

²On crossing rivers in ancient India, see DELOCHE 1980, 124 ff. (“La traversée des rivières”).

the Gaṅgā.³ Indeed, the ancient road from Mathurā to Pāṭaliputra passed through Kauśāmbī. And the road that leads to Pāṭaliputra via Sāketa is the road that ultimately comes from Gandhāra.

ABHYANKAR's argument in favour of a more northern position for Patañjali is hidden away in the Select Critical Notes that he added to the 3rd edition of KIELHORN's edition of the *Mahābhāṣya*, vol. I p. 571-572. It is based on the following illustration in the *Mahābhāṣya* on P. 2.1.29 vt. 2 (p. 384 l.18-19):

ṣaṇ muhūrtāś carācarāḥ | te kadācid ahar gacchanti kadācid rātrim | tad
ucyate | ahargatāḥ rātrigatā iti ||

JOSHI & ROODBERGEN (1969, 166) translate:

"The six *muhūrtas* are not fixed." These [*muhūrtas*] sometimes belong to day-time, [and] sometimes to night-time. This is expressed [in the words] *ahargatāḥ* "belonging to day-time", *rātrigatāḥ* "belonging to night-time".

ABHYANKAR's argument amounts to this that there are not so many places in India where the difference between the longest and the shortest day is as much as six *muhūrtas*, i.e. 6 x 48 minutes. He concludes: "Such a phenomenon occurs in the districts situated at a latitude of 34° north i.e., as far as India is concerned, in a district, situated to the west of Shrinagar and to the north of Takṣaśilā which appears to be the place of residence of the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*." It seems unlikely that Patañjali's statement allows of so precise a localization as ABHYANKAR provides.⁴ However, it does suggest a place in the north.

[Both the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (2.8.33-36 [= 34-38 in KIRFEL, 1954, 59-60]) and the *Arthaśāstra* (2.20.37) state that the duration of the longest day is 18 *muhūrtas* and that of the shortest day 12 *muhūrtas*. Neither text specifies for which part of India this is supposed to be true; the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* suggests that it is true for India as a whole. This makes this information less useful for our present purposes, and may indeed weaken ABHYANKAR's argument to some degree.]

It is not necessary to argue with SCHARFE who, as we have seen, thinks that Patañjali must have taken this information from other works. This is not necessary, because there are further reasons to think that Patañjali had close links with this region. AKLUJKAR (2008) has recently discussed a number of passages from the *Mahābhāṣya*, including the ones considered

³See BRONKHORST 1983, 397, with note 32; SCHWARTZBERG 1978, 19 Plate III.B.5 and 24 Plate III.C.5a; KULKE & ROTHERMUND 1998, 364.

⁴The basic calculation is correct, as can be verified with the help of the following site: http://culturesciencesphysique.ens-lyon.fr/XML/db/csphysique/metadata/LOM_CSP_QS_heure_coucher_soleil_Sol.xml.

above, and shown that Patañjali's association with Kaśmīra is supported by many of these.

There is more. In the region of Gandhāra and Kaśmīra a revolution in Buddhist thinking took place during the final centuries preceding the Common Era, and Patañjali knew about it. In several publications I have drawn attention to the fact that Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* shows clear traces of Buddhist influence, and not just any Buddhist influence.⁵ Patañjali, it appears, was familiar with the new notions and new way of thinking that the Buddhists of that particular region were elaborating. Since this was a regional Buddhist development, the question how Patañjali could possibly know about it has puzzled me for long. The riddle is solved if we accept, with ABHYANKAR, that Patañjali lived in the same region as those Buddhists, or near it.

