of intervocalic -j- > -y- in the Caraka school, acc. to VS Prāt., 4.163 sqq., cf. StII 8/9, p.209.

<sup>188</sup> See StII, and Beitr.z. S. As.forsch. 104.

<sup>189</sup> For the whole question, see Wack.I §188, Ved. Var. II §192.

While the preceding examples have indicated the development of a particular phonetic or grammatical feature and its subsequent diffusion to /their areas, the following feature is limited to the Kosalas, and to their Yajurvedins at that; some Eastern peculiarities may be mentioned here in passing. Renou has drawn attention to the fact that VSK and VSM differ in their treatment of -cm-, -jm- (RV, ŚBM, etc.), which in VSK becomes -km-, -gm-<sup>190</sup>, thus: avanegyam K: avanejyam M., or tanacmi TS 1.1.3.2 etc., but tanakmi VSK. Contrast this with the Western development of -jm- > ym (in KpS etc., see above). We must regard this as an early Middle Indian influence on the Vedic corpus, an intermediate stage in the general change of clusters involving palatals and nasals: jm > ym > Pāli/Pkt. mm, (cf. jñ > ññ, ण्ण).<sup>191</sup> Note the similar development in Caraka texts: -j- > -y-.<sup>192</sup>

Must we understand the spellings of VSK as similar to Paiśācī spelling (tenuis written for an intervocalic media in pronunciation), according to the recent explanation of the Paiśācī orthography by O.v.Hinüber?<sup>193</sup> Thus, is tanacmi pronounced [tanajmi] but written /tanakmi/? Such confusion was possible by the 1st cent. B.C., when -g- had become [ ] but was written with /y/k/g/<sup>194</sup> and could therefore be confused with older [c] > [j], which was written /j/y/. In that case, one would have to think of a very early written text for this Vedic school, which is unusual. So far, Vedic texts have been found in written form no earlier than the beginning of the 11th century A.D.<sup>195</sup> However, as ŚBK has some non-Vedic, "classical" forms (see below, on dugdhe §6.6), one could think of the Kāṇva dynasty in the last cent. B.C., and compare this to the writing down of the Pāli canon in Ceylon at the same time.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>190</sup> Renou, JA 1948, p.38: tanakmi VSK yunagmi VSK, tanacmi VSM yunajmi VSM; he regards this as an imitation of RV forms in -km- etc., like vívakmi; cf. also Caland, ed. ŚBK, p. 37: ŚBK jy: ŚBM gy in avanej/gyam.

<sup>191</sup> See O.V. Hinüber, Überblick, §251; in inscriptions, j > y since the 2nd cent. B.C., see §174.

<sup>192</sup> See StII 8/9, p. 209.

<sup>193</sup> Die Paiśācī und die Entstehung der sakischen Orthographie, in: Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus, Gedenkschr. L.Alsdorf, Wiesbaden 1981, p. 121-127; cf. Überblick, §51, 98 sqq.

<sup>194</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, §174.

<sup>195</sup> Preserved in the National Archives of Nepal, cf. Albīrūnī's note on the first Veda texts written down shortly before his time (1030 A.D.) in Kashmir. Only the Upaniṣads (Śaṅkara, etc.), are an exception, as they had been taken out of the Vedic corpus and transmitted as texts of the Advaitins.

<sup>196</sup> Note: Veyāliya, Vetāliya, Vetāliya, etc., in Jaina texts used as the name of a section in the 2nd Aṅga. Varāhamihira uses Vaitāliya as a synonym of Māgadhī (see Weber, Ind.Stud. 8,

## §6.5 Ṛgvedic and Taittirīya súvar and later Vedic svàr; anaptyxis.

It is well known that the Ṛgvedic group consonant + uv- (Cuv), which is also found in some other early texts (ŚS, etc.) developed to Cv- in later texts. The recent study of F.B.J. Kuiper (IJ 30, 1-8) underlines the fact that we must deal here with two sets of Cuv groups, one without laryngeal (\*Cuv, as in \*kúua) and one with laryngeal (\*CúHa, as in \*súHar > svàr, or CuHá as in: \*tanuHám > tanvám, \*tuHám > tvám, \*tuaHám > tvám).

While in the Ṛgveda, svar is always counted as dissyllabic,<sup>197</sup> the 'Śaunaka' (better: Vulgate) version of the AV has, according to Whitney, 27 cases of [súuar] but 11 cases of [svàr], if the repetitions are disregarded.<sup>198</sup>

As far as \*CúHa and \*Cuhá are concerned, the change to Cvà seems to be in progress in the Mantra period, as AV evidence indicates. A comparison with PS and other Mantra texts (VS, Mantra portions of MS, KS, TS) should be undertaken, but could not be included here.

As for non-laryngeal cases, Kuiper counts [kúua] 32 times in RV, while [kvà] occurs only 3 times.<sup>199</sup> A similar picture emerges from the Śaunaka AV: [kúua] appears 12 times, [kvà] twice. The change from Cuv > Cv thus seems to be post-Mantra in these cases. Note also the evidence from Śākalya's RV text (late Br. period, probably Eastern: Videha), where the Middle/Late Vedic pronunciation of the group -ḍiy- had already become -ḍy-; intervocalic -ḍ- > ! as in īḍe > īḷe, but \*īḍiya- was already pronounced īḍya, see above § 6.3.

Additional evidence can be found in the counting of the syllables of some words involving the cluster Cv < \* Cu(H)a made by the authors of some Vedic texts. Such countings involve both Ṛgvedic and post-Ṛgvedic verses, as well as prose Mantras, certain lists of words (like the lists of parts of the body of the "canonical creature"), and even incidental mention of singular words like tvac-. This has recently been studied by S.Jamison (IJ 29, 161-181), who

---

295, and 16, 261 sq.). Paiśāca = Vetāla may thus be an old nickname for persons of this area, cf. also ŚB asurya for Eastern aboriginals; but cf. Vesālīa, etc., Weber, loc. cit.

<sup>197</sup> Oldenberg, RV Noten, 1909, p. 218.

<sup>198</sup> Whitney, AV Index, 1881, p.332, Kuiper IJ 30, 1; Whitney, in his AV index: always suarvíd, mostly súarga-; mostly suastí, always kúa, exc. once 15.11.2-3; cf. also: both svastí- and suásti- (RV su-astí, 3x svastí); sváhā (AV once, RV 1x sú-āha 3.32.19), kvà once, otherwise like RV: kúa;

<sup>199</sup> Once in book 1, twice in book 2, Kuiper, IJ 30, 1.

concludes that the preservation of the pronunciation [Cuva] as in [tuvák], instead of the usual later Vedic tvák, is due, in the Brāhmaṇas, either to metrical considerations (p.161) or, in prose, to the pressure of traditional formulas (p.171).

In other cases, the pronunciation [Cvà] was already the contemporary one of the Saṃhitā prose texts. S.Jamison adduces one telling example. KS, KpS once substitute carman- for tvac- in a traditional explanation of the various parts of the body, i.e., in a list where tvác was counted originally as dissyllabic (as it is indeed found in the parallel passage of MS, see IJ 29,172). As MS generally is an older formulation of roughly the same material that is presented by KS-KpS, one may conclude that either the composers of MS still pronounced this cluster as [Cuva], or that even they had taken it over from the lost Mantra time, brāhmaṇa-like explanations of the ritual.<sup>200</sup>

In Mantras at least, the traditional dissyllabic pronunciation [Cuv] and [Ciy] was apparently preserved for a long time, until the time of the older (Western, Panjab/Kurukṣetra) portions of AB. This text (AB 3.12) counts ukthaḥ vācīndrāya [vāci indrāya] as 7 syllables, and ukthaḥ vācīndrāya [vāci indrāya] devebhyaḥ [devebhiyaḥ] as having 11,<sup>201</sup> while in the parallel passages in the generally younger (and also differently located, Central N. Indian) Kauṣītaki version of the RV Brāhmaṇas (KB 14.3) uktham avāci still is counted as having five syllables and uktham avācīndrāya [avāci indrāya] as 8, but on the other hand, avācīndrāyoktham devebhyaḥ [avācīndrāyokthaḥ devebhiyaḥ!] as having 9 syllables.<sup>202</sup>

The transition of [Ciya] > [Cya], even in the pronunciation of Vedic mantras, therefore seems to have taken place at the time of the late Brāhmaṇas, at least in the Central area. If one compares this to the insecurity felt by the Kaṭhas in the pronunciation of traditional [tuvák] as [tvák] (see above), it can be concluded that the transition first began in the West and the Central area with normal, everyday prose, perhaps at the time of the composition of the post-MS YV- Saṃhitā texts (KS, TS), and that it then (gradually) affected even the pronunciation of traditional Mantras (KB).

<sup>200</sup> These lost texts are only discernable in fragments, see K. Hoffmann, *Der Mantra yan navam ait*, Aufs. p.509 sqq. Cf. also the role of the lost texts of the Caraka school which predates KS/KpS and probably MS, see StII 8/9, p.178 sqq., esp., the diagram p.181.

<sup>201</sup> The mantra in question is found down from TS, in various forms, in TS, AB, GB, ĀŚS, VaitS, ĀpŚS, MŚS, see VC, s.v uktham vāci, sqq. Cf. Keith, transl. AB, p. 43, S. Jamison, IJ 29, 161; and see Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p.373-376, for details.

<sup>202</sup> Keith concludes that AB was redacted before the orthoepic diaskeuasis of Śākalya, p. 43 f.; he compares AA 1.3.4 (meaning 3.1.3 ??) which recognises the absence of Sandhi in such cases in the text of the RV; cf. further on Śākalya, AA tr. ad 3.1, etc.; cf. ann. 82,95,97.

However, even against this background, the post-Mantra evidence is confusing. After all, cases of Cuv viz. Ciy were changed, according to the later pronunciation, quite generally to Cv viz. Cy. It is here that we must take into account the redaction of all Vedic texts which laid a deceptive phonetical veil over the texts, making them appear more uniform than they were. The introduction of many of the "classical" Sandhi forms, like the abhinihita of -e/o a- > classical -e/o '- (see below) is another of the several witnesses to this. The redaction of all Vedic texts took place at a time when this development and other changes, like the loss of intervocalic -i-, had already taken place (cf. \*craiHistHa - > \*śraiiṣṭha > śreṣṭha, and the Ṛgvedic títaü).

Against this background, the retention of súvar, suvargá-, etc. in the Taittirīya school is surprising. The words are actually written like this, with inserted -u-, in the manuscripts (which are based on medieval recitation by Vaidik Brahmins), and the retention of -u- is indeed prominent in the recitation of the Taitt. texts even today. The writing Cuv -, however, is not attested to anywhere but in Taitt. texts.<sup>203</sup>

Usually this has been regarded as the survival of the older pronunciation. However, the occurrence of -uv- is limited even in Taitt. texts to a few, mostly semantically loaded, examples: e.g., suvar-, suvarga-, but also tanuvam < \*tanuHám, and even uv eva < u eva. It is not found, however, in other traditionally protected, in everyday words like tvám < \*tuHám, svastí, and even in the part of a traditional list, tvác-. The retention of súvar-, suvargá-, tanúvam, etc., is therefore a typical teacher's mannerism, a phenomenon particular to the Taittirīya school.<sup>204</sup> Probably they wanted to stress the 'ancient' character of their school in using this pronunciation in exposed words like súvar. (Note the formula bhūr bhuvaḥ svar.) Note also that Pāṇini, 4.3.102, knows only of the Taittirīya mantras (\*Tittiriṇā proktam) but apparently does not yet know or does not want to recognise the prose texts of this school. From scanning Vedic verses, the Taitt. reciters knew, of course, that some words like svàr, tanvám were to be spoken as [súvar, tanúvam]. The exact reasons for the introduction of these words and the exclusion of others, like kvà [kúva], from the canon of the Taitt. is unclear. The history of the RV text, with its long process of orthoepic diaskeuasis, however, teaches that the decision of one or more particular teachers, with all of their whims,

<sup>203</sup> With the exception of a few times in the JB/JUB: JUB suvar 3.14.3-4 (next to svar!); suvarga 3.14.4. without v.l.; cf. also tanuve 4.32 in a verse; this belongs to the Gāyatrasya Up. of Śāṭy., i.e. to the sister school of the Jaim. (JUB indeed has two Vaṁśas)

<sup>204</sup> Kuiper therefore justly regards it as a "school mannerism.... A historical justification for this distinction cannot be found," IJ 30, 2; cf. also Ved. Var. II § 773.



'tics', and mannerisms, introduced many unusual forms into the text.<sup>205</sup> The outcome is as unpredictable as the development of the spelling/pronunciation of an English word.

Note, however, that there are a few "innocent" cases, in which (Ṛgvedic) reminiscences have not played a role: *uv eva* TS, TB, BŚS, ŚBK or *nu vāva* ŚBK (*nvāva* JB), but: *nvai* TS (!), BŚS, VādhB, KB, and ŚBK(!).<sup>206</sup> It is interesting to note that the Taittirīyas did not introduce this phenomenon (Cuv) into a text that they borrowed from the neighbouring Kaṭha school; the so-called *aṣṭau kāthakāni* (TB 3.10-12, TĀ 1-2) do not have Taitt. *súvar* but the Kaṭha form *svār*. The occurrence of -u- in *súvar*, *suvargáu*, and *tanuvám* therefore serves as a shibboleth for typical Taittirīya texts.

\*\*\*\*\*

The cases mentioned so far must be distinguished from the independent development, as shown by Kuiper, of the Post-Ṛgvedic forms *tvám* and *tvám* < \**tuHám* and \**tuáHam*. In Middle Vedic, the RV form [tuvám, tvám] became *tvám* and *tvám*, apparently an innovation of the Kuru(-Pañcāla) Brahmins as the forms are found in KS, MS, and TS. Note that TS does not retain the older [tuvám] here! The Prākṛts do retain the older forms, however; F.B.J Kuiper has shown that both Old Pāli and Old Śaurasenī have *tuvam* (> *tumam*);<sup>207</sup> similarly, old Pāli has retained *kuvam* (next to *kvaḥ*, *kva-ci*); the other old Pkt., Paisācī, also has [kub/,a-], written *kupa-*, in *kupa-ci* (Kuiper, IIJ 30, 5).

This is one of the clear cases of opposition between the dialectal development of Middle Vedic and Prākṛt, cf. below § 9 for otherwise far-reaching similarities. It must be noted, of course, that the "occupational" caste language of the Brahmins could not be influenced in all its forms by the local Pkt.s. Their influence is sporadic and unpredictable; some of the major traits of the underlying local Pkt.s are taken over, but other areas of the grammar resist the "popular" forms out of necessity; there is always a need to

<sup>205</sup> See Oldenberg, Prolegomena.

<sup>206</sup> *uv eva* TS 2.3.7.4, *uv eva* TB 1.2.25; *uv eva* in BŚS, see Caland, Über...BŚS, p.51; *u(v) eva* in ŚBK, Cal. p.35 sq.; but JB §186 *sa u eva*; *nu vāva* ŚBK : *nvāva* JB 2.11, see L.Chandra, ed. JB II, p.23 ann.8; cf. *nu vāva* ŚBK : *nv eva* ŚBM, see Caland ŚBK, p. 82, § 39(n); further: *nvāvai* ŚBK 1.4.2.5, 1.43.2 : *nv eva* ŚBM. -- On the other hand: *nvai* TS, VādhB, BŚS (Caland, Über BŚS, p.50), ŚBK, KB, KS 23.6; *nvai* AB 1-5 :: *vai* 6-8; *u nvai* ŚBK 1.4.3.2, 4.9.3.15, 7.5.3.3, explained by Caland ed. p.80 (wrongly printed as *anvai!*); further, *ha tvai* TS 7.2.10.2, *tvāvā* TS, etc. Again, even in Taitt. texts, the anaptyxis did not work in all such inconspicuous cases; apparently, these forms, are mannerisms, too.

<sup>207</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, §371, §208.

distinguish the language of an occupation, a class, and certainly a caste, from that of other groups.

\*\*\*\*\*

All of these developments must, again, be kept separate from the so-called Eastern anaptyxis found in the Eastern Aśoka inscriptions (e.g., in Orissa)<sup>208</sup> and in Ardhamāgadhī.<sup>209</sup> This trait is, of course, attested in written form only since the third cent. B.C. (Aśoka), and indirectly, in some Eastern forms, in Pāli. The Western and Southern languages (Śaurasenī, Pāli, Mahārāṣṭrī) tend to assimilate consonant clusters, e.g., apatya: Eastern Aśoka inscr. (Khalsi, Dhauli in Orissa) apatiya, Western (Girnar) and Northern (Shabazgarhi) apaca, Pāli (an)apacca (O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p. 87). Anaptyxis, therefore, cannot be claimed to explain the forms tuvaṃ, etc., found in Pāli and Śaurasenī, and Bhāsa (mentioned above, see Kuiper, IJ 30). However, the development seems to be foreshadowed by a few interesting occurrences of anaptyxis in Middle and Late Vedic.

A case like ŚBM upavasathᵢya :: ŚBK upavasathyá- is very instructive, as it represents a major split in the treatment of this word in the various Vedic śākhās.<sup>210</sup>

upavasathyá-

AB 3.45; (cf. aupavasathya- AB 7.32);  
 ṢB 1.4.6, DŚS 2.1.22, 5.1.33; LŚS 2..1.20, 2.5.28; upavasathyaprabhṛti- DŚS 7.3.10; LŚS 3.3.12; GB 1.4.7, 1.4.8; ŚBK 4.6.1.26, 4.9.2.5; 3.2.7.4; and Kāṇva text corresponding to ŚBM 9.2.1.1 (See Caland, ed. ŚBK p.469)

upavasathᵢya-

TB 1.5.9.7; BŚS 3.15:1, 5.1:7, 10.16:19, 10.19:3, 12.20:21, 15.11:11 16.24:3, 17.11:9, 18.41:7, 23.2:22, 23.3:22, 24.20:4, 24.21:6, 26.2:18, VaikhŚS 18.9:9; JUB 1.17.2.3, 1.17.2.5; ŚBM 9.2.1.1

The Non-Eastern ("Western": Śāṇḍilya) part of the Mādhy. version of ŚBw (ŚB 6-10) and the Central TB, along with several Taitt. Sūtras and the

<sup>208</sup> Note that the Orissan pronunciation of Vedic texts continues this until today, see MSS 44, p.283 sqq.

<sup>209</sup> See: O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, § 75 p.60, §153 p.87; cf. also Sprache d.Buddh. in Zentralasien: Gāndharī p.31.

<sup>210</sup> Cf. Kuiper, IJ 30, 2; Wackernagel, Ai Gr. I, 202; Ved. Var. II § 784 sqq..

Southern Jaiminīya (originally a Central \*Śāṭyayana) text, and JUB retained or reintroduced the pronunciation Cīya in a cluster which had long since been Cya.<sup>211</sup>

On the other hand, the pronunciation Cya, which is, according to the early testimony of KS (tvak > carman, see above), to be expected in Western texts, indeed surfaces in the older part of AB<sup>212</sup> and the Western Sāmavedic texts: ŚB, DŚS, LŚS (perhaps already of Gujarat location); in ŚBK, which is almost always aligned with the Western schools, and finally in GB 1.4.7-8 which has been taken over from ŚB 12.1.21 sqq. (according to Caland, originally a Kāṇva text).

The case of the variants śunāsīryà- / śunāsīrīya- also supports this analysis:

śunāsīryà- MS 4.3.3; MŚS 1.7.2.7, 1.7.8.1,14,18, 5.1.4.26, 5.2.7.8; MGS 1.4.16; VārŚS 1.7.5.6,...; KāṭhŚS-Saṃk.28:23, 29.11, 29.13; ed. Lah. 1928:45; PB 17.13.15,17; 25.4.1; LŚS 8.8.47; NidānaS 3.3:12, 7.3:30; BŚS 28.12:15-16; BhŚS 8.23.1, 8.24.6; JB 2.234; KB 5.8; ŚŚS 3.18.1,3,17,20; ŚBM 2.6.3.6, 2.6.3.5, 2.6.3.2,11,13, 2.6.4.9, 5.2.4.4; GB 2.1.26 < KB 5.8(5.10 ed. Sarma)  
Pāṇ. 4.2.32

śunāsīrīya-  
TB 1.4.10.2, 1.4.3.9; BŚS 15.12:1, 17.58:1, 17.60:16, 24.10:3,4,...,°paruḥ 21.6:9,11, 25.1:2,5,14; ĀpŚS 8.20.1,5, 8.21.6, 18.9.5, 20.15.3, 22.9.1,...; HŚS 6.8.8, 14.3.18, 17.3.34, 17.4.1,...; KB 6.15, ŚSS 14.9.1,2,7, 15.12.10; VSK 26.4.4; ŚBK 1.6.3.2,5,8,9, 1.6.4.9, 7.1.2.4; VSM 24.19; ŚBM 11.5.2.6,9; KŚS 5.11.1,16, 18, 15.1.16, 17; °sthāna 22.7.10; KāṭhŚS-Saṃk. °28.23; ĀŚS 2.20.1, 9.2.22, 12.4.9;  
Pāṇ. 4.2.32

The distribution in this case is quite similar. The Central and Eastern Central schools have Cīya, but not, in this case and differently from upavasathya, the Southern Jaiminīyas: TB, Taitt. Sūtras, KB and its Sūtra ĀŚS, and, somewhat surprisingly, both Mādhy. and Kāṇva Vājasaneyin, and their Sūtra KŚS; the Kāṇvas exceptionally do not align themselves here with the Western schools (MS,KS). Note that the only occurrence of the form in ŚB 11 (and the corresponding part of VS) are from a book that is suspected

<sup>211</sup> Śāṇḍilya's ŚB perhaps is a Central text, if we take into account the Jaina testimony of a Saṇḍilla country in UP, see §4.1.

<sup>212</sup> But cf. the different derivation of aupavasathya- AB 7.32.

by Caland to represent an original Kāṇva text, and thus comes from an Eastern Central text.

The reason for this distribution may be that even in the West, the form in -īya may have been accepted at a late stage. Note that even Pāṇini teaches both possibilities; this may perhaps be supported by the appearance of the -īya form in Kāṭhśś and Āśś. The former, however, is extracted from a single MS of the commentary on the Kśś, as no MS of the text has been found so far; the latter text may already have been composed in the East, as (part of) the Aitareyins who had moved to Videha, etc., during the late Vedic period.

