GEORGE CARDONA

THE BHĀṢIKA ACCENT REVISITED[1]

1. Early Vedic texts are, as is well known, generally transmitted in a recitation that involves three contrastive pitch accents — *udātta, anudātta, svarita* — so that this is known as the *traisvarya* system. In addition, there is a recitation, best known from the *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* (*ŚBr*), in which there is no *svarita*, leaving only *udātta* and *anudātta*. This system, known as the *bhāṣika* accent system, was described in a relatively late work, the *Bhāṣikasūtra*. Modern scholars have disagreed about the status of this system. Some accept that the *Bhāṣikasūtra* formulates rules for a system which truly differs from the earlier *traisvarya* system and represents a historical development thereof. Other have maintained that what is at issue in the *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* is merely a particular notation, with the sub-stroke that generally represents an *anudātta* used here to designate an *udātta* in anticipation of a *svarita*. I argued some years ago that there was a true historical development involving the shift of *svarita* syllables to *udātta* syllables with the consequent replacement of earlier *udātta-s* by *anudātta-s*. I also demonstrated, I think, that the explanations given by modern scholars under the assumption that nothing but a notational peculiarity is involved are insufficient.[2] Quite recently,

however, a scholar has revived the view that there was no historical development resulting in a distinctive *bhāṣika* system, that the *ŚBr* recitation follows the *traisvarya* system, and that the written transmission involves only a notational variation :

> The [*Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*] accentuation is transcribed following the principles proposed by Hoffmann 1960, with the understanding that the original accent-system was not basically different from the one current in other Vedic texts and presupposed by Pāṇini, that the writing down and accentual notation of the *ŚBr*, as of all Vedic texts, are relatively late, and that the *Bhāṣikasūtra*, a *pariśiṣṭa* to a *pariśiṣṭa* (Pdt. Yugal Kishore Pāṭhak in *VS*, p. 412), is not indicative of a dialectal development in ancient India : it rather is a late text that tries to give a systematic account of a recitation style that developed in Śukla Yajurveda Pāṭhaśāla-s, independent of any linguistic practice in wider circles of Sanskrit speakers (to the extent these were still available in restricted niches). Differently: Chaubey 1975 and Cardona 1993.[3]

No evidence is given to support the view asserted, nor is note taken of early testimonia that attest to the *bhāṣika* system.[4] I wish here once more to note the testimony of early texts attesting to the existence of a distinct *bhāṣika* accent system and its historical development.

2. Kātyāyana's *Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya* (*VPr*) includes a set of *sūtra-s* in the first chapter (I.128-130) concerning how many distinctive accents there are in the recitation of *mantra-s* : *trīn dvau ekam*. These *sūtra-s* occur in a section that deals with different accentuations, beginning with rules stating what syllables bear the class names *udātta*, *anudātta*, and *svarita*.[5] In addition, *sūtra-s* of the section enumerate and describe different contextual types of *svarita-s*.[6] It is therefore appropriate to accept, with the commentators Uvaṭa and Anantabhaṭṭa, that *VPr* 128-30 concern the possible numbers of accents in Vedic recitations, namely three, two, or one. This interpretation is all the more justified in view of the fact that *VPr* I.130 is immediately followed by a rule[7] which specifies where the single entity in question is excluded (*-varjam*) : this does not apply in melodies applied to *mantra-s* (*sāma-*); in *mantra-s* that are repeated in a barely perceptible manner (*-japa-*); and in the *mantra-s* where the *-o* of *āpo* and certain other words is pronounced three times, each time with a high pitch and lengthened so as to be trimoric, five low-pitched short *-o* vowels follow each of the first two high-pitched *o*-vowels, and three such short *o-s* follow the last, for a total of sixteen vowels with differing lengths and pitches.[8]

