

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Pāṇini and the Veda reconsidered*

(published in: *Pāṇinian Studies*. Professor S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume. Edited by Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan. 1991. Pp. 75-121)

The relationship between Pāṇini and the Veda has been much debated.¹ The presupposition underlying a major part of this debate has been that much or even most of Vedic literature existed in its present form prior to Pāṇini. In this article an attempt will be made to establish, as far as possible, the relationship between Pāṇini and the Veda without taking the correctness of this presupposition for granted.

1.1 A fundamental question is whether Pāṇini knew the Vedic texts, i.e., the ones with which we are familiar, in the same form as we do. Were the Vedic texts that Pāṇini knew identical in all details with the editions we have now? It appears that the answer to this question must be negative.

It is not always possible to decide that a text has not reached us in its original form. In the case of metrical texts this may be possible, however, and to some extent we may be in a position to determine what the original text was like. This is the case regarding the *Ṛgveda*. In another study (Bronkhorst, 1981) it has been shown that certain rules of sandhi of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* fit an earlier stage of the text of the *Ṛgveda* than the one we now have. The conclusion was [76] drawn that "the lack of agreement between the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and our *Ṛgveda* may henceforth have to be looked at through different eyes. Certainly, where phonetic questions are concerned, Pāṇini may describe an earlier form of the *Ṛgveda*, and may not deserve to be blamed for being lacunary ..." (pp. 91-92).

This conclusion has far-reaching implications. The *Ṛgveda* has been handed down with great care, with greater care perhaps than any other Vedic text. Yet even here Pāṇini's rules of sandhi do not fully agree with the present text, although we know that at least some of them once fitted. How much less can we expect full agreement between Pāṇini's rules of sandhi and all other Vedic texts. This means that a comparison of

* This study was carried out as part of a project of professors M. Witzel and T. E. Vetter, which was financed by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.). In particular, Professor Witzel took a lively interest in the project. One of his own fields of specialization is the geographical distribution of Vedic schools in different periods. It is hoped that from that side additional evidence will come forth to shed light on the problems discussed here. Meanwhile, Witzel's "Tracing the Vedic Dialects" (1989) has appeared, which, unfortunately, could not be taken into consideration for the present article.

¹ For a survey, see Cardona (1976: 226-28). Some important articles have been reproduced and discussed in Staal (1972: 135-204).

Pāṇini's rules of sandhi and the Vedic evidence, if it is to be made at all, must be made with the greatest care. A straight confrontation of Pāṇini's rules with the Vedic facts cannot be expected to yield more than partial agreement, and says little about the state of affairs in Pāṇini's day. In the present context it is important to recall that "Pāṇini's rules on Vedic sandhi do not necessarily describe the sandhi which was actually used in the Vedic texts which Pāṇini had before him. Rather, they describe the sandhi as it ought to be according to Pāṇini. This is confirmed by the circumstance that Pāṇini sometimes gives the opinions of others besides his own, for example, in P. 8.3.17-19" (Bronkhorst, 1982: 275).²

A development in tone patterns, too, must have taken place after Pāṇini. Kiparsky (1982: 73) sums up the results of an investigation into this matter: "[T]he tone pattern described by Pāṇini represents an older stage than that [77] described for the Vedic *saṃhitās* by the Prātiśākhya. While the *saṃhitās* themselves are of course older than Pāṇini [?; see below], we may assume that they were accented in Pāṇini's time with the tone pattern described in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and that their present tone pattern, as well as the Prātiśākhya that codify it, are post-Pāṇinian revisions. "It is true that Kiparsky derives the different tone patterns from accent properties belonging to morphemes that are stable in time. Yet it is at least conceivable, also, that these accent properties changed in the time before the tone patterns reached their final form."³ This means that little can be concluded from such deviations from Pāṇini in the accentuation of Vedic words⁴ as occur in *arya* (Thieme, 1938: 91 f.; Balasubrahmanyam, 1964; 1969), *hāyana* (Balasubrahmanyam, 1966), *jyeṣṭha* and *kaniṣṭha* (Devasthali, 1967: 7-8),⁵ *arpita* and *juṣṭa* (Balasubrahmanyam, 1974),⁶ *śriyase* (Balasubrahmanyam, 1969; 1972), *voḍhave* (Balasubrahmanyam, 1983), and *vṛṣṭi*, *bhūti*, and *vitti* (Keith, 1936: 736).⁷

This is further supported by the fact that accents were not noted down until very late (Thieme, 1935: 120 f., 129 f.). A passage in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (1.6.3.10)

² This means that one cannot conclude from certain peculiarities of sandhi in the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* which are not described by Pāṇini, that they "escaped his observation", as Palsule (1982: 188) claims.

³ Balasubrahmanyam (1981: 400) notes that in the sample studied by him, "three per cent of the exclusive Vedic vocabulary differs from P[āṇini]'s accentual system, and four per cent of the common vocabulary manifests the apparent difference between P[āṇini] and the Veda with reference to the systems of *Kṛt* accentuation."

⁴ Even Kātyāyana and Patañjali sometimes ascribe an accent to a Vedic word that deviates from the accent found in the surviving texts (see Balasubrahmanyam, 1974: 3, on *sthānu*).

⁵ The fact that the *Phitsūtras* of Śāntanava ascribe to *arya*, *jyeṣṭha*, and *kaniṣṭha* the accents found in the extant Vedic literature is reason to think that Śāntanava is later rather than earlier than Pāṇini; cf. Kielhorn (1866: 1 f.) and Devasthali (1967: 39 f.). Kapila Deva Shastri (Saṃ 2018: 28 f.) argues for an earlier date of the *Phitsūtras* on insufficient grounds (Cardona, 1976: 176).

⁶ Cf. Kiparsky (1980: 69) and Devasthali (1984: 137).

⁷ Thieme (1985) shows that the accents prescribed by Pāṇini in the case of words that are commonly used to address people are the initial accents of the vocative. He concludes that Pāṇini's accents are later than the (differing) Vedic ones. This may be correct, yet it does not by itself prove that all the texts having Vedic accentuation in these cases are older than Pāṇini. It is certainly conceivable that the Vedic texts were composed in a form of language that was kept archaic also in its accents. Pāṇini's *bhāṣā*, too, is younger than Vedic, yet Pāṇini does not for that reason necessarily postdate scriptures that use the Vedic language.

gives further proof for this. There Tvaṣṭṛ pronounces a mantra wrongly, and as a result Vṛtra is killed by Indra instead of the reverse. The mantra concerned is *indraśatrur vardhasva*. The later tradition — Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (1: 2, 1. 12), *Pāṇinīya Śikṣā* (verse 52), Bhaṭṭabhāskara and Sāyaṇa (on TS 2.5.2), etc. — agrees that the mistake concerned the accent: an intended *Tatpuruṣa* compound 'killer of Indra' becomes a *Bahuvrīhi* 'whose killer is Indra'. The formulation of TS 2.5.2.1-2 — *yad abravīt svāhendraśatrur vardhasveti tasmād [78] asyendraḥ śatrur abhavat* — fully agrees with this. MS 2.4.3 is even clearer: *svāhendraśatrur vardhasva itīndrasyāhainam śatrum acikīrṣad indram asya śatrum akarot*. Yet the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* formulates the story in a way that can only be explained on the assumption that there was no way to make a difference in accentuation visible. Rather than writing (or reciting!) the *Tatpuruṣa* compound with the appropriate accent, it analyzes the compound into *indrasya śatruḥ*. The passage then reads: *atha yad abravīt indraśatrur vardhasveti tasmād u hainam indra eva jaghāna/ atha yad dha śasvad avakṣyad indrasya śatrur vardhasveti śasvad u ha sa indram evāhaniṣyat/*.

These considerations show that any comparison between the linguistic data in Pāṇini and those in the Veda must be extremely careful in the fields of sandhi and accentuation. They also suggest that in other respects the Vedic texts known to Pāṇini may have undergone modification since Pāṇini's time.

As an example of a feature that *may* have changed since Pāṇini, consider the word *rātri/rātrī* in the mantras of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*. According to P. 4.1.31 (*rātres cājasau*), *rātrī* occurs in ritual literature (*chandasi*, see below) before all endings except the nominative plural (cf. Bhat, 1968; Wackernagel, 1896-1930, 3: 185 f.).⁸ Five times the mantras of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* contain the word in a form that allows us to determine whether *rātri* or *rātrī* is used. Twice (TS 4.3.11.3 and 5.7.2.1) it is *rātrī*, thrice *rātri*. However, it is not impossible that originally all five occurrences had a form of *rātrī*. TS 4.1.10.1 (*rātriṃ rātriṃ aprayāvaṃ bharantaḥ*) recurs as *rātriṃ rātriṃ* (at MS 2.7.7 [79] and 3.1.9; KS 16.7 and 19.10; and ŚB 6.6.4.1). TS 4.4.1.1 (*rātriṃ jinvośigasi*) occurs as *rātriṃ jinvo* at KS 17.7. In these two cases the shortening of *ī* to *i* was a minor change. More problematic seems to be TS 7.4.18.1 (*rātrir āsīt piśaṅgilā*), to which no parallels with long *ī* correspond (Bloomfield, 1906: 823). Here a substitution of *rātrī* would lead to *rātry āsīt*, which differs rather strongly from the mantra as we know it. However, no such objection can be raised against an earlier **rātri āsīt*; this in its turn might be looked upon as the result of sandhi applied to *rātrī āsīt*, by P. 6.1.127 (*iko 'savarṇe śākalyasya hrasvaś ca*), a rule of sandhi that also held in the *R̥gveda*, at least according to Śākalya (see Bronkhorst, 1982a: 181).