On the other hand, the original form expected for the West is indeed found, just as in the case of upavasathya-. The Maitr, with their Sūtras, the Kāṭhaka Śrauta-Sūtra (which confirms the suspicion about the single Kāṭh. -īya form mentioned just now), the Western Sāmavedins (PB, Lśś). The form is, however, found in the Central area as well (KB, Śśś, later Taitt. Sūtras: Bśś in a late Prāyascitta section, Bhśś) and even in the South (JB). Interestingly, even the Easternmost school, i.e, the Mādhy. sub-school of the Vājasaneyins, has this Western form, and, even more surprisingly, in their genuine chapters 1-5. If this is compared to the Mādhy. form upavasathīya, then the true Mādhy. books have the Western form in -ya and those Mādhy. books derived from an original Kāṇva text have, in both cases (śunāsīriya, upavasathīya), the Kāṇva form.<sup>213</sup>

It is the Kāṇvas and the Jaiminīyas, both living on the fringe of the innovative Central area, that in one case side with the Central texts, and in the other one with the Western texts. Obviously, many more such observations will have to be made to arrive at a definite map of the diffusion of this phenomenon.<sup>214</sup>

The Central texts, with their lengthening of -iya > īya, point, in any case, to an underlying pronunciation [upavasathiya], [śunāsīriya] in the Central area and in parts of the Southern and Eastern areas. The words are, it is true, ones of traditional śrauta sacrifice, and one may explain -īya as the intentional stress of an antiquated pronunciation [-iya] which had no counterpart in contemporary pronunciation of the cluster -thy- viz. -rya-. However, the anaptyxis also occurs in inconspicuous groups like uv eva < u

<sup>213</sup> This may be of great importance for an understanding of how the Madhy. text evolved! Cf. Caland's opinion (introd. ed. ŚBK) that ŚBM 11-13 originally were Kaṇva texts.

<sup>214</sup> Cf. further Pāṇ. 4.2.32 dyāvāpṛthivīya, marutvatīya, agniśomīya, vāstoṣpatīya, gṛhamedhīya.

eva Taitt., nu vāva ŚBK, (but nvāva JB, cf. also nvai BŚS),<sup>215</sup> and therefore seems to be sprachwirklich, at least in the Taitt. and some bordering areas and texts.

Notably, the same holds true in the cases of the Upaniṣadic (traditional) pronunciation of satya, see S. Jamison, IIJ 29, 166 f.: satya [satiya < satya] agrees with the distribution given above; [satiya] is found in the Eastern texts, BAU 5, AA, KU, while [satya] appears in BAU2 (a Śāṅḍilya section!), and in a Western/Central Sāmaveda text, ChU.<sup>216</sup> The Jaiminīyas, an originally Central (Śāṭyāyana), then Southern text, have more forms of this kind. Caland, JS, p.33, adduces: duṣvapniyam, hastiya, kṛtviyo; śipriyandhasaḥ.<sup>217</sup>

It seems that the later Eastern anaptyxis began to evolve at this time, and not so much in the East but in the Central area, with some spread towards the Eastern Central area (Kosala) and the South (Jaim. territory in N. Madhya Pradesh, etc.). I suspect that the Central schools, like the Taitt., were under pressure from two factors. The old Vedic pronunciation of the clusters Ciya, Cuva was retained in Mantras and some "archaic" words (like súvar); otherwise they succumbed to the pressure from "below," i.e., from the spreading pronunciation of the (later on, Eastern) anaptyxis in cases like upavasathīya, śunāsīriya, and even uv eva.

## §6.6 The intrusion of some late and post-Vedic forms

Still later is the intrusion of late, post-Vedic forms into some of the texts, interestingly those also otherwise showing indications of a late redaction: as is well known, Ved. duhe becomes in late Vedic and class. > dugdhe; Ved. duhre > duhate, Ved. śaye > śete; however, the classical forms occur in such texts as VSK and PB.<sup>218</sup> Renou has shown that VSK is a text with a comparatively late redaction; it has otherwise strongly been influenced, as far as the form of the Mantras is concerned, by the RV.

<sup>215</sup> Caland, Über BŚS p. 50, see in detail, above, ann. 206.

<sup>216</sup> This could be enlarged further by investigating cases of Cy: Ciy, like vamriyaḥ VSK: vamryaḥ VSM 37.4, svite VSK, KS, MS, TS, RV: svite VSM 5.5, aghniye VSK, TS: aghnye MS, MŚS, PB (cf. Renou, JA 1948, p.39), etc. - See in detail, Ved. Var. II § 774-798.

<sup>217</sup> For similar cases, see Wack. I p. 200 sqq., e.g. gāyatriya-; cf. patnyaḥ Taitt., JB: patnyaḥ PB, etc. (Caland, Over JB p. 15 sqq.).

<sup>218</sup> See Caland, Over en uit het JB, p.17 sq.; Renou, JA 1948, p.38.

Typical is a comparison of the forms in PB and the parallel SV text, JB, as (to some extent) made by Caland: JB duhe ( 1Sg., 3Sg.) 1.225, 236, 256, 340; ŚBM 1.5.2.20, etc. :: PB dugdhe 4.3.9, 13.9.17, 13.11.18; 20.1.5, 21.2.5-6, 21.3.2, 24.1.6; ŚB 1.2; ŚBK 1.2.1.12 etc.; (TB 1.7.3.7 seems to be an exception in this school); JB duhre 1.256, 2.3, 2.410, 3.157 :: duhate ŚBK 1.2.4.11, etc.; duhanti PB 18.5.12 (but also ŚBM,AB,AA,TB).<sup>219</sup> Another later intrusion is the wrong form of the personal pronoun, nom. dual, of the first and second person:<sup>220</sup> nom. yuvám, acc. yuvám<sup>221</sup> RV+, but: nom. yuvām PB 21.1.1 (next to āvam!), otherwise apparently not found. Comparable, though more frequent, than nom. yuvām is the case of nom. āvám, acc. āvám, since RV, but: nom. āvām; usually found in AB (4.8, etc.), it is one of the curious modernisms in an otherwise old text;<sup>222</sup> also at ŚBM 4.1.5.16 (āvám ŚBK), 14.1.1.23, BĀUK 3.2.14 (āvám BAUM = ŚB 14.6.2.14); ChU 8.8.1.

Similar is the case of the occurrence in PB of Classical asthīni : Vedic asthāni JB.<sup>223</sup> PB also has the later form tanūm (12.2.3) for tanvam.<sup>224</sup> There

<sup>219</sup> See Caland, PB transl., p.XX.

<sup>220</sup> Pers. pronoun avam etc., see Caland, introd. PB, p. XIX sq. Over en uit het JB p. 17; see Wack. Debr., Ai.Gr. III.2, p.463 §229c, Aufrecht, AB p. 428.

<sup>221</sup> See Wack. Debr., Ai.Gr. II, 2 p.463 §229c; cf. Keith, transl. RV Br., p. 74; Caland, tr. PB p. XX; cf. the same confusion in some MSS of KaṭhŚiU, see WZKS 23, p.18, ann. 18. Contrast the correct use of nom. avam, acc. avām in JB, see ed. Cal. §186.

<sup>222</sup> Cf. above, opt. in -īta, ann. 15, 22; some gen.fem. in -ai in the older books, AB 1-5; this makes redactional tampering in the final redaction of AB even more likely, see ann. 89.

<sup>223</sup> Cf. Caland, PB transl., p. XIX sq., Over en uit JB, p.16. Cf. also: PB dakṣiṇāyām / dakṣiṇasyām: °āyām: JB, ŚBM, °asyām : PB obl. cases of śiras- in PB class. śirasā: JB Ved. śirṣṇā; PB śirasam, JB śirṣāṇam; etc. Survivals of Vedic forms, on the other hand, are found even in the early Sūtras: the old loc. sg. in -an which is still found in VādhB, and very frequently in BŚS, see Caland Über... BŚS p. 43; cf. also the use of tya- (syaḥ syā , tyad), Caland, Over... JB, p.17; tya: MS, JB, ŚBK, TS, ŚB 14.4.1.26 (Śāṇḍ.!) --- no tya- (but ayam janaḥ, mayi, etc.) (KS), PB, ŚBM. - - It is surprising that ŚBK shares many of the traits of PB which are later; see Caland, Over en uit het JB: p.15 sqq : abl. -an stems: -ani JB, -an PB, ŚBK; n.pl. ī stems: -īḥ JB, -yaḥ PB,ŚBK; - nom.pl.fem. -ayaḥ JB,TS, -yaḥ PB; acc. tanvam JB 3.82,178, -ūm PB; nom. tanvaḥ JB 3.178; -- obl.forms of śiras: śirṣṇā, śirṣāṇam JB,ŚBM, but śirasā, śirasam PB,ŚBK, etc.; -- asthāni JB, asthīni PB (Class.) - Nom. yuvam JB, ŚBK, Nom. yuvām PB 21.1.1. This points to late final redaction of this text, perhaps only under the Kāṇva dynasty of E. India, in the first mill. B.C.? Cf. that the Maitr., too, seem to have received their name from/because of the patronage of the local Maitraka dynasty of Gujarat. Their older name was Kalāpaka.- PB, likewise, may have received its final redaction in the East, see below, ann.250,290,334. In that case, the similar developmennts in the Kāṇva and Kauth., texts would not surprise. Note that the East is a centre for late Vedic redaction of texts, probably there were two areas:

Kosala:	Videha:
ŚBK	ŚBM
PB	*Bhāll.SV
RV Śāk.? or	RV Śāk., AB 6-8, AA

were several occasions<sup>225</sup> where it was obvious that the Pañcaviṃsa-Br. deviated from the other Vedic texts. First of all, it is an extremely abbreviated text, if compared to JB; such a degree of shortening is not otherwise found; see, for example, the degree of abbreviation and shortened retelling of older myths when found in TS, as compared to the older KS. On the other hand, PB tends to be extremely "archaic" in the use of the tenses. This is probably intentional, as at the same time, such late developments as the forms dugdhe, tanūm, yuvām, śirasā, etc., are found.

It seems that the Kauthuma school, which has no really old Brāhmaṇa texts, except for ChU (still late Vedic, though with some colloquial traits), reworked, at a late stage, and some older and unfortunately lost or untraceable Sāmaveda Brāhmaṇa,<sup>226</sup> in close cooperation with the Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭhas, perhaps in Gujarat, as one of the Śrautasūtras of this school, the Lāṭyāyana ŚS, seems to indicate and where the Kap. seem to have moved in the late/pots-Vedic period<sup>227</sup>; the home of the author of LŚS apparently was in Lāṭī, an area of S. Gujarat.<sup>228</sup> Note, in this context, that LŚS/DŚS must indicate the localities on the Sarasvatī by specifying them in detail, with the help of an inserted clause.<sup>229</sup> The author(s) of these texts apparently lived far away from Kurukṣetra.<sup>230</sup>

Again, such forms as mentioned above serve as warning signs. One could, without suspicion, lump a text like PB together with older Brāhmaṇas like TB, etc., as it seems to conform to their shibboleth-- the use of the impf. as narrative tense-- if it were not for the late verbal, pronominal, and nominal forms quoted above.

---

"Eastern RV"?

<sup>224</sup> Cf. above §6.5 on svar.

<sup>225</sup> See for example, gen.fem -ai, § 5.1, etc.; see also § 10.2

<sup>226</sup> Note that even their Kṣudra Sūtra contains many Br.-like passages.

- The final redaction may have taken place in the East, cf. the Videha king Namin Sāpya at PB 25.10.17, and the tradition about a bhāṣika accented PB text, see below ann.

230,317,334.

<sup>227</sup> See § 6.4 on the homeland of KpS

<sup>228</sup> See Weber and Parpola, Transl. LŚS/DŚS p. 29. Is the split between Kauthumas (LŚS) and Rāṇāyaṇiyas (DŚS) due to the movement of one subschool to Gujarat (together with the Maitr., and perhaps the Kap.), while the other went eastwards to Videha (cf. the Videha king Namin Sāpya in PB 25.10.17)? The Drāhy. (see Parpola.LŚS tr. p. 40), later on are found in S. India (together with the Taitt.) cf. ann. 230,334. Both schools differ in the use of -ym- (Kauth.) viz. -jm- (Drāh.).

<sup>229</sup> See K. Hoffmann, Ortsnamenparenthese, Aufs. p.123 sq., cf. Parpola, Transl. p. 30, ann.1.

<sup>230</sup> Cf., however, the supposed movement of the Kauthumas to the East, see ann. 223, note the alledged bhāṣika accents of PB (Śabara); cf. Parpola, transl. LŚS, p. 30, cf. ann. 228.

In the Vedic texts, with their long history of oral transmission, and the changes made by the collectors, redactors, and at the time of the final canonisation, it is necessary to be attentive at every step to such warning signals; they occur, however, time and again, if one is careful enough to notice them. Even if the Kauthumas had intended to produce a "perfect Brāhmaṇa" text, they would hardly have succeeded in cases like yuyām, anuvyam, etc.

While it is surprising to find the intrusion of late grammatical forms into a Brāhmaṇa text, it is, on the other hand, well known that the outward shape, the Sandhi form, of the texts is a late one, and that it has been established only by the orthoepic diaskeuasis of the RV and other texts. It has, so to speak, veiled the older state of things by a thin phonetical layer which lets the texts appear more uniform than they are. In the sequel, I will try to further indicate the influence of the redaction, taking the abhinihita sandhi as an example.

### §6.7 Abhinihita Sandhi: -e/-o a-

It is well known that the Vedas have not reached us in their original form. Just as many other Indian texts, like the Pāli canon, the Mahābhārata, etc., they have gone through a period of oral transmission which was followed by a redaction. In the case of the various Vedic texts, this has been well studied only for the Ṛgveda, notably by Oldenberg in his Prolegomena.<sup>231</sup> The text of the RV has been transmitted by only one school, the Śākala śākhā. The other two prominent schools, that of the Bāṣkalas and Māṇḍukeyas, have, for all practical purposes, been lost. As far as the other Vedas are concerned, this process has not been studied and understood very well.<sup>232</sup> Just as in the case of the Ṛgveda, however, there are a number of indications which show that these texts had a pronunciation which was different from the form that the texts have now, in their post-redactional shape.

One typical example, just as in the Ṛgveda, is the Abhinihita Sandhi, of final -as/ -e before a-. In the the Vedic texts, in the language Pāṇini uses in his own

<sup>231</sup> After what has been said above on the history of some Eastern texts, a detailed investigation of PB, ŚBK, ŚBM is in order; for PS, see for the time being, ZDMG, VI.Suppl.Bd., p.256 sqq., 1985.

<sup>232</sup> Especially PS, PB, ŚBK, ŚBM should be studied in detail.



grammar, and in classical Sanskrit, it results in -o ' - viz. -e ' -, This looks like an "elision" of the initial a-, and is usually described thus in Western grammars. Most Vedic texts, however, often write -o/-e a- next to -e/ ' -. This has not been a real pronunciation, however, and is nothing but a second-hand attempt by the redactors to restore the intelligibility of the text viz. the metre. Something like \*-ai a- is to be expected as R̥gvedic pronunciation.<sup>233</sup>

In pre-R̥gvedic pronunciation, the realisation of the later Vedic and Class. -e ' - still was \*-ai a-, as the monophthongisation \*ai > e had not yet taken place; thus \*rathai atra > rathai atra. The case of later -o a- is different: To be expected is \*-az a-, in analogy to other cases of -s before vowels (V) and voiced consonants (vC), like -iz a- > -ir a- ; -ur vC-. (Note that this is very old: -is > iz > ir, not > -iṣ, or older Ir. iṣ, in these cases).

To suppose a development -az a- > -ai a- for this early period would lead to nom. sg. like rathe, deve, putre, name, etc. only in Abhinihita Sandhi. This would be in competition with the normal forms in -o before voiced cons., like aśvaz vahati > aśvo vahati. Such forms in -e are unknown from Skt., except for a single case in RV where an older gen.sg. \*sūras duhitā > sūraz duhitā > sūra<sup>i</sup> dūhitā > sūre duhitā. The development here is one that otherwise is found in internal Sandhi, e.g. \*sasdai > saz dai > sa<sup>i</sup>dai > sede. (A similar development, also one that took place in the post-Ir. period, namely -az + voiced retroflex cons. > o is found in internal Sandhi: vajh-tā > vazdhā > voḍhā).

A nominative sg.in -e (\*deve, \*putre), however, occurs in Eastern Middle Indian, in Mg., AMg., the chancellery language of Aśoka, (see O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, §296: putte, etc.); these forms could be remnants of an older development as described above. One would, however, expect more cases of -e in RV that were not understood by the redactors and left in the text of the RV if the form was more frequent. Apparently it was not.

Forms like devo 'sti, namo'stu have to be explained differently:

If we compare the development of -as vC > -az vC, eg. \*aśvaz vahati > azvau vahati > aśvo vahati, as supposed by Allen, Sandhi, p. 39,62,71 sqq., this can be compared to the parallel earlier or dialect development \*sūraz duhitā > sūrai d<sup>o</sup> > sūre d<sup>o</sup>. The same is found in early Vedic internal Sandhi: \*sazdai > sede, while Avestan still has perf. hazd- < \*sazd-. Infact such changes are not unheard of. Allen, p.105 sq., compares, among other cases, the example of

<sup>233</sup> Differently, Oldenberg, Prolegomena: short -e/o a- p.447 sqq. Note, that this kind of restitution takes place even in MSS of the Middle Ages in the corrupt Kashmir MS of PS written in 1419 AD., see author, ZDMG VI. Suppl.Bd.

New Mexico Spanish, where *exacto* > *esauto* or *esaito* and of modern Provençal, where -s unv.C/V-, but -i vC-.

Here we have to take into account the nature of Vedic *a*, which was of a closed variety and this different from open *ā*. This is clear from Pāṇini's last Sūtra and has recently been shown by K. Hoffmann, Aufs.p. 552 sqq. Pluṭi cases like TS 3.2.9.5 śoṃsā moda-iva [śṓṃsā mṓda-ivə] @ < śaṃsa madeva [śəṃsə mṓdaiuə], ŚB 4.3.2.14 othā modaiva indicate that pluṭi lengthening of *a* resulted in [ə] which is different from normal *ā* [ā]. - In analogy to -az vC, -az a- must have developed, at a time when pre-RV/Eastern -az vC > -e vC (sede, and az D(h) > voḍha), no longer worked, via -au a- [ə<sup>u</sup>ə] to -o, as for example: \*devaz asti > devə<sup>u</sup>asti > devōsti. @

By the time of Pāṇini this had taken place already, as is evident from the Sandhi employed in his grammar and his own rules at 6.1.72, 6.109 sqq. (cf. P.Thieme, Pāṇ. and the Veda, p.46 sqq.). A Padapāṭhakāra at Pāṇ.'s time then had to decide, for every single case of -e/-o, whether the following word contained an original *a*- or not. This is simple in cases like \*aśvo vahati (where aśvo av<sup>o</sup> is impossible), more difficult in some cases where privative *a*- or, worse, the question of augment or no augment is involved (see K. Hoffmann, Inj. p. 146 sqq.). The only way to indicate what was intended was to insert secondarily from the Padapāṭha the Sandhi form -e /-o found before vC and to restore the "lost" *a*- thus: aśvo vahati, devo asti, namo astu. A pronunciation devosti [devəsti]@ left no other choice, even though the early grammarians noticed that not elision but substitution of two sounds by one had taken place.

Now it is interesting to note that Pāṇini still describes alternative opinions about the way to pronounce this Sandhi at 8.3.17 sqq. The generally taught rule had been taught at 6.1.109 sqq. (substitution of -e a. -o a by e,o)<sup>234</sup>. The effect of this "rule" is found in all the Vedic texts, with a few ad hoc exceptions (e.g., PSOr glides -y-, MS-Kps, see below). This testifies to the effectiveness of the efforts of the redactors following this line of grammatical thought in establishing the final canon of the R̥gveda<sup>235</sup> and of the various Vedic schools.

Pāṇ. 8.3.17--20:<sup>236</sup> (the examples are taken from the Kāśikā)

<sup>234</sup> Treated in detail by P. Thieme, Pāṇini and the Veda, p. 46 sqq.

<sup>235</sup> See K.Hoffmann, Injunktiv, p. 147 sqq. An older investigation of the cases can be found at Bartholomae, Studien zur idg. Sprachgeschichte, Halle 1890, p. 81 sqq; cf.Oldenbergh, Prolegomena, pp. 389, 447, also 434 sqq.

<sup>236</sup> Cf. the treatment of these rules by Bronkhorst, diss. Leiden 1980, p.101 sqq.



of ŚB/BAU, definitely an Easterner, although his RV school was originally from Eastern Panjab. Śakaṭāyana, unfortunately, is otherwise known only from the Nirukta and the Prātiśākhya.<sup>238</sup>

The two sets of rules concern (Vedic) texts in their Saṃhitā form (see Pāṇ. 8.2.108 with 8.3.16 sqq., and 6. 1.109 sqq. with 6.1.72). The Vedic texts, even the Eastern ones, cannot be expected to correspond exactly to forms of early Middle Indian or to the later Prākṛts. Otherwise, one would expect, for the East, a special Sandhi rule, taught by Eastern grammarians, to take care of the usual nom. pl. of i/u stems in -e (Eastern MIA bhikkave, see O.v.Hinüber, § 332) Or must we think of an older stratum, valid only for Brahmanical speech, where -o was Eastern? On the other hand, even the Asuras (using non-Brahmanical speech!) say in ŚB: "he 'lavo he 'lavo!"<sup>239</sup> This would mean that even in "Pkt.," -o was the normal form of (nom.) voc.pl. of i/u stems in the East at the time of ŚB. On the other hand, nom. pl. in -o is typically Western MIA. - The majority of the Sandhi cases mentioned in Pāṇ., however, will have come from nom. sg. in -as > -o in Sandhi like devaḥ > devo, and also from s-stems: namas- > namo. The pressure of these forms will have also set the rule for the nom./voc. pl. of i/u stems -as > -o, even in the Brahmanical/'Asura' speech of the East.<sup>240</sup> (As another non-Eastern phenomenon in the Asura quotation note the Sandhi -e '-). It seems that the Western Sandhi in -o ', -e '- prevailed everywhere. Pāṇ. is, in this case, more modern than some of his Eastern colleagues.<sup>241</sup> The older (Ṛg)Vedic practice seems to have been closer to Śakaṭāyana. This is evident if the abhinihita sandhi of the Ṛgveda is reconstructed, for example:

RV 2.36.1 túbhyaṃ hinvāno | 'vasiṣṭa gá apó / 'dhukṣan ... náraḥ // "having been instigated for you, (Soma) has dressed (himself) with waters; the men have milked...." The metre shows that the apostrophe, supplemented by K. Hoffmann in his discussion of the verse (Inj. p.147), represents a syllable lost in the Saṃhitā text based on Śākalya's reading.

