
SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 15

January, 1990

On Attitudes towards Language in Ancient India

by
George Cardona

Victor H. Mair, Editor
Sino-Platonic Papers
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA
vmair@sas.upenn.edu
www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series edited by Victor H. Mair. The purpose of the series is to make available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including Romanized Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

The only style-sheet we honor is that of consistency. Where possible, we prefer the usages of the *Journal of Asian Studies*. Sinographs (*hanzi*, also called tetragraphs [*fangkuaizi*]) and other unusual symbols should be kept to an absolute minimum. *Sino-Platonic Papers* emphasizes substance over form.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins and submitted in duplicate. A set of "Instructions for Authors" may be obtained by contacting the editor.

Ideally, the final draft should be a neat, clear camera-ready copy with high black-and-white contrast. Contributors who prepare acceptable camera-ready copy will be provided with 25 free copies of the printed work. All others will receive 5 copies.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to two or three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan.

N.B.: Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* will be published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web.

On attitudes towards language in ancient India

1. From early Vedic times, Indo-Aryans had an awareness of themselves as opposed to peoples with whom they came into contact and conflict. This awareness involved cultural and ethnic factors, including language, and it came down to a conflict between the Āryas (Sanskrit *āryāḥ*), upholding particular cultic practices associated with sacred texts in a particular language, against non-Āryas, who did not have the same religious practices and associated language. The Indo-Aryans' consciousness about their status as Āryas has its antecedent in Indo-Iranian culture, and it continued long after the Indo-Aryans had completed their migrations into the Indian subcontinent. The contrast ultimately developed into one between idealized speakers of a language that was culturally and ritually pure (*saṁskṛtam*), on the one hand, and barbaric speakers (*mlecchāḥ*) on the other; the latter, in turn, could be "foreigners" in the sense that they inhabited areas outside the bounds of Āryāvartta 'the abode of the Ārya' or, from the point of view of Sanskritic speakers, merely speakers of Middle Indic vernaculars, speech forms of which were viewed as corruptions (*apabhraṁśāḥ*) of the elevated Sanskritic speech. Moreover, grammar (*vyākaraṇam*), an ancillary to the Veda (*vedāṅgam*), came to be viewed as a means of describing such pure, correct speech set apart from the corrupt vernaculars. Further, grammar came quite early to be considered a means of attaining felicity and ultimate release through the purification of speech, which was elevated to a divine status. In this brief presentation, intended for nonspecialists, I shall give an overview of such Indian attitudes towards language, their background and development in ancient India, stressing points that, in my opinion, are worth emphasizing anew.¹

2. The Indo-Aryans and the Iranians both referred to themselves and to their speech as Ārya (Skt. *ārya-*, Av. *arya-*, OP *ariya-*). Thus, Achemenian kings emphasized not only that they were Achemenian (*haxamanišiya-*) and Persian (*pārša-*) but also Arya (*ariya-*) of Arya seed (*ariya cissa*): *adam dārayavauš xšāyaθiya vazraka xšāyaθiya xšāyaθiyānām xšāyaθiya dahyūnām vispa-zanānām xšāyaθiya ahyāyā būmiyā vazrakāyā dūraiapiy vistaspahyā pussa*

haxāmanišiya pārsa pārsahyā pussa ariya ariya cissa 'I am Darius the great king, king of kings, king of the countries with all sorts of people, king on this great earth, even to the distance, son of Vistāspa (Hystaspes), an Achemenian, a Persian, son of a Persian, an Arya of Arya seed.'² *adam xšāyarša xšāyaθiya vazraka xšāyaθiya xšāyaθiyānām xšāyaθiya dahyūnām paruvzanānām xšāyaθiya ahyāyā būmiyā vazrakāyā dūraiapiy dārayavahauš xšāyaθiyahyā pussa haxāmanisiya pārsa pārsahyā pussa ariya ariya cissa* 'I am Xerxes the great king, king of kings, king of the countries with many people, king on this great earth, even to the distance, son of king Darius, an Achemenian, a Persian, son of a Persian, an Arya of Arya seed.'³ Moreover, Darius specifically mentions that an inscription of his was in Arya,⁴ so that the concept of Arya applied not only to a people but also to their language.

3. If people thus refer to themselves and their language in a particular way, they certainly are aware of a contrast between themselves and others, both as a people and with respect to the languages they speak.

3.1. This contrast is particularly vivid in India, where people not only referred to themselves as *ārya* but also portrayed themselves as opposed in customs and speech to others. These others are principally referred to by the terms *dāsyu*⁵ and *dāsā*- in the earliest texts. For example, in the Ṛgveda, Indra is asked to recognize (*vījānīhi* [2sg. imper.]) the *Āryas* as opposed to the *dasyu* and to subject (*randhayā* [2sg. imper.]) those who do not follow vows of performing sacred rites to the will of one who has a strew of sacrificial grass (*barhīṣmate randhayā ... avratān*),⁶ that is, to subject the non-*Āryas*, who do not perform rituals for the *Ārya* gods, to the will of the *Ārya*. A poet also says to Indra, '... you revealed the light for the *Ārya*; the *dasyu* has been made to sit on the left' (Ṛgveda 2.11.18cd: *āpāvṛṇor jyótir āryāya ní savyatāḥ sādī dāsyur indra*). Another says to him, 'You tamed the *dasyu*, you alone won the settlements for the *Ārya*' (Ṛgveda 6.18.3ab: *tvām ha nú tyád adāmayo dāsyūṃr ékaḥ kṛṣṭīr avanor āryāya*) and speaks of Indra's help, through which, 'you brought down the settlements of the *dāsas*' (Ṛgveda 6.25.2d: *āryāya vísó'va tārīr dāsīḥ*). Again, Agni is told, 'You drove the *dasyu* from their home to create broad light for the *Ārya*' (Ṛgveda 7.5.6cd: *tvām dāsyūṃr ókaso agne āja urú*

jyótir janáyan nāryāya). Moreover, those who do not follow a vow to perform rites to the Ārya gods are called black-skinned, as in Ṛgveda 1.130.8a-c: *índrah samátsu yájamānam áryam právad víśveṣu śatámūtir ājíṣu svàrmīlheṣv ājíṣu / mánave śásad avratán tvácam kṛṣṇám arandhayat* ‘Indra of a hundred aids helped the sacrificer, the Ārya, in contests, in contests with the sun as reward; chastising for Manu the ones who lack vows of worship, he made the black skin subject (to Manu).’

3.2. The Āryas were contrasted with others in respect of their speech. Perhaps the most famous instance of this is found in Yāska’s Nirukta and Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya. In the course of setting forth principles for etymologically explaining (*nirvacanam*) words, Yāska mentions that in some areas verbal bases (*prakṛtayah* ‘original stuff, bases’) are used with verbendings (*prakṛtaya ekeṣu bhāṣyante*) and in some areas only derivatives (*vikṛtayah* ‘modifications’) of the same verbs are used (*vikṛtaya ekeṣu*). For example, in the area of Kamboja --- a district in the area now known as Afghanistan --- the verb *śav* ‘go’ is used, but among the Ārya the derivate *śava-* ‘corpse’ is used.⁷ In the introductory section of his Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali remarks that certain speech forms have restricted domains of usage, that is, only particular forms are used in particular meanings in given areas. For example, *śav* is used in finite forms meaning ‘go’ only among the Kambojas, while the Āryas use only a derivate of this verb, *śava-*; in Surāṣṭra, *hamm* ‘go’ is used, *ramh* is used in the same sense in the east and central part of the country, but Āryas use only *gam* in this meaning; the verb *dā* ‘cut’ is used in the east, but in the north only the derivate *dātra-* is used.⁸

3.3. Another important term is *mleccha*, which in its earliest use refers specifically to barbaric speech. The first place this occurs is the following famous passage from the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (3.2.1.22-24): *te devā īkṣāṁ cakrire yoṣā vā iyaṁ vāg yad enam na yuvitehaiva mā tiṣṭhantam abhyehīti brūhi tāṁ tu na āgatāṁ pratiprabrūtād iti sā hainaṁ tad eva tiṣṭhantam abhyeyāya tasmād u strīpumāṁsam samskṛte tiṣṭhantam abhyaiti tāṁ haibhya āgatāṁ pratiprovāceyaṁ vā āgād iti | tāṁ devā asurebhyo ’ntarāyaṁs tāṁ svīkṛtyāgnāveva parigrhya sarvahutam ajuhavur āhutir hi devānāṁ sa yām*

*evāmūm anuṣṭubhājuhāvus tad evainām tad devāḥ svyakurvata te'surā āttavacaso he'lavo he lava iti vadantaḥ parābabhūvuḥ | tatraitām api vācam ūdur upajijñāsyām sa mlecchas tasmān na brāhmaṇo mlecched asuryā haiṣā vāg evamevaiṣa dviṣatām sapatnānām ādatte vācam te'syāttavcaso parābhavanti ya evam etad veda*⁹ 'The gods considered that speech was a girl; since she had not joined with this (sacrificial rite), (they said to the sacrifice) "Tell her, 'Come to me standing right here', and tell us when she has come to you." She came to him standing just so. Thus it is that a woman approaches a man standing in the prepared place. He told them when she had come to him, "She has come." The gods came between her and the demons. Once they had gotten her to themselves, they took her and offered her as a complete oblation in the fire. For an offering made in the fire pertains to the gods. Once they had offered her with the anuṣṭubh, only then did the gods truly make her their own. The demons, with speech taken away from them, said *he'lavo he'lavaḥ* and were thus vanquished. They uttered this indistinct speech there. That is barbaric speech (*mlecchaḥ*). Therefore, a Brāhmaṇa is not to utter barbaric speech (*na mlecchet*), for this speech is of the demons. One who know thus takes the speech of his competitors who hate him; they are vanquished with their speech taken from them.' Now, the contrast here is not between Ārya and non-Ārya pure and simple. Instead, the emphasis is placed on usage that is correct according to an accepted norm and usage that is considered barbaric because of its deviation from the norm. Thus, the demons are said to have been vanquished because, incapable of uttering the correct form *he3arayo he3arayaḥ*, they said *he'lavo he'lavaḥ*.¹⁰ That is, instead of the accepted form *arayaḥ*, with *-r-* and *-y-*, they used a dialectal and unacceptable form *alavaḥ*, with *-l-* and *-v-*; and instead of using a prolated (trimoric) *-e3* that is exempt from phonological alternation, they used an ordinary vowel *-e* and followed the rule of phonologic alternation whereby word-final *-e* and word-initial *a-* together give *-e-*.¹¹

The same famous passage, with a slight variation, is alluded to by Patañjali, in the introductory section of his Mahābhāṣya. Here Patañjali discusses the reasons which prompt the study of grammar. After giving major reasons, for studying grammar,¹² Patañjali gives additional reasons. One of

these is to avoid being barbaric (*mlecchā mā bhūma* 'lest we be barbarians') by using barbaric speech; Mahābhāṣya I.2.3-9: *imāni ca bhūyaḥ śabdānuśāsanasya prayojanāni --- te'surāḥ ... te'surā helayo helaya iti kurvantaḥ parābbhūvuḥ | tasmād brāhmaṇena na mlecchitavai nāpabhāṣitavai mleccho ha vā eṣa yad apaśabdaḥ | mlecchā mā bhūma ity adhyeyam vyākaraṇam* 'These are additional reasons for grammar: *te'surāḥ...* The demons were vanquished because they said *helayo helayaḥ*. Therefore, a Brāhmaṇa is not to utter barbaric speech (*na mlecchitavai*) (that is,) not utter incorrect speech (*nāpabhāṣitavai*); incorrect speech is barbarism. Grammar should be studied in order not to be barbaric speakers.'