⁸ Note that MS 1.5.12 (p. 81 l. 2-6) uses *rātrī* in the language used by the gods and *rātri* elsewhere; this was pointed out to me by Professor Witzel.

1.2 The second introductory question we have to ask is whether or not Pāṇini's Vedic rules were meant to be universally valid in the Vedic texts. Our observations on sandhi have made it clear that here, at least, there is nothing to contradict the supposition that Pāṇini's rules were meant to be adhered to throughout. (This does not necessarily mean, however, that the texts known to Pāṇini always had Pāṇini's kind of sandhi.) It is at least conceivable that all the Vedic rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* were meant to be strictly followed unless the opposite is explicitly stated.

This takes us to the main point of his subsection. If Pāṇini's Vedic rules were not meant to be followed strictly, this should have been indicated in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Kiparsky (1980) has shown that Pāṇini distinguished three kinds of optionality: *vā* 'preferably', *vibhāṣā* 'preferably not', and *anyatarasyām* 'either way'. This means that Pāṇini used various means to indicate optionality. As a matter of fact, [80] option is indicated in a number of Vedic rules. P. 1.2.36, 6.2.164, and 7.4.44 read *vibhāṣā chandasi*, P. 1.4.9 (*ṣaṣṭhīyuktaś chandasi vā*), P. 8.3.49 (*chandasi vā 'prāmreḍitayoḥ*), P. 5.3.13 (*vā ha ca chandasi*), P. 3.4.88 and 6.1.106 (*vā chandasi*), P. 6.4.5 and 6.4.86 (*chandasy ubhayathā*), P. 6.4.162 (*vibhāṣarjōś chandasi*), P. 8.2.70 (*amnarūdharavar ity ubhayathā chandasi*), P. 8.3.104 (*yajuṣy ekeṣām*), P.8.3.119 (*nivyabhibhyo 'd vyavāye vā chandasi*), P. 8.3.8 (*ubhayatharkṣu*), and P. 6.4.9 (*vā ṣapūrvasya nigame*). The words *bahulam chandasi* 'variously in ritual literature' occur no less than seventeen times together,⁹ not counting the rules wherein they may have to be continued. In P. 1.2.61 (*chandasi punarvasvor ekavacanam*) and 62 (*viśākhayoś ca [chandasi]*), the word *anyatarasyām* is in force from P. 1.2.58, and is not cancelled until *nityam* in 1.2.63. In P. 6.1.52 (*khideś chandasi*) there is continuation of *vibhāṣā* from *sūtra* 51, cancelled by *nityam* in 6.1.57. P. 3.1.85 (*vyatyayo bahulam*) continues *chandasi* from 3.1.84 (*chandasi śāyaj api*), which itself indicates optionality by means of the word *api*. Similar devices are used in P. 1.4.81 (*chandasi pare 'pi*), and 82 (*vyavahitāś ca*); P.3.3.130 (*anyebhyo 'pi dṛśyate [chandasi 129]*); P. 5.3.14 (*itarābhyo 'pi dṛśyate [chandasi 13]*); P. 6.3.137 (*anyeṣām api dṛśyate [rci 133][?]*); P. 6.4.73 and 7.1.76 (*chandasy api dṛśyate*); P. 7.1.38 (*ktvāpi chandasi*); P. 5.2.50 (*thaṭ ca chandasi*); P. 5.3.20 (*tayor dārhilau ca chandasi*); P. 5.3.33 (*paśca paścā ca chandasi*); P. 5.4.12 (*amu ca chandasi*); and P. 5.4.41 (*vṛkajyeṣṭhābhyām tiltātilau ca chandasi*). P. 3.2.106 (*liṭaḥ kānaj vā*) is confined to ritual literature because only there *liṭ* occurs (P. 3.2.105 [*chandasi liṭ*]). P. 8.1.64 (*vaivāveti ca chandasi*) continues [81] *vibhāṣā* (63), cancelled by *nityam* in 8.1.66. P. 6.1.209 (*juṣṭārpīte ca chandasi*) continues *vibhāṣā* from 208, discontinued by 6.1.210 (*nityam mantrē*). In P. 6.3.108 (*pathi ca chandasi*) the word *ca* continues *vibhāṣā* from

⁹ P. 2.3.62, 4.39, 73, 76, 3.2.88, 5.2.122, 6.1.34, 70, 133, 178, 2.199, 4.75, 7.1.8, 10, 103, 3.97, 4.78. Cf. Shivaramaiah, 1969.

6.3.106 (cf. Kiparsky, 1980: 62). P. 8.3.105 (*stutastomayoś chandasi*) appears to continue *ekeṣām* from 8.3.104. P. 4.4.113 (*srotaso vibhāṣā dyadḍyau*) continues *chandasi* from 4.4.110.

Nityam in P. 4.1.29 (*nityaṃ saṃjñāchandasoḥ*), in 4.1.46 and 7.4.8 (*nityaṃ chandasi*), and in 6.1.210 (*nityaṃ mantrē*), does not indicate that here, exceptionally, some Vedic rules are universally valid. Rather, it is meant to block the option that is valid in the preceding rules, as so often in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. We have no alternative but to assume that, just as in his other rules, Pāṇini's Vedic rules not indicated as being optional were meant to be generally valid.¹⁰

From this we must conclude that deviations from Pāṇini in the Vedic texts known to Pāṇini either did not exist in his time or were not considered correct by him.

1.3 We now come to the question of what range of literature Pāṇini considered "Vedic" in one way or another. This is best approached by studying Pāṇini's use of the word *chandasi* by which he most often refers to Vedic literature. It is clear that Pāṇini employs this word in a special way. The most common meaning of *chandasi* is 'meter', and then 'metrical text'. But this is not the only sense in which Pāṇini uses it. Thieme (1935: *passim*, esp. 67-69) showed that rules given under *chandasi* 'in *chandasi*' are also valid for prose passages (*brāhmaṇa* and *yajus*). Here therefore rendered *chandasi* as 'in Sacred Literature'. Thieme criticizes [82] Liebich's (1891: 26) translation 'pre-classical language', saying: "I do not think it an appropriate translation, since it appears to endow Pāṇini with a historical perspective he hardly could have possessed" (p. 67).

This makes sense, but a major difficulty remains. Many of the forms taught under the heading *chandasi* occur in *Sūtra* texts. Instances are numerous and only a few will be given here. The name *Punarvasu*, used optionally in the singular in *chandasi* according to P. 1.2.61 (*chandasi punarvasvor ekavacanam [anyatarasyām 58]*), is so found at *Viṣṇu-smṛti* (78.12) and VāŚS (1.5.1.5), besides several places in the *Black Yajurveda*. The singular of *viśākhā*, only allowed *chandasi* by P. 1.2.62 (*viśākhayoś ca*), occurs similarly at VāŚS 2.2.2.14. The grammatical object of the root *hu* can have an instrumental ending in *chandasi*, according to P. 2.3.3 (*ṭṭīyā ca hoś chandasi*). One instance is MŚS 1.6.1.23 (*payasā juhōti dadhnā yavāgvājyena vā* [cf. Thieme, 1935: 10]). Some forms are *only* attested in *Sūtras*. *Khānya-* (P. 3.1.123) only occurs in LŚS 8.2.4 and 5; (*pra-*)*stāvya-* (id.) in LŚS 6.1.20; *unnīya* (id.) in ŚāGS 4.14.4; and *yaśobhagīna* (P. 4.4.132) in HiŚS 2.5.43, 6.4.3.

It seems safe to conclude that Pāṇini's term *chandasi* covered more than just 'Sacred Literature'. We may have to assume that certain works, primarily the ritual

¹⁰ It goes without saying that the generality of such rules can be restricted in various ways such as the presence of rules that account for exceptions (*apavāda*).

Sūtras, and among those first of all the *Śrauta Sūtras*, belonged to a fringe area wherein Vedic usage was sometimes considered appropriate. The effect of this assumption for our investigation is that, where a *chandas* word prescribed by Pāṇini is attested in one Vedic text and in one or more *Sūtras*, we are [83] not entitled to conclude that Pāṇini certainly knew that Vedic text.

1.4 The final introductory question we have to consider is the following. Are Pāṇini's Vedic rules descriptive or prescriptive? To be sure, to some extent they describe the language that Pāṇini found in Vedic texts, and are therefore descriptive. But are they exclusively so? It may well be that Vedic texts were still being composed in Pāṇini's day, and that he gives in his grammar guidelines regarding correct Vedic usage. This possibility has been discussed elsewhere (Bronkhorst, 1982: 275 f.) and is further strengthened by the evidence to be provided in the following sections of this article. Here attention may be drawn to another reason to conclude that at least some of Pāṇini's rules may have been meant to be prescriptive, besides, or rather than, being descriptive. They may have been composed with something like *ūha* in mind.