Śakaṭāyana would probably have pronounced:

túbhyaṃ hinvāno | 'vasiṣṭa gá apó / 'dhukṣan sīm ávibhir ádribhir náraḥ //

<sup>238</sup> Is Śakaṭāyana an Easterner, cf. K.L.Janert, Śakaṭa, KZ 71, p. 108-9; otherwise, he is known as author of the Ṛktantra, and some other texts, see Cardona, Pān., p. 149.

<sup>239</sup> Cf. above ann. 2, 65, 289, 240.

<sup>240</sup> That there was some difference in dialect we know from the statement of JB 1.333 §115, mentioned in the introduction (§1) that the Eastern language was not regarded fit for the son of a Kosala king.

<sup>241</sup> Note as well the older vowel Sandhi in AB 3.12 uktham avāci indrāya, while the parallel passages in the generally younger Kauṣītaki Br. 14.3 counts uktham avacīndrāyoktham devebhyaḥ [avacīndrāyokthaḥ devebhyaḥ!] as 9 syllables; cf. ann. 201-202.

[túbhyaṁ hinvāná-<sup>u</sup>-avasiṣṭa gá apá-<sup>u</sup>-adhukṣan ... nárah ]

Unfortunately, nothing is left of this pronunciation, except the invaluable notes by Pāṇin), some cases from SV, AŚS, ŚSS, KauśS, MU brought to light by Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 457 sq., 453, and the more important testimony of MS, KpS and of PS which has (almost) gone unnoticed thus far:

-as vowel- > -ay vowel-. KpS occasionally still changes -e > -ay , -o > -av, -ai > -āy before vowel: varuṇadhā-y-iti (Ms. eti) KpS 6.8; ruca-y-eṣā 7.5; ta-y-enam 7.8; vibhāvasa-v-iti 30.3.<sup>242</sup> PS also has a few cases like this, e.g., ta-y-eka PSOr 6.15.8.

It is remarkable that the Kapiṣṭhalas and, perhaps, the Paippalādins do not agree upon the rules of Pāṇinean grammar, even after millenia of their influence. Furthermore, there is another area of vowel Sandhi in which both the Maitr. and Kap. differ from Pāṇini:

MS: unacc. -e/as + acc. vowel > ā acc.v.<sup>243</sup>

The Kap. agree, though only a few forms are found sporadically:

KpS: (unnacc.) -e/as + (acc.)vowel > ā (acc.) v.<sup>244</sup>

Unless the occurrence of this rule in KpS is due to Maitr. influence on KpS in medieval Gujarat, it must go back to the Vedic period, when both schools lived in close proximity, in S. Kurukṣetra viz. S. Panjab. A decision is difficult to reach at this point, as KpS has been edited on the basis of a single manuscript of unknown provenience. A thorough search in Gujarat would perhaps turn up more MSS and help to solve the problem. In either case, this school peculiarity may provide a hint that Pāṇini's general Abhinihita rule (-e, -o) originated in the Northern part of Kurukṣetra (KS, AB) and not in the Southern part (MS, MU). This would be very important for a study of the history of Vedic texts; clearly, more research is needed.

To sum up: The older Sandhi forms still taught by Pāṇini were (occasionally) preserved by some of the rarer texts, notably those of which a Prātiśākhya has not been composed (or has not been transmitted during the post-Vedic period). The "classical" Abhinihita Sandhi taught by Pāṇini at 6.1.109 sqq. and actually used in his grammar has been introduced into almost all of the

<sup>242</sup> See Raghu Vira, ed. intr., repr. p. VI.

<sup>243</sup> Schroeder, ed. MS I, p. xxviii; cf. also Lubotsky, IJ 25.

<sup>244</sup> Schroeder, ed. MS I, p. xxxix; Raghu Vira, ed. repr. p. VI.

Vedic texts,<sup>245</sup> beginning with the RV; this must have happened already at the time of Pāṇini, as he subsumes this form of Sandhi under his saṃhitā rules.

\*\*\*\*\*

The preceding sections have established, I hope, certain trends: an early Kuru centre of innovation from which certain new trends started (like kś, ḷ-, sandhi -aṃ + voc.); a Taittirīya (Pañcāla) centre from which, on a somewhat later level, other trends took their course (gen. fem. -ai); and, finally, an Eastern centre of innovation (Videha, etc.) from which some of the late Vedic phenomena moved westward and south-westward (narr. perf.).

The following paragraphs, while dealing with topics that perhaps look more like matters of style than dialect variations, are meant to underline the broad divisions made above and to refine them to some extent; only a small selection of the facts can be presented in this article.

## §7 REGIONAL STYLISTIC FEATURES

### §7.1 The use of the particle khalu

It is well known from the study of the style of individual authors<sup>246</sup> that particles are a very useful and effective tool in the the process of determining whether (part of) a text belongs to a particular author, or whether an anonymous text is composed by one or more authors. This procedure can be used, with profit, in the study of Vedic texts and their affiliation with the various schools (śākhās). It can also be applied in the study of texts said to have been composed by a particular author, like Yājñavalkya.

The figures found for the use of the particle, khalu, show that after a single, initial appearance in the late RV, the centre of its diffusion lies in the territory of the Maitrāyaṇīyas.

---

RV 1 (10.34.14): 100 %

<sup>245</sup> Cf. the statistics of Ved. Var., II p. 423

<sup>246</sup> For example, cf. B.Kölver on Kalhaṇa's Rājataranṅinī, or Schetelich on the Arthaśāstra, T.Vetter on Śaṅkara's works, etc.

PS 0?      ŚS 0!

KS 11 : 1293%  
(late            TS 134 : 1840 %  
parts:  
32-35)

MS 69 : 681%

ABo 3 : 1295%  
TB 38 : 2739%  
TA 18 : 3443%

---

KB 2 : 1061%    ŚBK 7:    ŚBMo 24 : 3662%  
KA 3 :    997 %  
(>svid)

ŚBMw 2 : 426%

JBc 9: 4409%  
JUB 2: 1252%

ŚBMn 11 : 4211%

KaṭhB 1 : 95 %    VādhB<sup>247</sup>    BŚS  
(=TBk)

ŚBMa 0 : 0%

ŚBMu 9 : 2476%

ChU 4 : 663%

PB 18 : 1934%

ŞB 3

ABn 0! : 0%

(6-8)

AA 2 : 455%

MU 2 : 203 %

---

It is notable that the oldest texts, i.e., RV, PS, ŚS, (SV, RVKh) do not know this particle (except for one case in RV 10.34.14). Khalu suddenly makes its appearance with 69 cases in MS, the oldest surviving YV Saṃhitā. The neighbouring, and slightly later, Kaṭha school, however, does not follow suit, except in its later books 32-35 (which belong to the Orimikā < \*avarimikā section), i.e. the old, final book III (before the Yājñānuvākas and the

<sup>247</sup> N.B.: VPK does not mention khalu in the Sūtra Vols., except for a few token examples from ĀpŚS, Yāska, etc. The new ed. of the Brāhm. Vol. mentions only a few cases as well; the older ed. has many more. The figures given here for JB are from the old ed. of VPK and refer to the JB ed. of Caland only (JBc).

**Aśvamedha book were added). These chapters deal largely with the Sattra, with additions to the New and Full Moon sacrifice, and with the Prāyaścittas.**

**The Maitrāyaṇīyas (681%) have strongly influenced the Taittirīyas, who otherwise often closely follow the Kaṭhas (see §7.4 on sam.yat). TS, a text smaller in size than MS, contains 134 cases (1890%), more than double that of MS with 69 cases (681%), and the trend strongly continues in the post-Saṃhitā texts of the Taittirīyas (TB 2739%, TA 3443 %) and the originally Central, later Southern JB (4452 %). The other Western, Central, and E.Central schools do not follow this trend to that extent; they range from 426% (Western books of ŚBM) to 1300 % only, with the usual exception of the late PB with 1934%. Note also that the SV Kṣudra Sūtra still uses khalu quite frequently in its Br. -like ch. 3. The East, however, participates strongly in the trend (ŚBM 3662-4211%, and even in the Up. still 2476%).**

**The occurrence of khalu then diminishes in some late Vedic texts, and not only in the East (ŚBMu): MU 203; ChU 663%, down from PB 1934%, JUB 1252% (< JB 4409%), ABn 0 (< Abo 1295%; this is an unexplainable figure), AA still 455%, and even ŚBMa has no cases.**

**This is another case of disagreement between śākhā features on one hand and dialect features on the other. Schools that reside in the same territory do not always agree with the local usage. In this case, the split is between the Yajurvedins and the Ṛgvedins; it is only the Yajurvedins (with the exception of the Kaṭhas and Kāṇvas) and the Southern Sāmavedins (JB,JUB) who heavily employ this particle. In matters of style, like the use of a particular particle, the schools apparently often followed their own predilection and did not necessarily conform to the fashions of the dominant YV group in a particular area. Thus, the Eastern Ṛgvedins (ABn) totally disagree with the Eastern Yajurvedins (ŚBM), and the Central Ṛgvedins (KB) do not participate as strongly as for example the SV does: The (Southern) Jaiminīyas derive their text from the originally Central text of the Śāṭyāyanins, who were living in the same territory as the Taitt.s, and thus agree with the trend. Caland's ed. of JB, however, seems to contain only 9 cases of khalu, not a very large number for such a long text. The Vedic Word Concordance is, unfortunately, insufficient as far as the complete edition of the text (by Raghu Vira) is concerned. Note that the later Jaim. text, JUB, also has only 2 cases in VPK (Br. vol.).**

**The use of khalu in the older Saṃh. and Br. period is thus restricted to the two Yajurveda texts of the Maitr. and Taitt. schools. The later Br. texts reveal the same picture, with the exception of the ŚB; some differentiation**



must be made here. The Eastern Central Kāṇva school (books 1-7) has only 7 cases of khalu, as compared to the corresponding Mādhy. books 1-5, with 24 cases. It is interesting to note that the Kāṇvas often substitute svid where the Mādhy. have khalu.<sup>248</sup> This distribution again agrees with the overall picture which the Kāṇva books exhibit. They form a *pièce de résistance* in the East, wedged between the Taitt. and the Mādhy. schools.

The originally Western (Śāṇḍilya) books ŚBM 6-10, as well, contain only 2 cases, and therefore stand very close to the Kāṇvas and Kaṭhas, in opposition to the Maitr./Taitt. schools.<sup>249</sup> The later Mādhy. books 11-13, however, have 11 cases, while BAU (book 14, 3-9) has 9 cases. The later ŚBM, of Eastern origin, thus prefers to use khalu, while its truly Western components avoid it, although the latter had probably been transmitted to the East by the time of ŚBM composition.

Finally, it is interesting to note that an originally Western but late text, PB, makes frequent use of khalu. The text, as we have it now, may, however, have been redacted in the East. This holds true for ChU (with diminished percentage of khalu) as well, which belongs to the same SV school but contains some geographical materials which place it more in the direction of the Centre or the East. This low figure makes the text more akin to ŚBK (997%) and especially the "Western" Śāṇḍilya books of ŚBM (426%).<sup>250</sup> Unfortunately, this picture cannot be supplemented by the evidence of such late Br. and early Śrauta Sūtra texts as VādhB and BŚS, for here again, VPK does not provide sufficient information.

## §7.2 The occurrences of svid

The case of svid serves as a counter-check in that it replaces khalu in a few texts, such as ŚBK. If the occurrences of both khalu and svid are compared (see the maps), it becomes apparent that they tend to supplement each other; texts that have khalu have few cases of svid, and vice versa.

---

<sup>248</sup> Cf. also Caland, ed.ŚBK p.78 ("vai or svid"); at ŚBK 5.2.1.5 khalu svid ŚBK, but svid ŚBM.

<sup>249</sup> It is important to note that there are more similarities between the Kaṭha/Caraka and the Western ŚB books; see below.

<sup>250</sup> The redaction is very late; probably the text was summarized out of a larger (Prauḍha), lost \*Kauth. Br. referred to above, cf. ann.125, 223,250,290,334.



Even in subsections of a text, like ŚBM 1-5, one can distinguish certain styles in the use of particles. ŚB 1-2, for example, uses *na hi tad*, while ŚB 3-4 uses *na vai tad*.<sup>253</sup> It seems possible that we can recognize here the personal style of the author of these chapters, or, at any rate, that of the compiler of the chapters in question (who must then be different from the compiler of the ŚB as such).<sup>254</sup> In books 1-4 of ŚB there is, indeed, a difference in subject matter which makes two authors likely. ŚB 1 treats the New and Full Moon sacrifices, 2 deals with the Agnihotra, etc., 3 treats the Adhvāra (Soma), and 4, Soma (5: *rājasūya*, *vājapeya*). Both rituals (*Dārśapaurṇamāsa viz. Soma*) are prototypes of many others and may have been composed, in the late Br. period, by two different persons who based themselves on their older Black YV predecessors. - Another example is: *athātaḥ* ŚB, BŚS, KB, AB.

Needless to say, we need many more such observations and investigations. An investigation of the combination of particles would seem to be especially promising, but it can be done, at present, only through much labour (comparing all passages in VPK of concurrent occurrence of two or more particles).

\*\*\*\*\*

A few interesting cases involving single words and their spread throughout various texts, as well as typical (certainly style-oriented) expressions, may be added here. It is the (still very incomplete) collection of many such individual cases which will add perspective to the picture of the major grammatical forms and sound changes delineated above. Only a few can be given here, for want of space and opportunity to investigate them in detail.<sup>255</sup>

#### §7.4 On the relation of *sprdh* : *sam.yat*

<sup>253</sup> See Minard, *Enigmes I*, §800.

<sup>254</sup> Note that the compiler of ŚB had a good overview of the text, such a good one, indeed, that he could compare a section in the Soma book with one in the Pravargya book; see author, *Fs. U. Schneider*; cf. also Whitney, *TAPA 23*, who quotes several cases in ŚB where a passage reappears with the same wording (and the same mixed use of the tenses).

<sup>255</sup> I plan to add to the present collection of materials, from time to time, in Journals like *IJ* and *StII*.

It has been mentioned earlier that the traditional phrases which are found in the introduction to a myth or aetiological tale beginning with, "The gods and the Asuras were in contest," usually show up in the texts in two varieties, one using the word *spr̥dh* and the other the compound verb *sam.yat*.

In the oldest texts, MS and KS, the use of *spr̥dh* is found almost exclusively; starting with KS, *sam.yat* makes its appearance and is especially popular with the Central groups of the Taitt. and the Jaim., but not in the East. (The distribution, again, is similar to that of *vāva* and many other grammatical features mentioned in the preceding paragraphs). When the rates of occurrence are compared and calculated against each other (*sam.yat* : *spr̥dh*), this picture emerges:

---

early:	KS 16/4	TS 15/4	
Samh.	MS 5/20		
early	AB 6/3		
Brāhm.	ABo 4/2	TB 14/2	
later		KB 1/1	ŚBKo 1/25
Br.			ŚBMo 0/16
		JB 8/36	ŚBMw 0/5
		JUB 3/2	ŚBMn 1/6
Up.s &			ŚBMu 0/2
early			ŚBMa 0/0
Sūtras		BŚSb 2/1	
			ABn 2/1
	PB 0/7		
	ṢB 1/3		

---

When the relative percentage of *sam.yat* : *spr̥dh* is calculated for each text (regardless of relative size), we arrive at the following:

---

KS 400 %	TS 375 %		
MS 25 %			
	TB 700 %		
AB 200 %	KB 100 %	ŚBKo 0.04 %	ŚBM 0.03 %
PB -0.1 %	JB 0.22 %	[ŚBMo,w,u -0!]	
ŞB 0.33 %	JUB 150% <sup>256</sup>	BŚSb 200%	[ŚBn 0.16 % ]
			ABn 200 %

---

The centre of usage of sam.yat lies with the Kaṭha and Taitt. schools. As TS is a slightly later version of a YV Saṃhitā than is KS, the origin of the phrase must be sought with the Kaṭhas or their close relative, the lost Caraka school. The use of sam.yat is their innovation. MS is still older than KS, but predominantly employs sprdh, an old Indo-Iranian and Indo-European term of racing and competition (OAv. spərəd, Engl. sport, Germ. (sich) spurten, etc.).<sup>257</sup>

Note that the older Aitareyins who live in the same area as the Kaṭhas follow their trend; they keep this up, even after their emigration to the East, with the same percentage. This stands out clearly, as all the Eastern texts have but a sprinkling of cases of sam.yat, even the usually Western-oriented Kāṇvas. This is one of the many cases where the SW Maitr. and the Eastern Vāj. go together, which is frequent in later ritual and in the use of particular mantras.<sup>258</sup> The group MS-Vāj. is joined, in this case, by the Western and Southern SV (PB,ŞB,JB). In other words, the innovation sam.yat is limited to the Yajurveda and Ṛgveda texts. (Note the enormous increase in TB, in BŚSb, and in the late JUB, although the actual occurrence of cases is limited here.)

---

<sup>256</sup> Note that all cases of sam.yat in JUB come from one passage, 2.10.1 (= VPK notation: 2.4.1.1), as opposed to two of sprdh: 1.15.4.1, 1.8.5.1 (VPK).

<sup>257</sup> Cf. Schroeder, ZDMG 33, 177 sqq.

<sup>258</sup> How was this possible in geographical terms? In later texts, a closer connection between the two schools is possible, as MS expanded southwards and ŚBM south-westwards; the Madyandinoi reside, according to Arrian, Indikē 4.4, on the Southern side of the Ganges, opposite Allahabad. But what about early texts? - The (non)occurrence of Maitr.-related material must be checked in Jaim. texts.

## §8 SOME INDIVIDUAL CASES

The materials presented thus far can be extended further by including studies of single words and their changing usage in time and geographical spread, as well as a closer look at various trends in using one word instead of another (see esp., below, on *pāpa*).

### §8.1 *purūvasu* - :: *purovasu*

An interesting case is the interchange of u/o in RV + *purūvasu*- / *purovasu*-. The materials are:

*purūvasu*- RV, RVKh 3.1.1, 5.4.1; PSOr (*puruvasu*) 18.11.7; (*puruvásu*- MS 4.9.12:134.1); SVK 1.235, 1.244, 1.309, 2.161; SVJ 3.15.9; AVŚ 14.2.47, 20.36.4, 20.51.1, 20.56.5, 20.104.1; VSM 33.81; VSK 32.6.12; AB 2.27, AA 4.1.1, 5.2.5; PB 9.10.1; KB 17.1, 24.7; ŚŚS 9.5.3, 11.11.11,...; ĀŚS 5.5.8, 5.6.1, 7.4.4; VaitŚS 39.9, 41.13; KŚS 9.11.16, 25.5.30.

*purovasu*- PSK 18.11.7; JS 1.25.3 < RV 8.49.1 (-ū-), 4.14.6, 1.16.2, 1.20.9, 1.26.8, 2.7.1, 4.20.6; MS 1.3.9; MŚS 2.4.1.33; TS 3.2.10.2, 3.2.5.1; TB 4.20.1; BŚS 7.14.34; HŚS 8.6.26; VkhŚS 15.26.10, 15.32.2; ĀpMP 2.4.1.33.

---

ū RV	ū SVK	ū SVJ	ū AVŚ	ū VSK	ū VSM
ū RVKh	ū PB	ū KB	ū VaitS	ū KŚS	
u PSOr (o PSK)	ū ŚŚS				
KS 0					
ū AB					
ū AA					
ū ĀŚS					

---

	o TS	
	o TB	o BŚS
o/u MS	o HŚS	
o MŚS	o ĀpMP	
	o VkhŚS	
	ū SVJ	
	ū/o SVJ	

---

The forms in -o- are restricted to the Maitr., Taitt., and Jaiminīya schools. Unfortunately, the Kaṭha school does not show any case (as with KaṭhA). The few divergent forms in SVJ must be investigated. Note that AVŚ has forms only in book 20, all of which come from RV, except for one form in book 14 = RV 8.1.12. The only quotation from MS which has -u- is also found in the RV and must have been influenced by this text (MS 4.9.12=RV 8.1.12).<sup>259</sup>

It seems, therefore, that this sound change is one of the innovations emanating from the Central area, the Pañcāla land occupied by the Taitt. and the Śāṭyāyanins, the later Jaiminīyas.

## §8.2 Putting dialect studies to use: A case of religious belief

On the basis of the broad dialectal features established earlier, it will be very instructive to look at one or two examples which reflect the religious development of the late Vedic period. One such case, and a very important one in the development of the idea of rebirth and karma, is punarmṛtyu, "the recurrent, the second (and third, etc.) death," which is believed to occur after one's death here on earth.

The distribution of this word is as follows (śBM 10 = 100%):

Mantra/

early

Samh. 0

ABo 0

TB 4 : 4 %

early

(TB 3.9.22 and TbK)

Brāhm.<sup>260</sup>

TBk 3 : 12 %

TAk 2

<sup>259</sup> For the sound change o/u, cf. Ved Var. II § 717, 721; the single -o- in the Kashmir Ms of PS is negligible, as u and ū are constantly interchanged in Kashmiri MSS; the pronunciation is, in all three cases, [o].

<sup>260</sup> The passages are: KB 25.1; KA 13.1; TB 3.10.10.5, 3.11.8.5<sup>2</sup>, 3.11.8.6; TA 2.14.1, 2.19.1; VādhS 3.90; BŚS 2.11:22, 28.4:32; JB 1.6, 13, 23<sup>2</sup>, 25<sup>2</sup>, 46, 245, 246; JUB 3.6.7.7-8<sup>2</sup>, 4.12.2.6; ŚBK 3.1.9 differs from the parallel = ŚBM 2.3.3.9, 10.1.4.14, 10.2.6.19, 10.5.1.4, 10.6.1.4-9/11, 10.6.5.8, 11.4.3.20, 11.5.6.9, 12.3.4.11, 12.9.3.11-12, 14.4.3.6<sup>2</sup>, 14.6.2.10, 14.6.3.2; BAU 1.2.7, 1.5.2<sup>2</sup>, 3.2.10, 3.3.2; GB 1.1.5, 1.3.22; . KaṭhB (Svādhy.:81.7)

---

later Brāhm. Up.s	KB 1 : 3% KA 1	ŚBKo 0 : 0%	ŚBMo 1 : 1%
	JB 9 : 7%	ŚBMw 0 : 0%	
&	JBa 7 : 132% JUB 4 : 18%	ŚBMw (10) 11 : 100%	
			ŚBMn 5 : 15%
Early Sūtras	ChU 0 VādhB 1 BŚS 2	BAUK 5 : 48%	ŚBM a,u4 : 22%
	PB, ŚB 0 KaṭhB 5 (in pt.s = TBk/TAk:5x) (Kaṭh.Svādhy.Br.= TA 2)		ABn 0 : 0% AA 2 : 19%
	MU 0		GB 2

---

This evidence is interesting in many respects. First of all, the older texts do not know this word, and, apparently, they are also unfamiliar with the concept; it is found for the first time in the later Brāhmaṇas.<sup>261</sup> Even among these late Vedic texts, the first books of both ŚBM and ŚBK do not use the word, except for one case at ŚBM 2.3.3.9, where it looks like a later addition (it has no parallel in ŚBK!), in a passage dealing with one of the many speculations of the Brahmins and the Kṣatriyas on the nature and secret import of the Agnihotra sacrifice, so typical for late Br. texts and the Upaniṣads.<sup>262</sup> The same applies to JB, where the word is almost exclusively found in the late portion, JBa (JB 1-1.65, which also deals exclusively with the Agnihotra).

