

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and its Śākhā

(published in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 8/9 (1982), pp. 77-95)

1. The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya gives a detailed description of the phonetic aspects of the Ṛgveda and its Pada- and Kramapāṭha. The agreement with the Ṛgveda known to us¹ is almost complete, so much so that Max Müller (1891: li) could say, on the basis of this Prātiśākhya, that "previously ... to the time when the Prātiśākhya was composed, both the Pada and the Saṃhitā texts were so firmly settled that it was impossible, for the sake of uniformity or regularity, to omit one single short *a* ...". Surya Kanta (1933: 78-96) made a detailed comparison of the lengthening of final vowels in the Ṛgveda and the description of the same in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya, and found the latter to be "entirely free from all oversights" (p. 78).

There are, none the less, some points where the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya does not agree with our Ṛgveda. Some of these have given rise to expressions of doubt if the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya was meant for the version of the Ṛgveda which we are acquainted with, first by Rudolph Roth (1852: XLV), later by Hannes Sköld (1926: 42-46). Also Müller (1860: 135-136) had said that it is "doubtful how far the rules [of the Prātiśākhya] can be considered as representing the general opinion of the Śākālas." (The Śākālas constitute the Śākhā to which our Ṛgveda is said to belong (Renou, 1947: 24 n; Bhandarkar, 1893: 419); see § 4 below.) Yet Müller (1860: 135, 137) thinks that the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya is intimately connected with our Ṛgveda and does not hesitate to call it "Śākāla-prātiśākhya".

Clearly the question of the Śākhā of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya deserves closer study. In the following pages evidence pertaining to this question will be discussed, in an attempt to reach a solution.

2.1. On a number of occasions the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya presents as its own a point of view which does not agree with our Ṛgveda. In some cases it contrasts this with the view of certain others, which shows complete agreement with the text know to us.

RPr I.43 (44) says that *ṣ*, *ṭ*, *ṭh*, *ḍ*, *ḍh*, *ṇ* are cerebral (*mūrdhanya*). RPr I.51 (52) tells us that Vedamitra holds a partially different opinion: the places of articulation of *ḍ* are the root of the tongue (*jihvāmūla*) and the palate (*tālu*). The very next sūtra then

¹ Not to prejudge the issue, I shall speak of the "Ṛgveda known to us", "our Ṛgveda" etc., instead of using the term "Śākāla Saṃhitā" or some of its equivalents. See below.

adds that his (i.e. Vedamitra's) *ḍ* becomes *ḷ* when standing between two vowels, and his aspirated *ḍh* becomes *ḷh* in this situation; examples are *ilā*, *sālhā*, as well as *vīdvaṅga* when with an Avagraha (i.e., in the Padapāṭha: *vīlu'āṅga*). (RPr I.52 (53): *dvayoś cāsya svarayor madhyam etya saṃpadyate sa ḍakāro ḷakārah/ ḷhakāratām eti sa eva cāsya ḍhakārah sannūṣmaṇā saṃprayuktaḥ/ ilā sālhā cātra nidarśanāni vīdvaṅga ity etad avagraheṇa/*) This change of *ḍ* to *ḷ* and *ḍh* to *ḷh* characterizes our Ṛgveda, but is, apparently, not accepted by the author of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya.

RPr VI.1-13 (378-389) gives a detailed description of the circumstances in which doubling of consonants takes place. The Prātiśākhya then proceeds (sūtra VI.14 (390)): *saṃyuktaṃ tu vyañjanaṃ śākalena*. The commentator Uvaṭa (p. 200) gives two explanations of this sūtra. In the first one, a consonant which is connected with another one, which comes after a long vowel and is at the beginning of a word, is not doubled according to the precept of the Śākalas² (*saṃyuktaṃ vyañjanaṃ dīrghāt paraṃ na krāmati śākalena vidhānena/ ... padādir ity evānuvartate*). According to the second explanation of this sūtra, a consonant which is connected with another one is never doubled according to the precept of the Śākalas (*apare dīrghagrahaṇaṃ padādigrahaṇaṃ ca nānuvartayanti/ aviśeṣeṇa sarvatra śākalam icchanti*). The second interpretation seems to be the better one; it coincides with what we find in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. P. 8.4.51 reads: *sarvatra śākalyasya [yaro (45), dve (46), na (48)]* "In all [the contexts described in the preceding rules there is] no [substitution of] two [consonants] in the place of a consonant different from *h*, according to Śākalya."

The opinion here ascribed to the Śākalas is in agreement with our Ṛgveda, which does not contain doubled consonants in such contexts (Müller, 1869: CXIII). This opinion is again not shared by the author of the Prātiśākhya, who even considers absence of doubling a fault (RPr XIV.58 (816)).

RPr XI.17-19 (629-631) gives three opinions regarding the correct form of the Kramapāṭha on RV 8.70.9: *ud ū ṣu ṇo vaso* (see Müller, 1869: CCXXVIII; Uvaṭa, pp. 334-335). Sūtra XI.17 (629; *anantare trikramakāraṇe yadi tribhiś ca gārgyaḥ punar eva ca tribhiḥ*) gives the opinion of Gārgya; according to him the correct form is: *ud ū ṣu/ ū ṣu ṇaḥ*. Sūtra XI. 18 (630; *trisaṃgame pañcabhir ārsyānugrahaḥ*) mentions no name and favours acceptance of the whole row of five words *ud ū ṣu ṇo vaso* into the Kramapāṭha. Sūtra XI.19 (631; *catuḥkramas tv ācarito 'tra śākalaiḥ*), [79] finally, describes the practice of the Śākalas; they take four words into the Kramapāṭha: *ud ū ṣu ṇaḥ*. One gets the impression that sūtra XI.18 (630) expresses the view of the author of

² The word *śākala* could here be translated "of Śākalya" and "of the Śākalas". I choose for the second translation since Śākalya's opinion — as against the one of the Śākalas (see § 4, below) — is not always in agreement with our Ṛgveda. See Müller, 1869: 9 and § 4 below. It is true that on this particular point the Śākalas seem to be of one mind with Śākalya, as may follow from P. 8.4.51, to be mentioned presently.

the Prātiśākhya, not of some teachers (*eka ācāryāḥ*) as Uvaṭa (p. 334) has it. But this view is not in agreement with the present-day practice of the Vaidikas. Present-day practice is the same as what sūtra XI.19 (631) describes as the practice of the Śākālas: four words are taken into the Kramapāṭha. This I could ascertain by consulting Pandit Kinjawadekar Shastri in Poona, who has the Ṛgveda and its Pada- and Kramapāṭha committed to memory.

