

Johannes Bronkhorst  
[johannes.bronkhorst@unil.ch](mailto:johannes.bronkhorst@unil.ch)

Review of:

Ralf Stautzebach: *Pāriśikṣā and Sarvasaṃmataśikṣā. Rechtlautlehren der Taittirīya-Śākhā*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 1994. (Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 163.) VI + 419 pp.

(published: *Études Asiatiques / Asiatische Studien* 52(4), 1998, 1210-1225)

In the Foreword to *Veda-Lakṣaṇa: Vedic Ancillary Literature, A Descriptive Bibliography* compiled by K. Parameswara Aithal (Franz Steiner, Stuttgart, 1991), A. Wezler recalled that the Vedic ancillary texts known by the name Veda-Lakṣaṇa "have been virtually forgotten since about 40 years". Later on in the same Foreword he expressed the hope that Aithal's book "will fulfill its true purpose as a mighty incentive to resume the editorial and similar scholarly activities in this highly interesting field of traditional Indian learning". Aithal himself provided, towards the end of his Introduction (p. 20), a list of Śikṣās which he intended to edit. This list includes the items *Pāriśikṣā Savyākhyā* and *Sarva-saṃmata-śikṣā Savyākhyā*.

The book under review illustrates that Wezler's hope has, to at least some extent, been fulfilled and that some of the work that Aithal planned to do has been taken up by someone else, Ralf Stautzebach (RS). It will not cause surprise that RS has prepared this book at the University of Heidelberg, where it has been accepted as dissertation in 1993; the University of Heidelberg is the institution with which also the author of *Veda-Lakṣaṇa* is associated.

As indicated in the title, the book under review deals with two different Śikṣās of the Taittirīya-Śākhā. It further contains a short general introduction and an appendix about present-day Taittirīya-recitation in Tamil-Nadu. The present review will concentrate on the discussion, edition and explanation of the *Pāriśikṣā*.

It goes without saying that the book under review leans heavily on Aithal's *Veda-Lakṣaṇa*, sometimes to the extent of being rather unintelligible without it. Consider, for example, the ms-basis on which the edition of the *Pāriśikṣā* and of its commentary *Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa* has been prepared. In the relevant section "Zur Texterstellung" we read (p. 13): "Der im folgenden wiedergegebene Text der [Pāriśikṣā] mit dem Kommentar [Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa] gründet sich bis auf [Pāriśikṣā]

265-84 auf einer Devanāgarīkopie des Grantha-Ms. MD 924 in [Sanskrit Texts on Phonetics (Lokesh Chandra 1981)] 317-94. Es ist trotz mehrfachen Bemühungen von Herrn Dr. Aithal nicht gelungen, anderer Mss.-Kopien zu dieser *śikṣā* habhaft zu werden." This manuscript, then, contains both text and commentary. Three other mss. are mentioned, which are stated to agree largely with the one used by RS. None of them contains verses 265-284. These verses figure nonetheless in the edition. Where do they come from? The following remark is meant to provide the answer (p. 13): "In dieser Hinsicht gibt der Schluss des Hamburger Ms. eine vollständige Ergänzung, wenn auch der letzte Vers nicht abschliesst." None of this is very clear, until one looks up Pāriśikṣā in Aithal's *Veda-Lakṣaṇa* (p. 429-432), where not only various mss of Pāriśikṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa (or both) are mentioned and briefly described, but also the concluding verses in the Hamburg ms quoted.<sup>1</sup>

Also elsewhere the clarity of presentation leaves to be desired. There can of course be no doubt that the Śikṣās constitute a highly specialized area of research, access to which is not easy for an outsider. But this can be no reason to make the book which tries to provide such access itself inaccessible. Unfortunately there is no other way to describe the book under review. Texts unknown to all but a few readers, even there where they are introduced for the first time, are referred to with the help (?) of obscure abbreviations. The "Einleitung" contains, for example, the following information: "Bei der Bearbeitung der *pārś* und *śś* konnte ich an folgende Publikationen anknüpfen: *tpr* mit den Kommentaren *tbhr*, *vaid* und *māh* ...[;] *vyās* ...[;] *ks* ...[;] *kaunś* ...[;] *vās* ...[;] *bhvś* ... Weiterhin ... *śsu* ...[;] *sams* ...[;] *knś* ...[;] [d]ie *ārś* ...[;] [d]ie *siddhś* ..." The list of abbreviations is found at the end of the book (pp. 415-16) and makes itself abundant use of abbreviations. The notes, they too full of abbreviations, are also at the end of the book (pp. 275-409). The result is that, in order to read even the least problematic passage of the book under review, one needs to permanently keep at least two fingers on other pages. This might easily have been avoided.