We may exclude Gandhāra as possible region for Patañjali. His *Mahābhāṣya* itself specifies that the Śakas and the Yavanas live outside the Brahmanical heartland;⁶ Gandhāra had in 185 BCE once again come under the rulership of the Indo-Greeks, i.e. of Patañjali's Yavanas.⁷ Other early texts express themselves similarly. The *Assalāyana Sutta* from the *Majjhima Nikāya* (MN II p. 149) states that the four *varṇas* do not exist among the Yonas and the Kāmbojas.⁸ The four *varṇas* are, of course, the most crucial part of Brahmanical socio-political thought. Some texts add that there were not even Brahmins in that part of India. An inscription of Aśoka claims that there are no Brahmins and Śramaṇas among the Yonas. The *Anuśāsanaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (13.33.19-21) and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* (10.43-44) state that no Brahmins are seen among the Śakas and the Kāmbojas. Elsewhere the *Mahābhārata* depicts the inhabitants of Gandhāra as being beyond the system of *varṇas*, like fishermen.⁹

Then there is the following. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (9.3.1.24) speaks in very negative terms about the inhabitants of the region of the seven rivers that flow westward, i.e. the Punjab.¹⁰ The *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* enumerates the names of tribes that a good Brahmin should not visit, among them the Āraṭṭa and the Gāndhāra in the northwest.¹¹ It is not clear where

⁵BRONKHORST 1987, 43-71; 1994; 2002; 2004, esp. §§ 8-9.

⁶See CARDONA 1976, 265 f., with references.

⁷SALOMON 2005; FALK 2008. For a recent survey of the political history of the region, see OBERLIES 2010.

⁸"Kamboja [was] an Iranian area in eastern Afghanistan that spoke late Avestan" (WITZEL 2006, 461).

⁹E.g., Mhbh 12.65.13 ff.; 200.40-41. See further WITZEL 2006, 485 f.

¹⁰Cp. WITZEL 1997, 302.

¹¹BaudhŚS 18.13; cp. WITZEL 1987, 202. The *Kevaddha Sutta* of the buddhist canon in Pali (DN I p. 213) speaks of a "science from Gandhāra" (*gandhārī nāma vijjā*; cp. the *gāndhārī nāma*

exactly the Āraṭṭa lived;¹² the Gāndhāra, on the other hand, evidently lived in Gandhāra, a region that by this testimony was situated outside the realm where orthodox Brahmins lived at that time.¹³ Several late-vedic and more recent texts know Gandhāra as a more or less remote region, and none of the vedic schools appear to be found there.¹⁴ The much more recent *Rājataranī* of Kalhaṇa (1.307) admits that there are Brahmins in Gandhāra, but looks down upon them for accepting *agrahāras* from a worthless king.¹⁵

If, then, Patañjali can hardly have lived in Gandhāra, he may very well have lived in Kaśmīra.¹⁶ Kaśmīra was not Buddhist territory the way Gandhāra was.¹⁷ What is more, an early Buddhist text from Kaśmīra

vidyā of Abhidh-k-bh(P) p. 424 l. 18, under verse 7.47), which enables its possessors to multiply themselves, and other such things.

¹²*BaudhŚS* 18.44 suggests that Gandhāra and the land of the Ā/Araṭṭa were separate from each other. WITZEL (1989, 235) translates this passage: “Ayu went eastward. His (people) are the Kuru-Pañcāla and the Kāśī-Videha. This is the Āyava migration. (His other people) stayed at home in the West. His people are the Gāndhāri, Parśu and Araṭṭa. This is the Amāvasava (group).” CARDONA & JAIN (2003, 33 sq.) propose a different translation: “Āyu went eastward. Of him there are these: the Kuru-Pañcālas, the Kāśī-Videhas. This is the going forth of Āyu. Amāvasu (went) westward. Of him there are these: the Gāndhāris, the Sparśa, and the Arāṭṭas. This is the (going forth) of Amāvasu.”

¹³BRUCKER 1980, 147 states: “mit Gandhāra [begegnet uns] ein Land, das sicher schon sehr früh Kontakt mit den in Nordindien eindringenden Indern hatte. Um so erstaunlicher ist es, dass dieses Gebiet, das am Oberlauf von Sindhu und Vitasta zu lokalisieren ist, selbst in der Sūtrazeit noch nicht in die arische Siedlungsgemeinschaft inkorporiert war.” The “noch nicht” of this passage suggests that BRUCKER believes that Gandhāra was subsequently incorporated in the area of Aryan colonization; he does not however provide any evidence to support this.