3.4. The contrast between barbarians and their incorrect speech on the one hand and non-barbarians who use correct speech forms also involves the concept of Āryas in that the speakers who are considered the linguistic ideal to be emulated are characterized not only by their behavior (*ācārataḥ*) but also by where they live (*nivāsataḥ*), namely Āryāvartta ('abode of the Ārya'). In his commentary on Pāṇini 6.3.109: *prṣodarādīni yathopadiṣtam*,¹³ Patañjali notes that words of the type *prṣodara-* 'spotted belly', which exhibit particular irregularities, are said to be known from the usage of speakers referred to as *śiṣṭa* ('élite'). He also remarks that the behavior which characterizes these model speakers is found only in Āryāvartta, and he goes on to describe both the moral characteristics of the *śiṣṭas* and the limits of Āryāvartta: Mahābhāṣya III.174.7-10: *sa cācāra āryāvartta eva | kaḥ punar āryāvarttaḥ | prāg ādarśāt pratyak kālakavanād dakṣiṇena himavantam uttareṇa pāriyātram | etasminn-āryanivāse ye brāhmaṇāḥ kumbhīdhānyā alolupā aḡhyamāṇakāraṇāḥ kiṁcid antareṇa kasyāścid vidyāyāḥ pāragās tatrābhavantaḥ śiṣṭāḥ* 'And this behavior occurs only in Āryāvartta. But what is Āryāvartta? It is east of Ādarśa,¹⁴ to the west of Kālakavana,¹⁵ south of the Himālaya, and north of the Pāriyātra¹⁶. Brāhmaṇas in this abode of the Ārya and who possess at a time only as much grain as fits in a small pot¹⁷, are not greedy, act out of duty, not because of some obvious motive, and have attained full proficiency in some area of traditional knowledge without the need for anything such as explicit instruction, these noble men are the *śiṣṭas*.'¹⁸

3.5. From what Patañjali says, it is clear that for him there is a contrast in linguistic behaviour that pits correct speech (*śabdaḥ*), as used by ideal speakers (*śiṣṭāḥ*) --- namely Sanskritic Brāhmaṇas --- who live in Āryāvartta against incorrect speech, which in the Mahābhāṣya is called not only *apaśabdaḥ* or *apabhraṁśaḥ* but also *mlecchaḥ*. It is clear too that for this use of the term *mleccha-*, there is a parallel in the legend recounted in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (see 3.3).

Moreover, just as Patañjali's characterization of the śiṣṭas in Āryāvartta involves not only linguistic behavior but also other moral qualities (see note 18), similarly Āryāvartta itself is defined not only in geographic terms but also through cultural characteristics, as opposed to characteristics of the Mleccha country. Thus, for example, the Manusmṛti says that the area where the kṛṣṇasāra deer roams naturally is the land appropriate to the performance of rites; the area outside of this is Mleccha country.¹⁹ The Viṣṇusmṛti draws the contrast as follows: The Mleccha country is where the social organization into four groups called *varṇa* does not occur; the other is Āryāvartta.²⁰ In such contexts, *mleccha-* is not used merely in connection with barbaric speech, and the principal factor involved in contrasting the land of the Ārya and the land of the Mleccha is not geographic but cultural.²¹

3.6. Although a clear distinction is thus drawn, from Vedic times on, between Sanskritic speech recognized as correct and barbaric speech that includes dialectal and vernacular characteristics, this does not mean that even ideal speakers within Āryāvartta were considered always to use only the pure Sanskritic speech that was elevated to an ideal. Indeed, in social situations that must have prevailed on the subcontinent at the times in question,²² it must have been the case that speakers who would use the elevated Sanskritic speech on appropriate occasions also used vernaculars on other occasions. Moreover, Patañjali makes it clear that for him the restriction (*niyamah*) according to which only correct speech forms are to be used applies in the context of ritual. Thus, a discussion in the introductory section of the Mahābhāṣya concerns whether merit (*dharmah*) is linked to the knowledge of correct speech (*śabdasya jñāne*) or to verbal behavior (*ācāre*), the use of such speech (*prayoge*). A vārttika

speaks in support of the second position, and in his elaboration of this Patañjali again refers to the Vedic legend about the Asuras (see section 3.3): Paspasā vārttika 7: *ācare niyamaḥ*; Mahābhāṣya I.10.11-12: *ācāre punar ṛṣir niyamaṁ vedayate te 'surā ...* 'There is a restriction with respect to behavior. Moreover, the ṛṣi (i.e., the Veda) makes known a restriction with respect to behavior (when it says) ...' Later on in the introductory section of the Mahābhāṣya, however, Patañjali remarks that this restriction on verbal behavior holds only in respect of ritual activity (*yājñe karmaṇi*); elsewhere, there is no such absolute restriction (*anyatrāniyamaḥ*). In this connection, he recalls a legend about sages (*ṛṣayaḥ*) who, because of the way they spoke, were known as *yarvāṇas tarvāṇas*. These were true sages, with direct perception of dharma (*pratyakṣa-dharmāṇaḥ*) not directly knowable by ordinary men, who possessed both transcendental and other knowledge (*parāparajñāḥ*), who knew all that should be known (*viditaveditavyāḥ*), and who had acquired a complete knowledge of things as they are (*adhigatayāthātathyāḥ*). These revered men would say *yar vā ṇaḥ tar vā ṇaḥ* instead of the more purely correct *yad vā ṇaḥ* 'what is ours', *tad vā ṇaḥ* 'that is ours'.²³ On the other hand, they would not utter such incorrect forms (*nāpabhāṣante*) during a ritual act. The Asuras, however, did indeed utter incorrect speech in a ritual context, hence were vanquished.²⁴

3.7. Clearly, Patañjali could not and did not rule out the use of non-Sanskritic speech even by learned and revered sages. The same situation is reflected in a series of discussions in the Mīmāṃsāsūtras.

3.7.1. Mīmāṃsāsūtra 1.3.4.8: *teṣv adarśanād virodhasya samā vipratipattiḥ syāt* concerns the interpretation of Vedic passages where terms occur which are used in different meanings by different people but no conflict appears (*adarśanād virodhasya*) with respect to these meanings, so that one cannot show that one meaning must be given preference over another. Consequently, the different interpretations would have equal status (*samā vipratipattiḥ syāt*). In his commentary, Śabara cites three Brāhmaṇa passages: These speak of a porridge (*caruḥ*) made of yava (*yavamayaḥ*),²⁵ sandals (*upāhanau*) made of varāha skin (*vārāhī*),²⁶ and a mat (*kaṭa-*) made of vetasa (*vaitase kaṭe*).²⁷ Śabara remarks that some use *yava-*, *varāha-*, *vetasa-* with reference to long-bearded

barley, a hog, and the Vañjulaka plant, but that others use the same terms with reference to the Priyaṅgu plant, to a black bird, and to the Jambū plant. Since both meanings are understood for each term, this would result in allowing an option for ritual act in question.²⁸ In his next sūtra, Jaimini argues that only one of the two possible meanings is applicable, namely the one that is founded in the s̄āstra, since this is the source which determines what is to be understood.²⁹ Śabara comments as follows: It is not a question of different understandings having equal status, since one or the other meanings understood from the terms at issue can be accounted for through metaphoric usage. Thus, if *yava-* is primarily used with reference to long-bearded barley, then it will be used with reference to priyaṅgu due to a similarity, and vice versa: when an earlier planted crop has been exhausted, long-bearded barley and priyaṅgu come up, and this is the similarity between the two.³⁰ The question is, of course, which of the two meanings is to be treated as primary. According to Śabara, the primary meaning of the word is the one that is given to the word by men based in s̄āstra, that is by the śiṣṭas. These people are possessed of an unbroken memorial tradition with respect to words and the Vedas, so that they are the source of determining matters of lore that is not man-made and lore that stems from men.³¹ And, notes Śabara, these śiṣṭas hand down a tradition of interpretation according to which the Vedic passage calling for a porridge made of *yava* has a supplement which describes *yava*; this passage says that when other plants wither, these thrive.³² The Veda thus show that *yava* is the longbearded barley. Since the word *yava-* is found thus used in the Veda, then, one understands that this word has an uninterrupted tradition of being used with reference to barley. Hence, its use with respect to priyaṅgu is to be considered metaphoric, so that the offering at issue is to be made of barley.³³

Now, in his comments on JMS 1.3.4.8, Śabara refers merely to some (*kecit*) people who use words like *yava-* with reference to different things. It is, therefore, not certain that in this passage he contrasts the usage of Āryas and Mlecchas.³⁴ Other commentators, however, do indeed consider that Jaimini's sūtra concerns just such a contrast. Kumārila, for example, illustrates this with words like *pīlu-*: among the Āryas, this refers to a particular tree, but the

Mlecchas use it with reference to an elephant.³⁵ Whatever one may decide concerning Śabara's comments on JMS 1.3.4.8, however, it is absolutely clear that in his comments on the next sūtra Śabara explicitly refers to the śiṣṭas. In addition, it is hardly plausible to think that he would consider these people to be essentially different from the śiṣṭas of which Patañjali speaks. These śiṣṭas, repositories of traditional lore, are, of course, Brāhmaṇas and Āryas.

