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In two preceding papers¹, a case has been made for the existence of various old Indo-Aryan (OIA), notably Vedic, dialects which are different from the other forms of OIA, such as that of Panini and his North-Western bhasa². These post-Rgvedic dialects can first be noticed in Kurukṣetra and its surroundings and later on in all of Northern India, from the Beas in E. Panjab to the borders of Bengal. They show, in spite of the seemingly uniform nature of Vedic that has been transmitted by the texts, a large number of divergencies, some of which can be linked to the various earliest attested Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA) dialects³.

In order to reach even these preliminary results, it was necessary to establish (1) the homelands of the various Vedic texts, and (2) to provide a time frame for them, at least one of relative chronology. This was attempted in the two earlier articles mentioned above (see note 2).⁴

Just as Epic Sanskrit or Buddhist MIA, the Vedic speech of the Brähmana caste was a Koine used and understood in all of Northern India, from Madra (Panjab) in the West to Videha (Bihar) in the East, and up to Vidarbha (Berar, N. Maharashtra) in the South. It was divided⁵ into some major dialects, mainly the following three: those of the Kuru, the Pañcāla, and the Easterners (pracyya). The land of Kosala, situated between the Eastern and the Pañcāla dialects, and the large Southern (daksinatya) fringe of Vedic India, (i.e. Alwar, Baghelkand, Bun-
M. WITZEL

delkhand, Malwa/Avanti), were areas of transition which shared some of the features of the neighboring dialects.

Each one of the Vedic schools (śākha), by whom the various texts have been orally transmitted to this day, and since the middle ages also in writing, originated in a certain limited geographical area of Northern India. At first, the school in question continued to exist there, though it subsequently have spread to other, often distant parts of the subcontinent. Each school acquired, by and large, the grammatical features of the dialect of its original homeland. This took place before the texts of this particular śākha were collected and fixed phonetically and textually, and before they underwent their final redaction towards the end of the Vedic period. Therefore influences from the area to which the school moved only in post-Vedic times are no longer reflected in the features of the texts of the school.

When studying such school peculiarities, however, one always has to take into account two contradicting developments: on one hand, the normalizing tendency of the Brahmanical North Indian Koine as well as the redactional activities of the late Vedic redactors of the school in question, both of which blurred some of the local features. On the other hand, there are the frequently failing attempts of the local Brahmanical authors to use “high” Vedic Sanskrit. However, their ‘local color’ usually shows,—which is, of course, not an unwelcome feature as it helps to investigate the background of each text.

In the present article, and in others to come, I propose to elaborate further on this set of problems and I will try to delineate the general pattern and the main features of the dialect spread of Vedic India and their relation to the Vedic Koine; in addition, I propose to add, consecutively, more detailed examples from the very large number of available, though not always readily or easily accessible data in order to enlarge upon the general picture briefly described above.

It also will be necessary to expand the present, still somewhat simplified way of presentation which is, in this paper as well, mainly statistical. It would be useful, for example, to undertake some more detailed comparisons of the usage of certain grammatical categories in the texts, taking into account the actual text passages. This would, however, lead too far in the present context. It would also be illuminating to study the actual syntactical use of a particular particle and its various combinations with other particles in parallel or similar texts of the same relative age and the same or adjacent geographical areas,—for example the use u in “South-Eastern” texts such as ŠBK:: ŠBM:: VādhB:: JB, etc. One could then ask some questions as the following: Is there a difference in meaning in parallel sentences of related texts, with or without u, or is there no difference in meaning any more during this comparatively late Vedic period? Is u facultative in the
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late Brāhmaṇa period only in South-Eastern texts? Or, if not, by which particle can it be substituted?\(^{(1)}\)

In addition, more attention could be paid to the various stylistic levels of Vedic within each dialect and historical level. For example, it may be instructive, as far as Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa prose are concerned, to compare the features of the "didactic" theological explanations of the ritual with those of the language of the myths.\(^{(2)}\) One could also compare both types of prose with the direct speech that is reported in the texts.\(^{(3)}\)

**TYPICAL ŚĀKHĀ DIFFERENCES**

§1. Sandhi of -o/au + vowel

The Sandhi peculiarity to be studied first tends to reconfirm some of the conclusions made earlier (see "Tracing the Vedic dialects") on points of phonetics and flexion. It is well known, of course, that the various śākhās disagree on minor points of vowel Sandhi. One of these cases, though little noticed as far as its usefulness in ascribing certain texts to a particular school is concerned, is the Sandhi of final -o/-au and initial vowel.\(^{(4)}\)

The various texts\(^{(5)}\) have the following Sandhi forms:\(^{(6)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RV</th>
<th>-o: -a u-</th>
<th>PS -a u-(^{(7)})</th>
<th>ŠS -a V-</th>
<th>(SVK = RV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-au: -a u-</td>
<td>-a u-(^{(8)})</td>
<td>-a V-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVPrät.(^{(9)})</td>
<td>=AVPrät.(^{(10)})</td>
<td>=ŚaunPrät.(^{(11)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-a u(^{-22})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>-a V-</td>
<td>-āv V-</td>
<td>-ā V-</td>
<td>-av V-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ā u(^{-23})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>-a V-</td>
<td>-ā V-</td>
<td>-āv V-</td>
<td>-av V-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TS -āv V-</td>
<td>VSK -a V-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=VPrät.(^{(12)})</td>
<td>VSM -āv V-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpS</td>
<td>-au V-(^{-24})</td>
<td>TPrät. -a V-</td>
<td>-ā V-</td>
<td>-a u-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-āv V-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ā V-(^{-25})</td>
<td>-āu V-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>-a u-</td>
<td>ŠBK(^{26}) -a V-</td>
<td>ŠBM -āv V-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ā u-(^{-27})</td>
<td>-āv V-</td>
<td>-ā V-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-āv V-(^{-28})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>-a V-</td>
<td>KB -a u-</td>
<td>-ā V-</td>
<td>AŚ -āv V-(^{-29})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ā V-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JB -a V-</th>
<th>-āu V-(^{30})</th>
<th>-ā u-</th>
<th>AĀ 5 -ā u-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Some examples:
PSOr\(^{31}\) 10.9.10  
PSK  
PS 18.64.6  
RV 10.14.12  
AVŚ 18.2.13  
TĀ 6.3.2  
ĀśvŚS 6.10.20

Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
-āv & \text{ voc.} \quad -ā u- \\
-āv & \text{ voc.} \quad -āu u-
\end{align*}
\]

RV, ĀśvŚS.  
ŚS, TĀ;

\(āgnā, agni\, carati\)  
\(āgnā\)  
\(saha\, nā\, avatam\)

At first view, it is remarkable that MS and KS, the two oldest existent YV Samhitās, agree with each other also in this peculiarity. Both texts share many other unusual traits not found in other texts,—note that they do not possess a Prātiṣākhya or Śikṣā, and have been transmitted during the Middle Ages in areas of India which are quite distant from each other, namely in Gujarāt/N. Maharashtra and Kashmir.\(^{34}\) Mutual influence during the last one, or probably even two millennia thus is to be excluded.\(^{35}\) This indicates that the Sandhi forms of these two texts could be a trait going back to the period of their text formation\(^{36}\) or, at least, to the time preceding their redaction. This Sandhi thus represents an old Western feature, in other words: the Kuru dialect.

It is notable that, as so frequently, the Kāṇyas follow this Western trait, although they are wedged in between the Central (Taittirīya=Pañcāla) and Eastern (Mādhyaandina=Videha) dialects. As we know that the Kāṇyas ultimately came from a more Western area,\(^{37}\) the conservation of this Kuru Sandhi is another indication that it is of considerable antiquity.

The Taittirīyas have undergone a separate development which, interestingly, is not followed by the Jaiminiyas (or their predecessors, the Śātyāyanis), nor by the Kauśitakis who reside in the same area, the Pañcāla land. The “Taittirīya” form of this Sandhi is thus limited to YV texts only.

More interestingly, the Mādhy. Vājasaneyins stand quite apart from all the forms mentioned so far, but are in part joined by the Śākala Rigveda and all of the texts of the Aitareya school, even their older parts (AB 1–5). Viewed against the background sketched above,\(^{38}\) this is of extreme interest. It is obvious that the RV
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in its present Śākalya form was redacted, grammatically analyzed, and put into the new Padapāṭha form by Śākalya, and thus is comparatively late (i.e. of the late Br. period). Secondly, the present Padapāṭha text shares the Central North Indian development of the fem. gen. in -ai which by this time had spread to the East (ŚBM, VSM). It is not entirely surprising that Śākalya’s Padapāṭha, having been composed at the same time as parts of ŚB, also possesses the Eastern (Vāj.) form of the vowel Sandhi discussed here.

It is, however, quite instructive to compare this grammatical feature with the evidence for an Eastern movement of the Ṛgvedins by the time of Janaka of Videha (the Mahājanaka of the Pāli texts) and with the ‘sudden’ appearance of Vidagdha Śākalya and other Kuru-Pañcāla Brahmins at his court (BĀU 3, ŚB 11). Although Śākalya’s RV school of the Aitareyas originally stemmed from the West, and pertains, e.g., to the -l- zone, the evidence contained in the stories of ŚB and BĀU indicates that he redacted his RV in the East (or brought it, in more or less finished form, from further West) and partly adjusted it to local Sandhi norms. That the Śākalya RV was not the one originally found in the East is further underlined by the peculiarity reported at ŚB (Mādhy.) 11.5.1.10. According to this text, the Purāṇāvas hymn of the RV had 15 and not, as in the Śākalya RV, 18 stanzas. The theory, delineated above, of an import of the Śākalya RV from the West thus agrees with a feature found in the text itself.

If this were not the case, we must posit a Sandhi of the Ṛgvedic schools which was uniform from the Panjab (AB 1–5) via Pañcāla (KB) to the East, where it either coincided with the local version (as represented by ŚB 11.5.10 sq.), or where this Sandhi trait was taken over from, or adopted by, the Vājasaneyins. The latter case would be more likely as we have seen that their Śāhī has been extracted secondarily from ŚB and has (re-) gained the older, Ṛgvedic (Kuru) type accentuation it had lost in the East. Note, however, that the Kāṇyas, who usually try to conform to the well-known (Śākalya) RV as far as possible, do not follow suit here. The course of events, therefore, must have conformed to the scenario described above: import of the Śākalya (Aitareya) version of the RV from the West (Kurukṣetra and the lands west of it), and redaction of this Śākalya RV in the East by Śākalya, in the Vājasaneyi territory (Videha).

It is also notable that the Western trait of -l- for old intervocalic -d-, which originated in the Kuru territory with the Kaṭha and Aitareya schools and is thus also expected for a Śākalya text, has been retained in Śākalya’s RV as a characteristic, probably in order to distinguish his text from the local RV (as exemplified by the Purāṇāvas hymn of the Eastern RV).

The matter becomes even more involved when we take into account the teach-
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ings of the Prātiṣākhyas and of Pāṇini on this subject. According to Pāṇ. 8.3.19, Śākalya would have read, for example, asa adityah. This is not what we get in our present RV as well as in the RVPrāt. which teach the well-known forms such as asav adityah, also taught by Pāṇini at 8.3.17 (probably his own rule), cf. Tracing, p. 188.