¹⁴The *Yajurveda-Vrkṣa* mentions several schools that were supposedly situated *yavanadeśe*. WITZEL (1982, 192), who provides this information, points out that the dates of composition of the different versions of this text remain unknown. He suggests that the text here speaks of the Greek Panjab, or of regions in Sind, later also in Panjab, that were occupied at an early date by the Moslems.

¹⁵Evidence for a brahmanical presence in this later but still pre-Muslim period comes from statues and literary sources; KUWAYAMA 1976; 1999; see further MEISTER 2010.

¹⁶So MĪMĀMSAKA (sañ. 2030, I: 335), who does not however base his position on the arguments here presented. Note that “[Patañjali’s] mentioning of Kaśmīra is probably the oldest datable occurrence of the wor[d] in Indian literature” (WITZEL 1994, 241-242).

¹⁷LAMOTTE (1958, 369) states the following: “Notons . . . que la Bonne Loi ne connut pas le même succès dans tous les districts du Nord-Ouest indistinctement. Les renseignements fournis par les pèlerins chinois et les trouvailles archéologiques montrent que seuls les districts du Penjab occidental, du Gandhāra, de l’Uḍḍiyāna et sans doute aussi du Jāguḍa . . . furent véritablement bouddhisés dès l’époque Maurya. Il n’en fut pas de même pour le Kapiśa (Kohistān de Kābul) où Hiuan-tsang ne signale qu’un unique stūpa aśokéen, ni même pour le Kaśmīr où l’on n’a retrouvé aucune trace des fondations aśokéennes du Śuśkalettra et du Vitastrāta mentionnées par les voyageurs et Kalhaṇa. Que quelques bouddhistes s’y soient aventurés à l’époque ancienne, nul ne songe à le nier; mais une hirondelle ne fait pas le printemps et, à la lumière des nombreux indices que nous aurons à examiner plus loin, on peut croire que le Kapiśa et le Kaśmīr ne devinrent de véritables fiefs bouddhiques qu’à l’époque Kuṣāṇa. . .”

(first or second century CE), the *Vibhāṣā*, records that King Puṣyamitra persecuted Buddhists in Kaśmīra.¹⁸ The same information is found in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*.¹⁹ Puṣyamitra was a contemporary of Patañjali and is even mentioned in his *Mahābhāṣya*, in an example:²⁰ “We are officiating here at Puṣyamitra’s sacrifice.”²¹

This example suggests an answer to a question that has not yet been asked but that had to be asked at some point: Who financed Patañjali? The obvious answer now seems to be that he received support from King Puṣyamitra and his successors, or perhaps from their local representatives²², in Kaśmīra. This answer is hardly surprising. The Maurya empire had not been sympathetic to Brahmanism, and patronage during the Maurya period may have been next to impossible to obtain. Brahmins, moreover, did not normally receive financial support from the merchant community — as did the Buddhists and Jainas —, which made the absence of sympathetic rulers during the Maurya period all the more problematic. All this changed with the rule of Puṣyamitra, whose sympathies for Brahmanism are unanimously emphasized in the sources. Patañjali lived at the right time, under the right ruler. His massive *Mahābhāṣya*, a work whose influence on subsequent Brahmanical thought can hardly be overestimated, could be composed thanks to this new political situation.

What implications do these findings have for the presence of Vedic schools in northwestern India? Patañjali was acquainted with a number of Vedic texts, many of which he cites. Wilhelm RAU (1985) has identified a large number of these. These identifications led him to conclude that Patañjali was most intimately acquainted with the Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā and the Paippalāda Atharvaveda.²³ The evidence suggests as much, if not more, familiarity with the Ṛgveda; RAU ascribes this, rightly or wrongly, to its particularly close link with the Pāṇinian tradition.²⁴ He further notes that the Sāmaveda along

¹⁸LAMOTTE 1958, 425: “... Dans le pays-frontière (*pratyantajanapada*) du royaume de *Kia-chō-mi-lo* (Kaśmīra), il détruisit 500 Saṃghārama ...”