The *sūtra* in question bears a remarkable similarity to one in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*,[9] where Pāṇini states that a monotone (*ekaśruti*) is used for reciting *mantra-s* in the

course of ritual performance, except for *saman-s, japa,* and *nyūṅkha.* Even granting the possibility that *VPr* I.131 might not concern only recitation in ritual performance directly,[10] I think it inevitable to consider that the *sūtra* deals with accentuation in Vedic *mantra-s.*

Under this assumption, *VPr* I.128, with which I.130 is clearly paired, should also concern possible accentuations of Vedic *mantra-s.* The first *sūtra* says that three accents are recognized and used in such recitation, which are most reasonably considered to be *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita,* and the last rule states an exception to this, such that only one accent prevails, the mid-tone equivalent to *udātta* but which does not condition the change of a following *anudātta* to *svarita.*[11]

Further, *VPr* I.129 states that only two accents are recognized. Given that this text concerns the *Yajur-veda* and that the *bhāṣika* system is acknowledged for the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* of this Veda, the only reasonable conclusion is that this rule refers to the use of only *udātta* and *anudātta* within the *bhāṣika* system.[12]

3. The *Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya* rules considered in § 2 do not explicitly mention the particular accents at issue, so that *VPr* I.129 does not say overtly that the two accents in question are those of the *bhāṣika* system. On the other hand, the *Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra* (*KŚrS*) not only deals with accentual variation but also mentions explicitly the *bhāṣika* accent. *KŚrS* I.8.16-19

take up the relation between the accentuation of *mantra-s* as they are uttered when reciting Saṃhitā text and when they are used in the course of a rite. First, the position is taken that there is no explicit reason for differentiating the latter from the former, so that in the course of a rite *mantra-s* should be recited as traditionally transmitted (*yathāmnātam*).[13] The following *sūtra,* however, says that, alternatively, the *bhāṣika* accent (*bhāṣikasvaro vā*) is to be used in ritual recitation, because this is taught subsequent to the accent already gotten in *mantra-s* as handed down in the Saṃhitā text.[14] Subsequently, the position is stated that a *mantra* used in the course of ritual performance should have a monotone pitch (*tānaḥ = ekaśrutiḥ*).[15] Kātyāyana says that the reason for this is that this mode of recitation obtains obligatorily (*nityatvāt*) and then states a *sūtra* comparable to Pāṇini's rule[16] according to which a monotone is used to recite a *mantra* in the course of a ritual performance (*yajña-karmaṇi*) except for *japa, nyūṅkha,* and *sāman* (see §2 with note 7). The formulation in the *KŚrS* 17 says the monotone is excluded in reciting the *subrahmaṇyā mantra-s,*[18] *sāman-s, japa, nyūṅkha* and a *mantra* recited by the *yajamāna.* In addition, the alternative is considered that either the monotone or the accentuation which occurs in the original text of a *mantra* (*prāvacanaḥ*)[19] is used for a Yajus uttered in the course of a rite.[20]

4. In his *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* (*JMS*), Jaimini also takes up the issue whether the triple-accent pattern or the

bhāsika accent should apply in reciting *mantra-s* when these are uttered in the course of a rite.

4.1. As it is discussed by Śabara in his *Bhāṣya* (*ŚBh*), the argument concerns the *mantra* that begins with इमामंगृभ्णन्.[21]

In the *ŚBr*, the *pratīka* इमामंगृभ्णन्नशनामृतस्य is cited along with a statement of the act that this accompanies : the Adhvaryu takes hold of the rope that is to restrain the horse in the Aśvamedha.[22] When such a *mantra* is recited in the Brāhmaṇa, it is uttered with only two accents, according to the *bhāsika* accent system. Under the assumption that the Brāhmaṇa teaches this accentuation (*bhāsāsvaropadeśāt* 'because the *bhāsā* accent is taught'), the possibility arises that this would constitute a disallowing (*pratiṣedhaḥ*, negation) of the accentuation used in the source text (*pravacanapratiṣedhaḥ*, see note 19).[23] Jaimini also invokes a parallel to this : the original accentuation is set aside by the *bhāsika* accent in the same manner as the use of a *mantra* with *irā* (*airavat*)[24] in the course of a rite sets aside the use of *girā* found in the original *mantra*.[25] The example invoked involves the *ṛk* in *Ṛgveda* VI.48.1, and *Sāmaveda* 35 :

