

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDITED BY THE FINNISH ORIENTAL SOCIETY
55:22

**ON THE JAIMINĪYA AND VĀDHŪLA TRADITIONS
OF SOUTH INDIA
AND THE PĀṆḌU/PĀṆḌAVA PROBLEM**

BY
ASKO PARPOLA

HELSINKI 1984

ASKO PARPOLA

ON THE JAIMINĪYA AND VĀDHŪLA TRADITIONS OF SOUTH INDIA
AND THE PĀṆḌU/PĀṆḌAVA PROBLEM

1. S c o p e

Initiating a research project on the domestic rituals of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, which has been undertaken by the Department of Asian and African Studies at the University of Helsinki with grants of the Academy of Finland, my wife and I spent two months in the State of Kerala in South India at the end of the year 1983. This paper, one of the first fruits of the project, is dedicated with reverence and grief to the memory of Jussi Aro, Professor of Semitics at the University of Helsinki and a sincere man, who unexpectedly passed away that same year.

On November 21st and 22nd, 1983, we had the privilege of witnessing a Nambudiri brahman marriage, which joined in wedlock representatives of two exceedingly rare Vedic traditions. On this occasion I could gather some new information concerning the distribution of the Vādhūla school of Black Yajurveda, to which the bride's house belongs; this is now reported in the first part of the present paper along with similar data concerning the Jaiminīya school represented by the bridegroom — the only branch of the Sāmaveda prevalent in Kerala.

Willem Caland's four reports (1922-1928) on the Vādhūla texts containing lengthy extracts have fully demonstrated the immense importance of this unexpectedly discovered tradition for the study of the Vedic ritual, language and literature. I am taking the opportunity of also communicating in this paper some other data that I have come across over the years regarding the Vādhūla school in supplement to Michael Witzel's recent report (1975), which ably summarizes the prevailing situation. My primary research interests in the Vedic field lie in the ritual and texts of the Sāmavedins, especially the Jaiminīyas, but since it is urgent to preserve from destruction whatever written or oral material there still may be in Kerala of the Vādhūla tradition (cf.

Witzel 1975: 77), I have paid some attention to this duty too. It is hoped that these data will be useful for the editing of the Vādhūla texts, a highly important task that has been undertaken now at the Kern Institute of Indology, University of Leiden, by Professor Witzel and Dr. Max Sparreboom.

Another reason for my interest in the Vādhūlas is the close parallel provided by the history of this Vedic school to that of the Jaiminīyas. These rare schools have both survived only in southernmost India and their Sūtra texts belong to an archaic layer. For both reasons they hold a key position in the problem concerning the arrival of the Vedic traditions in Kerala and Tamilnadu, examined in the last parts of the paper. Attention is paid to both literary and archaeological evidence relating to the date and origin of the earliest Aryan traditions of South India.

The question about the North Indian affiliation of the early Sri Lankan and Tamil kings called Pāṇḍus and Pāṇḍyas has given occasion to ponder about their relationship to the Pāṇḍavas of the epic. This in its turn has led to a novel hypothesis concerning the Mahābhārata war: it is tentatively suggested that it might reflect battles associated with the arrival of the megalithic culture in India ca. 800 B.C.

2. The Nambudiri houses belonging to the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda

The aforementioned wedding was not performed at the bride's home, as was earlier the norm among the Nambudiri brahmans of Kerala, but, as is nowadays sometimes done if it is more convenient, in the house of the bridegroom's family. In this case it was the Kallampaḷḷi mana at Kiṭaṅṅūr, about 10 km from Errumanūr, which in turn is about 8 km from Kōṭṭayam in Central Kerala. Kiṭaṅṅūr is one of the 32 original brahman villages of Kerala mentioned in the chronicle Keralotpatti, which dates from the 17th century and is thus rather late, but embodies much earlier traditional lore (cf. Veluthat 1978: 21f., 29f., 106). The bridegroom was Śrī Kallampaḷḷi Dāmodaran Nambudiri, son of the Āyurvedic doctor Śrī Subrahmaṇyan Nambudiri, who had been adopted into the Kallampaḷḷi mana. This house belongs to the Jaiminīya school. Its ācārya is Śrī Muṭṭattukkāṭṭil Māmaṅṅu Iṭṭi Ravi Nambudiri (born 1904), the foremost Sāmavedic expert of Kerala, with whom I spent most of those two months in 1983 and who also advised the bridegroom in the performance of the marriage ceremonies. (For a brief life history of Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi Nambudiri, see Staal 1983: II, 762f.) The Nambudiri of the Kallampaḷḷi mana resident in the village of Kiṭaṅṅūr is mentioned as the teacher of the scribe in the obeisance at the

beginning of a paper manuscript of the Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa (belonging to the Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute at Hoshiarpur) used by B. R. Sharma (1967: 7 n.) for his edition of this text: *kallāmpaḷḷi divijendrāya kiṭṭaṅkargrāmaṅvāsine śrīrāmācandrahalpatyaravaye gurave namaḥ*.

The rarity of the Sāmavedins in Kerala is illustrated by the statistics given by A. C. Burnell (1869: 4 n.) and W. Logan (1886: I, 119), both cited by Staal (1961: 35; also 1983: 172f.): according to the former, "in Malabar, of 100 Brahmans (i.e. Nambudiris), 80 will be followers of the Ṛgveda, 19 of the Black Yajurveda and 1 of the Sāmaveda"; according to the latter, out of the total of 1017 houses (manas) surveyed in Malabar 466 belonged to Ṛgveda, 406 to Yajurveda, and 6 to Sāmaveda (the remaining 139 being either excluded from the Vedas or uncertain). Staal (1961: 35f.) also quotes the following estimate, possibly based on statistics prepared during the first half of this century by the Nambudiri Yogakṣema Mahāsabhā: out of the total Nambudiri population of Kerala (in 1961 belonging to 1561 *manas* and numbering about 60,000 people, out of a total population of about 14 million in Kerala), roughly 35% belong to Ṛgveda, 50% to Yajurveda, and 0.12% to Sāmaveda. Staal also pointed out that this and Burnell's information need not contradict Logan's table, because the latter excluded Travancore and Cochīn, which were not under the Collector's supervision, and especially "Cochīn has important and big YV centres. The information concerning SV is in full accordance with the fact that there are at present only 20 SV *manas* in the whole of Kerala" (ib. 36). A historical perspective is given by a copper plate grant issued in the year A.D. 864-865, which records the number of the seats allotted for different Sūtras in the school of Vedic study (*śāla*) at Kāntalūr: as examples are cited 45 seats for the Pavalīyacaraṇa (i.e. Āśvalāyana Ṛgveda), 36 for the Taittirīyacaraṇa (Yajurveda), and 14 for the Talavakāracaraṇa (Jaiminīya Sāmaveda) (cf. Varier 1983: 281).

Frits Staal (1961: 86) has already listed the names of the said 20 Sāmavedic houses, along with their location (village/district). In 1971, and again in 1983, I got some corrections to this list as well as important additional information concerning the mutual relationship and history of the houses from Śrī M. M. Iṭṭi Ravi Nambudiri and his eldest son Śrī M. M. Subramaṇian Nambudiri, who had given Staal his data. Below, I am giving a revised list of the Jaiminīya manas together with some other select data from my material. Excepting some words that have gained general currency, like Nambudiri(pad) instead of Nampūtiri(ppāṭu), I am using in this paper the conventional tran-

scription of Malayalam orthography (Staal's transcription is sometimes confusing, as it has tried to make a compromise between this and the pronunciation).

mana (house)	grāma (village)	district
1. Muṭṭattukkāṭṭu Māmaṇṇu	Pāññāḷ	Tr̥śśūr
2. Nellikkāṭṭu Māmaṇṇu	"	"
3. Perumaññāṭṭu	"	"
4. Tōṭṭam	"	"
5. Korāṭṭikkara	"	"
6. Maṅgalattēri	Mūkkutala	Malappuram
7. Pakarāvūr	"	"
8. Mūttiriññōṭṭu	Maṇṇenkoṭi	Paṭṭāmpi
9. Naripparra	Koṭṭumūku	"
10. Muṭṭāya	Kotalmaṇṇa	Kaṭampalippuram
11. Vaṭakkāñcēri	Eñkakkāṭṭu	Vaṭakkāñcēri
12. Malamēl	Kiṭaṇṇūr	Kōṭṭayam
13. Muriyōttu Malamēl	"	"
14. Muḷavēlippuram	"	"
15. Pārriyāla	"	"
16. Kallampalḷi	"	"
17. Nellippuḷa Kallampalḷi	"	"
18. Vaṭāna	"	"
19. Ōṇanturutti Pārriyāla	Ōṇanturutti	Atirampuḷa
20. Pōṭūr	"	"

The above order of the manas is that of Staal's list, which follows a geographical arrangement. When I asked about the gotras represented by these houses, the order was as follows:

- Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bharadvāja: 1, 2, 7
- Vasiṣṭha: 4, 3, 6, 5
- Āṅgīrasa(-Bharadvāja?): 12, 13, 14
- Bhārgava: 18, 16, 17, 15, 19, 20
- Kāśyapa: 8, 9, 11, 10.

An Āsvalāyana Ṛgvedin from the neighbouring village of Kiḷimaṅgalam enumerated the northern houses (of which he forgot no. 9) in the following order: 1, 2, 4, 3, 5, 8, 10, 7, 11, 6; the remaining manas to make up 20 were according to him in Kiṭaṇṇūr.

Until 1933, only the eldest son of a Nambudiri was allowed to marry Nambudiri girls, up to three at a time: he was to inherit the whole house, which could thus be kept undivided; the younger sons had relationships with Nāyar caste girls. Exceptions were made if the eldest son died or had no male issue. (For the kinship and marriage regulations of the Nambudiris and their position in the social structure of Kerala see especially Mencher 1966a and Mencher & Goldberg 1967; cf. also Staal 1983: 168.) In cases where the family line was about to become extinct, adoption was resorted to. So, when the Kallampalli mana (no. 16) became extinct, a Nambudiri from the Muriyōttu Malamēl mana (no. 13) was adopted there in 1940 — the father of our bridegroom. For the same reason one family of the Parriyāla mana (no. 15) also migrated to the Muriyōttu Malamēl mana (no. 13) in 1944. In 1971, the Korattikkara mana (no. 5) had become extinct.

Unlike the Ṛgvedins, nowhere in their rituals do the Sāmavedins mention their gotra and Sūtra. This may explain the uncertainty about the exact gotra of manas nos. 12-14: according to Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi, it is certain that they are Āṅgīrasa, but not sure whether they are Āṅgīrasa-Bharadvāja: nevertheless, this is accepted by Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi and others for marriages.

The four Vasiṣṭha manas originally belonged to the Panniyūr grāma, where the Āśvalāyana tradition was followed for hautra, and even nowadays the Āśvalāyana tradition is followed in the śrauta rituals performed on their behalf, although the Vasiṣṭhas have come over to the Śukapuram grāma represented by all the other Nambudiri manas belonging to the Sāmaveda. Before the coming of those four manas there was no Āśvalāyana practice in the Śukapuram grāma, only Kauṣītaki. (Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi, orally; cf. also Staal 1983: 173.)

Panniyūr and Śukapuram (or Cokiram) are prominent among the 32 villages mentioned as original brahman settlements in the Keralotpatti (cf. Veluthat 1978: 21f., 24). "In Śukapuram there is a grāma-kṣetra or village-temple of Śiva-Dakṣiṇāmūrti with ninth or tenth century inscriptions recording landed properties on a large scale (A.R.E. 1895, nos. 208-211). Panniyūr, with a grāma-kṣetra of Viṣṇu-Varāhamūrti, has a fragmentary inscription from the tenth century (A.R.E. 1895, no. 214). In addition, Śukapuram had a well-established history of yajñas dating back to Mēlattōḷ Agnihotri, who is said to have performed ninety-nine sacrifices. According to tradition, the spirit of competition led Panniyūr brahmins to accept paradeśi teachers, and this paved the way to disputes and violence. Finally one group polluted the temple, as a result of which they lost ritual privileges and came to be looked down upon by

the rest of the society." (Narayanan & Veluthat 1983: 270). Since both villages are mentioned with equal status in a copper plate grant dated 1225 A.D., it is supposed that their open feud, which is referred to in the Maṇi-pravāḷa poems of the 14th and 15th centuries and in accounts of foreign travellers, started some time after this date (ibid. 270f.). "The intensity of the feud is indicated by the fact that the two grāmas followed opposite ways in everything from sacrificial rituals to the manner of cutting vegetables. They never dined together, and they did not intermarry. Although the Panniyūr brahmins ultimately lost the privilege of performing Vedic sacrifices, stray references in medieval Malayalam literature indicate that the brahmins of Śukapuram continued their tradition of Vedic rituals and sacrifices" (ibid. 271; cf. also Varier 1983: 282, 289ff., 296).

Nowadays, then, all Sāmavedic Nambudiris belong to the Śukapuram grāma, although this village (situated 15 km east of Ponnani) is no longer their place of residence. This is reflected in their ritual, since at the beginning of all śrāddha rites for deceased ancestors, they perform, facing the direction of Śukapuram (west in Pāññāḷ, north in Mūkkutala), an obeisance (namaskāra) to the main deity of Śukapuram, Dakṣiṇāmūrti. (Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi, orally.) Similar worship is performed by the sacrificer and his priests at the commencement of a śrauta sacrifice (cf. Varier 1983: 291).

