

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Veda*

(Published in: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 70 (1989), 125-135)

‘Veda’ in the Veda

The terms ‘Ṛgveda’, ‘Yajurveda’ and ‘Sāmaveda’ do not occur in the oldest parts of Vedic literature. They occur nowhere in the Saṃhitās,¹ nor in the earliest parts of the Brāhmaṇas. This can be seen as follows.

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa can be divided into an earlier and a later part on the basis of the fact "that in the first twenty-four Adhyāyas (i - v.25) the only tense of narration is the imperfect, and that perfects are extremely rare in any narrative sense. On the contrary, from v.26 to the end the proportion of perfects grows steadily ..." (Keith, 1920: 34). From this and other² evidence Keith concludes that "the last sixteen Adhyāyas can be safely ascribed to a later period than the first twenty-four" (id.). The terms ‘Ṛgveda’, ‘Yajurveda’ and ‘Sāmaveda’ occur in only one section of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viz., 5.32 (25.7), i.e., in the younger part of the Brāhmaṇa.

Also the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is known to consist of parts that derive from different times. Books 11-14 are younger than the books preceding them, and indeed our three Vedas are mentioned by name only there, viz. at 11.5.8.3-6; 12.3.4.9; 14.4.3.12 [= BAU 1.5.5]; 14.5.4.10 [= BAU 2.4.10]; 14.6.10.6 [= BAU 4.1.2] and 14.7.3.11 [= BAU 4.5.11].

The Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa and Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda belong together, as their names indicate, and the latter is, not surprisingly, younger than the former (Eelsingh, 1908: xxx f.). Ṛgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda are mentioned by name in the Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (1.5.8; 4.1.2), not in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa.

[126]

The above three Vedas are also mentioned by name in a number of other relatively young Vedic texts. We find them e.g., included in the following enumeration of literary compositions in the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad (2.4.10; 4.1.2; 4.5.11 [= ŚB 14.5.4.10; 14.6.10.6; 14.7.3.11]) and Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad (6.32): *ṛgvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo 'tharvāṅgirasa itihāsaḥ purāṇaṃ vidyā upaniṣadaḥ ślokāḥ sūtrāṇy anuvyākhyānāni*

* I thank Dr. Harry Falk for critical comments. After this paper had been written I found that similar conclusions regarding the meaning of *veda* have been reached by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka in the introduction to his edition, translation and explanation of the Śābarabhāṣya (Mīmāṃsaka, 1987: 80-81).

¹ ‘Ṛgveda’ occurs in the Khilas of the Ṛgveda, at 4.2.6.

² See Keith, 1920: 28-36.

vyākhyānāni. GB 1.1.17-21 enumerates our three Vedas also with the Atharvaveda, *itihāsapurāṇa*, *vākovākya*, *gāthā*, *nārāśamsī*, *upanīṣad* and *anūsāsana*.

It seems that the youngest Vedic texts use the terms ‘Ṛgveda’, ‘Yajurveda’ and ‘Sāmaveda’ — which are used in the singular, as in the above quotations — more or less in the same way as we use them, i.e., to denote what is nowadays also known by the names ‘Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā’, ‘Yajurveda-Saṃhitā’ and ‘Sāmaveda-Saṃhitā’.³ And even if this is not the case, it seems clear that these terms refer to bodies of literature that include the Saṃhitās. ChU 3.1-3 contains a simile which seems to support the interpretation that the Ṛgveda is a collection of Ṛces, and similarly for the other two Vedas. The Ṛces are here compared to bees, the Ṛgveda to a flower: similarly for the Yajuses and the Sāmans vis-à-vis the Yajurveda and Sāmaveda respectively. The Ṛgveda clearly appears at the place where all the Ṛces meet, and therefore seems to be their collection; so for the Yajurveda and Sāmaveda. (ChU 3.4 relates in a similar manner the *atharvāṅgirasas* and *itihāsapurāṇa*, as if there were no Atharvaveda. The significance of this peculiarity is discussed elsewhere.⁴) And GB 1.1.29 mentions the four Vedas (i.e., our three plus the Atharvaveda) and gives their beginnings as we know them.⁵

It is clear that the word ‘Veda’, alone or in compounds, cannot be expected to give rise to difficulties in the younger Vedic texts. But how is the word used in the older texts, especially in those which do not know, or use, the terms ‘Ṛgveda’, ‘Yajurveda’ and ‘Sāmaveda’?

