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In two preceding papers\(^1\), 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 Pañini and his North-Western bhasa\(^2\). These postṚgvedic 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) dialects\(^3\).

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 Brāhmaṇa 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 divided\(^5\) into some major dialects, mainly the following three: those of the Kuru, the Pañcāla, and the Easterners (pracya). The land of Kosala, situated between the Eastern and the Pañcāla dialects, and the large Southern (dakṣinatya) fringe of Vedic India, (i.e. Alwar, Baghelkand, Bun-
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delkhand, Malwa/Avanti), were areas of transition which shared some of the features of the neighboring dialects.

Each one of the Vedic schools (sūkha), 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 sūkha 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 Brahanical 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 Brahanical 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 SBK:: SBM:: 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?\(^{11}\)

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 Saṃhitā 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.\(^ {12}\) One could also compare both types of prose with the direct speech that is reported in the texts.\(^ {13}\)

**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 śākhas 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.\(^ {14}\)

The various texts\(^ {15}\) have the following Sandhi forms:\(^ {16}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RV  -o:</th>
<th>-a</th>
<th>u-</th>
<th>-av</th>
<th>V-</th>
<th>PS  -a</th>
<th>u-</th>
<th>-av</th>
<th>V-</th>
<th>ŠŚ  -a</th>
<th>V-</th>
<th>(SVK=RV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-au:</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=RVPrät.(^{19})</td>
<td>=AVPrät.(^ {20})</td>
<td>=SaunPrät.(^ {21})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>u-(^ {22})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>-av</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>VŚK</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpS</td>
<td>-au</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>TPrät.</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>KpS</td>
<td>-av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>KB</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>u-</td>
<td>-āv</td>
<td>V-</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>-āv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSOr</td>
<td>10.9.10</td>
<td>uruṇasā-h-asūr[ ] udumbalau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSK</td>
<td></td>
<td>uruṇasāv aśrēd ūdumberau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>18.64.6</td>
<td>uruṇasāv asūrpāv ūdumbalāy+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>10.14.12</td>
<td>uruṇasāv asūtṛpāv ūdumbalāu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVŚ</td>
<td>18.2.13</td>
<td>uruṇasāv asūtpāv ūdumbalāu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>6.3.2</td>
<td>uruṇasāv asūtṛpāv ūdumbalāu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṛśś</td>
<td>6.10.20</td>
<td>uruṇasāv asūtṛpāv ūdumbalāu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus:

- av voc. -ā u- RV, Ṛśś, TA;
- av voc. -āv u- ŠŚ, TA;

agnā agniś carati MS, KS, MŚś, VŚK
agnā<sup>°</sup> ŚŚ, Vaiśī, Kauśī, TS, ŚBM, KŚś, Ṛśś, ChB, GGS<sup>32</sup>
saha nā avatam KaṭhŚīUp<sup>33</sup>
saha nāv avatam TU 1, and other texts following this famous Upaniṣad Śānti.

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 Prātiṣṭākhya or Śikṣā, and have been transmitted during the Middle Ages in areas of India which are quite distant from each other, namely in Gujarat/N.Maharashtra and Kashmir.<sup>34</sup> Mutual influence during the last one, or probably even two millenia thus is to be excluded.<sup>35</sup> This indicates that the Sandhi forms of these two texts could be a trait going back to the period of their text formation<sup>36</sup> 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 Kāṇyās follow this Western trait, although they are wedged in between the Central (Taftirīya=Pañcāla) and Eastern (Mādhyaandina=Videha) dialects. As we know that the Kāṇyās ultimately came from a more Western area,<sup>37</sup> the conservation of this Kuru Sandhi is another indication that it is of considerable antiquity.

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

More interestingly, the Mādhy. Vaiṣaṇeyins stand quite apart from all the forms mentioned so far, but are in part joined by the Śākala Rgveda and all of the texts of the Aitareya school, even their older parts (AB 1–5). Viewed against the background sketched above,<sup>38</sup> this is of extreme interest. It is obvious that the RV
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in its present Śākala 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).39) Secondly, the present Padapāṭha text shares the Central North Indian development of the fem. gen. in -ai40) 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-Paṅcāla Brahmins at his court (BĀU 3, ŚB 11).41) Although Śākalya’s RV school of the Aitareyains originally stemmed from the West,42) and pertains, e.g., to the -l- zone,43) 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 peculiar RV tradition reported at ŚB (Mādhy.) 11.5.1.10. According to this text, the Purūravas 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 Paṅcāla (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 Śāmhitā 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 Kāṇvas, who usually try to conform to the well-known (Śākalya) RV as far as possible,44) do not follow suit here.45) The course of events, therefore, must have conformed to the scenario described above: import of the Śākala (Aitareya) version of the RV from the West (Kurukṣetra and the lands west of it),46) and redaction of this Śākala RV in the East by Śākalya, in the Vājasaneyi territory (Videha).

It is also notable that the Western trait of -l- for old47) intervocalic -d-, which originated in the Kuru territory with the Kaṭha and Aitareya schools48) and is thus also expected for a Śākala 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 Purūravas hymn of the Eastern RV).

The matter becomes even more involved when we take into account the teach-
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SANDHI VARIATIONS
-2 + V02 - and -M + V02.