It seems that originally the Māmaṇṇu mana was the purohit family for all the Nambudiri Sāmavedins. It is said that in earlier times there were ten Māmaṇṇu manas in Pāññāḷ, but the names of all these are not remembered now. Today there survive only two neighbouring houses, Muṭṭattukkāṭṭu Māmaṇṇu mana and the Nellikkāṭṭu Māmaṇṇu mana respectively (nos. 1 and 2). The specifications are derived from the 'forests' (Malayalam *kāṭṭu*, from which the oblique *kāṭṭu* or the locative *kāṭṭil* figure in the name): 'situated in the forest of...'; *nelli* is 'emblic myrobalan' (*Phyllanthus emblica*), whose astringent fruit (*nellikka*) is eaten, while *muṭṭattu* is the oblique of *muṭṭam* 'trunk, log of wood'. The split has taken place more than ten generations ago, and in the course of time, there has been some amount of rivalry between these two houses. Nowadays the Muṭṭattukkāṭṭil Māmaṇṇu mana (Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi) functions as the teacher (*ācārya*) family for all other Sāmavedic houses in Kerala excepting the Vaṭakkāñcēri and Muṭṭāya manas (nos. 11 & 10), for which it is the Nellikkāṭṭu Māmaṇṇu; another exception are the Narippaṭṭa and Mūttiriñṅōṭṭu manas (nos. 9 & 8), for which the ācārya comes from the Perumaññāṭṭu mana (no. 3). A Nambudiri of Perumaññāṭṭu mana of the Panniyūr grāma came to Pāñ-

ñāl soon after Tippu Sultan's invasion of Malabar; at that time, there were no issues at the Kulaññara Māmaṅṅu mana, which is one of those original ten Māmaṅṅu manas, and the house and part of the lands were given to him, while the rest were donated to the temple. The Perumaññāṭṭu mana and the Nellik-kāṭṭu Māmaṅṅu mana mutually provide the ācārya for each other. Previously a similar relationship prevailed also between the Perumaññāṭṭu mana and the Muṭṭattukkāṭṭu Māmaṅṅu mana, but afterwards the Muṭṭattukkāṭṭu Māmaṅṅu mana took its ācārya from the Maṅgalattēri mana; during the past decades, however, this relationship has not functioned any more. At the moment, then, there are only three "teacher" (*ācārya*) houses (nos. 1-3); the rest are "pupils" (*śiṣya*).

The four Kāśyapa manas (nos. 8-11) are exceptional also in being the only ones representing the aristocratic *ādhyān* category of Keralan brahmins, who used to be richer and who have the more honorific title Nambudiripad (*Nampūtirippāṭṭu*); all other Keralan Sāmavedins are 'ordinary' Nambudiris of the *āsyān* category (for the Nambudiri status categories see Fawcett 1900: 34f.; Mencher & Goldberg 1967: 295f.). The famous commentator of the Jaiminīya Śrauta- and Ḡṛhya-Sūtra, Bhavatrāta (7th century), belonged to this Kāśyapa group (see below, § 7).

3. The houses belonging to the Vādhūla branch of the Taittirīya school of Black Yajurveda

If the bridegroom of the Kiṭaṅṅūr wedding belonged to a very rare Vedic school, so did the bride, Prasannā, daughter of Śrī Parameśvaran Nambudiri. The father of the bride had been adopted into the Kōśāppillī mana as there had been no male in the family to continue the line; by coincidence, the bride's father-in-law had also been similarly adopted into his mana, as we have seen. The Kōśāppillī mana in Nāyattōṭṭu near Kālaṭi or Aṅkamāli (between Alway and Trichur) belongs to the Vādhūla school of Black Yajurveda. This sub-branch of the Taittirīyas is to be found only in Tamilnadu (see below, § 6) and (mainly) in Kerala, where it represents the minority of the Nambudiri Yajurvedins.

The vast majority — "it is said over 90 %" (Staal 1961: 62) of the Nambudiri Yajurvedins belongs to another sūtra-caraṇa of the Taittirīyas, that of Baudhāyana, which itself is a rarity from an all-India point of view. Cf. also the statement by Raja (1910: 631), according to which "almost all the Yajurvedic Nambudiri families belong to the Baudhāyana school, the remaining few representing the Bādhūlaka section". The most detailed estimate so far concerning

the Vādhūlas is that quoted by Michael Witzel (1975: 77): "Nach E. R. S. Sarma soll es in Kerala nur noch wenige Personen geben, die in der Tradition der Vādhūla-Schule stehen; die mündliche Überlieferung selbst scheint bereits ausgestorben zu sein. In Kerala erzählt man von ursprünglich fünf Vādhūla-Familien, die nun auf etwa 60 *illams* angewachsen sein sollen."

This information could now be checked from the Vādhūlas present at the Kiṭaṅnūr marriage, especially their ācārya who was in charge of the ceremonies relating to the bride only. He was Śrī K. T. Parameśvaran Nambudiripad belonging to the Kiṭaṅnaśśēri Taraṇanallūr mana of Iriññālakuṭa. To my surprise, my informants were quite definite that there are only 15 traditional Vādhūla manas in Kerala. They could enumerate all of them:

1. Kiṭaṅnaśśēri Taraṇanallūr	Iriññālakuṭa		
2. Neṭumpiḷḷi Taraṇanallūr	"		
3. Veḷuttēṭattu Taraṇanallūr	"		
4. Tekkiniyēttu Taraṇanallūr	"		
5. Kūrṛampiḷḷi	"		
6. Maṭham	Veḷḷārappiḷḷi near Kālaṭi		
7. Kōśāppiḷḷi	Nāyattōṭṭu	"	"
8. Paṛavaṭṭam	"	"	"
9. Paḷaṅṅapparaṃpū	Kāññāṇi	"	Tṛśśūr
10. Paccāmpiḷḷi Tāmarappiḷḷi	Maṇalūr	"	"
11. Vaṭakkētattu Tāmarappiḷḷi	"	"	"
12. Kallēri Tāmarappiḷḷi	"	"	"
13. Kanniyil Tāmarappiḷḷi	"	"	"
14. Akkarakuriśśi	Veḷḷāñhellūr	"	Koṭuñhellūr
15. Iḷakuriśśi	"	"	"

Out of these 15 houses, Paccāmpiḷḷi Tāmarappiḷḷi (no. 10 in the list) has recently been partitioned into four houses with different names, not remembered by my informants.

The order in which the houses have been arranged in the above list is of my making — there appears to be no fixed traditional order. I have placed the four Taraṇanallūr manas at the beginning, since Taraṇanallūr (which long ago split into four manas) is traditionally the house of the Vādhūla ācāryas (teachers and spiritual guides). It is interesting to note that practically all Vādhūla manuscripts known to exist to date have come from the two manas mentioned first in the list (cf. Witzel 1975: 91 and passim). The village

called Saṅgama-grāma, which is mentioned as the abode of Nārāyaṇa (see below) or Miśra (cf. Witzel 1975: 90), the author of the Vādhūlagṛhyāgamavṛttirahasyam, appears to be Iriññālakkuṭam, where the manuscripts of this text come from, for according to E. Easwaran Nampoothiri (1972: 50) a 15th-century Kerala author called Saṅgama-grāma-Mādhava belonged to Ilaññippaḷḷi or Iriññā-ṭappaḷḷi, and these might stand for Iriññālakkuṭa. Gundert (1871: I, 110a) records the variant forms Iriññāṭikkūṭa and Iriññāṭikkōṭū; the oldest name of the town is Iruñkāṭikkūṭal, recorded in a granite inscription of its temple as old as 855 A.D. (cf. Varier 1983: 296 n. 3; Veluthat 1978: 70f.). This is one of the 32 original Nambudiri settlements enumerated in the Keralotpatti (cf. Veluthat 1978: 26f.).

4. Supplementary information on the Vādhūlas and their texts

In reply to my question whether he had any manuscripts of Vādhūla texts, Śrī K. T. Parameśvaran Nambudiripad said that he has a handwritten copy of a manuscript of the Vādhūlaka-gṛhyāgama-saṃgraha.

I was also told that Sōmayājippāṭū Mahan Vāsudēvan Nambudiri of the Maṭham mana (no. 6 in the above list) has recently edited and privately published a text called *Bādhūlakacāṭaṇṇū* (Kunnaṃkuḷam 1978, xli, 628 pp.). I could not myself secure a copy of this text, but one was kindly sent to me by Dr. Max Sparreboom (who visited Kerala in May–August 1984) just before this paper went to the press. My main concern during our stay in Kerala in 1983 was to copy from manuscripts a similar unpublished Jaiminīya-caṭaṇṇū and to prepare an annotated translation of it with the help of Śrī M. M. Iṭṭi Ravi Nambudiri and Śrī M. M. Subramaṇian Nambudiri. These are manuals written in Malayalam (the Dravidian language of Kerala), and give detailed instruction for the performance of the domestic rituals. (For a preliminary report, see Parpola 1984.) The caṭaṇṇūs of the three major schools of the Nambudiri brahmins have already been published some time ago, but as they are in Malayalam, they are scarcely known to indologists outside Kerala: Vākattānattū Eṭamana E. Eṃ. Kṛṣṇaśarmā (ed.), *Kriyāratnamāla athavā kṛṣṇayajurvedīya baudhāyana caṭaṇṇū*, 1103 (i.e., 1928 A.D.), 2. ed. 1127 (1958), 20 + 302 pp.; anon. (ed.), *Pakāḷiyam caṭaṇṇū*, 4th ed. 1141 (i.e., 1966), 236 pp. (now out of print); and anon. (ed.), *Kauṣītakaṃ caṭaṇṇū*, 1151 (1976), 183 pp. All of these have been published by the Pañcamgam Pustakaśāla at Kunnaṃkuḷam. — The name Pakāḷiyam for Āśvalāyana could not be explained to me even by ācāryas belonging to that school. In the form Pavaḷiyaccaraṇam it is found already in the above mentioned copper plate grant of 864–865 A.D.: it is derived from Sanskrit *bahvṛca* 'Ṛgvedin' (cf. Varier 1983: 281).

Long ago, Raja (1910: 631) noted that "the only difference now existing between these two schools — the Baudhāyanas and the Bādhūlakas — is to be found in their Vedic ritual and ceremonies, not in their Vedic texts, both the Saṃhitā and the Brāhmaṇa being the same for both." Caland's work in the 1920's showed that there is a lot of difference between their Sūtra texts, though both represent the most archaic texts of this category. According to the ācārya, whom I interrogated briefly on this topic, there is not much difference between the gṛhya ritual of the Baudhāyanas and the Vādhūlakas. Examples that readily came to his mind were the following. The Vādhūlas perform the ten steps (*daśapadam*) only at the very end of the marriage, not earlier as the Baudhāyanas. In the program of the student, *godāna-vrata* comes after the *śukriya-vrata*, while for the Baudhāyanas it is vice versa. The length of the firewood for the *camata-homa* of the brahmacārin is one span (Malayalam *oru cāṇ*), instead of four fists (*nālu muṣṭi*) for the Baudhāyanas.

This is all the information I could gather about the Vādhūlas during the Ki-ṭaṅṅūr wedding on October 20-21, 1983. Some supplementary information on the Vādhūlas and their texts remains to be added.

Between December 1970 and March 1971, Frits Staal "made several unsuccessful attempts to locate traditions, information and/or manuscripts of the extremely rare Bādhūlaka Taittirīyakas. Though brahmans belonging to this Sūtra were found, they belonged to the large majority of Nambudiris who have lost most or all of their Vedic culture..." (Staal 1971: 7). Finally, however, Staal had some success. Since his interesting report is rather inaccessible, I am quoting it in full:

"My final attempt to find Bādhūla manuscripts was successful. There is a large collection of manuscripts in the Irinjalakuda house of the Tantri of the famous Padmanābha temple at Trivandrum, Nedumpilly Tharananallur Govindaru Nambudiripad. The old Tantri, himself a Bādhūlaka and the author of several books in Sanskrit (dealing with ritual purity as well as religious hymns) was ill. All the same, he issued orders that the Bādhūla manuscripts be extracted from the collection and shown to me. These manuscripts included a Somayāgaprayoga, a Śrautaprayoga, a Śrautakalpāgamasamgraha, a Bādhūlakaprayogavṛtti, etc. That I was enabled to look at these manuscripts, presented with copies of the Tantri's books and permitted to make recordings of the Irinjalakuda style of chanting Yajurveda in this very orthodox manner, was due not only to the fact that I was accompanied by Sri Madamp Narayanan and other influential Nambudiri Yajurvedins, but also to the fact that I seemed to be the second visitor specifically interested in Bādhūla. The first, some half a century ago but still freshly remembered, was the emissary of the then Government who obtained the manuscript from which the fragments of the Vādhūlaśrautasūtra were in due course published by Caland. All the same, my handling of the manuscripts was not really relished, and it was suggested that a brahmana would be a more proper person to perform

such a task. My suggestion that another visit might be made by Dr. Sreekrishna Sarma was eagerly welcomed. In the meantime Dr. Sarma has agreed to do this and I look forward to the results." (Staal 1971: 9f.)

I would like to correct here a misunderstanding that has slipped into Witzel's paper (1975: 77, cf. also ib. 91 & n. 96a): "A. Parpola verdanke ich noch den Hinweis darauf, dass sich sowohl in der Trivandrum Oriental Manuscripts Library als auch in Vadankaceri [*sic*] (Trichur) im Privatbesitz noch Vādhūla-Handschriften befinden." My reference was to Śrī Māṭṭampu Nārāyaṇan Nambudiri, who lives as an advocate in Vaṭakkāncēri, and who is mentioned by Staal in the above quotation. Śrī Māṭṭampu Nārāyaṇan Nambudiri is himself a Bauddhāyana Yajurvedin and does not possess any Vādhūla mss., but wrote to me in March 1971: "About Badhulaka sutras some granthas can be seen at my relations' house at Kulakuda where Frits Staal and myself have gone once. After our return I got a letter from a relation of mine that one of the granthas has been found and that they are searching for some other granthas as well. I shall write to my relations there again to see the other granthas also if possible." Unfortunately, I have not been able to follow up this hint, but the name of this relative was K. B. Pandarathil Nambudiri and his address Srikulam, Kulakkada; the house was situated at the 52nd milestone at the left while going to the north from Trivandrum. The title of the discovered text was Vādhūlakalpasūtra.

The Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library of the University of Kerala at Trivandrum possesses several extensive Vādhūla manuscripts, all written on paper in the devanāgarī script and apparently copies from palmleaf originals at Iriññālakkūṭa. The two volumes of the *Alphabetical Index of the Sanskrit Manuscripts* in this library that had been published by 1971 comprised only letters A to Na (Kunjan Pillai 1957) and Ta to Ma (Raghavan Pillai 1965), but I could copy in 1971 the following information from the typescript for the remaining volume:

- T. 1083 Vādhūlakalpasūtram with the commentary of Āryadāsa, (extent:) 6200 granthas of 32 syllables
- T. 1147 Vādhūlakalpāgamasamgraha by Āryadāsa, 6200 gr.
- T. 1095 Vādhūlagṛhyaprayogaḥ, 1240 gr.
- T. 1092 Vādhūlagṛhyāgamavṛttirahasyam by Saṅgamagrāmavāsī Nārāyaṇa, 3460 gr.
- T. 1081A Vādhūlaśrautaprayoga by Padmanābha, 6800 gr.

I would now like to add the following information kindly communicated in September 1981 from the unpublished files of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* project of the Sanskrit Department of the University of Madras by Dr. C. S. Sunda-

ram. I had requested him to send me a list of all references to Bādhūla(ka) or Vādhūla(ka) texts. (For the abbreviations, see NCC.)

1. Vādhūla: Hall P. 112. L. 2054.
2. Vādhūlācārya: wrote a śrautasūtra to Kṛṣṇayajurveda. Mahādeva in his commentary on the Hiraṇyakeśisūtra: *Bādhūla Ācāryavaro akarot param sūtram tu yat Keraladeśasamsthitam.*
3. Vādhūlakalpasūtra: Commentary Vyākhyā. Adyar I. p. 255a (inc.) Baroda 13080(a) (inc.)
- C. Kalpāgamasāṅgraha by Āryadāsa. Baroda 12110 (inc.). CLB. III. p. 22 (2 ms., both inc.). MT. 2978(a) (inc.).
4. Vādhūlagṛhyakalpasūtra: Adyar. PUL. II. App. p. 33.
5. Vādhūlagṛhyavyākhyā: Adyar I. p. 255(b) (inc.).
6. Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra: Adyar I. p. 255.
7. Vādhūlapūrvaprayoga: C. Baroda 13080(c) (inc. upto upanayana).
8. Vādhūlaśrautaprayogakṛpti by Śivaśroṇa: Adyar. CLB. II. p. 78. MT. 2978 (c).
9. Vādhūlapūrvāparaprayoga: C. MT. 2978(c).
10. Vādhūlaguruparamparāstotra: MD. 18924.
11. Vādhūlavamaṣaparamparā: Mysore I. p. 563.
12. Vādhūlavṛttirahasya by (Saṃgamagrāma) Nārāyaṇa: Adyar I. p. 80b. MT. 3436 (inc.)
13. Vādhūlaśākhā: Quoted in Anuvyākhyāna of Madhva.
14. Vādhūlaśrautasūtra: in 15 sections. For a study see Journal of the Bombay University (New Series) XXV. Arts. No. 41 (1966) pp. 64-69. MT. 4375(b). PUL. II. App. p. 26. - C. PUL. II. App. p. 26. - C. Kalpāgamasāṅgraha by Āryadāsa. Adyar.
15. Vādhūlasūtra: Taittirīya school. For an analysis and textual study by Caland, see Acta Orientalia I (1923) 3-11; II (1924) 142-167; IV (1926) 1-41, 161-213; VI (1928) 97-241. R. A. Sastri III. pp. 256, 258.
16. Vādhūlasūtravṛtti: R. A. Sastri I. p. 50.
17. Vādhūlasmṛti: Adyar I. p. 103a. Baroda 10041(b). MT. 2180. Mysore I. p. 93. Mysore D. II. 131. Oppert I.1025 (Vīrarāghavācārya, Headmaster, Sanskrit school of Śatakopācārya, Kañcīpuram).
18. Vādhūlahautraprayoga by Mahādeva: Mysore I. p. 616.

Glancing through this list, one is immediately struck by the numerous manuscripts at the libraries of Baroda, Mysore and Adyar, which have escaped earlier attention; they are probably copies procured from Iriññālakuṭa by R. A. Sastri (cf. below). But there are also other interesting new items. With regard to no. 1 above, cf. A. A. Macdonell's note 1 in Raja 1910: 631: "On Bādhūla as the name of a family see Hall's Index to the *Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems* (Calcutta, 1859), p. 112, and Burnell's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. at Tanjore*, pp. 97, 122." With regard to no. 3 and no. 14

in fine, note that under the name Kalpāgamasamgraha (śr. name of C. by Ārya-dāsa on Vādhūlaśrautasūtra) NCC II: 167b and III: 246b gives the following references: Adyar. MT. 2978. Trav.Uni.L. 123A.124.

A significant unpublished source quoted among these references is the diary of the Tamil paṇḍit Śrī R. A. Sastri, preserved at the Sanskrit Department of the University of Madras. Sastri did remarkable work as a gatherer of Sanskrit manuscripts, and his diary should be published, even if it is somewhat laconic. It is clear that he is the man referred to in Staal's report, and that he paid many visits to Iriññālakkuṭa. (The Madras GOML and Hoshiarpur copies of Vādhūla texts have been prepared in 1919-1920, cf. Witzel 1975: 101 n. 36; 1920-1921, cf. *ibid.* 106 n. 95; and 1923-1924, cf. *ibid.* 98f. n. 12-13). Dr. Sundaram has obliged me by sending at my request a copy of some select pages, among them those referred to above. The relevant passages read as follows (I add an English translation in parentheses after Tamil and Malayalam expressions): "8-6-26 I Vādhūla sūtra Iraññālakōṭai^{ku} irañṇu mailukku mē^rku (2 miles west of Iraññālakōṭai). Kaṭaṅkaccēri maṇa Sōmayāji. II Neṭumpu^lli maṇa [*sic*]. Near the I. III Ki^llakē (eastern) maṇa. Tiruppayār camīpam (near T.). IV Paṭiñāra (western) maṇa" (vol. III, p. 256) and "8.6.30 Neṭumpu^lli maṇa. Iriññālakoda Cochin State. 7 mss. on Vādhūla sūtra. Offered to give on loan. They are in good condition. Already copied by Madras Govt." (Vol. III, p. 258). Compare further the notice written on the cover of Ms. no. 5657 of the Vishveshvara Vishva Bandhu Institute of Vedic and Indological Studies, Panjab University, Hoshiarpur, reported by Witzel (1975: 99 n. 16), according to whom the manuscript has apparently been copied in Madras between 20.9.1926 and 11.4.1927: "Since three times with the police commissioner of Cochin State tried and failed with the owner. Last time again tried and found the ms. damaged. 15.12.1935 R. A. Shastry, Lahore. The original ms. and the copying since (?) ...ing ms. ... the ms. discontinued. R. A. Shastry." The Baroda mss. of Vādhūla texts were undoubtedly also procured by R. A. Sastri, who was "during 1915 to 1922 ...engaged in the formation of the Oriental Library, Baroda" (Varma 1940: vi).

5. Quotations of Vādhūla texts

There seems to be precious little information about the Vādhūlas in Sanskrit texts which are not by the Vādhūlas themselves. This is undoubtedly due to their restricted geographical extension: it is well known that Mahādeva in the introductory verses to his commentary on the Hiraṇyakeśi-Śrautasūtra, called Vaijayantī, states that teacher Vādhūla composed an important Sūtra

which in his time (ca. 16th century) was extant (only) in Kerala (ed. p. 2 lines 3-4: *vādhūla ācāryaparo 'karot param / sūtram yat tu keraladeśasaṃsthitam*). Caland (1920: 474; 1922: 3) understands Mahādeva's expression *keraladeśasaṃsthitam* to mean that the work was composed in Kerala, but seems to be mistaken in this (cf. also Witzel 1975: 77).

On the other hand, one can reasonably expect to find some reference to the Vādhūlas in texts on Vedic rituals written in Kerala. Indeed, such references could perhaps serve as a criterion pointing to a Keralan or nearby origin of the works in which they have been found, although one must, of course, take into consideration the possibility of secondary quotations. Besides this information, Mahādeva quotes Vādhūlasūtra some five times (cf. ed. pp. 416, 531, 752; cf. also 477): these are the only quotations of Vādhūla texts known to Caland (1920: 474 n. 1; 1922: 3). Mahādeva was clearly a Vādhūla himself, for he has written a Vādhūlahautraprayoga (cf. above § 4). Interestingly, there may be an earlier commentary on the Hiraṇyakeśi Sūtras written by a Keralan author: possibly Mātṛdatta, the commentator of the Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhyasūtra and parts of the Śrauta, is to be connected with either the father or the son of Bhavatrāta, the masterly commentator of the ritual Sūtras of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, who certainly lived in Kerala, and whose work is the oldest datable Sanskrit text of Kerala: both Bhavarāta (*sic*) and Mātṛdatta are mentioned by Daṇḍin in his *Avantisundarīkathā* (cf. Parpola 1967: 185f.; Nampoothiri 1972: ix). It remains to be checked, however, if the style and other indications warrant this identification. But why should a Nambudiri have commented upon a Hiraṇyakeśi text, when the Nambudiri Yajurvedins belong to Bauddhāyana and Vādhūla schools alone? Perhaps because Bhavatrāta's grandfather came from Tamilnadu (cf. § 7): Was Hiraṇyakeśi perhaps the Yajurvedic school with which the Tamil Jaiminīyas collaborated? Epigraphically, the Hiraṇyakeśi school is mentioned in Tanjore and (17th cent.) Tirunelveli in Tamilnadu, as well as in north Konkan (7th and 8th cent.) and Koṅgu (6th century) (cf. Renou 1947: 202).

Bhavatrāta in any case refers to the Vādhūlas at least once on JŚS 1,24,6: *upadhāya rukmaṇ vādhūlakāḥ saṃpreṣyanti* (cf. Parpola 1967: 191). Perhaps also the beginning of a major division of an unknown text quoted without the mention of the source by Bhavatrāta on JŚS 1,1,1, which I have not been able to trace in the published parts, will ultimately turn up in Vādhūla texts when they are edited in full. In any case, it may be useful to record this quotation here: *dr̥śyate hy "āgneyaṃ cāgnīṣomīyaṃ ca puroḍāśāv āsādya hotāram āmant-*

rayate", "vyddhir ād aiḥ" (Pāṇini 1,1,1) *ity evamādiśāstrāṇi*. These are examples of texts which start without making an announcement about the topic to be discussed (*pratijñā*), usually starting with the word *atha*. It is clear that the context here is the new moon sacrifice, and the closest parallel to this quotation is provided by Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra 3,97: 98,5 *havīṃṣy āsād-ya hotāram āmantrayate* (cf. also Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra 1,1,4 *darśapūṣṇamāsa-yor haviḥṣv āsanneṣu hotāmantritaḥ...* and Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra 1,4,1 *āmant-rito hotā...*).

6. The Āgniveśyas and their relation to the Vādhūlas

Somewhat problematic in its relation to the Vādhūlas has been the school named after the ancient sage Agniveśya. The Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra (on which cf. also Panse 1966) is closely related to that of Baudhāyana (Varma 1940: ix) and virtually identical with the Gṛhyasūtra presupposed by the Vyākhyās of the otherwise unknown Vādhūla-Gṛhyasūtra (cf. Witzel 1975: 84ff.): the discrepancies amount to a different order or omission of words here and there, such a relation being very familiar from many other cases of closely related Vedic texts (cf. *ibid.* 86).

The crux of the matter lies in the fact that the five known manuscripts of the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra were all rescued from the Tanjore district of Tamilnadu, more exactly from the Ādikailāśa temple at Aviṭaiyār Kōil, where there were only 11 Āgniveśya families some sixty years ago; also these treasures were discovered by Pandit R. A. Sastri (cf. Varma 1940: vi ff.). No Āgniveśya families could be traced in Kerala, while according to the tradition of the Ādikailāśa temple, "at the beginning of Kaliyuga Śiva appeared at the place before his devotees and ordained that only Āgniveśya Sautrikas should officiate as priests in that temple and appointed the fore-fathers of the present priests as hereditary Archakas there" (R. A. Sastri quoted by Varma 1940: vii). Even though Varma (1940: ix f.) has pointed out some details in the ritual of the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra which point rather to Kerala than to Tamilnadu, this does not necessarily indicate a recent migration of the Āgniveśyas from Kerala; they could as well be shared retentions. I fully agree with Witzel's conclusions (1975: 88): A relatively long separation of the Āgniveśyas of Tamilnadu from the Vādhūlas of Kerala could indeed well explain the differences between their Gṛhyasūtras; but it is clear that ultimately both represent just sub-branches (*carāṇa*) of one and the same school of Vādhūla. Actually the Vādhūla-Śrautasūtra and its commentary speak of four branches of Vādhūlas (*caturṃṣṇ vādhūlāṇāṃ iti / ke te catvāro vādhūlāḥ / kauṇḍīnyāgniveśyagalava-*

śaṅkhānām kalpāḥ / tathā hi śulba uktaḥ: vādhūlā savādhūlās catvāro vihītāḥ), whose names are derived from the four pupils of the sage Vādhūla: Agniveśya, Kauṇḍinya, Galava, and Śaṅkha (Varma 1940: iii; Witzel 1975: 94ff.). One single Vādhūla text is known certainly to come from Tamilnadu. A short manuscript of 12 folia entitled Vādhūla-Smṛti was copied in 1916-1917 for the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library of Madras from a manuscript at Villiyampakkam, Chingleput District, Tamilnadu (cf. Witzel 1975: 90 & n. 94).