3.7.2. In his comments on JMS 1.3.5.10, Śabara explicitly speaks of Āryas and Mlecchas, in the following context. There are certain words which Āryas do not use in any sense, but which Mlecchas use in particular meanings; for example *pika-* 'cuckoo', *nema-* 'half', *sata-* 'a certain wooden bowl', *tāmarasa-* 'lotus'. Words like *pika-* are used in Vedic texts in connection with accepted rites, and there can be no question of any conflict between two possible meanings of such words, so that the only senses in which they are used are indeed accepted by dint of their not conflicting with authority.³⁶ Śabara considers two possibilities in connection with such terms. Since they are not used by Āryas, one might resort to etymological and grammatical explanations to arrive at meanings for them as derived from particular verbal bases by means of affixes, or one could simply accept that the meaning of each such word is the one in which Mlecchas use the term.³⁷ As a preliminary position, it is maintained that one must resort to meanings posited on the basis of etymological explanation, since, as has been said, the usage of śiṣṭas is authoritative, not the lore of non-śiṣṭas, and, in addition, non-śiṣṭas lack expertise concerning what meanings pertain to words.³⁸ The position accepted as final, however, is that in such cases the usage of Mlecchas has to be accepted: One should understand whatever meaning is given by Mlecchas to words like *pika-*, though such meanings are not normally understood for the terms among śiṣṭas; this does not conflict with any authority, so that it is not proper to reject it. Moreover, remarks Śabara, śiṣṭa usage is authoritative with respect to what is not known through the senses. As for the claim that only śiṣṭas have expertise with respect to determining the meanings of words, this may be true, but Mlecchas are even more expert in matters of cultivating and binding birds.³⁹

3.7.3. Obviously, there was a time at which words like *pika-*, *nema-*, which occurred in Vedic texts, hence could not be ruled out of court, came to be used normally only by non-Sanskritic speakers. Yet the śiṣṭas had to grant Mlecchas not only the right to use such words in particular meanings but also authority in determining the meanings of these words as found in Vedic texts. Thus we do not find merely interaction between śiṣṭas and Mlecchas in a society where the former could and did use non-Sanskritic forms under appropriate circumstances; the usage of Mlecchas had to be given status, albeit in a fairly limited sphere, with respect to the very Vedic lore of which the śiṣṭas were the guardians. And these very śiṣṭas themselves did indeed have occasion to use speech that was "corrupt", witness the behavior of the sages about whom Patañjali relates a story (see 3.5).

4. The example of the Asuras vanquished because they used barbaric speech forms in a ritual context (see 3.3, 3.5) is simply an instance on the supramundane level of something that happens to ordinary speakers: As they gain merit (*dharmāḥ*) from the knowledge and use of correct speech forms, so do they acquire demerit (*adharmāḥ*) from the knowledge and use of incorrect, corrupt speech.⁴⁰ Indeed, remarks Patañjali, any person who knows correct speech forms also knows incorrect ones and will thereby acquire greater demerit than merit, since for any given correct term such as *go-* (nom. sg. *gauḥ*) 'cow' there are several incorrect vernacular ones, such as *gāvī*, *goṇī*, *gotā*, and *gopotalikā*.⁴¹ The situation where such corruptions are necessarily to be avoided is the ritual, mantras involved in which must be uttered absolutely correctly if they are to be acceptable and effective.

4.1. Now, given that Sanskritic speakers are indeed allowed to use vernaculars without undesired consequences except in ritual usage, the scope of the pure Sanskrit speech is obviously quite reduced. Indeed, Pāṇinīyas recognize that vernacular usage is predominant (see note 41). A corollary of this is that, if the use of pure Sanskritic speech is to retain a status, it should have attributed to it in ordinary discourse the same sort of power that it has in ritual. For it cannot be the case that such speech serves merely the purpose of communication, since this is normally carried out through vernaculars, even by

speakers of the elevated language. From very early on, Pāṇinīyas do in fact reach this conclusion, and they draw parallels between restrictions made with respect to language usage and restrictions made in other spheres of behavior to ensure merit. For example, food is eaten in order to allay hunger, and this can be done with any sort of food, including dog meat. In the sphere of daily behavior, a restriction is formulated, whereby only certain foods may be eaten, others not, so that one is forbidden from eating the domestic fowl or pigs.⁴² In the sphere of ritual, it is said that the sacrificial pole to which an animal is tied should be made of Bilva or Khadira wood.⁴³ A sacrificial pole is used to tie up an animal that is to be immolated, and a sacrificer could use any kind of wood to tie up the animal, and he could put the pole upright or not. A restriction is formulated according to which the pole is to be of Bilva or Khadira wood.⁴⁴ Again, in the course of a rite, the Agnīdh officiant is supposed to heat up potsherds in which offerings will be heated by covering them with coals, and as he covers them the Agnīdh is supposed to utter the mantra *bhṛgūṇām aṅgirasām tāpasā tapyadhvam* (Vājasaneyisaṛṇhitā 1.18) 'Heat up with the ascetic heat of the Bhṛgu, of the Aṅgiras.'⁴⁵ As Patañjali remarks, the officiant addresses the potsherds with this mantra after he puts them on the fire, although even without the mantra the fire, whose very action is to burn, would heat them. A restriction is provided, whereby the act thus performed produces the good results desired, felicity.⁴⁶ Similarly, both a correct speech form and an incorrect one --- such as *gauḥ* or *gāvī* --- produces in a hearer the same understanding of a meaning, but a restriction is made for the sake of merit, whereby one is to express a meaning with a correct speech form, not with an incorrect one; if this is done, it produces desired felicity.⁴⁷ Indeed, there is an old tradition, alluded to by Patañjali, according to which one correct speech form properly used is a wish-granting cow in heaven.⁴⁸

4.2. Centuries later, Bhartr̥hari, acknowledged as the greatest systematic philosopher of language mediaeval India produced, takes note of two positions concerning correct and incorrect speech forms such as *gauḥ* and *gāvī*. According to some, an incorrect form signifies indirectly through inference: upon hearing a form like *gāvī*, a Sanskrit speaker infers the

corresponding correct form *gauḥ*, which alone is related with a meaning as its signifier (*vācakaḥ*). Others maintain that there is no distinction between the two as signifiers, both being equally capable of signifying a meaning, but that a restriction is made with respect to merit and sin (*puṇyapāpayoḥ*):⁴⁹ The use of correct speech alone has the effect of producing merit for a speaker.

4.3. In the Indian context, the ultimate good to which any one acquiring merit can aspire is release from the cycle of births and union with an ultimate being. Quite early on, moreover, grammarians not only concerned themselves with the formal description of Sanskrit and the details of how a grammar operates to carry this out but also with a philosophical-religious aspect of language associated with such release and union. In the introductory section to the *Mahābhāṣya*, Patañjali gives a grammarian's exegesis of a famous Vedic verse: *catvāri śṛṅgā trāyo asya pādā dvé śīrṣe saptā hāstāso asya | trīdhā baddhó vṛṣabhó roravīti mahó devó mártiyāṃ ā viveśa*.⁵⁰ Patañjali's exegesis is as follows: The four horns spoken of are the four major classes of speech units: nouns, verb forms, preverbs, and particles. The three feet are the three time divisions: past, future, and current. The two heads are the two aspects which speech has: It is eternal and susceptible of production.⁵¹ The seven hands are the seven nominal endings (*vibhaktayaḥ*).⁵² When the verse speaks of the roaring bull being bound in three places, the allusion is to the three general places where the breath goes in producing speech: the chest, the throat, and the head (i.e., the vault of the oral cavity).⁵³ Finally, the great god that is said to enter mortal beings is speech (*śabdaḥ*): we should study grammar in order to attain union with this great god.⁵⁴

4.4. The *Mahābhāṣya*'s interpretation of *Ṛgveda* 4.58.3, with its image of speech as the great god with whom one gains union through studying grammar, exerted great influence. In particular, this image is incorporated into Bhartṛhari's exposition, in the *Vākyapadīya* and his autocommentary thereon, of his philosophical position, intimately linked with grammar, according to which the ultimate being is brahma in the form of speech (*śabdabrahma*). In his commentary on *Vākyapadīya* 1.122 (edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer [Pune: Deccan College, 1965], p. 201), Bhartṛhari explicitly cites the *Ṛgvedic* verse.

In the words of the Vākyapadīya kārīkā itself (*api prayoktur ātmānam śabdāntaravasthitam | prāhur mahāntam ṛṣabham yena sāyujyam iṣyate*), the self of a speaker (*prayoktur ātmānam*) is said (*prāhuḥ* '... say') to be a great bull (*mahāntam ṛṣabham*), speech (*śabdāntaravasthitam*) situated within (*antaravasthitam*) and with which union is desired (*yena sāyujyam iṣyate*). According to Bhartṛhari's general philosophical framework --- which is based essentially on Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya and later sources from which he cites --- the explanation of correct speech forms by means of a grammatical system is a saṁskāra, not merely a derivational explanation but also a purification, whereby speech is cleansed of the impurities of incorrect speech forms. And one who knows grammar and uses correct forms thereby practices a type of yoga which gains him merit, felicity, and ultimate union with the absolute being.⁵⁵

5. There can be no doubt that one of the major sources for the sharp awareness early Indo-Aryan settlers in India experienced about language was their encountering non-Āryas who differed from them with respect to their speech as well as in other ways. There also can be no serious doubt that, as scholars generally have accepted, Sanskritic Indo-Aryan speakers paid enormous attention to the formal aspects of speech in order to keep their liturgical texts free from corruptions. Ultimately, these factors and the attitudes they encouraged resulted not only in a culture which distinguished sharply between correct Sanskritic speech and other linguistic types and in which formal grammar was cultivated to a degree of sophistication hardly found elsewhere, but also one in which grammar could be and was elevated to the level of a philosophical-religious system on a par with such systems as the Nyāya school of logic, Jainism, or various forms of Buddhism and Vedānta.⁵⁶ As in such systems as Nyāya or Vedānta, moreover, the ultimate goal is attainment of the supreme good (*niḥśreyasam*), so that grammar also became part of a soteriological system, with linguistic usage a means to acquiring merit and the ultimate good. In this respect, the Indian attitude towards language is probably unique.