[The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya gives another detail regarding how the Śākālas recite the Kramapāṭha in sūtra XI.61 (673). The Śākālas, we here learn, never recite a word in their Kramapāṭha *upasthita* (merely followed by *iti*); instead they recite such a word *sthitopasthita* (followed by *iti*, after which the word itself is repeated), since only thus the word is seen as it is (*sthitisthitopasthitayoś ca dṛśyate padaṃ yathāvad vyayavad dhy upasthite/ kvacit sthitau caivam ato 'dhi śākalāḥ krame sthitopasthitam ācaranty uta/*). Uvaṭa (p. 360) gives as illustrations: *āraig ity āraik* (to RV 1.113.16), *sv iti su* (to RV 1.173.12), *prātar iti prātaḥ*. This also is in agreement with present-day practice, as I again learned from Pandit Kinjawadekar Shastri. This time, however, the practice of the Śākālas is not explicitly contrasted with the practice of others.]

According to RPr I.64 (65) the Śākālas show nasalization in the vowel of three mātrās which occurs in a pause, in order not to neglect the instruction of the teachers (*tat trimātre śākalā darśayanty ācāryaśāstrāparilopahetavaḥ*). This concerns the last word of RV 10.146.1, which the Śākālas read *vindatī3m* as does our Ṛgveda. The last part of the sūtra is not fully clear (cf. Müller, 1869: XXIII), but seems to contrast this sūtra with the preceding one. According to the preceding sūtra, the teachers say that the first eight vowels (i.e., *a ṛ i u e ai au*) are nasalized when they occur in a pause and are not pragrhya (RPr I.63 (64): *aṣṭāv ādyān avasāne 'pragrhyān ācāryā āhur anunāsikān svarān*). If the opinion of the teachers coincides with the opinion of the author of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya — which is likely (cf. Shastri, 1937: 154), but not fully certain — this is the fourth instance where the version of the Ṛgveda which agrees with the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya differs from the version known to us.

RPr IV.17 (236) gives the opinion of "some" (*eke*, RPr IV.16 (235)). According to them, when *t* or *n* is followed by *s*, *t* comes in between (*takāranakārayos tu āhuḥ sakārodayayor takāram*). This rule is followed in our Ṛgveda, as far as the sound *n* is concerned. Examples are: RV 2.1.15 *tān-t-saṃ*; 3.1.4 *avardhayan-t-subhagaṃ*; 3.2.10 *akṛṇvan-t-svadhitiṃ*. The version underlying the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya did not, to all appearances, insert *t* in these cases.

[80]

Some more deviations of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya from our Ṛgveda may be mentioned. RPr IV.36 (255) prescribes elision of visarjanīya before a spirant which is

itself followed by a voiceless consonant, also when the spirant is cerebralized (*ūṣmany aghoṣodaye lupyate pare nate 'pi*). This rule is normally not obeyed in our Ṛgveda. For example, RV 6.69.6 reads *samudraḥ sthaḥ* where we would expect *samudra sthaḥ* on the basis of this sūtra. Similarly, RV 5.59.1 reads *vaḥ spaḥ* instead of *va spaḥ*, RV 6.47.30 *niḥ ṣtanihi* instead of *ni ṣtanihi*.³ The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya does not give the opinion of others this time.

RPr IV.6 (225) tells us that according to all teachers the sound *m*, when followed by an explosive which has a different place of articulation, changes into the nasal which has the same place of articulation as that following consonant (*visthāne sparśa udaye makāraḥ sarveṣām evodayasyottamaṃ svam*). This rule is not followed in our Ṛgveda, witness RV 10.135.3 *yaṃ kumāra*, not *yañ kumāra*; 8.62.11 *ahaṃ ca*, not *ahañ ca*; 3.48.2 *taṃ te*, not *tan te*. Again no contrasting opinions are given.

RPr IV.7 (226) says that *m* before *y*, *l*, *v* which occur in the beginning of a word, becomes itself nasalized *ỵ*, *ḷ*, *ṿ* respectively (*antasthāsu⁴ rephavarjaṃ parāsu tāṃ tāṃ padādiṣv anunāsikāṃ tu*). Our Ṛgveda does not obey this rule: RV 2.25.1 reads *yaṃ yaṃ yujaṃ* instead of *yạỵ yạỵ yujaṃ*; 10.71.2 *bhadraiṣāṃ lakṣmīr* instead of *bhadraiṣạ̄ḷ lakṣmīr*; 6.48.14 *taṃ va* instead of *tạṿ va*.

According to RPr IV.8 (227), *n* becomes *ḷ*, when followed by *l*. Our Ṛgveda does not oblige, vide RV 2.12.4 *jigīvāṃ lakṣam* (Pp. *jigīvān*) instead of *jigīvạ̄ḷ lakṣam*.

2.2. On a number of occasions the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya talks about verses which do not occur in our Ṛgveda.

RPr XVIII.56 (1057) reads: *caturbhis tu paraṃ dvābhyāṃ tava svādiṣṭhā tacchamyoh* "But the verses *tava svādiṣṭhā ...* and *tacchamyoh ...* are with four, then with two [versefeet]." The first of these two verses is RV 4.10.5. The second does not occur in our Ṛgveda. It occurs in the Ṛgveda Khila (5.1.5 and 5.3.7) and reads there: *tacchamyor ā vṛṇīmahe gātuṃ yajñāya gātuṃ yajñapataye daivī svastir astu nas svastir mānuṣebhyaḥ/ ūrdhvaṃ jigātu bheṣajaṃ śan no astu dvipade śaṅ catuṣpade//*. (It is not clear how this verse is to be divided into six versefeet (cf. [81] Müller, 1869: CCCLIII).) We learn from the commentator Nārāyaṇa on Āśvalāyaṇa Gṛhya Sūtra 3.5.9 that it is the final verse of the Bāṣkala Saṃhitā (Scheftelowitz, 1906: 132; Müller, 1869: CCCLIII).

RPr XVII.45 (996) reads: *ekādaśaiva chandasi pādā ye ṣoḷaśākṣarāḥ/ sarve trikadrūkiyāsu nākule 'ṣṭādaśākṣarāḥ//* "There are eleven versefeet in the Sāṃhitā⁵ which

³ The rule of the Prātiśākhya is at least once obeyed in our Ṛgveda. RV 1.182.7 reads *niṣṭhito* for Pp. *niḥ'sthitaḥ*. More interesting is that the text of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya itself follows the rule (Shastri, 1959: 63).

⁴ Müller's edition reads *antaḥsthāsu*. See however note 3 above.