¹⁹LAMOTTE 1958, 430: “En cet âge inférieur, il y aura un roi, Gomimukhya [i.e., Puṣyamitra], destructeur de ma religion (*śāsanāntadhāpako mama*). S’étant emparé de l’est (*prācīm diśam*) et des portes du Kaśmīr (*Kaśmīre dvāram*), ce fou aux intentions malveillantes détruira les vihāra et les reliques insignes (*dhātuvara*) et fera périr les moines de bonne conduite. ...”

²⁰Mahā-bh II p. 123 l. 3-4 (on P. 3.2.123 vt. 1): *iha puṣyamitraṃ yājayāmaḥ*.

²¹One might speculate that Patañjali had moved to Kaśmīra at the behest of Puṣyamitra. This would explain his claim that proper Sanskrit is spoken elsewhere, in Āryāvarta, not in Kaśmīra. See DESHPANDE 2006, 219 ff.

²²Patañjali mentions a king and a queen of Kaśmīra: *kaśmīrarāja*, *kaśmīrarājñī* (Mahā-bh II p. 193 l. 18, on P. 4.1.1 vt. 10; WITZEL 1994, 242).

²³RAU 1985, 103: “Das Mahābhāṣya gehört in die nächste Nähe des Kāṭhaka und des Paippalāda-Atharvaveda.”

²⁴RAU 1985, 103: “Dass gleichwohl die grösste Anzahl der hapax legomena dem Ṛgveda entnommen ist, erkläre ich mir aus der allgemeinen Tradition der pāṇinischen Schule. Diesen

with its Brāhmaṇas is not taken into consideration by Patañjali.

What does this mean? It seems reasonable to assume that there were Kaṭhas²⁵, Paippalādins and Ṛgvedins in Kaśmīra at the time of Patañjali. Conceivably they were newcomers, brought there by Puṣyamitra for the performance of his sacrifices in which Patañjali himself may have participated (see his example *iha puṣyamitraṃ yājayāmaḥ* cited in note 20 above). Or they may have recently arrived for some other reason. Or, finally, they may have been there already from the days before Puṣyamitra. But the presence in Kaśmīra of at least some representatives of these groups at the time of Patañjali seems the most plausible way to account for his familiarity with their texts. This conclusion, if it is correct, would be a welcome addition to our meager knowledge about Brahmins in early Kaśmīra (WITZEL 1994).

Let us turn to Kātyāyana. When did he live, and where? He obviously lived before Patañjali, for his vārttikas are embedded in the latter's *Mahābhāṣya*. He must therefore have lived before 150 BCE. But how much earlier? SCHARFE (1977, 138) proposes the following:

To determine when ... Kātyāyana lived we depend on incidental references. On Pāṇini VI 3 21 *ṣaṣṭhyā ākrośe* “[Before the second word of a compound there is non-disappearance of] the genitive ending if [the compound] expresses an insult” Kātyāyana's vārttika 3 demands an exception — *devānāṃpriya*, the title of the Maurya kings. The elliptical expression *śāka-pārthiva* ‘vegetable [eating] king,’ i.e. ‘vegetarian king’ in vārttika 8 on Pāṇini II 1 69, can hardly refer to anybody but Priyadarśin Aśoka and suggests thus a date after 250 B.C.

This much is relatively uncontroversial.²⁶ SCHARFE's subsequent observation — “Kātyāyana cannot have lived much later than [250 BCE] because of the large derived literature (variant readings of the vārttika-s, polemics against them, etc.) quoted by Patañjali (c. 150 B.C.) in his *Mahābhāṣya*” — is less compelling.²⁷ It is at least conceivable that the revived Brahmanical culture under rulers like Puṣyamitra displayed a more than average amount

Text kannte jeder Grammatiker der alten Zeit so gut, dass er ihm für Beispiele zuerst an der Hand war.”

²⁵“[I]n Alexander's time, the Kaṭhas made a strong comeback: the Kaṭha ‘tribe’ with their capital at Saggala (Śākala, mod. Sialkot) was among his fiercest enemies” (WITZEL 1997, 302). See further WITZEL 1987, 181 n. 37. For more recent time “[kann] davon ausgegangen werden . . . , dass die svaśākhā der kaschmirischen Brahmanen seit wenigstens tausend Jahren die Kaṭha-Schule war.” (WITZEL 1980, 46)

²⁶Even though it is not self-evident that *devānāṃpriya* in Kātyāyana has to refer to Aśoka; see DESHPANDE 2009.