Types of results, in simplified form:
1. RV - a V -
2. KS - a V -
3. IS - a V -
4. SS - a V -

The upper part of the circles refers to Sandhi of -9, the lower to -M.
ings of the Prātiṣākhya and of Pāṇini on this subject. According to Pāṇ. 8.3.19, Śākalya would have read, for example, *asa adityaḥ*. This is *not* what we get in our present RV as well as in the RVPrāt. which teaches the well-known forms such as *asav adityaḥ*, 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 Padapātha and probably not the Sāṃhitāpātha 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 Āranyaka which teaches some rules about RV pronunciation and adheres to the same Sandhi (-av 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 redaction 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 Taittirīya 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 utaye*41)

19.17.13b *uṣena vāya udakenēhi*

20.7.8a *dīvō vispa*50) *uta vā pṛthivyā.*

However, *-o a-* is found occasionally,53)
The cases of -o before other vowels are represented, as expected, by -av:

2.28.5b baradvējo madhav annam kṛnotu
4.12.4a eko bahtam asi manyav idita
6.16.3a upa naḥ pitaḥ ā gahi
7.19.6a yadā pilaḥ 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 the other vowels:

16.15.8d strī ca punāms ca tā ubhāv arasa;
19.52.9a urupāsav asūtraū udumbarau;
1.60.2b sasahai śvasuraū ubhau;
9.5.5d kim ārū pāda ucyete;
16.105.4b ubhā ugrau carato viryāva;

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

1.4.6b yad vastāv adhi samīrutam
4.37.2b yau viditāv isubhiṣṭam asīthaun
5.18.3a devāv imau vātav vāta
6.6.8b nynañjanti madhāv adhi
10.1.6a yau cāsa āhavih grhag
17.29.9a yau asya pūrṇapāduau tau pūrṇapakyaun
18.30.1c vāsantaev emau māsau pracyā diṣo gopāyato
20.15.9b yau astathatur bhuvanā jyeṣṭam.

However, there are some deviating cases:

19.52.15b data muḍāv uṭukyaḥ
16.83.2c sahnātirātrau ucchiṣte
16.153.8c te brahma kṛteva samidhāv upāsta

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

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

There is, as a study of the text of PS will quickly reveal,57) a considerable influence of the RV on PS, such as the preference of PS for Rgvedic kṛṇotu instead of common Atharvavedic karuṭu, etc. This is quite old, as cases such as kṛṇeva for kaṇva reveal: kaṇva 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 kaṇva 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
peculiar position of VS(M) with which it agrees in this case.

VS is extracted, according to Caland only secondarily from SB. Indeed the accent systems of both texts disagree sharply: SB has what the Bhāṣika Sūtra and Śabara call the bhaṣika accentuation, a simplification of the original Vedic tonal pattern to a sequence of high and low tones only. However, VS has the usual Vedic pattern with Anudatta, Udatta, Svarita (and other tones such as Anudattara). 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 follow the pattern of accentuation marks found in Māitr. 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 Vājasaṇeyins 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 l/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-Paṇcāla successor as found in the Sanskrit of the YV Śaṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. Generally speaking, words with l instead of r have been on the increase, as is well known, ever since the RV.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SBK 2</th>
<th>JB</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>GB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)pala.ayate</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SBK 2</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)pala.ayate</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>KpS,</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>BÄUK 4</td>
<td>(BÄUM vi-pary-l)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pla.ayate</td>
<td>MS,</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nil.ayate</td>
<td>TS,</td>
<td>TB,</td>
<td>VadhB,</td>
<td>BŚS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, TĀ, ŚB, VadhB, ŠBK 1 (=ŚBM). 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 Kaṇyas, 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 ŚB 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/penkha

penkha- is found in TS, TB, and JB, while pla. iṅkh is found in MS. On the other hand, preṅkha- occurs in RV, PS, KS, MŚS, VārŚS, ŚŚ, KĀ, ŚŚS, BŚS, ĀpŚS, HŚS, KŚS, AĀ, and pra. iṅkh 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 Pañcāla king Keśin Dalbhya has a variant of his name, Darbhya, which is closer to the original, as it is derived from darbh- (grass); indeed, there is a story in BŚS 18.38 which tells that his original name was Śīrṣanyā Kusa.(69)
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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, BSS 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 Maitrāyanīya 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 Kaushitakis and Taitt. in Uttar Pradesh (Paścāla 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 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 plaipala-ayate could be selected in both their “educated” and their popular forms. On the other hand, terms such as some popular words as aliklava “eagle”, lomaša “hare” (presumably, a specialized hunter’s term?), or a (predominantly?) children’s word such as pleňkh, pleňkha- 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 plaipala-ayate and loman are found in the whole area of Vedic dialects, from the Panjab 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 (pleňkh), both in the Central and Southern area (aliklava), in the N. Kuru-Paścāla area (lohita), in the Central area only (alukša), or are restricted to the Kuru-Paścāla area (lomaša).
EASTWARD SPREAD OF VEDIC ItemClick 1.

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 ŚB and the Kāuva version of the VS, a comparatively late extract from ŚB. Some variants with l of words with r never reach the east.
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The distribution in the various texts of the words in -l- 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) roman75)</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></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></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>VardSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romanavat77)</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomatas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVPar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lomāśa</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>ŠBK</th>
<th>ŠBM</th>
<th>ĀA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpS</td>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>BhŚŚ, ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VaitŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomaśāvākṣaṇa(lang)</td>
<td>ŠS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVKh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) lalāṭa</td>
<td>TS, ŠS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVKh, PS, KŚmp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSmp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpŚmp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBMo</td>
<td>ĀĀ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŚŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VaitŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarāṭa</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>VŚK</td>
<td>VSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KŚmp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSmp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>ŠBMo</td>
<td>ŠBMn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rarāṭi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VaitŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) rohita:</td>
<td>ŠS</td>
<td></td>
<td>VSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KŚp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>TB, TĀ</td>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ABn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DŚS, LŚS</th>
<th>ĀpŚŚ, HŚŚ</th>
<th>BŚŚ</th>
<th>KŚŚ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ŚŚŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ĀpMp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HŚŚ, ĀgGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVPar</td>
<td>VaitŚ, KauśŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lohita:81</th>
<th>RVKh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>ŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABo</td>
<td>TB, KB, JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TĀ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB</th>
<th>rohini:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>PS, SVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSP, MSm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>TB, TĀ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KathB</td>
<td>KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| lohini:82 | |
|-----------| PS |
|           | MSP |
| AB        | TĀ  | ŚBK | ŚBM |
|           | ŚA  |     | AĀ  |
|           | ĀpŚŚ | VaitŚ |

