THE ORTHOEPIC DIASKEUASIS OF THE RGVEDA AND THE DATE OF PÂÑINI*

ABBREVIATIONS

\[ P \] Pâninian sūtra

\[ RPr \] Rgveda-Prātiśākhya. The sūtra numbers both according to Mangal Deva Shastri’s and Max Müller’s editions are given.

\[ RV \] Rgveda

1.1. The Rgveda is known to us in a form which is fixed down to the minutest details. It obtained this form as the result of a process which, in as far as it concerns details of sandhi etc., is known by the name ‘orthoeptic diaskeuasis’.

The main hypothesis to be defended in this article is that the orthoeptic diaskeuasis of the Rgveda was not yet completed in the time of the Rgveda-Prātiśākhya, and ended when but one version of the Rgveda remained, i.e., probably with the disappearance of the Bāskala Samhitā. (I do not take here into consideration the Kashmir Rgveda; see Bronkhorst, forthcoming.) The hypothesis contrasts with the currently held belief that the Śākhās of the Rgveda, as well as the Rgveda-Prātiśākhya, presuppose, and therefore postdate, the final redaction of the Rgveda (Renou, 1947: 21, 35; cf. 1960: 1–2, 10).

A decision procedure, on the basis of which we can choose between these two opinions, is provided by the following. We have some idea of the original form of the hymns of the Rgveda, since the present Rgveda often deviates from the metre in a way that can easily be restored by undoing the sandhi or other minor changes. If the Rgveda-Prātiśākhya stands somewhere in the process which began with the original form of the Rgvedic hymns, we may expect that at least some of the authorities who preceded the Prātiśākhya but took part in the same process, came out in defence of a form of those hymns which, at least in some cases, deviates from their present, and is closer to their original one. If, on the other hand, the Prātiśākhya belongs to a period which came after the orthoeptic diaskeuasis, we may not expect such opinions on the part of those who took part in the development in which the Prātiśākhya participates.

1.2. The Rgveda-Prātiśākhya mentions the following authorities: Ānyatareya\(^1\) (3.22(208)), Gārgya (1.15(16); 6.36(412); 11.17 (629); 11.26(638); 13.31(739)), Pañcāla (2.33(137); 2.81(185)), Prācyā (2.33(137); 2.81(185)); Mākṣavaya (Intr. v. 2); Māṇḍūkeya (Intr. v. 2; 3.14(200)); Yāska (17.42(993)), Vedamitra
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(1.51(52)), Vyāḍi (3.23(209); 3.28(214); 6.43(419); 13.31(739); 13.37(745)), Śākaṭāyana (1.16(17); 13.39(747)), Śākala (1.64(65); 1.75(76); 6.14(390); 6.20 (396); 6.24(400); 6.27(403); 11.19(631); 11.21(633); 11.61(673)), Śākalya (3.13 (199); 3.22(208); 4.13(232); 13.31(739)), Śākalya (sthavira) (2.81(185)), Śākalya- pīṭ (4.4(223)), Śūravīra (Intr. v. 3), Śūravīra-suta (Intr. v. 3). Unfortunately, none of the opinions ascribed to these authorities in the Prātiṣākhya has an effect on the metre of the hymns, be it positively or negatively. However, many of these authorities are mentioned elsewhere in the ancient, and not so ancient, literature, and opinions are ascribed to them which are not found in the Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya. Many of these other opinions, also, do not affect the metre, but there are some which do in a way that deserves our attention:

(i) Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī contains the following rule: P.6.1.127: iko savaṇe śākalyasya hrasvaś ca [saṃhitāyām (72), ekah pūrṇaparayoh (84), na (115),3 aci (125)] “In the opinion] of Śākalya, in connected speech (saṃhitā), no single [substitute] of what precedes and what follows [comes] in the place of [the vowels] i, i, u, ā, r, ṛ, l, when a dissimilar vowel follows; and [if the earlier vowel is long,] a short [vowel comes in its place].”

The translation here given follows the interpretation of the Kāśikā (except in so far as this is not possible in view of footnote 12). The interpretation may, however, be improved upon by understanding the word chandasi “in Sacred Literature” (Thieme, 1935: 68) in this rule, from the preceding one. Both the mention of the name “Śākalya” and the unusual kind of sandhi described support this. We may expect that this rule was (also) valid for the Rgveda.