¹The most elaborate philosophical system involving grammar, speech, and soteriology is that elaborated by Bhartrhari, whose views are based on positions already espoused by Kātyāyana and Patañjali, centuries earlier; see most recently G. Cardona, *Pāṇini, his work and its traditions : volume I: Background and introduction* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988), pp. 629-646 (referred to below as 'Cardona 1988'), and, for bibliographical references, G. Cardona, *Pāṇini, a survey of research* (The Hague: Mouton, 1976, reprinted 1980, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), pp. 256, 299-300. For a recent consideration of major passages dealing with attitudes towards language in ancient India, see also M. M. Deshpande, *Sociolinguistic Attitudes in India* (Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, 1979), pp. 1-21. I am grateful to Wilhelm Halbfass for his comments on a draft of this paper.

²Darius, Naqš-i-Rustam a 8-15 (similarly, Susa e 8-14).

³Xerxes, Persepolis h 6-13.

⁴Darius, Behistan IV.88-89: *θātīy Dārayavauš Xšāyaθiya vasnā Auramazdāha iyam dipīmaiy tyām adam akunavam patisam ariyā āha* 'Says king Darius: by the will of Ahuramazdah is this inscription of mine that I made, and it was in Arya.'

⁵Sanskrit *dāsyu-* is cognate with Iranian *dahyu-*, which refers to a large geographical area (see the Old Persian citations in section 2) and in Avestan is also modified by *airya-*. The term has undergone a semantic shift in Indo-Aryan. Concerning the conflicts between Āryas and non-Āryas, the references and discussions given in A. A. Macdonell's and A. Berriedale Keith's *Vedic index of names and subjects* (London: John Murray, 1912, reprinted 1958, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass) under **Ārya, Dasyu, Dāsa** (pp. 64-65, 347-349, 356-358) are still valuable and judicious, even if in need of some updating. More recently, Vedic saṁhitā and brāhmaṇa passages in which *dāsyu-* and *dāsā-* are used have been studied by W. E. Hale, *Asura- in Early Vedic Religion* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986), pp. 146-169. The most recent pertinent contribution I know of is Asko Parpola, 'The coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the cultural identity of the Dāsas', *Studia Orientalia* 64: 195-302 (1988). I received his article, through the generosity of the author, in May of 1989, after I had completed and presented my own paper.

⁶Ṛgveda 1.51.8ab: *vi jānīhy āryān yé ca dāsyavo barhiṣmate randhayā śāsād avratān*. In the next verse (1.51.9a: *ānuvratāyā randhāyannapāvratān*), Indra is spoken of as subjecting those who have no vow of performing rites to one who follows such a vow.

⁷Nirukta 2.2: ... *athāpi prakṛtaya eva ikeṣu bhāṣyante vikṛtaya ekeṣu / śavatir gatikarmā kambojeṣv eva bhāṣyate ... vikāram asyāryeṣu bhāṣyate śava iti / dātir lavanārthe prācyeṣu dātram udīcyeṣu*. As shown, Yāska gives a second example: the verb *dā* 'cut' is used among easterners, but northerners use the derivate *dātra* 'sickle'. It is not necessary to consider here details concerning Yāska's use of the terms *prakṛti-* and *vikṛti-* in this passage.

⁸Mahābhāṣya (edited by F. Kielhorn, third edition, revised by K. V. Abhyankar [Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962-1972]) volume I, page 9, line 24- page 10, line 1: *etasminnatimahati śabdasya prayogaviṣaye te te śabdās tatra tatra niyataviṣayā drśyante / tadyathā śavatir gatikarmā kambojeṣv eva bhāṣito bhavati vikāra enam āryā bhāṣante śava iti / hammatih surāṣṭreṣu ramhatih prācyamadhyeṣu gamim eva tv āryāḥ prayuñjate / dātir lavanārthe prācyeṣu dātram udīcyeṣu*. I cannot

take up here details about differences between this passage and the related passage from the Nirukta (see note 7).

⁹In Romanized citations from the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, I mark only anudātta vowels, by means of underlined symbols, in accordance with the traditional method of transmitting this text. I thus depart from the transcription generally adopted by western scholars and which reflects Weber's theory that the mark under a vowel, elsewhere used to symbolize low pitch, is used here to symbolize a high pitch.

¹⁰Sāyaṇa, commenting on the pertinent part of the passage just cited: ... *he arayaḥ he araya ity uccārayitum aśaktā he 'lavo he 'lava iti vadantaḥ parābhūtāḥ*.

¹¹Cf. Pāṇini 8.2.84-85: *dūrād dhūte ca, haiheprayoge haihyoḥ*, which provide that the last vowel of an utterance used in calling someone from afar is prolated and high-pitched and that, if the interjections *hai*, *he* are used, their vowels have these properties. According to 6.1.125: *plutaḥprgrhyā acinīyam*, prolated vowels remain in their original form before other vowels. On the other hand, 6.1.109: *eṇaḥ padāntād ati* is a phonological rule whereby the first vowel of sequences *-ea-*, *-oa-* alone remains. See note 10.

¹²See recently, Cardona 1988 (note 1) pp. 631-632 (section 828), where references are also given to commentaries in which the faults found in *he 'layo he 'layaḥ* are explained.

¹³See recently, Cardona 1988 pp. 639-643 (section 834).

¹⁴Kaiyaṭa reads *prāg ādarśāt*, and Nāgeśa identifies Ādarśa with a mountain in Kurukṣetra; others have interpreted *prāg adarśanāt*, referring to the areas east of the place where the Sarasvatī river disappears.

¹⁵Nāgeśa identifies this with Prayāga.

¹⁶Nāgeśa identifies this with the Vindhya.

¹⁷That is, enough to last a particular time, specified differently in various texts. These details are not crucial to the present discussion.

¹⁸Similar descriptions of *śiṣṭas* are given in other texts. For example, in the Baudhāyanadharmasūtra (1.1.5-6: *śiṣṭāḥ khalu vigatamatsarā nirahaṅkārāḥ kumbhīdhānyā alolupā dambhadarpalobhamohakrodhavarjitāḥ, dharmenādighato yeṣāṃ vedasaparibarhaṇaḥ ...*) they are described as men without jealousy or egoism, who have at any time only so much grain as will fit in a small pot, are not greedy, do not wish to deceive, are without ostentation, craving, confusion, or anger; men who have acquired a knowledge of the Veda with its supporting texts through merit.

¹⁹Manusmṛti 2.23: *kṛṣṇasāras tu carati mṛgo yatra svabhāvataḥ / sa jñeyo yajñīyo mlecchas tv ataḥ paraḥ*.

²⁰Viṣṇusmṛti 84.4: *cāturvarṇyavyavasthānaṃ yasmin deśe na vidyate / sa mlecchadeśo vijñeya āryāvarttas tataḥ paraḥ*. For additional information on Āryāvartta, see P. V. Kane, *A History of Dharmaśāstra*, volume II part I (second edition, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1974) pp. 11-18. The geographic boundaries specified in different texts vary, and, in addition to Āryāvartta, authors recognize areas such as Brahmāvartta 'the abode of Brāhmaṇas' (Manusmṛti 2.17).

²¹In a well-known passage from his commentary on Manusmṛti 2.23, Medhātithi remarks that the description means that Mlecchas generally are found in these places, not that they are characterized by these places (*prāyeṇa hyeṣu deśeṣu mlecchā bhavanti na tv anena deśasambandhena mlecchā lakṣyante ...*). He goes on to note that if Mlecchas somehow were to overwhelm an area like Brahmāvartta and establish themselves there, this area would then be *mlecchadeśaḥ* (*tatra yadi kathaṅcid brahmāvarttādi-*

deśam api mleccchā ākrameyuḥ tatraivāvasthānaṁ kuryur bhaved evāsau mleccchadeśaḥ). Earlier, in his commentary on Manusmṛti 2.22, Medhātithi explains the term *āryāvartta* as designating the place where Āryas are born repeatedly (*āryā āvartante tatra punaḥ punar udbhavanti*) and goes on to say that, although Mlecchas may repeatedly make incursions into this area they do not stay there at length (*ākramyākramyāpi na ciram tatra mleccchāḥ sthātāro bhavanti*). There is, of course, no contradiction between this and what Medhātithi says in his comments on 2.23: If in fact the Mlecchas succeeded not only in making incursions but also in establishing themselves permanently, then the place in question could indeed be named *mlecchadeśa*.

²²See Hans H. Hock and R. Pandharipande, 'The sociolinguistic position of Sanskrit in pre-Muslim India South Asia,' *Studies in Language Learning* (University of Illinois) 1:2 (1976): 106-138.

²³That is, 'Let there befall us whatever will'.

²⁴Mahābhāṣya I.11.10-14: *yad apy ucyata ācāre niyama iti yājñe karmaṇi sa niyamo 'nyatrāniyamaḥ / evaṁ hi śrūyate/ yarvāṇas tarvāṇo nāma ṛṣayo babhūvuḥ pratyakṣadharmāṇaḥ parāparajñā viditaveditavyā adhigatayāthātathyāḥ/ te tatra bhavanto yad vā nas tad vā na iti prayoktavye yar vā ṇas tar vā na iti prayuñjate/ yājñe punaḥ karmaṇi nāpabhāṣante / taiḥ punar asurair yājñe karmaṇy apabhāṣitam tatas te parābhūtāḥ /* This passage has been the object of some discussion, centering upon whether the legend in question concerns two individuals named Yarvāṇas and Tarvāṇas; see recently K. Kunjuni Raja, 'Yarvāṇastarvāṇa', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* LXVIII (1987): 537-539.. My own opinion is that this concerns a group of sages to whom the labels *yarvāṇaḥ*, *tarvāṇaḥ* were applied because of the way they spoke, just as Śākāra in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is called this because of the way he speaks.

²⁵Cf. Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 5.2.4.11: *athendratūrīyam / āgneyo 'ṣṭākāpālaḥ puroḍāśo bhavati vāruṇo yavamayaś carū raudro gāvedhukaś carur anuḍuhyai vahalāyā aindram dadhi*. This concerns the Indratūrīya rite, in which the fourth offering is made to Indra; an offering of cakes cooked in eight potsherds is made to Agni, a porridge of yava is offered to Varuṇa, a wheat porridge to Rudra, and to Indra yogurt from the milk of a humped cow.