On the other hand, the Āgniveśya traditions have in earlier times been more widely known. Varma (1940: iiif.) has pointed to quotations from an Āgniveśyaśruti by Madhva, who hailed from South Karṇāṭaka (Udipi) and lived in the 13th century, and Appayya Dīkṣita, born in Kañcīpuram and attached to the court of Vijayanagara in the 16th century. The Keralan commentator of the Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa, Udaya, who lived around the 15th century, quotes a statement by Agniveśya: *prādeśas tu daśāṅgula ity agniveśyavacanād daśāṅgulapari-mitā samid bhavati* (ed. Sarma 1976: 40); as such, it cannot, however, be traced in the known Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra (cf. Sarma 1976: 710). Could this reference not be to the Keralan Vādhūla-Gṛhyasūtra, also called Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra? Perhaps the Śrauta- and Gṛhya-Sūtra of the Vādhūlas were ascribed by them to Vādhūla and Agniveśya (a teacher and a pupil, cf. Witzel 1975: 95) respectively, as the Śrauta- and Gṛhyasūtra of the Āśvalāyana school were in Kerala ascribed to Śaunaka (teacher) and Āśvalāyana (pupil) respectively (cf. Parpola 1967: 190).

7. Bhavatrāta and the early history of the Jaiminīyas

However this may be, there appears to be a dichotomy between the Vādhūlas of Kerala and of Tamilnadu similar to that prevailing between the Nambudiri and Tamil Jaiminīyas. In the latter case, the two traditions have clearly been separate for more than a thousand years; their original core areas appear to have been Kerala and the Cōla country respectively (cf. Parpola 1973: 22f.): in the latter area, the Jaiminīyas are mentioned in inscriptions from the 10th century onwards (cf. Renou 1947: 128). Thus during the rule of Rājendra I (1012-1044), an inscription records many details concerning a college at Rājara-jacaturvedimaṅgalam, modern Eṅṅāyiram in the South Arcot district: the brahmacārins learning the Vedas by rote comprized 75 belonging to the Ṛgveda, 75 to the Yajurveda, 20 each to the Vājasaneyya, Chandogasāma and Talavakārasāma schools, 10 to the Atharvaveda, and 10 to the Baudhāyana-Gṛhya, -Kalpa and Gaṇa (Nilakanta Sastri 1955: 630); Jaimini is called Talavakāraguru in Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra 1,14. The Tamil Jaiminīyas who have migrated from the village

of Anpil in the Tiruchirappalli district of Tamilnadu to Koṭuntirappuḷḷi near Palghat in Cōḷa times — perhaps some 700 years ago — have in their relative isolation in Kerala preserved their ancient traditions very well, as have the Nambudiri Jaiminīyas on their part; and there are some striking differences between these two traditions, especially in their style of chanting Sāmaveda and the hand movements that accompany it (cf. Howard 1977: 141-248), but also in their ritual (Parpola 1984).

The migration of Tamil Jaiminīyas to Kerala had started considerably earlier, around the sixth century, for Bhavatrāta in the introductory verses of his commentary on the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra mentions that his paternal grandfather Hastiśarman came to Kerala from the village of Vasiṣṭhakuṭi in the Cōḷa country, described by him as an ancient settlement of Sāmavedins descended from the sage Maṭhara belonging to the Kāśyapa gotra; in Kerala Hastiśarman married the daughter of Brahmadata from the line of Viśvāmitra, who became Bhavatrāta's teacher: his father Mātṛdatta mastered fully the Sāma-, Ṛg- and Yajurvedas, śruti as well as smṛti, but was apparently too busy to teach him, since Bhavatrāta says that he was held in high regard by kings and was much consulted by the brahmins. The crucial lines are missing from Premnidhi Sastri's edition (1966: 1f.) based on a single manuscript, so I quote the whole passage from my own forthcoming edition:

sāma gāyatram amṛtaṃ sāmavedārṇavāmṛtam |
yasmād ānaśire martyā brahmaṇo vibudhā iva ||
muner brahmanidhes tasya kāśyapasya mahātmanah |
bahavaḥ prathitā vaṃśā vivasvata ivāṃśavaḥ ||
teṣu yasyābhavad ṛṣir maṭharo maṇḍanaṃ param |
madhuḥ saṃvatsarasyeva maṇiḥ phaṇipater iva ||
tasmīn saṃjajñire vaṃśe sāmāgā guṇasālinah |
simhā iva suvarṇādrau dhiṣṇyāgnaya ivādhvare ||
sa vasiṣṭhakuṭiṃ nāma grāmaṃ coleṣv avekṣitam |
vaṃśo 'dhivasati śrīmān haṃsaśreṇīva mānasam ||
āsīd guṇanidhis tatra hastiśarmeti vedabhṛt |
sa keralākhyam sadrāṣṭram agān nāga ivārṇavam ||
tasya putro budhasamaḥ sāmargyajūṣapāragah |
avanīndrair abandhyājñaiḥ śirasā dhṛtasāsanaḥ ||
śrutismṛtyarthatattvajño dharmakarmasu dakṣinaḥ |
dviḥjanmahitalābhāya dviḥjanmabhir upāśritaḥ ||
āsīd anupamotsāhaḥ sarveṣu khalu jantuṣu |

*mātr̥tulyadayo nāmnā mātr̥datta iti śrutah ||
 parāṃ kāṣṭhāṃ gatavataḥ sa sutāṃ bodhakarmaṇoḥ |
 viśvāmitrajamukhyasya brahmadattasya labdhavān ||
 tasyāṃ ajani yas tena sa bhavatrāta ity abhūt |
 sa svavāganusṛtyaiva vyākaroṭi adhvarāgamam ||*

This information matches with several other data. In 1971, I wished to check whether any Jaiminīyas were left in Vasiṣṭhakuṭi and found some of them still living in the present-day village of Tiṭṭakuṭi in South Arcot district. In Kerala, on the other hand, Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi told me many unwritten legends about Bhavatrāta. Bhavatrāta is definitely considered to have been a Nambudiri and he is associated especially with the Naripparra mana (no. 9): it is only this and the three neighbouring manas that belong to the Kāśyapa gotra and it is only in these houses that the uncommon name Bhavatrāta is current (traditionally, the first son of a Nambudiri is given the name of his paternal grandfather, the second son that of his maternal grandfather, and the third son that of his father). Moreover, Bhavatrāta is said to have been the grandson of Mēlattōḷ Agnihotri, a famous culture hero of Kerala, a performer of 99 śrauta sacrifices during his lifetime, traditionally dated to 343-378 A.D. (on Agnihotri cf. K. K. Raja 1983: 304f.). Bhavatrāta allegedly functioned as the Subrahmaṇya priest in Agnihotri's sacrifices; the Yajñeśvara temple associated with the site of those sacrifices is in the immediate vicinity of the Naripparra mana. According to a medieval commentary written by Nīlakaṇṭha Nambudiri of the Kūṭallūr mana of Nāgaśreṇī (Nāreri), his father Brahmadata belonging to the Viśvāmitra gotra is a descendant of that Yajñeśvara Agnihotri (ibid. 304f.): the name Brahmadata (going down in the family line) and his gotra match with those of Bhavatrāta's grandfather.

Bhavatrāta's grandfather belonged to the early Tamil immigrants, who were still treated as equals and also accepted into marriage. Inscriptions from the 9th century suggest that owing to Cōḷa invasions, brahman students carried weapons (cf. K. K. Raja 1983: 302). From these times the relations between the immigrant Tamil brahmins and the Nambudiris have not been so cordial, and at least in the case of the Jaiminīyas the two groups have kept strictly separate. K. K. Raja (1983: 300f.) has stated that "there is nothing in the early Tamil Sangam literature to indicate that the brahmins of Kerala were at that time significantly different in customs or manners from those in the eastern region" and that "the emergence of Kerala as a distinct cultural unit and the evolution of Malayalam as a separate language may be said to coincide roughly with the

starting of the Kollam Era in A.D. 825". This statement may require some modification. Kuruntokai 277 wishes that the beggar may eat his fill of rice with ghee on a "sinless street (*ācil teruvil*) where there are no dogs in the wide doorways"; and Perumpāṇāruppaṭai 297ff. "speaks of a village of Brahmins where chickens and dogs are banned" (Hart 1975: 53). These references are understood to refer to streets inhabited exclusively by brahmins who, as today, "lived apart and refused to keep dogs or chickens lest they become polluted" (ibid.; cf. also Pillay 1966: 168). The basic settlement pattern of the Tamil brahmins consists of separate streets in villages of a nucleated type typical of Tamilnadu — this applies also to the village of Koṭuntirappuḷḷi near Palghat inhabited by Cōḷiya Jaiminīyas —, while the Nambudiri brahmins live in manors surrounded by large gardens in villages of the dispersed type typical of Kerala (cf. Mencher 1966b).

8. The earliest Vedic traditions of Kerala and Tamilnadu

Another feature shared by the Vādhūlas and the Jaiminīyas is their restricted geographical extension, which now covers just two southernmost states of India, although Mahidāsa, the 16th century commentator of the *Caraṇavyūha*, mentions Jaiminīyas as present in Karṇāṭaka as well. Mahidāsa's statement may partly apply even today, for according to oral information by E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma there should be one Jaiminīya village near Bangalore; but this remains to be checked. Staal has found some evidence suggesting that the Sāmavedins of South Canara near Udupi might previously have been Jaiminīyas (cf. Staal 1961: 73); this would fit with the testimony of the Paraśu-Rāma legend about the common origin of the Nambudiris and the Tuḷu brahmins (cf. § 12). While the majority of the Sāmavedins in Tamilnadu belong to the other major school of the Kauthuma-Rānāyanīyas (called Chandogasāma in the above cited inscription), the Jaiminīyas are the only representatives of the Sāmaveda in the less accessible Kerala. I have been arguing that the differences distinguishing the southern sub-branch of the Rānāyanīyas from the rest of the Kauthumas residing in North India have come into being as the result of a mingling between the later to arrive but more numerous Kauthumas in South India with the earlier to arrive (and partly absorbed?) Jaiminīyas (cf. Parpola 1968: 41). Especially the Sūtra texts of the Jaiminīyas make a more archaic impression than those of the Kauthumas and moreover seem to have been strongly influenced by the texts of the likewise southern school of Baudhāyana (cf. ibid. 42; 95f.). Similar judgements have been passed on the style of chanting (cf. Howard 1977: 200ff.; 1983: 312; Staal 1983: 172).

On account of their language, style and contents the Śrautasūtras of Baudhāyana and even more Vādhūla with its Anvākyānas (Anubrāhmaṇas) are without doubt the oldest surviving texts of this kind. These criteria place their composition approximately in the times of the Śatapatha- and Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇas. The toponyms and data of cultural history such as camels relate them to the same region of North India as the Brāhmaṇas just mentioned: that their authors lived close to Kuru and Pañcāla peoples is evident from the fact that habits peculiar to these tribes are occasionally mentioned as "current even now" (cf. Witzel 1975: 92f.).

It is striking that the Yajurveda Nambudiris of Kerala in the southernmost part of India represent these two most archaic schools. But is the archaic nature of the Śrautasūtras meaningfully related to the time of their departure from North India? This is a moot question that may best be left open here; similarly the related question concerning the date and place of origin of the corresponding Gṛhyasūtras. Like the Vādhūlas and the Jaiminīyas, the Baudhāyanas too are known from Tamilnadu, but not from other parts of India except the neighbouring Karṇāṭaka (cf. Bühler 1882: II, xlii f. ; Renou 1947: 202f.). From this later distribution alone it seems likely that they have once occupied the southernmost parts of the Vedic area and so have formed the first wave of emigrants that separated from the rest and moved to the south, being then pushed further and further ahead of them by later waves as the Vedic culture spread all over India. Together with these Yajurvedic schools must have gone the local schools of Sāmaveda and Ṛgveda with whom they collaborated in the śrauta rites: the Jaiminīyas and Kauṣītakins, whose Sūtras are also fairly archaic, and partly Brāhmaṇa-like, if not to the same degree as those of Vādhūla and Baudhāyana. The conclusion that these very schools probably represent the earliest Vedic Aryans who have reached Kerala and Tamilnadu seems likely also from another point of view. Bhavatrāta testifies that the Nambudiri and Tamil Jaiminīyas by his time (ca. 7th century) had been residing in Kerala and the Cōḷa country respectively for quite some time. The differences that had developed between these two branches by the time when, some five centuries later, Cōḷiya Aiyar Jaiminīyas of Tamilnadu migrated to Kerala, presuppose a much longer period of separation.

The presence of brahmins studying the Vedas and performing Vedic sacrifices in ancient Tamilakam is certainly implied in the earliest Old Tamil texts of the so-called Sangam period, especially the Puranānūru (or Puram in short), which cannot be dated later than to the first centuries of the Christian era.