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

(5) ariklava  aliklava
PS  ŚŚ
KS  JB

(6) arūkṣa
PB\(^{85}\)  <arūkṣa\(^{85}\)>
KB\(^{84}\)  ŚBK\(^{85}\)  ŚBM 13.8.3.13

KaṭhŚiU  <TU\(^{87}\)>
<TB>

(7) Kirāta
kirāta\(^{88}\)
PB  TB  VSK  VSM
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 (Kaṭha/Paippalāda/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 *Kṛṇya* for RV *Kanva*; similarly, in PS, the more archaic, Rgvedic forms *kṛṇu*-, *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 \( -l/-r \) versus \( -r/-l \) in the post-Rgvedic period, 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 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.

§3. The suffix *-iya* in Pāṇini and the Veda

Two forms in of adjectives *-iya* (i.e. *śunāśīriya, upavasatiya*), found instead
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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 sunāsīrya, also: dyācāprayiṣṭi, marutoṭi, agniṣomīya, vaṭāsparīya, and gṛhamedhiya.96)

Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altind. Gramm. II 2, §268 p.435 sq. report only a few Ṛgvedic words that have the suffix -iya, namely the following: the numerals devi-, trī-, turīya-, a few cases of -aniya-, the place names ārjīya- and hariya- and the ritual term gṛhamedhiya-. To this the AV adds: agniṣomīya-, and dakṣiniya- parvatiya-. 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 well97) and that it became very productive in the YV Saṃhitā and in the Brāhmaṇa periods.

This is also stressed by Wack.-Debr.II 2 p. 441 who underline98) that the suffix -iya/-iya- often is found in variation with -iya/-iya-, -yā/-yā- 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>(N.-)WEST</th>
<th>CENTER</th>
<th>E. CENTER</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gṛhamedhiya-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV 7.56.14;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS 21.13 (&lt;RV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 4.10.5 (&lt;RV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutras frequent:</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gṛhamedhiya-:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS 35.9 (=pākayaji);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutras frequent:</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB 2.1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāstopatiya-</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></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>
<tr>
<td>KGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vāstospatya—
MS 1.5.4.13;  
GB 1.2.18;  
Sutras:
MGS  VārŚŚ  
VaitŚŚ  
KauŚŚ  
AVPar

agniṣomiyya—  
(nearly all prose:) cf. Paṅ. 4.2.138, 3.13
Mantra:
PS 16.111.6  ŠŚ 9.6.6  VSK 26.2.3  VSM 24.8
MS 2.6.1
Prose:
KS[21]  TS[22]
Br. very frequent:
KaṭhB  TB
AB 2  KB
PB  JBa  ŠBK  ŠBM 1–5, 9, 11–13
GB,
Sutras (also compounds):
LŚŚ  JŚSKār  ĀŚŚ  DŚŚ
MŚŚ  
VārŚŚ  BŚŚ  ĀpSS, HŚŚ  VkhŚŚ  KŚŚ  ĀpDhŚ
KGS

agniṣomiyya—  
only in Paṅ.
marutavatlya—  
(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, 6.5.5.1–2
KS 18.11, 28.3, 44.3  KpŚ
Br. very frequent:
AB 3–5  KB  AB 6–8
KĀ  AĀ  
JB 3.179[23]  ŠBK  ŠBM 4, 8, 13

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

\[ \text{ ŚŚŚ} \quad \text{ĀŚŚ} \]
\[ \text{ BŚŚ} \]
\[ \text{ MŚŚ} \quad \text{ĀpŚŚ, HŚŚ} \]
\[ \text{ VarŚŚ} \quad \text{VkhŚŚ} \]
\[ \text{ KāṭḥŚŚ} \quad \text{Vait. S} \]

maruvatya-
only in Paṇ.

Pāṇini’s rule thus allows for -ya even where it is not attested (with the exception of: \text{vāstospatya}, \text{grhamedhya}, and \text{sunāsirya}).

The distribution of -iya- thus is very varied:

In a case found in older texts (\text{grhamedhiya}) it is widespread in various schools, geographical regions and texts; in other cases (such as \text{upavasathya}, \text{vāstospatya}), the use of the form is limited to the central area (Pañcāla land, modern Uttar Pradesh); in one case (\text{sunāsiriyā}) it has its origin in the Central area but spread to the East as well, and very late (KāṭḥŚŚ\text{180}), also to the East; in still another case its usage starts from the Western area (\text{agniṣomliya}); or it is found widespread right from the Mantra period onwards (maruvatyya).