These texts do indeed use the word ‘Veda’, be it not very frequently. A number of the occurrences of this word in the old texts support the view that ‘Veda’ is here more or less synonymous with *mantra*, and does not designate collections of mantras and the like.

[127]

AB 1.22 (4.5) has *ṛimayo yajurmayah sāmamayo vedamayo brahmamayo mṛtamayah saṃbhūya devatā apyeti ya evaṃ veda yaś caivaṃ vidvān etena yajñakratunā yajate* "Having come into existence as composed of the Ṛc, the Yajus, and the Sāman, **and of the Veda**, and of the *brahman*, and of the immortal, he attains to the deities who knows thus and who knowing thus sacrifices with this sacrificial rite" (tr. Keith, modified). There is no reason to translate *brahman* in the passage as ‘holy power’, as Keith does. It rather has the meaning ‘sacred utterance’, and thus is partially synonymous with the four terms preceding it. ‘Veda’ here can in this way be interpreted as one more name for the sacred utterances also known as Ṛc, Yajus, Sāman and Brahman. This same conclusion can be upheld if we understand *vedamayo* as an explanation of the three preceding terms and

³ Note that these expressions are totally unknown to the Vedic texts.

⁴ See Bronkhorst, 1991: § 4.4.

⁵ They are the same as those quoted in Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* (ed. Kielhorn I, p. 11, lines 4-5), but the order is different. It is particularly remarkable that Patañjali puts AV(P) *śam no devīr abhiṣṭave* first, while GB puts it last.

translate: "... i.e., as composed of the Veda". The proximity of *brahmamayo* would still favour the interpretation 'sacred utterance'.

Also AV 15.3.6-8 brings 'Veda' in connection with 'Brahman' while describing a settle (*āsandī*): "The verses (*ṛc*) [were its] forward cords (*tantu*), the sacrificial formulas (*yajus*) the cross ones. **The Veda the cushion** (*āstarāṇa*), the *brahman* the pillow (*upabarhaṇa*). The chant (*sāman*) the seat, the *udgītha* the support (?)." (*ṛcaḥ prāñicas tantavo yajūṃṣi tiryāñcaḥ/ veda āstarāṇam brahmopabarhaṇam/ sāmāsāda udgīthopāśravaḥ/* tr. Whitney). The two phrases *brahmaṇā kṣatram vyapibat* and *vedena rūpe vyapibat* in one and the same section (MS 3.11.6, VSM 19.75 & 78, VSK 21.5.2 & 5, KS 38.1; slightly different at TB 2.6.2.2-3) show again the close relationship between Veda and Brahman.

TS 7.5.11.2 (= KS 45.2), similarly, lists 'the Vedas' in an enumeration of sacred and less sacred utterances: *ṛgbhyaḥ svāhā yajurbhyaḥ svāhā ṅgirobhyaḥ svāhā vedebhyaḥ svāhā gāthābhyāḥ svāhā nārāśamsībhyāḥ svāhā raibhibhyaḥ svāhā sarvasmai svāhā*. It is hard to believe that the Vedas here referred to are the Ṛgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda, since these are never mentioned in the oldest literature; nor does the context seem to allow of the mention of collections at this place.

ŚB 5.5.5.5 appears to identify 'Veda' with Ṛc, Yajus and Sāman: *tasmād apy etarhy evam evaitair vedair yajñam tanvate yajurbhir evāgre 'thargbhir atha sāmabhir*" "Therefore they spread the sacrifice even to this day in the same way with those Vedas, first with the Yajus-formulas, then with the Ṛc-verses, and then with the Sāman-hymns" (tr. Eggeling). AV 7.57.1 may make the same identification: *ṛcam sāma yad aprākṣam havir ojo yajur balam/ eṣa mā tasmān mā himsīd vedāḥ pṛṣṭaḥ śacīpate/*" "When I have asked verse (*ṛc*) [and] chant (*sāman*) [respectively] for oblation [and][128] force, [and] sacrificial formula (*yajus*) for strength, let not therefore this Veda, asked, injure me, O lord of might" (tr. Whitney).