"The performance of a Vedic sacrifice" (*vēta-vēlvi-t-toḷil*, Puṛam 224,9) was often on behalf of an early Cēra, Pāṇḍya or Cōḷa king; in the case of the poem quoted, the famous Cōḷa king Karikār Peruvaḷattān is said to have performed a Vedic rite, in which a sacrificial stake (*yūpa*) forming a pillar (*tūṇ* from Sanskrit *sthūṇā*) was planted in front of an eagle (*eruvai*, i.e. the *śyena-citi* of a fire altar). (Cf. Filliozat 1968: 299f.) A descendant of this ruler was *irācasūyam vēṭṭa Perunaṅkiḷḷi* 'Perunaṅkiḷḷi who had the royal unction (*rājasūya*) performed' (colophons on Puṛam 16, 125, 367, 377; Nagaswamy 1978: 79). The name *pāṇṭiyan palyākacālai mutukuṭumi p-peruvaluti*, which the colophons of several Puṛam poems mention as the addressee, indicates that this Pāṇḍya king has '(established) many (*pal*) sacrificial halls (*yāga-śālā*)'. One of these poems mentions these halls with their sacrificial pillars (*yūpa*) (Puṛam 15,21), while another line of the same poem (17) refers to "good 'threads' (i.e. Sūtras) and the four Vedas" (*naṅ paṇuval, nāl vētattu*), in accordance with which were poured "oblations rich of melted butter" (*neyymali y-āvuti*, the last word being from Sanskrit *āhuti*). The poems themselves call this king Kuṭumi (Puṛam 6,26 and 9,8). Palyākacālai is also mentioned in a bilingual Sanskrit and Tamil inscription from the village Vēḷvikkuṭi "Village of Sacrifices" (E.I. XVII no. 16, p. 291-309), on the basis of which he can be placed some time before 400 A.D. (Filliozat 1968: 294-299). As to Kerala, "at least four of the eight early Tamil poets who sang the praise of Cēra kings were brahmins"; one of them, "Pālai Gautamanār performed ten sacrifices under the patronage of Palyānai Cēlkelu Kuṭṭuvan" (K. K. Raja 1983: 300). Puṛam 166 describes in considerable detail the activities of Viṇṇantāyan, a brahman belonging to the Kauṇḍinya gotra (*kauṇḍiyan*) who lived in Pūñcārūr in the Cōḷa country; Hart (1975: 52) gives the following summary of these 35 lines: "he performs without omission the twenty-one sacrifices; he knows the ancient book with six *aṅgas* of four parts that never leaves the mouth of Śi-va; he wears the skin of the *pulvāy* deer over his thread; his wife wears a *vaḷai* (an ornament worn on the forehead by the wife of the chief sacrificer, according to the *Tamil Lexicon*); he uses so much ghee in his sacrifices that water feels shame; and he has realized the lie of those who would quarrel with the ancient book (the four Vedas)" (Hart 1975: 52). Kauṇḍinya, as we have seen, was one of the pupils of Vādhūla and an eponym of an otherwise unknown Vādhūla sub-school. Significantly, among the numerous Sangam poets having gotra names (such as Kōcikaṅ i.e. Kausika, Kautamanār i.e. Gautama, etc., cf. Nagaswamy 1978: 80) is also a Vāṭuli 'one who belongs to the Vādhūla gotra' (TL): called Naṛcēntānār, this man lived in Kōṭi-maṅgalam (colophons of Akanānūru 179 & 232).

9. Origin of the earliest dynasties of South India and Sri Lanka

The exact time(s) of immigration and the route(s) along which the earliest Vedic brahmins reached South India remain problematic, but some hypotheses may be made. From the references in the Sangam literature it is clear that the brahmins were sponsored by the kings, who all over India at this time were legitimizing and asserting their kingship by the performance of royal rituals. Therefore, the brahmins are likely to have come to ancient Tamilakam in the wake of those adventurous Aryan noblemen, who had established themselves as the rulers of the indigenous population and soon become Dravidianized. Well known parallels for such a process are the Mitanni Aryans ruling Hurrians, and especially the Nordic Vikings sailing the Russian rivers as traders and looters, who founded the first Russian kingdom of Novgorod and Kiev in the 9th century A.D. We must now consider the evidence pointing to an Aryan origin for the early Tamil kings, as this provides a major clue for the time and routes of arrival for the Vedic traditions also.

The pearls of the Coromandel and Sri Lankan coasts must have become a major attraction to seafaring adventurers around the middle of the first millennium B.C. Megasthenes (quoted by Arrian in his *Indike*, chapter 8) ca. 300 B.C. refers to the Pāṇḍyan kingdom as controlling the trade and the diving of pearls, while the *Arthaśāstra* (2,11) mentions as sources of pearls several place names which can with more or less certainty be located along the coasts of southernmost India and northern Sri Lanka, among them Pāṇḍya-kavāṭa and Tāmraparṇī (cf. Maloney 1970: 604f.). Tāmraparṇī is both the name of a river in the Pāṇḍya kingdom of South India (Tāmparaparaṇi, Tampapaṇṇi), and the name of the first capital of historical Sri Lanka, Tambapaṇṇi (cf. Mahāvamsa 7,38-42), situated just opposite the river across the straits. This early port and capital gave its name to the whole island of Sri Lanka, which is referred to as Taprobane by Onesicritus, the admiral of Alexander the Great; and he had heard about it around 325 B.C. in the Indus valley, which proves the existence of full-fledged sea-traffic between these regions as early as the fourth century B.C. (Cf. Maloney 1970: 605f.).

The origin of the earliest Aryan kings of Sri Lanka is related in the chronicles *Dīpavaṃsa* (ch. 9-11) and *Mahāvamsa* (ch. 6-10), written around 400 A.D. (cf. Lamotte 1958: 129). At first seven hundred Siṃhalas came to Sri Lanka under the leadership of prince Vijaya. "Prince Vijaya was daring and uneducated; he committed most wicked and fearful deeds, plundering the people"

(Dīpavaṃsa 9,7, transl. Oldenberg 1879: 160) and was therefore expelled by his father, king Sīhabāhu ruling in Sīhapura in the kingdom of Lāḷa, i.e. Lāṭa (south Gujarat, cf. Law 1943: 352). On the way they landed among other places in the port town of Suppāra (Sopara on the west coast of India north of Bombay). Arriving at the island of Laṅkā at the time when the Buddha was born, they conquered the host of Yakkhas (demons). Vijaya founded the city of Tambapaṇṇi and married the daughter of king Paṇḍu ruling at Madhurā in southernmost India. Vijaya invited his brother Sumitta to come from Sīhapura and rule after himself. "The daughter of the Sakka prince Paṇḍu, the princess called Kaccānā, came over hither from Jambudīpa in order to preserve the dynasty. She was crowned as the queen-consort of Paṇḍuvāsa" (Dīpavaṃsa 10,1-2, transl. Oldenberg 1879: 163). In the Mahāvāṃsa, Paṇḍuvāsa is called Paṇḍuvāsudeva, and he is the youngest son of Vijaya's brother Sumitta, who married Bhaddakaccānā. Paṇḍuvāsudeva's son Abhaya took the name Paṇḍukābhaya when he ascended the throne; his wealthy brahman tutor was called Paṇḍula, and he came from the village Paṇḍula-gāmaka. After 20 years of rule, Paṇḍukābhaya was supplanted by his nephew Paṇḍukābhaya. (Cf. Lamotte 1958: 133f.; Maloney 1970: 606-608.)

Maloney (1970: 606ff.) has plausibly argued for a common northwest Indian origin for the Paṇḍus of Tambapaṇṇi (Sri Lanka) and the Pāṇḍyas of South India, whose earliest capital may have been on the river Tāmraparṇī. While recounting some of his further arguments (excluding S. Paranavitana's "newly discovered historical documents", which are fakes: cf. also Maloney 1975: 23 and notes 66-67), I shall bring in some refinements. According to the Sanskrit grammarians, Indian (Patañjali on Vārttika 3 on Pāṇini 4,1,168 and Kāśikā on Paṇini 4,1,171) as well as Western (Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954: 820), Pāṇḍya is an irregular patronym derived from the name Pāṇḍu with the suffix -ya (the expected form would have been Pāṇḍavya). The name Paṇḍu of the Sri Lankan chronicles means 'pale' and is the Middle Indo-Aryan counterpart of Sanskrit Pāṇḍu 'pale', as a proper name best known as that of the son of Vyāsa and the father of the five Pāṇḍavas, the heroes of the Mahābhārata. There is little reason to doubt the historicity of the legend concerning the origin of the earliest Sri Lankan kings. In fact, the names Pāṇḍu and Pāṇḍava survive even today in Gujarati onomastics, as is shown e.g. by the name of Pandurang G. Deshpande, author of a *Gujarati-English dictionary*.

In the Mahābhārata, the Pāṇḍavas fight with their cousins, the Kauravas, whose patronym connects them with Kuru-kṣetra, the heartland of the Vedic culture in the Brāhmaṇa period, and the battlefield of this great war. The most important

ally of the Pāṇḍavas was Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva, who originally ruled in Mathurā on the banks of Yamunā, but later, harassed by the Magadhans and their allies, had to move to Saurāṣṭra, where he founded the port city of Dvārakā (Mahābhārata 2,13). Kṛṣṇa's friendship seems to imply some historical alliance with the Pāṇḍavas and their physical presence in his neighbourhood. According to Mahābhārata (4,1 & 5) the Pāṇḍavas passed through the Śūrasena country on their way to Virāṭanagara (modern Bairāṭ near Jaipur), where they spent one year incognito in the court of Virāṭa, the king of the Matsyas. The Pāṇḍavas were much on the move, to the extent that they are said to have conquered the whole world (2,23-29). Interestingly, the detailed enumeration of the places vanquished by them include Siṃhapura in the Indus valley (2,24,19); the Chinese pilgrim Hsuan-tsang, too, records a Siṃhapura 700 *li* south of Takṣaśilā (Maloney 1970: 608 quoting Beals II,67). In the neighbourhood of this city, mentioned in the very next verse (2,24,20), the Pāṇḍavas crushed a people called Colas: otherwise Colas are known only from South India.

The name Paṇḍu-Vāsudeva connects the Sri Lankan Paṇḍus with the cult of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva of Mathurā. This tallies not only with the close relationship between the Pāṇḍavas and Kṛṣṇa in the Mahābhārata but also with the dynastic legends of the Pāṇḍyas and the name of their capital Maturai, which is just a Tamilization of Mathurā. According to Megasthenes (especially the fragments in Arrian, Indike 8-9 and Diodorus Siculus 2,39), the Indian Herakles was specifically worshipped in their cities called Methora and Kleisobora by the Sourasēnoi, through whose country flows the river Iōmanēs. This enables the identification of Herakles as Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva worshipped by the Śūrasenas of Mathurā on the river Yamunā. According to Megasthenes, Herakles while roaming around found in the sea a new kind of ornament, the pearl, which he gave to his only daughter Pandaiē together with the kingdom called after her and a considerable army. Finding no husband worthy of her, Herakles himself had intercourse with his own daughter to secure the dynastic line. Megasthenes' Pandaiē myth does not have a counterpart in the North Indian mythology of Kṛṣṇa, but it bears a resemblance to the local mythology of the Pāṇḍya capital Maturai, recorded in the *Tiruvilaiyāṭar-Purāṇam*, available in a shorter version from the 12th century and a longer one from the 16th century. The Pāṇḍya king of Maturai and her queen, daughter of a Coḷa king called Śūrasena, did not have offspring. Therefore, they performed a sacrifice to obtain a son. From the fire, a girl with three breasts was given into the hands of the king, and a voice from heaven told him that she should be educated like a prince, and she would conquer the whole world; the third breast would disappear when

she met her husband. This happened when she had subdued almost the whole universe and was finally fighting at mount Kailāśa against Śīva himself. She submitted to Śīva and took him to Maturai, where the god ruled as king Sundara-Pāṇḍyan. In this legend, the divine spouse of the goddess is Śīva. The name still used of him, Sundareśvara, means "the beautiful lord": it agrees with the local form of Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu, called in Tamil Alakar "the beautiful one"; Alakar is supposed to be the brother of this goddess Mīnākṣi of Maturai, from whom the Pāṇḍya kings descend. (Cf. Dessigane & al. 1960: I, iff., xii ff.; Filliozat 1969: 76f.; Shulman 1980: 202.)

The myth connected with the goddess of Maturai has a striking counterpart in Sri Lankan traditions. Upon his arrival in the island, the first king Vijaya is said to have united with a fierce yakṣinī called Kuveṇī (Pāli Kuvapaṇṇā), who helped him to overcome the yakṣas previously ruling in Sri Lanka. Like Mīnākṣi, Kuveṇī had three breasts, one of which was to vanish on her seeing her husband, and this happened when she met Vijaya. Vijaya, however, took as his queen the daughter of a princess from Mathurā, whereupon the jealous Kuveṇī tried to kill him. (Cf. Shulman 1980: 204f.)

Megasthenes' account of Herakles' discovery of the pearl in the ocean has a partial counterpart in the myth of Kṛṣṇa's victory over the demon Pañcajanya living in the ocean in the form of a conch-shell (*śaṅkha*): his 'bones' form the trophy and sacred trumpet of the god. This popular myth has originated in coastal areas of Northwest India, where shell-working has been an important industry since Harappan times. (Cf. Kenoyer 1984.) It is a telling indication of the significance of Kṛṣṇa worship in that area, from which the South Indian and Sri Lankan Pāṇḍyas and Paṇḍus arrived.