²⁷SCHARFE is slightly more flexible in another publication (1971, 224-225): “Kātyāyana cannot have flourished at a time much later than the reign of Priyadarśin Aśoka, because some time — with several other grammatical authors — must have passed before Patañjali wrote his Great Commentary (*Mahābhāṣya*).” The end of Aśoka's reign was around 233 BCE.

of intellectual activity, which might then account for the different readings and ideas recorded in the *Mahābhāṣya*. We will return to this question below.

A crucial indication for determining Kātyāyana's region is Patañjali's remark to the extent that Kātyāyana was a southerner. The expression used is *dākṣiṇātya*, a word that is unknown to Vedic literature. It is derived from the indeclinable *dakṣiṇā* by P. 4.2.98 **dakṣiṇāpaścātpurasas tyak**. The indeclinable *dakṣiṇā* is formed by P. 5.3.36 **dakṣiṇād āc**, in the interpretation of which the word *adūre* from the preceding rule 35 (which will be cancelled by *dūre* in rule 37) has to be taken into consideration. *Dakṣiṇā* therefore means "nearby towards the south", and *dākṣiṇātya* "someone who lives nearby towards the south". It is hard to believe that Patañjali, whose acquaintance with Pāṇini's grammar cannot be doubted, used the word in any other meaning than this.²⁸ Since we have now come to think that Patañjali lived in the northernmost region of the subcontinent, Kātyāyana, who lived "nearby towards the south" from there, may have lived in the Panjab or anywhere else in the northwestern parts of the subcontinent (perhaps even in Mathurā, where Patañjali is sometimes believed to have lived), but not in the Dekkhan.

Here as in the case of Patañjali we cannot avoid the question who might have provided patronage to Kātyāyana. Given that Brahmanical culture is supported by rulers rather than by the mercantile class, the choice for the period between Aśoka and Patañjali is very limited indeed. It is hard to imagine that Kātyāyana would receive patronage from the last rulers of the Maurya empire or their representatives. The break in favour of Brahmanism occurred around the year 187 BCE with the collapse of the Maurya empire and the usurpation of power by Puṣyamitra, the same ruler who presumably supported Patañjali. In other words, Kātyāyana, too, may have received support from Puṣyamitra, whose rule extended not only to Kaśmīra but also to areas "nearby towards the south" seen from Kaśmīra.²⁹ Kātyāyana would then have to be assigned to the early years of Puṣyamitra's rule, whereas Patañjali wrote his *Mahābhāṣya* after Puṣyamitra's death, when Greek rulers from neighbouring Gandhāra made deep inroads into the realm that had been Puṣyamitra's.

Many authors accept that Kātyāyana the author of the *Vājasaneyi*

²⁸It is to be noted that the word also came to be used for inhabitants of presumably more remote southern regions, as when Praśastapāda observes that a southerner (*dākṣiṇātya*) will be deeply impressed by seeing an animal as strange as a camel (WI § 304, p. 62: *paṭupratyayāpekṣād ātmamanasoḥ saṁyogād āścarye 'rthe paṭuḥ saṁskārātīśayo jāyate; yathā dākṣiṇātyasyoṣṭradarśanād iti*). However, the *Pañcatantra* (on v. 5.1) situates Pāṭaliputra in the south: *asti dākṣiṇātye janapade pāṭaliputraṁ nāma nagaram*.

²⁹Note however that "[t]he historical picture that coins offer is entirely contrary to the accepted notion of a Śuṅga empire. . . . 'Śuṅgas', if they ever existed, were probably as localized as the rest of the groups we know from coins in terms of their political prowess." (BHANDARE 2006, 97)

Prātiśākhya is identical with Kātyāyana the Vārttikakāra whose grammatical observations are included in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. This idea was first formulated by Max MÜLLER (1860, 138) and Theodor GOLDSTÜCKER (1861/1965, 204 ff.). It was subsequently defended by Paul THIEME (1935, 96 ff.; 1937; 1958, 41 (749) ff.), taken over by Louis RENOU (1938, 173 ff.), and adopted by Hartmut SCHARFE (1977, 140 f.). In this paper I, too, will adopt this position, at least as a working hypothesis.