This limits the occurrence of punarmṛtyu almost exclusively to the Upaniṣads, with the exception of ŚBM 10. This is one of the Śāṅḍilya books which was imported from a more Western location than where the rest of ŚB was composed.<sup>263</sup> Book 10 is, however, a late one within the Śāṅḍilya

<sup>261</sup> For the concept, see H.P. Schmidt, *Mélanges Renou*.

<sup>262</sup> See the examples in Bodewitz, *The daily morning and evening sacrifice*, Leiden 1976.

<sup>263</sup> This has been well known since Weber first established the facts more than 100 years ago; cf. K. Mylius, *Untersuchungen*, see above, §4.1. ann. 34. Note that ŚB 10 contains



collection; the Upaniṣad-like secrets of the Agnicayana are explained. It is difficult to decide whether the word was taken along eastwards, with the Śāṅḍilya text, to the territory of the Vāj. school in Kosala and Bihar, or whether it was introduced into the context of the Agnicayana discussion only in the East, and at a relatively late date. JBa may hint a more Western /Central origin, but this part of JB is late; cf, that it has 138 % as opposed even to JUB with 18%.

We can recognise, at any rate, a strong occurrence in ŚB 10 and JBa, where importance was attached to the concept within the framework of esoteric discussion. From there it spread to the later ŚB (both BAUM and BAUK), to the the latest books of the (by now Eastern!) Aitareyins (AA). Already in the Up.s like texts of the SV and in the Up.s of the Vāj. the occurrence recedes: ChU 0%, JUB 18%, BAUM 22 %, BAUK 48%. Not second death, but final emancipation is discussed in these texts.

It is important to note that the Central schools are hardly affected. The Taitt. school employs the concept, as far as true Taitt. texts are concerned, only once in its late TB book 3.9, and otherwise in the aṣṭau kāṭhakāni, an addition from the lost KaṭhB. Even a late Anubrāhmṇa, VādhB, has only one occurrence, and a Sūtra of the same period, BŚS, has only 2 cases. Similarly, the Central Kauṣītakis have only 2 instances in their Br. and Ar. taken together. Finally, a Western school, the Kaṭhas, exhibit this word in the decidedly late part3 of their Brāhmaṇa (i.e the parts which correspond to the fragments preserved in TB 3.9-12 and TA 1-2, and the Svādhy.Br.= TA 2).

The origin of the word (and of the concept) punarmṛtyu is, therefore, in all probability, to be found with the late Śāṅḍilya tradition of ŚB, e.g., not in the extreme East of Northern India, but in a more Western region and, perhaps if old, with their Southern neighbours, as can be seen in JBa.<sup>264</sup> It is typical for the esoteric discussions about the meaning of the Agnicayana (both Śāṅḍilya and Kaṭha) and the Agnihotra. It is to be noted that both rituals were of immediate concern for non-Brahmins as well; many Kṣatriyas take part in the discussions about the Agnihotra, a standard topic of the brahmodyas and other types of public debates.<sup>265</sup> The Agnicayana was, due to its cost and the elaborate rituals involved, of interest especially to the royal families and the well-to-do gentry.

---

references to Śāṭyāyani (10.4.5.2, the presumed author of Śāṭy.Br. > JB) and to Śāṅḍilya (10.6.3, etc.) and Celaka Śāṅḍilyāyana (10.4.5.3).

<sup>264</sup> Unless further research shows that ŚB 10, although a Śāṅḍilya book, was composed in the East by members of the Śāṅḍilya school.

<sup>265</sup> On this topic, cf. Fs. W. Rau, The case of the shattered head.

### §8.3 An unauspicious word, pāpa-:

As a sort of counter-example, the use of the word pāpa- can be studied. It is closely allied with Vedic ideas about guilt and merit, and is, in this way, linked to the complex of ideas about birth and rebirth. The word is found (including its comparative and superlative forms, but excluding compounds) as given below. If the simplex alone was studied, the results would look somewhat differently: pāpa then disappears quickly in post-Mantra texts, only to re-emerge strongly in the late Br. period. For completeness sake, however, comparative and superlative are included here.

---

RV 11	: 100 %		
Mantra	PS 48 : 631%	ŚS 24 : 490%	VSK 2: 76 %
	RVkh 12		
& early Saṃh.	KS 39 : 416 %	TS 28 : 359%	
	MS 33 : 303%		
early Brāhm.	ABo 9 : 353%	TB 16 : 202%	
-----			
		TBk 7 : 939%	
		TAk 2	
later Brāhm.		ŚBK 26+ <sup>266</sup> : 155%	ŚBMo 28 : 388%
		ŚBMw 2}	
Up.s	KaṭhB 6	KB 11 : 353%	(6-9) } 4:77%
		KA 4 ŚBMw 2}	
&		(10) : 233%	
	PB 8 : 222%		(IU 4) ŚBMn 16 : 556%
Early Sūtras	ŚB 1 VādhB 1		ŚBMa 2 : 406%
	ChU 3 : 165%	BAUK 12 : 675%	ŚBMu 11 : 974%

<sup>266</sup> VPK is not exhaustive here; I indicate suspected omissions in enumerating the occurrences of pāpa by + or ++.

**BŚS 18: 2?**

**TA 1 3**

**TA 10 10**

**TU 1**

**JB 45++ : 377%**

**JBa 8+ : 1186%**

**JUB 32 : 1821%**

**ABn 11 : 874%**

**AA 1 : 120%**

**MU 0**

**GB 5 (mostly from 1 passage)**

After the RV, there is a strong Mantra and YV Saṃh. time use of the word (30-600%), except for VS (76%) as most cases there are from RV. Most of these passages have forms of the comparative or superlative only. The word is used, in a similar percentage in the early and later Br.s (200-350%), except for an area located in the Kāṇva and Śāṇḍilya territory (only 77-155%). The then expands rapidly in the late Eastern (556-974%) and especially the Southern texts (1186-1821%). Note that the later, Eastern part of AB (6-8) has a comparatively large number of cases as well (874%).

It would be interesting to check which words are used instead of pāpa in the other texts. It is readily noticeable, however, that the usage is closely linked to ideas about guilt which are important in the context of punarmṛtyu. In both cases,<sup>267</sup> it is the late Eastern and Southern texts which initially viz. heavily employ the word; from the East, the fashion then spread westwards, to reach the late Taitt. (TB, in TB 3) and the Kaṭhas (Kāṭhaka portions of TB).<sup>268</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

In the preceding section, dealing with apparent matters of style, it is nevertheless possible to distinguish trends which spread from the Central

<sup>267</sup> Note, however, that the related word pāpman- does not disappear in the post-Mantra texts, but is found in all the Br. texts. An investigation into the semantics of both words, made by R.P.Das, MA thesis Hamburg, 1981, resulted in the meanings: "böse, schlecht, übel" for pāpa-, and "Schlechtigkeit" for pāpman-. The distribution of both words remains mysterious, and a fresh attempt is necessary to solve this problem.

<sup>268</sup> Another interesting case is that of the name for the Southern fire, usually dakṣiṇāgni, but once in TS and KS it appears as anvāhāryapacana; at the next text level, in the Br., the word has spread to nearly all the Br. texts (exc. PB) and, further on, to the Sūtras.

area (purovasu-) and the Eastern area (if ŚB is, as it seems, a late text: punarmṛtyu and pāpa). Just like developments in grammar, such matters of style spread in various directions from the original centre of innovation.

## §9. THE RELATION OF THE VEDIC DIALECTS WITH THE EARLY PRĀKRṬS<sup>269</sup>

In this section, the peculiarities of the (Post-Ṛgvedic) language will be compared with those features which link or distinguish it from the Middle Indian dialects.

Given what has been established above in §§ 1-8, it will be clear that a number of developments can be traced in the history of Vedic which are based on forms of actually spoken Vedic language, and which are not the result of simple matters of style, as, for example, the fem. gen. in -ai (as opposed to cases like the use of spr̥dh or sam.yat in traditional tales of the gods).

If this is so, it should not be surprising if some of these Middle and Late Vedic developments could be found in the various Prākṛts, especially in the older forms of these Prākṛts, and preferably in those MIA dialects which occupy the same area as the Vedic dialects in question. Vedic forms that are comparable to Pāli and other MIA forms have recently been treated by C.Caillat and O.v. Hinüber.<sup>270</sup>

In the sequel, I will rely mainly on forms from the recent, up-to-date treatment of the early Middle Indian by O.v. Hinüber, *Das altere Mittelindisch im Überblick* (SB d.Oester. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., Bd. 467, Wien 1986, abbreviated O.v.Hinüber, *Überblick*, in the sequel). This has the additional advantage that many of the forms listed by Geiger and Pischel and used by later scholars for comparisons with Ṛgvedic Skt. have been reviewed, and the forms, wrongly attributed by earlier grammars to the various Pkt.s, are eliminated from this paper. As has long been noticed, the

<sup>269</sup> For a summary of facts see O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, §7-12

<sup>270</sup> See *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung*, hg.H.Beichert, Göttingen, 1980, p. 50; Fs. I.B.Horner, Dordrecht 1974, p.49, ann.49; O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, passim; and his rev. of Beichert, *Die Sprache...IF* 88, 1983, p.307 sqq.

various Middle Indian dialects indeed exhibit a fair number of continuants of Vedic forms.<sup>271</sup>

### §9.1. "Ṛgvedic" ɭ-

To begin with, the Vedic attestation of intervocalic ɭ-<sup>272</sup> can be compared to the early Middle Indian attestation of ɭ:-<sup>273</sup>

W E S T	CENTRE/SOUTH		E A S T
Kaṭha Paippalādin (Kapiṣṭhala) Aitareyin Śākala RV?	Kauṣītaki	Kāṇva	Eastern Ait. Śākala RV ĀŚS
	Jaiminīya		
<hr/>			
Pāli: -ḍ- > ɭ- (MSS interchange with -l-)			
Inscr. W: Mathura, Sanci,	S: Karle, Nasik	E: Jaugada	
	(SE: Amarāvātī, Bhattiprolu)		
Old Śaurasenī ɭ-	Old AMg. -ɭ- <sup>274</sup>		
Pkt.Gr. : ḍ > l [ɭ] (N.Ind.MSS have -l-)			

Cf. the development in the Numerals 11-19:

Aśoka:<sup>275</sup>

W: dbādasā, treḍaśā,

terasa

N: badaya

-----

codasa

E: duvāḍasa, traidasa

<sup>271</sup> See, e.g., Emenau's article, The dialects of Old Indo-Aryan, see above §1.; the question is now summed up by O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, § 9.

<sup>272</sup> Cf. also Lüders, Phil.Ind., 546 sqq., Pischel, Pkt. Gramm. §226, 240; Wack., Ai. Gr. §222. The Northern MSS usually have -l-, as do the N. Kāṇva MSS; see Caland, ed. ŚBK, p. 12-23 passim. In the South, it is often inversely -ɭ- instead of -l-, thus the "Bhāsa" MSS; cf. W. Rau, MSS 42, p.187 sqq. In the Orissa PS, a clear distinction is made between ɭ < ḍ and old l; Pāli has -ɭ-, later, secondarily, -l- (O.v. Hinüber, Überblick: §198); Gāndh. -'ḍ- < @ -ḍ-. In Mārāṭhī, ɭ has been written since the 14th cent. (Master, Old Mar. §55); -l- modern pronunciation often is -ṛ(h); cf. Turner, Coll. papers, pp. 239-250.

<sup>273</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, §198 sqq., and on numerals, §401-402.

<sup>274</sup> For the fragments of Buddhist dramas, see Lüders, Phil. Ind., p. 547.

<sup>275</sup> For the forms, see O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, §400-402.

**Pāli:**

ekādasa, bārasa, -teḷasa, paṇṇārasa/pañcadasa

-----

ekārasa, pañcadasa/pannarasa (Gramm.)

catuddasa ,cuddasa, soḷasa

-----

**Inscr. W:** bāra(saka)

**E.:**paṃdarasa

**Niya:** badaśa, trodaśa/e, pañcadaśa

**Gāndh.:** tedasa

todaśa,trodaśe

ṣoḍaśa,sattārasa,

aṭṭhārasa

AMg. cau/coddasa

**Other Pkts.**

ekkārasa, barasa

AMg. duvālasa

ikkārasa , terasa

-----

paṇṇarasa, paṇṇaraha

**NIA:**

>rah(a) etc.

In some of the words from 11-19, the realisation as r/l̥/l may have been influenced by the immediate surroundings (trayodaśa: r..d ṣoḍaśa : ṣ..ḍ. etc.). The general distribution of -l̥-, however, is more important in this context.<sup>276</sup>

The evidence seems to indicate an early diffusion of the feature in Pāli, the Aśokan inscriptions (Delhi, Radhia, Mathia), Gāndhārī/Niya Pkt., and a later spread to all Prākṛts. In the numerals, under the special conditions mentioned, intervocalic -l̥- is found in Pāli and, perhaps (with -l-), in Ardhamāgadhī. Note, however, the almost universal change to -r- (continued in NIA), which seems to indicate a pronunciation [r̥/l̥]. It is surprising that Māgadhī is missing in the list. On the whole, the originally Western -l̥- of Vedic, which by the late Br. period had reached the East and South, had spread to all MIA dialects by the time they were first recorded.

## §9.2 Nom.pl. -āḥ/āsah; te devāḥ

<sup>276</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p.103 § 198; cf. Lüders, Phil. Ind., p.546-651, Wack., Ai. Gr., Nachtr. I §222.

The Ṛgvedic nom. pl. *-āsaḥ*<sup>277</sup> is found in Old Avestan as *-ānhö*, and in Mede as *-āha* (as represented in the O. Pers. inscriptions: *aniyāha bagāha*). The extension by *-as* is, therefore, an Indo-Ir. development (*\*-āsas*) which had (partially) affected some of the tribes but not all, notably not those of a later wave of immigrants (e.g., Y. Avestan, O. Pers., Post-Ṛgvedic). While the innovation *-āsaḥ* is found in the RV, the older form *-āḥ* is found exclusively in post-RV texts (except for archaisms and quotations from the RV/mantra language).

It is the later, mostly post-Ṛgvedic form (*-āḥ*), that has gained prominence in all Prākṛts (*-āḥ > ā*), except for *-āse* in Pāli verses (see O.v.Hinüber, *Überblick*, p.144 §312). This is a new formation in conjunction with the Eastern nom. pl. *-e*. Note that it is not found in Aśoka inscriptions or in Pkt., as Lüders has shown (Kl. Schr., p.437), apparently with the exception of two cases in a Western inscr. of Aśoka, that of Delhi Topra.<sup>278</sup> It is also remarkable that *-ase* does not yet appear as a popular form of Eastern Indo-Aryan in the "language of the Asuras," the famous exclamation *he'lavo* at ŚB 3.2.1.23 (ŚBK 4.2.1.18 *hailo*), which still retains the old voc. pl. *-o* (< *-aḥ*) in both versions; this is a phrase which otherwise shows the Eastern particularity of *r > l*, as well as that of *-y- > -v-:*<sup>279</sup> *he 'lavo < he 'rayo*, "hey, you strangers/guys."<sup>280</sup> It may well be the case that *-āse* is a fairly late development.<sup>281</sup> In this connection, it is interesting to note that AMg. *-ao* is equally a new formation (*-a + -o* of the cons. stems; see O.v.Hinüber, *Überblick* §312; voc.pl. Apabhraṃśa *-aho < -a + bho*, *Überblick* §322).

Thus the *Madhyadeśa* form is again accepted almost everywhere, except for some remnants in a few Old Pāli verses. This case indicates that the process of the spread of *Madhyadeśa* forms was a slow one. Apparently, it did not reach the East (Pāli verses) until the last few centuries, B.C.

<sup>277</sup> Cf. O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, p.144.

<sup>278</sup> See M.A.Mehendale, *Aśokan Inscriptions in India*, Bombay 1948, p. 28 §53 IXb: *viyāpaṭase*.

<sup>279</sup> See O.V. Hinüber, *Überblick* §214: E. Aśoka inscr., in Pāli (partly), in AMg, *Paiśācī*.

<sup>280</sup> Cf. ann. 2, 240; cf. P.Thieme, *Der Fremdling im RV*; in *Vedic*, cf. the JUB story 3.7.8, see Fs. W. Rau, *The case of the shattered head*.

<sup>281</sup> Cf. nom. sg.in Aśoka, A.Mg., and Mg. remnants in Pāli; see O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, p.127 §296; but pl. according to the pronoun *te?*, *Überblick*, p.161 §378 *te*. - Otherwise, one may think that perhaps it was indeed the famous "first wave" of Indo-Aryan immigration into the East which had perpetuated the spread of the Ṛgvedic usage *-āsaḥ* to the East, where it remained in use, while the Kuru-Pañcāla form *-āḥ* gained prominence in the rest of the Middle Indian dialects.

A similar development can be witnessed in the spread of the combination of pronoun and noun which reminds one of the Greek article. Not prominent in the RV, phrases like *té devāḥ* spread from the Kuru-Pañcāla centre (MS, KS, TS) to all areas; they are found in all later Vedic texts.<sup>282</sup> They also survive in the Epic to some extent, and one can now add the similar Pāli construction so 'ham = Vedic so 'ham, sa tvam, etc., as well as Pāli *taṃ tam* = Vedic *taṃ tvām*.<sup>283</sup>

### §9.3 Instr. pl. -ebhiḥ:<sup>284</sup>

In the RV, the stems in -a have the pronominal ending -ebhiḥ in the instr. pl. next to the nominal ending -aiḥ. This innovation (cf. O. Pers. -āibiś but Av. -āiś) spread to all the Prākṛts, while it disappeared in the post-Ṛgvedic texts. The local Prākṛts, however, have -ehi (Aśoka, Pāli, Pkt.s; see O.v.Hinüber, Überblick. §189), with the sole exception of some remnants in Pāli, where -ais > -e (O.v.Hinüber, Überblick, 145 §316). The crux is to determine whether this form is a Vedic remnant or a Middle Indic innovation, based on the analogy of other declensions (O.v.Hinüber, Überblick §316).

Comparing the close connection between the various Vedic dialects and the Prākṛts (see below), it is surprising that the Madhyadeśa form -aiḥ is not more prominent than its survival in a few limited cases of Pāli. It might seem, therefore, that MIA -ehi is a new formation.

On the other hand, the Pañcāla innovation of gen. fem. -ai (see below) was not accepted into Pāli, the representative of early Western Middle Indo-Aryan. It may be, therefore, that in the case of some nominal endings, the older state of affairs was preserved by the Pkt.s, i.e., instr. pl. -ebhiḥ (RV stage) and gen.fem. in -āyāḥ (RV & Mantra stage). If this is true, then the "first wave of immigration" had already spread this usage to all the areas of Northern India settled by IA speakers; this usage, then, was already too established in popular speech to be replaced by Kuru (MS, KS) or

<sup>282</sup> Cf. Delbr., Syntax p.214. Note that stories often begin with *devā vai...*, but that AB has *te devāḥ...* 3.22, 3.26., 3.27. Note as well the change from a RV usage *devāḥ* > *devatāḥ*; cf. K.Hoffmann, Aufs., p.213.

<sup>283</sup> Cf. C.Caillat, in: Sprache der alt.buddh.Überl., ed. H.Bechert; O.v. Hinüber, rev. of SÄBÜ in IF 88, 107 sqq.; - for the Mbhār., cf. Holzmann, Gramm. aus dem Mahābhārata, and K. Meenakshi, Epic Syntax, Delhi 1983. Note the frequent cases in PS and ŚS of *taṃ tvā* "[To] you, as such (and such) a person ...," usually misunderstood in the ed. of PSOr.

<sup>284</sup> O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p. 145 § 316



**Madhyadeśa (Taitt.) innovations (only found in educated, Brahmanical OIA).<sup>285</sup>**

#### §9.4 Gen. fem. in -ai

The gen. fem. in -ai, known from a number of Vedic texts, can be found in its Middle Ind. equivalent<sup>286</sup> in the oblique form of the -ā stems: *Māharāṣṭrī -āe* (also *ai, āa,*), Pkt. -āe (also- *ai,-e*),<sup>287</sup> *Aśoka -āya*, (NW and E -āye)<sup>288</sup>, Pāli -*āya*;

If one compares this with the evidence from the Vedic texts, it is obvious that the geographical location of the following Vedic schools and the Pkt. dialects agree. *Saurasenī*, with -āe, agrees with the Taitt./Kauṣ. form -ai, and *Māh.* -āe (also -āi, -e) agrees with Jaim. -ai. (Note, however, that *Māh.* also has -ai and -āa, which are regarded as metrical variants only; see O.v.Hinüber, *Überblick* § 80).

It seems that the Madhyadeśa innovation (TS, etc. -ai) subsequently spread to all nooks and corners of the subcontinent where IA was spoken. Or, in other words, the Middle Indic innovation is first seen in the Madhyadeśa texts like TS, etc., and then is accepted into other Vedic dialects due to the prestige of the (Kuru-) Pañcāla Brāhmaṇical language. Note as well that the form disappears from Epic (and Class.) Skt. which, in this case, continues the Western Vedic dialects.

#### §9.5 The preterite

It has been mentioned above (§5.2) that the development of the tenses in late Vedic and early MIA foreshadows a complete restructuring of the tense system in MIA.<sup>289</sup>

<sup>285</sup> Note that there still remains a remnant case of -ebhiḥ in KapBr. = TB 3.12.3.3, a text surviving as a fragment only; see Raghuvira, ed. KpS, p.XIX (repr.), however this is in a puronuvākya.

<sup>286</sup> See Bloch/Master, *Indo Aryan*, p.135.

<sup>287</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, p.150 §334; §80

<sup>288</sup> See also O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 299

<sup>289</sup> In this section, I again quote from my article on the origin of the frame story, in the Fs. U. Schneider.