⁵ This translation of *chandasi* follows Uvaṭa (p. 484).

have sixteen syllables; they are all in the verses of the Trikadruga. There is a verse-foot of eighteen syllables in the hymn of Nakula." Our Ṛgveda contains no hymn that is ascribed to Nakula. Uvaṭa (p. 485) quotes in this connection the following line: *arcāmi satyasavaṃ ratnadhām abhi priyaṃ matiṃ kavim*. This occurs in the Ṛgveda Khila (3.22.4a).

RPr XVI.88-92 (947-951) deals with the Subheṣaja hymn, which does not occur in our Ṛgveda. The reading of sūtra XVI.92 (951) has been corrected by Scheftelowitz (1906: 125) and shown to be about Ṛgveda Khila 4.9.

RPr II.46 (150) refers to the verse *tena no 'dya ...* This is Ṛgveda Khila 5.1.3b, which reads: *tena nodya viśve devās sam priyām sam avivanan*.

The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhyā refers five times to verses which occur neither in our Ṛgveda nor in the Khilas known to us, viz., in sūtras XVI.19 (878), XVI.17 (876), V.24 (341), VII.33 (465), IX.11 (548); see Scheftelowitz, 1906: 18-19. Two of these five references can be traced in the Brāhmaṇas and Śrauta Sūtras of the Ṛgveda. RPr XVI.19 (878) uses the word *indra* to refer to a three-verse (*trc*) which, according to Uvaṭa (p. 445), begins thus: *indra juṣasva pravahā yāhi sūra harīha/pibā sutasya matir na madhvaś cakānaś cārur madāya//*. This section occurs at Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 4.1.2, Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa 17.1, Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra 6.3.1, and Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra 9.5.3. RPr V.24 (341) seems to refer to the line *te devāḥ parisvr̥teṣu eṣu lokeṣu* (Uvaṭa, p. 177). This is quoted at Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa 8.8.⁶

2.3. It is clear that the deviations of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhyā from our Ṛgveda described in § 2.1 constitute strong evidence that this Prātiśākhyā primarily deals with a version of the Ṛgveda which differed in some points from ours. The mention of other views which agree with our Ṛgveda indicates that the [82] author of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhyā was also, be it secondarily, familiar with our text.

It is not so certain what conclusions can be drawn from the fact that the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhyā refers to verses which do not occur in our Ṛgveda (§ 2.2, above). One might base oneself upon the hypothesis of Scheftelowitz (1906: 11-13) that all verses contained in the Ṛgveda Khila belonged to other Śākhās of the Ṛgveda, and argue that all the verses referred to in the Prātiśākhyā and not occurring in our Ṛgveda belonged to the Śākhā of the Prātiśākhyā. Many of these verses, as we have seen, do indeed occur in the Ṛgveda Khila, and some of the remaining ones are quoted in the ancillary literature, which also seems to agree with the thesis that they once belonged to at least some version of the Ṛgveda.

⁶ If RPr V.24 (341) is really about this line, then Keith's (1920: 396 n) proposal to read *parisvr̥teṣu* for *parisvr̥teṣu* is in conflict with the Prātiśākhyā, for the Prātiśākhyā prescribes that *s* will remain unchanged (*prakṛtyā*).

Unfortunately, it is far from certain that Scheftelowitz's hypothesis regarding the Khilas is correct (Renou, 1947: 21; Oldenberg, 1907: 217-235; Keith, 1907: 225-228). Moreover, we know that the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya does not limit its description to its own version of the Ṛgveda, for it gives information about our version of it. It is therefore conceivable that the Prātiśākhya also commented upon the phonetic shape of verses which did not occur in its own version of the Ṛgveda. We shall find evidence to show this assumption right.⁷

But if we cannot decide which is the Śākhā to which the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya primarily belongs on the basis of the verses it refers to, how can we come to know this Śākhā? The answer is easy: The Prātiśākhya tells us so itself.

3.1. The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya says in an introductory verse that it comments upon the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda (verse 7: *asya jñānārtham idam uttaratra vakṣye śāstram akhilaṃ⁸ śaiśirīye*).

Not much can be learned about the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda from the ancient literature. There is, however, one old work which professes to deal with this same version, viz. the Anuvākānukramaṇī. This work admonishes the Śākalas, in an introductory verse, to hear, in due order, of how many sūktas the anuvākas consist in the Ṛgveda, in the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā (verse 9: *ṛgvede śaiśirīyāyāṃ saṃhitāyāṃ yathākramam/ pramāṇam anuvākānāṃ sūktaiḥ śṛṇuta śākalāḥ*)). A perus[83]al of the Anuvākānukramaṇī brings to light two further differences between the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda and the one known to us. First, the Śaiśirīya version did not, apparently, contain the Vālahilya hymns (RV 8.49-59), for it counts 92, instead of 103, hymns in the eighth Maṇḍala (see verse 35: *dve caiva sūkte navatiṃ ca vidyād athāṣṭamaṃ ...*; cf. Macdonell, 1886: xv). [The Vālahilya hymns are none the less dealt with in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya (Müller, 1891: xlvi f.; Scheftelowitz, 1906: 18 (note that Khila 3.1-8 are the first 8 Vālahilya hymns, i.e., RV 8.49-56, and Khila 1.6 = RV 8.59); Oldenberg, 1907: 213). This shows again that the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya did not confine itself to what it found in its own Saṃhitā.] Second, the Anuvākānukramaṇī gives two different numbers of the verses contained in the Saṃhitā (Müller, 1860: 220-221; Macdonell, 1886: xvi; see also below). If we take the lowest number and compare this with the number of verses in our Ṛgveda, not counting the Vālahilya hymns, we come to the closest agreement possible, but are still left with 15 extra verses that were

⁷ Here it may be noted that RPr XVI.87-88 (946-947) seems to indicate that the Subheṣaja hymn did not belong to the ten Maṇḍalas (Oldenberg, 1907: 214). These sūtras read: *sarvā dāśatayīṣv etā uttarās tu subheṣaje* "All these metres are in the ten Maṇḍalas; the following ones, however, are in the Subheṣaja."

⁸ Oldenberg's (1907: 212) suggestion to understand *akhila* in the sense "die Khila übergehend", "was nicht Khila ist", seems belied by the circumstance that the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya draws the Vālahilya hymns into the discussion. See below.

apparently part of the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda (Oldenberg, 1888, 498-503, esp. 502).

One more peculiarity of the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda may have been the following. Verse 43 of the Anuvākānukramaṇī gives as the total number of verses 10580,5. The total number contained in vargas, on the other hand, is 10417 (verses 40-42). This leaves 163,5 verses that are not contained in vargas. The Anuvākānukramaṇī (verses 7, 17, 36, 39) makes a mention of Khilas and adds that for them no anuvākas are stated (verses 17 and 36; Oldenberg, 1907: 211 n). Probably also no vargas were stated for the Khilas, for the total number given in the Anuvākānukramaṇī agrees with the number found in our Ṛgveda (Oldenberg, 1888: 500; Keith, 1907: 228). This would mean that the Khilas referred to in the Anuvākānukramaṇī contained 163□ verses.

The Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and the Anuvākānukramaṇī together have brought to light the following distinguishing features of the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda. They are distinguishing in the sense that they are not present in our version of the Ṛgveda. If they were all simultaneously present in the Śaiśirīya Śākhā depends on the question how far this Śākhā remained unchanged in the period between the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and the Anuvākānukramaṇī. The features are:

- (i) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā did not contain the Vālahilya hymns (RV 8.49-59).
- (ii) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā did not contain the sounds *l* and *lh*.⁹
- (iii) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā doubled its consonants under the circumstances specified in RPr VI.1-13 (378-389).

[84]

- (iv) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā elided the visarjanīya before a spirant which is itself followed by a voiceless consonant.
- (v) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā did not insert *t* between *n* and *s*.
- (vi) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā had the nasal corresponding to the following explosive in the place of *m*.
- (vii) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā had *y*, *l*, *v* in the place of *m* before word-initial *y*, *l* and *v* respectively.
- (viii) The Kramapāṭha to RV 8.70.9 of the Śaiśirīya school contained the row of five words *ud ū ṣu ṇo vaso*, whereas the Kramapāṭha known to us has no more than four words: *ud ū ṣu ṇaḥ*.

Perhaps we may add:

- (ix) Vowels occurring in a pause, not being pragrhya, were nasalized, in the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā.

⁹ According to Lüders (1923: 298) the Kāṇva recension of the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā contained *l* and *lh*, whereas the Mādhyandina recension did not.

- (x) The Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā contained 15 verses more than our Saṃhitā (not counting the Vālahilya hymns).
- (xi) The Śaiśirīya Śākhā had Khilas, which contained 163,5 verses.

We note that the differences between the Śaiśirīya and the Śākala versions are no smaller than the ones which are known to exist between the Śākala and Bāṣkala versions (Renou, 1947: 20, 22; Oldenberg, 1888: 490 f.; Singh, 1975).

3.2. It is noteworthy that a large number of these characteristics, which differentiate the Śaiśirīya Śākhā from our version of the Ṛgveda, are found in the Ṛgveda Ms. from Kashmir, on the basis of which Scheftelowitz made his edition of the Khilas (1906), and of which he gave a fuller description later (1907). How much agreement exists between this Kashmir Ṛgveda (KRV) and the Śaiśirīya Śākhā may become clear when we go through the above enumerated points.

(i) The KRV does not contain the Vālahilya hymns; they are included in the Khilas (Scheftelowitz, 1920: 194 n; 1906: 35).

(ii) The KRV contains *l̥*, but not *lh* for which the Śāradā script (in which the Kashmir Ms. is written) has no sign.¹⁰

[85]

(iii) The KRV often doubles *t* and *dh* after a short vowel or anusvāra before *y* and *v* (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 112). This agrees with RPr VI.1 (378), which prescribes doubling of consonants which are initial in a group of consonants, after a vowel or anusvāra (*svārānusvāropahito dvir ucyate saṃyogādih sa kramo 'vikrame san*).

(iv) The KRV drops visarjanīya (or *s*) before *s* followed by a voiceless consonant. Examples of *s+st>st*, *s+sth>sth*, *s+sp>sp*, *s+sk>sk* can be found in Scheftelowitz, 1907: 104-105.

(v) The KRV does not insert *t* between *n* and *s* (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 118).

(vi) The KRV always has the nasal corresponding to the following explosive in the place of *m* (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 115-16).

(vii) The KRV writes *ṃvv* and *ṃyy* where *m* precedes *v* and *y* respectively, initial in a word; *m+l* and *n+l* become *ṃll* or *ṅll* (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 116). This seems closer to *ṽv*, *ṽy*, *ṽl* than what we find in our Ṛgveda (*ṃv*, *ṃy* and *ṃl* respectively).

¹⁰ That the Kashmir Ms. has a sign for *l̥* was pointed out to me by Dr. M. Witzel. It had not been noticed by Scheftelowitz (1906: 47). For the form of this sign see Renou & Filliozat, 1953: 692. The presence of *l̥* in the KRV may be due to śākalization, which also changed *d* into *l̥* in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya (see § 4, below). That the KRV considered itself to be the Śākala Saṃhitā (Scheftelowitz, 1906: 168) merely strengthens this supposition. Note that the orthography of the concluding portion of the Kashmir Ms. which contains this information "weicht ... schon ein wenig von den ihm vorangehenden vedischen Texten ab, indem *v* und *y* nach einem Anusvāra nicht verdoppelt werden. Ausl. *m* wird hier vor anl. Sibilant, h, r, Nasal, Palatal gewöhnlich zum Anusvāra" (Scheftelowitz, 1906: 167).

- (viii) About the Kramapāṭha of the KRV we have no information.
- (ix) Scheftelowitz, 1907 gives no information regarding nasalization of vowels in pausa;
- (x) nor about possible additional verses in the KRV.
- (xi) The KRV has Khilas, but the number of verses contained in them is greater than 163,5.

The agreement between the KRV and the Śaiśirīya Śākhā¹¹ is clearly great, but not complete. It cannot be explained by assuming that someone "improved" the text of the Ṛgveda on the basis of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya. Several circumstances exclude this possibility. The most important is perhaps that the KRV contains features which are characterized as faults (*doṣa*) in the Prātiśākhya. The KRV often contains single consonants where it should have two of them (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 105-107); this is a fault according to RPr XIV.16 (774) and XIV.58 (816). Further, at some points our Ṛgveda is in closer agreement with the Prātiśākhya than the KRV. RPr IV.18 (237) says that *c* is inserted to make *-ñ cch-* **according to some**. The Śaiśirīya Śākhā therefore probably had *-ñ ch-*, as has our Ṛgveda. The KRV, on the other hand, has *-ñ ch-* only when a vowel (or *r*) follows, [86] when a consonant follows it has *-ñ cch-* (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 120).

It is of some importance to note that the KRV is independent from the Padapāṭha. This appears most clearly from the deviant readings in the Vālakhilya hymns (Schroeder, 1898: 283; Scheftelowitz, 1906: 36-45), but also from those in the main body of the KRV (Scheftelowitz, 1907: 85-90).