TB 3.10.11.3-4 tells the story of Bharadvāja who spent three lifetimes (Sāyaṇa explains: three hundred years) studying the Veda. Indra offers him a fourth lifetime and asks what Bharadvāja wants to do with it. When Bharadvāja makes known his intention to continue his Vedic studies, Indra shows him three mountains, takes a handful from each, and says:

These, indeed, are the Vedas. Infinite indeed are the Vedas. This (i.e., the three handfuls) is what you have studied in these three lifetimes. The rest you have not studied at all yet.⁶

It is hard to see how the Saṃhitās as we know them can be said to be 'infinite', even if we add the Brāhmaṇas to them. Countless numbers of Brahmins have managed to learn one,

⁶ TB 3.10.11.4: *vedā vā etc/ anantā vai vedāḥ/ etad vā etais tribhir āyurbhir anvavocathāḥ/ atha ta itarad ananūktam eva/*

sometimes more than one, Veda by heart, so it looks odd that Bharadvāja had not yet mastered even a single ‘mountain’ after three lifetimes. The three ‘mountains’ must rather be considered to consist of non-collected, or only partially collected Ṛces, Yajuses and Sāmans. The meaning of "infinite indeed are the Vedas" seems to be: the number of Ṛces, Yajuses and Sāmans, i.e. of sacred utterances, is infinite.

The interpretation ‘sacred utterance’ for ‘Veda’ in the earlier texts, rather than ‘collection of sacred utterances’, also fits the occurrence of this word in RV 8.19.5 (= KS 39.15) *yaḥ samidhā ya āhuti yo vedena dadāśa marto agnaya* "the mortal who has served Agni with firewood, oblations and ‘sacred utterances’".

If indeed ‘Veda’ did not have its later sense yet in the earlier Vedic texts, it is not impossible that the same is true of the earliest occurrences of ‘Ṛgveda’, ‘Yajurveda’ and ‘Sāmaveda’. In a large number of cases the context does not allow us to determine the exact significance of these terms. Yet at least one context is suggestive.

A number of passages deal with the creation of the three Vedas.⁷ Common to most versions is that the Ṛgveda is born from Agni, the Yajur[129]veda from Vāyu, the Sāmaveda from Āditya.⁸ These three Vedas, in their turn, give rise to *bhūḥ*, *bhuvah* and *sva* respectively.⁹

From this point onward some of the texts start using the terms ‘Ṛc’ and ‘Ṛgveda’, ‘Yajus’ and ‘Yajurveda’, ‘Sāman’ and ‘Sāmaveda’ rather indiscriminately. AB 5.33 (25.8) has *tad āhur mahāvadhāḥ, yad ṛcaiva hautram kriyate yajuṣādhvaryavaṃ sāmnoḍgītham vyārabdhā trayī vidyā bhavaty atha kena brahmatvaṃ kriyata iti trayyā vidyayeti brūyāt* "Important sages say ‘Since the Hotṛ's office is performed with the Ṛc, the Adhvaryu's with the Yajus, the Udgāṭṛ's with the Sāman, the threefold knowledge is taken up; how then is the Brahman's office performed?’ ‘With the threefold knowledge’, he should say." (tr. Keith). JB 1.358 asks the same question in the form *tad āhur yad ṛcā hotṛtvaṃ kriyate yajuṣādhvaryavaṃ sāmnoḍgītho 'tha kena brahmatvaṃ kriyata iti/ anayā trayyā vidyayeti ha brūyāt/*. But ŚB 11.5.8.4 conveys the same information in the words *ṛgvedenaiva hotram akurvata yajurvedenādhvaryavaṃ sāmavedenodgītham yad eva trayyai vidyāyai śukraṃ tena brahmatvam athocakrāma*. JB 1.358, moreover, seems to use the expression *trayo vedaḥ* ‘threefold Veda’ interchangeably with *trayī vidyā* ‘threefold knowledge’. In view of the fact that *trayī vidyā* primarily refers to the knowledge of Ṛc, Yajus and Sāman, rather than to the three Vedas named after them, these two passages suggest that they, too, used ‘Veda’ for ‘sacred utterance’, rather than for the collections known to us by that name.

⁷ AB 5.32 (25.7), ŚB 11.5.8.3 f., ŚadB 4.1.2, JB 1.357, GB 1.1.6.

⁸ ŚadB 4.1.2 has the Ṛgveda born from the earth, the Yajurveda from the intermediate space (*antarikṣa*), the Sāmaveda from heaven.

⁹ ŚadB 4.1.2 is again the exception. The story takes here an altogether different turn.

How many Vedas?