*Ūha*¹¹ is the term used to describe the adjustments Vedic mantras undergo to make them fit for other ritual contexts. An original mantra such as *agnaye tvā juṣṭam nirvapāmi*, directed to Agni, can become modified into *sūryāya tvā juṣṭam nirvapāmi*, directed to Sūrya.¹² *Devīr āpaḥ śuddhā yūyam* (MS 1.1.11, 1.2.16, 3.10.1; KS 3.6), directed to the waters, becomes *deva ājya śuddham tvam* when directed to clarified butter (*ājya*). Sometimes only the number needs adjustment, as when *āyur āśāste* (MS 4.13.9; TS 2.6.9.7; TB 3.5.10.4) becomes *āyur āśāsāte* or *āyur āśāsate*. Only the gender is modified when *jūr asi dhṛtā manasā juṣṭā viṣṇave tasyās te satyasavasah* (MS 1.2.4, 3.7.5; KS 2.5, 24.3; TS 1.2.4.1, 6.1.7.2; VS 4.17; ŚB 3.2.4.11; ŚBK 4.2.4.9) becomes [84] *jūr asi dhṛto manasā juṣṭo viṣṇave tasya te satyasavasah* because a bull is under discussion.

Another interesting question is whether modified mantras are in fact mantras themselves. The later Mīmāṃsā tradition appears to be unanimous in its opinion that they are not. PMS 2.1.34 and Śabara's *Bhāṣya* thereon state explicitly that the result of *ūha* is not a mantra, and all later authorities in this field seem to have followed their example. This opinion is found, perhaps for the first time, in ĀpŚS 24.1.35, which reads *anāmnātās tv amantrā yathā pravaroḥanāmadheyagrahaṇānīti* "Die nicht (im Mantra- oder Brāhmaṇa-teile) überlieferten Teile sind indessen nicht als Mantra zu betrachten,

¹¹ For a brief description, see Chakrabarti, 1980: 134-36 and Jha, 1942: 294-99.

¹² The following examples are taken from Bhartṛhari's discussion of *ūha* in his commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* (see below).

z.B. der Pravara, die 'Verschiebung' (*ūha*), die Nennung eines Namens" (tr. Caland, 1928a: 387).

It is not surprising that modified mantras were not considered mantras in their own right from an early date onward. After all, the opposite opinion would leave almost unlimited scope for creating new mantras. At a time when efforts had been made to gather all mantras into Vedic collections this must have been undesirable.

Yet there are clear traces of evidence that modified mantras were not always considered nonmantras. As late an author as Bharṭṛhari (fifth century A.D.),¹³ who includes a long discussion on *ūha* in his commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* (Ms 2b9 f.; AL 5.18 f.; Sw 6.17 f.; CE Āhn. 1, 5.1 f.) mentions "others" who think that modified mantras are themselves mantras.¹⁴ And several *Śrauta Sūtras* make no mention of the nonmantric nature of modified mantras in contexts in which that would have been appropriate, for example, BhāŚS (6.15), MŚS (5.2.9), and ŚŚS (6.1). Moreover, HiŚS (1.1.13 -[85] 14) specifies that which is not a mantra without mentioning *ūha*! Apparently, at one time, modified mantras were mantras.

This view is supported by the fact that modified mantras have actually been included in the Vedic collections as mantras. A particularly clear example is the long *adhriḡu* passage that occurs, or is discussed, in MS 4.13.4, KS 16.21, TB 3.6.6, AB 2.6-7 (6.6-7), KB 10.4, ĀśvŚS 3.3, and ŚŚS 5.17, with this difference: TB, AB, KB, and ŚŚS have *medhapatibhyām* where MS and KS have *medhapataye*. Interestingly, the difference is explained in AB 2.6.6 (6.6.6) in the following words:

sa yady ekadevatyaḥ paśuḥ syān medhapataya iti brūyāt yadi dvidevatyo medhapatibhyām iti yadi bahudevatyo medhapatibhya ity etad eva sthitam
If the victim be for one deity, 'for the lord of the sacrifice' [*medhapataye*] he should say; if for two deities, 'for the two lords of the sacrifice' [*medhapatibhyām*]; if for many deities, 'for the lords of the sacrifice' [*medhapatibhyaḥ*]. That is the rule. (Tr. Keith, 1920: 138)

This is as clear a case of *ūha* as is possible.¹⁵

TS 2.3.10.1-2 repeats the same sacrificial formula four times, with differences in number, in a single passage in order to adjust it to different numbers of gods:

¹³ We should not be misguided by this late date. Bharṭṛhari made use of works on Mīmāṃsā older than Śabara's, among them probably the one by Bhavadāsa. See Bronkhorst, 1989a.

¹⁴ The relevance for grammar is, of course, that in this way it can be decided whether or not Vedic rules are to be used in the modified mantras. Note that Kumārila's *Tantravārttika* on PMS 1.3.24 maintains that *ūha* is brought about without the help of grammar but rather with forms found in the Veda.

¹⁵ ŚŚS 6.1.15, similarly, prescribes substitution of *medhapataye* or *medhapatibhyaḥ* for, apparently, *medhapatibhyām*, as instances of *ūha*.

aśvinoḥ prāṇo 'si tasya te dattām yayoh prāṇo 'si svāhā indrasya prāṇo 'si tasya te dadātu yasya prāṇo 'si svāhā [86] mitrāvaruṇayoḥ prāṇo 'si tasya te dattām yayoh prāṇo 'si svāhā viśveṣām devānām prāṇo 'si tasya te dadatu yeṣām prāṇo 'si svāhā

The question we must now consider is to what extent the Vedic rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* can be looked upon as having been composed with this kind of *ūha* in mind. Obviously, it cannot be maintained that this was the only purpose of these Vedic rules, for some were undoubtedly intended to describe isolated Vedic facts. But this does not exclude the possibility that *ūha* was one of the purposes for which some of the Vedic rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* were formulated.

There is some reason to accept this last view. Some *Śrauta Sūtras* lay down rules pertaining to the modification of certain verbal forms. MŚS 5.2.9.6, for example, lists the following acceptable modified forms: *adat*, *adatām*, *adan*, *ghasat*, *ghastām*, *ghasan*, *aghasat*, *aghasatām*, *aghasan*, *karat*, *karatām*, *karan*, *agrabhīt*, *agrabhīṣṭām*, *agrabhīṣuḥ*, and *akṣan*. ĀśvŚS 3.4.15, similarly, lists *ādat*, *ghasat*, *karat*, *juṣatām*, *aghat*, *agrabhīt* and *avīṛdhata*. ŚŚS 6.1.5, finally, lists *ādat*, *ādan*, *ghastu*, *ghasantu*, *aghasat*, *aghasan*, or *aghat*, *akṣan*, *agrabhīt*, *agrabhīṣuḥ*, *avīṛdhanta*, and others. This shows that there was concern in ritual circles regarding the correct use of certain verbal forms in modified mantras. Among the recurring forms are the aorists of the roots *ghas*, *ad*,¹⁶ and *kṛ*.

The shared concern of ĀśvŚS 3.4.15, ŚŚS 6.1.5, and MŚS 5.2.9.6 is explained by the fact that most of the modifications are meant for virtually identical texts, the so-called *Praīṣa sūktas*, in particular RV Khila 5.7.2 (f and l), which [87] correspond to MS 4.13.7 (p. 208, l. 3-7) and 4.13.9 (p. 211, l. 5-12).

It is very probable that Pāṇini knew the *Praīṣa sūktas* in which these modifications were to take place, for Scheftelowitz (1919: 47 f.) has adduced reasons to believe that the *Praīṣas* are among the oldest Vedic texts in prose. This allows us to surmise that a Pāṇinian *sūtra* may have been composed partly to solve this same problem. This *sūtra* would then be P. 2.4.80 (*mantra ghasahvaraṇaśavṛdahādvṛckṛgamijanibhyo leḥ*), which deals with the aorists of a number of roots, among them *ghas* and *kṛ*, in a *mantra*. It favors here such forms as *(a)ghat*, *(a)ghastām*, *akṣan* and *akaḥ*, and *akran* (not in all cases the same forms as the above *Śrauta Sūtras*).

If it can be accepted that P. 2.4.80 was composed to serve the purpose of *ūha* (besides other purposes), the same may be true of other rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This, in turn, would mean that these rules not only *describe* Vedic data but also *prescribe* the means for modifying Vedic mantras when necessary. This implies that we cannot always be sure that Pāṇini's Vedic rules describe forms that occurred in Vedic texts

¹⁶ *ghas* replaces *ad* before aorist endings according to P. 2.4.37 (*luīsanor ghas*).

known to Pāṇini. Unattested forms accounted for by rules in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* do not, then, in all cases have to have been part of texts that are now lost.

2. We can now turn to the main part of the present investigation: an attempt to determine which Vedic texts Pāṇini knew and which he did not. The above considerations make it clear that in this context Pāṇini's rules on sandhi and accent will be of little help. Moreover, none of the rules that concern details of the phonetic shape of words, [88] i.e., the orthoepic diaskeuasis of texts, can be relied upon to determine which texts Pāṇini knew, for the simple reason that these features may have changed, and in some cases certainly changed, after him. Our enquiry must in the main rely on word-forms prescribed in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

Here another consideration arises. We have decided to take Pāṇini seriously, but this does not mean that we demand his grammar to be complete. Nor does it exclude the possibility that he made occasional mistakes. It does, however, imply that, where Pāṇini clearly and explicitly excludes certain features from the Vedic language, we must regard with suspicion the Vedic texts containing those features.

We proceed in a twofold manner. On one hand, we collect forms prescribed by Pāṇini for Vedic and attested in but one Vedic texts and nowhere else. If a sufficient number of such forms are found for a particular Vedic text and nothing else pleads against it, we may then assume that this Vedic text was known to Pāṇini. On the other hand, we shall look for Vedic texts that contain features excluded by Pāṇini. If the number of such features is sufficiently large, we may consider the possibility that Pāṇini did not know these texts. This double approach will provide us with the material to be evaluated in subsequent sections.