The Rgveda in its present form is not in agreement with Śākalya’s rule. The earlier form of the Rgveda, on the other hand, agrees with it. E. Vernon Arnold (1905) makes the following statements about the original Rgveda. First: “Before dissimilar vowels final -i -ī -u -ū are regularly used with hiatus” (p. 76). Second: “The vowels -ī, -ū are regularly shortened when followed by dissimilar vowels, but there are many exceptions” (p. 135). Third: “Final -a, -ā are regularly combined with an initial vowel or diphthong following: and final -i -ī -u -ū are regularly combined with similar vowels, that is -i or -ī with either -i or -ī, and -u or -ū with either -u or -ū” (p. 72). These three statements are so close to the opinion ascribed to Śākalya in P. 6.1.127 that they are almost a translation of that rule.

(ii) Puruṣottamadeva’s Bhāṣāvyrtti on P. 6.1.77 contains the following line (quoted in Mishra, 1972: 30n, 32n; Mimāṃsaka, 1973: I: 26): ikāṁ yanbhīr vyāvadhānāṁ vyādīgālavayor iti vaktavyam/dadhiyatra dadhy atra madhuvatra madhv atra/ “It must be stated that [in the opinion] of Vyāḍi and Gālava there is separation of [the vowels] i, u, r, l by [the consonants] y, v, r, l [respectively. Examples are] dadhi-y-atra [for dadhi atra, where we normally find] dadhy atra, madhu-v-atra [for madhu atra, where we normally find] madhv atra.” The kind of
sandhi here ascribed to Vyādi and Gālava is not found in our *Rgveda.* (It is found in a few places elsewhere in the Vedic literature; see Mīmāṃsaka, 1973: I: 27f.) It would, however, make good the metre of the hymns of the *Rgveda* in innumerable instances (Whitney, 1888: 39, §113).

(iii) The third case rests upon a somewhat unorthodox interpretation of some rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī,* an interpretation which, however, has rather strong arguments to support it. They will be discussed in § 1.2.3.

Pāṇini’s grammar contains the following three rules: P. 8.3.17: bhobhagoaghoa-pūrvasya yo’ṣi [rōḥ (16), rāḥ (14)] “In the place of r of rU, which is preceded by bho, bhago, agho, -a or -ā, [comes] y, when a vowel or voiced consonant follows.”

P. 8.3.18: vyor laghuprayatnatarah śākaṭāyanasya [asi (17)] “According to Śākaṭāyana, in the place of ν and y [comes a substitute] of which the [articulatory] effort is lighter, when a vowel or voiced consonant follows.”

P. 8.3.19: lopaḥ śākalyasya [vyoh (18), asi (17)] “According to Śākalya, there is elision of ν and y when a vowel or voiced consonant follows.”

When these rules are applied to a word ending in -as that is followed by a-, this sandhi evolves: -ast- > -a-rU+a- (8.2.66) > -ay+a- (8.3.17) or -āy+a- (8.3.17&18) or -a+a- (8.3.17&19). None of these three forms is ever found in our *Rgveda,* which invariably has -o- or -o+a-. The metre requires two distinct syllables in the vast majority of cases and that the first syllable be metrically short (Wackernagel, 1896: 324, § 272b; Ghatage, 1948: 14). Oldenberg (1888: 458) has argued that the original reading was -a+a-. We note that this is the opinion of Śākalya expressed in P. 8.3.19. Oldenberg (1888: 457–58) further shows that -av for -as occurs in the Vedic literature, and does not exclude the possibility that -av+a- for -asa- was the original form in the *Rgveda.* This would correspond to the opinions of Śākaṭāyana (p. 8.3.18) and Pāṇini (if P. 8.3.17 gives indeed Pāṇini’s opinion).

All these three passages need some further comments.