यज्ञायज्ञा वो अग्नये' गिरागिरा च दक्षसे ।

प्रप्र' वयममृतंज्ातवेदसम् प्रियम्मित्रन्न शसिषम् ॥

as chanted with the appropriate *sāman* when used in a rite. The term *girā* of the original verse is replaced by *irā* for taboo reasons : if the chanter uttered the former,

he would thereby destroy himself (*ātmānaṃ girati* = 'swallows himself').[26]

Śabara also makes clear the argumentation involved, asking how one knows that in the *ŚBr* it is the accentuation that is taught and not the original *mantra*. The answer to this is that the *mantra* does not have to be taught, since it already obtains by virtue of its being in the original Saṃhitā text (*rūpāt* = because of its form) ; the accentuation found in the Brāhmaṇa, on the other hand, does obtain because it was not taught earlier.[27]

4.2. The argument and conclusion noted in §4.1 are subsequently refuted. Jaimini reaches the final conclusion that the Brāhmaṇa teaches a *mantra* itself, not its accentuation, and that the *mantra* is uttered with the *bhāsika* accentuation so as not to break up the flow of this mode of recitation in the Brāhmaṇa.[28] The argumentation is fleshed out by Śabara as follows. What is uttered in the Brāhmaṇa serves to teach a *mantra*, since it is in conformity with this procedure : the *ŚBr* states, 'saying . . ., he takes up the rope to hold the horse', and the Adhvaryu takes up the rope to the accompaniment of a *mantra*, not of the *bhāsika* accent. The Brāhmaṇa thus conveys a *mantra*, not the other.[29] Further, in answer to the question why the *bhāsika* accent is pronounced in the Brāhmaṇa when uttering a *mantra* from a source, the response is that uttering the *mantra* with its original *traisvarya* would result in the disappearance of the *bhāsika* accentuation that applies

elsewhere in the Brāhmaṇa: the *bhāṣika* accentuation takes effect in the Brāhmaṇa from its inception; if, in the midst of this, a text were recited with an original accentuation, the continuity of the *bhāṣika* accentuation would be cut off. A *mantra* is thus taught with this accentuation in order to avoid this discontinuity.[30] Śabara adds a parallel concerning the chanting of *sāman*-s. Those who chant *sāman*-s on Ṛgveda *ṛk*-s utter those segments that are inserted with the same melody that applies to the chanted verses, and this is done so as to avoid a break in the flow.[31]

Hence, one concludes that a *mantra* is not cited in the Brāhmaṇa in order to teach the *bhāṣika* accentuation, which would mean that this would set aside the use of the original accentuation of a *mantra* when it is used in the course of a rite.[32]

4.3. Finally, Jaimini draws a distinction between this situation and the parallel invoked earlier (see §4.1) in support of the preliminary view. As shown (§4.2 with notes 27 and 28), Jaimini argues that *mantra*-s are cited in the Brahmaṇa text with respect to ritual acts they accompany, so that the Brāhmaṇa does not directly teach the *bhāṣika* accentuation of the *mantra*-s. No comparable cause is stated or understood which would serve to show that the modification of a *mantra* by changing *girā* to *irā* is not intended. Consequently, since this modification is provided at the time of a ritual performance, it blocks the use of *girā* that obtains by virtue of being part of an original *mantra*.[33]