The lack of effort to make the text accessible to a non-initiated public is a general feature of the book. This is to be regretted, for the very neglect into which this type of text had fallen calls for a work that introduces readers not accustomed to this kind of literature. More could have been done to make the work under review fulfill that role.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Hamburg ms is "Hamburg [Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek] (cod.PalmbI. III 8/133)" and is described separately on p. 549-550 of Aithal's *Veda-Lakṣaṇa* (item 1195: *Veda-Lakṣaṇa* (HB)). Strangely, the Pāriśikṣā is not found among the 39 texts which this codex is here stated to contain.

Questions relating to the Pāriśikṣā are discussed in a short introduction to the text. Here I will take up one of those questions, the one whether the author of the Pāriśikṣā also wrote its commentary Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa or not. RS dedicates less than a page to it and does not come to a clear conclusion. I will show that much more could be said about it, and that a very probable answer can be reached.

The question is taken up in a short section, § 2.8 on p. 26-27 ("Sind Verfasser von [Pāriśikṣā] und [Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa] identisch?"). The question is only dealt with cursorily. Consider the following passage: "Die Identität geht nicht, wie Varma meint, aus der Einleitung des Kommentars hervor. Mit [Cakra] wird lediglich der Autor eines Lehrwerkes zum *varṇakrama* benannt, was sich auch auf einen Kommentar beziehen kann." In other words, this introductory verse might identify the author of the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa as being Cakra. This is practically all RS says about the issue.

Note here that the preceding introductory verse adds that Cakra's father's name was Rāma. With regard to the Hamburg ms, considered above, Aithal's *Veda-Lakṣaṇa* states (p. 549): "The Ms. must have been written by or belonged to Cakra, son of Rāma Ayyaṅgār (of Úruttiṭi ?), whose writings are found in the codex." It seems likely that the two Cakras are identical. The Hamburg ms, as we have seen, contains the Pāriśikṣā,<sup>2</sup> but not the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa. This same ms does however contain commentaries on other Śikṣās (e.g., the Sarvasaṃmataśikṣā-vyākhyā). If Cakra the son of Rāma had composed both Pāriśikṣā and its commentary Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa, it would be hard to explain why he left out the commentary in this case. The situation becomes somewhat more understandable, without as yet becoming fully clear, if we assume that he is the author of the commentary only. In that case the Hamburg ms may be a collection of works he copied, perhaps against payment, and to which he could not, or did not wish to, add his own composition. This agrees with the circumstance that a colophon after Pāriśikṣā 168 explicitly identifies the son of Rāma as the author of the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa, a commentary on the Pāriśikṣā (...*rāmasūnuviracite pāriśikṣāvyākhyānabhūte ... yājuṣabhūṣaṇākhye* ...). Further research — beginning with a detailed inspection of the Hamburg ms — may throw further light on this issue, but RS has not even mentioned it.

Internal criteria will have to be considered next. The use of the first or third person in the commentary to refer to the basic text does not help — here as so often — to determine identity or difference of authorship. Both occur, as in

---

<sup>2</sup> See however note 1, above.

*udāhariṣyāmaḥ* introducing [221], against *nirūpayati* to introduce [124] and following śloka, besides numerous occurrences of *āha*.

Occasionally RS points to a difference between Pāriśikṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa, without discussing its relevance for the question of authorship. Pāriśikṣā 65 defines the place of articulation (*sthāna*) of consonants as the place where contact takes place. The commentary adds that this definition does not literally apply to fricatives etc., because no contact takes place in their case. RS comments (p. 61): "Die Begründung trifft nicht auf [die Pāriśikṣā] zu, da [Pāriśikṣā] 76 zu den Frikativen lediglich eine Öffnung in der Mitte des Artikulators beschreibt." Does this have implications regarding the authorship question? RS does not raise the question, but one is tempted to interpret this difference as due to different authorship.

In this connection it is to be noted that Pāriśikṣā 3 announces an enumeration of sounds (*varṇasamāmnāya*), but that no such list is given in that text. The Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa, on the other hand, does list these sounds, 59 in number, in four verses. This might at first sight be considered an indication that the commentary is an integral part of the Pāriśikṣā. However, it is equally possible to look upon these four verses as belonging to the Pāriśikṣā rather than to the commentary. It is not clear by what criterion RS has relegated them to the commentary.