There is a tradition of five (rather than three or four) Vedas which is attested both in Vedic and non-Vedic texts. The Buddhist canon preserves it in a form which does not mention the Atharvaveda, and may therefore be oldest in origin. There is the oft-recurring phrase in Pali:

... *tiṇṇaṃ vedānaṃ pāragū sanighaṇḍukeṭubhānaṃ sākkharappabhedānaṃ itihāsapañcamānaṃ padaḷo veyyākaraṇo ...*¹⁰

The same phrase occurs in Sanskrit with minor variations:

... *trayānāṃ vedānāṃ pāragah sanighāṇṭakaitabhānāṃ sāksaraprabhedānāṃ itihāsapañcamānāṃ padaśo vyākaraṇah ...*¹¹
 [130] ... *trayānāṃ vedānāṃ pārago sāksaraprabhedānāṃ itihāsapañcamānāṃ sanighāṇṭakaitabhānāṃ*¹²
 ... *trayānāṃ vedānāṃ pārago sanirghaṇṭhakaitabhānāṃ itihāsapañcamānāṃ akṣarapadavyākaraṇe analpako ...*¹³
 ... *trayānāṃ vedānāṃ pārago akṣaraprabhedānāṃ itihāsapañcamānāṃ sanighāṇṭukaitabhānāṃ anupadakavyākaraṇakuśalo ...*¹⁴

An echo of this phrase is found in Avadāna 33 of the Divyāvadāna:

... *vedān samanumarati sma sāṅgopāṅgān sarahasyān sanighāṇṭukaitabhān sāksaraprabhedān itihāsapañcamān ...*¹⁵

It seems clear that all these phrases agree in enumerating five Vedas. The reason to think so is that *itihāsapañcamānāṃ* (or its equivalent in Pali) is a Bahuvrīhi compound qualifying *vedānāṃ*, and should therefore be translated: "with *itihāsa* as fifth [Veda]". We shall see that this interpretation fits other evidence which will be discussed presently.

The different phrases show some variation regarding the precise contents of Vedas number four and five. They all consider *itihāsa* 'legend' part (sometimes the whole) of the fifth Veda. Most of them agree that the fourth Veda encompasses *akṣara* / *akkhara* 'phonology (PED)' and *pra-* / *pabheda* 'etymology (PED), exegesis (Rhys Davids, 1899: 109)', or perhaps rather *akṣaraprabheda* / *akkharapabheda* 'philologische Technik (Franke,

¹⁰ DN I.88, 114, 138; MN II.133, 141, [146,] 147, 165, 168, 210; AN I.163, 166; III.223; Sn p. 105.

¹¹ Av II.19.

¹² Mv I.231.17-18.

¹³ Mv II.77.9-10; Mv II.89.16-17 has *kuśalo* for *analpako*.

¹⁴ Mv III.450.6-7.

¹⁵ Divy 619.21-23.

1913: 87)'; one however does not include them in any Veda. The items *nighaṅṭa / nirghaṅṭa / nighaṅṭu / nighaṅṭu* 'lexicology / etymology (BHSD), synonymische Wortverzeichnisse (Franke, id.), explanation (PED), indices (Rhys Davids, id.), vocabularies (Horner, 1957: 317)' and *kaiṭabha / keṭubha* 'ritual science (BHSD), Hilfsbücher (Franke, id.), ritual (PED)' are usually part of the fourth Veda, in two cases of the fifth.

Some passages of the Madhyamāgama preserved in Chinese mention five Vedas, but specify the contents of the fifth one in an altogether different way:

[He] has crossed the four classical texts, with the correct literature of profound intelligence on causes and conditions as fifth.¹⁶

[131]

Here the Atharvaveda seems, implicitly, to have made its way into the list, which may indicate its relative lateness.

The five Vedas are again, this time explicitly, referred to in an otherwise obscure verse of the Saṃyutta Nikāya (I.29):

*pañcaveda (v.l. -vedā) satam samam/
tapassī brāhmaṇācaram (v.l. caramti)//*

(Note that the prose portions of the Pali canon refer always to five Vedas; only in verse the three Vedas are referred to a few times,¹⁷ and this may be an abbreviation dictated by the demands of metre.)

The five Vedas are enumerated, finally, in the Dīpavaṃsa (V.62): ... *irurvedaṃ yajurvedaṃ sāmavedaṃ pi nighaṅṭuṃ itihāsaṃ ca pañcamam*.