4.4. It is clear from the above that Jaimini definitely knew of the *bhāṣika* accentuation, which he referred to using both *bhāṣāsvara* and *bhāṣika*. I consider it worth while also to make note of something more that Śabara says in his *Bhāṣya* on *JMS* XII.3.8.20. He quotes here a verse which identifies what the *bhāṣika* accentuation is: that which the chanters of *sāman*-s as well as adherents of the Ṛgveda, and the Vājasaneyin school of the *Yajurveda* say is a high and low accent is said to be *bhāṣika*.[34] Certain aspects of the verse bear emphasizing. To begin with, *uccanīcasvaram* is a *samāhara dvandva* referring to the pair of accents, high and low. Such a pair, which adherents of different Vedic traditions proclaim (*prāhuḥ* 'say'), is said to be (*ucyate* 'is said, is called') the *bhāṣika* accentuation. Moreover, the verse specifies the chanters of *sāman*-s (*chandogāḥ*) that is, *sāmavedin*-s adherents of the Ṛgveda (*bahvṛcāḥ*) and Vājasaneyin-s (*vājasaneyinaḥ*). Now, Śabara can merely be stating that the pair of accents, high and low, to the exclusion of the *svarita*, together constitute the *bhāṣika* accentuation and that the two accents in question are those which reciters of the three main Vedic saṃhitā traditions know. On the other hand, the *Jaiminīya-nyāyamālāvistara* (*JNMV*) goes farther. Mādhava remarks that the verse given in Śabara's *Bhāṣya* says that the accent which occurs in Brāhmaṇa-s of individual Śākhā-s of Vedic texts is called *bhāṣika*.[35] He thus appears to attribute the *bhāṣika* accentual system not

only to the Brāhmaṇa of the Śuklayajurveda but also to Brāhmaṇa-s in particular branches of other Vedic traditions.[36]

Whether or not one accepts this, however, the indisputable fact remains that Jaimini knew of and discussed the status of the *bhāṣika* accentuation with respect to the use of *mantra-s* in ritual performance.

5. There is thus a series of discussions concerning the possible application of the accentual system called *bhāṣika* involving only *udātta* and *anudātta* syllables in a *prātiśākhya* pertaining to the Śuklayajurveda (§2), the Śrautasūtra associated with this Veda (§3) and also in the Mīmāṃsā tradition as codified in Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* (§4).

It is generally accepted that, despite difficulties in establishing exact dates and the fact that the texts in question exhibit layers, all of these works date from before the common era. Indeed, Jaimini may date from as early as the fifth century BC.[37] One must accept that the recitation tradition involving the *bhāṣika* accentuation system was well established by this time. The fact that the *Bhāṣikasūtra*, which describes this system, is a relatively late text therefore in no way justifies the assumption that this accentuation itself was so very late. Moreover, the replacement of a *svarita* syllable by an *udātta* syllable is already vouched for by Pāṇini (see note 18), who can reasonably be dated to around 500 BC.[38]

In view of these facts, we are required to conclude,

I think, that the *bhāṣika* accentuation system represents a real historical development in Indo-Āryan consisting first in the replacement of a syllable combining high and low pitches by one with only a high pitch, that this development began before the sixth century BC, and that it was fully carried out by the fifth century BC.

Abbreviation

A	Aṣṭādhyāyī
An	Anantabhaṭṭa
JMS	Mīmāṃsāsūtra
JNMV	Jaiminīya-nyāyamālā-vistara
KŚrS	Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra
ŚBh	Śabara Bhāṣya
ŚBr	Śatapathabrāhmaṇa
U	Uvaṭa
VPr	Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya

Notes

1. This paper was originally presented at the International Seminar on Sanskrit in the context of western criticism, held at the University of Allahabad, 19th to 21st December, 2010, and may appear in the proceedings of this seminar, if they are published. I thank Kei Kataoka for comments.

2. See G. Cardona, 'The bhāṣika accentuation system', *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 18: 1-40 (1993), where references to earlier work are given and the conclusions of earlier scholars are discussed.

3. Jan E.M. Houben, 'Studies in India's Vedic Grammarians, 1: Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's *Prakriyā-sarvasva* and Pāṇini's Se' (*Studies in Sanskrit Grammars*, Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section, 14th World Sanskrit Conference, edited by George Cardona, Ashok Aklujkar and Hideyo Ogawa, New Delhi: D.K. Printworks, 2011), p. 182, note 42.