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parvatiya-</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parvatya-</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjalya-</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjaliya-</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avartiya-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārtya-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avaryā-</td>
<td>MS, KS</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāryā-</td>
<td>MS, KS</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satarudriya-\text{105}</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātārudriya-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiṣapraṣādyā-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiṣapraṣāriya-</td>
<td>MS, KS</td>
<td>TS, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajanya-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajanīya-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṣṭriya-</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṣṭriya-</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāṣṭriya-</td>
<td>Paṇ. 4.2.93, Mbhār.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An evaluation of this evidence indicates that the distribution of the forms in -ίγα- 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: -yajñīya/yajñīya- in ĀpSS or stōkiya KB: stōkiya ŠŚS. 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, ŠŚS, JB) with -yajñīya: a Yajurvedic text of the Southern part of the Western region (MS)
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and Central Yajurvedic and Atharvavedic texts (TS, SS) 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, grñamedhiya, cf. also marjalîya).

— Some words show a spread that transgresses geographically neighboring areas (agnîsomiya, 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 u 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 u 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 u 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 u, as reported by VPK, results in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SVK</th>
<th>SVJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(rest &lt; RV)</td>
<td>501112)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(rest &lt; RV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only the Saṁhitās 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 Saṁhitās (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 Saṁhitā prose; MS, KS, and TS all have only about half the cases they exhibit in their Mantra section. If both the Mantra and the Saṁhitā 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 (VādhaB, BŚS); this also affected the neighboring texts, ŚB 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+ahuḥ, and of \( ha \) vai or khaḷu vai.\(^{128} \)

KS

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

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

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

KS 21.9:49.8 \( Kṣṇvo \) \( ha \) \( vai...=where \) MS reads \( tām \) \( vai \) \( Kāṇṇvaḥ...3.3.9:42.11 \)

in a parallel passage; KS 27.5: 145.12, KpS 42.5: \( etad \) \( dha \) \( vai \) \( Vīptijanas Saurakīḥ \)

\( vidām \) \( cakrāka<><>) \) MS 4.6.2: 79.18 tēna \( vai \) \( Vīptijanaḥ Sāurakīḥ; \)

- KS also exhibits cases of a combination of \( ha \) khaḷu vai;\(^{131} \)

\( vindati \) \( ha \) \( khaḷu \) \( vai \) KS 33.1:17.10; \( yo \) \( khaḷu \) \( vāva \) 33.4:30.10.

TS

contains, according to VWC, many cases of \( ha \) (\( vai \)), but they do not yet include a combination with \( u \): \( ha \) (\( vai \))+\( uvāca \) 11 cases, \(+aḥa \) 2, \(+papraccha \) 1, \(+vidaṁ \)

cakrā 1, and 15 cases+perf.\(^{122} \) 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 Saṅhītā prose, its diffusion begins at

a later stage.

AB:

16 cases of \( ha \)+perfect, notably in the later pāṇcikās (books), however, only a few

which include \( u \): \( ha \) 5x in book 7; \( ha \) vai 8x, especially in books 8 (1x in b.5, 1x in
b.3); but *u ha* only 1x in book 7 (7.22); cf. also *u haiva* 1x (7.34.9). Note that *vai* is especially used in books 1–5; it occurs in these collocations: *u khalu vai* 1x (5.31), *yady u vai* 1x (1.6).

The later fashion of using *u ha/u haiva* is found at AB 2.3 *u ha*, and in book 7.**130**

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

**TB:**
This text equally does not favor *ha+pres.* 1.1.2.2, 1.2.2.5 (3x), 2.3.8.3; *ha+fut.* 2.2.10.2; *ha+perf.*: 2.8.6.5 *ha vai*; 3.8.6.3 *uvaça ha Prajātiḥ*; in Mantra: 2.8.6.6, 2.8.7.8, 2.8.8.1, 2.8.8.10;

further: *u vai*, for example at 3.12.4.4.

**TĀ:**
1.9.2 *ha uvaca Vyāsah Parāśaryah*; 1.22.10 *etad ha sma va āhuḥ*; 1.26.1 *atha ha sma āha*; 1.26.1 *atha āhuḥ*; note that all these occurrences are in a very late section (=KāṭhB) of TĀ; however, single *ha* occurs in 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 *u* with (*ha*) (*vai*) quite frequently:**130**

**VādhaB:**
*haiva* 3x, but: *u ha* 4x (I, p. 9; 3.94, 4.49, 4.93.), and: *u ha vai* 25x in 4. Mitteilung alone; *u haiva* 4.7, 7.74, 4.102. Cf. also *u vai* 1.43, 4.92, *sa u vai eṣa* 4.113; note the "Taittirīya" type Sandhi of *u* in: *uv evaitad* 3.12, and *uv eva* VādhaS 2, 7–8 and cf. AO 2, p.153, 158.**138**

**VādhaSS:**
*yady u* 2.1, 5.3; *tam u* 4.2, 7.3; *etad u* 1.3; *u ha vai*, see VādhaS 2.8, 9, 11; *ha sma+perf.* 3.1, etc.

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

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;
tasmād u §25, 145, 156, 160, 207;

sa u §181,
sa u eva §186;
yu u §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 vāvā §136, 145;

u ha §47, 49, 127, 130, 135, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 151, 152 (tasmād 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.

ŚBK	extsuperscript{137}:
ha+pres. 1.1.1.5, 6; 2.2.4.17; evāṁ 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,
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1.1.1.6;
ha vai+pres. <u vai> 4.3.3.11; ŠBK 4.4.4.2 aspardhanta;
atha heyam tarhi+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 Kāṣṇa version:

ŠBM:  
1.1.1.7 u ha+perf.  
1.1.1.10 u ha sma+a ha+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 (Kāṣṇa) 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+a ha+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>early KS138</th>
<th>ha sma</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>TS ha</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hasma vai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u ha sma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ha sma vai</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha vai</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>ha tvai</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha tvai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ha vāva</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha khalu vāva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha khalu vāi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MS139
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ha vai</th>
<th>1+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ha v eva</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incompl.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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: VādhB, BŚS, JB, ŚB, and AB (6–8).143)

Already in the older Sānkhītās, *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(^{144})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</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 punarmanṭyas and on pāpo).