It seems that the “Śākalya” of Pāṇini still is more “Western” (=KS, MS) then the one we have in the present RV/RVPrāt. Note also that Śākalya basically produced a Padapāṭha and probably not the Saṃhitāpāṭha as such, which he must have imported from the West (in a form phonetically slightly different from our present one, of course). Our present Śākala RV thus is comparatively late and Eastern, and akin to Aitareya Āraṇyaka which teaches some rules about RV pronunciation and adheres to the same Sandhi (-as voc. etc.) as found in our Śākala RV and in RV-Prāt. Note, however, that AĀ 5 (a Sutra style text dealing with the Mahāvrata) does not follow this Sandhi rule. —To the same group of texts as our present Śākala RV belongs, as far as the Sandhi discussed above is concerned, the PS as it has come down to us. One may suppose that it has been exported, along with other Kuru texts, to the East and received its final reaction there, in Videha, together with the RV. This type of Sandhi influenced many other Vedic texts as well (see the table, above). The East and especially Videha, in the time of Janaka, seems to have been the area where many Vedic texts were collected and redacted.49) If this is correct, it would also explain why Pāṇini often refers to the “Easterners” when rules of Sandhi etc. are concerned but that does not know, or rather does not want to accept as authority the Vedic texts of the East such as ŚB, etc.

Note finally, that the Kāpiṭṭhalas stand apart, though they are a branch of the Kaṭhas, and were situated, according to Megasthenes/Arrian, roughly in the same area as the Kaṭhas, though somewhat more to the west of Kurukṣetra, at the confluence of the Panjab rivers. Although they have, like the Kāṇvas, undergone heavy influence by the RV they did adopt the Sandhi norms of the Taittiriya school.50)

Excursus:

The case of PS needs special discussion as the text has not been edited satisfactorily so far:

The sandhi of -o: -a u- is found, for example, at:
4.34.4a pra sumatim savitar vāya hitaye41);
19.17.13b uṣena vāya udakenehi;
20.7.8a dīva vīṣṇā55) uta va pṛthivyā.
However, -o a- is found occasionally.55)
The cases of -o before other vowels are represented, as expected, by -av:

2.28.5b bharadvṣo madhav annam kṝntu
4.12.4a eko bhaṁām asi manyau idita
6.16.3a upā naḥ pitaḥ ā gahi
7.19.6a yadā pilav āṅgirasa.

There is, however, also one case of -o → -a.55) The sandhi of -au is easily divided into the two categories mentioned above: -ā before u/ā and -av before other vowels:

16.15.8d stṛ ca punāṁ ca ta ubhāv arasa;
19.52.9a urāṣṭṛav āsirṛāḥ udumbarau;
1.60.2b sāsahai śvasurā ubhau;
9.5.5d kim ārā pādā ucye;
16.105.4b ubhā ugrau carato viṛyāya;

The Sandhi of -āv + vowel is very common (here follows a small extract only):

1.4.6b yaḍ vastāv adhi samīrutam
4.37.2b yau viḍītāv iṣubhṛtām asiṣṭhau
5.18.3a dvāv imau vātau vāta
6.6.8b nyanjandi madhāv adhi
10.1.6a yaś cāsāv ahavir gṛhaḥ
17.29.9a yau asya pūrṇapādu tāu pūrṇapākyau
18.30.1c vāsantaḥ enam māsau pracyā dīśo gopāyato
20.15.9b yau astathatur bhuvanā jyotām.

However, there are some deviating cases:

19.52.15b daṇḍa mūdāv utūkyaḥ
16.83.2c saṅnātirātāv ucchiṣṭe
16.153.8c te brahma kṛtva samidhāv upāsta

This probably is due to the restauration by Barret.56)

The result of this special investigation is surprising: PS, other than ŚS (or rather, the Vulgate edited by Roth-Whitney and Śaṅkar Pāṇḍuraṅ Pāṇḍit), agrees with the Sandhi rules of the RV and its Prātiṣākhya. How is this to be explained?

There is, as a study of the text of PS will quickly reveal,56) a considerable influence of the RV on PS, such as the preference of PS for Rgvedic kṝntu instead of common Atharvavedic karotu, etc. This is quite old, as cases such as kṛṇeva for kaṇeva reveal: kaṇeva is found already in the RV itself and the substitution of r cannot have been made much later than the AV period itself as the knowledge of the correct etymology of kaṇeva was quickly forgotten.57)

However, in the present case, the Sandhi peculiarity can either be patterned on the RV (Śākalya, and VSM) pattern or it was common already to the original (Śākala/Aitareya) RV of the Kurukṣetra area and to PS, which had its origin in the same area. The last possibility is more probable. First, as this form of the Sandhi seems most easily explained (loss of -u before u/ā-) and secondly, because of the
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peculiar position of VS(M) with which it agrees in this case.

VS is extracted, according to Caland\(^{(39)}\) only secondarily from ŚB. Indeed the accent systems of both texts disagree sharply: ŚB has what the Bhāṣīka Sūtra and Śabara call the bhaṣīka accentuation, a simplification of the original Vedic tonal pattern to a sequence of high and low tones only.\(^{(39)}\) However, VS has the usual Vedic pattern with Anudattta, Udattta, Svarita (and other tones such as Anudattāra). The modern MSS all show this with the usual marks used in accenting the RV, TS (and modern AV Vulgate MSS). However, the older Nepalese VS manuscripts of 1422 A.D. and earlier\(^{(60)}\) follow the pattern of accentuation marks found in Maitr. S. (and the older AV MSS of Gujarat). This means that VS, even during the middle ages, still had a tonal pattern agreeing with that of MS, AV (Vulg.) with the udatta as the highest tone. The same may have held for PS but this cannot be ascertained as it follows the Kashmiri (KS) pattern.

In any case it is clear that VS followed an accentuation model derived either from the MS-KS-AV(Ś)-PS(?) tradition or the one close to it, that of RV-TS. An influence on the Sandhi pattern therefore cannot be excluded. That the two schools of the Vājasaneyins wavered in this respect is indicated by Vāj. Prāt. which prescribes and describes two different versions of the Sandhi, now found in the Kāṇva and the Mādhya. traditions. We must thus regard the Vāj. traditions of VS as secondary and cannot expect their influence on RV (Śākalya) or even on PS.

The outcome therefore is the expected one: The local Sandhi pattern of the Aitareyins (Śākala) in the Eastern Panjab and that of the neighboring Paippalāda school agreed with each other already at the time of PS collection (and thus long before its final redaction and equally long before the Śākala RV was transplanted into the East, under Janaka of Videha).

§2. Some interchanges between /r/ in Middle Vedic

The variation in the distribution of /r/ and /l/ has fascinated scholars since the beginnings of modern Vedic research. It is generally believed that just as in the later dramas, the cases of /l/ in Vedic texts are due to the Eastern dialects. These are supposed to form a (more popular) substratum even beneath the Rgvedic language and for its Kuru-Pañcāla successor as found in the Sanskrit of the YV Sāmhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. Generally speaking, words with /l/ instead of /r/ have been on the increase, as is well known, even since the RV.\(^{(61)}\)

However, a closer look at some post-Rgvedic texts indicates that the case is much more complicated than supposed so far.
a. Forms with -l- taught by Pāṇ. 8.2.19:

The compound verb *-ayate* occasionally has preverb forms containing -l- instead of the more common -r-; this has recently been studied by T. Goto.\(^{(62)}\)

\[\text{(-)pala.ayate} \quad \text{MS, TS, } \text{TB, SB, ŠBK 2, JB, PB;} \quad \text{GB} \]

\[\text{(-)paly.ayate} \quad \text{KS, } \text{KpS, ŠB, JB, JUB;} \quad \text{BĀUK 4, (BAUM vi-pary-!)} \]

\[\text{pla.ayate} \quad \text{MS, KS} \]

\[\text{nil.ayate} \quad \text{TS, TB, VadhB, BŚS.} \]

The rest of the *-ayate* forms (with preverbs other than those containing -r-) are found in: RV, AV, PS, MS, KS, KaṭhB, KaṭhĀ TS, TB, TA, ŠB, VadhB, ŠBK 1 (=ŠBM). T. Goto (p. 95), rightly calls this distribution dialectical. Quite surprisingly, the occurrence of the forms in -l- is thus limited to the Western and Central areas. The East, with the usual exception of the Kaṅvas, is conspicuously absent in this case. This seems to contradict the well-known preponderance of -l- forms in the East in later stages of the language, such as *lajā* for *raja*. The development is indeed foreshadowed in the famous Asura quotation of ŠB he 'lavo he 'lavo<*>he 'rayo*. Why is an everyday word such as *pra. ayate*> *playate* not accepted in its popular form in the East?

b. The comparable interchange of *preṅkha/pleṅkha*

*pleṅkha-* is found in TS, TB, and JB, while *pla. ũkh* is found in MS. On the other hand, *preṅkha-* occurs in RV, PS, KS, MŚS, VārŚS, ŚS, KĀ, ŚŚS, BŚS, ĀpŚS, HŚS, KŚS, AĀ, and *pra. ũkh* in RV, PS, KĀ, ŚŚS, AĀ. Again, the -l- forms are limited to the Maitr. and Taitt. areas; the East is conspicuously absent, as in the first case (*-ayate* verbs).

c. Keśin *Darbhaj/Dalbhya*

The famous Pañcālā king Keśin *Dalbhya* has a variant of his name, *Darbhya*, which is closer to the original, as it is derived from *darbha-* (grass); indeed, there is a story in BŚS 18.38 which tells that his original name was Śirṣānya Kuṣā.\(^{(60)}\)

\begin{itemize}
  \item **Darbhya-**
  \begin{itemize}
    \item RV 5.61.17 (without Keśin)
    \item MS 1.4.12\(^{(60)}\), 1.6.5\(^{(65)}\), 2.1.3\(^{(66)}\)
    \item TS 2.6.2.3
    \item JB 2.53
darbha-
    \begin{itemize}
      \item 2.100, 2.102
      \item 1.285, 2.68, 2.122, 3.166, 3.312
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}

  \item JUB 3.29.1 (=3.6.1.1–2), 3.31

  \item BŚS-Pravara 22:435.1
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item **Dalbhya-**
  \begin{itemize}
    \item KS 10.6 (Vaka Dalbh), 30.2.183.15, 47\(^{(7)}\)
    \item KpS 46.5
    \item KB 7.4\(^{(60)}\), VadhB 4.37\(^{(60)}\)
    \item JB 1.257, 1.337
    \item JUB 1.12.4.1, 1.18.4.3, 1.22.3, 4.6.2.2
    \item PB 13.10.8\(^{(70)}\)
    \item BŚS 18.38: 389.17\(^{(7)}\)
    \item 18.26: 374.12\(^{(70)}\)
\end{itemize}

\]
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What surprises in this distribution is that the Western texts such as KS, KpS, PB have the popular form in -l- while the central N. Indian texts such as TS, KB, JB, BŚŚS have -r-. Even more surprising, prima facie, is the split in the tradition of the Jaiminiya school, both in their Brāhmaṇa as well as in their Ār./Up (JUB). We would expect a complete alignment with the adjacent Taittirīya or the Maitrāyaṇīya schools. The Jaim. texts (in their earlier form as Śāty. Br., — a Central N. Indian text) in part came from originally the same territory as the Central N. Indian Kauśītakas and Taitt. in Uttar Pradesh (Pañcāla land). They share the apparently fluctuating distribution of l/r in this area which also is found with their Western neighbors (Kaṭha -l-, Maitr. -r-), representing the N. and S. Kuru areas.