4. See Cardona, op. cit (note 2), 20 note 45.

5. उच्चैरुदात्तः । नीचैरनुदात्तः । उभयवान् स्वरितः ।

   (*VPr* I.108-10), comparable to Pāṇini's (*A* I.2.29-31).

6. *VPr* I.111 (*ekapade nīcapūrvaḥ sayavo jātyaḥ*) states the conditions under which a *svarita* is called *jātya*: if it occurs in a single word, possibly preceded by a low-pitched syllable, and includes *y* or *v*. Subsequent rules, through I.120, give the conditions for *svarita* syllables to bear seven other names, *abhinihita* and so on.

7. सामजपन्यूङ्खवर्जम् ।   (*VPr* I.131).

8. चतुर्थेऽहनि प्रातरनुवाकप्रतिपद्यर्धर्चाद्योन्यूङ्खः । द्वितीयं स्वरमोकारं त्रिमात्र-मुदात्तं त्रिः । तस्य तस्य चोपरिष्टादपरिमितान् पञ्च वार्धीकारानानु-दात्तानुत्तमस्य तु त्रीन् । पूर्वमक्षरं निहन्यते न्यूङ्खमाने ।

   Āśvalāyana-śrautasūtra VII.11.1-11). See Sayaṇa's *Bhāṣya* on *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* V.2 for a detailed explanation.

9. *A* I.2.34: यज्ञकर्मण्यजपन्यूङ्खसामसु । (एकश्रुति ३३).

10. cf. Uvata's (U) and Anantabhaṭṭa's (An) comments on *VPr* I.130: तानलक्षणमेकं स्वरमाहुर्यज्ञकर्मणि (उवटः) । तानस्वरलक्षणमेकमेव स्वरं मन्यन्ते केचित् । यद् वा यज्ञकर्मणि तानस्वरलक्षणमेकं स्वरमाहुः सामजपन्युङ्खवर्जम् (अनन्तभट्टः) ।

11. cf. Uvata's and Anantabhaṭṭa's comments on *VPr* I.128: उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितान् यजुर्वेदे त्रीन् स्वरानाहुः तथा चोक्ता एव सन्तोऽनूदन्त एवेदानीमपवादार्थम् (उवटः) । यजुर्वेद उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरित-स्वरास्त्रय एवेत्येके मन्यन्ते (अनन्तभट्टः) ।

12. cf. Uvata and Anantabhṭṭa on *VPr* I.129: किम् विशेषेण यजुर्वेदे त्रीन् स्वरान् आहुः । नेत्युच्यते। द्वौ स्वरा-नुदात्तानुदात्तौ भाषिकलक्षितौ शतपथब्राह्मणे आहुः । पारिशेष्यान् मन्त्रेषु त्रैस्वैर्यम् (उवटः) । उदात्तानुदात्तलक्षणौ द्वावेव स्वरौ यजुर्वेद इत्यन्ये । यद् वा मन्त्रे त्रीन् शतपथब्राह्मणे भाषिकलक्षणौ उदात्तानुदात्तौ द्वावेव स्वरौ (अनन्तभट्टः) ।

13. मन्त्रे स्वरक्रिया यथाम्नातमविशेषात् । (*KŚrS* I.8.16). Karka : कर्मणि प्रयुज्यमाने मन्त्र आम्नातस्वरेण प्रयोगः । कुत एतत् । अविशेषात् । न विशेषोऽवसातुं शक्यतेऽनेन स्वरेणानेन वा प्रयोग इति तस्मात् समाम्नायस्वरः ।

Karka notes that this is a preliminary conclusion that tentatively obtains : एवं प्राप्त आह ।