The above suggests that the version of the Ṛgveda known from the Kashmir Ms. is closely related to, but not fully identical with, the version primarily described in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya. This latter version was compared with, and perhaps to some extent adjusted to, the Padapāṭha, which the former was apparently not. The two versions are so close that we are tempted to think that the KRV is a descendant of the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā, or perhaps both are descendants of a common ancestor.

(Caution is however required. Some (or even all) of the similarities between the KRV and the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā may be due to other factors. Witzel (1980: 45-46), for example, has argued that the absence of *t* between *n* and *s* (point (v) above) is a peculiarity of the Veda tradition of Kashmir: it is also found in the Kaṭha material from Kashmir and in the Kashmir Ms. of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. It might of course be maintained that this is explained by the fact that in Kashmir the prestigious Ṛgveda was preserved in the Śaiśirīya version which contained this feature. Alternatively, this

¹¹ Another Ṛgveda Ms. from Kashmir, discovered by M.A. Stein in 1896, shows striking similarities with the KRV, at least in points (iii), (iv), (vi) and (vii), and possibly in others (Dumont, 1962). Interestingly, this Ms. claims to belong to the Āśvalāyana Śākhā.

feature might have existed independently in the KRV and, say, the Kaṭha school. Witzel, however, thinks that it came about under the influence of the Kaṭha school. The case of *anunāsika* before *v, y, l* (point (vii) above) is similar; see Witzel, 1980: 21-22.)

3.3. There are some more works which claim to belong to the Śaiśirīya Śākhā. One of them is the Vikṛtivallī, which says of itself that "the eight *vikṛtis* (modified ways of recitation of the Veda, viz.,) *jaṭā* etc. are characterized, not too extensively, by the great Seer Vyādi, with respect to the Śaiśirīya text" (verse 4, p. 1: *śaiśirīye samāmnāye vyāḍinaiva maharṣiṇā/jaṭādyā vikṛtīr aṣṭau lakṣyante nātivistaram//*; note the "archaic" (?) Nom. Pl. *vikṛtīh!*). It seems that the author of the Vikṛtivallī blindly followed the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and Anuvākānukramaṇī in expressing its allegiance to the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā, for his Ṛgveda did not agree with what we know about the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā in at least one respect. In verse 13 we read: *ḍakārādividhānaṃ tat svarāntaḥparivartanam* "That rule regarding *ḍ* etc. is a change [which takes place when *ḍ* etc. are] between vowels." We know that in the Śākala Saṃhitā *ḍ* becomes *ḷ* when between two vowels, but not in the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā (§ 3.1, above). The Vikṛtivallī therefore deals either with the same version of the Ṛgveda as ours, or at best with a śākalized version of the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā. Mīmāṃsaka (1973: I: 278, 291) has argued [87] on other grounds that the Vikṛtivallī is a late work. See also Abhyankar-Devasthali, 1978: XIV-XV. This makes it all the more likely that this text concerns itself with our Ṛgveda.

The same is true of the Śaiśirīyaśikṣā. This treatise describes a Saṃhitā which knows the sounds *ḷ* and *ḷh* (here called *duṣprṣṭa*; see p. 2, l. 22) and prescribes insertion of *t* between *n* and *s* (p. 5, l. 96; p. 16, l. 307-08). In general it may be said that this Śikṣā follows the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya upon its heels.

4. What more do we know about the Śaiśirīya Śākhā of the Ṛgveda? Verse 9 of the Anuvākānukramaṇī (quoted above, § 3.1) suggests that there existed a close connection between the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā and the Śākalas. The same is done by verse 36, which reads: *tān pārāṇe śākale śaiśirīye vadaṃti śiṣṭā na khileṣu viprāḥ* "The learned Brahmins do not state those (i.e., anuvākas) in the Khilas in the Śākala, in the Śaiśirīya text." The most natural interpretation of this verse leads us to the assumption that the Śākala text and the Śaiśirīya text were one and the same. This assumption is in perfect agreement with verse 9, and is not contradicted by anything in the Anuvākānukramaṇī. It is not, however, in agreement with the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya. This Prātiśākhya, as we have seen (above, § 2.1), contrasts on three occasions its own view (which is the view of the Śaiśirīyas), with the view of the Śākalas. The views of these Śākalas are embodied in

our Ṛgveda, so that we have no reason to doubt that our Ṛgveda is the text of the Śākālas. And our Ṛgveda deviates in two further respects from the description of the Anuvākānukramaṇī (above, § 3).

We might try to interpret verses 9 and 36 in such a way that the Śaiśirīyas are a branch of the Śākala Śākhā. This interpretation would be in agreement with the Purāṇas, which tell us that Śākalya taught the Ṛgveda to five pupils, one of them being Śaiśiri or Śiśira (Sagar Rai, 1964: 101-105; Renou, 1947: 52-56). Unfortunately, our most ancient sources of information regarding the Śākhās of the Ṛgveda make no mention of such a subdivision of the Śākala, or indeed any other, Śākhā. They are Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (Vol. I, p. 9, l. 22) and the Mahābhārata (12.330.32). Also the Carañavyūha (1.5; p. 253) and the Carañavyūha contained in the Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda (49.1.6; Bolling-Negelein, 1909: 335) keep silence on this point. Moreover, this interpretation agrees as little with the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya as the former one. The account of the Purāṇas may have been an attempt to explain such passages as the two verses under discussion of the Anuvākānukramaṇī. Renou's (1947: 54-56) attempt to show the "well-foundedness of certain purāṇic traditions" (p. 54) may well have succeeded in doing the opposite: demonstrating on the basis of what meagre information the Purāṇas built their account. When, e.g., the [88] Bṛhaddevatā¹² (8.84-85) mentions the names of Baudhya and Māṭhara in a passage which deals with the Bāṣkala version of the Ṛgveda, and the Purāṇas make Baudhya and (Agni-)māṭhara into pupils of Bāṣkala, then the Purāṇas may very well have done so in order to explain this passage of the Bṛhaddevatā. We must, therefore, be careful with the use we make of the Purāṇic account of the Vedic schools.

We must also be careful not to draw conclusions from the fact that the only two commentators whose comments on the eighth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda have survived — Sāyaṇa and Venkaṭamādhava — failed to comment on sūktas 49-59, the Vālakhilya hymns, which were absent from the Śaiśirīya Saṃhitā. There is no reason to think that these hymns were late additions to the text.¹³ On the contrary, they are accompanied by a Padapāṭha, and belonged therefore — in spite of Scheftelowitz, 1920: 194-198 — to a version of the Ṛgveda even before the time of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya (see further Müller, 1891: xlvi f.).