It would be interesting so see whether a distinction could be made between N. Kuru -r-: S. Kuru -l-: W. Central -r-: E. Central -l-: Southern r/l.

d. Some other examples

However, I have briefly investigated a few more examples where r and l vary in the various texts. Taking into account the probable social implications of the feature — l is, as is well known, a more ‘popular’ sound — than r, — some words from various social levels of post-Rgvedic speech were selected for this purpose. Even then, the attestation of l varies greatly. Here I merely report the results as space does not allow to go into much detail here.

Surprisingly, the geographical distribution in the fluctuation of l/r is found to vary greatly from one word to another. Equally, the distribution of l does not agree, as one might be led to think, with the historical level(24) of speech (Mantra:: prose in the Samhitās, Br., etc.). Even, the presumed social level does not play a decisive role.

For example, everyday words such as loman - “hair”, lohita “red, blood”, otherwise found with -r- (but note that loman occurs already in RV with -l-), or pla/pala-ayate could be selected in both their “educated” and their popular forms. On the other hand, terms such as some popular words as alıkla/va “eagle”, loma/sa “hare” (presumably, a specialized hunter’s term?), or a (predominantly?) children’s word such as ple/nkh, ple/nkha- would be expected to appear only in their popular forms with -l-. This, however, is precisely not the case. Instead, the distribution of r/l varies greatly.

While pla/pala-ayate and loman are found in the whole area of Vedic dialects, from the Panjāb to the borders of Bengal, other words with l are found in certain areas only: for example in the S. Kuru/Central and Southern area (ple/nkh), both in the Central and Southern area (alıkla/va), in the N. Kuru-Pañcāla area (lohita), in the Central area only (alukṣa), or are restricted to the Kuru-Pañcāla area (loma/sa).
EASTWARD SPREAD OF VEDIC l.

Some typical examples of the spread of words with l in the post-Rgvedic period; other areas have these words with r instead.

Some words in l (instead of those having 'High Vedic' r) are already found in the RV, and in Middle Vedic texts such as MS and TS: they slowly spread southwards and eastwards. Notably, the east - believed to be the domain of forms in l", is reached only in the late Vedic period, as shown by ŠB and the Kāpila version of the VS, a comparatively late extract from ŠB. Some variants with l of words with r never reach the east.
NOTES ON VEDIC DIALECTS, (1)

The distribution in the various texts of the words in -ι- mentioned above, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N.-) WEST</th>
<th>CENTER</th>
<th>E. CENTER</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) roman⁷⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td></td>
<td>SVJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVKh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABo</td>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŞA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loman⁷⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŞS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>VSK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpS</td>
<td></td>
<td>TB, TĀ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABo</td>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>ŞBK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŞA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ŞBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB, ŞB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaṭhB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VarŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romavat⁷⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomavat⁷⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVKh</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŞS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomatas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>ŞBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) romaśa⁷⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŞS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>KB, JB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŞA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŞŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BDhŚ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lomāsa</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>KpS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>BaŚS, ĀpŚS</td>
<td>ŠBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HŚS</td>
<td>VaitŚ</td>
<td>ĀA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lomāśāvākṣāṇā²³⁰</th>
<th>ŠS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RVKh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) lalāta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RVKh, PS, KŚmp</th>
<th>TS, ŠS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSmp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpŚmp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŠBMo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ĀK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GB             | JB |
|                | JUB|
|                | ŠŚS|
|                | ĀpŚS|
|                | VaitŚ|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KGS</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>VŚK</th>
<th>VSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rāraḷa</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBMo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KŚmp</td>
<td>KB</td>
<td>ŠBMn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSmp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) rohīta:

| RV        | ŠS |
| PS        |    |
| KŚp       |    |
| MSp       |    |
| KpŚ       |    |

| AB         | TB, TĀ |
|            | ŠBK    |
|            | (ABn)  |
| GB         | JB |
| ChU        |    |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>ApŚS, HSŚ</th>
<th>BŚS</th>
<th>KŚS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DŚŚ, LŚŚ</td>
<td>ApŚŚ, HŚŚ</td>
<td>BŚŚ</td>
<td>KŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ApMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HGS, AŚGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VaitŚ, KauŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVPar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lohita[81]</td>
<td>RVKh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>ŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABo</td>
<td>TB, KB, JB</td>
<td>ŚBK</td>
<td>ŚBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohini:</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS, SVK</td>
<td>ŚŚ, SVJ</td>
<td>VSK</td>
<td>VSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MŚP, MŚm</td>
<td>TŚP, TSm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSŚ, KSŚm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>TB, TĀ</td>
<td>ŚBK</td>
<td>ŚBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaṭhB</td>
<td>KB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lohini:[82]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>ŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MŚP</td>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>ŚBK</td>
<td>ŚBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>ŚA, ŚŚŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VaitŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following cases reflect a clear West-East difference; the Western (Kuru) texts preferring –r– while the Central (Pañcāla) texts have –l–:

(5) arikla\a\a
   PS       | ŚŚ       |     |     |
   KS       | JB       |     |     |

(6) arūkṣa\[85\]
   PB\[86\]  | <alūkṣa\[87\]> | ŚBK\[85\] | ŚBM 13.8.3.13
   KB\[84\]  |     |     |     |
   JB\[86\]  | <TUS\[87\]> | ŚBK\[85\] | ŚBM 13.8.3.13
   <TB>     |     |     |     |

(7) Kirāta\[88\]
   PB       | TB       |     |     |
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What seems to appear from this pattern of the distribution of \( l \) in some selected words are two important observations:

— First of all, the distribution of \( l/r \) differs per word and apparently also according to the social level of the word in question. Everyday words with \( l \), such as those designating a part of the body such as *loman* "hair", are more widely accepted than others;

— Secondly, the language of the Northern Kuru area (Katha/Paippalada/ Aitareyin) is more "educated" or at least strives to appear so: indeed, in this dialect area one prefers even hyper-correct forms such as PS *Kṛṇva* for RV *Kanva*; similarly, in PS, the more archaic, Rgvedic forms *kṛnu-, kṛṇa/kṛṇo-* instead of typical post-Rgvedic *kar/kur-* are predominant in the present tense of *kr.*

In contrast, the Southern rim of the Kuru area (MS) and the vast territories east of it (Pañcāla with the Taitt., etc.) show a greater preference for the "popular" forms in \( l \). However, the area famous for the preponderance of \( l \), the East (Videha) still is largely absent from this picture. It seems that the \( l \)-forms spread into the Videha area only comparatively late. (We have, of course, to take into account that the Brahmanical texts intentionally may have avoided words with \( l \) in this area, precisely as they were regarded as popular. That popular or uneducated speech indeed had words with \( l \) instead \( r \) is seen in the famous Asura exclamation *he 'lavo.)*

It appears now, even from this rather limited investigation that, before we can reach a clear picture of the distribution of -\( l \)- versus -\( r \)- in the post-Rgvedic period\(^{93}\), several studies must be carried out. These should include, preferably, statistics of the occurrence of \( l/r \) in the various texts and in their constituent parts and text layers, as well as studies of particular words and word fields. Only a thorough study including an enumeration of such cases will allow to draw more detailed maps of isoglosses and sub-dialects\(^{94}\) which will make it possible to further demonstrate certain trends in the development of the Vedic dialects and to establish, for certain areas at least, the interrelations between the (surviving) texts and schools.\(^{95}\)

**§3. The suffix -\( īya \) in Pāṇini and the Veda**

Two forms in of adjectives -\( īya \) (i.e. *śunāsīrīya*, *upavasathīya*), found instead
of the normal Vedic -(i)ya have been treated in ‘Tracing the Vedic dialects’, § 6.5 p. 179 sqq.—Pāṇini 4.2.32 teaches, besides sunāsīrīya, also: dyācāprthiṇīya, marutoaṭīya, agniśomīya, vāstospatiya, and grhamedhiya.  

Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altind. Gramm. II 2, § 268 p. 435 sq. report only a few Rgvedic words that have the suffix -iya, namely the following: the numerals devīya-, tṛtiya- turiya-, a few cases of -anīya-, the place names ārjīkiya- and hariyāpīya- and the ritual term grhamedhiya-. To this the AV adds: agniśomīya-, and dakaṇṭinīya- parpatīya-. Wackernagel-Debrunner stress that the formation is more numerous in the YV and the Brāhmaṇas and Sutras, as it is preferred in ritual contexts. Indeed, it seems that the suffix -iya- had its origin in a very limited context, that of numerals, place names and ritual terms (as the examples adduced by Pāṇini indicate as well) and that it became very productive in the YV Samhitā and in the Brāhmaṇa periods.

This is also stressed by Wack.-Debr. II 2 p. 441 who underline that the suffix -iya-/-iya- often is found in variation with -iya/-iya-, -ya/-ya- and that -iya/-iya- clearly is the younger formation.

The words mentioned by Pāṇini at 4.2.32 with variant forms in -iya are attested in Vedic as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTER</th>
<th>E. CENTER</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grhamedhiya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV 7.56.14; KŚ 21.13 (&lt;RV) MS 4.10.5 (&lt;RV)</td>
<td>TS 4.3.13.6</td>
<td>ŠŚŚ</td>
<td>BŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutras frequent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŠŚŚ</td>
<td>BŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ApŚŚ, BhŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grhamedhiya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KŚ 35.9 (=pākayajña);</td>
<td>TB 1.6.6.3; 1.6.7.1-3</td>
<td>ŠBM 11.5.2.4;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KB 5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB 2.1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāstospatiya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose:99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutras frequent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŠŚŚ</td>
<td>BŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BhŚŚ, ApŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HŚŚ, VkHzŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AVPar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŠGS</td>
<td>BGS, BDhŚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS</td>
<td>KauŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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vāstospatya—
MS 1.5.4.13;
GB 1.2.18;
Sutras:
MGS  VarŚŚ
VaitŚŚ
KauŚŚ
AVPar

agniṣomya—
(nearly all prose:) cf. Paṭ. 4.2.138, 3.13
Mantra:
PS 16.111.6  ŚŚ 9.6.6  VSK 26.2.3  VSM 24.8
MS 2.6.1
Prose:
MS100
KS101) TS102)
Br. very frequent:
KaṭhB  TB
AB 2  KB
PB  JBa  ŚBK  ŚBM 1–5, 9, 11–13
GB,
Sutras (also compounds):
ŚŚŚŚ  ĀŚŚ
JŚŚKar  DŚŚ
BŚŚ
ŚŚŚŚ, HŚŚ
VkhŚŚ
ŚŚŚŚ
ĀpDhŚŚ

KGS
agniṣomya—
only in Paṭ.
marutvatīya—
(partly prose):
MS 2.8.9, 2.11.5  TS 4.4.2.2  VSK 16.3.8  VSM 15.12, 18.20
KS 17.8  6.5.5.1–3  19.7.2
Prose:
MS 4.6.1, 4.6.8  TS 4.7.7.2,
KS 18.11, 28.3, 44.3  6.5.5.1–2
KpŚ
Br. very frequent:
AB 3–5  KB  AB 6–8
KĀ  AĀ
JB 3.1791003)  ŚBK  ŚBM 4, 8, 13

GB,
Chāg. Up. 23.11, 24.13
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Sutras: very frequent (also in compounds):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSS</th>
<th>ÅSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSS</td>
<td>HSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VkhSS</td>
<td>Vait. S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

marutvatiya—
only in Pañ.