1.2.1. There is no reason to doubt that the Śākalya mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is identical with the Śākalya mentioned in the *Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya.* On one occasion we find in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* an opinion ascribed to Śākalya which the *Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya* ascribes to the followers of Śākalya (Bronkhorst, forthcoming). P. 1.1.16, moreover, seems to bring Śākalya in connection with a Padapāṭha. We know from *Nirukta* 6.28 that the author of the Padapāṭha of the *Rgveda* was called thus. The connection of the Śākalya mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with the *Rgveda* seems therefore established.

1.2.2. Of the two, Vyādi and Gālava, only the first one is mentioned in the *Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya.* It is unlikely that Puruṣottamadeva derived his knowledge directly or indirectly from the *Samgraha,* a work reputedly written by someone
called 'Vyāḍi'. All we know about this work (see Mīmāṁsaka, 1973: I: 282–90) shows that the Saṃgraha dealt with philosophical questions, and was not just a grammar. We are therefore justified in neglecting the claim of the commentator Abhayandarini on the Jainendra grammar to the extent that this rule derives from the Saṃgraha and is there ascribed to "some" (Jainendra Mahāvīrti 1.2.1: ikāṃ yanbhīr vyavadhānam ekesān iti saṃgrahah; quoted in Mīmāṁsaka, 1973: I: 26n). We further do not have to decide whether the two Vyāḍis are one and the same or not.

1.2.3. The example -as+a- would yield -o- according to the orthodox interpretation of Pāṇini's grammar, in the following manner: -as+a- > -a-rU+a- (8.2.66) > -a-u+a- (6.1.113) > -o+a- (6.1.87) > -o- (6.1.109). There can be no doubt that this form of sandhi was also accepted by Pāṇini, for his own grammar makes an abundant use of it, e.g., in P. 8.3.17 (see above) which has yosi for yastasi. The question is if only this form was accepted. Some circumstances indicate that such is not the case.

The fact is that a strict application of the principles of Pāṇini's grammar can not lead to -o-, only to -ay+a-, -āy+a-, and -a+a-! To understand why, we must recall that the substitute rU for s is introduced in P. 8.2.66, a rule which is part of the last three sections of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, the so-called "Tripādi", which has a linear rule ordering (Bronkhorst, 1980: 72f.). Use of P. 8.2.66 can therefore only be followed by application of a rule which comes after P. 8.2.66, certainly not by application of P. 6.1.113, which would be necessary to obtain -o-.

The location of P. 6.1.113 is the most flagrant violation of the principle of linear rule ordering of the Tripādi which there is in the Aṣṭādhyāyī (cf. Buiskool, 1939: 83, 99). P. 6.1.113 reads: ato ror aplutād aplute [atti (109), ut (111)] "In the place of rU which follows a that is not prolated, [comes] u, when a non-prolated a follows." This rule presupposes the presence of the substitute rU. But rU is not introduced except in the Tripādi. Strictly speaking P. 6.1.113 should never apply, and be superfluous. Why was P. 6.1.113 not located in the Tripādi, somewhere after P. 8.2.66 and before P. 8.3.17?

I think there are two answers to this question, which are simultaneously valid. The first is that P. 6.1.113 has to "feed" P. 6.1.87 in the derivation of -o- out of -as+a- (see above). This answer alone is not fully satisfying, for if the linear ordering of the Tripādi was to be broken, then why not after the application of P. 6.1.113?

The second answer is that if P. 6.1.113 were located in the Tripādi, it would make the derivation of -ay+a-/āy+a-/a+a- out of as+a- impossible. That this second answer leads to a result which agrees so well with the original Rgveda, only confirms that it is most probably correct.

1.3. The above shows that Śākalya was not the final redactor of the Rgveda, as
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Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya seems to say he was (on P. 1.4.84, vol. I, p. 347, 1.3: śākalyena sukṛtām samhitām anunīśamyā devaḥ prāvārṣat). Patañjali’s opinion illustrates the process of apotheosis which Śākalya underwent, as I observed elsewhere (Bronkhorst, forthcoming).

I shall now show that other data we possess about Śākalya and his Padapāṭha agree, or at any rate do not disagree, with the view that Śākalya preceded the final redaction of the Rgveda.