Pāṇinian terminology constitutes the background of the terminology of the Pāriśikṣā. Indeed, the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa speaks of "the agreement with the established conventions of grammar etc." (*vyākaraṇādīśāstrasiddhasaṃketānusāra*) as an argument justifying certain expressions (p. 41). Many technical terms introduced in the Pāriśikṣā coincide with those known from grammar. Occasionally a grammatical convention is used without it being introduced in the text. Consider the use of *t* after a short vowel — in *at*, *it* and *ut* — to designate just the short vowel (Pāriśikṣā 18). This convention should have been, but is not, explained in the initial section on technical terms (called *paribhāṣāprakaraṇa* in the commentary). The expressions *at*, *it* and *ut* are explained in the commentary, as *akāra*, *ikāra* and *ukāra* respectively. Had the authors of the Śikṣā and of the commentary been one and the same person, one might have expected a definition of this convention.

The same is true for the use of the Pāṇinian *pratyāhāras*. *Ac*, used for the first time in Pāriśikṣā 25, covers all vowels, but nothing in the Pāriśikṣā tells us why. The commentary explains the expression (*akārādyaukāraparyanta svāra*; p. 43), and is clearly aware that it needs explanation. Under Pāriśikṣā 27 it similarly

explains *ac* (*svara*) and *hal* (*vyañjana*).<sup>3</sup> Had its author been the author of the Śikṣā, he might then have added the required explanation in the section on technical terms.

A strange reading is provided in Pārisīkṣā 43-44 which, even more strangely, seems to be confirmed by the commentary. We read there: *nādasya samvṛte kaṅṭhe śvāsas tu vivṛte sati/ hakāraḥ kriyate madhye .../*. RS translates/paraphrases "Bei zusammengezogener Stellung im Hals wird Ton, bei geöffneter Hauch und in der Mittelstellung *hakāra* erzeugt". This no doubt gives the intended meaning, but it only translates the Sanskrit if we assume as first word nominative *nādaḥ* rather than genitive *nādasya*. The parallel passage in the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya has indeed *samvṛte kaṅṭhe nādaḥ kriyate*. Yet the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa introduces this verse with the words: ... *nādāday[ah]* ... *ucyante "nādasya" ityādinā*, thus confirming the reading *nādasya*. It does not however try to explain this reading, and comments as if the expected nominative were there. Only one conclusion seems possible here: the author of the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa found the incorrect reading *nādasya* in his ms. (The correct reading may have been *nādas tu*, *nādaś ca*, or something of the sort.) This in its turn is only possible if the author of the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa was not identical with the author of the Pārisīkṣā. Once again the situation might be further clarified by a detailed inspection of other mss.

[A similar situation occurs in Pārisīkṣā 51, but this time without confirmation by the commentary. The reading *ekāntarasya* does not seem to make sense, and the corresponding sūtra of the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya (2.25) has *ekāntaras tu*. The Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa appears to cite the text as *ekāntara iti*. It would have been appropriate to explain why *ekāntarasya* has been maintained, but RS has not done so.]

It is also interesting to see that the term *hanu* "jaw" is feminine in the Pārisīkṣā, but masculine in the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa (except where the latter cites the former). Cp. *hanūpasamhṛtatare*<sup>4</sup> in Pārisīkṣā 53, *atyupasamhṛte hanū* in 54, *nātivyaste hanū* in 57; against *hanū ... atyupasamhṛtau ... vivṛtau* etc. in Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa 48 (p. 52 l. 11 f.).

In this context we also have to consider the relationship between Pārisīkṣā 48 and the way it is explained in the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa. The Śikṣā reads *nātivyastam avarṇe hanvoṣṭhaṃ nātyupasamhṛtam*, which RS translates: "Bei den *a*-Vokalen

<sup>3</sup> Surprisingly, the commentary on Pārisīkṣā 135 explains the plural *acaḥ* as *acādayaḥ svarāḥ*.