Pāṇini’s rule thus allows for -ya even where it is not attested (with the exception of: vāstospatiya, grhamedhya, and sūnasīrya-).

The distribution of -iya- thus is very varied:

In a case found in older texts (grhamedhiya) it is widespread in various schools, geographical regions and texts; in other cases (such as upavasathiya, vāstospatiya), the use of the form is limited to the central area (Pañcāla land, modern Uttar Pradesh); in one case (sūnasīrya) it has its origin in the Central area but spread to the East as well, and very late (KāthāSS100), also to the East; in still another case its usage starts from the Western area (agniṣomīya); or it is found widespread right from the Mantra period onwards (marutvatiya).

In addition, Wackernagel-Debrunner (II 2 p. 441 §268 d) adduce the following examples which are quoted here in their geographical and historical distribution in order to indicate the development of this suffix:

| parvatya-       | RV         |
| parvatiya-      | AV         |
| marjalya-       | RV         |
| marjaliya-      | KS         |
| avarīya-        | KS–Aśv.    |
| pārīya-         | KS–Aśv.    |
| avarīya-        | MS, KS     |
| pārīya-         | VS         |
| śatarudriya-105 | KS         |
| satarudriya-    | TS, TB     |
| vajapravayya-   | MS, KS     |
| vajapravāryya-  | TS, TB     |
| sajanya-        | KS         |
| sajanyā-        | TS         |
| rāgṛiya-/-iya- | MS         |
| rāgṛiya-/-iya- | KS         |
| rāgṛiya-       | Pañ. 4.2.93, Mbhār. |

49
An evaluation of this evidence indicates that the distribution of the forms in -iya- generally follows the dialect features established in Tracing... However, each word has its own area of distribution, as should not surprise in the spread of a feature that still is expanding during the period in question.

Various texts of a particular Vedic school usually follow the same pattern (e.g. śatarudrīya TS, TB). However there are some cases where even a school is split: -yajñiya/yajñiya- in ĀpŚŚ or stokiya KB: stokya ŚŚŚ. Such cases need a special investigation.106

A particular geographical region sometimes is split (as already noticed in Tracing), but then according to the various schools and Vedas involved, e.g. North-Western Yajurvedic (KS) and Central Rgvedic and Sāmavedic texts (KB, ŚŚŚ, JB) with -yajñiya: a Yajurvedic text of the Southern part of the Western region (MS)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yajñāyajñāya-</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>AB, AA, PB, ŚB</th>
<th>KB, JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KGS, Kuḍraś</td>
<td>ŚŚŚ, ĀpŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ChU, LŚŚ, DŚŚ</td>
<td>MŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñāyajñāya-</td>
<td>MS, KpS, PS</td>
<td>AV, TS</td>
<td>VŚK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BŚŚ</td>
<td>ŚBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ĀpŚŚ, HŚŚ</td>
<td>KŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VaikhŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñāpātryad-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñāpatrīlya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jātyā-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jātīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stokya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>ŠŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KB</td>
<td>ŚB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stokīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>ŚBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stotṛiya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>LŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stotṛīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ChU, GGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homtya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sattrīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brāhmaṇas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sattrīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ChU, GGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homtya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sattrīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brāhmaṇas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sattrīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>putṛya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŚB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>putṛīya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pañ., Epic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apuṭriya-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pañ.</td>
<td>ŠGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for double forms in Pañ, see above, note 96)
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and Central Yajurvedic and Atharvavedic texts (TS, ŠS) with -yajñiya-.

Though the distribution of a feature such as the suffix under investigation is notoriously unpredictable with regard to the speed of its spread, there are some clear patterns:

— Some forms show a spread which starts at one historical level of Vedic and continues to spread during the following level (-yajñiya, grhamedhiya, cf. also marjaliya).

— Some words show a spread that transgresses geographically neighboring areas (agniśomiya, marutatiya, -yajñiya).

— There is a clear variation between closely related but competing schools: ŠBM: ŠBK, KS: KpS, etc; sometimes this is even found inside a school, i.e. the Taitt. school (TS: TB).107)

REGIONAL STYLISTIC FEATURES

The following paragraphs deal with features that at first may look more like matters of style than dialect variations; yet they add more materials and generally refine our picture of the many levels on which dialect features worked in the various schools and their respective territories. Again, only a small selection of the facts can be included in this article.

§4. (u) (ha) (vai)

The particle ū in its various combinations (here studied especially in its occurrences with ha and ha vai) is of particular interest, as its use or non-use is one of the characteristics that distinguish certain schools. Though ū is an old particle, frequently used in the RV,108) its use in the combinations mentioned above had become fashionable at a certain time and in a certain region. This group of particles occurs, indeed, in all possible combinations in the various texts, which makes it a shibboleth for textual adherence.109)

The particle ū in isolated position, without ha or ha vai, has been studied in detail by J.S. Klein.110) He also treats the Middle Vedic texts briefly.111

A count of the cases of ū, as reported by VPK, results in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RV 501</th>
<th>SVK 2</th>
<th>SVJ 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(rest &lt; RV)</td>
<td>rest &lt; RV</td>
<td>rest &lt; RV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only the Saṃhitās can be evaluated with some certainty, due to the unreliable materials in the later volumes of the Vedic Word Concordance (VPK). It is clear, above all, that the number of cases apart from the RV shrinks dramatically in Mantra language, i.e., in the two AV Saṃhitās (and also in VS). Both texts are smaller than RV, but contain less than half of the cases that they “should,” according to their size. The diminishing trend continues with equal speed in Saṃhitā prose; MS, KS, and TS all have only about half the cases they exhibit in their Mantra section. If both the Mantra and the Saṃhitā prose portions of these texts are taken together, the following picture emerges. KS has only 1/8 the number of independent cases when compared with RV. TS has approximately 1/6, while MS, however, still has about 1/5 of the cases in comparison to those of RV.

The difference between these texts is interesting. The relative strength of survival of *u* in the Kaṭha school is surprising; MS has only a relative strength of 3/4 when compared to the occurrences in KS, and TS only 2/3. The use of *u* in prose, therefore, seems to have survived best in the Kaṭha area, although later on there is a sudden explosion of cases, indicating a veritable fashion in usage, in the area to the East of this school: in the texts of the Pañcāla region (VādhB, BŚS); this also affected the neighboring texts, ŠB and JB. Unfortunately, it still is impossible to gain a proper perspective on the Br. and Sutra period, given the incomplete materials in VPK. Any reader of these texts, however, will have noticed the
NOTES ON VEDIC DIALECTS, (1)

sudden increase of \( u \) in the Central and Eastern texts of the late Br. and Sutra period.

A comparison of the use of \( u \) in collocation with other particles (which are better represented in VPK) is helpful to adumbrate this.

\( u \) ha:

The combination with the particle \( ha \) is of special interest as it occurs, from the beginning, with the perfect.\(^{124} \) It can, therefore, also be used as a counter-check or reconfirmation of the dialectal spread of the narrative perfect.\(^{125} \)

The older, post-mantra texts do not have many occurrences of combinations with \( u \):

MS

apparently has no occurrence of \( u \) ha, \( u \) ha vai\(^{126} \) but it has a case of \( ha \) sma+\( \text{ahuh} \), and of \( ha \) vai or khalu vai.\(^{128} \)

KS,

however, has a case of \( u \) ha sma, where MS has \( ha \) sma:

\[ \text{KS} 31.2:3.8 \text{ tad } u \text{ ha } \text{sma-ahur} = \text{KpS 47.2.}\(^{129} \) = \text{MS 4.1.3:5.4 } tād \text{ dha } \text{sma-ahur} \]

Another typical feature of KS:: MS seems to be that KS has \( ha \) vai while MS has a pronoun+\( \text{vai} \).\(^{130} \)

\[ \text{KS 21.9:49.8 } \text{Kauvo } \text{ha } \text{vai} \ldots = \text{where MS reads } \text{tām } \text{vai } \text{Kāṇva} \ldots 3.3.9: \text{42.11} \]

in a parallel passage; KS 27.5: 145.12, KpS 42.5: \( \text{etad dha vai Vīpūjanas Saurakiḥ} \text{vidāṃ cakāra} \langle \rangle \) MS 4.6.2: 79.18 \( \text{tena vai Vīpūjanāḥ Sāurakiḥ} \); --KS also exhibits cases of a combination of \( ha \) khalu vai;\(^{131} \)

\[ \text{vindati } \text{ha } \text{khalu vai } \text{KS 33.1:17.10; yo } \text{khalu } \text{vāva } \text{33.4:30.10.} \]

TS

contains, according to VWC, many cases of \( ha \) (\( \text{vai} \)), but they do not yet include a combination with \( u \): \( ha \) (\( \text{vai} \))+\( \text{vāca} \) 11 cases, \(+\text{aha} \) 2, \(+\text{papraccha} \) 1, \(+\text{vidām cakāra} \) 1, and 15 cases+perf.\(^{132} \) in the following books: TS 1 (4x same passage), 2 (1x), 5 (2x), 6 (6x), 7 (2x). This result underlines what has been said above; \( u \) is not frequent, yet, in normal argumentative Saṁhitā prose, its diffusion begins at a later stage.

AB:

16 cases of \( ha \)+perfect, notably in the later \( \text{pañcihās} \) (books), however, only a few which include \( u \): \( ha \) 5x in book 7; \( ha \) \( \text{vai} \) 8x, especially in books 8 (1x in b.5, 1x in
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b.3); but \textit{u} \textit{ha} only 1x in book 7 (7.22); cf. also \textit{u} \textit{haiva} 1x (7.34.9). Note that \textit{vai} is especially used in books 1–5; it occurs in these collocations: \textit{u} \textit{khalu vai} 1x (5.31), \textit{yady u vai} 1x (1.6).
The later fashion of using \textit{u} \textit{ha/u} \textit{haiva} is found at AB 2.3 \textit{u} \textit{ha}, and in book 7.\textsuperscript{133)}

\textbf{KB:}
This text apparently does not favor combinations with \textit{u} as well: \textit{u} \textit{ha} \textit{sma}+\textit{aha} 1x (2.9.27); cf. \textit{nu\textit{a} u} (i.e.: \textit{nu vai u}) 1x (27.11.26), but \textit{ha} 3x, \textit{ha vai} 7x.

\textbf{TB:}
This text equally does not favor \textit{ha}+pres. 1.1.2.2, 1.2.2.5 (3x), 2.3.8.3; \textit{ha}+fut. 2.2.10.2; \textit{ha}+perf.: 2.8.6.5 \textit{ha vava}; 3.8.6.3 \textit{uvaca ha Prajātiḥ}; in Mantra: 2.8.6.6, 2.8.7.8, 2.8.8.1, 2.8.8.10;
further: \textit{u vai}, for example at 3.12.4.4.

\textbf{TĀ:}
1.9.2 \textit{ha uvaca Vyasah Parāśaryah}; 1.22.10 \textit{etad ha sma va āhuḥ}; 1.26.1 \textit{atha ha sma āha}; 1.26.1 \textit{atho āhuḥ}; note that all these occurrences are in a very late section (=KathB) of TĀ; however, single \textit{ha} occurs in \textit{Mantras} of this section: 1.4.2, 1.8.8, 1.10.2, 1.23.8.