²⁶Cf. Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa 1.7.9.4: *vārāḥī upānāhāv upamuñcate*. This involves part of the Rājasūya rite, during which the king puts on (*upamuñcate*) the sandals, thus avoiding direct contact with the earth, which would take away his lustre.

²⁷Cf. Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa 3.8.20.4: *citē 'gnāv ādhi vaitasē kátē 'śvam cinoti* 'He makes the horse lie down on a mat made of vetasa (spread) on the place where the fire is heaped up.' This occurs during the Aśvamedha rite.

²⁸Śābarabhāṣya (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 97.2 [1970] p. 139-140): *yavamayaś caruḥ vārāḥī upānahau vaitase kaṭe prājāpatyān samcinotīti yavarāhavetasaśabdān samāmananti / tatra kecid dīrghaśūkeṣu yavaśabdān prayuñjate kecit priyaṅguṣu varāhaśabdān kecit sūkare kecit kṛṣṇaśakunau vetasaśabdān kecit vañjulake kecid jambvām / tatrobhaythā padārthāvagamād vikalpaḥ*. Citations in notes 30, 31, 33, 37-39 are from the volume indicated above.

²⁹Mīmāṃsāsūtra 1.3.4.9: *śāstrasthā vā tannimittatvāt*. The term *śāstrasthā* is subject to different interpretations: It can be interpreted as a nominative singular feminine modifying *vīpratipattiḥ* 'differing understanding' or as a nominative plural masculine (*śāstrasthā* for *śāstrasthāḥ* before the *v-* of *vā*) referring to men whose usage is based on *śāstra*. The two possible interpretations are mentioned by commentators; for example, Kumārila in his *Tantravārttika* (ĀĀSS 97.2, pp. 140, 141) remarks: The understanding based on *śāstra* is stronger; the everyday understanding is gotten also through metaphoric usage (*śāstrasthā tannimittatvāt pratipattir balīyasī / laukikī pratipattir hi gauṇatvenāpi nīyate*); alternatively, the understanding that depends on men who are set in *śāstra* is to be considered authoritative, since such men are more worthy of trust (*śāstrasthāḥ puruṣā ye vā pratipattis tadāśrayā / pramāṇtvena mantavyā sapratyayatarā hi te*). Śabara adopts the second interpretation. References to the *Tantravārttika* in notes 33, 35 are from the volume indicated above.

³⁰Śābarabhāṣya p. 141: *vāśabdaḥ pakṣam vyāvartayati / yavaśabdo yadi dīrghaśūkeṣu sādṛśyāt priyaṅguṣu bhaviṣyati / yadi priyaṅguṣu sādṛśyād yaveṣu kim sādṛśyam / pūrvasasye kṣiṇe bhavanti dīrghaśūkāḥ priyaṅgavaś ca etat tayoh sādṛśyam*.

³¹Śābarabhāṣya pp. 141-142: *kaḥ punar atra niścayaḥ / yaḥ śāstrasthānām sa śabdārthaḥ / ke śāstrasthāḥ / śiṣṭāḥ / teṣām avicchinnā smṛtiḥ śabdeṣu vedeṣu ca / tena śiṣṭā nimittam śrutismṛtyavadhāraṇe*.

³²Cf. Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 3.6.1.10: *tasmād yatrānyā oṣadhayo mlāyanti tad ete modamānā vardhante*.

³³Śābarabhāṣya p. 142: *te hyevaṃ samāmananti yavamayeṣu karambhapātreṣu vihiteṣu vākyaśeṣam --- yatrānyā oṣadhayo mlāyante 'thaithe modamānā ivottiṣṭhanti (cf. note 31) iti dīrghaśūkān yavān darśayati vedāḥ / vede darśanād avicchinnapāraparyo dīrghaśūkeṣu yavaśabda iti gamyate / tasmāt priyaṅguṣu gauṇaḥ*. It does not matter for the present discussion that, as Kumārila notes (*Tantravārttika* p. 141), the rite to which Śabara refers here is not the same as the one associated with the Brāhmaṇa passage alluded to.

³⁴Kumārila assumes that Śabara in fact does not do this.

³⁵*Tantravārttika* p. 143: *tasmād anyad udāhṛtya vicāryam idam īdṛsam / yatra vipratipattiḥ syād āryamlecchapravogajāḥ ... tasmāt pīlvādiśabdānām vṛkṣahastyādibodhanai samā vipratipattiḥ syād āryamlecchapravogataḥ*. It is not necessary to deal here with the precise arguments Kumārila gives for his interpretation of what Śabara says and to justify his own interpretation.

³⁶JS 1.3.5.10: *coditam tu pratiyeta virodhāt pramāṇena*.

³⁷Śābarabhāṣya p. 149: *atha yāñ śabdān āryā na kasmimścid artha ācaranti mlecchās tu kasmimścit prayuñjate yathā pikanemasatatāmarasādiśabdās teṣu sañdehaḥ kim nigamaniruktavyākaraṇavaśena dhātuto 'rtho kalpayitavya uta yatra mlecchā ācaranti sa śabdārtha īti*.

³⁸Śābarabhāṣya pp. 149-150: *śiṣṭācārasya prāmāṇyam uktaṃ nāśiṣṭasmṛteḥ / tasmān nigamādivaśenārthakalpanā nigamādīnām caivam arthavattā bhaviṣyati / lanabhiyogaś ca śabdārtheṣv aśiṣṭānām abhiyogaś cetareṣām / tasmād dhātuto 'rthaḥ kalpayitavyaḥ*. The élite Sanskritic people were more expert in matters concerning what words meant from two points of view: As maintainers of Vedic tradition, they were privy to knowledge concerning what these texts meant; in addition, *śiṣṭas* were learned in *vedāṅgas*, including grammar.

³⁹Śābarabhaṣya p. 151: *yat tu śiṣṭācāraḥ pramāṇam iti tat pratyakṣānavagate 'rthe / yat tv abhiyuktāḥ śabdārtheṣu śiṣṭā iti tatrocyaṭe abhiyuktatarāḥ pakṣiṇām poṣaṇe bandhane ca mlecchāḥ.*

⁴⁰In his sixth vārttika cited in the introductory section of the Mahābhāṣya, at the beginning of the section concerning whether merit is associated with the knowledge or use of correct speech, Kātyāyana says *jñāne dharma iti cet tathādharmāḥ* 'If one maintains that there is merit in the knowledge (of correct speech forms), then there is also demerit.' Patañjali goes on to explain how this is so; see below with note 41.

⁴¹Mahābhāṣya I.10.6-9: *jñāne dharma iti cet tathādharmāḥ prāpnoti / yo hi śabdāñ jñānty apaśabdān apy asau jñānti / yathaiṣa śabdajñāne dharma evam apaśabdajñāne 'py adharmāḥ / athavā bhūyān adharmāḥ prāpnoti / bhūyānso 'paśabdā alpīyānsaḥ śabdāḥ / ekaikasya śabdasya bahavo 'pabhrañśāḥ / tadyathā gaur ity asya gāvī goṇī gotā gopotaliketyevamādayo 'pabhrañśāḥ.* Patañjali's statement implies, of course, that any speaker of the pure Sanskrit language was also a speaker of a vernacular, so that he necessarily knew vernacular "corruptions" (*apabhrañśāḥ*) of correct Sanskrit forms.

⁴²Mahābhāṣya I.8.10-12: *loke tāvd abhakṣyo grāmyakukkuṭo 'bhakṣyo grāmyasūkara ity ucyaṭe / bhakṣyaṃ ca nāma kṣutpratighātārtham upādīyate / śakyaṃ cānena śvamāmsādibhir api kṣut pratihantum / tatra niyamaḥ kriyate idam bhakṣyam idam abhakṣyam iti.* Various texts list five sorts of five-nailed animals that may be eaten; e.g., Rāmāyaṇa 4.17.34, Yajñavalkyasmṛti 1.177, Manusmṛti 5.19.

⁴³Cf. Aitareyabrāhmaṇa 2.1: *khādiraṃ yūpaṃ kurvīta svargakāmaḥ / khādireṇa vai yūpena devāḥ svargaṃ lokam ajayāms tathaiṣa yajamānaḥ khādireṇa yūpena svargaṃ lokam jayati / bailvaṃ yūpaṃ kurvītānādyakāmaḥ puṣṭikāmaḥ / samāṃ samāṃ vai bilvo gṛbhītas tadannādyasya rūpam ā mūlāc chākhābhir anucitas tat puṣṭeḥ /* '(A sacrificer) who desires heaven should make a sacrificial pole of Khadira wood. As is known, the gods won the world of heaven with a sacrificial pole made of Khadira wood. In the same way, a sacrificer wins the world of heaven with a sacrificial pole made of Khadira wood. ... who wishes food to eat, who wishes to thrive, should make a sacrificial pole of Bilva wood. As is known, the Bilva tree yearly is overtaken with fruit: this is the sign of edible food. It is filled with branches up to its roots: this is the sign of prospering.'

⁴⁴Mahābhāṣya I.8.16-18: *tathā bailvaḥ khādiro vā yūpaḥ syād ity ucyaṭe / yūpaś ca nāma paśvanubandhārtham upādīyate / śakyaṃ canena kiñcid eva kāṣṭham ucchṛityānucchṛitya vā paśur anubandhum / tatra niyamaḥ kriyate.*

⁴⁵Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra 2.4.37: *bhṛgūṇām ity aṅgārair abhyūhati* 'Saying, "bhṛgūṇām ...", he covers them with embers.'