2.1 Many words prescribed by Pāṇini are found only in the *Ṛgveda*. Some examples are *vṛkati* (P. 5.4.41) at RV 4.41.4; *cicyuṣe* (P. 6.1.36) at RV 4.30.22; *yajadhvainam* (P. 7.1.43) at RV 8.2.37; *jaḡrbhma* (P. 7.2.64) at RV 1.139.10 and 10.47.1;¹⁷ *vṛṣaṇyati* (P. 7.4.36) at RV 9.5.6; *tetikte* (P. 7.4.65) at RV 4.23.7; and *svatavāṃḥ pāyuh* (P. 8.3.11) at RV. 4.2.6.

[89]

2.2 Three words prescribed by Pāṇini for Vedic are only found in the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*: *khanya-* (P. 3.1.123) at TS 7.4.13.1; the denominative *kavya* (P. 7.4.39) at TS 7.1.20.1; and *āṇṛhuḥ* (P. 6.1.36) at TS 3.2.8.3. Note that all three words occur in mantras. Thieme (1935: 64) was of the opinion that a fourth word, *brahmavādya* (P. 3.1.123), is found only in the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*. This word occurs in a *brāhmaṇa*

¹⁷ The value of this case is somewhat in doubt since TB 2.8.2.5 cites the same mantra as RV 10.47.1 with *jaḡrbhṇā*; it may have contained *jaḡrbhma*.

portion (at TS 2.5.8.3) but not only there; it is also found at JUB 3.2.3.2; ĀpŚS 21.10.12; and VādhŚS (Caland, 1928: 176). Thus, no direct evidence remains that Pāṇini knew the *brāhmaṇa* portion of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*.

2.3 Not all the evidence produced by Leopold von Schroeder (1879: 194 f.; 1881-86: 1: x1 f., 2: viii f.) to show that Pāṇini knew the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* can stand scrutiny. Some cases are derived not from Pāṇini but from his commentators. Others correspond to rules of Pāṇini that are not confined to Vedic usage; these cases do not prove that Pāṇini knew the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, or a part thereof, for the simple reason that the words concerned were apparently also in use in other than ritual contexts. Finally, there are cases wherein Schroeder was mistaken in thinking that certain Vedic words prescribed by Pāṇini occurred only in the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* and not in other texts.

However, the following cases can be used to establish Pāṇini's acquaintance with at least certain parts of the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. P. 3.1.42 teaches the Vedic (*chandasi*, but *amantre*) verbal forms *abhyutsādayām akaḥ*, *prajanayām akaḥ*, and *pāvayām kriyāt*. They occur at MS 1.6.5, 1.6.10 and 1.8.5, and 2.1.3, respectively, and nowhere else. The Vedic (*nigame*) forms *sādhyai* and *sādhvā* (P. 6.3.113) are [90] nowhere found except in MS 1.6.3 and 3.8.5, respectively. *Agrīya-* (P. 4.4.117) is only attested at MS 2.7.13, 2.9.5, and in the colophon to 3.1.10. Noncompounded *bhaviṣṇu* (P. 3.2.138) is found only at MS 1.8.1. *Praṇīya-* (P. 3.1.123) is found at MS 3.9.1 and nowhere else; *ucchiṣya-* occurs only at MS 3.9.2. *Purīṣyavāhana* (P. 3.2.65) is found only at MS 2.7.4.

2.4 Vedic forms attested only in the *Kāthaka Saṃhitā* are the following (cf. Schroeder, 1880; 1895): *ramayām akaḥ* (P. 3.1.42) at KS 7.7; *upacāyapṛḍa* (P. 3.1.123) at KS 11.1; and *kṣariti* (P. 7.2.34) at KS 12.11. One word occurs only in the *Kāthaka Saṃhitā* and in the *Kapīṣṭhala Saṃhitā*. Since the latter "is practically a variant of the *Kāthaka*" (Gonda, 1975: 327), it is here included: *jagatya-* (P. 4.4.122) at KS 1.8 ~ KapS 1.8, and at KS 31.7. *Adhvarya* in P. 3.1.123 may indicate acquaintance with KS 35.7 = KapS 48.9 (Thieme, 1935: 23-24; Gotō, 1987: 191 n. 355).

2.5 A Vedic form found exclusively in the *Atharvaveda* is *ailayīt* formed by P. 3.1.51 (cf. Thieme, 1935: 64); it occurs at AVŚ 6.16.3.¹⁸ *Śivatāti* (P. 4.4.143) is only found at AVP 5.36.1-9. The word *māmakī*, formed by P. 4.1.30, occurs only AVP 6.6.8.¹⁹

¹⁸ My friend Dr. Harry Falk points out in a forthcoming article that Pāṇini cannot have known AVŚ 6.16.3, the reason being that Pāṇini derives *ailayīt* from *elayati*: the same mantra contains the form *ilaya* (*avelaya*), so that Pāṇini, had he known AVŚ 6.16.3 as a whole, would have derived *ailayīt* from *ilayati* rather than from *elayati*.

¹⁹ This was pointed out by Manjul Mayank in a paper read at the Seventh World Conference, Leiden, 1987.

2.6 Two Vedic forms occur in the *Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra* of the *Sāmaveda* and nowhere else (except, of course, in the later *Drāhyāyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra*, which is often no more than a recast of the former): *khānya-* (P. 3.1.123) at LŚS 8.2.4 and 5 (DrŚS 22.2.5 and 6); and (*pra-*)*stāvya-* (id.) at LŚS 6.1.20 (DrŚS 16.1.22 and 18). *Hvarita* (P. 7.2.33) occurs only in a mantra in MŚS 2.5.4.24d and 4.4.39. *Sanim sasanivāmsam* (P. 7.2.69) occurs in mantras in MŚS 1.3.4.2 and VāŚS [91] 1.3.5.16 (cf. Hoffmann, 1974). *Dādharti* is only attested in JB 2.37.²⁰ *Yaśobhagīna* (P. 4.4.132) is only attested HiŚS 2.5.43 and 6.4.3.

3.1 We now turn to forms excluded by Pāṇini.

P. 3.1.35 (*kāspratyayād ām amantre liṭi*) forbids a periphrastic perfect to occur in a mantra, yet AVŚ 18.2.27 has *gamayām cakāra* (cf. Whitney, 1893: 249). AVP 18.65.10 has *gamayām cakartha*.

P. 5.1.91 (*vatsarāntāc chaś chandasi*) prescribes *-īya* after words ending in *-vatsara*, resulting in forms like *saṃvatsarīya*. The next rule, 5.1.92 (*saṃparipūrvāt kha ca*), adds *-īna* in the same position, provided that *-vatsara-* is preceded by *sam-* or *pari-*. This means that Pāṇini did not know, or approve of, forms wherein *-vatsarīna-* is not preceded by *sam-* or *pari-*. Yet such forms occur: *idāvatsarīna* at TB 1.4.10.2 and *anuvatsarīna* at TB 1.4.10.3.

P. 5.4.158 (*ṛtaś chandasi*) forbids the addition of *kaP* after a *Bahuvrīhi* compound ending in *-ṛ*. An exception is *brāhmaṇabhartṛka* (AA 5.3.2).

P. 6.3.84 (*samānasya chandasy amūrdhaprabhṛtyudarkeṣu*) forbids substitution of *sa-* for *samāna* before *mūrdhan*, *prabhṛti*, and *udarka*. Yet this substitution has taken place in *saprabhṛti* (PB 15.1.6 and KB 20.4, 21.4, etc.); *sodarka* (PB 13.7.9, 13.8.1, 13.8.4, and 13.8.5; and KB 20.4, 21.4, etc.).

P. 7.1.26 (*netarāc chandasi*) prohibits the use of neuter *itarad* in ritual literature. Yet it occurs at AB 6.15; KB 12.8; ŚB 4.5.8.14 and 13.8.2.9; TB 3.10.11.4; JB 1.213, 2.75, and 2.249; and at ṢaḍB 4.3.7, 4.4.10, and 4.5.8.

[92]

P. 7.2.88 (*prathamāyāś ca dvivacane bhāṣāyām*) prescribes the nominatives *āvām* and *yuvām* with long penultimate *ā* for secular language, thus excluding these nominatives from the Vedic language. Yet they occur in *āvām* (AB 4.8; ŚāñA 5.7; ŚB 4.1.5.16 and 14.1.1.23; BAU[K] 3.2.13; ChU 8.8.1) and *yuvām* (PB 21.1.1).

²⁰ The corresponding plural *dādharti* occurs at TS 2.3.1.2, 5.3.9.2; MS 2.2.1; and KS 11.6. However, the juxtaposition of *dādharti*, *dardharti*, *dardharṣi*, and other finite verb forms seems to indicate that the precise form *dādharti* is meant.

3.2 We obtain further results by applying more strictly our rule that Pāṇini's grammar is to be taken seriously. Grammatical *sūtras* that are not indicated as being optional must be accepted as intended to be of general validity. In incidental cases this may give rise to doubts,²¹ but no such doubt seems to attach to the following cases.