Probably these commentators, too, were led astray by the Anuvākānukramaṇī, as were Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, who commented on the Sarvānukramaṇī (Müller, 1891: xlvi), and

¹² Renou (1974: 54), following Bhagavad Datta, reads BD 8.84 thus: *āśiṣo yogam etaṃ hi baudhyo 'rdharcena manyate* "telle est la combinaison de prière que vise Baudhya au moyen de cette demistrophe".

¹³ The great length of Adhyāya 6.4 (Roth, 1846: 34-36), which encompasses the Vālakhilya hymns, merely suggests that the division into Adhyāyas originally belonged to a Śākhā which did not contain the Vālakhilya hymns, possibly the Śaiśirīya Śākhā. This is confirmed by the fact that in the KRV the division into Adhyāyas is the main one (Scheftelowitz, 1906: 32-33).

perhaps the author of the Sarvānukramaṇī, seven of the nine Mss. of which used by Macdonell (1886: 30 n) leave out the Vālahilyas (Scheftelowitz, 1920: 194).

It seems that in the Anuvākānukramaṇī we are witnessing an attempt to unite the Śaiśirīya and the Śākala Śākhā of the Ṛgveda; more precisely, an attempt on the part of the Śaiśirīya Śākhā to be considered identical with, or part of, the Śākala Śākhā. This supposition, which solves the difficulty raised by the contradictory information provided by the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and the Anuvākānukramaṇī,¹⁴ is further supported by number of facts, which will now be discussed.

To begin with, both the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and the Anuvākānukramaṇī mention Śākalya. The Prātiśākhya gives the latter's opinion regarding certain matters in a number of sūtras. In one case Śākalya's opinion deviates from our Ṛgveda, i.e., in RPr IV.13 (232) (Renou, 1947: 22 n; Müller, 1869: 8).¹⁵ This suggests that the author [89] of the Prātiśākhya knew that Śākalya's opinion was not always identical with the opinion of the Śākalas,¹⁶ even though the latter derived their name from the former; "Śākalas" means "pupils of Śākalya" (*śākalyasya cchātrāḥ*), as Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (vol. II, p. 210, l. 7-8) tells us. In short, the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya presents us Śākalya as a historical person, who had had certain views. In the Anuvākānukramaṇī, on the other hand, Śākalya is promoted to the rank of having seen the Veda (verse 45). This indicates that the Anuvākānukramaṇī is later than the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya, farther removed in time from Śākalya; it further suggests why the Śākala Śākhā could absorb the Śaiśirīya Śākhā; if the Veda had been seen by Śākalya, only the Śākalas, Śākalya's followers, could be in possession of the correct form of the Veda.

¹⁴ It also explains why the KRV claims to belong to the Śākala Śākhā.

¹⁵ Also from Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī we learn that Śākalya's opinion did not always agree with our Ṛgveda (Geldner, 1901: 145); similarly from the Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya (Weber, 1858: 72-73).

¹⁶ It seems that also the later tradition discovered the disagreement between Śākalya and the Śākalas. They solved it (or so it seems) by calling the final redactor of the Ṛgveda "Śākala" instead of "Śākalya", as he is called in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (vol. I, p. 347, l. 3). Müller (1860: 237) cites a verse from Śaḍguruśiṣya's commentary on Kātyāyana's Sarvānukramaṇī, which reads: *śākalasya samhitāikā bāṣkalasya tathāparā* "There was one Śākhā of Śākala, another of Bāṣkala" (tr. Müller, 1869: 232). The author of the Vikṛtivallī (supposedly Vyāḍi) says: *namāmi śākalācāryaṃ śākalyaṃ sthaviraṃ tathā*. This can mean either of two things: "I bow to the teacher Śākala and to the old Śākalya"; or: "I bow to [Śākalya] the teacher of the Śākalas, and to the old Śākalya". The second interpretation is closer to the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya, which seems to distinguish between Śākalya and the old Śākalya. The commentator Gangādhara Bhaṭṭācārya, nevertheless, chooses in his Vikṛtikaumudī for the first interpretation (p. 6). On p. 7, moreover, he quotes some verses (reproduced below, § 4) which speak of Śākala and his five pupils. Renou (1947: 24b) mentions another occurrence of the personal name "Śākala".

Śākalya is again mentioned on several other occasions in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya. In RPr III.13 (199) he is made to uphold the view that in the case of Praśleṣa sandhi of two short vowels *i*, and in the case of Kṣaipra and Abhinihita sandhi, the resulting vowel gets svarita accent, if the first of the two vowels was udātta (*ikārayoś ca praśleṣe kṣaiprābhinihiteṣu ca/ udātapūrvarūpeṣu śākalyasyaivam ācaret//*). This agrees with our Ṛgveda. On three other occasions it is not possible to decide on agreement or otherwise. RPr II.81 (185) and III.22 (208) give Śākalya's opinion on details of pronunciation which are not reflected in writing. (The former of these two sūtras speaks of the "old Śākalya" (*śākalyasya sthavirasya*), which leaves us in doubt if not someone else is meant.) RPr XII.31 (739) merely tells us in what sense the teachers Vyāli, Śākalya and Gārgya used the term *samāpādyā*. RPr IV.4-5 (223-224), finally, ascribe opinions to Śākalya's father, which agree with our Ṛgveda.

Secondly, the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya mentions many authorities, the Anuvākānukramaṇī knows only of two Śākhās. Müller (1860: 142-143) gives the following list of authorities met with in the Prātiśākhya: Ānyatareya,¹⁷ Gārgya, Pañcālas, Prācyas, [90] Bābhavya, Māṇḍūkeya, Yāska, Vedamitra, Vyāli, Śākaṭāyana, Śākala, Śākalya, Śākalya-pitr (sthavira), Śaunaka (?). The Śākalas represent, to all appearances, the version of the Ṛgveda known to us.¹⁸ Vedamitra is mentioned once and seems to be one of the Śākalas (see § 2.1, above).¹⁹ Māṇḍūkeya is, as his name suggests, to be connected with the Māṇḍūkāyanas, who had an own version of the Ṛgveda according to the Caraṇavyūha (1.5; p. 253). Behind one or more of the other names may hide representatives of the Bāṣkala Śākhā, because the Prātiśākhya refers to a verse which we only know to have been part of the Bāṣkala Saṃhitā (§ 2.2, above). The Anuvākānukramaṇī, on the other hand, makes only mention of the Śākalas and the Bāṣkalas (verses 21 and 36), and of course the Śaiśirīyas, but these last as identical with, or perhaps a subdivision of, the Śākalas. It is, of course, possible that the author of the Anuvākānukramaṇī simply had no urge or occasion to vent his knowledge regarding the other Śākhās. More likely seems that the process of absorption and identification had considerably reduced the number of Śākhās.