In this case, the Eastern feature (typical is ŚBM, AB 6-8), with a two-fold opposition aorist : perfect(/impf.), is fused with the Central/Western one (TB, AB 1-5) with a retention of the older three-fold opposition aorist : imperfect : perfect, and the Southern one (JB) with a new, two-fold opposition aor. : perf.(/impf.).

In late Vedic, a restructuring of the use of the past tenses seems to have taken place (see above §5.2); a distinction is made between the value of the augmented forms (impf., aor., conditional) in "pluperfect meaning" (vorzeitig), and the unaugmented forms (perf., pres., future, subj., opt., imp.).<sup>290</sup>

In early Middle Indian, the perf. is found only in a few remnant forms of Pāli; it has almost disappeared in the other languages. The impf. is extinct, except for a few remnants in Pāli (like āsī < āsīt), which have been classified with the aorists as preterite. The situation in Pāli, which developed from the Buddhist Middle Indian in (partly) the same area (Pañcāla/Ujjain, etc.) as the lost Śāṭy. Br. and JB, is still comparable to that of the Jaim. texts. Instead of an opposition (impf.)/perf. : aor., Pāli has almost no impf. left at all,<sup>291</sup> and rarely a perf. (and then only in the older text level, in the Gāthās; O.v.Hinüber, Überblick, § 480). The normal past tense is the aorist. When compared to even late Vedic, Pāli is one or two steps ahead. The survival of the aor. in Pāli (more rarely in A.-Mg., and in a few cases in J.-Māh.) fits the situation encountered in the Jaim. texts (JB and JUB) quite well, where the aor. is the most prominent past tense (next to the perfect).<sup>292</sup>

One can imagine the following pattern of innovation for (part of) the area where Pāli developed from Buddhist Middle Indian. As an example, the Southern text, JB, which was (re)composed/ redacted on the basis of a lost (Central, i.e., Pañcāla) Śāṭyāyana Br. in Avanti, Bundelkhand, Malva, lends itself for comparison, as the other Central texts, TB/TĀ, KB are either more conservative or do not show the same kind of development. JB uses the imperfect tense to narrate events of a (long distant) past and also for those

<sup>290</sup> Note that there is no functional distinction between augmented and unaugmented forms in Pāli, but that this is a remnant of older forms regulated acc. to the length of the form and its origin in one of the aor. types. The same uncertainty occurs in Pāli: On prohibitives / injunctives with mā which employ augmented "injunctives" in Pāli and Epic, see C. Caillat, Some idiosyncracies of language and style in Asoka's rock edicts at Girnar, in: *Hinduismus und Buddhismus*, Fs. U. Schneider, ed. H. Falk, Freiburg, p.97 sq. with lit; cf. ann 132. Cf. the restructuring of tenses in Young Avestan, see Kellens, *Le Verbe Avestique*, Wiesbaden 1984, p.431 sqq.

<sup>291</sup> O.v. Hinüber, Überblick § 479.

<sup>292</sup> Cf. O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p.192 § 477-488, esp. § 478.

events which the speaker or listener recalls as a personal experience. The aorist is used for events that took place "just now," in the near past, including those that took place in the near past and have an effect in the present.

Once the new opposition-- (distant) past : near past-- had been established, a situation could occur when a narrator goes on to tell in the aor.: "(and then) this happened, and then that happened just now / a day before > at any time before now." Constant use of this tense (aor.) must have led to the use of the aor. as a general past tense (preterite) and to the disappearance of the perfect in Pāli and other early Middle Indian dialects.<sup>293</sup>

## §9.6 The Subjunctive

The gradual disappearance of the subjunctive in Vedic and its survival in the 1st forms of the imperative paradigm have been studied by L. Renou, in his *Monographies sanskrites*, Vol. I, Paris 1937. He concludes (p.43) that in Vedic prose, the subj. was an archaic remnant, a fossil (une formation figée) which was necessarily on its way out. He continues that its reappearance, more apparent than real, in the late Br., has no "chronologic" value,<sup>294</sup> in this case, a correct evaluation. His materials indicate the beginning of the gradual decline of the subj. in the Mantras of the YV (TS, see p.15 sq.).

Samhitā prose contains a fair number of cases. TS has 118 cases (of which 1st pers. = 56x, and thus should be disregarded; see p.36). The decline is more pronounced in the Brāhmaṇas; from 8-9% forms in the old Samh.s, the usage of the subj. falls to 1.5% in AB (78 cases), viz. 2.5% in KB (67x, mantras, sampraīṣa, gātha always excluded). This agrees with an accelerating simplification of its syntactical usage (p.16 sq.). Notably, the 2nd (AB 2x, KB 0) and also the 3rd persons (AB 11, KB 7) become rare (p.20). The 2nd person was probably already regarded as archaic by the authors of AB (p.21); in ŚB, it is found only in narrative portions. Another Western Br., PB, has 27 cases, of which 16 are in the 3rd pers. and 2 in the 2nd (p.37). The late AA has 20 cases, including 2 in the Sūtra-like book 5 (p.39).

<sup>293</sup> See Geiger, Pāli, § 120, 158- 171; in § 162, he is misinformed about the Vedic impf.; cf. C. Caillat, *Pour une nouvelle grammaire du Pāli*, Ist. di Indol. d. Univ. di Torino, Conference IV, Torino 1970; O.v. Hinüber, MSS 36, pp. 39. (cf. also MSS 32, p.65 sqq., KZ 96, p.30 sqq.).

<sup>294</sup> One of his favourite, although generally too global, opinions regarding linguistic variation in the Samh. and Br. texts; cf. above ann. 12, which is shared by Caland and Minard. They all regard such variations as a simple matter of style, not taking into account the geographical spread and little of the relative chronology of the texts.

As has been indicated above, the subjunctive makes a sudden comeback in some late Brāhmāṇas; JB has 194 cases (1st pers.: 152, 2nd: 2, 3rd: 40; Renou p. 36). VādhB (listed as Sūtra with Renou,) has, true to its Br. character, 74 cases (1st: 39, 2nd: 12, p. 40).

BŚS, apparently including the Br. portions, has but a few cases: 4 in the 2nd pers., 3 in the 3rd. Similarly, JŚS has just one case. The Up.s, too, exhibit but a few instances: AitU 1, ChU 3, BAU more (Renou, p. 40 §54).<sup>295</sup>

The use of the subj. in ŚB increases again, as indicated above, although it makes out only 1.9% of the verb forms (excl. BAU), of which the 1st pers. accounts for 65% (437 cases of the 1st pers., 21 of the 2nd).

Notably, the Western books ŚB 6-10 again have fewer instances of the subj. than the other books (p. 37, §47, cf. Minard Enigmes I, §461b), which agrees with the decline of the subj. in the West and the Centre (AB, KB, PB); ŚBMo has 385 cases, ŚBMw 155, ŚBMn,a 114. If the occurrences of the subj. together with *nēt* are calculated, we get a similar result: ŚBMo 97, ŚBMw 39, ŚBMn,a,u 29 (Renou, p. 38, 25% of the cases). Note the late hyper-characterised forms: -ā- as a subjunctive marker, even of cons. stem verbs.<sup>296</sup>

The figures are (subj. of 2nd and 3rd pers. in brackets):

---

	TS 118 (62)	
AB 78 (13)	KB 67 (7)	ŚBM : 654 (217)
	VādhB 74 (35)	ŚBo 385
	JB 194 (40)	ŚBw 155
		ŚBn,a 114
PB 27 (18)		
ChU 3		AA 22
	BŚS 4	(AA5: 2)
		AitU 1

---

<sup>295</sup> See Liebich, Pāṇini, p. 28, 67 and Fürst, Sprachgebr. der Up. p. 19, 59.

<sup>296</sup> See Renou, Mon. Skt. I, p. 5, §7-8. Note that hyperchar. -ā- is found first, with some cases in RVKh, YV Mantra and notably in ŚS, but is less common in the Br. other than ŚB; Renou notes these forms, in increasing order of occurrence in: TS, AB, PB, JB, VādhB., and esp. ŚB (p.39); (-ā- occurs also in VādhB).

The strong occurrences in ŚB and JB lead us to expect that the subj. would survive in the early Pkts. and in Pāli (based as it is on a W./S. language comparable to JB with some older Eastern words and forms, comparable to ŚB). However, all MIA languages present a much more advanced state of affairs in the Aśoka inscriptions; remnants and new formations of this verbal category are found only in certain inscriptions, and then (as expected) only in Eastern ones: Sarnath huvāti, nikhīpātha, see O.v.Hinüber, Überblick, p.172 §413.

However, the supposedly Western forms of Pāli as the representative of Buddh. Middle Indian (forms like garahāsi) must be explained differently. Thus the last flowering of this verbal category in ŚB must have been removed from the early MIA of Aśoka, Pāli, and the other Pkt.s by a wide margin of time, another confirmation, incidentally, of what has been noted above about the respective dates of some late Vedic texts like BAU, and the early MIA texts, and also of Pāṇini who still teaches the subj., though his language is particularly conservative (see below, on -eṣma, §9.7).

### §9.7 The Precative in -eṣ(ma)

The spread of the precative in -eṣ-, formed from roots in -ā is of particular interest for the history of early Vedic dialects: The Ṛgvedic forms in -eyā- (e.g. deyās-) are replaced in post-Ṛgvedic texts by those in -eṣ- (e.g. deṣ-). Forms like deṣma from dā are typical Kuru-Pañcāla innovations which have spread to all post Ṛgvedic -Mantra texts.) Their origin, however, can be traced already in the RV itself (yeṣma, jeṣma)<sup>297</sup>

Such forms are attested in:

(RV)	PS	ŚS	VS
	KS MS	TS	
	KSa		
			ŚB (pr. in acc. with verse ŚB 4.3.4.17)
			some later Sūtra texts (Mantra)

The Vedic forms in -eṣma have their counterparts in the Prākṛts<sup>298</sup> as well: -eṣma is attested in Mg., Śaur. - but not A.Mg! -. In Pāli, some forms (-aṃhase, -oṃhase), which are found exclusively in SE Asian MSS, may have

<sup>297</sup> see K.Hoffmann, Aufs. 465-74.

<sup>298</sup> See O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, p. 177.

been derived from the precative (or the injunctive; see O.v.Hinüber, Überblick, p.178 §433).

It is very illustrative to note here that the extreme North-West, i.,e Pāṇini's language has not accepted the Kuru-Pañcāla innovation.<sup>299</sup> Pāṇ. still teaches -yāsma in dāyāsma, etc., and therefore stands on the level of the RV. This is another indication of the extreme conservatism of the Northern educated speech, cf. KB on Northern speech, quoted above.

## §9.8 The Infinitive in -tavái

In classical Skt. only one infinitive survived, the one in -tum; this agrees with the major infinitive form of the Prākṛts: Pāli -tum, Śaur.-dum, J.-Māh. -um<sup>300</sup>; it is, however, rarely found in A.Mg.<sup>301</sup>

In the Veda (and to some extent in Middle Indian) there still was a great variety of inf. endings (-e,-dhyai,-as, -am,-toḥ, -tave, tavai, etc.), of which the one in -tos has been studied above, (cf. § 5.4). The dative variety -tavái, (which developed from the earlier -tave, note the accent)<sup>302</sup> is found in a number of texts,<sup>303</sup> quoted here according to Renou, Mon.Skt. and Delbrück, Syntax; (the numbers followed by ? indicate my uncertainty as to the inclusion intended by Renou of all cases found in the texts).

---

RV 25            ŚS 3?

MSp 14            TSp 2?

KSp 8	ŚBK more frequent than M <sup>304</sup>	ŚBM 37	ŚBMo 26 <sup>305</sup> (16)
-------	---	--------	-----------------------------

<sup>299</sup> See already K.Hoffmann, p.470: "indication for dialect differences in the Brahmanical caste language.

<sup>300</sup> See O.V. Hinüber, Überblick §497, p. 198.

<sup>301</sup> Cf. also Renou, Mon.Skt. II §39 sqq., cf. Minard, Trois énigm. I § 119c.

<sup>302</sup> From -tave-vái, see Thurneysen, Mél.Saussure, p. 233 sqq.

<sup>303</sup> cf. already Brunnhofer, Beitr.z. Kunde d. idg. Sprachen, X, p.234-266; Delbrück, Ai. Syntax, p. 427 sqq., Oertel, Journal of Ved. Stud. I, p. 141 sqq.; Renou, Mon. Skt.2, esp. p. 26 sqq.= §26 sqq.; Oertel, KZ 65, p.71 (īśvara- + °tavai).

<sup>304</sup> See Caland, ed. ŚBK p.47, 74, 85, Oertel ZII 5, p. 111.

<sup>305</sup> The numbers in brackets are those of Brunnhofer, whose facts Renou, p. 37, calls "ne sont rien moins que sûres".

AB 4?	KN 1 ?	ŚBMw 1 (2) <sup>306</sup>		
		JBc 4 ?	ŚBMn 5 (4)	
		JUB 1	ŚBMa 0 (0)	
		Vādhb 10	ŚBMu 5 (2)	
PB 1				AA 0

Sūtra forms < Br., Saṃh.

---

To supplement these figures, the cases of -tavái use in conjunction with a verbum dicendi (āha, brūyāt, also āhuḥ, bravasi, uvāca) are given below; the figures are taken from J. Gippert<sup>307</sup>. This collocation occurs 60 times in the Vedic texts (excluding the passages occurring in parallel versions of several texts); mainly in ŚB and JB, also in TB, KB, JUB, VādhB, but not at all in AB.

---

RV 1	ŚS 1			
	KS 1			
	MS 3			
	AB 0	TB 2		
	KB 1	VādhB 7	ŚBKo 6	ŚBMo 17 <sup>308</sup>
		JB 6	ŚBMw 5	
		JUB 2	ŚBKn 2	ŚBMn 1

ŚrautaS < almost only quot. from Saṃh., Br. texts<sup>309</sup>  
 ĀrṣU1

---

It can be seen that both sets of figures, those of Renou and of Gippert do not oppose each other but, to some extent, supplement each other. Together, they provide an indication of the development of this infinitive in Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa prose. The figures indicate that in late Br. prose, the inf. in -tavái survived (relatively) well in the Eastern Centre and the East (even taking into account the size of ŚB: contrast the large JB!).

<sup>306</sup> -tavai is missing in books 6-10: Renou, Mon Skt.II §38; Minard I 384d, except for one case in book 9; K.Hoffmann, -tavai brū, Aufs. p.103 : JB,ŚB; cf. Oertel JVS 1,141.

<sup>307</sup> See MSS 44, p.27 sqq.

<sup>308</sup> Note that most cases of -tavai in ŚBMo do not have parallels in ŚBKo, see Gippert, MSS 44, p.50, ann.5; the opposite, -tavai in K but other forms in M, is rare.

<sup>309</sup> Gippert, p. 47 sqq. , with ann. 74.

It is not surprising, therefore, that out of the variety of infinitives in Middle Indian, the continuant of -tave, -tavai is found in A.Māg.-tae; note that the other inf., that in -dum is rare in AMg! The occurrences of Pāli -tave (cf. also and Aśokan inscr. -tave, not found in NW inscr.) may perhaps be due to the preceding stages of Old Indian that are represented by Maitr./Jaim. schools.

### §9.9 RV hi śma, Gāndh. hi śma, Pāli hi ssa

Another example, furnished recently by C. Caillat, J.Brough and K.R. Norman<sup>310</sup>: Ṛgvedic hi śma survives in Gāndharī (Dharmapada) hi śma and in Pāli (Theragāthās) hi ssa, while the Brāhmaṇas usually have ha vai.

### §9.10 sa in initial position in late Br. texts

In sentence initial position, sa is frequently found in late Br. texts, for example, at ŚB 1.2.5.24 (where the parallel Kāṇva version, 2.2.3.21, has atha!).<sup>311</sup> - In JB, the collocation occurs in the earlier books (i.e excluding the late Agnihotra book JB 1.1-65).<sup>312</sup> - AB, however, has only two isolated cases, notably in the later books: 7.5.1; 7.29.2 . This fits well with the attestation in other late Br. texts like BŚS, VādhB.<sup>313</sup>

The phrase can also function as an important indicator for the relative date of Pāli, JB, and BŚS as its continuant is found in Pāli: seyyathā, cf. taṃyathā (O.v.Hinüber, Überblick, § 375, Minard, Enigmes I §119a.) -- In addition, it may be mentioned that the tmesis which is prominent in late Vedic texts like Baudh., VādhB, is already rarely found in Pāli, see O.v.Hinüber, Überblick §

<sup>310</sup> See C. Caillat, in: Die Sprache der ältesten buddh. Überlieferung (see ann. 270).

<sup>311</sup> See Minard, Enigmes I, §119a, cf. Caland, ŚBK p.95.

<sup>312</sup> See Bodewitz, transl. JB, p.120.

<sup>313</sup> For BŚS, see Caland, Über BŚS, § 54 ; VādhB, Caland AO 1, p.9, etc.; this is close to ŚBK, see Caland, ed. ŚBK p.98; further: Keith, ad AB 7.5, see tr.p.291, n.2 "a sign of lateness". The collocation is important for a study of the relationships of late Br. texts: sa ya, sa yathā/yatra etc. should be taken up in detail; -- cf. also the continuant of sentence initial pronoun, tad in casu, in the Epic, meaning "then, now", cf. Kāṇva atha for Mādhy. sa! -- For other similarities between Pāli and late Vedic, see author in Fs. U.Schneider (the splitting of the head, the Gandharva/Yakṣa with an iron hammer in his hand etc.; cf. foll. ann. on mahāśāla).



58 (Epileg.CPD I, s.v.tmesis). Numerous further comparisons that could be added, are left out here for want of space and time.<sup>314</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

This section has indicated, I hope to have shown, that some of the peculiarities noted for the various Vedic dialects reappear in the later Prākṛts, and, in spite of the gap between Late Vedic and attested MIA, often in the same areas as those of the preceding Vedic dialects. Now that the area and the time-frame of the Vedic dialects are better known than before, the various Middle Indian languages and dialects can be compared with the earlier Vedic evidence much better than possible so far. It is also interesting to note that forms which are found in the RV and have been compared directly to the Pkt.s often have undergone a long development, visible in the various Middle and Late Vedic dialects, until they reached the MIA stage; the various levels of such developments and their geographical will be easier to follow in the future.

## §10. CONCLUSIONS:

### §10.1. Dialects and centres of innovation

The preceding investigation will have established, it is hoped, a number of results regarding the post-Ṛgvedic dialects. Among the more general are:

\* 1: There are regional differences in Vedic. This is the opinion of the Vedic texts themselves,( see above § 1 ), and this outcome has been exemplified so frequently by the materials presented above (§5.1-3, §6) that further discussion does not seem necessary here.

\* 2: These regional differences are not static both in time and space (geographical distribution) but are dynamic: certain developments spread from an original (often small) area to the surrounding territories

---

<sup>314</sup> Note, however, Ved. tād, found only a few times in RV and in ŚS,PS; it appears in the Pkts., see O.v.H, Überblick, p.160 §374 and in Aśoka, Khalsi Inscr.; - some additions of common vocabulary are: mahāsāla-, of Brahmins with a large house(hold), occurs first at: ŚB 10.6.1.1; 10.3.3.1; 10.6.1.6; Up.: ChU 5.11.1/3; 6.4.5 ; Chāg.24:6/7;Vādh.B 4.89:31, cf. Pāli mahāsāla DhN 12.2, etc.; - or: śiraḥ + pra.han, śiraṃ + vi.pat in late Br., Up.s, cf. with Pāli muddhā + phal, see now author, Fs.W.Rau.

(§5.1-2). It is especially remarkable that certain localisable innovations in one level of Vedic language spread quickly during the next level.

This does not always occur only in an Eastern direction, as one might think, (taking into account the history of settlement of N.India by IA speakers), but also in other directions, as for example southwards, or from the extreme East towards the West (§5.2)

Especially clear is the example of the diffusion of the gen. fem. in -ai which originated in a small area of N. India (the Pañcāla land in Eastern U.P.) and subsequently spread east- and southwards, - without affecting, however, the West (the Kuru area) and the "North" (Panjab and the E.Gandhāra area of Pāṇini's bhāṣā).

Among the innovations treated in this paper (and a forthcoming one, treated in Notes on Ved. dialects, 1) are the following:

(1) In the field of phonetics:

**Innovations:**

- \* khy > kś (Kuru )
- \* -ḍ- > ḷ- (Kuru)
- \* -jm- > ym (part of Kuru area)
- \* CuV > CV (Kuru)
- \* purūvasu- > puro<sup>o</sup> (part of Kuru area)
- \* parāyate, etc. > palā<sup>o</sup> (Kuru)
- \* preñkha > pleñkha (part of Kuru area)
  
- \* svar, etc. > suvar Pañcāla YV
- \* tanacmi > tanakmi, etc. Prācyā (Eastern dialect)

**Further diffusion of early Kuru innovations:**

- \* purovasu- (Pañcāla)
- \* palāyate, etc. (Pañcāla)

**Retentions:**

- \* [ ch/śch ] retained (Kuru area: E. Panjab/W. Uttar Pradesh), later > [ cch ]

**Sandhi Innovations::**

- \* Sandhi -ān V- > aṃ V- (part of Kuru area)

- \* Sandhi -e/o a- > -a a Prācyā (Śākalya)
- \* Sandhi -e/o a- > -e/o ' North? (Pāṇini) and general Koine?
- \* Sandhi -o/au V- various innovations in Pañcāla/Prācyā dial.

