The two grammarians Patañjali and Kātyāyana have been associated with two Vedic schools: that of the Paippaladins and that of the Vājasaneyins respectively. A renewed reflection on the dates and regions in which they lived and worked may throw light on the whereabouts of these schools.

I will not waste words on Patañjali’s date. I agree with those who believe that “Patañjali must have composed his work sometime around 150 B.C. because of several references to historical events of his time” (SCHARFE 1977, 153).

About Patañjali’s whereabouts SCHARFE states the following (ibid.): “Patañjali’s home may have been Mathurā, which figures prominently in his examples, or a place nearby because one travels, he says, to Pātaliputra via Sāketa.” He then continues: “This deduction is preferable to that of K. V. ABHYANKAR who concluded from astronomical data contained in the text that Patañjali lived north of Taxila and west of Shrinagar. Not being an astronomer himself, Patañjali would have taken this information from other works, and his praise of the speech and the customs of the people of Aryāvarta would be inconsistent with his residence outside this hallowed province.”

I am not convinced by SCHARFE’s reasoning. A look at the map shows that it is far from evident that one travels from Mathurā to Pātaliputra via Sāketa. Mathurā is on the Yamunā river, Sāketa on the Sarayū. Both rivers join the Gaṅgā, at different points and from different sides. If one were to travel from Mathurā to Sāketa, one would have to cross the Gaṅgā and some smaller rivers. This trouble could be avoided by traveling, not via Sāketa, but via Kauśāmbī, simply following the Yamunā and subsequently

---

1 The example “the part this side of Sāketa of the measureless road to be traveled” (yo 'yam adhvā 'parimāṇo gantayya tasya yad adhvaramā sāketād; Mahā-bh 1 p. 162 l. 8-9) suggests that Patañjali lived far from Sāketa.

2 On crossing rivers in ancient India, see DELOCHE 1980, 124 ff. (“La traversée des rivières”).
Indeed, the ancient road from Mathura to Pataliputra passed through Kasamb. And the road that leads to Pataliputra 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):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ṣaṇ muhūrṭaḥ caryārāh} & \mid \text{te kaḍācid ahār gacchanti kaḍācid rātrim} \mid \text{tad ucyate} \mid \text{ahāragataḥ rātrigataḥ iti} \|
\end{align*}\]

Joshi & Roodbergen (1969, 166) translate:

“The six muhūrtaḥ are not fixed.” These [muhūrtaḥ] sometimes belong to day-time, [and] sometimes to night-time. This is expressed [in the words] ahāragataḥ “belonging to day-time”, rātrigataḥ “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 muhūrtaḥ, 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. 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 muhūrtaḥ and that of the shortest day 12 muhūrtaḥ. 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.xm.
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. 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; Gandhāra had in 185 BCE once again come under the rulership of the Indo-Greeks, i.e. of Patañjali’s Yavanas. 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 Kambojas. 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.

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. The Baudhāyana Śrutasūtra enumerates the names of tribes that a good Brahmin should not visit, among them the Aṛatṭa and the Gāndhāra in the northwest. It is not clear where
exactly the Áraṭṭa lived;¹² the Gāndhāra, on the other hand, evidently lived in Gāndhāra, a region that by this testimony was situated outside the realm where orthodox Brahmans lived at that time.¹³ Several late-vedic and more recent texts know Gāndhāra as a more or less remote region, and none of the vedic schools appear to be found there.¹⁴ The much more recent Rājatarāṇīṇī of Kalhaṇa (1.307) admits that there are Brahmans in Gāndhāra, but looks down upon them for accepting agrahāras from a worthless king.¹⁵