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

§5. pitāmātar-\( mātāpiṭār -\)

The \( dvandva \) compound \( mātār-piṭārāu \), listed by Pāṇini at 6.3.32, is interesting, for he regards it as an expression taught by the Northern\(^{145} \) (\( udīcyā \)) grammarians.\(^{146} \) Wackernagel regards the word as derived from RV, VS \( mātāra-piṭārāu \) (RV 4.6.7 \( mātārā-piṭārā \)). The similar formation \( mātā-piṭārāu \) is found in AVŚ.

Pāṇ.: mātār-piṭārāu (\( = \) "Northern")

mātā-piṭārāh:

RVKh, MS, KS, KpŚ, TS, VSM, VSK

pitāmātārā (\( = \) "Vedic")

pītārā-mātārā

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 mātārapitārau as far as word position is concerned. The compound (in its various forms) is, however, too widely used to be called “Northern.” More importantly, pitra-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/ mātara-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, AĀ, etc., and when we assume that he did not know or did not wish to acknowledge the (fairly late) Eastern Vedic texts149 such as SB.149

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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yan mātaram pitaram} & \quad \text{ŚS, PS, MS,} \\
\text{vā jihimāma} & \quad \text{TS, TB, TĀ 2.6.1, AŚS} \\
mātā pita ca & \quad \text{ŚS} \\
\text{retaso bhavāthah} & \quad \text{KS, KpS}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yat pitaram mātaram vā} & \quad \text{KS, KpS} \\
jihō & \quad \text{PS} \\
pitā ca mātā ca retaso bhavāthah & \quad \text{PS}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
mātā pita ca & \quad \text{KS, KpS} \\
dadhatur νu agrē & \quad \text{TS, AŚS, MŚS} \\
mātā ca pita ca & \quad \text{ŚS}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
māṭrdevo bhava, pitṛdevo bhava...
\]

The texts which could be called “Northern”, or which are situated on the border of the Udīcyā territory, like KS and AB, participate in both groups, that is
those which place *matr* and those which place *pitṛ* first. But some Central (TS) and Eastern texts like VS, ŚB (M, K) agree with this usage. Strictly speaking, however, Panini’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 Panini from the Northern *bhāsa* 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 Panini’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 śākhās

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.

* *brahmavādino vadanti,* and: *tad ahūṭ,* used in the older Samhitas and Br., in order to quote opinions of other ritual specialists. It is not always clear whether *tad ahūṭ* indicates the communis opinio of the Vedic people or only that of ritual specialists.

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

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

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

* *tasyoktam brahmaṇam,* AB.

* *iti brahmaṇam udāharanti* AB.

* *tad evākhyāyate* ŚB 1.7.4.4, explains ritual through a story; ŚBK 2.7.2.1; *ity ākhyāyate* JB 1.165 (at the end).

* *tat tan nāḍṛtyam* “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: *tat tathā na kuryāt (tad u punaḥ paricākṣate)* AB 6–8, or *na
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tad adriyate KĀ, KB, see Lévi, Sacr., p. 38 n. 6, 44 n. 1.
* tv eva sthīta- KB, see Caland, ed. ŠBK, p. 84.
* tv eva sthitam, ŠBK, Cal. p. 84; VadhB, see Cal. AO 2, p. 155, etat sthitam VadhB, see AO IV, p. 213.
* esa eva sthitih ŠBM, ŠBK, Cal. p. 84; esa sthitih VadhB, see AO 2, p. 155.
* ity etat ekam...ity etat ekam...BSS, while VadhS uses athaikam...athaikam... when different opinions are mentioned; see Caland, AO II, p. 155=KL. Schriften p. 290.
* tad rjudha saṁtiṣṭhate “this according to the well-known procedure” BSS, see Caland, Über BSS, p. 54; cf. Vadh B rju-, see AO 4, p. 213.
* etacan nana “this much is different” BhSS, VkhSS, see Kashikar, ed. BhSS p. LXXXIII.
* atha vai bhavati, BSS, very frequent, used when quoting a Br. passage of the Taitt. school, see Kashikar, ed. BhSS, p. LXXVII.
* iti vijñayate, BSS (frequently), also in BhSS; ĀpSS 15.6.13, etc., used for quotations taken from a Brāhmaṇa; ĀpSS 21.2.10, cf. Kashikar, ed. BhSS p. LCII.
* iti uktam ĀpSS, sometimes used to quote a Br. passage, see Kashikar, ed. BhSS p. LXXXII.
* ity aparam, ity eke, used, e.g., in ĀpSS to quote the opinion of others, see Garbe, ed ĀpSS III, p. XIV, Kashikar, ed. BhSS p. XCIV.
* sāyujyam salokatām jayati VadhB 4.94
sāyujyam sarūpatām salokatām aṁute AB 1.6
sāyujyam salokatām āpnoti, TB 3.10.11.6 (<KaṭhB)
(...sāyujyam), sarśītām samānālokatām yanti TB 3.12.9.8 (<KaṭhB).
* 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 VadhS, 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-
article 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 PAÑCĀLA KOSALA VIDEHA
Kaṭha (KS, KpS) Taittirīyā (TS, TB) Kāśva (ŚBK) Mādhyanāda (ŚBM)
Aitareyin (AB: Kuśītakī (KB, KĀ) Baudhāyana AB (later part)
older part) *Śatya. Br. > JB (BŚS) Śākalya’s RV
Kauthuma (PB, ChU) *Bhālāvīn Br. (SV)
Paippalādin (PS) Śaunaka (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 Südasiensforschung 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 Ś–, as in uchhiṣṭa for uchchhiṣṭa) seems to be based on medieval manuscripts, see Lubotsky, IJ 25, p. 167-179. Here also belong cases of medieval North Indian peculiarities such as SB or VS 1.1-2: vṛtyavas sastra, pūrāppayatu, īṣeṣṭhatamāyā karmamāṇa āppayayādmvan, bahuvir, viśvevadhā, vvasoḥ, (cf. also VIJ XII p. 128 sqq., and Tracing, p. 109, and note 30) or South Indian (Taittirīyā) writings such as śātithīri.