⁴⁶Mahābhāṣya I.8.18-20: *tathāgne kapālān adhiśṛityābhimantrayate bhṛgūṇām aṅgirasāṃ tapasā tapyadhvam iti / antareṇāpi mantram agnir dahanakarmā kapālāni santāpayati / tatra niyamaḥ kriyate evaṃ kriyamāṇam abhyudaykāri bhavātīti.*

⁴⁷Mahābhāṣya I.8.20-22: *evam ihāpi samānāyām arthagatau śabdena cāpaśabdena ca dharmaniyamaḥ kriyate śabdenaivārtho 'bhidheyo nāpśabdeneti evaṃ kriyamāṇam abhyudaykāri bhavātīti.*

⁴⁸Mahābhāṣya on 6.1.84 (IV.402): *... śabdasyāpi jñāne prayoge prayojanam uktam / kim / ekaḥ śabdaḥ samyag jñātaḥ śāstrānvitāḥ supryuktaḥ svarge loke kāmadhug bhavati* 'A purpose has been stated for

knowing and using correct speech. What? A single correct speech form, precisely known in accordance with grammar, properly used, is a wish-granting cow in heaven.⁴⁹

⁴⁹Vākyapadīya 3.3.30: *asādhur anumānena vācakaḥ kaiścid iṣyate / vācatvāviśeṣe vā niyamaḥ puṇyapāpayoḥ.*

⁵⁰Rgveda 4.58.3. Other interpretations of the verse need not concern us here.

⁵¹In his *Dīpikā*, Bhartṛhari gives various possible points of view from which speech is considered thus. First, some maintain that speech is something eternal, while others consider it something that is produced, hence not eternal. On the other hand, some interpret the opposition in question to hold between speech genera and individual tokens. Still another alternative is that the opposition is between non-eternal sounds as the manifestors of eternal speech units that are to be manifested thereby. *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* (fasciule IV, āhnikā 1, edited by J. Bronkhorst [Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1987]) 12.2-3: *kaiścin nityo 'yam iti dṛṣṭaḥ kaiścid anitya iti / athavā jātir vyaktiś ceti / athavā sphoṭo dhvaniś ca.* In his *Pradīpa* (edited by Vedavrata [Rohatak: Gurukul Jhajjar, 1962-1963], I.16), Kaiyaṭa adopts the third of these alternatives: *nityaḥ kāryaś ceti vyaṅgyavyañjakabhedena.* See also 4.4.

⁵²Kaiyaṭa remarks (*Pradīpa* I.17) that the interpretation noted results in leaving out verb endings, also called *vibhakti*, so that they take the *Mahābhāṣya*'s *sapta vibhaktayaḥ* 'seven vibhaktis' to refer to the six major participants in the bringing about of actions --- agent, object, instrument, locus, apādāna and sampradāna --- together with a residual set signified by adnominal genitives: *sapta vibhaktayaḥ / supa ity arthaḥ / kecit tu tūnām aparigrahaprasaṅgāt saha śeṣeṇa sapta kārakāṇi vibhaktiśabdābhidheyānīti vyācakṣate.* Details about this need not be considered here.

⁵³*Mahābhāṣya* I.3.19-20: *tridhā baddhas triṣu sthāneṣu baddha urasi kaṅṭhe śirasīti.*

⁵⁴*Mahābhāṣya* I.3.21-22: *maho devo martyaṃ ā viveśeti / mahān devaḥ śabdaḥ / martyā maraṇadharmāṇo manuṣyāḥ / tān a viveśa / mahatā devena naḥ sāmyaṃ yathā syād ity adhyeyaṃ vyākaraṇam.*

⁵⁵On *saṃskāra* and Bhartṛhari's position, see recently Cardona 1988 pp. 646-655 (838-844).

⁵⁶Thus, one of the darśanas included in Mādhava-Sāyaṇa's fourteenth-century treatise *Sarvadarśana-saṃgraha* is the Pāṇinidarśana. It is worth emphasizing that formal grammatical considerations and philosophical stands influenced each other. Thus, Bhartṛhari maintains that the true linguistic unit is the utterance (*vākyam*), which is indivisible and linked to an equally indivisible meaning, although he also must admit certain difficulties with this position. In effect, Bhartṛhari upholds ideals of sentential unity within a philosophical system where the ultimate indivisible unit is śabdabrahma. See recently, G. Cardona, *Linguistic Analysis and Some Indian Traditions* (Pandit Shripad Shastri Deodhar Memorial Lectures, first series [Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1983]), pp. 152-153.

Previous Issues

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
1	Nov. 1986	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	The Need for an Alphabetically Arranged General Usage Dictionary of Mandarin Chinese: A Review Article of Some Recent Dictionaries and Current Lexicographical Projects	31
2	Dec. 1986	Andrew Jones <i>Hiroshima</i>	The Poetics of Uncertainty in Early Chinese Literature	45
3	March 1987	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	A Partial Bibliography for the Study of Indian Influence on Chinese Popular Literature	iv, 214
4	Nov. 1987	Robert M. Sanders <i>University of Hawaii</i>	The Four Languages of “Mandarin”	14
5	Dec. 1987	Eric A. Havelock <i>Vassar College</i>	Chinese Characters and the Greek Alphabet	4
6	Jan. 1988	J. Marshall Unger <i>University of Hawaii</i>	Computers and Japanese Literacy: Nihonzin no Yomikaki Nôryoku to Konpyuta	13
7	Jan. 1988	Chang Tsung-tung <i>Goethe-Universität</i>	Indo-European Vocabulary in Old Chinese	i, 56
8	Feb. 1988	various	Reviews (I)	ii, 39
9	Dec. 1988	Soho Machida <i>Daitoku-ji, Kyoto</i>	Life and Light, the Infinite: A Historical and Philological Analysis of the Amida Cult	46
10	June 1989	Pratoom Angurarohita <i>Chulalongkorn University Bangkok</i>	Buddhist Influence on the Neo- Confucian Concept of the Sage	31
11	July 1989	Edward Shaughnessy <i>University of Chicago</i>	Western Cultural Innovations in China, 1200 BC	8

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
12	Aug. 1989	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	The Contributions of T'ang and Five Dynasties Transformation Texts (<i>p'ien-wen</i>) to Later Chinese Popular Literature	71
13	Oct. 1989	Jiaosheng Wang <i>Shanghai</i>	The Complete Ci-Poems of Li Qingzhao: A New English Translation	xii, 122
14	Dec. 1989	various	Reviews (II)	69
15	Jan. 1990	George Cardona <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	On Attitudes Toward Language in Ancient India	19
16	March 1990	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Three Brief Essays Concerning Chinese Tocharistan	16
17	April 1990	Heather Peters <i>University Museum of Philadelphia</i>	Tattooed Faces and Stilt Houses: Who Were the Ancient Yue?	28
18	May 1990	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	a. Two Non-Tetragraphic Northern Sinitic Languages b. Implications of the Soviet Dungan Script for Chinese Language Reform c. Who Were the Gyámi?	28
19	June 1990	Bosat Man <i>Nalanda</i>	Backhill/Peking/Beijing	6
20	Oct. 1990	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Introduction and Notes for a Translation of the Ma-wang-tui MSS of the <i>Lao Tzu</i>	68

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
21	Dec. 1990	Philippa Jane Benson <i>Carnegie Mellon University</i>	Two Cross-Cultural Studies on Reading Theory	9, 13
22	March 1991	David Moser <i>University of Michigan</i>	Slips of the Tongue and Pen in Chinese	45
23	April 1991	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Tracks of the Tao, Semantics of Zen	10
24	Aug. 1991	David A. Utz <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Language, Writing, and Tradition in Iran	24
25	Aug. 1991	Jean DeBernardi <i>University of Alberta</i>	Linguistic Nationalism: The Case of Southern Min	22 + 3 figs.
26	Sept. 1991	JAO Tsung-i <i>Chinese University of Hong Kong</i>	Questions on the Origins of Writing Raised by the Silk Road	10
27	Aug. 1991	Victor H. Mair, ed. <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Schriftfestschrift: Essays in Honor of John DeFrancis on His Eightieth Birthday	ix, 245
28	Sept. 1991	ZHOU Youguang <i>State Language Commission, Peking</i>	The Family of Chinese Character- Type Scripts (Twenty Members and Four Stages of Development)	11
29	Sept. 1991	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	What Is a Chinese “Dialect/Topolect”? Reflections on Some Key Sino-English Linguistic Terms	31
30	Oct. 1991	M. V. Sofronov <i>Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Academy of Sciences, Moscow</i>	Chinese Philology and the Scripts of Central Asia	10
31	Oct. 1991	various	Reviews (III)	68

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
32	Aug. 1992	David McCraw <i>University of Hawaii</i>	How the Chinawoman Lost Her Voice	27
33	Sept. 1992	FENG Lide and Kevin Stuart <i>Chuankou No. 1 Middle School and Qinghai Education College</i>	Interethnic Contact on the Inner Asian Frontier: The Gangou People of Minhe County, Qinghai	34
34	Oct. 1992	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two Papers on Sinolinguistics 2. A Hypothesis Concerning the Origin of the Term <i>fanqie</i> (“Countertomy”) 3. East Asian Round-Trip Words 	13
35	Nov. 1992	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i> with an added note by Edwin G. Pulleyblank	Reviews (IV)	37
36	Feb. 1993	XU Wenkan <i>Hanyu Da Cidian editorial offices, Shanghai</i>	Hanyu Wailaici de Yuyuan Kaozheng he Cidian Bianzuan (Philological Research on the Etymology of Loanwords in Sinitic and Dictionary Compilation)	13
37	March 1993	Tanya Storch <i>University of New Mexico</i>	Chinese Buddhist Historiography and Orality	16
38	April 1993	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of <i>The Sutra of the Wise and the Foolish</i>	95
39	Aug. 1993	Jordan Paper <i>York University</i>	A Material Case for a Late Bering Strait Crossing Coincident with Pre-Columbian Trans-Pacific Crossings	17

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
40	Sept. 1993	Michael Carr <i>Center for Language Studies, Otaru University of Commerce</i>	<i>Tiao</i> -Fish through Chinese Dictionaries	68
41	Oct. 1993	Paul Goldin <i>Harvard University</i>	Miching Mallecho: The <i>Zhanguo</i> <i>ce</i> and Classical Rhetoric	27
42	Nov. 1993	Renchin-Jashe Yulshul <i>Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Kokonor (Qinghai)</i> and Kevin Stuart <i>Institute of Foreign Languages, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia</i>	Kham Tibetan Language Materials	39
43	Dec. 1993	MA Quanlin, MA Wanxiang, and MA Zhicheng <i>Xining</i> Edited by Kevin Stuart <i>Kokonor</i>	Salar Language Materials	72
44	Jan. 1994	Dolkun Kamberi <i>Columbia University</i>	The Three Thousand Year Old Charchan Man Preserved at Zaghunluq	15
45	May 1994	Mark Hansell <i>Carleton College</i>	<u>The Sino-Alphabet: The Assimilation of Roman Letters into the Chinese Writing System</u>	28
46	July 1994	various	Reviews (V)	2, 155
47	Aug. 1994	Robert S. Bauer <i>Mahidol University Salaya Nakornpathom, Thailand</i>	Sino-Tibetan *kolo “Wheel”	11
48	Sept. 1994	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Introduction and Notes for a Complete Translation of the <i>Chuang Tzu</i>	xxxiv, 110