14. भाषिकस्वरो वोपपन्नमन्त्रोपदेशात् (*KŚrS* I.8.17) वाशब्दः पक्षव्यावृत्तौ। भाषिकस्वरो वा भवति । ब्राह्मणस्वरो न मन्त्रस्वरः । कुत एतत् । उपपन्नस्वरस्यैव मन्त्रस्य विद्यमानस्वरस्य ब्राह्मणे स्वरान्तरेणोपदेशो भवति । तस्माद् भाषिकस्वर इति । Karka notes that this too is a preliminary conclusion that tentatively obtains : एवं प्राप्त आह।

15. तानो वा नित्यत्वात् । (*KŚrS* I.8.18). The precise import of *nityatvāt* here is not obvious. In terms of rule relations, this would mean that the monotone prevails because it has obligatory application. On the other hand, *nitya* could allude to the eternality of what is handed down. This is the sense Karka gives to the term in his discussion of this and the following *sūtra* (see note 17), as follows :

   वाशब्दः पक्षान्तरपरिग्रहे । नैतदस्ति यद् भाषिकस्वर इति । तानेन प्रयोगः । एकश्रुत्या प्रयोग इत्यर्थः । कुत एतत् । एकश्रुति दूरात् संबुद्धौ यज्ञकर्मणि सुब्रह्मण्यासामजपन्यूङ्खखयाजमानवर्जम् (१.८.१९) । स्मर्यते ह्येवम् एकश्रुति दूरात् संबुद्धौ (अष्टा १.२.३३) इति वर्तमाने यज्ञ-कर्मण्यजपन्यूङ्खसामसु (अष्टा १.२.३४) इत्येवमादिवर्जितानां मन्त्राणाम् एकश्रुत्या तानेन प्रयोगः । नन्वियं स्मृतिः श्रुत्या च मन्त्रप्रयोगः स्वरान्तरेणोच्यते । नैव श्रुतिः मन्त्रप्रयोगार्था तं प्रथयत्युरुप्रथा उरु प्रथस्व (श ब्रा १.२.२.८) इति प्रयोगवचनेनोपसंगृहीतत्वात् । लिङ्ग्येन प्रथने प्राप्नोत्येव । तत्र श्रुतिरर्थवादार्था उरु ते यज्ञपतिः प्रथताम् (वा सं ९.२२) इति । प्रशस्तमेतत् प्रथनं येन यज्ञपतिरपि प्रजया पशुभिश्च प्रथत इति । अपि च नित्या स्मृतिरविच्छिन्नपारम्पर्यात् । अथवा नित्यत्वादिति नित्यं वैदिकं वचनं स्मृतीनां मूलमित्येवं स्मृतेर्नित्यत्वम् ।

16. See note 9.

17. एकश्रुतिदूरात् संबुद्धौ यज्ञकर्मणि सुब्रह्मण्यासामजपन्यूङ्खयाजमानवर्जम् (का श्री सू १.८.१९) । एकश्रुति दूरात् संबुद्धौ is identical with *A* 1.2.33. I cannot discuss here the question whether Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vājasaneyiśrautasūtra*, post-dates or predates Pāṇini. Nor is this crucial to my argument.

18. Pāṇini (*A* I.2.37: *na subrahmaṇyāyāṃ svaritasya tūdāttaḥ*) also excludes *ekaśruti* in the *subrahmaṇyā* but notes, in addition, that here a *svarita* is replaced by an *udātta*.

19. Uvata and Anantabhaṭṭa explain that *pravacana* refers to the original recitation (*ārṣapāṭha*) and *prāvacana* designates the accent (*svara*) that occurs therein :
प्रवचनशब्देनार्षपाठ उच्यते । तत्र भवः स्वरः प्रावचनः । स च यजुषि भवति । वा तान इति विकल्पः । स च त्रैस्वर्यलक्षण एव भवति । (*Uvaṭa VPr* I.132) प्रवचनशब्देनार्षपाठ उच्यते । तत्र भवः स्वरः प्रावचनः । सा वा यजुर्वेदे स्यात् । स च त्रैस्वर्यलक्षण एव तानो वा यज्ञकर्मणीति विकल्पः । (*Anantabhaṭṭa VPr* I.132).