<sup>4</sup> This should of course be *hanū upasamhṛtatare*, dual *ū* being *pragṛhya* (Pāṇini 1.1.11). Is this a mistake?

sind die Kiefer und Lippen nicht zu weit geöffnet und nicht zu sehr angenähert". This line is practically identical to Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya 2.12 (*avarṇe nātyupasaṃhṛtam oṣṭhahanu nātivyastam*) but for the fact that the Pāriśikṣā, unlike the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, is metrical. Both the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa and the commentaries on the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya interpret this statement in such a manner that the two adjectives concern different sounds: short *a* on the one hand, long *ā* and *pluta ā* on the other. The Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa cites even another part of the Pāriśikṣā to support its interpretations. RS does not comment in any detail on the significance of this apparent difference between text and commentary, and limits himself to saying that the citation is not very convincing. William D. Whitney (1868: 55) is more outspoken and concludes that (at least in the case of the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya) the commentator appears to go against the text he comments. If we draw the same conclusion in the case of the Pāriśikṣā, one is led to think that its author was different from the author of the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa. What is more, one may then have to consider the possibility that the author of the Pāriśikṣā was not influenced by any of the three surviving commentaries on the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, with all the chronological consequences this may entail. The case is not however completely waterproof. One might still maintain that a supposedly single author of both Pāriśikṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa wished to imitate the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya and one of its commentaries (the Vaidikābharaṇa). But this alternative would seem to be less convincing than the thesis of double authorship.

Pāriśikṣā 167 contains an obscure reading. RS presents it in the form apparently accepted by the commentator: ... *nityaḥ ātocyate 'sau kvacid eṇa oṇaḥ*. The problem lies in the last two words, which in the ms have the form *eṣa oṇaḥ*. Neither reading is clear, but the commentator explains: *eṇa oṇa ekāreṇa okāreṇa*. This leads RS to the paraphrase "der *nityakampa* [wird] mit *ā*, bisweilen mit *e* und *o* [gebildet]". There can however be no doubt that this interpretation does not fit the words of the Śikṣā, and indeed that the words of the Śikṣā must here be corrupt. The commentator forces an impossible interpretation on a nonsensical reading, which implies that he is different from the Śikṣākāra.

Elsewhere the commentator explains a grammatically incorrect line as being *ārṣa* "usage of the seers". Pāriśikṣā 183 concludes with the words: *evaṃ ca saptasvarabhakty udāhṛtāḥ* "So sind Beispiele für die 7 *svarabhaktis* gezeigt worden". The commentator observes: *atra svarabhaktaya iti vaktavye svarabhaktīy*

*ārṣetyādi vijñeyam*.<sup>5</sup> It seems unlikely that the commentator describes his own language as *ārṣa*.

Pāriśikṣā 244-245 express the following: "Ein tonlos unaspirierter Verschlusslaut am *pada*-Ende wird vor *ṣ* oder *s* aspiriert". However, "[d]er K[ommentar] führt weiterhin Beispiele zur Aspiration innerhalb eines *pada* auf: *saṃvathsaram*, *takḥṣam*. Dem entspricht die Regelfassung in [Sarvasaṃmata-Śikṣā] 19-20.1".<sup>6</sup> The text commented upon is however very explicit about the requirement that this operation can only take place at the boundary between two words: the expression *padānta* figures twice over, and the following *s* and *ṣ* are characterized as *apadāntavartin*. It seems certain that commentator and Śikṣākāra did not agree in this matter, and were therefore different people.

This short survey shows, I believe, that *all* passages allow of the possibility that Pāriśikṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa had different authors, and that *some* more or less force us to draw this conclusion. I have no doubt that RS, if he had taken the trouble to take this issue somewhat more seriously, would have arrived at the same conclusion. As it is, he seems to be inclined to consider the two identical.

The hypothesis that the Pāriśikṣā could be older than the commentaries on the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, discussed above, is not without consequences. RS draws in the introduction to the Pāriśikṣā attention to its similarity with that Prātiśākhya. He then states (p. 24-25): "In einigen Fällen flossen hierbei Interpretationen ein, die [Tribhāṣyaratna] und [Vaidikābharaṇa] (i.e., the two commentaries on the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya of that name, JB) gleichermassen entsprechen ... . Unter den Auslegungen zum [Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya] geben insbesondere jene einen Impuls zur Bewertung der [Śikṣā], die nur auf [Vaidikābharaṇa] zurückzuführen sind ...". After some examples and remarks RS concludes: "ich [halte] es für wahrscheinlich, dass zu den Vorlagen der [Pāriśikṣā] ebenfalls [Vaidikābharaṇa] zählt".