1.3.1. Aitareya Āranyaka 3.2.6 lays down two rules: where there is doubt whether or not n is to be used, there n must indeed be used;9 where there is a similar doubt regarding s, there s must be used (p. 139: sa yadi vicikitset saṇkāraṁ bravāṇi3m anākāra3m iti saṇkāram eva brūyāt saṣaṇkarām bravāṇi3m aṣaṇkāra3m iti saṇkāram eva brūyāt). The same chapter of the Aitareya Āranyaka (3.1.2) mentions the opinion of Śākalya regarding the mystical significance of union (saṃhitā). Doubts regarding the correct form of the Rgveda were apparently still alive in the time after Śākalya.

1.3.2. Six verses of the Rgveda have no Padapāṭha. They are RV 7.59.12; 10.20.1; 121.10; 190.1–2–3 (Kashkar, 1951: 44). This is most easily explained by the assumption that these verses were not considered part of the Rgveda by Śākalya. It further shows that the final redactors did not hesitate to deviate from the composer of the Padapāṭha in deciding what did, and what did not, belong to the Rgveda. (It is interesting to note that at least one hymn of the Rgveda (10.95) is known to have had fewer verses than at present at as late a date as that of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. See Oldenberg, 1912: 303.)

1.3.3. Oldenberg (1888: 384–85) points out that the Samhitā text contains several nom. sing. fem. words ending in -ā which are not joined with a following vowel. Oldenberg, following Lanman, explains this by assuming that the final redactors of the Rgveda considered these words as really ending in -āh. The Padapāṭha, on the other hand, presents all these forms as actually ending in -ā. This indicates that the maker of the Padapāṭha and the final redactors of the Samhitā were different persons. Since the final redactors did not consider the Padapāṭha authoritative (see above, further fn. 8), this fact does not conflict with Śākalya’s temporal priority to these redactors.10

2.1. In what phase of the development of the Rgveda does Pāṇini fit? There is no doubt that Pāṇini came after Śākalya, for he mentions the latter four times (P. 1.1.16; 6.1.127; 8.3.19; 4.51; see above pp. 84 and 85. The question is: Had the Rgveda known to Pāṇini already obtained the form which it had in the time of the
Ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya, and which was to remain virtually unchanged ever since. Three places of the Aṣṭādhyāyī seem to indicate that this was not the case.

(i) P. 6.1.134: so ści lope cet pāḍāpūrṇam [sulopaḥ (132)] “There is elision of [the nom. sing. case-affix] sU of sa ‘he’ before a vowel, if, in case of elision, there is completion of the Pāda.” This rule is obeyed in our Ṛgveda where sas is followed by a vowel different from a; e.g., in RV 1.32.15: sed u rājā kṣayati carṣaṇīnām for saḥ/ it/ etc., and in RV 8.43.9: sauṣadhir anu rudhyase for saḥ/ oṣadhiḥ/ etc. (cf. Oldenberg, 1888: 464; Arnold, 1905: 74). Where, however, sas is followed by a- and the metre requires contraction, “ist in einer Reihe von Fällen sa- überliefert . . . in einigen andern so a- oder so mit dem Abhinihita Sandhi” (Oldenberg, 1888: 464; cf. Arnold, 1897: 292). Oldenberg is of the opinion that all these cases originally had sā-.11 Apparently Pāṇini defends here quite generally an older reading which survived but in a number of cases. Moreover, Pāṇini’s concern for metre contrasts with the unconcern for the same found in the Ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya; see Oldenberg, 1888: 372–73n; Müller, 1891: lxxixf.

(ii) P. 6.1.115: nāntahpādam avyapare [sāṃhitāyām (72), ekaḥ pūrvaparayoḥ (84), pūrvah (107), eṇāḥ padāntād ati (109)] “In a Sāṃhitā [text], when e or o which are final in a word precede, [and] when a which is not [itself] followed by y or y, follows, [then] the preceding [sound is] not the single [substitute] of both the preceding and the following [sound], when [these sounds occur] in the interior of a Pāda.”

P. 6.1.116: avyādadvadvyādavakramavratāyamavantavasyasyuṣu ca [sāṃhitāyām (72), ekaḥ pūrvaparayoḥ (84), pūrvah (107), eṇāḥ padāntād ati (109), nāntahpādam (115)] “In a Sāṃhitā [text], when e or o which are final in a word, precede, [and] when a follows which is [the initial sound] in [one of the following words: avyāt, avadyāt, avakramuh, avrata, ayam, avantu, avasyu, [then] the preceding [sound is] not the single [substitute] of both the preceding and the following [sound], when [these sounds occur] in the interior of a Pāda.”