## (2) In declination:

### Innovations viz. elimination of older RV forms:

- \* elimination of n.pl.m. -āsaḥ; introduction of -āḥ (Kuru)
- \* nom. dual -au (Kuru)
- \* n.pl.ntr. -āni (Kuru)
- \* istr.pl. -aiḥ (Kuru)
- \* -yuvam > -vyam (part of Kuru area)
- \* gen. fem. - ai (Pañcāla)
- \* case forms of sāyam (Pañcāla)
- \* late forms of pronouns:
  - nom. vayām, āvām (part of Kuru?, Prācyā area)
- \* late forms of śīrṣan-  
made from śīras- (part of Kuru?, Prācyā area)

## (3) In conjugation

- \* spread of inf. -toḥ (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* decline of subjunctive (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* injunctive disappears (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* decline of inf. -tavai (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* further diffusion of RV precativ in -eṣ(ma) (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* retention of RV precativ in -āyās(ma) (Northern bhāṣā:Pāṇini)

### Innovations:

- \* periphrastic aorist (-ām akar, etc.) (Kuru area, only Saṃh. prose)
- \* spread of narrative perfect (Prācyā)
- \* renewed use of subjunctive,  
hypercharacterised subj. (Prācyā)
- \* renewed use of inf.-tavai (Prācyā)
- \* late forms of duh : dugdhe (part of Kuru?, Prācyā)

## (4) Particles

- \* spread of khalu (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* spread of svid (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* spread of vāva (Kuru area and beyond)

- \* decline of u (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* renewed use of u in collocations: Prācyā/Southern
- \* sa in sentence initial position: Prācyā/Southern

### (5) Style<sup>315</sup>

#### Innovations:

- \* use of sam.yat (part of Kuru area)
- \* devāsura- (Kuru and beyond)
- \* punarmṛtyu- (Prācyā)
- 
- \* retention of sprdh (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* avoidance of pāpa- (Kuru area and beyond)
- \* renewed use of pāpa- (Prācyā)

\*\*\*\*\*

## §10.2.Three Centres: Kurukṣetra, Pañcāla, (Kosala-)Videha

Observing and evaluating all the dialect features mentioned above, certain dialect areas can now be distinguished:

When one excludes the Panjab, the main area of the Ṛgvedic tribes, which itself shows many dialect variations,<sup>316</sup> three centres of innovation and subsequent diffusion of dialect features are observable:

(1) -- The Kuru area (E.Panjab, Haryana) is an important centre of innovation in Mantra and YV Saṃhitā prose texts (MS,KS, as well as

<sup>315</sup> Certain lacunae, however, have to be identified here: they occur, as has been mentioned in the introduction, in those areas of Vedic grammar which are not directly approachable for a detailed investigation so far, i.e. the occurrence of certain endings of verbs and nouns, their statistical or geographical relations to each other, or the combinations of two or more particles with each other. Only a data base system, built up with the help of a complete electronic storage of the Vedic texts, will bring significant progress.-- Other lacunae concern certain forms and words - especially particles - which are not completely listed in Vishva Bandhu's Vedic Word Concordance (VPK), most notably in the Sūtra volumes. It is regrettable that an old Śrautasūtra like BŚS is recorded only so imperfectly.

<sup>316</sup> Which are presently studied by S.Insler.

the early Brāhmaṇa text, AB 1-5) and has a few other, typical developments:

Among the innovations, the following are notable: khy > kś ; -ḍ- > ḷ-; CuV > CV; parāyate > palā°; purūvasu- > puro°; preñkha > pleñkha; introduction of: n.pl. -āḥ; nom. dual -au; n.pl.ntr. -āni; istr.pl. -aiḥ; - - yuvam > -vyam; periphrastic aorist (-ām akar, etc.); vāva; use of sam.yat; devāsura-.

The following innovations only affected a part of the Kuru area (but often spread beyond it): -jm- > -ym- ; Sandhi -ān V- > aṁ V-;

The Kuru area is the centre of diffusion, though not of original occurrence of: the RV inf. -toḥ; of the RV precativ in -eṣ(ma); of khalu, svid.

Notable retentions are: archaic [ ch/śch ], (otherwise > [ cch]); retention of sprdh in part of the area; avoidance of pāpa-;

Some categories viz. words disappear or are on their way out in the Kuru area: elimination of the older RV n.pl. -āsaḥ, dual -ā, istr.pl. -ebhiḥ; decline of subjunctive; the injunctive disappears; decline of inf. -tavai; decline of the use of the particle u.

(2) -- The Pañcāla land (Madhyadeśa, W.Uttar Pradesh) has its share of innovations; they are later than those of the Kuru area and are represented by texts like TS, TB, KB.

Innovations: svar, etc.> suvar; Kuru [ ch/śch ] changed to > [ cch ]; gen. fem. -ai; case forms of sāyam;

Further diffusion of early Kuru innovations: purovasu- ; palāyate, etc.;

**Sandhi Innovations:**

Sandhi -o/au V- : various innovations in Pañcāla dial.

(3) -- The East, primarily Videha (N.Bihar) but to some extent also Kosala (E.Uttar Pradesh, W.Bihar), are the late Vedic centre of major innovations; the area is represented by ŚBM and ŚBK, the later part of

**AB, i.e. AB 6-8, and BaudhŚS, perhaps also by PB if the text indeed got its final redaction in the East.**

**Innovations:**

**tanacmi > tanakmi, etc. ; Sandhi -e/o a- > -a a (Śākalya); Sandhi -o/au V- : various innovations in Prācyā dial.; late forms of pronouns: nom. vayām, āvām (part of rācyā area); late forms of śīrṣan- made from śīras- (part of the area); diffusion of the narrative perfect; renewed use of subjunctive; hypercharacterised subj.; renewed use of inf.-tavai; late forms of duh : dugdhe (part of the Prācyā area); renewed use of u in collocations; sa in sentence initial position; punarmṛtyu- ; renewed use of pāpa-**

\*\*\*\*\*

**The Kosala land, occupied by the Kāṇvas, Baudhāyanīyas, and Śāṇḍilyas, however, is in many ways a transitional area (usually with a strong Western influence); the South (E.Rajasthan, N.Madhya Pradesh, i.e. Baghelkhand, Malva), occupied by the Jaiminīyas, equally is a transitional area between (Eastern) Central and Western influences.**

**Each one of these centres is characterised by a number of developments which either originated there at a certain stage of the development of the Vedic language, or which spread from there in subsequent levels of Vedic. A case can be made, and has been made above, for defining each of these centres and their immediately surrounding territory as dialect areas, i.e. the Kuru, Pañcāla, and Eastern (Prācyā) dialects, as well as the transitional dialects of the South and of Kosala.**

**The last two areas are somewhat problematic as many developments that took place there also occur in the Eastern area (ŚB, AB 6-8), and there is no certainty at this moment which part, for example, of JB is older or younger than a certain part of ŚB, or BŚS, or VādhB. If these texts are more or less contemporary, one may posit a late Vedic Eastern Central/Southern/Eastern dialect grouping which stands opposed to the earlier Kuru-Pañcāla area. Much more research into the relative chronology of the texts involved is necessary in order to explore this problem.**

**The earliest form of post-RV Sanskrit, i.e. the Kuru dialect, is characterised by a number of phonetical and flexional developments which distinguish the earlier Mantra and YV Saṃhitā period from the later Saṃhitā (TS) and Brāhmaṇa (KB, etc.) levels. The Kuru form of**

Vedic held sway over the Pañcālas for a long time, until it had to give way to and subsequently was overshadowed by the one that had developed among the Pañcālas themselves (most notable is the gen. fem. in -ai). This dialect gained prominence in the late Saṃhitā and in the early Brāhmaṇa period and strongly influenced the areas East and South to it. The "Eastern dialect", perhaps best called Prācyā in accordance with Pāṇini and other early sources, emerged into prominence only during the late Brāhmaṇa period. Interestingly, even the present version of JB (i.e. the one superseding the originally Central Śāṭy.B) still criticises (albeit indirectly) a king's son for speaking "like the Easterners". Subsequently, some of the characteristics of the Prācyā dialect seem to have been strongly preferred, so strongly in fact that they penetrated further and further westwards until they reached the Panjab (but not Pāṇini's homeland) during the late Vedic period. Typical is the diffusion of the narrative perfect which began in this area. Other peculiarities, like the use of certain groups of particles, too, quickly spread westwards. Finally, the East is very important as the late Vedic centre of redactional activity (Śākalya for the RV, "Yājñavalkya" for the White YV, etc.)<sup>317</sup>

In addition to these major dialect areas, there are others about which we do not know anything or only have some stray facts. These are those of the

-Bāhīkas (Madra, Mahāvṛṣa) in the Panjab:

- note the local names of Rudra (Bhava/Śarva), ŚB 1.7.3.8, cf.6.1.311-15<sup>318</sup>
- they speak uttarāhi ŚB 3.2.3.15 (only Kuru),

<sup>317</sup> It must be stressed again that all Vedic texts share at least one feature: thn (svar, śreṣṭha) and the late introduction of the Abhinihita Sandhi -o/e a- > ' a-, a state of affairs described by Pāṇini at 6.1.109 sqq., who, however, also notes the divergent older pronunciations of Śākalya, at 8.3.17 sqq. (see above §6.7). Where did this movement of modernisation start? Was it perhaps only under the influence of the Late Vedic Eastern kings, like Janaka? Cf. the gramm. modernisations in ŚBK, VSK, PB! -- Also, why do the Buddhists still have to talk about chandas pronunciation? Probably because the Western Vedic trend to use three levels of tones (versus the two of ŚB, bhāṣika acc.) was encouraged by orthoprax Eastern kings, for reasons of status. Note that even VS, which probably was extracted from ŚB, has introduced the Western system, and as Śabara's Bhāṣya shows, at an early time! (In the Middle ages VS was still closer in accentuation to MS, see the old Nepalese MSS of 1421 and earlier, described in VIJ 12, p.472 sqq.). Holy texts thus were characterised by musical accents, with great variations in pitch, something the local Pkt. of Buddha's time did no longer have. Therefore, Kāṭyāyana, Vārtt. and Patāñjali have to specify: ādy-udātta, see 1.3.9:266.18, etc.; cf. P. Thieme, Pan. p. 19.

<sup>318</sup> Cf. below, §10.3, at the end of the table.

but ŚBK uttarāhai 4.2.3.15 (of the Kuru-Mahāvṛṣa): i.e. the speak with higher pitch than their more Eastern neighbours<sup>319</sup>. -  
 - they have different names for wells, Pāṇ.4.2.74  
 - in general, their language is disregarded, despised (they speak: ripratarāḥ, śapanatarā, āhanasyāvāditarā bhavanti, ŚB 9.3.1.24)

Northern speech, partly known from Pāṇini's bhāṣā and a few statements in the Brāhmaṇa texts is generally praised for its high standard (KB 7.2), but partly overlaps with that of the Bāhikas.<sup>320</sup>

- Border area dialects, like that of Varṇu (Pāṇini 4.2.103 kāṇṭhaka instead of kāṇṭhika); or that of the Kamboja, an Eastern Iranian language, cf. Kamb. śavati for YAv. šauuaiti,<sup>321</sup> vs. Vedic gacchati in Nirukta and Patañjali, who adds Saurāṣṭrian hammati (attested only in Eastern NIA).
- Some local peculiarities of Kurukṣetra, the land between the Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī rivers in E. Panjab, like the auśānasa stones BŚS 18.47:7, or nyubja as name of bowls (see above, § 1), perhaps Vaiśambhalyá as a name of the River Sarasvatī (TB 2.5.8.7, ĀpŚS 4.14.4, Wack.II,1,206)
- 'Asura' speech (Eastern ?) : he 'lavo he 'lavo ŚB, but cf. ŚBK hailo hailo, (see above, ann. 280, 240)

Unfortunately there are more lacunae. We would like to have more material from the important S.region (of the Jaim.); so far there is directly localisable evidence only from JB and JUB; if we had more, connections with Pāli would be probably still be easier to establish. We do not have an Eastern SV text, unless part of PB was composed and redacted there; the Br. text of the Bhāllavin (which employed, like ŚB,

<sup>319</sup> Cf. author, On Late Vedic pitch accent, forthc.

<sup>320</sup> It is curious that a Western text, ŚB 9, raises this point. The Panjab was overrun by new waves of immigration at the time of composition of this passage, cf., the role of the Salvas at JB 2.208 who conquered Kurukṣetra, of the Malla (JB §198) and of the Vṛji (Pāṇini 4.2.131); see above.

<sup>321</sup> See author, Persica IX,1980, p. 92.



the bhāṣika accent) is lost. Nor do we have the lost Paipp.Br. for part of the AV. The list can be prolonged. Such lacunae can, in the future, be worked away to some extent, step by step, if we succeed in filling in the map of Vedic India with the help of the "lost schools" (cf. Bh. Ghosh: Lost Br.).<sup>322</sup>

There remain, however, still a few more problems in the definition and proper delineation of the Vedic dialects.

The various dialects mentioned just now will always have to be clearly distinguished from local style, especially the style of a few Vedic śākhās versus others. Examples have been mentioned and discussed above: the use of sam.yat versus spr̥dh, the new compound devāsurāḥ (to be treated separately), and other school mannerisms and peculiarities like súvar for svàr, etc.

\*\*\*\*\*

It has been noted above that several peculiarities are not shared by the various schools (śākhās) of all four Vedas of a particular dialect area, e.g. that of the Pañcālas, but only some (or even only one) of them, while the peculiarity in fact transgresses the dialect area. In such cases the peculiarity is often restricted to the schools of only one Veda (cf. above, passim) and thus found in various dialect areas. It can be noticed that, for example, both a Western and a Central Vedic school share the same traits, while those belonging to another Veda in the same area disagree. This necessitates, in future studies, a careful deliberation of several factors. The setting provided by time (relative / absolute chronology) and location (the homeland of a school viz. [part(s)] of a particular text) will have to be distinguished from the influence of such factors as the peculiarities belonging and restricted to one of the four Vedas only, or to one or more of the neighbouring schools, viz. to those occupying the same area as the text in question.

To provide a concrete example: is AB 6-8 just late or is it late and Eastern at the same time? Are some characteristics of AB 6-8 (like the use of the narrative perfect or of vāvai) due, thus, to the date of its composition or are they just due to its Eastern location and, for example, the influence of the Vājasaneyins? Or: why should the opt. ending -īta of a-stem verbs be regarded as younger in AB 1-5 (an old text!) but as contemporary in KB; why does it only occur in these two Brāhmaṇas

---

<sup>322</sup> See §9.5 ann. 334.

belonging to the Ṛgveda, and why only later otherwise, in BŚŚ, etc.? Is the final redaction even of AB 1-5 so late? Was the text revised in the East, by Śākalya or his school, during t(e late Br. period?

While deliberating on such questions, a circular argument has, of course, to be avoided. The only way to do so with the still limited materials at hand, is, in my opinion, to take into account as many factors concerning a particular text or śākhā as possible: that means, such features of a particular text as its (absolute and relative) time of composition, collection or redaction, its geographical location, its levels of text composition, its position in the development of the Vedic language, school peculiarities, special features belonging to a particular Veda, etc. These peculiarities have to be evaluated while not losing sight of the feature under discussion. I hope to have shown in the preceding chapters that the facts gleaned from the various Vedic texts tend to support and to complement each other rather than to conflict with each other; they form a consistent pattern of dialectal divergencies which slowly spread, from various centres of innovation viz. (secondary) diffusion, over the length and breadth of Northern India.

If we take a look at some of the major cases of an uneven diffusion of dialect features, - either attested only in part of the area of a particular dialect, or more interestingly, in the various schools of o n e Veda, - it will be seen that no single answer can be given for this phenomenon. Most cases, however, fall under the two categories of diachronic development viz. the influence of areal features; sometimes the still uncertain attribution of a text or of its final redaction to a certain area creates difficulties (as in the case of PB).

(a) diachronic development:

\* The uneven distribution of the narrative impf./perf. in the Pañcāla area (§5.2, cf. ann. 117): A late text like TA uses (outside the Kaṭha chapters) the imperfect while KB uses the perf. On the other hand, the late Anubrāhmaṇa of the Taitt., VādhB, has both impf. and perf. The reason for this distribution is the intentionally conservative nature of the Taitt. school (cf. suvar!). Especially, TA tends to copy older parts of TS (such as a whole section in TA 5 dealing with the Pravargya but copied from a Soma chapter of TS). Note, however, that the Pravargya chapters (TA 4-5) are not necessarily very young but have been set aside, into the Ar., as they deal with a secret and dangerous ritual (cf. KathA, ŚBM 14,1-3). The case of PB has been discussed above; the text must be based

on an old Western SV Br. which used the impf. but probably received its redaction in the East (note the extra-ordinary high number of perfects in ChU, a late Kauth. text).

\* The use of the infinitive in -toḥ shows some minor variations between the various Vedas; it is strong in the YV (with the exception of MS and the Śāṅḍilya books of ŚB), ranging from 140 to 240 %, and in the RV texts: AB 289%,<sup>323</sup> KB 160%. The SV is a little weaker: PB 194%, JB only 92%, JUB 113%. This involves both diachronic and areal features: If PB has received its redaction in the East then its percentage agrees with that of the other Eastern texts (ŚBM).

(b) areal features:

\* The diffusion of khalu is limited to part of the YV texts (MS,TS, Mādhy.) but includes PB (§7.1), and thus is an areal feature restricted to parts of the Kuru and Pañcāla territory (including the JB) and to the extreme East . As this is more of a matter of style, the competition between various schools and their trend to set themselves off against each other may have played a role: note that there is a pattern of intermittent use viz. non-use in adjacent areas: MS-(KS)-TS-(ŚBK)-ŚBM. The case of PB is open to discussion. While PB is otherwise closely linked to the (Kap.-)Kaṭhas, the use of khalu in this text may be due to Eastern influence, at the time of redaction of PB.

\* sam.yat (§7.4 ) is another matter of style, but here the explanation is different. This old Western innovation that took place only in part of the Kuru area (KS,KpS) was transmitted to the Central area (TS) only. TS often copied KS during its formative period. The JUB use of sam.yat, high in percentage but limited in number, may be just a matter of chance, especially when the sprinkling of cases in other W., Central and E. texts is taken into account.

\* Another areal feature is the diffusion of !- (§ 6.3). This is clearly limited to the West (KS,KpS,PS,AB and Śāk.RV) and part of the Central/Southern area (KB,JB). The Kāṇvas participate, as they so often do, in this Western feature. On the other hand, if one looks at the

---

<sup>323</sup> If the collection of the inf.-toṃ + īśvara-, made by Oertel, KZ 65, 1938, p. 55 sqq., is taken as representative (see above § 5.4), AB 1-5 has 7 cases, AB 6-8 has 9; the length of the two parts of the text is : 157 : 78 pp., 2/3 to 1/3, and thus the number of cases in ABn is about 2 times higher than expected.

distribution of ʎ- in terms of an opposition of neighbouring schools, the (non)use of this feature makes sense again in almost all of the cases:

YV: (MS) - KS,KpS - (TS) - ŚBK -(ŚBM)  
 SV: (PB) - JB - (Eastern PB)  
 AV: PS - (ŚS) - ?  
 RV: RV(Ś)/ABo - KB - ABn

The only exception in this scheme is KB which I cannot explain at this moment. It may be that, originally, there was some difference between the Śāṅkhāyana and Kauṣītaki schools of this branch of the RV, or that the school simply took over the forms of the dominant Śākalya school at a relatively late time. However, if taken simply as a diffusion of a Kuru peculiarity, the occurrence of ʎ- in KB does not create a problem at all.

It can be seen, thus, that the seemingly disturbing occurrence of a particular dialect feature just in one Veda finds adequate explanations in almost all cases noted so far and that this was due to factors well known from dialect studies, namely limited spread within a part of a dialect area only viz. alternating diffusion at the diachronically separate levels of the language.

The remaining cases of mutual influence of the various schools of one Veda on each other (and those that will be noticed in future) are to be explained by their constant interaction in ritual and the discussion of it. There is ample evidence in the Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts about the constant discussion and refinement of ritual practices. The texts frequently quote the opinion even of teachers not agreeing with and not belonging to the mainstream opinion of the proponent of a particular text; other texts quote their unnamed colleagues (brahmavādino vadanti) or just "people" (tad āhuḥ), or even abbreviate this by the ity eke device. It is obvious that such ritual discussion on topics of the ritual and its meaning first and foremost was carried on between the specialists of a particular branch of Vedic learning and ritual practise, for example the Yajurvedins, Ṛgvedins, etc. This does not exclude the discussion with specialists belonging to other Vedas, though the typical open challenges on 'popular' topics like the Agnihotra in which Brahmins and Kṣatriyas participate are, at least in the texts, a phenomenon restricted to the late Br. and the Up.s. The constantly ongoing discussion of the ritual was supported by the habitual travelling of the Brahmins to the various parts of N.India in order to seek employment or to strive for victory in ritual discussion (brahmodya).<sup>324</sup>

<sup>324</sup> Cf. author in Fs. W. Rau.

We therefore witness, as the outcome of this constant travelling, a Koine type of spread of dialect features, often limited to one Veda. This has to be distinguished from the movement of whole schools, a few cases of which have been mentioned above, passim: The sudden Eastern displacement of the Kāṇva, Śāṇḍilya (ŚB 6-10), Aitareyin (AB 6-8) brought many of the major dialect features of their respective areas to the East (Kosala, Videha), while these immigrants were increasingly influenced by the local (Eastern) peculiarities.

\*\*\*

In future, when many more dialect features have been recorded and compared and when a much closer grid of interlocking or overlapping dialectal patterns has been established, we will probably be able to point out even the origin of the spread of such developments limited to the schools of one Veda like the Opt. in -īta of a- stem verbs. At present, we can only wonder whether the origin of this feature is in the AB area (E. Panjab) or in the KB area (U.P), and whether in the latte2 case, the Central (Kauṣ.) peculiarity influenced at first only the later text level of AB (6-8) and subsequently, at the time of its redaction, even the older parts (AB 1-5): To solve this and similar problems, we will have to learn more, first of all, about the final redaction of AB which took place in the East and was executed either by Śākalya or someone else of his school.<sup>325</sup>

But in spite of these minor divergencies regarding only some of the numerous features found within the large dialect areas mentioned above, the general pattern of the major dialects of Vedic Sanskrit (Kuru, Pañcāla, Eastern), is prominent enough, I believe, as to establish their individual characters.

### §10.3 Successive waves of Indo-Aryan immigration

---

<sup>325</sup> Note the same problem with regard to text variants already in the Mantras. This indicates that right down from post-RV mantras, there existed a "mīmāṃsā" type activity inside one Veda and that certain texts were changed right down to the Br.period. Only at the time of the collection/ redaction of a text did the particular form of a Mantra become "sacrosanct" and was 'pushed through' everywhere in a particular school, especially to distinguish the text from that of other schools. Note, for example how ŚBM/ŚBK treat the Caraka quotations quite differently, each text according to its own phonetic rules (see StII 8/9).

The observation of the various grammatical features which, assembled and compared with each other, indicate the dialect areas mentioned just now, also lends itself for a comparison with the supposed waves of immigration of speakers of Indo-Aryan into N.India.

Since the beginning of this century, the idea of a first and a second wave of immigration has been discussed, a series of "invasions" (better: a gradual trickling in, by the movement of certain clans, and ultimately, tribes), resulting in the outer band and the inner band of New Indo-Aryan languages.