Why not assume the opposite, that the Vaidikābharaṇa was influenced by the Pāriśikṣā? The question is discussed, in the usual cursory manner, in the section dealing with the relationship between Pāriśikṣā and Vyāsaśikṣā. We read here (p. 25): "Dass letztere keineswegs der [Pāriśikṣā] folgt, zeigt [Pāriśikṣā] 239-40. Dieser Vers vereinigt bei der Definition eines Augmentes die Darstellung des [Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya], der [Vyāsaśikṣā] und des [Vaidikābharaṇa]. Die

<sup>5</sup> A similar remark might have been appropriate under Pāriśikṣā 179, which contains apparently an accusative plural *svarabhaktayas* (*udāhariṣye svarabhaktayas tāḥ*). Instead the commentator repeats the phrase without grammatical remarks.

<sup>6</sup> RS adds a reference to "*vāsś* 10-1". Since this abbreviation does not occur in the list of abbreviations at the end of his book, this reference remains obscure.

[Pāriśikṣā] kann hier nicht zugleich von [Vyāsaśikṣā] und [Vaidikābharaṇa] übernommen worden sein, da beide grundsätzlich verschiedene Ansätze vorbringen." This statement is not further explained, neither here nor under Pāriśikṣā 239-40. And indeed, it is not easy to find what part of the Vaidikābharaṇa supposedly exerted an influence here. The most likely candidate, as far as I can see, is the phrase: *sa khalv abhinidhāna ity ucyate/ abhinidhīyate prakṣipyata ity abhinidhānaḥ* (Shama Sastri & Rangacarya, 1906: 379). Something similar occurs in Pāriśikṣā 240: *sa cābhinidhīyate 'trābhinidhāna ucyate*. But obviously no Sanskrit author needs another text in order to link *abhinidhāna* with *abhinidhīyate*. It is true that the Yājñabhūṣaṇa cites the Vaidikābharaṇa, but this proves nothing with regard to the relationship between Pāriśikṣā and Vaidikābharaṇa. Or does RS take it for granted that Pāriśikṣā and Vaidikābharaṇa have the same author? As so often, RS remains vague.

The Yājñabhūṣaṇa regularly gives etymologies (*nirvacana*) of key terms. RS seems to attach more value to these etymologies than they may deserve. This is what one is tempted to conclude from a note added to Pāriśikṣā 12-14. These lines assign the name *upasarga* to *pari, ā, ni, adhi, abhi, vi, prati, pra, ava* and *upa*. The commentary contains the following two lines, which occur in (have been taken from?) the Vaidikābharaṇa and the Tribhāṣyaratna respectively: *nirvacanaṃ tu gatitayā karmapravacanīyatayā vā padāntarair upasṛjyanta ity upasargāḥ/ yajurvedaviṣaye upasargā etāvanta eveti mantavyam/*. RS explains (p. 39): "Weiterhin gibt der [Kommentar] die Ableitung: 'Die Präpositionen (*upasarga*) heissen so, weil sie mit anderen *pada*-s zusammengebracht werden (*upasṛjyante*) mit der Eigenschaft als *gati* oder als *karmapravacanīya*'. [The Yājñabhūṣaṇa] verlässt nun den Bereich grammatischer Argumentation und fährt fort: 'Im Bereich der [Yajurveda] sind nur diese (gemeint sind offensichtlich die im Vers genannten) als Präpositionen anzunehmen. ...'" In a note (no. 26 on p. 288) RS observes that the commentary here "[Vaidikābharaṇa] und [Tribhāṣyaratna] sinnwidrig zusammengestellt hat." He then explains: "Nach Vorgabe des Merkspruches haben Präpositionen des Typs *gati* als ... *upasarga* zu gelten. Es müsste dann aber nach [Pāriśikṣā] 234 *anu chandāṃsi* zu *anu cchandāṃsi* erweitert werden, was der [Kommentar] ausschliessen will."

This does not seem to make sense. The *Merkspruch* is, apparently, the etymology. But an etymology cannot be looked upon as a definition, nor as having more than approximate validity in the interpretation of a word, in this case *upasarga*. It is not therefore justified to conclude that passages from the



Vaidikābharaṇa and from the Tribhāṣyaratna have here "sinnwidrig" been combined. Note also that the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa does not hesitate to use the expression *upasarga* in connection with prepositions that are not included in the above list, such as *sam* (p. 31). This appears to mean that the term *upasarga* is only used in connection with the above enumerated list where the Yajurveda is concerned. Everywhere else Pāṇinian terminology is used.