P. 6.1.116 is not in agreement with the facts of our Ṛgveda. There are at least two places where ayam has been joined with a preceding e or o, viz. RV 1.108.6 vrṇāno’yam and RV 5.30.3 vahate’yam. Nowhere does ayam behave in the prescribed manner. avasyu is joined with a preceding o in RV 8.21.1 bharanto’vasyavah. And avantu is always joined with a preceding e or o (RPPr. 2.40(144); Böhtlingk, 1887: 298). The precise prescription contained in P. 6.1.116 makes it very difficult to believe, with Thieme (1935: 51), that this rule does “not imply strict application”. Indeed, there is reason to believe that sūtras 6.1.115 and 116 were forerunners of certain sūtras from the Ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya, and, like those, did imply strict application; see below, § 2.2.

(iii) Pāṇini seems to consider the sandhi form -ay+a- for -as+a- correct, which agrees with the original Ṛgveda, but not with the Ṛgveda known to us. This has been explained in § 1.2, above.
2.1.1. It must still be shown that the sūtras 6.1.134 and 6.1.115–116 really are about the Veda. In the case of P. 6.1.134 there can be no doubt. The preceding rule contains the word chandasi “in Sacred Literature”. The Kāśikā illustrates the rule with the help of the two examples from the ṛgveda which were reproduced above (and adds that some think that the rule is not confined to Vedic verse alone (pādagrahaṇenātra ślokapādasyāpi grahaṇaṃ kecid icchanti; this would justify a verse subsequently quoted in the Kāśikā). It seems that wherever in the Aṣṭādhyāyī the word pāda is used to specify a context, it refers to feet of Vedic verse. The remaining places are: P. 3.2.66: here chandasi is understood from rule 63; P. 8.3.9: rksu is understood from the preceding rule; P. 6.1.115 and 8.3.103: here yajusī “in a sacrificial formula in prose” occurs in a following rule (P. 6.1.117 and 8.3.104 respectively), suggesting that the verse-feet (pāda) talked about in the earlier rules likewise belong to sacrificial formulas, and therefore to Vedic verse; P. 8.1.6, finally, deals with a phenomenon which is only found in Vedic verse (see the Kāśikā on this rule).

2.1.2. P. 8.3.17, which justifies the sandhi form -ay+a- for -as+a-, occurs in the company of P. 8.3.18 and 19, which mention Śākaṭāyana and Śākalya respectively (see p. 85, above). These two authorities are mentioned in the ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya, and their opinions may be considered to apply also to the ṛgveda, if not primarily to that work. It is therefore safe to say the same of P. 8.3.17.

2.2. The above seems to show that Pāṇini worked with a version of the ṛgveda which is earlier than the versions described in the ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya. The only serious objection which one might raise, as far as I can see, is that Pāṇini’s version is not earlier, but quite simply different from the ones of the Prātiṣākhya. And indeed, we have no guarantee that the ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya describes all the versions of the ṛgveda which existed in its time. The fact that we obtain opinions of the authorities mentioned in the Prātiṣākhya from sources other than the Prātiṣākhya shows that the information provided by the Prātiṣākhya is in no way complete.

There is, nonetheless, reason to think that Pāṇini did not draw upon an altogether different version of the ṛgveda. To begin with, Pāṇini mentions Śākalya on four occasions (p. 87, above) and also knows of the Śākalas, or so it seems (P. 4.3.128). Perhaps more important is that his rules 6.1.115–116 (which we discussed in § 2.1, above) seem to be an earlier version of some rules of the ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya. This I shall show now.