Starting from this working hypothesis, situating the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*, whether in time or in space, becomes a matter of situating the Vārttikakāra Kātyāyana. Since we have now tentatively situated Kātyāyana in the early years following the collapse of the Maurya empire, in a region south of Kaśmīra but not far removed from it, we may have to situate the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* there, too.

Northwest India, then, would be the region where the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* was composed. At first sight this may look problematic. SCHARFE (1977, 139) puts it as follows:

One thing is certain: Kātyāyana neither belongs to the West nor to the North of India because of his links with the White Yajurveda which was not represented in these areas; nor was he an Easterner because in his vārttika 8 on Pāṇini VII 3 45, he postulates the bird name *vartaka* ‘quail’ for the ‘eastern’ dialect while he apparently used *vartika* — as does the *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* XXIV 30.

Since we have decided to accept, at least provisionally, that the Vārttikakāra Kātyāyana also composed the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*, also his link with the White Yajurveda has to be accepted. Where does that leave us with regard to SCHARFE’s claim that the White Yajurveda was not represented in the West and North?

It goes without saying that the author of the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* had links with the White Yajurveda. This link is less clear with regard to the Vārttikakāra, presumably the same person. However, I have argued elsewhere (2007, 237 f.) that the Vārttikakāra was acquainted with an in his time recent and still independent work that he called *yājñavalkāni brāhmaṇāni*, and that we know as the Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* of which it came to be part, presumably after Kātyāyana. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* is, of course, part of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, and therefore a text of the White Yajurveda.³⁰

³⁰Cf. WITZEL 1987, 200-201: “The Bṛhadāraṇyaka-[Upaniṣad] is mostly read in its Kāṇva version (the [Mādhyandina] text is found in [Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa] 14.4-9). Being one of the latest texts in Vedic language of this Śākhā, it offers [a] wide horizon of geographical knowledge: The Western Madra (3.31.3.7), the central Kuru-Pañcāla (3.1.1.3.9.1), the Pañcāla alone (6.2.1), the Kāśya (3.82) and Vaideha (3.8.2 etc.) are named. Also, both the rivers flowing down from the Himavant (3.8.9) westwards and eastwards, are known to the authors of this text. The center of attention is, as already pointed out by Weber, the Videha area (3.8.2 sqq.).”

Must we conclude that the White Yajurveda was known in northwestern India at the time of Kātyāyana? The information I have been able to collect from recent secondary literature is as follows. While books 1-5 of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (Mādhyandina) are acquainted with more eastern regions, books 6-10 had their origin in a north-western location.³¹ Books 11-14 frequently mention not only eastern areas (Kosala, Videha) but also more western ones; the final collection and edition of this text portion was made in the east.³² Subsequently the Mādhyandina school may have moved from the Prayāga-Kāśī area towards the west, and have reached Gujarat at an early point of time, in any case before 650 C.E. Since the middle ages the Vājasaneyins have occupied all of northern India.³³

All this may be too vague to come to any definite conclusion. I do hope, however, that the reflections here offered with regard to Kātyāyana can play a role in further discussions of the region, or regions, of the White Yajurveda.

³¹See esp. WITZEL 1987.

³²WITZEL 1987, 197 ff.; cp. MYLIUS 1965; 1972.

³³WITZEL 1987, 201; 1985.