In comparison with the above sporadic evidence, the texts coming from the more Eastern and Southern areas, called “South-Eastern Late Vedic” in the introduction (see above), exhibit various combinations of \textit{u} with (\textit{ha} \textit{(vai)} quite frequently:\textsuperscript{134)}

\textbf{VādhB:}
\textit{haiva} 3x, but: \textit{u} \textit{ha} 4x (I, p. 9; 3.94, 4.49, 4.93.), and: \textit{u} \textit{ha vai} 25x in 4. Mitteilung alone; \textit{u} \textit{haiva} 4.7, 7.74, 4.102. Cf. also \textit{u vai} 1.43, 4.92, \textit{sa u vā eṣa} 4.113; note the “Taittirīya” type Sandhi of \textit{u} in: \textit{uv evaitād} 3.12, and \textit{uv eva} VādhS 2, 7–8 and cf. AO 2, p.153, 158.\textsuperscript{135)}

\textbf{VādhSS:}\textsuperscript{136)}
\textit{yady u} 2.1, 5.3; \textit{tam u} 4.2, 7.3; \textit{etad u} 1.3; \textit{u ha vai}, see VādhS 2.8, 9, 11; \textit{ha sma}+perf. 3.1, etc.

\textbf{BSS} (Br. chapters of book 18 only are taken into account here):
\textit{ha} 3x (18.38, 18.41, 18.44); \textit{ha vai} 3x (18.30, 18.38); \textit{haiva} 1x (18.31); \textit{ha sma vai} 1x (18.40); all of these collocations, notably, do not occur in collocation with \textit{u}; compare, however, the late Sutra portions, which have got \textit{u}: Dhvaidha Sutra: \textit{u khalu} (20.1); Karmānta Sutra: \textit{u khalu} 25.13, 25.24, \textit{katham u khalu} 20.1, 24.32,
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e tc.

JB:
According to VWC (Br., 2nd ed.), there are only the following cases of ha (others have been included here from parts [§1–50, 124–212] of Caland’s Auswahl, quoted with §):

haiva 1.1, 1.2;
ha vai 1.17;
ha + pres. 1.18, 3.377 (7x), 3.379 (4x), pres./opt. 3.377; ha + perf. (story) 1.285 (11x);
ha sma + pres. 2.8;
ha sma + aha §168; but cf. also ha + u 2.279;
ha khalu vai 2.281, 2.418;

u §8, 32, 156, 157, 168, 192;
u eva §151;
tad u §34, 129, 171 (teṣām u 172), 172, 176, 192, 208 (teṣām u) 208;
tad u vai §11, 129, 130, 167, 168, 187;
tad u sma + aha §18;
tasmad u §25, 145, 156, 160, 207;

sa u §181,
sa u eva §186;
y a §25, 209,
yad u §15, 35, 180, 181, 186, 188, 192, 198, 201, 202, 203, 204, yady u §13, 28, 126, 136, 192;

u vai 2.8, §124, 126, 133, 134, 137, 139, 140, 142, 144, 167, 168;
u vava §136, 145;

u ha §47, 49, 127, 130, 135, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 151, 152 (tasmad u ha 156,
tad u ha 164, u haiva 186, tam u ha 198, tad u ha 198, sa u ha 203, tad u haiva 203, 204, tad u ha 212,);

u ha vai is more common in the later parts of the text: §133, 137, 143, 156, 176.

ŠBK137):
ha + pres. 1.1.1.5, 6; 2.2.4.17; evam ha sma + pres. 1.1.1.6; ha sma + pres. 3.2.8.2, 3;
ha + perf. 1.1.1.3, 1.1.1.7, ha sma + perf. 3.2.8.2, 3; ha vai + perf. 1.1.1.4, 1.1.1.5,
1.1.1.6;

ha vai+pres. <u vai> 4.3.3.11; ŠBK 4.4.4.2 aspardhanta;

atha heyam tarihi+perf. 1.1.1.6;

once u at 1.2.2.12; u ca 8x (2.4.4.4, etc.); yady u vai 1.1.1.9 (ŠBM yady u), 4.6.4.1; 7.3.1.12; but: yady uv e° (with "Taittiriya" Sandhi) 7.5.1.16; u ha 4.1.1.7.

A comparison between ŠBK and ŠBM is instructive. There are only two cases involving u ha available from the Mādhy. text that have a parallel in the Kāṇva version:

ŠBM:
1.1.1.7 u ha+perf.
1.1.1.10 u ha sma+aha+api

ŠBK:
1.1.1.3 ha+perf. (in a story)
1.1.1.4 ha vai+perf.

Again, u seems to be typical for the Eastern (Mādhy.) rather than the more original Western (Kāṇva) texts (which belong, actually, in late Vedic to the Eastern Central area).

ŠBM:
ha+pres. 1.1.1.5, 1.1.1.19;
ha+perf. 1.2.4.5, 3.6.2.3, (story of Kadru), 3.6.2.4, 3.6.2.6, 3.6.2.8;
u ha+perf. 1.1.1.7, u ha sma+aha+api 1.1.1.10;
ha vai+perf. 1.1.1.16 (not mentioned in VPK Br. Vol. 2nd ed. s.v. ha); for many more examples of u see Delbrück, Syntax, p.499, 508 sqq.

The distribution according to schools and their texts is as follows (note that this is an incomplete listing, due to the lack of materials in VPK; + indicates probable abbreviation of entries by VPK; -I also list a few interesting collocations of u not involving ha/vai):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>ha sma</th>
<th>ha sma vai</th>
<th>u ha sma</th>
<th>ha vai</th>
<th>ha tvai</th>
<th>ha khalu vāva</th>
<th>ha khalu vai</th>
<th>ha vai</th>
<th>ha v eva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TS ha  | 18  |
ha vai  | 12  |
ha sma vai | 8    |
ha tvai | 3   |
ha vāva | 1   |

MS129  | ha vai | 1+ |
ha v eva | 1   |
(incompl.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>early</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brāhm.</td>
<td>ABō</td>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u khalu vai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yady u vai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>later</th>
<th>KB</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u ha sma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nā u</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB141</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u ha</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u ha vai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u haiva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haiva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha khalu vai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>early</th>
<th>VaḍḥB</th>
<th>u ha</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sutras</td>
<td>u ha vai</td>
<td>25142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u haiva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha vāva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha sma vāva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha sma vai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VaḍḥŚŚ</td>
<td>u ha vai</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha sma</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BŚB</td>
<td>u khalu</td>
<td>(late)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>later</th>
<th>ŚBKo</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha sma</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚBM</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u ha</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following conclusion can be drawn regarding the usage of ha: ha±perf. first occurs in a few statements of MS and KS (such as “XY knew this”), and then frequently in TS (a text of somewhat later composition), as well as in the later books of AB (but not in the older, Western, books 1–5); it is typical for the Central, Southern and Eastern texts: VaḍḥB, BŚŚ, JB, ŚB, and AB (6–8).143

Already in the older Saṁhitās, ha had sometimes been used to indicate that someone formerly had “known”, had “seen”, discovered something about the ritual. This kind of one-time statement consequently was expanded to other, more general statements, to short abbreviative tales about mythological events, and finally to relating of any event of the past.

Just like the use of the perfect in narrative passages (see Tracing §5.2), ha and its collocations (ha vai, u ha vai, etc.) predominate in the East, and, in the late Br./
early Sutra texts, also in the South and the Center.

The collocation with u (u ha vai, u ha) is typical for the East but includes, at a late stage, the Vādhus of the Central area as well (Vādhu Anvākhyāna).

The late Vedic spread of u:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of u in collocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;MS&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ABo&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the future, a more detailed study should not only be made of the distribution of u and its collocations in those texts that are not well covered by VWC, but also of the syntactic differences (if any) of the use or non-use of u in the texts of the later Brāhmaṇa/early Sutra period.

Some INDIVIDUAL CASES

The materials presented thus far can be extended further by including studies of single words and their changing usage in time and geographical spread, as well as closer look at various trends using one word instead of another (see Tracing, on punarmṛtyu and on pāpa).

Similar distributional studies can also be made of many particular words. Here I add only:

§5. pitāmātar-/mātāpitar-

The dvandva compound mātara-pitārau, listed by Pāṇini at 6.3.32, is interesting, for he regards it as an expression taught by the Northern (udīcyā) grammarians. Wackernagel regards the word as derived from RV, VS mātāra-pitārau (RV 4.6.7 mātāra-pitāra). The similar formation mātā-pitārau is found in AVŚ.

Pāṇ.: mātara-pitārau ("Northern")

mātā-pitāraḥ:

RVKh, MS, KS, KpŚ, TS, VSM, VSK

pitāmātarā (= "Vedic")

pītāra-mātāra

KS!, SV(K), TS, VSM,
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ABn, ŠBM, ŠBK
KaṭhB, MaitrU
mātāra-pitrā RV 4.6.7

Unless Pāṇini only wants to note the unusual case ending of mātara- as a local peculiarity taught by Northern grammarians, as seems probable, it is only the cases in KS, and perhaps also in MS, that could be invoked to substantiate his claim for a Northern usage of mātara-pitrāu as far as word position is concerned. The compound (in its various forms) is, however, too widely used to be called “Northern.” More importantly, pitrā-mātāra, the form which according to Pāṇini 6.3.33, should be “Vedic” (chandasi) rather than “Northern”, is indeed found in a North-Western (i.e. Kuru) and probably also a Northern (Gandhāra) Vedic text known to Pāṇini, that is KS 14.1:200.16. Pāṇini’s knowledge of Vedic texts does not fit, in this instance, the evidence of the texts. It is surprising that Pāṇini neglects RV 4.6.7.

If Vedic usage is, indeed, closely linked with the “bhāṣa,” the educated Sanskrit speech of a certain area, the claim for a typically “Northern” form mātā/pitr- could only be made if we think of Pāṇini as belonging to the post-YV-Saṁhitā period, and as having a relative date earlier than that of AB 6–8, AA, etc., and when we assume that he did not know or did not wish to acknowledge the (fairly late) Eastern Vedic texts such as ŠB. To enlarge upon this topic, the collocations as found in Oertel, Wortstellungsvarianten (SB Akad. München 1940, p. 81) may be adduced.

The “Northern” version (as far as word position is concerned) is represented in the following texts:

| yan mātāra pitarāva jihimsima | ŠS, PS, MS, TS, TB, TĀ 2.6.1, ĀŚŚ | yat pitarā mātāra vā jihā | KS, KpS |
| mātā pita ca retaso bhavāthāḥ | ŠS | pita ca mātā ca retaso bhavāthāḥ | PS |

But often the same texts have the opposite version as well:

| mātā pita ca dadhatur uiv agre | KS, KpS | pita mātā ca dadhatur yad (nv) agre | TS, ĀŚŚ, MŚŚ |
| mātā ca pita ca | ŠS | pita mātā ca | PS(169) |

One can also compare the well-known phrase, TU 1.11 = KaṭhŚiU 11.151)

mātṛdevo bhava, pitṛdevo bhava...

The texts which could be called “Northern”, or which are situated on the border of the Uṣīcyā territory, like KS and AB, participate in both groups, that is
those which place *mātr and those which place *piitr first. But some Central (TS) and Eastern texts like VS, SB (M, K) agree with this usage. Strictly speaking, however, Pāṇini’s observation concerns, as has been pointed out above, only the compound, and here the usage in the texts runs counter to Northern (RV), KS, Western (MS, KS, KaṭhB, AB, MU), central (TS) and Eastern (VS, ŚBK, ŚBM, AB 6–8) texts.