P. 6.1.115–116 specify the circumstances in which e and o retain their original form before a. The ṛgveda-Prātiṣākhya adopts the opposite procedure: it specifies the circumstances when e and o merge with a. In spite of this difference, there is a remarkable similarity.
RPr 2.35(139) reads: antahpādam akārāc cet saṃhitāyām laghor laghu yakārādy aksaram param vakārādy api vā bhavet “In the interior of a Pāda, if, in the Saṃhitā [text], a light syllable beginning with y or even v follows a light vowel a, [this a becomes one with the preceding e or o]”. This means the same as P. 6.1.115, and more. In addition it contains a restriction on that rule. According to P. 6.1.115, e and o merge with a following a, when that a is followed by v or y. According to RPr 2.35(139), e and o merge with a following a, when that a is followed by v or y, and is a light vowel, and when moreover the syllable beginning with v or y is light.

The advantage of the formulation in the Prātiśākhya is clear. Of the seven exceptions which Pāṇini had to enumerate in rule P. 6.1.116, six are excluded by the added restriction of the Prātiśākhya. But a price had to be paid. Twenty exceptions are enumerated in the immediately following sūtras of the Rgveda-Prātiśākhya. This means that the complicated qualification which we find in RPr 2.35(139) does not in any way simplify the description of the subject-matter. The formulation of the Prātiśākhya can most easily be accounted for by taking it as an improvement upon an earlier formulation, the one found in the Aṣṭādhyāyī or one closely similar to it.

2.3. I shall now enumerate a few more circumstances which seem to fit our conclusion that Pāṇini preceded the Rgveda-Prātiśākhya and made use of an earlier version of the Rgveda.

2.3.1. Pāṇini’s grammar does not know the retroflex consonant l. Our Rgveda contains this sound, but we know that not all versions had it (Bronkhorst, forthcoming). The introduction of l was “doubtless a dialectical anticipation of the more general identical process in MidIA” (Allen, 1962: 54) and may have taken place rather late. This is supported by the fact that l occupies the place of d where our Rgveda would otherwise have had d between two vowels, not where the original Rgveda would otherwise have had d between two vowels (Wackernagel, 1896: 255–56). E.g., viḍv-aṅga was originally pronounced viḍuv-aṅga, but contains nonetheless no l. One way of explaining the absence of l in the Aṣṭādhyāyī is that Pāṇini lived before this sound made its appearance in the Veda, and therefore before the Rgveda-Prātiśākhya. (If Pāṇini lived after the sound l had found entrance into the Śākala version of the Rgveda, it would be hard to account for the absence of l from the Aṣṭādhyāyī by saying that this sound was not used in the language of the region where Pāṇini lived (Lüders, 1923: 301–02). Pāṇini knew the Śākalas (above, p. 89) and therefore probably also the peculiarities of their version of the Rgveda. If these peculiarities included l in Pāṇini’s time, this sound would, and should, have been mentioned in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, irrespective of the presence or absence of the sound in Pāṇini’s own dialect.)
2.3.2. Vowels with circumflex accent are described as follows in the Aṣṭādhyāyī: P.1.2.31: samāhāraḥ svaritaḥ [ac (27)] “A vowel which is a mixture [of an udātta and an anudātta vowel] is svarita”.

P.1.2.32: tasyādita udāttam ardhaḥrasvam “Of that [svarita vowel] half [the length of] a short [vowel, starting] from the beginning, is udātta.”

There has been some discussion why this description is included in the Aṣṭādhyāyī (Thieme, 1957; Cardona, 1968), which does not concern us here. We note the difference from the Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya,16 which has the following sūtras: RPr 3.4(189–90): tasyodāttatarodāttād ardhamātrārdham eva vā “Of that [svarita accent17] half a mātrā or even half [of the svarita accent] is higher than the udātta [accent].”

RPr 3.5(191): anudāttah paraḥ śeṣah sa udāttāsrutiḥ “The following remainder [of the svarita accent] is anudātta; it sounds like udātta.”

RPr 3.6(192) further specifies that this description is not valid when a syllable follows which has an udātta or svarita accent. The commentator Uvaṭa explains that in such cases the latter part of the svarita accent becomes really udātta (p. 114: yadi tūdāttaṃ svaritaṃ vā param syāt tadānudāttah paraḥ śeṣah syāt). The description of the Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya makes the impression of being more sophisticated than the description of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. This may be due to the fact that the former is of later date than the latter.18

3.1. We see that there are good reasons to think that our hypothesis is correct. The orthoepic diastrueosis of the Rgveda took place over a rather long period of time, and was not yet fully completed when the Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya was composed (better perhaps: reached its present form).