P. 2.3.61 (*preṣyabruvor haviṣo devatāsampradāne*) is a rule valid for *Brāhmaṇa* literature (*anuvṛtti* of *brāhmaṇe* from rule 60; see Joshi and Roodbergen, 1981: 101 n. 331), prescribing a genitive for the object of *preṣya* and *brū*, if it is an oblation in an offering to a deity. It thus excludes the use of the accusative in such cases. Yet the accusative is often used in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, most clearly in *agnīṣomābhyām chāgasya vapāṃ medaḥ preṣya* (ŚB 3.8.2.27; ŚBK 4.8.2.21), *agnīṣomābhyām chāgasya haviḥ preṣya* (ŚB 3.8.3.29; ŚBK 4.8.3.18), *indrāya somān prasthitān preṣya* (ŚB 4.2.1.23; ŚBK 5.2.1.20), and *chāgānām haviḥ prasthitam preṣya* (ŚB 5.1.3.14).²²

P. 3.1.59 (*kṛmṛdṛruhibhyaś chandasī*) is a nonoptional rule (cf. Kiparsky, 1980: 62) prescribing *añ* as an aorist marker after the roots *kṛ*, *mṛ*, *dṛ*, and *ruh* in ritual literature. It excludes in this way the forms *akārṣīt*, *akārṣīḥ*, *akārṣam*, and *arukṣat* from Vedic literature. Yet these forms occur, as follows: (*a*)*kārṣīt* (GB 1.3.4; ChU 6.16.1); *akārṣīḥ* [93] (ŚB 10.5.5.3; GB 1.3.11); *akārṣam* (AVP 20.1.6; TB 3.7.5.5; TA 10.24.1, 10.25.1; GB 1.3.12); and *arukṣat* (AVŚ 12.3.42; AVP 17.40.2).

P. 4.4.105 (*sabhāyāḥ yaḥ*) prescribes the suffix *ya* after *sabhā* in the sense *tatra sādhuḥ* (4.4.98). The next rule, P. 4.4.106 (*dhaś chandasī*), makes an exception for ritual literature. The form *sabhya* derived by P. 4.4.105 should apparently not occur in Vedic literature. It does, though, at the following places: AVŚ 8.10.9, 19.55.5; AVP 16.133.5; MS 1.6.11; TB 1.2.1.26, 3.7.4.6; and ŚB 12.9.2.3.

P. 5.4.103 (*anasantān napuṃsakāc chandasī*) prescribes for ritual literature the addition of *ṭac* to neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds the last member of which ends in *-an* or *-as*. Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya* (2: 441) makes this rule optional, in order to account for words like *brahmasāman* and *devacchandasa*, but this merely emphasizes the fact that Pāṇini's rule is not optional. Yet there are numerous exceptions, some of which occur in the following texts:²³

AVŚ 5.10.1-7 (*aśmavarman*), 19.7.2 (*mṛgaśiras*), 19.30.3 (*devavarman*).

²¹ For example, P. 7.1.57 (*goḥ pādānte*) prescribes that the genitive plural of *go* at the end of a verse-foot in ritual literature is *gonām*. This is illustrated in RV 10.47.1. But the Kāśikā rightly observes that there are exceptions: RV 10.166.1 has *gavām* at the end of a verse-foot.

²² The Kāṇva parallel ŚBK 6.1.3.12 (*chāgānām haviṣām prasthitam preṣya*) seems to be the only example in Vedic literature in which P. 2.3.61 is obeyed. Note that the single *vārttika* on P. 2.3.61 is intended to make the rule invalid where the oblation is *prasthita*. This would justify all, or almost all, deviations from Pāṇini's rule, yet the fact that Pāṇini says nothing about *prasthita* in this context shows that he did not know, or accept, these counterexamples. Similarly, see Navathe, 1987.

²³ *bāhvojas* in RV 8.93.2 is considered a *Bahuvrīhi*, and not therefore a *Tatpuruṣa* compound, by Oldenberg (1909-12: 2: 144). *somaparvabhiḥ* in RV 1.9.1 = AVŚ 20.71.7 = VSM 33.25 = VSK 32.2.8 = SVK 1.180 = SVJ 1.2.1.7.6 can be derived from *-parva*, by P. 7.1.10.

- AVP 5.29.1 (*sūryavarcaś*), 6.12.9-11 and 6.13.1-3 (*aśmavarman*), 13.11.21 (*devavarman*), 19.48.14 (*hiraṇyanāman*).
- MS 3.6.7 (*dīkṣitavāśas*), 3.11.9 (*vyāghraloman*).
- VSM 19.92 (*vyāghraloman* = MS 3.11.9).
- VSK 21.6.13 (*vyāghraloman* = MS 3.11.9 and VSM 19.92).
- AB 1.26 (*devavarman*), 4.19 (*brahmasāman*, *agniṣṭomasāman*), 7.19 (*iśudhanvan*), 8.5 and 8.6 (*vyāghracarman*).
- KB 2.1, 5.7, and 27.1 (*devakarman*), 5.5 (*pūrvedyuhkarman* and *puṣṭīkarman*), 5.7 (*pitṛkarman*), 8.7 (*paśūkarman*), 27.1 (*agniṣṭomasāman*), 30.11 (*rātricchandas*).
- [94]
- GB 1.3.16 (*sarvacchandas*), 1.5.25 (*svakarman*), 2.1.23 (*puṣṭīkarman*, *pūrvedyuhkarman*), 2.6.6 (*yajñaparvan*).
- TB 1.7.8.1 (*śārdūlacarman*).
- ŚB 4.6.6.5 and 13.3.3.5 (*brahmasāman*), 5.3.5.3, 5.4.1.9, and 11 (*śārdūlacarman*), 6.6.1.4, 7.3.1.4, etc. (*adhvarakarman*, *agnīkarman*), 13.3.3.4 (*maitrāvaruṇasāman*), 13.3.3.6 (*acchāvākasāman*), 13.5.1.1 and 13.5.3.10 (*agniṣṭomasāman*), 14.3.1.35 (*patnīkarman*).
- ŚBK 1.1.2.5-6 (*mṛgaśīras*), 7.2.4.3 and 7.3.1.9-10 (*śārdūlacarman*).
- JB 1.149, etc. (*rathantarasāman*), 1.155, etc. (*acchāvākasāman*), 1.172, etc. *agniṣṭomasāman*), 2.240 (*uttaravayas*), 2.276 (*ācāryakarman*), etc.
- PB 4.2.19, etc. (*agniṣṭomasāman*), 4.3.1, etc. (*brahmasāman*), 8.10.1, etc. (*acchāvākasāman*), 9.2.7 and 15 (*kṣatrasāman*), 9.2.20, etc. (*rātriśāman*), 11.3.8 and 9 (*somasāman*), 13.9.22 and 23 (*varuṇasāman*).
- ṢaḍB 4.2.12-14 (*brahmasāman*).
- ĀrṣB 1.378 (*varuṇasāman*), 2.3.11 (*arkaśīras*), etc.
- JĀB 5.3, etc. (*somasāman*), Arkaparvan 3.9 (*arkaśīras*), etc.
- SāB 1.5.15 (*svakarman*), 2.1.6 (*setuśāman*), 2.3.3 (*sarpasāman*), 2.3.6 (*arkaśīras*).
- ŚātyB, p. 72 (*brahmasāman*, *acchāvākasāman*).
- VaṃśaB 1 (*giriśarman*).
- ŚānA 1.5 (*devacchandas*), 3.5 (*brahmayaśas*, *brahmatejas*).
- TA 1.15.1, etc. (*svatejas*).

P. 5.4.142 (*chandasi ca*) prescribes substitution of *datR* for *danta* final in a *Bahuvrīhi* compound in ritual literature. It excludes from the Vedic language *Bahuvrīhi* com-[95]pounds ending in *danta*. Yet there are some: *kṛṣṇadanta* at AA 3.2.4 and ŚānA 11.4; *viśadanta* at AVP 5.9.8; *iṣīkādanta* at AVP 1.4.4.2; *ubhayatodanta* at AA 2.3.1, ŚB 1.6.3.30, ŚBK 2.6.1.21, JB 1.128, 2.84 and 2.114 and SāB 1.8.2; and *anyatodanta* at ŚBK 2.6.1.21 and JB 1.128, 2.84 and 2.114.

P.7.1.56 (*śrīgrāmaṇyoś chandasi*) determines the form of the genitive plural of *śrī* and *grāmaṇī* as *śrīṇām* and *grāmaṇīnām*, respectively. But genitive *sūtagrāmaṇyām* occurs at ŚB 13.4.2.5 and 13.5.2.7.

P.6.4.141 reads *mantr̥ṣv āñy āder ātmanaḥ* (*lopaḥ* 134) “In mantras there is elision of the initial [sound *ā*] of *ātman* when [the instrumental singular ending] *āñ* follows.” It is not easy to determine the precise meaning of this *sūtra*. It may not imply that *ātman* never loses its initial *ā* before other case endings, since for all we know Pāṇini may have looked upon *tman* as a separate vocable, but this *sūtra* clearly excludes the occurrence of *ātmanā* in mantras. This form is found, however, in mantras at the following places: AVŚ 3.29.8; AVŚ 5.29.6-9 ~ AVP 13.9.7-8; AVŚ 8.2.8 ~ AVP 16.3.9; AVŚ 9.5.31-36 ~ AVP 16.99.8; AVŚ 18.2.7; AVŚ 19.33.5 ~ 12.5.5; AVP 3.28.1, 16.100.5-11, and 16.119.1-3; VSM 32.11 ~ VSK 35.3.8; and MS 2.8.14.