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
49	Oct. 1994	Ludo Rocher <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Orality and Textuality in the Indian Context	28
50	Nov. 1994	YIN Binyong <i>State Language Commission and Institute for Applied Linguistics (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)</i>	Diyi ge Lading Zimu de Hanyu Pinyin Fang'an Shi Zenyang Chansheng de? [How Was the First Romanized Spelling System for Sinitic Produced?]	7
51	Nov. 1994	HAN Kangxin <i>Institute of Archeology Chinese Academy of Social Sciences</i>	The Study of Ancient Human Skeletons from Xinjiang, China	9 + 4 figs.
52	Nov. 1994	Warren A. Shibles <i>University of Wisconsin Whitewater</i>	Chinese Romanization Systems: IPA Transliteration	20
53	Nov. 1994	XU Wenkan <i>Editorial Offices of the Hanyu Da Cidian Shanghai</i>	Guanyu Tuhuoluoren de Qiyuan he Qianxi Wenti [On the Problem of the Origins and Migrations of the Tocharians]	11
54	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) <i>University of Toronto</i>	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Jegün Yogur	34
55	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) <i>University of Toronto</i>	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Dongxiang	34
56	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) <i>University of Toronto</i>	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Dagur	36
57	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) <i>University of Toronto</i>	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Monguor	31

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
58	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) <i>University of Toronto</i>	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Baoan	28
59	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart <i>Qinghai Junior Teachers College;</i> Limusishiden <i>Qinghai Medical College Attached Hospital, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)</i>	China's Monguor Minority: Ethnography and Folktales	i, I, 193
60	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart, Li Xuewei, and Shelear <i>Qinghai Junior Teachers College, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)</i>	China's Dagur Minority: Society, Shamanism, and Folklore	vii, 167
61	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart and Li Xuewei <i>Qinghai Junior Teachers College, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)</i>	Tales from China's Forest Hunters: Oroqen Folktales	iv, 59
62	Dec. 1994	William C. Hannas <i>Georgetown University</i>	Reflections on the "Unity" of Spoken and Written Chinese and Academic Learning in China	5
63	Dec. 1994	Sarah M. Nelson <i>University of Denver</i>	The Development of Complexity in Prehistoric North China	17
64	Jan. 1995	Arne Østmoe <i>Bangkok, Thailand, and Drøbak, Norway</i>	A Germanic-Tai Linguistic Puzzle	81, 6
65	Feb. 1995	Penglin Wang <i>Chinese University of Hong Kong</i>	Indo-European Loanwords in Altaic	28
66	March 1995	ZHU Qingzhi <i>Sichuan University and Peking University</i>	Some Linguistic Evidence for Early Cultural Exchange Between China and India	7

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
67	April 1995	David McCraw <i>University of Hawaii</i>	Pursuing Zhuangzi as a Rhymemaster: A Snark-Hunt in Eight Fits	38
68	May 1995	Ke Peng, Yanshi Zhu <i>University of Chicago and Tokyo, Japan</i>	New Research on the Origin of Cowries Used in Ancient China	i, 26
69	Jan. 1996	Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis, Keith Slater, <i>et al.</i> <i>Qinghai, Santa Barbara, etc.</i>	Language Materials of China's Monguor Minority: Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer	xi, 266
70	Feb. 1996	David Utz, Xinru Liu, <i>Taylor Carman, Bryan Van Norden, and the Editor Philadelphia, Vassar, etc.</i>	Reviews VI	93
71	March 1996	Erik Zürcher <i>Leiden University</i> Seishi Karashima <i>Soka University</i> Huanming Qin <i>Tang Studies Hotline</i>	Vernacularisms in Medieval Chinese Texts	31 + 11 + 8
72	May 1996	E. Bruce Brooks <i>University of Massachusetts</i>	The Life and Mentorship of Confucius	44
73	June 1996	ZHANG Juan, et al., and Kevin Stuart <i>Qinghai, Inner Mongolia, Shanxi, Henan, Liaoning</i>	Blue Cloth and Pearl Deer; Yogur Folklore	iii, 76
74	Jan. 1997	David Moser <i>University of Michigan & Beijing Foreign Studies University</i>	Covert Sexism in Mandarin Chinese	23
75	Feb. 1997	Haun Saussy <i>Stanford University</i>	The Prestige of Writing: Wen ² , Letter, Picture, Image, Ideography	40

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
76	Feb. 1997	Patricia Eichenbaum Karetzky <i>Bard College</i>	The Evolution of the Symbolism of the Paradise of the Buddha of Infinite Life and Its Western Origins	28
77	Jan. 1998	Daniel Hsieh <i>Purdue University</i>	The Origin and Nature of the “Nineteen Old Poems”	49
78	Feb. 1998	Narsu <i>Inner Mongolia College of Agriculture & Animal Husbandry</i> Kevin Stuart <i>Qinghai Junior Teachers’ College</i>	Practical Mongolian Sentences (With English Translation)	iii + 49 + ii + 66
79	March 1998	Dennis Grafflin <i>Bates College</i>	A Southeast Asian Voice in the Daodejing?	8
80	July 1998	Taishan Yu <i>Chinese Academy of Social Sciences</i>	A Study of Saka History	ii + 225
81	Sept. 1998	Hera S. Walker <i>Ursinus College (Philadelphia)</i>	Indigenous or Foreign?: A Look at the Origins of the Monkey Hero Sun Wukong	iv + 110
82	Sept. 1998	I. S. Gurevich <i>Russian Academy of Sciences</i>	A Fragment of a pien-wen(?) Related to the Cycle “On Buddha’s Life”	15
83	Oct. 1998	Minglang Zhou <i>University of Colorado at Boulder</i>	Tense/Aspect markers in Mandarin and Xiang dialects, and their contact	20
84	Oct. 1998	Ulf Jäger <i>Gronau/Westfalen, Germany</i>	The New Old Mummies from Eastern Central Asia: Ancestors of the Tocharian Knights Depicted on the Buddhist Wallpaintings of Kucha and Turfan? Some Circumstantial Evidence	9

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
85	Oct. 1998	Mariko Namba Walter <i>University of New England</i>	Tokharian Buddhism in Kucha: Buddhism of Indo-European Centum Speakers in Chinese Turkestan before the 10th Century C.E.	30
86	Oct. 1998	Jidong Yang <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Siba: Bronze Age Culture of the Gansu Corridor	18
87	Nov. 1998	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Canine Conundrums: Eurasian Dog Ancestor Myths in Historical and Ethnic Perspective	74
88	Dec. 1998	Saroj Kumar Chaudhuri <i>Aichi Gakusen University</i>	Siddham in China and Japan	9, 124
89	Jan. 1999	Alvin Lin <i>Yale University</i>	Writing Taiwanese: The Development of Modern Written Taiwanese	4 + 41 + 4
90	Jan. 1999	Victor H. Mair et al	Reviews VII [including review of The Original Analects]	2, 38
91	Jan. 1999	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Phonosymbolism or Etymology: The Case of the Verb “Cop”	28
92	Jan. 1999	Christine Louise Lin <i>Dartmouth College</i>	The Presbyterian Church in Taiwan and the Advocacy of Local Autonomy	xiii + 136
93	Jan. 1999	David S. Nivison <i>Stanford University</i>	The Key to the Chronology of the Three Dynasties: The “Modern Text” Bamboo Annals	iv + 68
94	March 1999	Julie Lee Wei <i>Hoover Institute</i>	Correspondence Between the Chinese Calendar Signs and the Phoenician Alphabet	65 + 6

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
95	May 1999	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	A Medieval, Central Asian Buddhist Theme in a Late Ming Taoist Tale by Feng Meng-lung	27
96	June 1999	E. Bruce Brooks <i>University of Massachusetts</i>	Alexandrian Motifs in Chinese Texts	14
97	Dec. 1999	LI Shuicheng <i>Peking University</i>	Sino-Western Contact in the Second Millennium BC	iv, 29
98	Jan. 2000	Peter Daniels, Daniel Boucher, and other authors	Reviews VIII	108
99	Feb. 2000	Anthony Barbieri-Low <i>Princeton University</i>	Wheeled Vehicles in the Chinese Bronze Age (c. 2000-741 BC)	v, 98 + 5 color plates
100	Feb. 2000	Wayne Alt <i>Community College of Baltimore County (Essex)</i>	Zhuangzi, Mysticism, and the Rejection of Distinctions	29
101	March 2000	C. Michele Thompson <i>South Connecticut State University</i>	The Viêt Peoples and the Origins of Nom	71, 1
102	March 2000	Theresa Jen <i>Bryn Mawr College</i> Ping Xu <i>Baruch College</i>	Penless Chinese Character Reproduction	15
103	June 2000	Carrie E. Reid <i>Middlebury College</i>	Early Chinese Tattoo	52
104	July 2000	David W. Pankenier <i>Lehigh University</i>	Popular Astrology and Border Affairs in Early China	19 + 1 color plate
105	Aug. 2000	Anne Birrell <i>Cambridge University</i>	Postmodernist Theory in Recent Studies of Chinese Literature	31

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
106	Sept. 2000	Yu Taishan <i>Chinese Academy of Social Sciences</i>	A Hypothesis about the Sources of the Sai Tribes	i, 3, 200
107	Sept. 2000	Jacques deLisle, Adelheid E. Krohne, and the editor	Reviews IX	148 + map
108	Sept. 2000	Ruth H. Chang <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Understanding <i>Di</i> and <i>Tian</i> : Deity and Heaven From Shang to Tang	vii, 54
109	Oct. 2000	Conán Dean Carey <i>Stanford University</i>	In Hell the One without Sin is Lord	ii, 60
110	Oct. 2000	Toh Hoong Teik <i>Harvard University</i>	Shaykh 'Alam: The Emperor of Early Sixteenth-Century China	20
111	Nov. 2000	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	The Need for a New Era	10
112	July 2001	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Notes on the Anau Inscription	xi, 93
113	Aug. 2001	Ray Collins <i>Chepachet, RI</i> David Kerr <i>Melbourne, FL</i>	Etymology of the Word “Macrobiotic:s” and Its Use in Modern Chinese Scholarship	18
114	March 2002	Ramnath Subbaraman <i>University of Chicago</i>	Beyond the Question of the Monkey Imposter: Indian Influence on the Chinese Novel, <i>The Journey to the West</i>	35
115	April 2002	ZHOU Jixu <i>Sichuan Normal University</i>	Correspondences of Basic Words Between Old Chinese and Proto- Indo-European	8