The investigation has further provided us with some chronological information, most important among which is, no doubt, that Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī is older than the Rgveda-Prātiṣākhya. We also saw that Śākalya, who in Yāska’s Nirukta was no more than the composer of the Padapāṭha, had become the redactor of the Samhitā in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya. Since in the Anuvākānukramaṇi he is said to have seen the Veda (Bronkhorst, forthcoming) and apparently has reached his apex, it is reasonable to think that these three works have this chronological order: the Nirukta preceded the Mahābhāṣya, which in its turn preceded the Anuvākānukramaṇi.

There have been attempts to discover the rules employed in the orthoepic diastrueosis of the Rgveda (Hejab-Sharma, 1979; Ghatage, 1948: 18). Such rules may be discoverable in some cases, but the complicated history of the process, in which many people participated while representing different views, makes it unlikely that all phonetic peculiarities of our Rgveda fall under rules.

It must, finally, be pointed out that the lack of agreement between the Aṣṭādhyāyī and our Rgveda may henceforth have to be looked at through different
eyes. Certainly where phonetic questions are concerned, Pāṇini may describe an earlier form of the Rgveda, and may not deserve to be blamed for being lacunary, as he is, e.g., by Renou (1960: 27).

3.2. It remains to say a few words about the difference that may have existed between schools that were concerned primarily with the Rgveda Samhitā and those that were concerned primarily with the ritual. Karl Hoffmann (1974) has argued – on the basis of P. 7.2.69: sanim sasanivāmsam, which is found in Mānava Śrauta Sūtra 1.3.4.2 and Vārāha Śrauta Sūtra 1.3.5.16 – that Pāṇini lived in the older Sūtra period, i.e., after the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra and the Vārāha Śrauta Sūtra. I am not sure if Hoffmann’s arguments are compelling, for (as Hoffmann himself observes, pp. 75–76) the words sanim sasanivāmsam occur in a cited mantra, which may be older than these two Sūtras. Be this as it may, Hoffmann’s hypothesis places Pāṇini in a time when differences of opinion regarding the ritual had given rise to different schools (Renou, 1947: 25–26). This means that we may have to distinguish between simultaneously existing schools connected with the supposedly correct form of the Rgveda Samhitā, and such as owe their existence to particular views on the ritual. Schools belonging to these two groups may, but by no means have to, coincide.

We know the names of at least three schools that were concerned with the form of the Rgveda: Śākala, Šaśiṣiriya (see Bronkhorst, forthcoming), Bāśkala. Schools of the second type, which were primarily concerned with the ritual, may have been the Āsvalāyana and Śānkhyayana schools (Renou, 1947: 25f). R. G. Bhandarkar (1893) has argued that these two schools belonged to both the Śākala and the Bāśkala Śākhā. This point of view is confirmed by the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on Āsvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra 1.1.1 (p. 1); see also his comments on Āsvalāyana Grhya Sūtra 3.5.9 (pp. 167–68). Some other evidence tends to ascribe both the Āsvalāyana and the Śānkhyayana school to the Bāśkala Śākhā (Renou, 1947: 25, and esp. Aithal, 1969: 187–89).

It is interesting to observe that the unification of Śākhās which we noticed with respect to the form of the Samhitā, has its counterpart in the tendency to rejoin which is found in the ritual schools of the Rgveda (Renou, 1947: 46; cf. Surya Kanta, 1933: 9–11, 66).
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NOTES

* This article came into existence as a result of discussions which I had with Prof. S. D. Joshi. At a later stage I could avail of valuable suggestions made by Prof. M. Witzel. I wish to express my gratitude to both these scholars.
The Rgveda-Pratisthākhyā does not enable us to decide whether “Anyatareya” or “Ānyatareya” is the correct name. The commentator on Caturādhyāyikā 3.74, however, cites the opinion of one Ānyatareya. See Whitney, 1862: 174.


See note 12, below.

Ghatage’s (1948) attempts to prove that the passages concerned must be read -ō+τ-, with short ō, show at best that this was “an intermediate stage of abhinihita sandhi”, as he himself seems to admit (p. 18).