To the above cases the following may be added:

P.2.4.48 (*hemantaśísirāv ahorātre ca chandasi*) implies, as Thieme (1935: 13) rightly pointed out, that Pāṇini “must have known *śísira-* as a *neuter*.” However, *śísira* is masculine at SVK 3.4.2; SVJ 2.3.3; AVŚ 6.55.2 and 12.1.36; AVP 17.4.6 and 19.9.3; ŚB 2.1.3.1, 2.6.1.2, 8.7.1.7 and 8, 13.6.1.10 and 11; ŚBK 1.1.3.1 and 1.2.3.6; JB 1.313, 2.51, 2.211, 2.356; and TA 1.6.1.

[96]

P.3.1.118 (*pratyapibhyām graheḥ* [without *chandasi*; see Kielhorn, 1885: 192 (195); Thieme, 1935: 16]) prescribes *pratigr̥hya-* and *apigr̥hya-*. Kātyāyana’s *vārttika* on this *sūtra* confines it to Vedic literature (*chandas*) and Patañjali mentions the alternatives *pratigr̥hya-* and *apigr̥hya-*. The last two forms were apparently not known to Pāṇini, yet *apratigr̥hya-* occurs at SāB 1.7.2.

4. What patterns arise from these data? Which Vedic texts did Pāṇini know, and which did he not know? We shall try to arrive at an opinion on the basis of the forms emphatically accepted or rejected by Pāṇini himself.²⁴

4.1 Pāṇini records a number of forms that occur in the *Ṛgveda* and nowhere else. Among the forms he clearly rejects, not one occurs in the *Ṛgveda*. To this must be added the fact that P.1.1.16-18 refer to Śākalya’s *Padapāṭha*. The *Padapāṭha* was added to the collection of hymns (excepting six verses; see Kashikar, 1951: 44) and presupposes the latter. We may safely assume that Pāṇini knew the collected *Ṛgveda*, not just the individual hymns.

²⁴ Note that the insufficiency of Pāṇini’s grammar with regard to the Vedic data has been known for a long time in the Pāṇinian tradition. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, in his *Tantravārttika*, cites in this connection SVK 2.1006=SVJ 4.17.11 (*madhya āpasya tiṣṭhati*), which has *āpasya* instead of *apām*.

Note that this is in no way obvious. Pāṇini knew Vedic stanzas (*ṛc*) and sacrificial formulas in prose (*yajus*)—both of these went by the term *mantra*— besides *brāhmaṇa* and *kalpa*. He nowhere says that he knew the mantras in collections. In this connection it is interesting to observe that the term that came to designate such collections (*saṃhitā*) did not yet have this meaning in Pāṇini's grammar and in the Vedic scriptures. There it is synonymous throughout with *sandhi*. The *saṃhitā-pāṭha*, as opposed to the *pada-pāṭha*, is the version of the text with sandhi.

4.2 The question as to whether the Vedic collections, [97] the *Samhitās*, existed in Pāṇini's time as collections becomes pertinent with regard to the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*. We saw that three forms prescribed by Pāṇini occur in the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* and nowhere else (2.2, above). All these words occur in mantras. This means that possibly Pāṇini may not have known the *brāhmaṇa* portions of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*. This possibility is supported by the fact that these *brāhmaṇa* parts frequently contain a conspicuous non-Pāṇinian feature, viz., the ending *-ai* instead of *-ās* (see Caland 1927, 50; Keith 1914, 1: cxlv f.). Note also that the *brāhmaṇa* portion of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* refers twice (6.1.9.2, 6.4.5.1) to Aruṇa Aupaveśi, whose grandson Śvetaketu Āruṇeya is characterized as modern in the *Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra* (1.5.5).

All this suggests that the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* was collected in its more or less final form at a late date, perhaps later than Pāṇini. This agrees with some facts regarding the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, to which we now turn.

Both the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* contain forms that are explicitly rejected by Pāṇini. The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* has *idāvatsarīṇa*, *anuvatsarīṇa*, *itarad* (3.1, above), *akārṣam*, *sabhya*, and *śārdūlacarman* (3.2). The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* has *akārṣam*, *svatejas*, and *śisīra* (m.) (3.2). It seems safe to conclude that these works were not known to, or accepted by, Pāṇini. The *Baudhāyana* and *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtras* "accord in recognizing the whole content both of the *Brāhmaṇa* and of the *Āraṇyaka*" (Keith 1914, 1: lxxviii). Yet "it would be impossible, so far as can be seen, to prove that to [these *Sūtras*] even the [98] *Sanhitā* was yet a definite unit" (ibid., lxxix-lxxx). The *sūtras* only distinguish between mantra and *brāhmaṇa*, which occur in each of the three, *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, and *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*.²⁵

The interrelationship of mantras and *brāhmaṇa* portions of the three *Taittirīya* texts suggests that they, or parts of them, once existed as an undivided whole. We see, for example, that the *brāhmaṇa* portions of TS 2.5.7 and 8 comment on the mantras of TB 3.5.1 and 2; TS 2.5.9 on TB 3.5.3.1-4.1; TS 2.6.1 and 2 on TB 3.5.5-7; TS 2.6.7 on

²⁵ Caland (1921: 3) observed that the *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra* refers to mantras of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* by way of their initial words, and to those of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* by citing them in full. Kashikar (1968: 400) has also shown that mantras from the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* are often quoted by *pratīka*. The *Bhāradvāja Śrauta Sūtra* follows a similar practice (Kashikar, 1968: 401).

TB 3.5.8; TS 2.6.9 on TB 3.5.10; and TS 2.6.10 on TB 3.5.11 (Keith, 1914: 1: lxxxiv). TS 3.5.11 supplements TB 3.6.1, giving the mantras for the *hotṛ* for the animal sacrifice (Keith 1914, 1:286, n. 4). Keith (1914, 1:lxxix) comes to a similar conclusion on the basis of the *Śrauta Sūtras*: "So far as we can judge there is no trace of any distinction being felt by the *Sūtrakāras* between the nature of the texts before them. "

It is not impossible that the creation of a *Padapāṭha* differentiated the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* from *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, just as the *Rgveda* may conceivably have been collected by the author of its *Padapāṭha* (Bronkhorst 1982a: 187).

The fact that Pāṇini derives the term *Taittirīya*, in the sense ‘uttered by Tittiri’, in P.4.3.102 does not, of course, prove that the *Taittirīya* texts, as now known, were known to him. Pāṇini probably knew the mantras, of a number of them, that are now part of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, and he may indeed have considered them *taittirīya* ‘uttered by Tittiri’.

[99]

Note, finally, that the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* appears to borrow from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 1-5, as argued by Keith (1914: 1:xcvii f.); see also Aufrecht (1879: vi, 431f.) and Keith (1920: 46). The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* itself, including its first five chapters, deviates in a number of points from Pāṇini (4.5, below).

4.3 Some of the other *Saṃhitās* of the *Yajurveda* sin occasionally against Pāṇini.

The *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā* has *ātmanā*, masculine *śísira*, and one *Tatpuruṣa* compound in *-an* (*vyāghraloman*). It shares this, however, with the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*.

The *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* has *sabhya*, some *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-as* and *-an*, *ātmanā*; note further *dādhrti* (see note 19, above). These deviations from Pāṇini in the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* are most surprising because Pāṇini appeared to know both the mantra and *brāhmaṇa* portions of this text (see 2.3, above). This warns us once again that we cannot assume that the texts we know now existed in the same form in Pāṇini’s day.

4.4 Did Pāṇini know the *Atharvaveda*? Two forms prescribed by him are found only there, one in the *Śaunakīya* version and one in the *Paippalāda* version. However, opposed to these two forms are numerous others forbidden by Pāṇini. They include *gamayāṃ*, *cakāra*, *gamayāṃ cakārtha* (3.1), *akārṣam*, *aruḥṣat*, *sabhya*, several neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds ending in *-an* and *-as*, *viṣadanta* and *iṣikādanta*, *haricandra*, *ātmanā*, and *śísira* (masc.) (3.2).

One might raise the question of whether the word-forms in the *Atharvaveda* may not have been Vedic in Pāṇini’s opinion, that is, whether, perhaps, they were covered by

[100] non-Vedic rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This is suggested by Balasubrahmanyam's remark (1984: 23):

Among the seven *khyun-* derivatives taught by P[āṇini] in A[ṣṭādhyāyī] 3.2.56, *subhagaṃkaraṇī* and *priyaṃ-karaṇam* are only attested in the *Samhitā* texts of the [*Atharvaveda*]— the former occurring at [AVŚ] 6.139.1 and AVP 7.12.5, and the latter at the *Paippalāda Samhitā* (3.28.5; 6). Neither in the other Vedic *Samhitās* nor in the *Brāhmaṇa-Āraṇyaka* texts, do we come across these derivatives.

Balasubrahmanyam's observation is misleading in that *subhagaṃkaraṇī* is not taught in P.3.2.56 nor anywhere else in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This is so because a *vārttika* of the *Saunāgās* (Mbh, 2:105, 1.8; on P.3.2.56) is required to provide *subhagaṃkaraṇa* with its feminine ending, *ī*, as shown by Balasubrahmanyam himself. Thus, P.3.2.56 did not derive *subhagaṃkaraṇī* in the *Atharvaveda*. The fact that the *Atharvaveda* contains two more words of the same kind (*ayakṣmaṃkaraṇī* at AVŚ 19.2.5 and AVP 8.8.11; *sarūpaṃkaraṇī* at AVŚ 1.24.4 and AVP 1.26.5; see Balasubrahmanyam 1984, 25f.) and that these words are not even partially²⁶ derived in Pāṇini's grammar, makes it less than likely that the *priyaṃkaraṇam* of AVP 3.28.6 was meant to be explained in P.3.2.56.