20. प्रावचनो वा यजुषि । (*VPr.* I.132).

21. इमामगृभ्णन्नशनामृतस्य पूर्व आयुंषि विदर्थेषु कृव्या (*Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā*, 22.2)

22. इमामगृभ्णन्नशनामृतस्येत्यश्वाभिधानीमादत्ते । (*ŚBr* XIII.1.2.1).

23. भाषास्वरेणोपदेशादैरवत्प्रावचनप्रतिषेधः स्यात् । (*JMS* XII.3.8.20). भाषिकेण स्वरेण केचिन्मन्त्रा ब्राह्मण उपदिष्टाः मन्त्रसमाम्नाये त्रैस्वर्येण पठिताः । यथा इमामगृभ्णन् नित्याश्वमेधे । तेषु मन्त्रेषु प्रावचनस्य स्वरस्य प्रतिषेधः स्यात् निवृत्तिः । कस्मात् । स्वरान्तरोपदेशात् । (*SBh* 12.3.8.20). See §4.4 with note 34.

24. *aira*-derives from *irā*-. In the Pāṇinian system, the *taddhita* suffix *aṇ* follows a *pada irā-s* (*A* V.2.61: *vimuktādibhyo 'ṇ matau* 59, *adhyānuvākayoḥ* 60), consisting of *irā* and the ending *su* (*irā-s-a-* → *irā-a-* → *airā-a-* → *aira-*) to form a derivate used in the same sense as one with the suffix *matup*, that is, something in which *irā* occurs (*tadasyā-sty asminn iti matup*, *A* 5.2.94). This holds under the assumption that the suffix in *airā-* is not redundant (*svārthika*). If, on the other hand, *aṇ* is considered redundantly introduced by *A* V.4.38 (*prajñādibhyaś ca*) by considering the *gaṇa prajñādi* to be a type set (*ākṛtigaṇa*), then *aira-* refers to *irā* itself.

25. ऐरावत् । यथेरापदस्योपदेशात् कर्मकाले गिरापदस्य निवृत्तिः (*ŚBh* XII.3.8.20).

26. cf. *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* VIII.6.8-10: एतद्ध स्म वा आह कुशाम्बः स्वायवो ब्रह्मा लातव्यः । कँ स्विदद्य शिशुमारी यज्ञपथेऽप्यस्ता गरिष्यति ॥ ८ ॥ एष वै शिशुमारी यज्ञपथेऽप्यस्ता यज्ञायज्ञीयं यद्

गिरागिरेत्याहात्मानं तदुद्गाता गिरति ॥ ९ ॥ ऐरङ् कृत्वोद्गेयम् इरायां यज्ञं प्रतिष्ठापयत्यप्रमायुक् उद्गाता भवति ॥ १० ॥

In the actual singing of the verse, *irā* is further modified. This is discussed in various places, including *JMS* IX.1.18.54-8. For the present argument, it is not necessary to consider these discussions.

27. कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते स्वरस्यायमुपदेशो न मन्त्रस्येति । मन्त्रो नोपदेष्टव्यः । रूपादेव प्राप्नोति । स्वरस्त्वनुपदिष्टो न प्राप्नोति । तस्मात् तस्यो-पदेशः । (*SBh* XII.3.8.20).

28. मन्त्रोपदेशो वा न भाषिकस्य प्रायापत्तेर्भाषिकश्रुतिः । (*JMS* XII.3.8.21).

29. मन्त्रस्य वायुमुपदेशो न स्वरस्येति । कथं ज्ञायते । मन्त्रोपदेशसरूपोऽयं शब्दः । किमस्य तत्सारूप्यम् । इत्यश्वाभिधानीमादत्त इत्याह । मन्त्रेण चासावादीयते न भाषिकस्वरेण । मन्त्रोपादानं प्रत्याययति नेतरस्य । (*SBh* XII.3.8.21).