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
116	May 2002	LIU Yongquan <i>Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences</i>	On the Problem of Chinese Lettered Words	13
117	May 2002	SHANG Wei <i>Columbia University</i>	<i>Baihua, Guanhua, Fangyan</i> and the May Fourth Reading of <i>Rulin Waishi</i>	10
118	June 2002	Justine T. Snow <i>Port Townsend, WA</i>	Evidence for the Indo-European Origin of Two Ancient Chinese Deities	ii, 75, 1 color, 1 b-w print
119	July 2002	WU Zhen <i>Xinjiang Museum, Ürümchi</i>	“Hu” Non-Chinese as They Appear in the Materials from the Astana Graveyard at Turfan	21, 5 figs.
120	July 2002	Anne Birrell <i>University of Cambridge, Clare Hall</i>	Female-Gendered Myth in the <i>Classic of Mountains and Seas</i>	47
121	July 2002	Mark Edward Lewis <i>Stanford University</i>	Dicing and Divination in Early China	22, 7 figs.
122	July 2002	Julie Wilensky <i>Yale Univesity</i>	The Magical <i>Kunlun</i> and “Devil Slaves”: Chinese Perceptions of Dark-skinned People and Africa before 1500	51, 3 figs.
123	Aug. 2002	Paul R. Goldin and the editor	Reviews X	30
124	August 2002	Fredrik T. Hiebert <i>University of Pennsylvania</i> John Colarusso <i>McMaster University</i>	The Context of the Anau Seal Remarks on the Anau and Niyä Seals	1-34 35-47

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
125	July 2003	ZHOU Jixu <i>Sichuan Normal University Shanghai Normal University</i>	Correspondences of Cultural Words between Old Chinese and Proto- Indo-European	19
126	Aug. 2003	Tim Miller <i>University of Washington</i>	A Southern Min Word in the <i>Tsu- t'ang chi</i>	14
127	Oct. 2003	Sundeep S. Jhutti <i>Petaluma, California</i>	The Getes	125, 8 color plates
128	Nov. 2003	Yinpo Tschang <i>New York City</i>	On Proto-Shang	18
129	Dec. 2003	Michael Witzel <i>Harvard University</i>	Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Exchange in Prehistoric Western Central Asia	70
130	Feb. 2004	Bede Fahey <i>Fort St. John, British Columbia</i>	Mayan: A Sino-Tibetan Language? A Comparative Study	61
131	March 2004	Taishan Yu <i>Chinese Academy of Social Sciences</i>	A History of the Relationship between the Western and Eastern Han, Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Western Regions	1, 3, 352
132	April 2004	Kim Hayes <i>Sydney</i>	On the Presence of Non-Chinese at Anyang	11
133	April 2004	John L. Sorenson <i>Brigham Young University</i> Carl L. Johannessen <i>University of Oregon</i>	<i>Scientific Evidence for Pre- Columbian Transoceanic Voyages</i> CD-ROM	48, 166, 19, 15 plates
134	May 2004	Xieyan Hinch <i>Neumädewitz, Germany</i>	Two Steps Toward Digraphia in China	i, 22

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
135	May 2004	John J. Emerson <i>Portland, Oregon</i>	<i>The Secret History of the Mongols</i> and Western Literature	21
136	May 2004	Serge Papillon <i>Mouvoux, France and</i> <i>Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia</i>	Influences tokhariennes sur la mythologie chinoise	47
137	June 2004	Hoong Teik Toh <i>Harvard University</i>	Some Classical Malay Materials for the Study of the Chinese Novel <i>Journey to the West</i>	64
138	June 2004	Julie Lee Wei <i>San Jose and London</i>	Dogs and Cats: Lessons from Learning Chinese	17
139	June 2004	Taishan Yu <i>Chinese Academy of</i> <i>Social Sciences</i>	A Hypothesis on the Origin of the Yu State	20
140	June 2004	Yinpo Tschang <i>New York City</i>	Shih and Zong: Social Organization in Bronze Age China	28
141	July 2004	Yinpo Tschang <i>New York City</i>	Chaos in Heaven: On the Calendars of Preclassical China	30
142	July 2004	Katheryn Linduff, ed. <i>University of Pittsburgh</i>	<i>Silk Road Exchange in China</i>	64
143	July 2004	Victor H. Mair <i>University of</i> <i>Pennsylvania</i>	Sleep in <i>Dream</i> : Soporific Responses to Depression in <i>Story</i> <i>of the Stone</i>	99
144	July 2004	RONG Xinjiang <i>Peking University</i>	Land Route or Sea Route? Commentary on the Study of the Paths of Transmission and Areas in which Buddhism Was Disseminated during the Han Period	32
145	Aug. 2004	the editor	Reviews XI	2, 41

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
146	Feb. 2005	Hoong Teik Toh <i>Academia Sinica</i>	The - <i>yu</i> Ending in Xiongnu, Xianbei, and Gaoju Onomastica	24
147	March 2005	Hoong Teik Toh <i>Academia Sinica</i>	Ch. <i>Qiong</i> ~ Tib. Khyung; Taoism ~ Bonpo -- Some Questions Related to Early Ethno-Religious History in Sichuan	18
148	April 2005	Lucas Christopoulos <i>Beijing Sports University</i>	Le gréco-bouddhisme et l'art du poing en Chine	52
149	May 2005	Kimberly S. Te Winkle <i>University College, London</i>	A Sacred Trinity: God, Mountain, and Bird: Cultic Practices of the Bronze Age Chengdu Plain	ii, 103 (41 in color)
150	May 2005	Dolkun Kamberi <i>Washington, DC</i>	Uyghurs and Uyghur Identity	44
151	June 2005	Jane Jia SI <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	The Genealogy of Dictionaries: Producers, Literary Audience, and the Circulation of English Texts in the Treaty Port of Shanghai	44, 4 tables
152	June 2005	Denis Mair <i>Seattle</i>	The Dance of Qian and Kun in the <i>Zhouyi</i>	13, 2 figs.
153	July 2005	Alan Piper <i>London (UK)</i>	The Mysterious Origins of the Word "Marihuana"	17
154	July 2005	Serge Papillon <i>Belfort, France</i>	<i>Mythologie sino-européenne</i>	174, 1 plate
155	July 2005	Denis Mair <i>Seattle</i>	Janus-Like Concepts in the <i>Li</i> and <i>Kun</i> Trigrams	8
156	July 2005	Abolqasem Esmailpour <i>Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran</i>	<i>Manichean Gnosis and Creation</i>	157
157	Aug. 2005	Ralph D. Sawyer <i>Independent Scholar</i>	Paradoxical Coexistence of Prognostication and Warfare	13

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
158	Aug. 2005	Mark Edward Lewis <i>Stanford University</i>	Writings on Warfare Found in Ancient Chinese Tombs	15
159	Aug. 2005	Jens Østergaard Petersen <i>University of Copenhagen</i>	The <i>Zuozhuan</i> Account of the Death of King Zhao of Chu and Its Sources	47
160	Sept. 2005	Matteo Compareti <i>Venice</i>	Literary Evidence for the Identification of Some Common Scenes in Han Funerary Art	14
161	Sept. 2005	Julie Lee Wei <i>London</i>	The Names of the <i>Yi Jing</i> Trigrams: An Inquiry into Their Linguistic Origins	18
162	Sept. 2005	Julie Lee Wei <i>London</i>	Counting and Knotting: Correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo-European	71, map
163	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei <i>London</i>	Huangdi and Huntun (the Yellow Emperor and Wonton): A New Hypothesis on Some Figures in Chinese Mythology	44
164	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei <i>London</i>	Shang and Zhou: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origins of Two Dynastic Names	62
165	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei <i>London</i>	DAO and DE: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origins of Some Terms in Chinese Philosophy and Morality	51
166	Nov. 2005	Julie Lee Wei <i>London</i> Hodong Kim <i>Seoul National University</i> and David Selvia and the Editor <i>both of the University of Pennsylvania</i>	Reviews XII	i, 63

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
167	Dec. 2005	ZHOU Jixu <i>Sichuan Normal University</i>	Old Chinese '帝*tees' and Proto-Indo-European “*deus”: Similarity in Religious Ideas and a Common Source in Linguistics	17
168	Dec. 2005	Judith A. Lerner <i>New York City</i>	Aspects of Assimilation: the Funerary Practices and Furnishings of Central Asians in China	51, v, 9 plates
169	Jan. 2006	Victor H. Mair <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Conversion Tables for the Three-Volume Edition of the <i>Hanyu Da Cidian</i>	i, 284
170	Feb. 2006	Amber R. Woodward <i>University of Pennsylvania</i>	Learning English, Losing Face, and Taking Over: The Method (or Madness) of Li Yang and His Crazy English	18

Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* will be published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web. For prices of paper copies, see the catalog at www.sino-platonic.org

171	June 2006	John DeFrancis <i>University of Hawaii</i>	The Prospects for Chinese Writing Reform	26, 3 figs.
172	Aug. 2006	Deborah Beaser	The Outlook for Taiwanese Language Preservation	18
173	Oct. 2006	Taishan Yu <i>Chinese Academy of Social Sciences</i>	A Study of the History of the Relationship Between the Western and Eastern Han, Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Western Regions	167
174	Nov. 2006	Mariko Namba Walter	Sogdians and Buddhism	65

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
175	Dec. 2006	Zhou Jixu <i>Center for East Asian Studies, University of Pennsylvania; Chinese Department, Sichuan Normal University</i>	The Rise of Agricultural Civilization in China: The Disparity between Archeological Discovery and the Documentary Record and Its Explanation	38
176	May 2007	Eric Henry <i>University of North Carolina</i>	The Submerged History of Yuè	36
177	Aug. 2007	Beverley Davis	Timeline of the Development of the Horse	186