8) To mention just one case: the Abhinīhita Sandhi, first securely attested in Pāṇini’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, Pāṇini himself attests other pronunciations as still existing in his time (see Tracing § 6.7, p. 188), and while pseudo-restitutions (<– o α– 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-Pañcāla 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 Saṭhindas).

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 da|a ms|k|v u|l|k|v|y|a|h, 16.83.2c sa|hn|tir|t|r|v u|c|hi|s|t, 16.153.8c te brahma h|y|t|v|a sam|id|h|v u|p|a|s|t, which probably all are due to Barret; note the same problem for other still unedited books of PS, below in note 55.

19) RV Prá́tt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda Prátiśākhya, 3.40 (repr. Varanasi 1962, p. 147).

20) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now


22)  u|c|h|c|f|t|e, 16.83.2c sahnatir, 16.153.8ctebrahma krtvasamidhav asubhavya, which probably all are due to Barret; note the same problem for other still unedited books of PS, below in note 55.

23) RV Prátt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda Prátiśākhya, 3.40 (repr. Varanasi 1962, p. 147).

24) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

25)  u|c|h|c|f|t|e, 16.83.2c sahnatir, 16.153.8ctebrahma krtvasamidhav asubhavya, which probably all are due to Barret; note the same problem for other still unedited books of PS, below in note 55.

26) RV Prátt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda Prátiśākhya, 3.40 (repr. Varanasi 1962, p. 147).

27) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

28) RV Prátt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda Prátiśākhya, 3.40 (repr. Varanasi 1962, p. 147).

29) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

30) RV Prátt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda Prátiśākhya, 3.40 (repr. Varanasi 1962, p. 147).

31) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

32) RV Prátt. 129 (2.9) and 135 (2.11), see Ved. Var. II §855, and cf. Whitney, ad Atharva-Veda Prátiśākhya, 3.40 (repr. Varanasi 1962, p. 147).

33) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

34) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

35) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

36) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

37) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

38) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

39) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

40) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

41) AVPrátt. 2.21 sq.; see Ved. Var. §885; note a case in ŚŚ which is taken from RV where ~au u~ -now

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 Kathalois (=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 SB version, are inconclusive in this matter. There is no vowel Sandhi of the above type; cf. nevertheless: 3c avre kṛḍau 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 (isle : 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: \(-i/\) is also found in Kaṭha texts (see above); Anuvāra before \(i, s, l, h\) 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 VI\(1\) 12—which unfortunately contains many printing mistakes). The true Mantra variants and the division of KpS in Aṭakas, however, remain valid arguments when comparing KpS with RV.

51) Note that the Orissa MSS have a glide here: \(-y-\)ataye; 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\(a\); 6.16.5d tuvigrīva \(\)iverate (Or. mss. \(\)evere); 7.4.1b \(\)itra imā (Or ms. \(-y-amā\); 9.11.2b rudras te (Or. MS tey) \(\)amṣum; 14.6.10c \(\)ārpta eṭā (Or. MS yeṭām); 20.3.3d \(\)rayacchan pura (Or MS pura-\(y\)-) etu; cf. also 20.6.2b dīvo ya (Kashm. MS ya-y) eka; in general, cf. also Wack.-Debr., Ai. Gr., I, Nachtr. p. 183: 233.18 ga \(iṣṭa\)\(a\), Ep. Ind. 8.16.

52) The Orissa MSS all read viṣṇu!

53) At PS 5.7.10c pra pīyātām viṣṇo aśrasya reto; 4.12.3a sahasva manyo abhimātim asme; 4.32.1a yas te manyo \(\)ividhad vajra sāyaka. This deviation probably is due to a restauration, at the time of redaction, of the “normal Abhinihita”.

54) PS 20.14.3c dira[\(i\) teva manya abhrtaṃ; thus all MSS, but one Or. MS has manya. There is no ready explanation for this but to suppose influence from other cases where \(\)ā precedes \(u\)\(\)a-.

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.


60) See VI\(1\) 12, p. 490, and Vasudha XV, No. 12 (Kathmandu, Oct. 1976).
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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 Pañcal ā; this name is changed to Kuśa later on, out of respect.

64) cf. TS 1.6.3.

65) cf. KpS 6.9, TB 1.1.5, 1.1.3.

66) Rāthaprotā Dārbhāyā 2.1.3:4.3.


69) Cf. also VadhB 3.87 (Keśin Maitreya), 3.46, 3.94, 4.37, 4.102.

70) Cf. JUB 3.31, for variants see Caland, PB transl. ad loc.

71) Cf. JB 2.100–102 Caland §133.