If, then, Patañjali can hardly have lived in Gāndhāra, he may very well have lived in Kaśmīra.¹⁶ Kaśmīra was not Buddhist territory the way Gāndhāra 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 BaudhŚŚ 18.44 suggests that Gāndhāra and the land of the Á/Araṭṭa were separate from each other. Witzel (1989, 235) translates this passage: “Ayu went eastward. His (people) are the Kuru-Pañcāla and the Kaśi-Videha. This is the Áyava migration. (His other people) stayed at home in the West. His people are the Gāndhāri, Parśu and Araṭṭa. This is the Anavasava (group).” Cardona & Jain (2003, 33 sq.) propose a different translation: “Ayu went eastward. Of him there are these: the Kuru-Pañcālas, the Kaśi-Videhas. This is the going forth of Ayu. Amavasā (went) westward. Of him there are these: the Gāndhāris, the Sparśa, and the Arāṭṭas. This is the (going forth) of Amavasā.”

¹³Brucker 1980, 147 states: “mit Gāndhāra [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 Sūтраzeit noch nicht in die arische Siedlungsgemeinschaft inkorporiert war.” The “noch nicht” of this passage suggests that Brucker believes that Gāndhāra was subsequently incorporated in the area of Áryan colonization; he does not however provide any evidence to support this.

¹⁴The Yauryveda-VŚ mentions several schools that were supposedly situated yavanadesc. 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 Miṃmāśaka (saṃ, 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 word in Indian literature” (Witzel 1994, 241-242).

¹⁷Lamotte (1958, 369) states the following: “Notons . . . que la Bonne Loi ne connaît 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 Panjab occidental, du Gāndhāra, de l’Uḍḍiyāna et sans doute aussi du Jāṇu . . . furent véritablement boudhïsés dès l’époque Maurya. Il n’en fut pas de même pour le Kapiṣa (Kohistan de Kābul) où Hiuan-tsong ne signale qu’un unique stūpa asokéen, ni même pour le Kaṃśir où l’on n’a retrouvé aucune trace des fondations asokéennes du Śuṣkaletra et du Vītraśra mentionnées par les voyageurs et Kalhaṇa. Que quelques boudhïstes s’y soient aventurés à l’époque ancienne, nul ne songe à le nier; mais une hiérarchie ne fait pas le printemps et, à la lumière des nombreux indices que nous aurons à examiner plus loin, on peut croire que le Kapiṣa et le Kaṃśir ne devinrent de véritables fiefs boudhïques qu’à l’époque Kuśaṇa . . . .”
(first or second century CE), the *Vibhāṣā*, records that King Puṣyamitra persecuted Buddhists in Kaśmīra.\(^{18}\) The same information is found in the *Maṇjuśrīmulakalpa*.\(^{19}\) Puṣyamitra was a contemporary of Patañaḷi 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 Patañaḷi? The obvious answer now seems to be that he received support from King Puṣyamitra and his successors, or perhaps from their local representatives\(^ {22},\) 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. Patañaḷi 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? Patañaḷi 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 Patañaḷi was most intimately acquainted with the Kāṭhaka Samhitā and the Paippalāda Atharvaveda.\(^ {23}\) The evidence suggests as much, if not more, familiarity with the Rgveda; RAU ascribes this, rightly or wrongly, to its particularly close link with the Pāṇijnin tradition.\(^ {24}\) He further notes that the Śāmaveda along

---

\(^{18}\) LAMOTTE 1958, 425: “…Dans le pays-frontière (*pratyantajanapada*) du royaume de Kia-chō-mi-lo (Kaśmīra), il détruit 500 Samghārāma…”

\(^{19}\) LAMOTTE 1958, 430: “En cet âge inférieur, il y aura un roi, Gomīnukhya [i.e., Puṣyamitra], destructeur de ma religion (*śasanāntadhāpako mama*). S’étant emparé de l’est (*pracīṇī disam*) et des portes du Kaśmīr (*Kaśmīre dvāram*), ce fou aux intentions malveillantes détruira les vihāra et les reliques insignes (*dhātwarā*) et fera périr les moines de bonne conduite. …”

\(^{20}\) *Mahā-bh II p. 123 l. 3-4* (on P. 3.2.123 vt. 1): *ṣa puṣyamitrāṇī yājyāmaḥ.*

\(^{21}\) One might speculate that Patañaḷi had moved to Kaśmīra at the behest of Puṣyamitra. This would explain his claim that proper Sanskrit is spoken elsewhere, in Aryāvarta, not in Kaśmīra. See DESHPANDE 2006, 219 ff.