This quotation of Pāṇini from the Northern bhaṣa therefore cannot be directly aligned with any dialect area known from the Vedic texts; this is a useful conclusion, as it points to the gaps in our knowledge of old Indo-Aryan in general. A brief glance at the maps of schools and texts provided in Tracing indicates that there are some major areas of Northern India for which the texts provide little or no information. This especially concerns the Panjab (with the exception of Pāṇini’s Gandhāra homeland), as well as Sindh and a major part of the area South of the Ganges (for which we only have JB and JUB evidence).

§6. Typical formulas of various sākhās

In conclusion, attention is drawn to a preliminary and, of course, quite incomplete collection of some phrases found in the various texts that are typical of the various schools and areas.

* brahmaṇa vādino vādanti, and: tād ahuḥ, used in the older Śaṁhitās and Br., in order to quote opinions of other ritual specialists. It is not always clear whether tād ahuḥ indicates the communis opinio of the Vedic people or only that of ritual specialists.

* ya evam vidvān KS, ca. 120 times, but ca. 80 times in MS and TS; the more common formula is ya evam veda;153 cf. also ya evam etad veda, ya u cainām veda, evam vidvā;154 yasya evam vidiṣṭa VadhB, KS, KaṭhB; see Caland, AO IV p. 309 n. 4 = Kl. Schriften p. 309.

* iti vadantāḥ AB 2.22.1, BŚS, and SB when referring to the opinion of others, see Caland, Über BŚS p. 53.

* athataḥ SB, BŚS, KB, AB etc., see Caland, Über BŚS p. 53.

* tasyoktam brahmaṇam, AB.

* iti brahmaṇam udāharanti AB.

* tād vyākhyāyate SB 1.7.4.4, explains ritual through a story; ŚBK 2.7.2.1;155 ity ākhyāyate JB 1.165 (at the end).

* tat tān nādṛtyam “this is not to be followed, observed” AB 1–5, AĀ 1.2.3, see Keith AĀ transl., p. 176, n. 1; Aufr. ed. AB, p. 432.

* but contrast: tāt tathā na kuryāt (tād u punah paricāṣate) AB 6–8156, or na
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tad ādriyate KĀ, KB, see Lévi, Sacr., p. 38 n. 6, 44 n. 1.

* tv eva sthitā- KB, see Caland, ed. ŠBK, p. 84.

* tv eva sthitam, ŠBK, Cal. p. 84; VādhB, see Cal. AO 2, p. 155, etat sthitam VādhB, see AO IV, p. 213.

* eva eva sthitih ŠBM, ŠBK, Cal. p. 84; eva sthitih VādhB, see AO 2, p. 155.

* ity etat ekam...ity etat ekam...BSS, while Vādh uses athaikam...athaikam... when different opinions are mentioned; see Caland, AO II, p. 155=KL. Schriften p. 290.

* tad rajñā saṁtiṣṭhate “this according to the well-known procedure” BSS, see Caland, Über BŚS, p. 54; cf. Vādh B raju-, see AO 4, p. 213.

* etāvan nana “this much is different” BhŚS, VkhŚS, see Kashikar, ed. BhŚS p. LXXXIII.

* atha vai bhavati, BŚS, very frequent, used when quoting a Br. passage of the Taitt. school, see Kashikar, ed. BhŚS, p. LXXVII.

* iti uviṣṇayate, BŚS (frequently), also in BhŚS; ĀpŚS 15.6.13, etc., used for quotations taken from a Brāhmaṇa; ĀpŚS 21.2.10, cf. Kashikar, ed. BhŚS p. LCII.

* iti uktam ĀpŚS, sometimes used to quote a Br. passage, see Kashikar, ed. BhŚS p. LXXXII.

* ity aparam, ity eke, used, e.g., in ĀpŚS to quote the opinion of others, see Garbe, ed ĀpŚS III, p. XIV, Kashikar, ed. BhŚS p. XCIV.

* sāyujuṣam salokatām jayati VādhB 4.94
  sāyujuṣam sārūpaṭam salokatām ānute AB 1.6
  sāyujuṣam salokatām āpnoti, TB 3.10.11.6 (<KāṭhB)
  (…sāyujuṣam), sārūṣṭam samānālokatām yanti TB 3.12.9.8 (<KāṭhB).

* repetition of the last sentence at the end of a chapter in AB, and in many other texts, including some Upaniṣads. Note the special conditions regarding this in VādhS, see W. Caland, KL. Schriften, p. 268 sqq. passim.

Notes


2) Another type of OIA could be represented in the Gāthās and Ślokas that are contained in the various Vedic texts (almost completely collected by P. Horsch, Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur, Bern 1966). I will deal with this in a further instalment of this series. A first impression, however, seems to indicate that the Gāthās and Ślokas follow the trends found in their host texts.

3) This has been discussed in § 9 of “Tracing the Vedic dialects”.—Cf. also the forthcoming ar-
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ticle by C. Caillat, a lecture given at the First International Vedic Conference, held at Harvard Univ., June 1989

4) For ready reference I repeat the major schools and their areas:
(N.-) WEST: CENTER: E. CENTER: EAST:
KURU PaNCāLA KOSALA VIDēHA
Kaṭha (KS, KpS) Taittirīyā (TS, TB) Kāva (ŚBK) Mādhyandina (ŚBM)
Aitareyin (AB: older part) Kaśītakī (KB, KĀ) Baudhāyana AB (later part)
*Śāty. Br. > JB (BSS) Śākalya’s RV
Kauthuma (PB, ChU) *Bhāllavin Br. (SV)
Paippalādin (PS) Śāunaka (ŚŚ = AVŚ)

5) See Tracing Vedic Dialects, pp. 224 sqq.

6) For some indication of this, see author, Regionale und überregionale Faktoren in der Entwicklung vedischer Brahmanengruppen in Mittelalter. (Mater. zu den ved. Schulen, 5). Regionale Tradition in Südasien, ed. by H. Kulke and D. Rothermund (= Beiträge zur Sūdasienforschung 104), Heidelberg 1986, pp. 37-76

7) Except for some easily detectable phonetical features and influences of the local script on the actual form of the text. For example, there is the Kashmiri preference for writing ich instead of "normal" Vedic ch or ech (such as in gacchati); the Gujarati peculiarity of the MS Sandhi –n ch– (<-t s-, as in uchhiṭṭa for uchchita) seems to be based on medieval manuscripts, see Lubotsky, IJJ 25, p. 167-179. Here also belong cases of medieval North Indian peculiarities such as SB or VS 1.1-2: vaśayāvas stta, pprāppayatu, śiṛṣṭhatāmāyā karrmaṇā āppayādhiṃvam, bhūtvā, viśvevadā, vacasoḥ, (cf. also VIJ XII p. 128 sqq., and Tracing, p. 109, and note 30) or South Indian (Taittirīyā) writings such as śaṭīthi.

8) To mention just one case: the Abhinihita Sandhi, first securely attested in Paṇini’s rules (6.1.109) has been carried through in all Vedic texts with just a few overlooked passages that have preserved older forms; on the other hand, Paṇini himself attests other pronunciations as still existing in his time (see Tracing §6.7, p. 188), and while pseudo-restitutions (–o a– etc.), have been introduced by the redactors such as Śākalya, in many passages from the RV downwards. The texts, in their present redacted form, exhibit a pseudo-unity (for example, –o ‘–) which never existed during the Vedic period. It will be one of the tasks of future research to establish the proper forms of Sandhi and other phonetic peculiarities for each Vedic school. This is, as any investigation of the Paippalāda material will quickly show, not an easy task (see below §1, and cf. Prolegomena on AV tradition, forthcoming).

9) See note 4

10) If viewed in opposition to the older Kuru-Paṇcāla texts such as PS, KS, MS, TS, AB etc.

11) The case of vai is similar. In some late texts, such as TĀ, vai is no longer employed in the typical identifications (e.g.: reto ‘gniḥ); they have become too commonplace to need any stress, (as was still needed at the time of the Sāthitās).

12) And again, as far as the myths are concerned, the older, traditional beginning sentences and the often younger phrases that enlarge on a traditional topic, as has been pointed out recently by S. Jamison at the First International Vedic Workshop, held at Harvard University in June 1989 (publ. in press).

13) S. Jamison, personal communication.

14) Note WZKS 24, p. 52, 74 on the relation of the Kaṭha: Taitt. school.

15) For the abbreviations of texts see Tracing the Vedic dialects

16) See also Ved. Var. II, §885 sqq.; subsequently, I always arrange the texts in geographical order from West to East (horizontally), and in quasi-historical order (vertically).
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17) exceptionally –o a-, see below
18) but: 19.52.15b āṇuṣṭāvā āṇuṣṭāvā 16.83.2c sāhāntītātāvā ucchīṣṭe, 16.153.8c te brahma
   kṣetvā samidhāv upāsta, which probably all are due to Barret; note the same problem for other
   still unedited books of PS, below in note 55.
19) RV Prāt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda
20) AVPrāt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where –au
   u–>–a u–.
22) aśvinā udajyataṁ 4.8.9; aśvinā śṛcitāḥ 7.16; dvā ubhayōḥ 8.5; see ed. Aufrechtp. 427.
23) Vaj. Prāt. 4.124 prescribes this but quotes other authorities at 4.125 which agree with the
   practice of RV, VSM.
24) For example KpS 2.4 viṣṇa ete=RV 7.99.3 < > KS 2.10:266.10 viṣṇa ete, see Oertel, SB
   Münchener 1934 p. 17.
25) Taitt. Prāt. 10.19; but 10.29 mentions another teacher who prescribes āv, āv in all cases, as
   do the MSS.
27) For example PB 11.4.13 bāhūto 'sāv ubhe.
28) For example manāṇo rū ṛ PB 5.9.4.
29) See Keith, tr. AĀ p. 55; Aufrechtp. ed. p. 427: aṣṭāv-aṣṭā udyante 1.3.5; aindrāṇā śṛcitā 1.5.1;
   kāṇḍa upāsaṇyata 3.2.4; tā unātriṭkata 1.4.2; nākaraṇa kārṇa upāptaṁ 3.2.6;
30) For example: JB 1.1=Caland §1: dvau samudrāv acaryauv, mahātāv śa śavaśartete; śyāmaśa-
   balav eva JB 1.6 = §2; 186 bhāṣajyataṁ idam, imāv upāgaṇatām, etc., somapa iti; presently,
   I cannot find cases of –o u, u–.
31) Also, (pratīka) at PSK 13.9.1=PSOr 12.18, 15.22.3, 18.64.6, 20.43.7; cf. author, IJ 25,
   p. 239; cf. also BhGS 2.7, HGS 2.7.2, KpMp 2.16.2, HirPīś 18.10. The text runs: PS
   10.9.10 uṛuṣa-h-asvya [ ] udumbala. yamasya ditauc carato janāh anu | tāv asmabhyaṁ
   dṛṣṭaye sāryaṁ punar dātam asum adyeta bhadram; Note the Orissan glide –h–; more fre-
   quent is a glide –y–.
32) Keith, AĀ transl. p. 55: au> āv not in AĀ 5=Sūtra (where –al); cf. also Paś. 8.3.17–22: asā
   ādityaṁ.
33) The text editions of all the various U.p.s having this śanti seem to follow the tradition with
   the Sandhi nā, even those of Kaṭha Up.; this may, however, be due to the fact that the U.p.s
   were transmitted outside the text corpus of the Kaṭha school.
34) There is, however, one single Kaṭha inscription of the 11th cent. in the Malwa area, see
   Renou, Ecoles, p. 203. For the tradition of this school see StII 8/9, pp. 183 sqq., 223 sqq.;
   author, The Veda in Kashmir, ch. VIII (forthc.)
35) It is quite a different matter that some other texts transmitted in Kashmir (such as
   the Kashmir RV and PS) are influenced by the dominant Veda tradition in the Valley, i.e. that
   of the Kaṭhās.
36) Note some other special Sandhis in MS, see M. Lubotsky, IJ 25, 167 sqq.
38) And especially in Tracing, passim and p. 240 n. 334.
39) cf. Tracing, §5.1, and for –f– §6.3.
40) Tracing, §5.1.
41) For more details, see “The development of the Vedic Corpus and of the Vedic Schools”, in
   Proceedings of the First International Vedic Workshop, Harvard University, June 1989,
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42) Cf. the Śākala ritual at AB 3.43.5 (a text from the Panjab), Greek: Sāggala ~ modern Sialkot in the eastern Panjab. For Greek Sāggala, see Arrianus, Anabasis 5.22.2, in the land of the Kathaioi (=Katha).