Pāṇḍya-kavāṭa mentioned in Arthaśāstra 2,11,2 as a source of pearls corresponds to the city of Kapāṭapuram in the 8th century A.D. Tamil legend of ancient academies (*saṅgam*) of poets (cf. Maloney 1970: 612f.). Since *kavāṭam* / *kapāṭam* means 'fold of a door', even this city name may be a reminiscence of the Saurāṣṭran 'door city' Dvārakā allegedly founded by Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva.

10. The Pāṇḍavas and the Mahābhārata: criteria of dating

Long ago, Albrecht Weber (1853: 402-404) drew attention to an important fact relating to the names Pāṇḍu and Pāṇḍava: they are never once mentioned in any Vedic text. This statement is still valid, for the only possible exception, Pāṇḍuhṛdāḥ in the pravara section (chapter 49) of the Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra, is a most uncertain reading. The absence is very striking in view of the cen-

tral position occupied by the Pāṇḍavas in the epic, combined with the fact that the Kurus as well as some specific persons who figure prominently in the Mahābhārata are mentioned in the Veda, for example Janamejaya Pārikṣita (Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 13,5,4,1 ff.; Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 7,34; 8, 11 & 21; etc.); his ancestor, the Kuru king Parikṣit is known already to the Atharvaveda (20, 127,7-10). In the Mahābhārata, king Janamejaya Pārikṣita is said to be a descendant of Pāṇḍu (1,18,8, etc.) but also *vice versa* (1,89,45ff.)! Weber drew the inescapable conclusion that the Mahābhārata must therefore be essentially a post-Vedic work, composed during the rule and in the courts of the victorious Pāṇḍava kings, who had come from some other region and overthrown the earlier dynasty of Kuru kings. (Cf. also Hopkins 1889: 3ff.; 1901: 376.)

In order to justify their kingship in genealogies recited on state occasions, the Pāṇḍavas were grafted on the Kuru line, represented as cousins of their foes, and glorified beyond measure (cf. also Hopkins 1889: 13 n.). According to Weber (1853: 403), the texts of the northern Buddhists written around the first century A.D. may give a more realistic description of the Pāṇḍavas than the idealized epic: they are mentioned as a marauding hill tribe, which infested eastern as well as western regions including Kosala, Ujjayinī and probably also Takṣaśilā. While composing the proto-Mahābhārata, which was then enlarged over many centuries, until about 400 A.D., the bards naturally modelled their narrative upon the more ancient epic traditions glorifying Kuru kings; these older traditions are reflected in the gāthā and śloka fragments quoted in Vedic texts (cf. Weber 1891; Horsch 1966). "For the history of the poem it is worth noticing that, though the Pāṇḍus are the present heroes, the stereotyped phrase is always 'praise of the Kuru race', even where a Pāṇḍu is praised" (Hopkins 1901: 366).

Their fraternal polyandry is another important reason why many scholars have considered the Pāṇḍavas to be outsiders who have been represented as relatives of the Kauravas just by the composers of the epic (cf. Schroeder 1887: 478 n. 2; Hopkins 1889: 298f.; 1901: 376). It is in striking contrast with Vedic marriage customs, according to which one man could have two or more wives, but one wife did not have many husbands at the same time (cf. Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 12,12; Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 6,6,4,3). The Mahābhārata (1,195,27-29) also records the shock experienced by the people at the polyandric marriage of the Pāṇḍavas: nobody had ever heard of such a practice. Pāṇḍu, on the other hand, says (Mahābhārata 1,113,4ff.) that formerly women were unrestrained and had free sexual relations with any man they liked, as is still the custom among the Uttara-

Kurus. (Cf. Kane 1941: II/1, 427f.; 550f.;* 554.) In the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (8,14) there is a reference to Uttara-Kurus as living "beyond the Himavat". Herodotus (1,216) records something similar for the Massagetæ of Araxes: "Each man has but one wife, yet all the wives are held in common; for this is a custom of the Massagetæ and not of the Scythians, as the Greeks wrongly say. When a man desires a woman he hangs his quiver in front of her waggon and has intercourse with her unhindered" (Rawlinson 1942: 114).

The Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍavas may therefore represent a new wave of marauding Aryans coming from Central Asia to northern and western India around the eighth or ninth century B.C. (for the date, cf. van Buitenen 1973: I, xxiv). Such an assumption is further supported by the meaning of the name Pāṇḍu, 'white, whitish, yellowish, pale', which the Mahābhārata itself connects with skin colour. In 1,100,17f., Pāṇḍu's father Vyāsa says to his mother: "Since you paled when you saw my ugliness, you shall have a son of a sickly pallor, and so his name shall be Pāṇḍu the Pale" (transl. van Buitenen 1973: I,236); in 1,90,67, Pāṇḍu pales on hearing a curse. This association presupposes that the appellation originated among the darker-skinned native population of northwest India. The etymology has not been satisfactorily explained (cf. Mayrhofer 1963: II,248). Moreover, the words *pāṇḍu*, *pāṇḍura* and *pāṇḍara* all meaning 'white, yellowish, pale' are first attested in Sanskrit relatively late, around 800 B.C. (in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa) about the same time as many words which are clearly of Dravidian origin (cf. Burrow 1955: 385f.). Therefore, it does not seem impossible to derive it from the same Dravidian root *pal-/paṇḍ-* 'to ripen, (fruit) to become yellow, (hair) to become grey' as Sanskrit *phala* 'fruit' and *paṇḍita* 'learned' (cf. DEDR 4004; Weber in Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 327; Burrow 1955: 384). If this is correct, it suggests that the Pāṇḍavas had come via Sindh, Gujarāt and Mālwa, where Dravidian languages are likely to have been largely spoken in the early first millennium B.C. (cf. Southworth 1974). This would be in accordance with the fact that the allies of the Pāṇḍavas mainly came from the south (cf. Schroeder 1887: 478 n. 2; cf. van Buitenen 1978: III,138ff.).

The Pāṇḍavas are not the only important epic names missing in the Veda. Thus there is, for example, no mention of the city of Mathurā, nor any indubitable reference to Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva before the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad, which in 3,17,6 says that Ghora Āṅgīrasa explained to Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra how the human life is a (Vedic) sacrifice: it is not absolutely certain that this is the Kṛṣṇa of Bhagavadgītā, but the possibility does seem rather tempting — the doctrines

related in this context could very well have developed into the teachings of the Gītā (cf. especially De 1959: 32-35; also Gonda 1960: 238). Moreover, as Pāṇini (ca. 5th century B.C.) already mentions Arjuna and Vāsudeva together as divine persons (4,3,98), it is likely that the main story of the epic was in existence in his time. Pāṇini (4,2,80 & 110) is also the first to mention the Śūrasenas, who, like the Pāṇḍavas, are absent from the Veda, though Yadu or Yādva (as the name of king and a tribe) is repeatedly mentioned in the Ṛg-veda: according to the epic, Śūrasena, Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva's grandfather, was the first king of the Yādavas. Kātyāyana, Pāṇini's commentator supposed to have lived in the fourth century B.C., is the first Sanskrit author to refer to the Coḍas and Keralas of South India (Vārttika 1 on Pāṇini 4,1,175).

Whatever their origin, the Pāṇḍavas of the epic, living in the area of the Kurukṣetra, appear to have quickly assimilated themselves with the earlier Vedic people. "They, a new race, not known by ancestors noble enough to be reflected in the older literature, became formidable through allying themselves with the Panchalas" (Hopkins 1889: 10): they married the daughter of the king of the Pañcālas, an old Vedic people. (For an analysis of the historical situation, cf. van Buitenen 1973: I,8ff.). After their victory, Yudhiṣṭhira celebrated the horse sacrifice, which attests to the Pāṇḍavas' quick adoption of Vedic traditions including the rituals, which the Paṇḍu / Pāṇḍya kings were then in a position to import to South India. The burial rites of Pāṇḍu recorded in the Mahābhārata do not essentially differ from the Vedic practice (cf. Tiwari 1979): but this may be due to just such a cultural assimilation.

The culture characterized by the so-called Painted Grey Ware has with great plausibility been equated with the culture of the later Vedic Aryans and the people of proto-Mahābhārata: the temporal, spatial and cultural horizons are practically identical (cf. Lal 1981; Allchin & Allchin 1982: 315-317). "Later Vedic" here refers to the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra period. From the point of view of chronology it is important to note that only very few towns are mentioned by name in the Brāhmaṇa texts: Kāmpīla (Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā 44,8; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā 3,12,20; Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 13,2,8,3; etc.) — unless it is a kind of cloth! — may be identified with later Kampil between Baudaun and Farukhabad; Āsandīvant, the capital of the Kuru king Janamejaya Pāriḥṣita (Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 8,21,3; 13,5,4,2) is equated with modern Asandh near Chitang; and Kauśāmbī (Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 12,2,2,13; Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa 1,4,24) is undoubtedly later Kosam 22 km west of Allahabad on the Yamunā river (cf. Mylius 1969). At

Kampil, "a large number of PGW sherds have been collected from the surface of this mound" (Tripathi 1976: 31), while the earliest period at Kauśāmbī is characterized as follows: "This is the pre-NBP ware deposit. Few PGW sherds are reported from here. ... Kauśāmbī represents a degenerate phase of PGW. Associated with this period are a few sherds of red ware. It has been dated 800-600 B.C. This period is overlain by a sterile deposit of a thickness of three meters" (Tripathi 1976: 38); the next period, which is characterized by the Northern Black Polished ware, is dated 600-200 B.C. (cf. *ibid.*). The *Samhitā* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts do not yet mention the names of such cities celebrated in the *Mahābhārata* as Hastināpura, Indraprasthā, Mathurā, Kāśī, Mithilā, Rājagṛha, or Girivraja; whether Ayodhyā in Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka 1,27,3 is a real or mythical town is uncertain, as it is called "the city of the gods" (cf. Mylius 1969). At Mathurā, to which the legends link the early Pāṇḍya kings of Tamilakam, the oldest levels (37-40) of the mound of Sonkh "showed large masses of Painted Grey Ware, mingled with Black and Red ceramics" (Härtel 1976: 71); they can be dated to about 800-400 B.C., and are succeeded by Pre- and Early Maurya (35-36) and Maurya (33-34) levels characterized by the appearance of Northern Black Polished Ware and the complete disappearance of earlier ceramics (*ibid.* 78f.). It seems possible to conclude that the *Brāhmaṇa* period proper ends by about 750 B.C.

I have argued elsewhere (Parpola 1983) that the heterogenous Black-and-Red Ware cultures of North India during the first half of the first millennium B.C. are likely to represent various non-Vedic but Indo-Aryan speaking communities. At Hastināpura, Ahicchatra, Mathurā and other sites of western Uttar Pradesh and Bikaner regions, the Black-and-Red Ware has been found in association with the Painted Grey Ware, closely following the Painted Grey Ware in shape and in its fine make (cf. Tripathi 1976: 53f.). The Black-and-Red Ware could in this case be interpreted to reflect the Pāṇḍava element, or the Yādavas whom the epic itself and other sources (Megasthenes, traditions of Madurai, Paṇḍu-Vāsudeva of early Sri Lanka) connect with the Pāṇḍavas. At that time, it seems, Yādava kings controlled the lands on the Narmadā river, Mahiṣmatī, Vidarbha, Daśārṇa, Avantī and Gujarat (cf. Majumdar 1969: 27), all ancient Black-and-Red Ware areas (cf. Tripathi 1976: 50ff.). It is through Saurāṣṭra and Gujarat that the Pāṇḍus came to Sri Lanka, according to the tradition in the times of the Buddha. If the Pāṇḍyas of Madurai had any real connection with Mathurā, they could have set off southwards at the latest around 400 B.C. According to the *Mahābhārata*, Kṛṣṇa had to retreat to Saurāṣṭra in front of the expanding forces of Magadha. Van Buitenen (1975: II,15) under-

lines that the hegemony of Magadha was clearly accepted as a matter of fact at the time of composition of the Sabhāparvan, the second book of the Mahābhārata. But the capital of Magadha was then Girivraja, not yet Bimbisāra's (ca. 500 B.C.) Rājagṛha let alone Pāṭaliputra of the Mauryan emperors. The westwards expansion of Magadha seems to start with Bimbisāra's son Ajātaśatru, who conquered Kāśi (cf. *ibid.* 16).

The extreme dates for the Northern Black Polished ware are ca. 600 (Bihar) to 50 B.C.; it has spread from mid-eastern India (around Pāṭaliputra) to Nepal and Swat in the north, Kathiawar in the west, Ter and Brahmagiri in the Deccan, Kandanpur, Eran and Tripuri in Central India, and Chandraketurgarh and Amaravati in the east (cf. Tripathi 1976: 48). This temporal and spatial distribution strongly endorses its identification with the spread of Magadhan power (cf. Tripathi 1976: 47f.; Allchin & Allchin 1982: 320) and in its later phase with the spread of Buddhism under Aśoka (cf. Lamotte 1958: 244ff.) and the formation of the Pāli language (cf. *ibid.* 607-657, and Bechert 1980): it might be useful for the study of these phenomena to take into regard the NBP ware.

The above considerations and data, then, give us relatively narrow time brackets for the war between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas (around the 8th to early 5th century B.C.), the composition of the proto-Mahābhārata (around 700-500 B.C.), and for the emigration of the Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍyas to South India (around the 5th century B.C.).