Abbreviations

AAWL = Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse	bhāṣya, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1880-1885
BaudhŚS = Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra	Mhbh = Mahābhārata, crit. ed. V. S. Sukthankar u.a., Poona 1933-66 (BORI)
DN = Dīghanikāya, ed. Th.W. Rhys Davids, J. E. Carpenter, 3 vols. 1890-1911 (PTS)	WI = Word Index to the Praśastapāda-bhāṣya: A complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapāda-bhāṣya, by Johannes Bronkhorst & Yves Ramseier, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994
Mahā-bh = Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahā-	

References

- AKLUJKAR, Ashok. 2008. "Patañjali: a Kashmirian." In *Linguistic Traditions of Kashmir*. Essays in memory of Paṇḍit Dinanath Yaksha. Ed. Mrinal KAUL & Ashok AKLUJKAR, 173-205. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld.
- Arthaśāstra*. The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Part I: edition; part II: translation; part III: study. By R. P. KANGLE. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1986.
- BHANDARE, Shailendra. 2006. "Numismatics and history: the Maurya-Gupta interlude in the Gangetic plain." = OLIVELLE 2006: 67-112.
- BRONKHORST, Johannes (1983): "On the history of Pāṇinian grammar in the early centuries following Patañjali." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11: 357-412.
- . 1987. *Three Problems Pertaining to the Mahābhāṣya*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-Graduate and Research Department Series, No. 30. "Pandit Shripad Shastri Deodhar Memorial Lectures" [Third Series].)
- . 1994. "A note on Patañjali and the Buddhists." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 75: 247-254.
- . 2002. "Patañjali and the Buddhists." *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori*, 485-491. Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai (International Buddhist Association).
- . 2004. *From Pāṇini to Patañjali: the search for linearity*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series, 46.)
- CARDONA, George. 1976. *Pāṇini. A survey of research*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- CARDONA, George & JAIN, Dhanesh (ed.). 2003. "General introduction." In *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, 1-45. London and New York: Routledge.

- DELOCHE, JEAN. 1980. *La circulation en Inde avant la révolution des transports. I: La voie de terre*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême Orient. (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient, 122.)
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. 2006. "Changing perspectives in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition and the changing political configurations in ancient India." = OLIVELLE 2006: 215-225.
- . 2009. "Interpreting the Aśokan epithet *devānampiya*." *Aśoka in History and Historical Memory*. Ed. Patrick OLIVELLE, 19-43. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- FALK, HARRY. 2008. "GANDHARAN ERAS." *Gandhara. The Buddhist Heritage of Pakistan: Legends, Monasteries, and Paradise*. Volume printed on the occasion of the exhibition of that same name, 70-71. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- GOLDSTÜCKER, Theodor. 1861/1965. *Pāṇini: His Place in Sanskrit Literature. An investigation of some literary and chronological questions which may be settled by a study of his work*. First Indian edition, ed. Surendranath Shastri. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, 48.)
- JOSHI, S.D. & ROODBERGEN, J.A.F. 1969. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Avyayābhāvatatpuruṣāhnikā (P. 2.1.2 – 2.1.49)*. Edited with translation and explanatory notes. Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 5.)
- KANGLE, R.P. 1965. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Part III: A study. First edition: Bombay University, 1965. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1986.
- . 1969. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Part I: A critical edition with a glossary. Second edition: Bombay University, 1969. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1986.
- . 1972. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Part II: An English translation with critical and explanatory notes. Second edition: Bombay University, 1972. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988.
- KIRFEL, Willibald. 1954. *Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude (Bhuvanavinyāsa). Die kosmographischen Traktate der Purāṇa's: Versuch einer Textgeschichte*. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität.
- KULKE, Hermann & ROTHERMUND, Dietmar. 1998. *A History of India*. Third edition. London & New York: Routledge.
- LAMOTTE, Étienne. 1958. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien, des origines à l'ère Śaka*. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- MĪMĀṂSAKA, Yudhiṣṭhira (sam. 2030): *Samśkrta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa*. 3 parts. Bahālagadha, Sonipāta (Haryana): Ramlal Kapur Trust.
- MÜLLER, Max. 1860. *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, so far as it illustrates the primitive religion of the Brahmans*. Second edition, revised. London & Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