An interesting confirmation that the *Atharvaveda* did not exist as a collection until long after the other three Vedas were collected is found in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. Sections 3.1-5 make a number of comparisons, or rather identifications, of which the following are of interest to us. [101] Section 3.1 states that the bees are de *ṛcs*, the flower is the *Ṛgveda*; in 3.2 the bees are the *yajus* (pl.), the flower is the *Yajurveda*; and in 3.3 the bees are de *sāmans*, the flower is the *Sāmaveda*. The interesting observation comes in section 3.4, where the bees are the *atharvāṅgirasah* and the flower is *itihāsapurāṇam*. In 3.5, finally, the bees are the hidden teachings (*guhya ādesāḥ*), which may be the *Upaniṣads*, and the flower is *Brahman* (n.). Since the *atharvāṅgirasah* constitute the *Atharvaveda* as we know it, the logic of the situation would have required that the flower in 3.4 be identified with the *Atharvaveda*. The fact that it is not hardly allows an explanation other than that the author of this passage did not know of such a definite collection of *atharvans* and *āṅgirasas*. *Itihāsa* and *purāṇa* certainly do not designate the *Atharvaveda*, neither separately nor jointly (see Horsch, 1996: 13f.).

Bloomfield (1899: 2f.), too, came to the conclusion "that many hymns and prose pieces in the AV. date from a very late period of Vedic productivity." Indeed, "there is nothing in the way of assuming that the composition of such texts as the AB. and ŚB. preceded the redactions of the Atharvan *Samhitās*."

Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* cites in its opening passage the first lines of the four Vedas; these apparently existed as collections in those days (second century B.C.). The

²⁶ That is, not even the forms *ayakṣmaṃkaraṇa* and *sarūpaṃkaraṇa*, without the feminine *ī*, are derived.

first line is *śaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaye*, which begins the *Paippalāda* version of the *Atharvaveda*. Patañjali even informs us of the size of the *Atharvaveda* known to him, saying (Mbh 2:378, 1.11; on P.5.2.37): *viṃśino 'ṅgīrasaḥ*. This fits the twenty books of the *Paippalāda Saṃhitā*.²⁷ We may conclude [102] from this that the *Paippalāda Saṃhitā* existed in its present form, at any rate, in the second century B.C.

4.5 The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* transgresses Pāṇini's rules in containing *itarad*, nominative *āvām* (3.1), and several neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-an* (3.2). It is also interesting that AB 7.17 has the periphrastic perfect *āmantrayām āsa*, as opposed to P.3.1.40, which allows only *kṛ* in such formations (Keith 1936: 747). We also find optatives in *-(ay)īta* instead of *-(ay)eta* (Renou, 1940: 11), and the ending *-ai* for both genitive and ablative *-ās* (Caland, 1927: 50), not prescribed by Pāṇini.

By way of exception some older arguments adduced by Keith (1920: 42f.) to determine the date of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* will be reviewed here (see also Bronkhorst, 1982: 276). The language of this *Brāhmaṇa* is said to be "decidedly older than the Bhāṣā of Pāṇini", on the basis of Liebich's Pāṇini (1981). The circularity of Liebich's arguments has been shown elsewhere (Bronkhorst, 1982: 275f.). The fact that Yāska knew the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* is irrelevant, since it is very likely that he is later than Pāṇini (Bronkhorst, 1984: 8f.). The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* contains indications that it knew the *Ṛgveda* before the completion of the orthoepic diaskeuasis but this implies nothing in view of the fact that the orthoepic diaskeuasis of the *Ṛgveda* was not completed until long after Pāṇini (Bronkhorst, 1981). The absence of reference to metempsychosis must be viewed against the background of the unwillingness of orthodox Brahmanism to let these ideas find entrance into their sacred texts even at a time when they had become generally known and widely accepted (Bronkhorst, 1989: 125).

[103]

4.6 The other *Brāhmaṇas* that are considered early are the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (Renou, 1957: 14). We can be brief about them.

The *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa* has a number of forbidden words: *saprabhṛti*, *sodarka*, and *itarad*, besides many neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-an* and at least one in *-as*. Like the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, it has optatives in *-(ay)īta* and *-ai* for *-ās*.

The *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, too, has *saprabhṛti* and *sodarka*, as well as nominative *yuvām*, and many neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-an*.

²⁷ Note that the *Mahābhāṣya* also prefers the *Paippalāda* version of the *Atharvaveda* in some citations (see Renou, 1953: 463).

The *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* goes against Pāṇini's grammar in having *itarad*, many neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-an* and *-as*, *ubhayatodanta* and *anyatodanta*, and masculine *śísira*.

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* deviates from Pāṇini's grammar in the words *itarad*, nominative *āvām*, *akārṣiḥ*, *sabhya*, an accusative rather than a genitive for the object of *preṣya*, many neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-an*, *ubhayatodanta*, genitive plural - *grāmaṇyām*, and masculine *śísira*.

The *Kāṇva* version of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, finally, deviates in fewer respects, containing a few neuter *Tatpuruṣa* compounds in *-an* and *-as*, *ubhayatodanta* and *anyatodanta*, an accusative rather than a genitive for the object of *preṣya*, and masculine *śísira*.

5. The above considerations must be treated with caution. For one thing, it is not known in any detail what changes were made in the texts during the process we refer to as their "orthoepic diaskeuasis". This implies that we cannot be altogether sure what features of those texts can [104] be used to determine their relationship with Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. We also do not now know how many serious deviations from Pāṇini's explicit statements must be considered evidence that Pāṇini was ignorant of a particular text. Further, we should remember that we made an assumption, which may not be acceptable to everyone, that Pāṇini's grammar can be taken seriously.

Neither should we be rash in concluding that Vedic texts that transgress the rules of Pāṇini repeatedly were for that reason completely unknown to Pāṇini. The problem is that, probably, no Vedic text has a single author. All are collections of parts of more or less heterogeneous origin. This applies to the *Samhitās* as well as to the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas*. The most we can conclude from the deviations between the majority of Vedic texts and Pāṇini's grammar is that Pāṇini did not know much of Vedic literature in its present form, that is, in the collections known to us. Much of Vedic literature was still in a state of flux in Pāṇini's day, and had not yet reached the unalterable shape in which we know it.

These considerations are of value with regard to the texts that would seem to have been unknown to Pāṇini on the basis of the evidence reviewed in this article. They are, however, of equal value where the texts that appear to have been known to Pāṇini are concerned. The *Ṛgveda* may be an exception; it was known to Pāṇini along with its *Padapāṭha*, which leaves little room for major changes other than sandhi. But we must be cautious with respect to such texts as the *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā* and *Kāṭhaka Samhitā*. It is true that they contain words prescribed by Pāṇini, which occur [105] nowhere else, but this proves no more than that Pāṇini was acquainted with certain portions of them, if it proves anything at all.

The regional origin and early spread of most of the Vedic texts may account for Pāṇini's lack of acquaintance with some of them. Pāṇini is held to have lived in north-west India. Texts from other parts of the country may only have become known to him if they were generally accepted as Vedic in their region and beyond it.

[110]

Abbreviations

AA	<i>Aitareya Āraṇyaka</i>
AB	<i>Aitareya Brāhmaṇa</i>
AL	Abhyankar and Limaye's edition of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣyadīpikā</i>
ĀpŚS	<i>Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra</i>
ĀrṣB	<i>Ārṣeya Brāhmaṇa</i>
ĀśvŚS	<i>Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
AVP	<i>Atharvaveda</i> (Paippalāda)
AVŚ	<i>Atharvaveda</i> (Śaunakīya)
BAU(K)	<i>Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad</i> (<i>Kāṇva</i>)
BhāŚS	<i>Bhāradvāja Śrauta Sūtra</i>
CE	"Critical edition" of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣyadīpikā</i>
ChU	<i>Chāndogya Upaniṣad</i>
DrŚS	<i>Drāhyāyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra</i>
HiŚS	<i>Hiraṇyakeśi Śrauta Sūtra</i>
JAB	<i>Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa</i> , edited by Bellikoth Ramachandra Sharma. Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha. 1967.
JUB	<i>Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa</i>
KB	<i>Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa</i>
KS	<i>Kāthaka Saṃhitā</i>
LŚS	<i>Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
Ms	Manuscript of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣyadīpikā</i>
MS	<i>Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā</i>
MŚS	<i>Mānava Śrauta Sūtra</i>
P.	<i>Pāṇinian sūtra</i>
PB	<i>Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa</i>
PMS	<i>Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra</i>
[111]	
SāB	<i>Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa</i>
ṢaḍB	<i>Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa</i> , edited by Bellikoth Ramachandra Sharma. Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha. 1967.
ŚāGS	<i>Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra</i>

ŚāñA	<i>Śāñkhāyana Āraṇyaka</i>
ŚāṭyB	<i>Śāṭyāyana Brāhmaṇa</i>
ŚB	<i>Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa</i>
ŚBK	<i>Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Kāṇva)</i>
ŚŚS	<i>Śāñkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
Sw	Swaminathan's edition of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣyadīpikā</i>
TB	<i>Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa</i>
VaṃśaB	<i>Vaṃśa Brāhmaṇa</i>
VāŚS	<i>Vārāha Śrauta Sūtra</i>