This is, of course, easily challengeable. Outer band features can have their origin, e.g. in the Middle Ages; they represent remnants of an older situation, but do not necessarily date back to the Vedic period, while the "centre" (the later Hindustani/Hindi/Urdu) developed innovative, unifying features which just did not reach the outlying regions.<sup>326</sup>

In the case of ancient N. India, we do not know anything about the immigration of various tribes and clans, except for a few elusive remarks in the RV, ŚB or BŚS. This text retains at 18.44: 397.9 sqq. the most pregnant memory, perhaps, of an immigration of the Indo-Aryans into Northern India and of their split into two groups: *prāñ Ayuḥ pravavrāja. tasyaite Kuru-Pañcālāḥ Kāśī-Videhā ity. etad Āyavam. Pratyāñ amāvasus. tasyaite Gāndhārayas Parśavo 'raṭṭā ity etad Āmāvasyavam.*" Ayu went eastwards. His (people) are the Kuru-Pañcāla and the Kāśī-Videha. This is the Āyava (group) (His other people) stayed at home in the West. His people are the Gāndhāri, Parśu and Araṭṭa. This is the Amāvasyava (group)."

This again does not agree with the inner and outer band: The Gāndhāri, Parśu<sup>327</sup> and Araṭṭa but also the Kāśī-Videha should belong to the outer band while the Kuru-Pañcāla form the (innovative) Centre. Instead, the text makes a differentiation between the peoples of the Panjab and the

<sup>326</sup> A good example of such developments is Japan where the capital and thus the centre of administration has shifted several times from the Western Kansai (Yamato, Kyoto area) to the Eastern Kanto (Kamakura, Edo/Tokyo), and back. Innovations which developed during one of these periods spread concentrically outwards, towards the Eastern and Western ends of the archipelago, starting from of the capital of the time: they now form multiple, overlaying patterns of various dialect features. A particular innovation sometimes reached the ends of the archipelago, but as often, it did not. In such a situation, it naturally helps to know where the development in question started, -something we still had to find out for the Vedic period.

<sup>327</sup> Regarded by some as Persians, see Cardona, Pāṇini, p. 276; cf. ann. 327,339.

territories West of it on one hand, and of the "properly Vedic" tribes of Madhyadeśa and the adjacent country East of it, on the other hand.

Much has been made, in past decades, of the Vrātyas as the early Eastern immigrants; now H. Falk's book 'Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel' provides a better interpretation of their character, strictly derived from the evidence of the texts themselves: The Vrātyas are poor, mostly younger Brahmins and Kṣatriyas who in search of a "start capital" form a dark, ominous sodality which demands ransom from the local well-settled gr̥hasthas and even from the kings.<sup>328</sup>

A closer reading of the texts yields more results for the still very hazy picture of Vedic history: for example the fate of the Kurus, who have been overcome by the Śalvas (JB 2.206). ŚB and BAUK mention the uncertain fate of the Pārikṣitas, the royal family of the Kurus: "where has their glory gone?" Such sentences might, ultimately, provide the clue for the prominence, in the later YV-Saṃhitā and the Brāhmaṇa period, of the Pañcālas with their Taitt., Kauṣ., Śāṭy. schools; notable is the prominence of Keśin Dārbhya and his successors in these texts.<sup>329</sup>

The mysterious Ikṣvākus may help to explain the Eastern Central developments. They are mentioned already in the AV as one of the Eastern groups living at the edge of Indo-Aryan settlements. (Note that Kāśī still is outside the pale of Vedic culture for PS). In the Pāli texts (DN 3.1.15 sqq.) Okkāka (< Ikṣvāku) is the forefather of the Śākyās, who lived in the Central Tarāī of Southern Nepal. A connection of the Ikṣvāku territory with that of the Kāṇvas is highly probable. There may be a direct correlation of the movement of the King Videgha Māthava and his priest Gotama Rahūgaṇa, the bearers of Vedic (orthodox and orthoprax) culture, towards the East, to the country East of the Sadānīrā (to the Kāṇva, this is the country East of the Kuru-Pañcālas, i.e. Kosala.<sup>330</sup>

<sup>328</sup> Note the story in BŚS 18.26, cf. H.Falk's transl. in Bruderschaft, p.55 sqq., about the Vrātyas of the Kurus at the court of the Pañcāla king Keśin Dārbhya. The Kurus apparently play the role of vrātyas for the Pañcālas (and vice versa?). Is a constant dichotomy of society expressed by the loose union of the two tribes? Cf. situation as reflected in religion: the devas and asuras are in constant conflict; note also JB 2,278-9 Keśin Dārbhya (Pañcāla king): his mother and his (maternal) uncle Uchchāśravas, son of Kuvaya, the King of Kurus (kauravya rājā): a clear case of intermarriage of the two royal houses.

<sup>329</sup> Cf. the fight of the Pañcālas with the Kuntis, see ann. 113, KS 26.9, end.

<sup>330</sup> Note the intention of the story: Gotama Rahūgaṇa is otherwise known only as the author of Ṛgvedic hymns. To make him the culture hero of the East is as conspicuous as the

The story, as told in ŚB, expressively mentions the role of the ritual fire, called Agni Vaiśvānara in the legend, in making the marshy country of the East arable and acceptable for Brahmins. The Māthavas, about whom nothing is known outside the ŚB, may be the Máthai of Megasthenes who places them East of the Pazalai (Pañcāla), at the confluence of the Erénnesis (Son) with the Ganges.<sup>331</sup> While the movement of some clans and their King Videgha from the River Sarasvatī in Kurukṣetra to the East may coincide with the 'ritual settlement' of Kosala(-Videha), this is not to be confused with the wholesale movement of Vedic Śākhās, like the one of Kāṇva, Śāṇḍilya, and Aitareyin eastwards, to Kosala and Videha.

A final stage is reached only in the Pāli texts: Suddenly, we do not read about the Kosala-Videha but about a separate Kosala kingdom and a large Vajji (= Vṛjji) confederation which includes tribes like the Licchavi, Naya, and the Videha. West of them live the Śākya, Bulinda, Malla, Moriya and Kalāma. None of these tribes, with the exception of the Videha and the Malla, is known from the Vedic texts. Interestingly, JB still locates the Malla in the desert (Tharr, see JB §198; cf. the Malloi of the Greeks in S. Panjab). Equally, the Vṛji of Pāṇini 4.2.131 are mentioned together with the Madra; in all probability, they still were inhabitants of the Panjab at the time. What we see here is, I believe, the last wave of immigration which overran Northern India in Vedic time and which came to an end in its easternmost part (at that time), in N. Bihar. Note the somewhat unusual origin of the Śākya from a marriage of the sons of King Okkāka with their sisters and compare that even in Manu, the Nicchavi (sic) still are regarded as only half-orthoprax. This wave of immigration from the West is fairly late, as no Vedic text contains any hint of it and it is only Pāṇini (4.2.131 Vṛji, Vṛjika) and the Pāli canon which provide a clue to it.

---

sudden replacement of whole schools, notably the Aitareyins, Śāṇḍilya, Śākala, and Kāṇvas into the East.- Cf. the RV name Namin Sāpya as King of Videha at PB 25.10.17, interestingly described as making a pilgrimage to Kurukṣetra, the holy land of the Veda and the home of Gotama Rahūgaṇa and Videgha Māthava who in ŚB are the prototypes of the eastward movement of Vedic orthopraxy.

<sup>331</sup> See Arrian, Indikē 4.5 and cf. the commentary by O.v. Hinüber, in: Arrian, Der Alexanderzug. Indische Geschichte, hg. und übers. von G. Wirth u. O.v.H., München u. Zürich (Artemis) 1985, p. 1095; cf. also author, Fs. Eggermont.



If we first limit ourselves strictly to some typical linguistic features, we can establish this provisional scheme<sup>332</sup>

---

**B.C.**

**1750 - OCP/late Harrapan/**

**Gandhāra Grave culture**

**Earliest immigration?**

**Kāfirī dac** : Ved. daśa, Ir. dasa

**muṣ/muš** : Ved. muṣ

**ašpa@** : Ved. aśva, Ir. aspa/asa

---

**FIRST I.-A. IMMIGRATION into the Panjab**

**OCP** linguistically, closer to Med./O.Av.

**RV istr.pl. -ebhis** = **O.Pers. -aibiš**

**n.pl. -āsas** = **Med./O.Av. -āha**

**etc.** (**aniyāha bagāha**)

**partly, -l- (loka),**

**next to -r-;**

**'popular elements' like:**

**dy > jy (jyotiṣ), muhur, etc.**

---

**ca. NEW WAVE of IMMIGRATION: ling.closer to YAv.**

**1180 B.C.**

**BRW** centre at Kurukṣetra:

**(iron!)** composition of  
YV Mantras, PS, AVŚ, Kuntāpa hymns; SV

**istr.pl. -ebhiḥ > -aiḥ** : **YAv. -aih**

**anye devāḥ** : **YAv. anye, daivāh, vīspe**

**innovations:**

**n.du.m. -ā-u**

**ntr.pl. -ā-ni**

---

<sup>332</sup> The dates have been taken from archeological finds, acc. to the standard works of B. and R. Allchin, *The rise of civilisation in India and Pakistan*, Cambridge 1982, and W.A. Fairervis Jr., *The roots of ancient India*, 2nd ed. Chicago and London 1975; see below § 10.4.

**r is preferred  
viśva- > sarva-  
progressive disappearance  
of injunctive**

---

**WEST:                      CENTRE:                      EAST:**

---

**ca. 900-  
PGW**

**Kurukṣetra, U.P.  
MS,KS                      TS**

**only -aiḥ, devāu,  
te devāḥ, ntr.pl.-āni  
remain**

**<< -ebhiḥ (> Pkt.)  
<< -l- typical in E.Pkt >>  
<< cf. he 'lavo < he 'rayo >>**

**loss of injunctive,  
introd. of periphr. aor.**

**khyā > kśā  
Cuv > Cv; Ciy > CyV  
khalu  
-yuvam > vyam  
-jm- > -ym  
diffusion of RV inf. -toḥ  
decline of inf.-tavai  
sam.yat**

---

**NEW IMMIGRATION:  
into Kurukṣetra:  
Salvas**

**Madhyadeśa (Pañcāla) innov.:**

**gen. fem. -ai**

**ch/śch > cch**

**Sandhi innov. of -o/au + V**

**súvar, uv (eva)**

**further diffusion of**

**Kuru peculiarities**

**Kāṇva, Śāṇḍilya,**

**Aitareyin,**

**move to the East**

**Post-Saṃhitā developments:**

loss of per. aor.  
 athātaḥ (ŚB,BŚS,KB)  
 sāyam > sāye etc.

**Eastern innovations:**

-----  
 spread of narr. perfect  
 renewed use of subj.  
 spread of hyperchar.  
 subjunctive  
 renewed use of inf.-tavai  
 tanacmi >tanakmi

old accent (with three tones)      Vājasan. bhāṣika acc.  
 Mahāvṛṣa & Kuru acc.: "uttarāh(a)i"      with two tones only;  
 also in PB;  
 Chandas accent not  
 allowed in Buddh. texts

-500

-----  
500 PGW

Aitareyins (Aśvala=  
 hotṛ of Janaka; Śākala,  
 Uddālaka in Videha

Paṇini:  
 archaic precativ  
 knows of Eastern grammarians  
 and E. forms but excludes Central  
 and E. Veda texts

-----  
 Yugandhara,  
 Salvi tribe  
 in the Kuru/  
 Matsya terr.

immigration  
 into the East:  
 Śākya, Licchavi,  
 Malla, etc.

Late intrusions: duhe > dugdhe,  
 nom. yuvām, avām in ŚBK, VSK, PB

note: 'Bhava' in the East,  
 Śarva in W.: Bāhika term;  
 500 BC: Persians in Panjab cf.with Vīdēvdād: Sauruua,  
 and Salva,<sup>333</sup> Salvi

---

This is only a brief summary of what could be established in this article, even if some aspects were only briefly touched upon. More results are to be expected from a larger collection and comparison of facts. The scheme mentioned above can, however, be enlarged and modified by a closer look at the spread and the early history of some Vedic schools (śākhā) and their ritual.<sup>334</sup> It is important, in this regard, to pay close

<sup>333</sup> Is the name of the tribe, Salva, to be compared with Iran. Sa<sup>u</sup>ruua (=Ved. Śarva, a Western, Bāhika name of Agni/Śiva)? Just as Bharata is a name of Rudra in RV, Śarva could be taken from the (Ir.) name of the tribe as well.

<sup>334</sup> For the post-RV period cf. the role of the Adhvaryus in the development of the Śrauta ritual and their apologetic myth (the cutting off, by Indra, of Dadhyañc's head, viz. that of the head of the sacrifice, see Author, Fs. W. Rau, ann.104); a comparison of RV hymns taken over into the other Vedas establishes that there must have been a period when there was an Ur-YV, Ur-SV, Ur-AV (cf. already Oldenberg, Prolegomena, and for non-metrical texts, author, WZKS 24, p.22 sqq., 76 sqq.); these texts were first assembled and composed in the Kuru country (cf. the role of Kurukṣetra as devayajana, and cf. BEI 2, Sur la voie du ciel); from there, they spread eastwards, being both gradually changed or consciously altered (out of the wish to establish separate identities, because of 'political' motives), until they reached their Pañcāla (TS, Śāṭy, KB, AVŚ), Kosala (ŚBK) or Videha (ŚBM, Bhall., Eastern RV) forms. The centre of ritual activity spread eastwards; note the lack of complete Br. or Ār. texts of the Kaṭhas and Maitr. schools (though both schools developed Sūtras, probably in their new territories, in Gujarat viz.the East: Prācyā-Kaṭha) ; --- The spread eastwards and the role of the Kāṇvas in the colonisation of the East has to be studied, (Videgha Māthava from the Sarasvatī, together with a RV author, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa!); the East was a melting pot of earlier IA and non-IA settlers and took over the Vedic śrauta orthopraxy only at a late stage (during the Br. period); the Kāṇvas were in competition with the Central Taitt. school and others, like the ancient school of the Carakas; this process is, as it were, personified by the adoption of Taitt. ritual by the first Sūtrakāra, Kāṇva Bodhāyana, who probably wanted to codify ritual "for once and all". The strange correspondences of the Mādhy. texts with those of the Maitr. have to be investigated and have to be compared to the same situation relating the Kāṇvas with the West (Kaṭhas/Carakas?), or the Taitt. with the Kaṭhas, etc. -- Furthermore, the spread eastwards of the Śaṅḍilya school and its texts (ŚBM 6-10) has to be investigated. They were imported from the West (at least, from the Central area, cf. the Saṅḍilla country in the Jaina texts, N. of Benares). Other Western schools were - in an apparently politically motivated move by (Mahā-) Janaka - imported into the East: The Aitareyins (AB 6-8), and most probably also Śākalya who redacted his RV in the East, in competition with an earlier Eastern RV; composition of ĀŚS in the East; -- the probable move of some Kauthumas (cf. the RV name Namin Sāpya, already a Videha king at PB 25.10.17, cf. the bhāṣika accent of PB, - just like ŚB - which is lost now in PB) and some Kaṭhas, the later Prācyā Kaṭha of the

attention to the general political and historical situation, as exemplified above, and the development or gradual deterioration of some schools, (like that of the Caraka, Kaṭha and Maitr. śākhās even during the Br. period). The Veda and its development have, also in this regard, been left "floating in thin air" for too long. Texts are not composed or collected by priests just to pass their time, and complicated rituals like the classical śrauta form of the Aśvamedha are not just a form of priestly speculation but serve, besides their religious and social functions, a clear political purpose of establishing the cakravartin superiority of a king over his neighbours.

#### §10.4 Vedic dialects and archeology

It has been mentioned above that the three centres of innovation coincide more or less with the territory of the Kurus, Pañcālas and (Kosala-)Videhas. This is, from the point of view of political history, not too surprising. It is well known from dialect studies that political boundaries often coincide with dialect boundaries, cf. e.g. the curious case of Germ. dial. schlīn, schlēn 'schlagen' which straddles the Middle Rhine valley and coincides with the borders of the old principality (bisdom) of Trier. All surrounding dialects have schlān or schlön.<sup>335</sup>

That the territory of Vedic dialects covers that of the political units, like that of the Kurus, etc., is thus not surprising. In fact, the coincidence of tribal and dialect territory and the spread of certain dialect peculiarities agrees well with the political development as we know it on the basis of

---

Car.Vy., to the East; -- the problem of the Brahmanisation of the "foreign" territory of Magadha (and Aṅga), and the Southern spread of the Mādhyandinas; the late/post-Vedic immigration of new tribes into the East (Malla, Licchavi, Śākya, etc.) and the possibility of an Iranian element among them (note the river names from E. Iran/Afghanistan like Gomatī, Sarayū in the East, and cf. the Śākya and their marriage customs, further Balhika in ŚB, etc.). --- The gaps in the late Vedic geographical attestation of the śākhās can now be closed to some extent: The SV of the East is unknown but must have been that of the Bhāllavins as their Br. was recited with the bhāṣika accent, like ŚB. Perhaps this was a sub-school of the Kauthumas, cf. the notice in Bhāṣika Sūtra that PB was transmitted with bhāṣika accent as well (see ed.Kielhorn, Ind. Stud.10, p.421). By the time of Śabara (Mīm. Sūtra), the accented tradition was lost already. - Equally, the SV of the Central area was that of the pre-Jaim. Śāṭyāyanins; the question of the other Vedas in the Jaim. territory is open: probably, they were partly Maitr., partly Taitt. (note a Taitt. quotation in the late Pāli texts, the Jātakas), cf. ann. 345; it can now be attempted to close the gaps between the late Vedic spread of schools and their earliest attestation on copper plate grants (cf. author, Beitr. zur Südasienforschung, 104).

<sup>335</sup> See W.König, dtv-Atlas zur Deutschen Sprache, München 1978, p.142

the texts. An earlier Kuru realm was succeeded by a Pañcāla kingdom and this was superseded in importance by the kingdoms of the Kosala, Videha (viz. the Vṛjji/Vajji confederation) and finally, of Magadha.<sup>336</sup>

The comparison with archeology becomes important when the areas of these dialects are compared to early cultures of N.India. In the past few decades a large number of sites has been excavated. Furthermore, W.Rau has compared, in a number of publications, the archeological evidence with the textual one for material culture. Recently, he has summed up of the textual evidence according to Vedic sources and has compared it to the archeological evidence. However, as was mentioned at the outset, the Vedic texts and schools were not located before, and every comparison hinges, of course, on the exact location of the texts from which the evidence for the material culture has been taken. When both approaches are combined (and supplemented by the study of dialects presented above), we can, finally, attempt, with greater certainty than possible until now, a definite identification of certain archeologically attested copper and iron age cultures with Vedic textual evidence and Vedic tribes.

In the sequel, I follow R. and B. Allchin and others.<sup>337</sup> A simplified table of archeological data would look like this. (OCP = Ocre Coloured Pottery, BRW = Black and Red Ware, PGW = Painted Gray Ware, NBP =Northern Black Polished Ware).

	Panjab/"North"	West	Centre	East
<b>2300 B.C.- Indus culture</b>				
1750-	Late Indus/OCP	OCP		(neolithic)
		OCP		
1180-		BRW	BRW	(chalcolithic)
900-		PGW	PGW	BRW

<sup>336</sup> This is, more or less, also what H.Oldenbergh in the introduction to his book, *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, extracted from the Vedic and Pāli sources more than 80 years ago. (His comments about the negative influence of the climate on the development of Indian mind and the attitude towards an active life are, however, better forgotten, although this is a much loved topic in contemporary Indian apologeticism.

<sup>337</sup> B.and R. Allchin, and W.A. Fairservis.

500-      NBP                              NBP      NBP      NBP

---

**To begin with the last stratum: It is a characteristic of the Northern Black Polished pottery that it quickly spreads, around 500 B.C., over all of N. India, just as the late Brāhmaṇa texts suddenly have a geographical horizon reaching from Gandhāra (and beyond) to Aṅga, from the Himālaya in the North to Vidarbha, Andhra in the South, and including the South-Eastern tribes of the Puṇḍra, Kaliṅga etc.**

**If we tentatively align these texts with the NBP culture, which in terms of the more advanced material culture of the late Vedic period should not present difficulties, then a problem arises concerning the absolute dates of the later Brāhmaṇa texts (and of the early Up.s). These have generally been aligned with the age of the Buddha, who is usually believed to have lived from 563-483 B.C. However, H. Bechert recently has cast some doubt on this date: the Buddha might have lived ca. 100 years later.<sup>338</sup> In fact, as has been pointed out above, the Pāli texts, which were written down only in the 1st century B.C., but were composed several centuries earlier, reflect a much later stage in the cultural and political history than even the late Vedic texts (like the Upaniṣads): in the Pāli texts (like Dīgha Nikāya) even Magadha and Aṅga are Brahmanical territory, while the Veda has only a single case (at KA 7.14) where a Brahmin lives in Magadha, a generally avoided and despised country. Note that there is no mention of towns in the Vedic texts, nor of writing. Though this may be due to the cultural tendency of the Brahmins who have no use for writing, as they learnt all their - mostly secret - Vedic texts by heart and also could preserve their ritual purity better in a village than in a busy town, both items cannot simply be dismissed. A date of ca. 500 B.C. for early Up.s (like BAU, ChU), BŚS, and some late Br. texts like VādhB,<sup>339</sup> and late parts of ŚB, AB 6-8 does not seem, to my mind, impossible, - at least at the present state of our knowledge.**

**Interestingly, the geographical knowledge of the Pāli texts agrees with the area of spread of NBP ware and with that of the later Brāhmaṇa literature: However, some of the names of the famous 16 kingdoms of**

---

<sup>338</sup> See the summary by O.v. Hinüber, Überblick, § 6.

<sup>339</sup> Note that BŚS 18.44 perhaps intends the Persians with its term Parśu (see ann. 334, 323); however, also other tribes of similar names are attested in the area of E.Afghanistan (Gr. Paryetai, etc.); for this period, cf. H.Kulke, The historical background of Indian's axial age, forthc.