- MYLIUS, Klaus. 1965. "Geographische Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgegend des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität (Leipzig)* 14(4), 759-761. = Mylius, 2000: 18-22.
- . 1972. "Das geographische Milieu der mittelvedischen Literatur." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung (Berlin)* 17(3), 369-382. = Mylius, 2000: 93-107.
- . 2000. *Das altindische Opfer. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Rezensionen. Mit einem Nachtrag zum 'Wörterbuch des altindischen Rituals'*. Wichtrach: Institut für Indologie.
- OBERLIES, Thomas. 2010. "Die Geschichte Indiens, Teil 1 — Von 300 vor bis 300 nach Christus." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 26 (2009), 125-176.
- OLIVELLE, Patrick (ed.) 2006. *Between the Empires. Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*. Oxford University Press.
- PATAÑJALI (*Vyākaraṇa-*)*Mahābhāṣya*. The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, edited by F. KIELHORN. Third edition, revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by K. V. ABHYANKAR. Volume I. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962.
- RAU, Wilhelm. 1985. *Die vedischen Zitate im Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden. (AAWL, 1985, 4.)
- RENOU, Louis. 1938. Review of Thieme, 1937. *Journal Asiatique* 230: 169-176.
- SALOMON, Richard. 2005. "The Indo-Greek era of 186/5 BC in a Buddhist reliquary inscription." *Afghanistan: ancien carrefour entre l'est et l'ouest*. Ed. Osmund BOPEARACHCHI & Marie-Françoise BOUSSAC, 359-401. Turnhout: Brepols.
- SCHARFE, Hartmut. 1971. "The Maurya dynasty and the Seleucids." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 85: 211-225.
- . 1977. *Grammatical Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (A History of Indian Literature, vol. V, fasc. 2.)
- SCHWARTZBERG, Joseph E. (ed.) 1978. *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. (The Association for Asian Studies, Reference Series Number 2.)
- STAAL, J. F. (ed.) 1972. *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: MIT Press. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi etc. 1985.
- THIEME, Paul. 1935. *Pāṇini and the Veda. Studies in the early history of linguistic science in India*. Allahabad: Globe Press.
- . 1937. "On the identity of the Vārttikakāra." *Indian Culture* 4(2): 189-209. Reprint: Thieme, 1984: 552-572; Staal, 1972: 332-356.
- . 1958. Review of *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit* by L. RENOU. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 212, 19-49. Reprint: Thieme, 1984: 727-757.

- . 1984. *Kleine Schriften*. Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.
- Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. The Viṣṇu-Purāṇam. Sanskrit text and English translation, by H.H. WILSON. Edited and revised by K. L. JOSHI. Delhi: Parimal Publications. 2005. (Parimal Sanskrit Series, 63.)
- WITZEL, Michael. 1980. “Die Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad und ihr Verhältnis zur Śikṣā-Vallī der Taittirīya-Upaniṣad.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 24: 21-82.
- . 1981 & 1982. “Materialien zu den vedischen Schulen, 1: Über die Caraka-Śākhā.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7: 109-132 & 8/9: 171-240.
- . 1985. “Regionale und überregionale Faktoren in der Entwicklung vedischer Brahmanengruppen im Mittelalter (Materialien zu den vedischen Schulen, 5).” *Regionale Tradition in Südasiens*. Hrsg. Hermann KULKE und Dietmar ROTHERMUND, 37-76. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. (Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung, Südasiens-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, 104.)
- . 1987. “On the location of Vedic texts and schools (Materials on Vedic Śākhās, 7).” *India and the Ancient World. History, trade and culture before A. D. 650*. (Fel. Vol. Eggermont.) Ed. Gilbert POLLET. Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 25: 173-213.
- . 1989. “Tracing the Vedic dialects.” *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Ed. Colette CAILLAT, 97-265. Paris: de Boccard. (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8°, Fascicule 55.)
- . 1994. “The Brahmins of Kashmir.” *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in ancient Kashmir*. Ed. Yasuke IKARI, 237-294. Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.
- . 1997. “The development of the Vedic canon and its schools: The social and political milieu. (Materials on Vedic Śākhās, 8).” = Witzel, 1997a: 257-345.
- (ed.) 1997a. *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New approaches to the study of the Vedas*. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University. Distributed by South Asia Books, Columbia, Mo. (Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, 2.)
- . 2006. “Brahmanical reactions to foreign influences and to social and religious change.” = OLIVELLE 2006, 457-499.