The last fact which supports the thesis that the Śaiśirīya Śākhā was absorbed by the Śākala Śākhā is perhaps the most striking of all. We know that the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya is against the substitution of *l* for *ḍ* in its own Śākhā (§ 2.1, above). But the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya itself shows this forbidden feature (Shastri, 1959: 63)! The sound *l* occurs in quotations as well as outside them, as follows. In quotations: RPr II.71 (175) *ratholha*; 72 (176) *vīlū*; IV.49 (268) *ilāyāḥ*, *ilaḥ*; V.55 (371) *dūlabha*; 59 (375) *heḷaḥ*; VII.19 (451) *mṛlayadbhyām*; 33 (465) *mṛla*, *ilīṣva*; VIII.34 (521) *mṛlayantaḥ*; 35 (522) *mṛlayā*; XI.40 (652) *dūlabha*; XVI.17 (876) *vīlitaḥ*; 73 (932) *krīlan*; XVIII.53 (1054) *īle*. Not in quotations: the word *vyāli* occurs 5 times (RPr III.23 (209); 28 (214); VI.46 (419); XIII.31 (739); 37 (745)), *ṣal* followed by a vowel 9 times (RPr IX.35 (572); XVI.11 (871); 13 (872); 16 (875); 23 (882); 28 (887); 34 (892); 35 (894); 75 (934)),

¹⁷ Müller writes sometimes "Ānyatareya" (1860: 142), sometimes "Anyatereya" (1869: LXVII). The commentator on Caturādhyāyikā 3.75 speaks about an "Ānyatareya" (Whitney, 1862: 174).

¹⁸ This follows from the passages collection in § 2.1, above, and from the fact that the other opinions ascribed to the Śākalas in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya nowhere conflict with our Ṛgveda. The remaining passages which use the word *śākala* are as follows. RPr I.75 (76) mentions in passing that the particle *u* is nasalized and lengthened, according to the Śākalas (or Śākalya; Uvāṭa (p. 53) explains *śākalena* as *śākalena matena*) in the Padapāṭha (*ukāraś cetikaranena yukto rakto 'ṛkto drāghitaḥ śākalena*). RPr VI.20 (396) ff. ascribe some particular kind of pronunciation to the Śākalas, which it is hard to check against existing practice (assuming that such niceties of pronunciation remained unchanged, which is not certain). RPr XI.21 (633) speaks about a *śākaḷam* which people often remember/cite (*smaranti*) regarding the correct recitation of the Kramapāṭha. Uvāṭa (p. 337) explains this word as *śākalavidhānam* "precept of the Śākalas/Śākalya"; Müller translates "Śākala-Lehrbuch".

¹⁹ The Purāṇas identify Vedamitra (sometimes called "Devamitra") with Śākalya (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 3.4.20; Vāyu Purāṇa 1.60.63; Bhāgavata Purāṇa 12.6.57; all quoted in Sagar Rai, 1964: 98-100). They may have based this identification on the mention of Vedamitra in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya.

pīlana 4 times²⁰ (RPr XIV.3 (761); 11 (769); 17 (775); 29 (787)), *ṣolaśa* 3 times (RPr XVII.44 (995); 45 (996); XVIII.54 (1055)), *vrīlana*¹⁹ (RPr XIV.6 (764)), and *kṣveḷana*¹⁹ (RPr XIV.20 (788)), each once. [91] The quoted word *niṣṣāt* followed by *avikramā* becomes *niṣṣāl* in RPr XIV.36 (794). The Prātiśākhya of the Śaiśirīya Śākhā is thus adjusted to the Śākala Śākhā.

5. So there is reason to believe that the Śaiśirīya Śākhā was once an independent branch of the Ṛgveda and disappeared completely as the result of a process of absorption and identification. The last step of this process is taken in the *Anuvākānukramaṇī*, which virtually denies the existence of an independent Śaiśirīya Śākhā. An earlier step was taken in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya, in that it commented, not only on the Śaiśirīya version of the Ṛgveda, but simultaneously also on other versions. Traces of the former existence of the Śaiśirīya Śākhā we find in the refusal of the commentators to comment on the Vālahilya hymns, and in the Purāṇic accounts. There is, however, no reason to think that these later authors had access to important sources of information regarding the Śaiśirīya Śākhā beyond what they found in the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and the *Anuvākānukramaṇī*.

The absorbing Śākhā is here the Śākala Śākhā. It seems likely that the absorbing force of the Śākala Śākhā increased as the sanctity of Śākalya grew.

It is interesting that the same absorbing force of the Śākala Śākhā shows itself in the work of a much later author, this time with respect to the Bāṣkala Śākhā, the only other Śākhā which survived for some time besides the Śākala Śākhā (Renou, 1947: 20). Gangādhara Bhaṭṭācārya's *Vikṛtikaumudī*, commenting on the *Vikṛtivallī* (1.4) ascribed to Vyādi, contains these two verses (p. 7; quoted by Bhagwaddatta (1920: 3)):

*śākalasya śataṃ śiṣyā naiṣṭhikabrahmacāriṇaḥ/
pañca tatra gr̥hasthās te dharmiṇas ca kuṭumbinaḥ//
śaiśiro bāṣkalaḥ śāṅkho²¹ vātsyaś caivāśvalāyanah/
pañcaite śākalāḥ śiṣyāḥ śākhābheda pravartakāḥ//*

[92]"Śākala²² had hundred pupils, perfect brahmacārins. Five among them were householders, and virtuous heads of a family: Śaiśira, Bāṣkala, Śāṅkha, Vātsya and Āśvalāyana. These five pupils of Śākala produced the differences between the Śākhās."

Clearly this account of the origin of the Śākhās is influenced by the Purāṇas (cf. Sagar Rai, 1964: 102-105). But here we find among Śākala's pupils also Bāṣkala mentioned!

²⁰ Müller's (1869) edition writes *pīdana*, *vrīdana*, and *kṣvedana*, but has *l* in all the other cases.

²¹ The edition reads *sāṅkhyo*. Another edition — without title page, but apparently edited by Satya Vrata (Śarman or Bhaṭṭācārya?) and published by the Satya Press, Calcutta, 1890 — has *śāṅkho*, which must be preferred on account of its relatedness to *śāṅkhāyana*.

²² On Śākala see note 15, above.

In other words, the Bāṣkala Śākhā is here not represented as an independent Śākhā, but as a subdivision of the Śākala Śākhā!

It is tempting to think that this process of absorption and unification existed already before the time of the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya and is ultimately responsible for the fixed form which characterizes our Ṛgveda, down to the minutest details. If this is true, we shall have to abandon the idea that the Śākhās of the Ṛgveda all presuppose a finally redacted text of the same (Renou, 1947: 21, 35). On the contrary, the final redaction will then have to be considered the final outcome of this process. In another article (Bronkhorst, 1981) I have produced evidence which supports this point of view.