Northern India differ from those of the Vedic texts:<sup>340</sup> Again, the Pāli texts seem to reflect a later stage in the political development.<sup>341</sup>

The Pāli texts,<sup>342</sup> indeed, know of the complete Vedic corpus:<sup>343</sup> the three Vedas and their transmitters (tiṅṅaṃ vedānaṃ pāragū, DN 1.88; tevijja Thag 1248, Thīg 65; mantrapāragū Aṅg.N. I p.163,166: 58,59, etc.), and even the the various ancillary texts like etymology, grammar, etc. (DN 2.13, MN 2.91.93, Bv.38). The Vedic texts apparently had already been redacted and collected: "the old text of the mantras.." (porāṇaṃ mantapadaṃ itihītiha paraṃparāya piṭakasampadāya MN 2, p.169 : 95); apparently the collection of mantras is called piṭaka in analogy to the the Buddhist texts. A Padapāṭha seems to have been in existence, as padaka belongs to the standard description of Brahmins (DN 1.88, MN 2.133, Ap 502, etc.). The names of the Vedas occur in later texts, at MA 3.362, DA 247, AA 2.61 SnA 447: iru-<sup>344</sup>, yaju-, sāma-(b)beda; otherwise, some Veda schools are mentioned at DN 1.237.10-18, Addharīya (~ Ādhvaryava, adhvaryu-, YV), Tittirīya (Taittirīya), Chandoka (Chāndog(y)ā, SV), and Bavharija (Bāhvṛca-, RV) are known; Titt. brahmacāriya occurs at Vin. 2.162, and two separate Brahmins called Assalāyana (Āśvalayana) are found at MN 2.147.9-157.17, Pj 2.372.25, 406.26, Ap 480.17. A late text even quotes, almost verbatim, a passage<sup>345</sup> from TS.<sup>346</sup>136

If the late Br. texts are compared with the earlier Brāhmaṇas which are limited to the Kuru-Pāñcāla area, or better, with the YV Saṃhitā texts

<sup>340</sup> The only Vedic text that mentions 16 kingdoms, however, without names, is VādhB., see StII 1, p. 75 sqq.

<sup>341</sup> Note that king Ajātasatru occurs in ŚB and VādhB but as a king of the Kāśīs viz., the Kurus. Ajātasattu of Magadha is still unknown; cf. also Brahmadata Prāsenajita of Kosala, JB §115, with the Kosala king Pasenadi in Pāli; apparently both names were common in late Vedic as well as at the time of the Buddha (for more ling. correspondences, see ann. 314, 359). W. Rau, *Altertumskunde*, p.21, ann.2 regards the Pāli texts as much later, because of the development of (material) culture they indicate, and consequently wants to date all the Vedic texts that precede them later than usually thought.

<sup>342</sup> Of course, the problem of the redaction of the Pāli canon, at a later date, remains. Yet the testimony about Vedic schools, at inconspicuous places in the Pāli canon, is valuable.

<sup>343</sup> For many of the following passages, see Hillebrandt, *Kl. Schr.* p. 309 sqq.; cf. now Pali Tip. Concordance for more examples.

<sup>344</sup> There is some S.Indian influence in these late texts; irubbedā in Mil. under has received its shape under the influence of the form of the word, see O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 126

<sup>345</sup> Cf. TS 1.1.9.1, quoted in *Jātaka* VI,212,11\*, see O.v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, p.131 §275.

<sup>346</sup> Note also that both late Vedic and Pāli texts contain similar concepts, like the case of the shattered head (cf. Fs.W.Rau), and often express them with more or less the same words (e.g. the Gandharva, Ṛtu, Yakkha kūṭahasta, see ann. 314,359).



(MS,KS,TS) it immediately appears that these texts know only the area from E.Panjab to Allahabad / Benares.<sup>347</sup> A look at the material culture of the texts is facilitated by W. Rau's investigations: They provide evidence for: *ayas* ("Nutzmetall", copper (bronze which is unusual in India; not, as usually translated:"iron"), but also iron (*śyāma-ayas-*), wattle (and daub) huts, which were easily removable; cultivation of rice, barley, etc., cattle (horse, etc.), in short, a generally still very simple material culture.

Pottery, as described in the texts, unfortunately does not provide a good possibility for comparison: Vedic pots, as used in ritual and described in the texts, were handmade or even built up of several lumps (the *Pravargya mahāvīra* vessel); they could not be made by potters as these did not belong to the three higher castes; they had, instead, to be made by the Brahmins, typical non-specialists of pottery thus. Both the well-known archaism of ritual implements as well as the caste system conspire to deprive us of one of the most important and useful parts of archeological comparison.<sup>348</sup>

However, apart from the general agreement of the testimony of the texts on material culture and archeological finds, there is one more surprising correspondence. The area of the YV *Samhitās* and of *Paippalāda-AV* is: E. Panjab, Kurukṣetra, Haryana, W. Uttar Pradesh up to Allahabad/Benares (*Kāśī*). This is precisely the area that is covered by PGW culture...<sup>349</sup> To my mind, the coincidence is too great to be accidental. If future research will provide more material to support the identification of the PGW civilisation with that of the post-Mantra and pre-Late Br. period of texts and of the Kuru-Pañcāla tribes, this will be of major importance both for dating the texts (see below) and for a general correlation of Vedic studies with archeology, as well as for the further interpretation by archeologists of this culture.

<sup>347</sup> See Fel.Vol. Eggermont; the only exception is ŚS, with Aṅga which replaces *Kāśī* of PS.

<sup>348</sup> W.Rau is a little more optimistic: he thinks it is possible to compare sacral pottery with everyday pottery objects which were already thrown on a wheel but regarded as demonic (*asura*-like); see also W.Rau, *Altertumskunde*, p.41 sq.

<sup>349</sup> I should like to underline, that I began this whole investigation with no thoughts spent on centres of innovation, or on political centres, not to speak of archeological regions. Yet the outcome indicates several centres of innovation which happen coincide with those of the political centres/tribal kingdoms, -- and with those of archeologically attested cultures, at least as far as we know them at this moment.- Cf. also W. Rau who, on other grounds, came to a similar conclusion: *Altertumskunde*, p.48: "The so-called.../OCP/...agrees best, according to the area of spread, technical condition, and approximate age, with the pottery described in the Vedic texts." (my transl.)

If the preceding identifications are correct, they can now be further built on: The level preceding PGW, that is the copper hoard culture, now frequently found together with Ochre Coloured Pottery, (OCP), then should correspond, if indeed Vedic, with a still earlier level of Vedic: I think this is the one of the Mantra period: of the AV, and YV Mantras. Notably, these texts are the first which mention iron at all: AV 11.3.7, 9.5.4 first speaks of the "black metal".<sup>350</sup> The date of the introduction of iron thus correponds, again, with the relative chronology of the Vedic texts.

The historical facts, as gleaned from the texts, agree: The earliest centre of political power was in the West, in Kurukṣetra itself. Ever since the late RV, it has been the "holy land" of the Brahmins. This is the place where even the gods usually sacrifice (devayajana), and for a good reason: here is the 'centre of Heaven and the Earth'<sup>351</sup>, and the political centre (at Āsandīvant<sup>352</sup>) of the Bharata/Kuru tribe<sup>353</sup> which dominated the late Ṛgvedic and post-Ṛgvedic period.<sup>354</sup>

In short, if the comparisons made above are correct, we arrive at the following table:

W E S T	C E N T R E	E A S T
1750-	OCP: Ocre coloured/	

<sup>350</sup> See author, E.Iran and the AV, Persica X. - Therefore, I cannot agree with W. Rau when he says, *Altertumskunde*, p. 19, that the beginning of the Vedic period might perhaps be suppressed below the date of 1000 B.C. The introduction of iron alone (which is not yet mentioned in RV!) but appears in India already in the 12th cent. B.C. and fittingly, also in the second oldest Vedic text, the AV, is too early for the date proposed by W.Rau (even if a late redaction of AV is taken into account).

<sup>351</sup> JUB 4.26.12, and the unpubl. VādhPiS, see BEI 2, p.223, with ann. 74

<sup>352</sup> Note the meaning of this geographical term 'having a/the throne'

<sup>353</sup> For details, cf. my article on the Kuru Realm, forthc.

<sup>354</sup> Some further speculation may be added, if the other copper hoard cultures in the South are taken into account: Do they represent the earliest forerays of IA speakers (or of tribes closely related to them in culture not in language!), which petered out, without much effect? Only after the consolidation of IA culture in the Kuru-Pañcāla area, did the spread southwards start again, as ŚB 2.3.22 asserts: Naḍa Naiṣadha (sic) is said to carry Yama (death) (further) South, day by day. Cf., however, the Aśoka edicts in Pkt. in S. Karṇātaka: whom does he want to address there in Pkt.in this area? Note that he uses Greek in a Greek area (Kandahar).

RV	<b>Late Harappan and various smaller cultures (Grey Ware, Gandhāra grave culture, etc.) (no iron)</b> <b>(1250 Kausambi: OCP)</b>	(Neolithic)
1180	<b>BRW: Black &amp; Red ware</b> <b><u>KURU</u> (with iron!)</b> <b><u>1st centre</u> Mantras, AV, etc.</b>	(chalcolithic)
900-	<b>PGW: Painted Gray Ware</b> <b>MS,KS</b> <b><u>PAÑCĀLA</u></b> <b><u>2nd centre</u></b> <b>(iron)</b> <b>TS</b> <b>(Kaus. 750 B.C.)</b>	<b>900- Black &amp; Red Ware</b>  <b>(&amp; Grey Ware)</b>  <b>No PGW!</b>
-500 B.C.	<b>(<u>Kosala-</u>) -<u>VIDEHA</u></b>  <b>ŚBK</b> <b>ŚBM</b>	<b><u>3rd centre</u></b>  <b>-500 B.C.</b>
500- B.C.	<b>NBP: Northern Black Polished Ware spreads over N.India</b>	

**The establishment of an absolute chronology correlated with archeology, would allow us, for the first time, to date the several layers of Vedic texts which so far have received only very general dates in terms of relative chronology.**

## **§10.5 Dating the Vedas**

It goes without saying that even the following tentative dating, based on the present knowledge in archeology, has some major consequences for the interpretation of the Post-Ṛgvedic texts: the various texts receive, for the first time, a position both in time and space. Future research will show whether each of the following statements is correct or will have to be adjusted. However, I have no doubt that the general scheme of text layers and geographical attributions is correct. The preceding chapters have shown, time and again, that the spatial and temporal relationships of the Vedic texts agree with the various sorts of evidence brought into play. In the following table, this is merely extended to include firm dates which are based both on the evidence of the material culture mentioned in the texts and on the geographical distribution of the texts and schools.

In the table, some more details regarding the various Vedic texts and schools, their formation and relative position, and the relevant layers of some texts as well as some important historical and cultural data have been added.

	Panjab	WEST & South	CENTRE	EAST
1750-	Late Harappan/ OCP: Ocre coloured pot.			
	and various smaller cultures (Grey Ware, Gandhāra grave culture, etc.) metals: copper, no iron no rice		1250 Kausambi: OCP	(Neolithic)
	Ṛgveda composition & first fam. collections			
	immigration to the Panjab, of OIA speakers, in several waves, the latest = Bharata		NB. rice is	

RV hymns composed	early in the	
	Malwa culture	
gold, silver, ayas (copper) mentioned, no iron; no rice	Kīkaṭa, S. of	
	Kurukṣetra =	
	later Niṣāda?	

---

1180	<b>BRW: Black &amp; Red ware</b>	
	<b>KURU (with iron!)</b>	
	establishment of	
	1st centre Kuru realm in	chalcolithic
	E.Panjab/W. Uttar Pradesh	(rice)
	(Kurukṣetra as centre)	
	Pārikṣita dynasty	
	collection of RV 1-10,	
	PS, SV, RVKh (kuntāpa hymns!), and	Kāśī = outsiders
	Mantras of Car.S, MS, KS composed and	(PS)
	collected;	
	composition of early (lost) Br.type	
	explanation of the Śrauta ritual	
	<b>Iron first mentioned in AV:</b>	
	śyāma- ayas-	
	rice first mentioned (AV, Mantras)	

---

1000/900-	<b>PGW: Painted Gray Ware</b>	<b>No PGW!</b>
-----------	-------------------------------	----------------

**YV prose composed and collected in MS,KS**  
**ABo**

**General movement towards the East (KS) and South (MS)**  
**impermanence of settlements:**  
**grāma = trek; wattle huts;**  
**Immigration into**  
**and conquest of**  
**Kurukṣetra by the**

Salvas (& Trigartas)	<u>PAÑCALA</u> 2nd centre	900- Black & Red Ware
Temporary decay of Kaṭha and Maitr. schools (no Maitr.Br., fragm. KaṭhB) emigration to Gujarat and towards the East (Kosala/ Videha)	TS prose, TB *Śāṭy.Br.  prominence of the dynasty of Keśin Dārbhya  (Kaus. 750 B.C.) PGW  Kosala = border of W. dial. traits: prācyavad bhāṣ = not accepted  schools: Kāṇvas, Śāṇḍilya, Aitareyin	(and Grey Ware) (iron)  immigration of Western orthoprax groups, from the Sarasvatī (=Kuru) area: Videgha Māthava, with Gotama Rahūgaṇā; -- immigration of some W. and C.
	New Kaṭha and Maitr. texts composed in new homelands (only?)	& Śākala, Prācyā- Kaṭha, probably Kauthuma (PB)
	movement towards the South: Yama and Naḍa Naiṣadha (ŚB)	

- 500 B.C.

(Kosala-) -VIDEHA  
3rd centre

KaṭhB

KB

JB

BŚS

ŚBKo

ŚBMo

ŚBMw

- 500 B.C.

KaṭhB

JB

BŚS

ŚBMw

ŚBKo

ŚBMo

JUB VādhB

ŚBMn,a

KaṭhŚiU

ChU

TU

BAUK

ŚBMu

(BAUM)

			<b>ABn</b>
	<b>PB</b>	<b>KA</b>	<b>AA, AitU</b>
		<b>(PB?)</b>	<b>AA 5</b>
<b>MU</b>			<b>ĀśvŚS</b>
	<p><b>16 kingdoms are known (VādhB,Pāli) prominent are: Kosala, Kāśī, Videha, Aṅga, Magadha?, and: the older kingdoms of Kuru-Pañcāla, Matsya; also: Vaidarbha, Trigarta, Salva, Madra, Gandhāri, Āraṭṭa, Parśu, Sindhu-Sauvīra; non-IA S.E. tribes like Puṇḍra, Kaliṅga, Andhra.</b></p>		

**Pāṇini knows of:**

**King of Kambojas: E.Iranians? Persians?-  
KS, Car., Tittiri Mantras, Sūtra, Upaniṣad,  
pariṣad; sūtra-kāra, pada-kāra; Śākalya;  
bhikṣu; kumāra-śramaṇā (fem.!) 2.1.70;  
Maskarin (= Makkhali Gosāla?); nāstika;  
nirvāṇa 8.2.50; Vṛji, a Panjab tribe;  
E.Iranian word lipi/libi, grantha**

**Yājñavalkya as prominent  
rel.figure in ŚB; (Mahā-)  
Janaka as Videha king  
attracts W. brahmins:  
Uddālaka Āruṇi & Śākalya  
in the East, in ŚB 11 and  
BAU;  
Aśvala=hotṛ of Janaka,cf.  
Pāli Assalāyana and AA 5;**

**Pāṇ.'s accents = old accentuation:**

**(3 tones: (an)udātta,svarita)  
Mahāvṛṣa & Kuru speak uttarāh(a)i  
(with higher pitch, 3 tones)**

**Vājasan. bhāṣika accent.  
(2 tones: high/low)  
chandas lang. not to be  
used in Buddh.texts,  
refers to old W. pitch  
accent with 3 tones? <sup>355</sup>**

<sup>355</sup> For Mahājanaka, see Franke Kl.Schr., 379. -- For accents see O.v.H. Überblick,p.90 §159; cf. Bronkhorst, Two traditions, Stuttgart 1986, p.111. - Note that his examples are from ŚB/BAU! But there are even later texts with accents: Some late RVKh portions (Śrī Sūkta, even found in Nepalese Buddhist texts!), the Vaiṣṇava stanzas of Vaikh Mtr.Pr., the last, very late sentences of ŚB itself about Yājñavalkya; (accent was, on a scholarly basis, used even much later: some acc. Pāṇinean MSS., a Śikṣā was used to accent an AV MS even some 300 years ago, see introd.to the AV ed. by Śaṅkar Pāṇḍuraṅ Pt.). Therefore, BAU, when taken isolatedly and compared to the Buddh. rules about chandas language, in order to establish a contemporaneity of its period with Buddh. texts, has no value: the Buddh. rule could equally mean late Vedic texts, like Vaikh.Mtr.Pr.-- Note also P.Thieme's observation that Kātyāyana uses the word ādy-udātta- to express a pitch and does not simply use the pitch itself, as Pāṇini did: That would mean that in ca. 300 B.C. there was no living pitch accent in the East, - or at least one different (i.e. bhāṣika) from the Western type with 3 tones.

**Late Vedic immigration of  
Vṛjji, Malla, Śākya, etc.  
into Bihar (E.Kosala, Videha);  
no longer mentioned in the  
Ved. texts, attested in Pāli texts  
as Vajji, etc.**

**(Yugandhara in the Matsya area, ĀpMp)**

**500 B.C. Persians have conquered  
Gandhāra, Panjab and Sindh**

**500- B.C. NBP: Northern Black Polished Ware spreads over N.India**

**150+ B.C. New waves of immigration: Abhīra (Pat.), Śaka, etc.**

---

## **§10.6 Conclusion and prospects**

**What remains to be done is to collect many more features of the various Vedic dialects from the texts,<sup>356</sup> - preferably with the help of the computer. Many more larger or smaller facets and aspects of the dialects, the overlay of various features, either agreeing with or transgressing the dialect boundaries stipulated above, will have to be collected, so that some of the isolated features treated in this article (like u/o in puruvasu-) are put into perspective. Only then will it become clear whether all the tendencies and trends mentioned above are borne out, or whether they were sometimes established on a too limited collection of material.**

**In particular, the position of the transitional dialects, like that of Kosala and of the South (Jaim.) should be investigated in much more detail, and at the same time be separated from such late intrusions as are visible in VSK, ŚBK, and PB.**

**An intriguing investigation could be made into the probability of a late Vedic "Eastern Koine" which would then have included the Videha-Kosala area but would have influenced, more or less heavily, the Central and Southern texts like VādhB, BŚS, JB, JUB, and ChU.**

---

<sup>356</sup> I propose to do so, periodically, in various journals.



The language of the Yajñagāthās will have to be studied closely as to establish links with the Epic and with MIA and early Classical Skt..<sup>357</sup>

In order to get a grip on the problem of a general North Indian Koine, the language of the śiṣtas, a good collection of Pāṇini's bhāṣā material has to be prepared which will have to be compared with his Vedic rules and with the language he actually uses in his Aṣṭādhyāyī, i.e. both the grammatical forms employed and the words attested (thus, excluding his meta language); for example the words used in definitions of meanings of compounds could be studied. Also, the words he actually teaches in the text of his grammar (excluding the examples contained in gaṇas, because of their more or less uncertain extent) will have to be taken into account. Only then can the connections with texts like the PS, KS, etc. and the relation of his archaic bhāṣā to the language of the RV be further elaborated, in succession of the work of P.Thieme's Pāṇini and the Veda. and, on the other hand, the relation to Middle/Late Vedic<sup>358</sup> and to the (possible) continuant of his bhāṣā in Gandhārī be indicated.<sup>359</sup>

<sup>357</sup> Cf. for example, Renou, Histoire de la langue Sanskrite, p.38: "spécimens d'une poésie ... non hiératique,... réellement populaire; (ann.)... sont d'une niveau différent de la prose [brāhmanique]."; cf. ann. 64.

<sup>358</sup> Pāṇini's report of forms with the comparative and superlative suffixes as taught by the Eastern grammarians, 5.3.94, is interesting. The suffixes -tara/tama in composition with eka- indeed occur only in Eastern Vedic texts: ŚBK 7x, ŚBM 1-5 only 1x, and 1x in ŚBM 12; otherwise, -tama is found only in very late Vedic texts: KGS, ĀgGS; -tara- appears in HGS, AVPar, ŚB, again in late texts. This seems to indicate that Pāṇ. lived at the end of the late Br. or even during the Sūtra period. This conclusion is also reached by K. Hoffmann, Aufs. p.541 sqq.: Pān. knew the late Vedic Sūtra texts MŚS, VārŚS (or at least, the lost Br. -if it existed - of the Maitr. school. The mantra in question is used at the Soma sacrifice; MŚS has, when compared to MS, taken over many mantras it lacked in its Saṃhitā from other schools, e.g. the Kaṭhas. Perhaps the mantra belonged to the fragmentary KaṭhB. At this instance, we can only state that MŚS is quoted by Pāṇini.) - He knew of Eastern forms (see above) and of the teaching of the Eastern grammarians (Śākalya!) but he did not acknowledge the Eastern Veda texts (ŚB, VS, nor even TS-prose, see ann. 98). This seems to indicate that he lived in a period (cf. ann. 58) when late Br. like ŚB were redacted and some of the earlier Sūtras (MŚS) were composed, and probably before the Vṛj(j)i had moved eastwards to Bihar (see ann. 97), i.e. before the time of the Buddha, or at least, that of the composition of the relevant Pāli Suttas mentioning the Vajji in connection with the Magadha kings.

<sup>359</sup> Similarly, at Pāṇ. 4.1.17, according to the Eastern gramarians, Vṛddhi + accented suffix -yá, as for example (in Kāśikā) \*Gārgyāyaṇī from Gārgī; the Veda has only: Gārgyāyaṇa- in the Vaṃśa of BAUK 4.6.2, an Eastern text, and Gārgyāyaṇī in Kauṣ Up. 1.1, which is a Central (Pañcāla) text.

**At the other end of the spectrum, the dialect features found in the R̥gveda still await a detailed study (which is under preparation by S.Insler). As a next step, these features could be compared to those of the Middle/Late Vedic period, as described to some extent in this paper. Also, the three forms of Vedic, namely R̥gvedic, Middle Vedic, and Late Vedic in their various dialects, could then again be compared to the archaic features of Middle Indo-Aryan.**

**Finally, it will be interesting to compare the features of R̥gvedic with those of Old Avestan and Old Persian, and those of Middle Vedic (Mantra language, YV Saṃhitā prose) with those of Young Avestan, as has been briefly indicated above, § 10.3. Such a study could, in all probability, teach us much about the early movements of the various Iranian and Indo-Aryan tribes, about their temporary settlement in close proximity to each other in the prehistoric period, and about their final immigration into Iran and India in several successive waves.<sup>360</sup>**

**\* Part of the materials included in this paper were first presented at the Sixth World Sanskrit Conference at Philadelphia, Oct. 1984, and in enlarged form, at this conference. Subsequently, more materials have been added; others, excluded from this paper, will shortly be published as a first installment in a planned series of articles, Notes on Vedic Dialects, (see §10.2). - For abbreviations of the names of Vedic texts see below, §4.2.5., and for special abbr. see ann. 72.**

---

<sup>360</sup> Needless to say, I invite colleagues to join forces in this long term endeavour to find out more about the exact state of dialect features in Vedic and to exchange materials, preferably in electronic form.