In the Veda itself we find the five Vedas enumerated at ChU 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.2.1 and 7.7.1. ChU 7.1.4 reads: *ṛgvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmaveda ātharvaṇas caturtha itihāsapurāṇaḥ pañcamo vedānāṃ vedaḥ pitryo rāsir daivo nidhir vākovākyam ekāyaṇam devavidyā brahmavidyā bhūtaividyā kṣatравидyā nakṣatравидyā sarpadevajanavidyā*. Most of the terms of this list are unknown (see Horsch, 1966: 33). Here it is clear that *caturtha* 'the fourth' refers to a Veda, viz., the Atharvaveda: the same must therefore be true of 'the fifth'. (We may follow Horsch, and thus indirectly W. Rau, in taking *itihāsapurāṇaḥ pañcamo vedānāṃ vedaḥ* together, translating 'itihāsa and purāṇa, which constitute the fifth Veda among the Vedas'. This does not however affect our main argument.) [Śaṅkara's comments on ChU 7.1.2 are intriguing (cf. Horsch, 1966: 36). *Vedānāṃ vedaḥ* is taken as a new item after the fifth Veda, meaning *vyākaraṇa*, because by means of *vyākaraṇa* the Ṛgveda etc. are known in their division into *pada* etc. (*vyākaraṇena hi padādivibhāgaśo ṛgvedādayo*

¹⁶ T. 26 (vol. 1) p. 663c line 8, p. 680b lines 28-29, p. 685a lines 11-12.

¹⁷ Thag 1171; SN IV.118; J VI.214.

jñāyante). The result is so close to the enumerations in Avadānaśataka and Mahāvastu presented above that it seems likely that Śaṅkara was influenced from Buddhist side.]

The Buddhist enumerations of five Vedas have no place for the Atharvaveda. The Jaina canonical scriptures contain an enumeration which seems clearly derived from the one used by the Buddhists, **with** the Atharvaveda. Unlike the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, it does not simply drop the ‘original’ fourth Veda, but moves it to the sixth place. *Itihāsa* keeps its traditional fifth place. The result is an enumeration of six Vedas:¹⁸

[132]

*riuvveda-jajuvveda-sāmaveda-athavvaṇaveda-itihāsapañcamāṇam
nighaṁtachaṭṭhāṇam caūṇham vedāṇam saṁgovamgāṇam sarahassāṇam sārāe vārae
pārae ...*

A very clear enumeration of five Vedas is provided by the Arthaśāstra (i.3.1-2):

sāmargyajurvedās trayas trayī/ atharvavedetihāsavedau ca vedāḥ/.

It is not without interest, yet hardly surprising, to see how the Mahābhārata, once it was written down sometime before the 5th century A.D.,¹⁹ appropriated to itself the title of ‘fifth Veda’.²⁰ This however focuses attention on the fact that before that time the ‘fifth Veda’ was no collected whole. The same is true of the ‘fourth Veda’ in most of the Buddhist enumerations. Could it be that the first three Vedas were no collected wholes either at the time when the tradition of five Vedas came into existence? [We may have to make an exception for the Ṛgveda, whose Padapāṭha is old (Bronkhorst, 1982) and may be referred to by the Pali *padaka* in the phrase studied above: this word is derived by Pāṇini’s rule 4.2.61 in the sense ‘who studies or knows the Pada(-pāṭha)’.] The fact that the tradition of five Vedas soon passed out of existence might then be attributed to the circumstance that no more than three, or four, Vedas came to constitute tangible collections. Already the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad and the Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad (cited above) enumerate partly the same items as ChU 7 without mentioning the five Vedas. The Milindapañha in its later portions, similarly, gives a clearly related enumeration without mentioning them (178.15-17): *Irubbedam Yajubbedam Sāmavedam Athabbaṇavedam lakkhaṇam itihāsam purāṇam nighaṇḍu keṭubham akkharappahedaṇ padaṇ veyyākaraṇam ...*

* * *

¹⁸ Viy 2.1.12; 9.33.2; Aupapātika Sūtra (ed. Leumann) section 77, and elsewhere, see Charpentier, 1914: 28.

¹⁹ The evidence discussed by Bühler and Kirste (1892) shows that the Mahābhārata existed in something like its present form in the 5th cent. A.D.

²⁰ See Fitzgerald, 1985. Later authors like Madhva accept the Mahābhārata as fifth Veda but apply the term to other works as well, like the Pañcarātra; see Glasenapp, 1923: 5, 7. See further Rocher, 1986: 16 f. (Purāṇas), Keith, 1924: 12-13, Kuiper, 1979: 118-119 n. 42, 121 f. (Nāṭyaśāstra).