30. कस्मात् तर्ह्युच्चार्यते । प्रायापत्तेर्भाषिकश्रुतिः । भाषास्वरो ब्राह्मणे प्रवृत्तः । तन्मध्ये यदि प्रवचनेन पठ्यते भाषिकस्वरसन्तानो विच्छिद्यते । तत्-परिहारार्थं भाषिकेणोपदेशः । (*SBh* XII.3.8.21).

31. यथा गायना गीतवस्तुकानि यानि गीतकेषु प्रक्षिपन्ति तान्यपि तेनैव गीतास्वरेणोच्चारयन्ति । मा भूत् स्वरसन्तानस्य विच्छेद इति । (*SBh* XII.3.8.21).

32. तस्मान्न भाषिकस्वरोपदेश इति । (*SBh* XII.3.8.21).

33. विकारः कारणाग्रहणे (*JMS* XII.3.8.22), इरापदेन तु गिरापदस्य विकारो युक्तः कारणाग्रहणात् । यथा भाषिकस्यानुपदेशो मन्त्रोपदेशेन कारणेनोक्तः नैवमिरापदस्यानुपदेशे किंचित् कारणं गृह्यते । तस्मात् तस्योपदेशः । स कर्मकाले विधानात् समाम्नायेन प्राप्तं गिरापदं बाधते । तस्मात् तत्र विकारः । (*SBh* XII.3.8.22). In the next Adhi-karaṇa, Jaimini goes on to consider the accentuation of *mantra-s* that are first uttered in the Brāhmaṇa ; I do not think it is necessary for me to consider this section here.

34. कः पुनर्भाषिकः स्वरः । उच्यते छन्दोगा बह्वचश्चैव तथा वाजसनेयिनः । उच्चनीचस्वरं प्राहुः स वै भाषिक उच्यते इति । (*SBh* XII.3.8.20).

35. तत्तच्छाखीयब्राह्मणस्वरो भाषिक इत्युच्यते । तदुक्तमाचार्यैः छन्दोगा बह्वचश्चैव तथा वाजसनेयिनः । उच्चनीचस्वरं प्राहुः स वै

भाषिक उच्यते इति । (*JNMV* XII.3.8).

36. In this connection, let me note a possible textual variation in Mādhava's text. As shown here (see note 34), in the Ānandāśrama edition of Śabara's *Bhāṣya*, the final *pāda* of the verse in question is *sa vai bhāṣika ucyate*, and this appears also in the Ānandāśrama ed. of the *JNMV* (vol. 24, 1892, p. 690) as well as the earlier (1873) edition of Th. Goldstücker, completed by ¹E.B. Cowell, reprinted Osnabrück 1970: Biblio Verlag ᷅(p. 527). In Jibananda Vidyasagara's edition (Calcutta, 1883), p. 706, line 8, however, the *pāda* is *sarvair bhāṣika ucyate*, saying that the accent is called *bhāṣika* by all. The same reading is found in subsequent editions that appear to be reprints of Jibananda's edition: Bombay: Vidyaranya Vidyapeetam, 1983, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 2005 (p. 706, line 8). The evidences indicates that *sa vai bhāṣika ucyate* should be accepted. See also James Benson, *Mīmāṃsā-nyāyasaṃgraha: A Compendium of the Principles of Mīmāṃsā, Mahādeva Vedāntin*, edited and translated (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), p. 789, note 186.

37. See, for example, Jean-Marie Verpoorten, *Mīmāṃsā Literature* (*A History of Indian Literature*, edited by Jan Gonda, volume VI, fasc. 5, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987), p. 5, §7 with references.

38. The widely held claim that Pāṇini must be dated in the middle of the fourth century BC is based on the assumption that Pāṇini's *sūtra* V.2.120 : *rūpād āhataprasaṃsayor yap* serves to derive *rūpya* as the name of a coin that is to be identified with copper-punched coins. This assumption is unjustified, as I have argued in 'Pāṇini's dates and the evidence of coinage', in *Indological Research: Different Standpoints* (P.C. Muraleemadhavan, editor, New Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2013), pp. 147-71.