43) See Tracing, §6.3.

44) See Renou, JA 1948, p. 35 §16.

45) Unfortunately, the Sandhi forms in the Śākalya hymn 10.95, as compared to the ŚB version, are inconclusive in this matter. There is no vowel Sandhi of the above type; cf. nevertheless: 3c avrē kṛtāu vi.

46) See Localisation, p. 186.

47) The comparative age is indicated, as is well known, by the fact that originally intervocalic -iy-, that had already developed to -y-, is no longer affected (ule : idya-).

48) See Tracing, §6.3.

49) For some articles (in the press) on this point, see see note 41.

50) Cf. Oertel, SB Akad. München 1934, p. 14 sqq. and cf. Raghu Vira, ed. KpS, repr. p. XII (with partly incorrect reasoning: -/- is also found in Kaṭha texts (see above); Anuvāra before ṣ, ś, ṣ, ḫ is due only to the lackadaisical ways of late medieval scribes; the system of marking the accents resembles that of the RV, but is found also in old MSS of VS (1423 A.D. and earlier, see author in VIJ 12—which unfortunately contains many printing mistakes). The true Mantra variants and the division of KpS in Aṣṭakas, however, remain valid arguments when comparing KpS with RV.

51) Note that the Orissa MSS have a glide here: -y-ātaye; this kind of glide is not unfrequently met with in PS as transmitted in Orissa (e.g. at PS 6.15.8 ta-y-eka; 6.16.5d tuvigraṇ a vera te (Or. MS tey) aṃṣum; 14.6.10c ṛāpita etāḥ (Or. MS yetaḥ); 20.3.3d prayacchan pura (Or MS pura-γ-) etu; cf. also 20.6.2b dīvo ya (Kashm. l MS ya-y) eka; in general, cr. also Wack.-Debr., Ai. Gr., I, Nachtr. p. 183: 233.18 ga iṣya, Ep. Ind. 8.16.8.

52) The Orissa MSS all read viṣṇu!

53) At PS 5.7.10c pra puṇyaātaṁ viṣṇo aśraya reto; 4.12.3a sahasva manyo abhimātim asme; 4.32.1a yas te manyo 'vidhad vajra sayaka. This deviation probably is due to a restauration, at the time of redaction, of the “normal Abhijnihita”.

54) PS 20.14.3c dīrā[ti] tev manya abhīrtam; thus all MSS, but one Or. MS has manyā. There is no ready explanation for this but to suppose influence from other cases where -ō precedes u[ḥ]-.

55) Note that books 16 and 19 are involved of which I cannot check the Orissa MSS right now; cf. above, note 19.


57) See K. Hoffmann, Aufsätze, p. 15 sqq.

58) See W. Caland, Kleine Schriften, Stuttgart 1990, p. XIV.
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63) See Tracing, p. 101 n.6; cf. also the story in JB 2.100–102 Caland §133: Darbha Śatāniki is called "Darbha" even by the boys of the Pañcāla; this name is changed to Kusā later on, out of respect.

64) cf. TS 1.6.3.
65) cf. KpS 6.9, TB 1.1.5, 1.1.3.
66) Rāthaprotaka Darbhāyā 2.1.3:4.3.
69) Cf. also VadhB 3.87 (Keśin Maitreya), 3.46, 3.94, 4.37, 4.102.
70) Rathaprota Darbhya 2.1.3:4.3.
71) Cf. also BSS 18.19, 14.7, 17.54 where only Keśin (with Dār/lbhya) is mentioned.
72) Cf., however, O.v. Hinüber’s note, in his Überblick, p. 109 sq. on the distribution of r/l and its phonetic character within the same dialect/area.
73) The various objectively existing historical levels in Vedic Sanskrit and in Vedic texts were apparently regarded by the authors of the texts as both historical and "social": Sometimes the texts regard the forms of the Mantras as archaic, see now J. Gonda, Mantra interpretation in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Leiden 1988, S. Jamison, Mantra glosses in the ŚB, Hoenigswald-Fs., Tübingen 1987, p. 169 sqq.; see already author, Kaṭha-Āraṇyaka (Kathmandu 1974) 2.99 (saddhā— in Mantra :: gṛhd— in Brahm.), with commentary in unpubl. thesis, Erlangen 1972, ad loc.).—In other cases, the texts make a distinction between human and divine speech. For example, at MS 1.5.12:81.3–4, the gods use the archaic form rātrīm while the author of this YV Saṅkh. text itself already uses rātrīm, without any discussion. (A similar case is the well known ŚB distinction between arva: aśva: hari: haya, the name of the horse with the gods, men and ancestors, ŚB 10.6.4.1,—see Tracing, p. 101.)
74) RV 1.65.4; 9.97.11; 1.135.6; 9.62.8; 9.75.4; RVKh 2.12.2; SVK 2.370<RV, SVJ 3.30.13<RV; PS 16.75.12; 16.139.18.
75) According to the Vedic Word Concordance:
PS 2.33.2; 2.83.2; 16.53.5; 16.100.12; 16.111.2; 17.9.1; 17.29.11; 19.47.12; 20.60.11; 4.15.3; 17.16.7; 16.149.2; 4.7.7.
ŚS 4.12.5; 9.6.2; 9.12.15; 10.7.20; 10.9.2; 24; 12.11.7; 12.4.8;
MŚp 1.8.1, 10. 12; 3.3.3; 3.11.9; 12.21;
KŚp 6.1.2; 13.10; 21.4; 34.12; 36.6; 38.3; KSAśv 10.4
KpS 3.12; 4.1; 31.19; 39.4;
TS 5.1.26; 5.2.11.2;
TSp 7.4.9.1
VSM 19.212; 23.36
VSK 21.6.13²; 25.7.4.
77) RV 9.112.4.
78) ŚŚ 20.133.6.
79) RV 8.31.9; 10.86.16–17; 1.126.7; 8.91.6;
ŚŚ 20.16.16–17;
PS 4.26.6; cf. PS 4.24.2; 1.49.3;
80) RVKh 4.7.6–7; ŚŚ 5.5.7; PS 6.4.6; there is no romaśavakṣyāra; see also lomaśasaktīya VS 24.1, VSK 26.1.3, TS 5.5.23.1, KS Aśv. 8.2, lomasaktīya MS 3.13.2.
82) ŚŚ 12.3.54; 10.2.11; 7.78.1; 12.3.21;
PS 17.4.4; 1.94.3; 2.64.1; 16.60.3; 17.22; 17.39.1.

82a) Only TB 1.6.6 and TĀ/TU. ĀpŚŚ 22.14.20.
83) PB 20.13.5.
84) KB 10.1.
85) ŠBK 4.3.4.7, with the typical adherence of the Kaṇvas to Western norms. ŠBM 13.8.3.13.
86) JB 3.2.4.17; 3.111; JUB 3.6.4.
87) TU 1.11, TB 1.1.6.6.
88) Kirata: VS 30.16, VSK 34.3.3, TB 3.4.12.1, PB 13.12.5.
89) PB 20.13.5.
90) Kiratika: VS 30.16, VSK 34.3.3, TB 3.4.12.1, PB 13.12.5.
91) Kailata: PS 8.25a kailata pīṇa upatīnya babhaya; should one compare also Kailāsa (a mountain, KaṭhB ed. Caland, Ver sac 1920 p. 486): kailasa (illness), which has its origin in the mountains?
92) A provisional count of the forms with kar-/kur vs. kr̥o/kṛ̥- in PS shows 30 forms of kur- vs. 185 of kr̥o/-c- (incl. 37 of kr̥-) and 11 of kar- vs. 231 of kr̥-.
93) Of interest, and fitting the above scheme of the distribution of l/r is the corruption of *abhigur vadah* > abhi gul bodhandhaḥ MS 4.9.12:133:1–3, (abhigur vṛdhanaḥ TĀ 4.20.2, abhi hūrvataḥ Kaṭhā 1.198.11); see K. Hoffmann, StII 3/6 p. 90.—For the interchange between l/r in ŠBM/ŠBK, see Caland, ed. ŠBK, p. 37 §5). The Kaṇvas usually have r, while the Madhy. have l; this underlines the usual Western preferences of the Kaṇvas, while the Madhy. l agrees with the ‘Eastern’ l in Middle-Indian and the Pkts.—
94) Numerous other investigations are possible; I select only a few examples: the spread of the verb gad which seems to have originated in the Pañcāla land (TB+), cf. Lüders, Phil. Ind., p. 435 sq., Kuiper, IJ 4, p. 273 sq.; or the restriction of the verb ilayati to some texts, see J. Narten, IJ 10, 239 sqq.: or the difference in sounds of RV vṛad vs. post-Rgvedic mrāḍ; cf. a similar distribution in padbhāsa/padēvīsā (cf. StII 8/9, p. 156 sqq.).

A mere change in expression, which nevertheless agrees with the various dialect groups established in Tracing..., and also agrees with the divisions of ŠB, may be noted in margin: dvādaśa vai māṣāḥ saṃvatsaraḥ MS, KS, KP Ś, TS, TB, TĀ, VadhB, PB, JB, GB; ŠB 6–10, 13, dvādaśa vai māṣāḥ saṃvatsaraḥ AB-6, KB, dto. 9ha vai GB, dvādaśa māṣāḥ sa saṃvatsaraḥ MS, KS, KP Ś, TS, PB, (AB with presumptive tāvān), dvādaśa māṣāḥ saṃvatsaraśya ŠB 1–5, 11–13, 14.2 and typically, ŠBK 1; dvādaśa māṣa paścāsād/saptā ṛtvatvāh saṃvatsaraḥ ŠB 8, ṛtvatvāh SB 6–10, 13, paścā ṛtvatvāh saṃvatsaraḥ ŠB 6–9, JB, VadhB, also: “vai” ŠB, ṛtvatvāh saṃvatsaraḥ ŠB 6–7, 12–13, TĀ, PB, JB, also: “vai” MS, KS, KP Ś, TS, KB, JB, VadhB, saptā ṛtvatvāḥ saṃvatsaraḥ ŠB 6–9, tṛayāl/paścāsād tṛtēvāh saṃvatsaraśya ŠB 1–5, 11–12, ŠBK, GB, tṛayodāśa māṣāḥ saṃvatsaraḥ MS, KS, KP Ś, TS, VadhB, ŠB 6–9, 13, tṛayodāśa māṣāḥ saṃvatsaraśya ŠB 3, 14.1–3, GB, caturvedaṁiśātīrdhaḿaṁ saṃvatsaraḥ ŠB 2–5, 11, caturvedaṁiśātīrdhaḿaṁ saṃvatsaraśya KS, KP Ś, PB, KB, ŠB 2–5, 11, ŠBK; see Oertel, Fs.
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Thomas, p. 691 sqq.