72) Cf. also BŚS 18.19, 14.7, 17.54 where only Keśin (with Dār/ibhya) is mentioned.

73) 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.

74) 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 Satapatha-Brahmaṇa, 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 (sadaśṭha-in Mantra :: ghṛti-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 Saṁhitā text itself already uses rātrī, without any discussion. (A similar case is the well known ŚB distinction between arvan : aśva : hari : haya, the name of the horse with the gods, men and ancestors, ŚB 10.6.4.1,—see Tracing, p. 101.)

75) 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.

76) According to the Vedic Word Concordance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Words Containing r/l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>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; 14.19.2; 4.7.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚŚ</td>
<td>4.12.5; 9.6.2; 9.12.15; 10.7.20; 10.9.2; 24; 12.11.7; 12.4.8;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSp</td>
<td>1.8.1, 10.12; 3.3.3; 3.11.9; 12.21;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KŚp</td>
<td>6.1.2; 13.10; 21.4; 34.12; 36.6; 38.3; KSAv = 10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpS</td>
<td>3.12; 4.1; 31.19; 39.4;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>5.1.26; 5.2.11.2;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSp</td>
<td>7.4.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSM</td>
<td>19.21; 23.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSK</td>
<td>21.6.13²; 25.7.4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 romaśavakṣanā; see also lomaśakṣhya VS 24.1, VSK 26.1.3, TS 5.5.23.1, KS Aśv. 8.2, lomasākṣhya MS 3.13.2.


82) ŠŚ 12.3.54; 10.2.11; 7.76.1; 12.3.21;
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PS 17.4.4; 1.94.3; 2.64.1; 16.60.3; 17.2.2; 17.39.1.
82a) Only TB 1.1.6.6 and TĀ/TU. ĀpŚŚ 22.14.20.
83) PB 20.13.5.
84) KB 10.1.
85) ŚBK 4.3.4.7, with the typical adherence of the Kāṇvas to Western norms. ŚBM 13.8.3.13.
86) JB 3.113, JUB 3.64.
87) TU 1.11, TB 1.1.6.6.
88) Kirāta: VS 30.16, VŚK 34.3.3, TB 3.4.12.1, PB 13.12.5.
89) PB 20.13.5.
90) Kairatika: VŚ 30.16, VŚK 34.3.3, KB 10.1.4, SBK 4.3.4.7.
91) Vśaka: VŚ 30.16, VŚK 34.3.3, SBK 4.3.4.7, Kairatika, Kairatika kumārika, ṚG 4.20.2, abhi kūvētā Kāthā 1.198.11; see H. Hoffmann, StI 5/6 p. 90.—For the interchange between l/r in ŚBM/ŚBK, see Caland, ed. ŚBK, p. 37 §5. The Kāṇvas usually have r, while the Madhy. have l; this underlines the usual Western preferences of the Kāṇvas, while the Madhy. l agrees with the ‘Eastern’ l in Middle-Indian and the Pkts.—
92) A provisional count of the forms with kar-/kurvs. kr/kr in PS shows 30 forms of kur- vs. 185 of kr/-i (incl. 37 of kr- ) and 11 of karo- vs. 231 of kr-.
93) Of interest, and fitting the above scheme of the distribution of l/r is the corruption of *abhigur vadāh*: abhī guñbadhanāh MS 4.9.12:133:1–3, (abhigur vṛdhānaḥ TĀ 4.20.2, abhi kūvētā Kāthā 1.198.11); see H. Hoffmann, StI 5/6 p. 90.—For the interchange between l/r in ŚBM/ŚBK, see Caland, ed. ŚBK, p. 37 §5. The Kāṇvas usually have r, while the Madhy. have l; this underlines the usual Western preferences of the Kāṇvas, 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 sqq., Kuiper, IJ 4, p. 273 sqq.; or the restriction of the verb īlayati to some texts, see J. Narten, IJ 10, 239 sqq.: or the difference in sounds of RV vṛad vs. post-Rgvedic mrād; cf. a similar distribution in podhīsa/podvīsa (cf. StII 8/9, p. 156 sqq.).

A more change in expression, which nevertheless agrees with the various dialect groups established in Tracing ..., and also agrees with the divisions of ŚB, may be noted in margin: dvādaśa vai māsāḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ MS, KS, KPŚ, TS, TB, TĀ, VadhB, PB, JB, GB; ŚB 6–10, 13,
dvādaśa vai māsāḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ AB–6, KB, dta. 2ha vai GB,
dvādaśa māsāḥ sa sāṃvatsaraḥ MS, KS, KPŚ, TS, PB, (AB with presumptive tāvan),
dvādaśa māsāḥ sāṃvatsarasya ŚB 1–5, 11–13, 14.2 and typically, ŚBK 1;
dvādaśa māsa pāca/sa/d/taśa rtaḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ ŚB 8, Šaṭṇu KB, ŚB 6–10, 13, pāca rtaḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ ŚB 6–9, JB, VadhB, also: “vai” TB,
saṭa rtaḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ ŚB 6–7, 12–13, TĀ,
PB, JB, also: “vai” MS, KS, KPŚ, TS, KB, JB, VadhB,
saṭa rtaḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ ŚB 6–9,
trayā/pāca/sa/d/taśa rtaḥ sāṃvatsarasya ŚB 1–5, 11–12, ŚBK, GB,
trayodaśa māsāḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ MS, KS, KPŚ, TS, VadhB, ŚB 6–9, 13,
trayodaśa māsāḥ sāṃvatsarasya ŚB 3, 14.1–3, GB,
caturvimsatār ardhāmāsāḥ sāṃvatsaraḥ TS, TB, PB, ŚB, VadhB, dta. “vai” MS,
caturvimsatār sāṃvatsarasyārdhamāsāḥ KS, KPŚ, PB, KB, ŚB 2–5, 11,
caturvimsatār ardhāmāsāḥ sāṃvatsarasya KS, KPŚ, PB, KB, ŚB 2–5, 11, ŚBK; 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 raṣṭrīya- (var. lect. in MS, KS, found next to Vedic raṣṭrīya- MS, KS; see further below), 5.1.40 putrīya/purtīya-, 4.2.27, 28: apāṃnaprīya/apāṃnaprīya/apāṃnaprīya/a ponaprīya/ (and: apāṃnaprīya/a ponaprīya- which is unattested); 4.2.29 mahendrīya/ mahendrīya-, 4.2.32 agnīṣṭoma- etc.; 5.1.4 apāṃpya/apāṃpya- etc.; 5.1.69: dakṣināya/dakṣināya; kaṅkārya/kaṅkārya-; 5.1.70 sthālīya/sthālīya-; cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altind. Gramm. II 2, §268 p. 435.