11. The Pāṇḍus/Pāṇḍavas and the megalithic culture

The Śaka-like marriage customs of the Pāṇḍavas and their relatively late appearance on the Indian scene around 800 B.C. make one suspect that they might have belonged to the same wave of iron-age immigrants as those who introduced the megalithic graves into the Deccan during this same period. After all, the arrival of the megalithic culture was a major event, which must have had some effect in North India as well, and about the only one that fits in chronologically with the date of the proto-Mahābhārata. The carriers of the megalithic culture have adopted the Black-and-Red ware tradition in India. Moreover, the popular traditions of the Andhra Pradesh, Karṇāṭaka and Tamilnadu associate the megaliths with the Pāṇḍavas, since the old names of the megaliths in these regions are respectively *paṇḍavara mane* 'house of the Pāṇḍavas', *paṇḍupare* 'stone of the Paṇḍus', and *paṇṭu-kal* 'stones of the Paṇḍus' (cf. Deo 1973: 12f.; Leshnik 1974: 2f.; Leshnik translates *paṇṭu-kal* 'old stones', which is in itself correct, but also refers to stories that "make the Paṇḍukal cists

into retreats ...of the five Pāṇḍavas when they were fleeing from Duryodhana"). There are megaliths in North India, too, but they are yet to be examined properly (cf. Rau 1983: 46 with n. 217-221).

The oldest excavated megaliths are simple stone-circles discovered in ancient Vidarbha in northeastern Mahārāṣṭra. They date from about 800 B.C. These people were marauding pastoral nomads, riding richly decorated horses and living in circular huts with a fireplace resembling yurts. They were buried with weapons and horses. Especially the horse-furniture has parallels in Central Asia, the Caucasus region, and Western Iran (cf. Deo 1973; 1984; Allchin & Allchin 1982: 344f.). In relation to the earlier population, the introducers of the megalithic culture were probably comparatively few in number, and with the further southward spread of the megalithic culture became early Dravidianized linguistically. (Cf. Parpola 1973.) They succeeded, however, in introducing into peninsular India those traditions of heroic warfare which characterize the Old Tamil poetry, and in fact still continue in large parts of the Deccan (cf. Maloney 1975: 11; Sontheimer 1976). In South India, the megalithic culture continued well into the Sangam age, till the 2nd century A.D. (cf. Maloney 1975: 6ff.).

In her recent study, Jane R. McIntosh (1983) proposes dividing the megalithic culture proper into three major phases, II (800-550 B.C.), III (550-300 B.C.) and IV (300-100 B.C.). Phase I (1100-800 B.C.) is reserved for "the earliest period of the South Indian Iron Age", which "cannot strictly be included in the Megalithic culture. The graves of this period differ little from those of the preceding Neolithic/Chalcolithic period." According to McIntosh, "in the period IIIA, the introduction of cremation to Maharashtra suggested northern influences; by the beginning of period IIIB, the Maharastrian group had been swallowed up by the aggressive expansion of northern militaristic states, followed later by large portions of Andhra Pradesh, until finally in the 3rd century northern expansion reached its maximum extent in Asoka's empire". She further sees the megalithic culture as having expanded explosively in period IIIB over hitherto sparsely settled Kerala and Tamilnadu.

Many things suggest that civilization spread from the Gujarat region via sea traffic first to Sri Lanka and from there to the extreme south of India: the names and legends of the early dynasties of Sri Lanka and Tamilakam; the spread of the Brāhmī script in the third century B.C. in a variety mostly resembling the Brāhmī of Gujarat (cf. Maloney 1975: 20f.); the presence of Greco-Roman trading stations on the western as well as the eastern coast of

South India; and the testimony of the Old Tamil texts, which speak of a flourishing sea trade. (Cf. Maloney 1970: 603, 609ff.) Archaeologically this is supported by the fact that Sri Lanka and South India share identical megalithic burials and associated artefacts as well as a similar technique of early irrigation agriculture (cf. McIntosh 1983). "It is not until period IIIB that swords first appeared in Megalithic burials. A notable feature of the distribution of swords is that they occur almost exclusively within the coastal plains of Tamilnadu and Kerala" (ibid.). Another specific distributional feature suggesting diffusion from north India by sea is a new grave type, likewise attested from period IIIB onwards: "Urn burials appeared initially in the extreme south of the peninsula, at sites like Adichanallur ...and Tiruthu...In period IIIC, they were common all over the southern half of south India, in Kerala and southern Tamilnadu, ... and by period IV urn burials were known as far afield as central Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh" (ibid.). McIntosh thinks that the south to north spread of the urn burial is best explained by supposing that it was first introduced to Sri Lanka by immigrants from North India, where "although the evidence is scanty, inurned cremation seems to have been a major mode of disposal in 1st millennium B.C." (ibid.). According to the *Āgñiveśya-Gṛhyasūtra* (3,4,5), the bones of the deceased are collected after cremation into a new pot, which is disposed with either in a river or in the sea, or dug into a pit filled with earth. I could not readily locate the passage referred to by the editor, Varma (1940: ii), who asks: "may not *pāṣaṇa-sthāpana*, a ceremony in connection with the obsequies, be a miniature replica of *dolmen* making of olden days?"

12. The Paraśu-Rāma legend

Kerala was fully involved in the coastal traffic of the Sangam age. Each of the ten Cēra kings eulogized in the ten poems of *Patirruppattu* "was renowned either for his naval exploits or for his wealth acquired by sea trade" (Maloney 1970: 615). It is also assumed that during the Sangam period, "Kerala formed an integral part of *Tamiḷakam* in the political, social, cultural, and linguistic senses, and the early bards of *Tamiḷakam* travelled freely between the forts of chieftains on either side of the Western Ghats" (Narayanan & Veluthat 1983: 256). Nevertheless, there are both archaeological and literary reasons to suppose that at least Northern Kerala was colonized overland as well. According to McIntosh (1983), "the presence of a number of similar artefacts, such as the four-legged vessels J1B, in sites of north Kerala and Coorg" supports the hypothesis that "settlers spread southward from Karnataka into

northern Kerala". She connects this movement with "the possible southward migration of groups from Maharashtra" which "penetrated right to the south of the peninsula" during period IIIB: Maharashtra types of bronzes and beads have been discovered as far south as Adichanallur and south Kerala respectively.

While the Agastya legend — according to which Brahmanism was introduced to South India by this Vedic sage — is known in Tamilnadu too late to be taken into consideration here (cf. Filliozat 1967-1968), there is every reason to pay attention to the Paraśu-Rāma legend associated with the coming of the Nambudiri brahmins to Kerala. According to the traditions recorded in the Kēraḷōtpatti and other late texts, Paraśu-Rāma "reclaimed from the sea the land from Gōkarṇa to Kanyākumārī (Cape Comorin) and donated it to the brahmins to organize a theocratic government. It is said that the brahmins settled in sixty-four grāmas, thirty-two in Tuḷunāḍu in the north and the other thirty-two in Kerala proper" (K. K. Raja 1983: 300f.). Thereafter, the chronicles start dealing with the rule of the Cēra Perumāḷs of Kotuṅkallūr (cf. Narayanan & Veluthat 1983: 259). This, combined with the evidence concerning Tuḷuva and South Canara (see below), and the absence of references to early Cēra kings and other data of the Sangam period, has suggested that the foundation of the 32 settlements is to be attributed to the seventh and eighth centuries — they all appear to have been founded by 800 A.D. (cf. *ibid.* 257 ff.). Yet the Kēraḷōtpatti itself indicates that these villages represent a second wave of colonization, for the first brahman settlers, called "early Tuḷu people" (*paḷantuḷuvar*) — possibly a reference to brahmins of the Sangam age — "suffered from the hostility of the Nāgas and fled" (*ibid.* 257). These earlier brahmins Paraśu-Rāma is said to have brought from the banks of river Krishna (cf. Fawcett 1900: 72). In any case, the rudiments of the Paraśu-Rāma legend seem to be attested already in the Old Tamil Sangam literature: in Akanānūru 220, the poet Maturai Marutaṅ Iḷanākaṅār sings about Cellūr as the site of the Vedic sacrifice by "the long one wielding the axe" (*maḷu vāḷ ne-tiyōn*) who destroyed many princes. Several authorities have taken this as a clear reference to Paraśu-Rāma, and Cellūr has been identified with Periñcel-lūr (modern Taḷiparaṅga) in the Cannanore district of North Kerala, one of the two northernmost among the legendary 32 first brahman settlements of Kerala (cf. Narayanan & Veluthat 1983: 256f.; K. K. Raja 1983: 301).

The importance of the Paraśu-Rāma legend is enhanced by the fact that it is shared by brahmins all along the west coast, from Kerala through Karṇāṭaka,

Koṅkan, and Mahārāṣṭra to Gujarāt and Saurāṣṭra: there is thus reason to suspect that it might reflect the southwards Aryanization of the coast (cf. Narayanan & Veluthat 1983: 257). If this is the case, the original Sanskrit versions of the legend, which are connected with specific regions in the north, may indicate the areas from which hailed the forefathers of those brahmins who carried the legends to the south. Rāma Jāmadagnya or Rāma Bhārgava, later called Paraśu-Rāma, is not known from Vedic texts. According to the earliest epic and Purāṇic sources he was a brahmin and the grand-nephew of Viśvāmitra, a king of Kanyākubja in the Madhyadeśa (modern Kanauj in U.P.); he killed the murderer of his father, the Haihaya king Kārtavīrya Arjuna, who ruled at Mahiṣmatī (modern Maheswar) on the Narmadā river, completing his revenge with 21-fold eradication of the kṣatriya class; finally, at the order of Kaśyapa, he left the earth and created a new country at Śūrpāraka (60 km north of Bombay) by throwing his axe at the sea, which in fright retreated and gave up the coastal strip below the Western Ghats (cf. Gail 1977: 1ff.; 221). The area where the Paraśu-Rāma legend originated has on this ground been defined as Mālwa (cf. Gail 1977: 27). We have seen above that the port of Śūrpāraka (Suppāra) figures as an intermediate station along Vijaya's route to Sri Lanka in the Dīpavaṃsa (9,15f.).

A more southern version of the legend is found in the later Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa (3,57-58): here Paraśu-Rāma reclaims the land from the ocean at the bid of the inhabitants of Gōkarṇa (cf. Gail 1977: 191ff.). The Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa of the Skanda-Purāṇa connects Paraśu-Rāma's land-winning with the city of Bāṇavallī and the origin of the seven Koṅkana countries: Kerala, Tulaṅga, Saurāṣṭra, Koṅkana, Karahāṭa, Karanāṭa and Barbara, or in a variant version, the strip of land from Nāsika-Tryambaka (Nasik) to Kanyākumārī (Cape Comorin). The city of Bāṇavallī (6,46) can be identified with Banavasi, the residence of king Mayūravarma (the founder of the Kadamba dynasty in Tuḷuva, South Canara, A.D. 345-360), who is also mentioned in the text (7,50): he is said to have brought brahmins from Ahicchatra (in Uttar Pradesh). This tradition is mentioned in local inscriptions (starting with 904 A.D.) and in the Grāmapaddhati, a text relating the social order of the 32 Tuḷuva villages. (cf. Gail 1977: 200-205; Narayanan & Veluthat 1983: 257f.)

The Paraśu-Rāma legend, then, suggests that early Vedic traditions of South India are ultimately derived from the Pañcāla area (Kanyākubja and Ahicchatra) in Uttar Pradesh via Mālwa and southwards along the west coast. This is in broad agreement with the earlier discussed textual evidence connected with

the origin of the Pāṇḍyan dynasty of Tamilnadu and the earliest Siṃhala kings of Sri Lanka. Jainism and the Mauryan political influence reached Karṇāṭaka overland by about 300 B.C., and in view of the legends concerning the flight of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva in front of the advancing Magadhans, it seems quite likely that the Jains were preceded by a wave of Vedic Aryans associated with the Paraśu-Rāma legends. The overland route can be expected to have taken a longer time than crossing the distance to South India by sea. It is therefore of interest to note that Rāma Jāmadagnya in the epic as a whole is treated as an ancient figure: his destruction of the kṣatriyas is considered to mark the end of the second world period (*tretāyuga*) (Mahābhārata 1,2,3), as the Kaurava-Pāṇḍava war ends the third (*dvāparayuga*) (cf. van Buitenen 1975: II,14 n. 32; 194).

13. Jaimini and the Mahābhārata

Finally, I would briefly like to draw attention to one thing which suggests that the migration of the Jaiminīyas to South India was somehow intimately related to the composition of the Mahābhārata. Instead of the old Vedic eponym of their school, Śāṭyāyani (often quoted as an authority in the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa, which itself is referred to in the Vedic texts as Śāṭyāyanakam, cf. Renou 1947: 106f.), they nowadays associate themselves with Jaimini. This change of name by the Jaiminīyas, it will be pointed out elsewhere (in continuation of Parpola 1981), is rather strange and somewhat contradictory, and understandable only against the background of some drastic change in external circumstances. In any case it predates the times of Bhavatrāta (ca. 7th century A.D.), who in the introductory verses to his commentary on the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra pays homage to Jaimini.