95) See for the time being, Tracing p. 240 n.334; p. 115.

96) He also teaches: 4.2.93 rāṣṭriya- (var. lect. in MS, KS, found next to Vedic rāṣṭriya- MS, KS; see further below), 5.1.40 putraṇya/putraya-, 4.2.27, 28: apāṃnapṛtya/apāṃnapṛtya/apāṃnapṛtya/aponapṛtya/ (and: apāṃnapṛtya/aponapṛtya- which is unattested); 4.2.29 mahendriya/mahendriya-, 4.2.32 agnīṣṭoma- etc.; 5.1.4 apāṃṣya/apāṃṣya- etc.; 5.1.69: daksina-;daksina-; kāhakṣara-/kāhakṣara-; 5.1.70 sthālibya/sthālibya-; cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altind. Gramm. II 2, §268 p. 435.


As can easily be seen, when taking apart the verb forms in -anīya-, -ya- and the numerals, most forms concur with Wackernagel-Debrunner’s statement.— Cf. also puroṣaṣya : puroṣaṣya KS 32.7, see Bronkhorst, Kratylos 32, 1987, p. 56.


99) Here, again, the question rises: which Vedic texts did Pāṇini know? The present quotation seems to indicate, if taken in isolation, that he knew even the prose texts of TS; he infers the Taitt. texts (Brāhmaṇa and Mantra: chando-brāhmaṇāni 4.2.66) which had been promulgated by Tittiri (4.3.102 tittiri-varantantu-khaṇḍikahāca chan); cf. below, n. 146 and §5.

100) 1.5.6, 1.5.7, 1.5.12, 1.6.8, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 3.4.5, 3.6.10, 3.7.8, 3.8.2, 3.13.9, 4.3.1;

101) 7.5, 8.10, 10.2, 13.12; 15.1, 23.7, 24.7, 29.1, 34.14, 37.2;

102) 1.8.1.1, 2.3.3.3, 2.5.2.3, 2.3.2.2, 3.4.3.2, 3.4.3.3, 6.1.11.6, 7.5.15.1;

103) marutvatīya-niṣhevalya-

104) One cannot exclude, however, that KaṭhāSŚ was composed in the East, along with the Jēṣṭ, so-called Prācyā Kaṭha texts.
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105) Patañjali ad Pāṇ. 4.2.28 has both forms.

106) yajñayajñṣya- is attested at ĀpŚŚ 5.11.6, 5.13.8, 5.15.6, 17.23.7, 22.10.1; while yajñayajñṣya- is attested at ĀpŚŚ 13.15.3, 5; 14.34.4, 17.9.1, 17.12.10, 21.5.14; however, there is no obvious difference in the use of the words which refer to stotras and melodies. One may speculate on various authors (cf. Ālekhana, etc.) of the several parts of ĀpŚŚ. The above list is complete; however, only a few of these instances are quoted in VWC.

107) Which reminds of the findings of Kashikar in Fs. Kuiper (Pratidanam, Leiden 1967) which point to a certain difference between the Saññhita and the Brāhmaṇa as far as the original sub-school adherence is concerned.


109) Delbrück, Syntax p. 504 sqq., lists: u+vāi, evā, hi, ha, svīd ca and the secondary position of u in cases like dīho, tātha, uto: but also: u khalu p. 492, cf. u ha 499; atha-u, tatha-u, uto-u 514; vai-u 482; āha sentence 520; ha: kim u 508, 517.

110) See the preceding notes; cf. also Delbrück, Syntax, p. 500.


112) According to Klein, Towards..., pt. 2, p. 6. However, Grassmann seems to have only 392 cases (my count).

113) All figures in the Br. Vol. of VPK are unreliable; the examples are from AB 1–2, ŚBM 1–3, ŚBK 1, etc., only. The new Br. ed. has even fewer; the Up. vol. and the Sūtra vol. (ĀŚŚ, ŚŚŚ, Nirukta) also contain but very few cases. We are in need of a new, preferably a computer-based index.

114) Forms uvo(+ eva) in TB, BŚŚ, optionally in ŚBK, see ed. Cal. p. 35, sq.; uvo eva TB 1.2.2.5; uvo eva TS 2.2.7.4, 2.3.7.4, etc.; BŚŚ 16.10: 266.6; but u eva ŚBM; VadhB uvo evaitad 3.12, cf. AO IV p. 212; JB §186 sa u eva, etc.

115) The Kṣudra Sūtra, an appendix to the Māsāka Kalpa ŚŚ of the Kauth. SV which precedes LŚŚ, DŚŚ, has a few chapters which are Br.-like in style (notably Kṣ.Ś 3); here u is found frequently, esp. yady u, yady u vai, but also u ha and single u.

116) Very common; see Caland, 3.212.

117) Very common; see Caland, Über BŚŚ p. 50 sq.

118) The SV can be neglected here, as it almost completely consists of RV Mantras (i.e. with the exception of 75 Mantras in the whole of SV). Thus, there are only 2 viz. 4 new cases of u in SV.

119) PS, with a size approximately 2/3 that of RV, should have about 261 cases but has only 143, less than half of the expected number; ŚŚ, a text roughly 5/7 the size of RV, should have 280 cases but has only 127, again less than half the expected number.

120) Calculated according to the size of RV/KS.

121) TS, approximately 3/4 the size of RV, does not contain the roughly 294 cases to be expected, but rather has only 52 new cases, i.e. about 1/6 the expected rate of occurrence.

122) MS, roughly 5/6 the size of the RV text, does not have ca. 326 but only 66 new cases, i.e., only 1/5 the number that one might expect to find.

123) If the 28 occurrences in the Sāthiṇhita prose of KS are compared to those of TS and MS, we get: KS with almost 100% of the RV text and 28 cases :: MS, with 3/4 of the text, does not have *21 but only 15 cases, i.e., 3/4; TS, with 3/4 of the size, contains not *17 cases but only
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13, i.e., 2/3 the expected finding.

124) See Delbrück, Syntax p. 499 sq. ("constatiert") + *uvāca*.

125) I am not sure whether I counted all of the cases of this combination, since without a computer database it is very difficult (given the state of affairs in the Vedic Word Concordance), as well as very time consuming, to check all of the cases in all of the necessary texts. This section, therefore, should not be taken as statistically reliable at all, but rather as an indication of a trend.

126) Cf. WZKS 24, 37 and StII 10, 232, n.7: MS *tēna vai...< > KS etad dha vai...(*pāparastyasām/ vidām*) cahāra.

127) MS 4.1.3:5.4 tād dha *sma-ahur* = KS 31.2:3.8 *tad u ha *sma-ahur.*

128) *ha vai* MS 3.7.10:91.3; *khalu vai* MS 2.2.4:18.15; 2.1.3:4.13.

129) Cf. also: *Kaavyo...Śrāvasa...ha vai...vidām cahāra;* further...*ha *sma papraccha* 21.9. MS reads *tām vai* 3.3.9:42:11 in the parallel of KS 21.9, MS 4.1.3:5.4 *tad ha *sma-ahur* = KS 31.2.

130) Cf., however, differently: *sidhyati hai vai* MS 3.7.10:91.3.

131) Cf. also *ha sma vai;* *ha tvai* KS 20.8:27.11; 21.12:53.3.

132) The rest of the cases in TS has other tenses: *ha vai* 10x, *ha sma (vai)* 6 ×, *ha tvai* 4 ×.

133) Note also—without special reference to the perfect—*atha khalu* 2.6, 2.15; *atho khalu* 1.6, 1.11, 5.24, 6.26, 6.36 (*khalu vai* 1.2, 1.15, 2.3, 4.5, 4.16, 8.13, 8.2, 8.4; *u khalu vai* 5.31²; *tad u khalu* 3.11, 3.34; but: *vai khalu* 6.11);—*athataḥ* 13 × in books 6–8!

134) The following texts are not yet viz. cannot yet be presented here statistically due to the deficiencies of VWC. However, *u* occurs frequently in all of them.

135) Note that *uv eva* also occurs in TB, BŚŚ, ŚBK, see Caland, ed. p. 35 sq.; also *ha vāvā* 4.22, 4.4.27, 4.96, *ha sma vāvā* 108; *ha sma vai* 4.50, 4.89.

136) See Caland, AO II p. 153. These are texts from the actual Sūtra, while those labeled VādhB are the so-called Vādhūla-Anvākhyānas (usually misunderstood and quoted as "VādhS", but see StII 1, p. 75 sq.)—The first chapter of the Vādhūla has now been edited and translated by M. Sparreboom (in: M. Sparreboom and J.C. Heesterman, The ritual of setting up the sacrificial fires according to Vādhūla school (Vādhūla-rāutasutra 1.1–1.4), Wien 1989).


138) *ha* occurs in 101 passages (excluding RV quotations), the collocations of which have been mentioned above.

139) MS has 146 cases of *ha* (excluding the quotations from RV); *ha vai* also at MS 1.8.2.

140) TĀ is mentioned among the Brahmaṇas here because of its generally very conservative character (however, TĀ 1, and TĀ 7–10 are late).

141) Preliminary figures, based on VPK and the occurrences mentioned above.


143) On *ha sma* "Dauer in Verg."; see Caland, Über das BŚŚ.

144) texts with rare occurrence = < >; those with frequent occurrences are underlined.

145) See Thieme, Paṭini and the Veda, p. 79.

146) The question is: what does he understand by *udṛṣṭa* Gandhāra, the Uttara-Kuru, Uttara-Madra, the Bāhika tribes? Note also the lumping together of the Kuru and Mahāvṛṣa tribe in SB, see Tracing p. 106 n.20; cf. AB 8.14 on the Northern kingdoms. Thieme, Paṭini and the Veda, thinks *udṛṣṭa* = Paṭini's area, cf. Cardona, Paṭ., p. 147. Cf. also Kaśikā 1.1.75 prāg-udṛṣṭa—"the Northern and the Eastern dialects".


148) He lists the early Middle Vedic periphrastic aorists found in MS and KS as peculiarities,
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cf. above, and knows of Śākalya’s RV text (contemporary with the later parts of ŚB and the late AB) as well as of the Vṛji people (probably of the Panjab), who are later found in Videha and otherwise first mentioned in the Pāli canon (as Vaiṣṇī).

149) The later part of AB (Pañčikās 6–8) indeed has one case at 7.9, but none are found in the earlier parts of this text (AB, Pañčikās 1–5).

150) For more examples of the interchange in Mantras between pītv and māttṛ, see Oertel, p. 82.


152) Cf. Tracing, §10.

153) See author, WZKS XXIII, 1979, p. 7, n. 12. For the situation in ŚB, see Minard, Enigmes I, §373: ya evam veda is less common in books 1–9, but increases in 10 sqq. and esp. in BĀU; cf. Renou, BSL 34, 49 sqq.

154) See Minard, Enigmes, II, §453a, for more details.

155) Cf. the use of anto-ākhyāna in VādhaB.

156) Also at 3.32.