97) Actually the suffixes in -iya/-iya are much more widespread in later Vedic than Pāṇini adduces. A look into Viśva Bandhu's Vedic Word Concordance, vol. 15a (Index ab ultimo) p. 238 sqq. supplies more than a thousand examples, which, of course, cannot be investigated here. Instead, I select those which Pāṇini felt necessary to discuss. The older, accented examples (of various origins) are, in reverse alphabetical order: aṛjīkīya-, aḥūṣṭīya-, vaṃśaṭīya-, aṣṭasāhāya, svaṃśaṭīya-, hṛṣṭīya-, jāyantiya-, parīyāya- etc.; 5.1.40 putrīya/purtīya-, 4.2.27, 28: aṃnaprīya/aṃnaprīya/aṃnaprīya/a ponaprīya/ (and: aṃnaprīya/a ponaprīya- which is unattested); 4.2.29 mahendrīya/ mahendrīya-, 4.2.32 agnīṣṭoma- etc.; 5.1.4 apāṃpya/apāṃpya- etc.; 5.1.69: dakṣināya/dakṣināya; kaṅkārya/kaṅkārya-; 5.1.70 sthālīya/sthālīya-; cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altind. Gramm. II 2, §268 p. 435.98)


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 Tītthī (4.3.102 tītthī-antarāntu-bhāgikahāpac caṇḍ); 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, 6.11.16, 7.5.15.1; 103) marutvatīya-niśhevalya- 104) One cannot exclude, however, that Kaṭhāś as was composed in the East, along with the lost, so-called Prācyā Kaṭha texts.
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105) Patañjali ad Pāñg. 4.2.28 has both forms.

106) yajñayajñiya- is attested at ĀpŚS 5.11.6, 5.13.8, 5.15.6, 17.23.7, 22.10.1; while yajñayajñiya- is attested at ĀpŚS 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 ĀpŚS. 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 Sathhitā 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, svid ca and the secondary position of u in cases like ātho, tātho, uto: but also: u khalu p. 492, cf. u ha 499; atha-u, thatha-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, ŠBM 1–3, ŠBK 1, etc., only. The new Br. ed. has even fewer; the Up. vol. and the Sūtra vol. (ĀŚS, ŚŚS, Nīrūkta) also contain but very few cases. We are in need of a new, preferably a computer-based index.

114) Forms uv( + eva) in TB, BŚS, optionally in ŠBK, see ed. Cal. p. 35, sq.; uv eva TB 1.2.2.5; uv eva TS 2.2.7.4, 2.3.7.4, etc.; BŚS 16.10: 266.6; but u eva ŠBM; VadhB uv evaitad 3.12, cf. AO IV p. 212; JB §186 se u eva, etc.

115) The Kaḍra Sūtra, an appendix to the Māsaka KalpaŚ. of the Kauth. SV which precedes LŚS, DŚS, has a few chapters which are Br.-like in style (notably KaśŚ 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 BŚS 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; SS, 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 Sathhitā 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...(pāpavastyaśāmī/ vīdāṃ) cakara.

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

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: Kayvo...Śrāyaso...ha vai...vīdāṃ cakara; further...ha sma papraccha 21.9. MS reads tam vai 3.3.9:42:11 in the parallel of KS 21.9, MS 4.1.3:5.4 tād ha sma-āhur = 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 5.31; tad u khalu 3.11, 3.34; but: vai khalu 6.11);—athataḥ 13 × in books 6–81

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, BŚS, ŚBK, see Caland, ed. p. 35 sq.; also ha vāva 4.22, 4.4.27, 4.96, ha sma vāva 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 VādhŚS 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 (Vādhūlaśrautasutra 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.

142) In 4. Mitteilung alone, 25 cases.

143) On ha sma "Dauer in Verg." see Caland, Über das BŚS.

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

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

146) The question is: what does he understand by udīcya: Gandhāra, the Uttara-Kuru, Uttara-Madra, the Bāhika tribes? Note also the lumping together of the Kuru and Mahāvṛṣa tribe in ŚB, see Tracing p. 106 n.20; cf. AB 8.14 on the Northern kingdoms. Thieme, Paṇini and the Veda, thinks udīcya = Paṇini's area, cf. Cardona, Paṇ., p. 147. Cf. also Kāśikā 1.1.75 prāg-udāicau- "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 Vajji).

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 pitṛ and mātṛ, 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 ātu-ākhyāna in VādhdB.

156) Also at 3.32.