The above evidence suggests that the meaning of the word 'Veda' underwent a development. Before the 'Saṃhitās' had come into existence, it did not, indeed could not, designate these. 'Veda' appears to have been used in that period, and perhaps for some time afterwards, as an approximate synonym of *mantra* and *brahman* 'sacred utterance'. It was apparently used much like *vidyā* in *trayī vidyā*, which kept this sense when 'Veda' came to designate the Vedic collections including or consisting of the 'Saṃhitās'. Before the word 'Veda' obtained its final meaning, however, it may have been used in a far looser sense to refer to the 'five Vedas', at least some of which never were collections in the proper sense of the term.

[133]

Bibliography

- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1982): "Some observations on the Padapāṭha of the Ṛgveda." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24, 181-189.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1991): "Pāṇini and the Veda reconsidered." *Pāṇinian Studies*. Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation Volume. Edited by Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan. Number 37, pp. 75-121.
- Bühler, G., and Kirste, J. (1892): *Indian Studies. No. II. Contributions to the History of the Mahābhārata*. Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften 127, XII. Abhandlung.
- Charpentier, Jarl (ed., tr.)(1914): *The Uttarādhyayanāsūtra, being the First Mūlasūtra of the Śvetāmbara Jains*. New Delhi: Ajay Book Service. 1980.
- Eelsingh, Herman Frederik (ed.)(1908): *Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇam Vijñāpanabhāṣyasahitam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Eggeling, Julius (tr.)(1882-1900): *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa according to the text of the Mādhyandina School*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fitzgerald, James L. (1985): "India's fifth Veda: the Mahābhārata's presentation of itself." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 20, 125-140.
- Franke, R. Otto (tr.)(1913): *Dīghanikāya. Das Buch der langen Texte des buddhistischen Kanons in Auswahl übersetzt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Glaserapp, Helmuth von (1923): *Madhvas Philosophie des Vishnu-Glaubens*. Bonn-Leipzig: Kurt Schroeder.
- Horner, I.B. (tr.)(1957): *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-Nikāya)* vol. II. London: PTS. 1975.
- Horsch, Paul (1966): *Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*. Bern: Francke.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale (1924): *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press. 1970.
- Kuiper, F.B.J. (1979): *Varuna and Vidūsaka. On the origin of the Sanskrit drama*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company. (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, deel 100.)

[134]

- Leumann, Ernst (ed.)(1883): *Das Aupapātika Sūtra, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina*. I. Theil. Einleitung, Text und Glossar. Leipzig. Reprinted by Kraus Reprint Ltd., Nendeln, Liechtenstein. 1966.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (1987): *Ācārya-Śabarāsvāmiviracitaṃ Jaiminīya-Mīmāṃsā-Bhāṣyam Ārsamatavimarśinyā Hindīvyākhyayā Sahitam*. Part 1. 2nd edition. Bahālgadh: Ramlal Kapur Trust.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. (tr.)(1899): *Dialogues of the Buddha*. Part I. London: PTS. 1977.

Rocher, Ludo (1986): *The Purāṇas*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (*A History of Indian Literature*, II.3.)

Whitney, William Dwight (tr.)(1905): *Atharva-Veda-Saṃhitā*. Revised and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman. 2 vol. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass. 1984. (Harvard Oriental Series 7-8.)

Abbreviations

(all Pali texts PTS edition)

AB	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa
AN	Aṅguttara Nikāya
Av	Avadānaśataka
AV	Atharvaveda (Śaunakīya)
AV(P)	Atharvaveda (Paippalāda)
BAU	Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad
BHSD	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary by F. Edgerton
ChU	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
CPD	Critical Pali Dictionary
Divy	Divyāvadāna
DN	Dīgha Nikāya
GB	Gopatha Brāhmaṇa
J	Jātaka
JB	Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa
KS	Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā
MN	Majjhima Nikāya
MS	Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā
Mv	Mahāvastu
PED	Pali-English Dictionary (PTS)
PTS	Pali Text Society
RV	Ṛgveda
ṢaḍB	Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa
ŚB	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
Sn	Suttanipāta
SN	Saṃyutta Nikāya
T.	Taishō edition of the Tripiṭaka in Chinese
TB	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
Thag	Theragāthā
TS	Taittirīya Saṃhitā
Viy	Viyāhapannatti (Jaina-Āgama-Series 4)
VSK	Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā (Kāṇva)
VSM	Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā (Mādhyandina)