[93]

REFERENCES

- Abhyankar, K. V. & Devasthali, G. V. (1978): *Vedavikṛtilakṣaṇa-Saṃgraha*. (A collection of twelve tracts on Vedavikṛtis and allied topics.) Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Research Unit Publications, No. 5.)
- Anuvākānukramaṇī*. Edited, with Ṣaḍguruṣiṣya's commentary, by A. A. Macdonell. See Macdonell, 1886.
- Āsvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*. Edited, with Gārgya Nārāyaṇa's commentary, by Rāmanārāyaṇa Vidyāratna and Ānandachandra Vedāntavāgīśa. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press. 1869.
- Bhagwaddatta (1920): *Lectures on the Rigveda*. Part I. Lahore: The Research Department D.A.V. College.
- Bhandarkar, R. G. (1893): "The relations between the Sūtras of Āsvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana and the Śākala and Bāṣkala Śākhās of the Ṛiksamhitā." *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*. Vol. I. Pp. 411-420. Kraus Reprint. Nendeln/Liechtenstein. 1968.
- Bolling, George Melville & Negelein, Julius von (ed.)(1909): *The Parisīṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*. Volume I. Part I. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Bṛhaddevatā*. Edited and translated by Arthur Anthony Macdonell. 2 Parts. Second issue. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1965.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981): "The orthoepic diaskeuasis of the Ṛgveda and the date of Pāṇini." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 23, 83-95.
- Caranavyūha*. Edited by Albrecht Weber. *Indische Studien* 3 (1855), 247-283.
- Dumont, P.-E. (1962): "The manuscript of the Ṛgveda of the M.A. Stein collection." *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society. (American Oriental Series, Volume 47.) Pp. 51-55.
- Gaṅgādhara Bhattācārya: *Vikṛtikaumudī*. = Abhyankar-Devasthali, 1978: 4-22.
- Geldner, Karl F. (1901): "Śākalya." In: *Vedische Studien*, von Richard Pischel und Karl F. Geldner. Dritter Band. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. Pp. 144-146.
- Kanta, Surya (ed.)(1933): *Rktantram*. Delhi: Meherchand Lachhmandas. 1970.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale (1907): Review of Scheftelowitz, 1906. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1907), 224-229.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale (1920): *Rigveda Brāhmanas. The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmanas of the Rigveda*. Translated from the original Sanskrit. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Lüders, Heinrich (1923): "Zur Geschichte des I im Altindischen." *ANTIDWPON* (Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel). Pp. 294-308. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony (ed.)(1886): *Kātyāyana's Sarvānukramaṇī* etc. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[94]

- Mahābhārata. Śāntiparvan.* Mokṣadharmā pt. 3. Edited by S. K. Belvalkar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1953.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (1973): *Samkṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa.* Parts I-III. Sonapat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. Samvat 2030.
- Müller, F. Max (1860): *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.* Second Edition, Revised. London-Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.
- Müller, F. Max (1869): *Rig-Veda-Pratisakhya, das älteste Lehrbuch der vedischen Phonetik.* Sanskrittext mit Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Müller, F. Max (1891): *Vedic Hymns.* Part I. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1964.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (1888): *Die Hymnen des Rigveda. Band I. Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena.* Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (1907): Review of Scheftelowitz, 1906. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 169, 210-241.
- Patañjali: *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya.* Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. 3 volumes. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.
- Renou, Louis (1947): *Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Renou, Louis, & Filliozat, Jean (1953): *L'Inde classique.* Tome II. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Rgveda Khila.* Use has been made of the edition in Scheftelowitz, 1906.
- Rgveda-Prātisākhya.* 1. Edited, with Uvaṭa's commentary, by Mangal Deva Shastri. Volume II. Allahabad: The Indian Press. 2. See Müller, 1869.
- Roth, Rudolph (1846). *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda.* Stuttgart: A. Liesching & Comp.
- Roth, Rudolph (1852): *Jaska's Nirukta sammt den Nighaṇṭavas.* Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung.
- Sagar Rai, Ganga (1964): "Śākhās of the Ṛgveda as mentioned in the Purāṇas." *Purāṇa* 6, 97-112.
- Śaiśirīyaśikṣā.* Edited by Tarapada Chowdhury. *Journal of Vedic Studies.* Vol. 2 No. 1 (April, 1935), pp. 197-216 (i-ii, 1-18).
- Scheftelowitz, J. (1906): *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda.* Breslau: M. & H. Marcus.
- Scheftelowitz, J. (1907): "Zur Textkritik und Lautlehre des Rgveda." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 21, 85-142.
- Scheftelowitz, J. (1920): "Die Stellung der Suparṇa- und Vālakhilya-Hymnen im Rgveda." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 74, 192-203.
- [95]
- Schroeder, L. v. (1898): "Der Rigveda bei den Kathas." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 12, 277-288.
- Shastri, Mangal Deva (1937): *The Rgveda-Prātisākhya with the Commentary of Uvaṭa.* Volume III. English translation of the text, additional notes, several appendices and indices. Lahore: Moti Lal Banarsi Das.
- Shastri, Mangal Deva (1959): *The Rgveda-Prātisākhya with the Commentary of Uvaṭa.* Volume I. Introduction, original text of the Rgveda-Prātisākhya in stanza-form, supplementary notes and several appendices. Varanasi: Vaidika Svādhyāya Mandira.
- Singh, A. D. (1975): "Bāṣkala Samhitā of the Rgveda." *Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)* 25, 111-115.
- Sköld, Hannes (1926): "Was the Rik Prātisākhya a work of the Śākalas?" *Papers on Pāṇini.* Pp. 42-46. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Uvaṭa: *Prātisākhyaḥ.* See *Rgveda-Prātisākhya.*
- Vyādi: *Vikṛtivallī.* = Abhyankar-Devasthali, 1978: 1-3.
- Weber, Albrecht (1858): "Das Vājasaneyi-Prātiçākhyam." *Indische Studien* 4, 65-171 & 177-331.

- Whitney, William D. (1862): *The Atharva-Veda Prātiśākhya or Śaunakīya Caturādhyāyikā*. Text, translation and notes. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1962.
- Witzel, Michael (1980): "Die Katha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad und ihr Verhältnis zur Śikṣā-Vallī der Taittirīya-Upaniṣad." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 24, 21-82.

ABBREVIATIONS

BD	Bṛhaddevatā
KRV	Kashmir Ṛgveda
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra
Pp.	Padapāṭha
RPr	Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya
RV	Ṛgveda