Bibliography

- Aufrecht, Theodor (1979): *Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1964): "The accentuation of *arya* in Pāṇini and the Veda." *26th International Congress of Orientalists*. New Delhi. Summaries of Papers, III, 54-55.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1966): "An accentual problem in Pāṇini and the Veda apropos of the word *hāyana*-" *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 25, 43-58.
- [112]
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1969): "*Arya*:- an accentual study." *Indian Antiquary*, Third Series, 3 (R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume), 112-127.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1972): "Vedic *śriyase* and Pāṇini 3.4.9" *Vishveshvarananda Indological Journal* 10, 7-10.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1974): "Pāṇini 6.1.209-210." *Charudeva Shastri Felicitation Volume*. Delhi, 189-193.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1974a): "Kāṭyāyana and some Vedic formations." *Samskṛtavimarśaḥ* 1(2), 1-4.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1981): *The System of Kṛt Accentuation in Pāṇini and the Veda*. Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha (Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series No. 32).
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1983): "An accentual note on Vedic *voḍhave*." *Surabhi*. Sreekrishna Sarma Felicitation volume. Tirupati: Sri Venkateswara University, 229-240.
- Balasubrahmanyam, M.D. (1984): "*Subhagaṃkaraṇī* in AV 6,139,1." *Amṛtadhārā*. R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume. Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 21-27.
- Bhartṛhari: *Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā*. (1) Edited by K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1970 (Post-Graduate and

- Research Department Series No.8). (2) Partly edited by V. Swaminathan under the title *Mahābhāṣya Tīkā*. Varanasi: [113] Banaras Hindu University. 1965 (Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series Vol. 11). (3) Manuscript reproduced. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1980. (4) "Critical edition" and translation. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1983 ff.
- Bhat, M.S. (1968): "The Vedic stem *rātri-* and Pāṇini." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 41-42 (1966-67, N.S.), 8-11.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1899): *The Atharva Veda*. Asian Publication Services. 1978.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1906): *A Vedic Concordance*. Delhi, Varanasi, and Patna: Motilal Banarsidass. 1964 (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 10).
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981): "The orthoepic diaskeuasis of the *Ṛgveda* and the date of Pāṇini." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 23, 83-95.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1982): "The variationist Pāṇini and Vedic." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24, 273-282.
- [114]
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1982a): "Some observations on the Padapāṭha of the *Ṛgveda*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24, 181-189.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1984): "Nirukta, Uṇādi Sūtra, and *Aṣṭādhyāyī*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27, 1-15.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1989): "L'indianisme et les préjugés occidentaux." *Études de Lettres*, April-June 1989, 119-136.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1989a): "Bhartṛhari and Mīmāṃsā." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 15, 101-117.
- Caland, W. (tr) (1921): *Das ŚrautaSūtra des Āpastamba*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Caland, W. (1927): "On a paragraph of Vaidic syntax." *Acta Orientalia* 5, 49-51.
- Caland, W. (1928): "Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra." *Acta Orientalia* 6, 97-241.
- Caland, W. (tr) (1928a): *Das ŚrautaSūtra des Āpastamba*. Sechszehntes bis vierundzwanzigstes und einunddreissigstes Buch. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen.
- Cardona, George (1976): *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*. Delhi, Varanasi, and Patna: Motilal Banarsidass. 1980.
- [115]
- Chakrabarti, Samiran Chandra (1980): *The Paribhāṣās in the ŚrautaSūtras*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.

Devasthali, G. V. (1967): *Phīṣūtras of Śāntanava*. Edited with introduction, translation, and critical and exegetical notes. Poona: university of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 1).

Devasthali, G. V. (1984): "Pāṇini and Vedic—a critique. " *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 64 (1983), 137-148.

Gonda, Jan (1975): *Vedic Literature (Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas)*. Vol. I, Fasc. I of *A History of Indian Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Gotō, Toshifumi (1987): *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hoffmann, Karl (1974): "Pāṇini VII 2, 69 *saniṃ sasanivāṃsam*." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 32, 73-80.

Horsch, Paul (1966): *Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*. Bern: Francke Verlag.

Jha, Ganganatha (1942): *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*. Second edition, 1964. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University.

[116]

Joshi, S. D., and Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1981): *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Prātipadikārthaśeṣāhnikā (P.2.3.46-2.3.71)*. Pune: University of Poona (Publication of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 14).

Kapila Deva Shastri, Saṃ 2018: *Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa meṃ Gaṇapāṭha kī Paramparā aura Ācārya Pāṇini*. Ajmer, Bhāratīya-Prācyavidyā-Pratiṣṭhāna.

Kashikar, C. G. (1951): "The problem of the Gaḷantas in the Ṛgveda-Padapāṭha." *Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference* 13 (1946), 39-46.

Kashikar, C. G. (1968): "The Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa in relation to the Sūtrakāras. " *Pratidānāma*. Festschrift Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 398-408.

Keith, Arthur Berriedale (tr.) (1914): *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittirīya Saṃhitā*. 2 parts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (Harvard Oriental Series 18, 19).

Keith, Arthur Berriedale (tr.) (1920): *Rigveda Brahmanas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda*. Delhi, Patna, and Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1971 (Harvard Oriental Series 25).

[117]

Keith, Arthur Berriedale (1936): "Pāṇini and the Veda. " *Indian Culture* 2, 735-748.

Kielhorn, Franz (1866): *Śāntanava's Phīṣūtra*. Mit verschiedenen indischen Commentaren, Einleitung, Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben. Genehmigter Nachdruck. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, Ltd. 1966 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, IV. Band No. 2).

- Kielhorn, Franz (1885): "Der Grammatiker Pāṇini. " *Göttingen Nachr.* 1885, 185-199.
Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* I. 188-202. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1969.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1980): *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Edited by S. D. Joshi. Pune: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, in collaboration with the MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., and London.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1982): *Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini's Grammar*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: *Tantravārttika*. In: *Mīmāṃsādarśana*. Edited by Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyankara and Pt. Gaṇeśaśāstrī Jośī. Poona: Ānandāśrama. 1973-84 (Ānandāśrama Saṃskṛtagranthāvali 97).
- Liebich, Bruno (1891): *Pāṇini: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der indischen Literatur und Grammatik*. Leipzig: H. Haessel.
- [118]
- Mayank, Manjul (1990): "Pāṇini's acquaintance with the Atharvaveda. " In: *Pāṇini and the Veda*. Edited by Madhav M. Deshpande. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Navathe, P. D. (1987): "On the prasthitam haviḥ." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 68 (Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar 150th Birth-Anniversary Volume), 645-651.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (1909-1912): *Ṛgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten*. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. Band XI Nro. 5 and Band XIII Nro. 3).
- Palsule, G. B. (1982): "Two Vedic rules of Pāṇini: 8.3.47 and 8.3.10. " *Golden Jubilee Volume*. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, 185-188.
- Pāṇinīya Śikṣā*. Edited by Manomohan Ghosh. Calcutta: University of Calcutta. 1938.
- Patañjali: *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K.V. Abhyankar. 3 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.
- Renou, Louis (1940): "Sur certaines anomalies de l'optatif sanskrit. " *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 41, 5-17.
- [119]
- Renou, Louis (1953): "Le Veda chez Patañjali. " *Journal Asiatique* 241, 427-464.
- Renou, Louis (1957): *Altindische Grammatik: Introduction générale*. Nouvelle édition du texte (by Jacob Wackernagel) paru en 1896, au tome I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Scheftelowitz, Isidor (1906): *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1966.

- Scheftelowitz, Isidor (1919): "Die Nividas und Praiṣas, die ältesten vedischen Prosatexte." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 73, 30-50.
- Schroeder, Leopold von (1879): "Ueber die Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, ihr Alter, ihr Verhältniss zu den verwandten ĩākḥā's, ihrer sprachliche und historische Bedeutung." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 33, 177-207.
- Schroeder, Leopold von (1880): "Das Kāṭhakam und die Māitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā." *Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1879), 675-704.
- Schroeder, Leopold von (ed.) (1881-1886): *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. Parts I-IV. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Schroeder, Leopold von (1895): "Das Kāṭhaka, seine Handschriften, seine Accentuation und seine Beziehung zu den indischen Lexi-[120]cographen und Grammatiker." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 49, 145-171.
- Shivaramaiah, B. K. (1969): "A note on 'bahulaṃ chandasi.'" *The Mysore Orientalist* 2(1), 7-11.
- Staal, J. F. (ed.) (1972): *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, MIT Press.
- Thieme, Paul (1935): *Pāṇini and the Veda*. Studies in the early history of linguistic science in India. Allahabad: Globe Press.
- Thieme, Paul (1938): *Der Fremdling im Ṛgveda*. Eine Studie über die Bedeutung der Worte *ari*, *arya*, *aryaman* und *ārya*. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Reprint: Kraus Reprint, Ltd., Nendeln, Liechtenstein. 1966.
- Thieme, Paul (1985): "Nennformen aus anrede und Anruf im Sanskrit." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 44 (Festgabe Karl Hoffmann) I, 239-258.
- Wackernagel, Jakob (1896-1930): *Altindische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Whitney, William Dwight (1893): "The Veda in Pāṇini." *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 7, 243-254.
- [121]
- Witzel, M. (1989): "Tracing the Vedic dialects." In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Edited by Colette Caillat. Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Fasc. 55), 97-265.