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

\(^{23}\) RAU 1985, 103: “Das Mahābhāṣya gehört in die nächste Nähe des Kāṭhaka und des Paippalāda-Atharvaveda.”

with its Brāhmaṇas is not taken into consideration by Patañjali.

What does this mean? It seems reasonable to assume that there were Kaṭhas\textsuperscript{25}, Paippalādins and Řgyedins 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 \textit{aha puṣyamitrarāṇ 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 \textit{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 \textit{saṣṭhya ākroṣe} “[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 — \textit{devānāmpriya}, the title of the Maurya kings. The elliptical expression \textit{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.\textsuperscript{26} Scharfe’s subsequent observation — “Kātyāyana cannot have flourished at a time 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 \textit{Mahābhāṣya}” — is less compelling.\textsuperscript{27} It is at least conceivable that the revived Brahmanical culture under rulers like Puṣyamitra displayed a more than average amount

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{25} Text kannte jeder Grammatiker der alten Zeit so gut, dass er ihm für Beispiele zuerst an der Hand war.”

\textsuperscript{26} Even though it is not self-evident that \textit{devānāmpriya} in Kātyāyana has to refer to Aśoka; see Deshpande 2009.

\textsuperscript{27} Scharfe 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 *daksinātya*, a word that is unknown to Vedic literature. It is derived from the indeclinable *daksinā* by P. 4.2.98 *daksināpāścātpurasas tyāk*. The indeclinable *daksinā* is formed by P. 5.3.36 *daksinād 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. *Daksinā* therefore means “nearby towards the south”, and *daksinātya* “someone who lives nearby towards the south”. It is hard to believe that Patañjali, whose acquaintance with Panini’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*

\(^{28}\)It 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 (*daksinātya*) will be deeply impressed by seeing an animal as strange as a camel (WI § 304, p. 62: *patuḥpatuḥyāpeksāt adātmamanasah sanīyoṣoḥ aścarye ‘rthe puṣyamitra saṁskārātisayo jāyate; yathā daksinātyaṇaṇaṣṭaṁ daksinātyaṇaṇaṣṭaṁ atyaṁ samayate*). However, the *Pañcatantra* (on v. 5.1) situates Patañjala in the south: *asti daksinātya janapade patañjala in nāma nagaram.*

\(^{29}\)Note however that “[t]he historical picture that coins offer is entirely contrary to the accepted notion of a Śunīga empire. . . . ‘Śunīgas’, 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)
Prātiṣākhya 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 ff.). In this paper I, too, will adopt this position, at least as a working hypothesis.

Starting from this working hypothesis, situating the Vājasaneyi Prātiṣākhya, 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 Kaśmir but not far removed from it, we may have to situate the Vājasaneyi Prātiṣākhya there, too.

Northwest India, then, would be the region where the Vājasaneyi Prātiṣākhya 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 vārttikas 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 Sanhitā XXIV 30.

Since we have decided to accept, at least provisionally, that the Vārttikakāra Kātyāyana also composed the Vājasaneyi Prātiṣākhya, 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 Prātiṣākhya 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 Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad of which it came to be part, presumably after Kātyāyana. The Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad is, of course, part of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, and therefore a text of the White Yajurveda.30

30 Cf. Witzel 1987, 200-201: “The Brhadāraṇyaka-[Upaniṣad] is mostly read in its Kāśyapa version (the [Mādhyanamaka] 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-Paṇcāla (3.1-1.3.9.1), the Paṇcāla alone (6.2.1), the Kaśya (3.82) and Viśdheha (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.).”
Vedic schools in northwestern India

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 (Mādhyaṇḍina) 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 Mādhyaṇḍina school may have moved from the Prayaga-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.
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