Śāṭyāyani and Tāṇḍya — the eponymic teacher connected with the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa of the Kauthuma school — are quoted side by side still in the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra (1,1,18-19). Jaimini first appears in the Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra (1,14), where he heads the list of Sāmavedic teachers to be satiated daily with water-offerings (*tarpaṇa*). Jaimini is credited especially with the composition of the Mīmāṃsāsūtra, a work perhaps slightly older than Kātyāyana's Vārttikas on Pāṇini's grammar, which are dated to the fourth century B.C. (cf. Paranjpe 1922: 76f.; Parpola 1981: 151). According to the Mahābhārata (1,48,6), Jaimini functioned as the chief chanter priest (*udgātar*) in Janamejaya's snake sacrifice; moreover, Vyāsa, the compiler of the Vedas and the Mahābhārata, taught them to Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila, his own son Śuka, and Vaiśampāyana respectively (Mahābhārata 1,57,74-75), Jaimini receiving the

Sāmaveda (cf. also the Purāṇic data in Renou 1947: 124ff.). It is significant that in the tarpaṇa lists of the Gṛhyasūtras of Āśvalāyana (3,4,4), Kauṣītaki (2,5,3) and Śāṅkhāyana (4,10,3 & 6,6,11) as well as in the Atharva-Pariśiṣṭas (43,4,13ff.) Jaimini is mentioned together with Sumantu, Vaiśampāyana, and Paila (and Śuna in the Atharva-Pariśiṣṭa is undoubtedly to be emended to Śuka); the first two of these latter texts mention in this connection also the Mahābhārata and the Sūtra (for which the Atharva-Pariśiṣṭa has Pāṇini) and the Bhāṣya. That this tradition was important for the Jaiminīya Nambudiris and may have been brought with them to Kerala is suggested by the name of that one among the 32 earliest Nambudiri villages to which the Jaiminīyas belong, Śukapuram: it refers to Vyāsa's son and pupil Śuka (Śrī Iṭṭi Ravi Nambudiri, orally). On the face of all this evidence, it is difficult to believe that the mention of the name Jaimini in the Jaiminīya-Gṛhyasūtra is just a much later interpolation: it seems to date from times shortly after the composition of Jaimini's Mīmāṃsāsūtra and the proto-Mahābhārata, both of which may have taken place around the 5th century B.C.

R E F E R E N C E S

- Allchin, Bridget & Allchin, Raymond, 1982. *The rise of civilization in India and Pakistan*. Cambridge.
- Bechert, Heinz, 1980. (Hrsg.) *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung*. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 117.) Göttingen.
- Buitenen, J. A. B. van, 1973-1978. (Transl.) *The Mahābhārata I-III*. Chicago & London.
- Burnell, A. C., 1869. *Catalogue of a collection of Sanskrit manuscripts I*. London.
- Burrow, T., 1955. *The Sanskrit language*. London.
- Bühler, Georg, 1882. (Transl.) *The sacred laws of the Aryas II*. (Sacred Books of the East 14.) Oxford.
- Caland, Willem, 1920. Brāhmaṇa- en Sūtra-aanwinsten. *Verlagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde, 5 Reeks, IV Deel, 461-498*.
- , 1922. Über das Vādhūlasūtra. *Acta Orientalia* 1, 3-11.
- , 1924. Eine zweite Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *Acta Orientalia* 2, 142-167.
- , 1926. Eine dritte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *Acta Orientalia* 4, 1-41 & 161-213.
- , 1928. Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *Acta Orientalia* 6, 97-241.
- De, Sushil Kumar, 1959. *Aspects of Sanskrit literature*. Calcutta.

- DEDR = T. Burrow & M. B. Emeneau, 1984. *A Dravidian etymological dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Deo, S. B., 1973. *Problem of South Indian megaliths*. (Kannada Research Institute, Research lectures, New series 4.) Dharwar.
- , 1984. Megalithic problems of the Deccan. Bridget Allchin (ed.), *South Asian Archaeology 1981*, 221-224. (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 34.) Cambridge.
- Deshpande, Pandurang Ganesh, 1974. *Gujarati-English dictionary*. Ahmedabad.
- Dessigane, R. & Pattabiramin, P. Z. & Filliozat, J., 1960. *La légende des jeux de Çiva à Madurai d'après les textes et les peintures*, 1. (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 19.) Pondichéry.
- Fawcett, Fred., 1900. Notes on some of the people of Malabar. *Madras Government Museum Bulletin* 3:1, 1-85.
- Filliozat, Jean, 1967-1968. Agastya et la propagation du brahmanisme au Sud-Est asiatique. *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 31-32, 442-449.
- , 1968. Le Veda et la littérature tamoule ancienne. *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8^o, 28), 289-300. Paris.
- , 1969. Les dravidiens dans la civilisation indienne. *Journal des Savants* 1969:2, 74-91.
- Gail, Adalbert, 1977. *Paraśurāma, Brahmane und Krieger*. Wiesbaden.
- Gonda, Jan, 1960. *Die Religionen Indiens I*. (Die Religionen der Menschheit 11.) Stuttgart.
- Gundert, H., 1871-1872. *A Malayalam-English dictionary I-II*. Mangalore.
- Hart, George L., III, 1975. *The poems of ancient Tamil: Their milieu and their Sanskrit counterparts*. Berkeley - Los Angeles - London.
- Hopkins, Edward W., 1889. *The social and military position of the ruling caste in ancient India, as represented by the Sanskrit epic*. Repr., Varanasi 1972.
- , 1901. *The great epic of India: Its character and origin*. New York & London.
- Horsch, Paul, 1966. *Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Litteratur*. Bern.
- Howard, Wayne, 1977. *Sāmavedic chant*. New Haven & London.
- , 1983. The music of Nambudiri unexpressed chant (aniruktagāna). Staal (ed.) 1983: II, 311-342.
- Härtel, Herbert, 1976. Some results of the excavations at Sonkh: A preliminary report. *German scholars on India II*, 69-99. New Delhi.
- Kane, P. V., 1941. *History of Dharmaśāstra II/1*. (Government Oriental Series B 6.) Poona.
- Kauṣītakam caṭaṅṅū*, 1976. 2nd ed. Kunnaṅkulam.
- Kenoyer, Jonathan M., 1984. The sacred conch shell: From the Indus civilization to modern Bengal. *Archaeology* (in press).
- Kṛṣṇaśarmā, Vākattānattu Eṭamana E. Eṃ., 1952 (1928). (Ed.) *Śrī kriyāratna-māla athavā kṛṣṇayajurvedīya baudhāyana caṭaṅṅū*. Kunnaṅkulam.
- Kunjan Pillai, Suranad, 1957. (Ed.) *Alphabetical index of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum*. I (A to Na). (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 186.) Trivandrum.

- Lal, B. B., 1981. The Indo-Aryan hypothesis vis-à-vis Indian archaeology. *Ethnic problems of the history of Central Asia in the early period (second millennium B.C.)*, 280-294. Moscow.
- Lamotte, Étienne, 1958. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*. (Bibliothèque du Muséon 43.) Louvain.
- Law, Bimala Churn, 1943. *Tribes in ancient India*. (Bhandarkar Oriental Series 4.) Poona.
- Leshnik, Lawrence S., 1974. *South Indian 'megalithic' burials: The Pandukal complex*. Wiesbaden.
- Logan, William, 1886. *Malabar I*. Madras.
- Majumdar, Bimanbehari, 1969. *Kṛṣṇa in history and legend*. Calcutta.
- Maloney, Clarence, 1970. The beginnings of civilization in South India. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 29:3, 603-616.
- , 1975. Archaeology in South India: Accomplishments and prospects. Burton Stein (ed.), *Essays on South India*, 1-40. (Asian Studies at Hawaii 15.) Honolulu.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1963. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen II*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek.) Heidelberg.
- McIntosh, Jane R., 1983. Dating the South Indian megaliths. (Preprint.) To appear in *South Asian Archaeology 1983*.
- Mencher, Joan P., 1966a. Namboodiri brahmins: An analysis of a traditional elite in Kerala. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 1, 183-196.
- , 1966b. Kerala and Madras: A comparative study of ecology and social structure. *Ethnology* 5:2, 135-171.
- & Goldberg, Helen, 1967. Kinship and marriage regulations among the Namboodiri brahmins of Kerala. *Man N.S.* 2, 87-106.
- Mylius, Klaus, 1969. Gab es Städte im jungvedischen Indien? *Ethnologisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 10, 33-39.
- Nagaswamy, R., 1978(?). Comments. *The origin of the Brahmi script*, 72-82 & 110-112. Madras(?).
- Nampoothiri, E. Easwaran, 1972. *Sanskrit literature of Kerala. An index of authors and their works*. Trivandrum.
- Nampūtiri, Vellārappiḷḷi Maṭhattil illattu Sōmayājippāṭ Mahan Vāsudēvan, 1978. (Ed.) *Bādhūlakaccāṭāṇṇū*. Kunnaṁkuḷam.
- Narayanan, M. G. S. & Veluthat, Kesavan, 1983. A history of the Nambudiri community in Kerala. Staal (ed.) 1983: II, 256-278.
- NCC = *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An alphabetical register of Sanskrit and allied works and authors*, I-. 1949-. Madras.
- Nilakanta Sastri, K. A., 1955. *The Coḷas*. 2nd ed. Madras.
- , 1966. *A history of South India from prehistoric times to the fall of Vijayanagar*. 3rd ed. Madras.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, 1879. (Ed. & transl.) *The Dīpavaṁsa, an ancient Buddhist historical record*. London.
- Pakalīyam caṭāṇṇū*, 1966. 4th ed. Kunnaṁkuḷam.
- Panse, G. M., 1966. Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra: An analytical study. *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal* 4:1, 44-50.

- Paranjpe, V. G., 1922. *Le Vārtika de Kātyāyana*. (Thesis.) Paris.
- Parpola, Asko, 1967. On the Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra and its annexes. *Orientalia Suecana* 16, 181-214.
- , 1968. *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries: An English translation and study* I:1. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 42:2.) Helsinki.
- , 1973. *The literature and study of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda in retrospect and prospect*. (Studia Orientalia 43:6.) Helsinki.
- , 1981. On the formation of the Mīmāṃsā and the problems concerning Jaimini. (I.) *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 25, 145-177.
- , 1983. The pre-Vedic Indian background of the śrauta rituals. Staal (ed.) 1983: II, 41-75.
- , 1984. Domestic rituals of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda: (1) The Nambudiri brahmins of Kerala. Paper read at the Sixth World Sanskrit Conference, October 13-20, 1984. Philadelphia.
- Pillay, K. K., 1966. Aryan influence in Tamilaham during the Sangam epoch. *Tamil Culture* 12:2-3, 159-169.
- , 1975. *A social history of the Tamils* I. 2nd ed. Madras.
- Raghavan Pillai, K., 1965. (Ed.) *Alphabetical index of Sanskrit manuscripts in the University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum*. II (Ta to Ma). (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 215.) Trivandrum.
- Raja, K. Kunjunnī, 1983. Sanskrit and Malayalam references from Kerala. Staal (ed.) 1983: II, 300-310.
- Raja, K. Ramavarma, 1910. The Brahmins of Malabar. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1910, 625-639.
- Rau, Wilhelm, 1983. *Zur vedischen Altertumskunde*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg. 1983: 1.) Mainz.
- Rawlinson, George, 1942. (Transl.) *Herodotus, The Persian wars*. (The Modern Library 255.) New York.
- Renou, Louis, 1947. *Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda*. (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 9.) Paris.
- Sarma, E. R. Sreekrishna, 1976. (Ed.) *Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa. 2: Vyākhyā of Udaya*. 1-2. (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 9: 2-3.) Wiesbaden.
- Sastri, R. A., n.d. Unpublished diary/journal in 3 volumes in the possession of Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras.
- Schroeder, Leopold von, 1887. *Indiens Literatur und Cultur in historischer Entwicklung*. Leipzig.
- Sharma, Bellikoth Ramachandra, 1967. *Jaiminīyārṣeya-Jaiminīyopaniṣad-Brāhmaṇas*. (Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series 5-6.) Tirupati.
- Shastri, Premnidhi, 1966. (Ed.) *Jaiminīya-Śrauta-Sūtra-Vṛtti of Bhavatrāta*. (Śata-Piṭaka Series 40.) New Delhi.
- Shulman, David Dean, 1980. *Tamil temple myths*. Princeton.
- Southworth, Franklin S., 1974. Linguistic stratigraphy of North India. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 3:2, 201-223.

- Staal, Frits, 1961. *Nambudiri Veda recitation*. (Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 5.) 's-Gravenhage.
- , 1971. *Some Vedic survivals: Report on research done in India Dec. 1970 - March 1971, A(merican) I(nstitute of) I(ndian) S(tudies) grant*. (Stencilled.)
- , 1983. (Ed.) *Agni: The Vedic ritual of the fire altar I-II*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- Tiwari, Jagdish Narain, 1979. *Disposal of the dead in the Mahabharata*. Varanasi.
- TL = *Tamil Lexicon*, 1924-1939. I-VI & Supplement. Madras.
- Tripathi, Vibha, 1976. *The Painted Grey Ware: An Iron Age culture of Northern India*. Delhi.
- Variar, M. R. Raghava, 1983. The Nambudiri ritual tradition (with special reference to the Kollengode archives). Staal (ed.) 1983: II, 279-299.
- Varma, L. A. Ravi, 1940. (Ed.) *Āgniveśyagṛhyasūtra*. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 144.) Trivandrum.
- Veluthat, Kesavan, 1978. *Brahman settlements in Kerala. Historical studies*. Calicut.
- Wackernagel, J. & Debrunner, A., 1954. *Altindische Grammatik II:2*. Göttingen.
- Weber, A., 1853. Berichtigungen, Erwiderungen und Nachträge zum ersten und zweiten Bande. *Indische Studien* 2, 390-418.
- , 1891. Episches im vedischen Ritual. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Historisch-philologische Klasse, Jahrgang 1891*.
- Witzel, Michael, 1975. Eine fünfte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 1, 75-108.

Addendum:

- Sontheimer, Günther-Dietz, 1976. *Birobā, Mhaskobā und Khaṇḍobā: Ursprung, Geschichte und Umwelt von pastoralen Gottheiten in Mahārāṣṭra*. (Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 21.) Wiesbaden.