“Vyādi”, which is found in the Rgveda-Pratisthākhyā, is a sākalization of “Vyādi”. See Bronkhorst, forthcoming.

Explicitly said by Bhartrhari, Mahābhāṣyadipikā p. 23, 1. 19. Vyādi and the Samgraha are both mentioned in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya, possibly with the understanding that the former was the author of the latter; see Scharfe, 1977: 125.

As far as I can see, no difficulties would arise if P. 6.1.113 and 6.1.87 — but then also P. 6.1.109 and 6.1.78 — would be taken into the Tripādi, in this order (after 8.2.66 and before 8.3.19, of course). If this is correct, the riddles surrounding P. 6.1.113 intensify and depend for their solution exclusively on the second answer.

Interestingly, Patañjali has no respect for the makers of Padapāthas (padakāra), for he says that they must follow grammar (laksana), rather than vice versa: na laksanena padakārā anvartyaḥ/ padakārar nāma laksanam anvartyaṃ/ yathālaksanam padam kartavyam/ (vol. II, p. 85, 11. 4–5; vol. III, p. 117, 11. 18–19; p. 398, 11. 8–10). We may recall that also Yāska did not hesitate to disagree with Śākalya’s Padapātha (Nirukta 6.28).

This advice has been followed by the Taittirīyas with regard to borrowed mantras (Renou, 1947: 33n). According to Bhartrhari (Mahābhāṣyadipikā p. 1, 1. 7) the Taittirīyas read even the word agni with n. This probably refers to Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 3.5.6 (borrowed from RV 6.16.34): agnir vṛtrāni jānghanat. This line has no ni in agnir in our version of that text, but Jayantabhaṭṭa records that it sometimes has (Nyāyaśaṅkarārī vol. 1, p. 685).

Oldenberg (1888: 386) thinks that these redactors preceded the Padapātha. Since he gives no real arguments, we can ignore his opinion.

Oldenberg later (1907: 834–35) changed his view, on the basis of the later language. This, of course, is a weak argument. Pāṇini’s rule is evidence that Oldenberg’s earlier opinion was the correct one.

This is the reading found in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya. The Kāśikā has: prakṛtyāntahpādam avvapare. The Bhaṭya-reading seems to be older, for, although Patañjali is acquainted with the reading prakṛtya, Kāśikāya’s vṛttikas show no sign of such an acquaintance. See Thieme, 1935: 47–48. The word prakṛtyā may have been borrowed from RPr 2.51(155), which defines the meaning of praghāya.

Already Renou (1957: 120, n. 580) pointed at the similarity between P. 6.1.115f and RPr 2.35(139)f.

Sandhi with preceding e or o takes place in avartraḥ, avyatayai, ayopāṣṭh, avantu, avirāt, avatvacah, avirate, avāṃśi, aveh (RPr 2.40(144)). Further exceptions: agne’ym (RPr 2.42(146)); yavase’visyan, viṇtrahatevi’vih (RPr 2.43(147)); tavase’vāci, vaiha’t’ym, januṣo’y’yd (RPr 2.44(148)); viśo’yanta, santo’vadaye, bharanto’vasyavah (RPr 2.45(149)); te’vardhanta (RPr 2.46(150)); te’vīdan (RPr 2.47(151)).

That the Padapātha contains I, may be explained by the process of sākalization, which also affected the Rgveda-Pratisthākhyā (Bronkhorst, forthcoming).

The Aṣṭādhyāyī differs in this respect from the other Pratisthākhyas as well. See Whitney’s (1862: 164–69) description of the svarita in the Pratisthākhyas.

The terms uddatta, anudatta and svarata apply to vowels in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, to accents in the Rgveda-Pratisthākhyā (Cardona, 1968: 455).
18 Cardona (1968: 459) thinks that the description of svarita in the Aṣṭādhyāyī was only meant for svarita vowels occurring in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. This seems unlikely.
19 Of course, we must be careful not to revert to the belief that there was a clear Brāhmaṇa period followed by a clear Śūtra period; see Renou, 1947: 36, Gonda, 1975: 22.
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