The same attitude with regard to etymologies shows itself under Pāriśikṣā 15-16. The commentary contains the following etymological explanation (p. 40): *anusvaryate paścārdhe svaravad uccāryata ity anusvārah* "Weil er in der letzten Hälfte (*anu*) wie ein Vokal (*-svaryate*) ausgesprochen wird, heisst er *anusvāra*." A note (no. 5 on p. 288) comments: "Dieser Satz kann als Ergänzung der *anusvāra*-Definition 228-9.1 angesehen werden." This remark does no harm, if its sole aim is to derive information from the etymology. But the etymology was certainly not intended to be a definition, or a supplement to a definition.

Pāriśikṣā 133 explains the expression *dhaivata* with the help of the verbal form *abhisandhīyate*. RS comments (p. 89): "Der Name [*dhaivata*] wird offenbar als derivative *vṛddhi* aus einer angesetztten Wz. *dhī* (aus *dhā*) entwickelt." However, etymology is differentiated in India from grammar, and does not require strict derivations.<sup>7</sup>

The Sanskrit text of the Śikṣā and its commentary is followed by an incomplete, but as a rule reliable paraphrase. Occasionally a literal translation is provided. This, too, is normally reliable, but there are exceptions. Consider the following. The Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa (under Pāriśikṣā 39-40) contains the following passage (p. 47 l. 4-7): *dvividhaḥ śabdo nityaḥ kāryaś ceti/ tatra nityaḥ sarvadeśavyāpy avyakta ekaḥ śabdo brahmety abhidhīyate/ tasmāt kāryaḥ śabda utpadyate/ sa vyaktaḥ kvācitko 'nantabhedaś ca/ tasya varṇātmakasyotpattir iha vyākh[ya]yatayādhikriyate/*. RS translates this as follows: "Der Laut ist zweifach: unvergänglich und hervorgebracht. Der unvergängliche Laut durchdringt alle Orte und ist *ungeschieden* und *einzig*. Er wird *brahma* genannt. Aus diesem entsteht der hervorgebrachte Laut. Er ist *isoliert*, tritt bisweilen in Erscheinung und hat unendlich viele Arten. Er *enthält* die Sprachlaute. Seine Entstehung, *die einer weiteren Erklärung bedarf*, wird zum *adhikāra* erhoben." The German words in italics present cases where the translation leaves to be desired. *Avyakta* and *vyakta* do not, in this context, mean "ungeschieden" and "isoliert", but "non-manifest(ed)" and "manifest(ed)" respectively. And the manifested sound does not contain

<sup>7</sup> Cp. Bronkhorst, 1984.

(*enthält*) the phonemes, but is made up of them (*varṇātmaka*).<sup>8</sup> The expression (*utpattir*) *vyākhyeyatayādhikriyate*, finally, does not mean "Seine Entstehung, die einer weiteren Erklärung bedarf, wird zum *adhikāra* erhoben", but "Its production is made the subject-matter as something that is in need of explanation / as the thing to be explained".

This last expression contains the instrumental of an abstract noun (*vyākhyeyatayā*) in connection with the object of a verb. It seems that RS has difficulties with such constructions in general. Under Pāriśikṣā 41-42 he paraphrases *pratiniyatayā śrūyate* as "Vernommenwerden durch Zurückkommen". The correct translation is "it is heard **as** fixed for each single case"; cp. Filliozat, 1988: p. 82 § 27d.

The fact that as a rule no literal translation is provided may account for the fact that at times Sanskrit readings are accepted that are untranslatable. Examples are *nādasya* and *ekāntarasya* in Pāriśikṣā 43 and 51 respectively, considered above. Also the line *idaiddvitīyedrasavahnisaṃjñāḥ* in Pāriśikṣā 83 seems to me hard to construe; the obvious emendation *idaiddvitīyedrasā vahnisaṃjñāḥ* would go against the metre. *Gakārasya* in Pāriśikṣā 229 must be something like *gakāraḥ sa*, as is confirmed by the commentary. A particularly striking example is *svaro na sandhānapade visargaḥ* in Pāriśikṣā 198, which must be *svāro na sandhau na pade visargaḥ*. In all these and similar cases one wonders how RS conceives of the task of editing a text. The notes at the end of the book show that he does not always simply reproduce the manuscript, but on many occasions he apparently does, even when the result is plainly incorrect, or contrasts with the reading accepted by the commentator (recall that RS considers the commentator as being possibly identical with the Śikṣākāra!). On p. 128 RS characterizes a passage from the commentary as being "leicht korrump" without specifying what is wrong with it, nor proposing any emendation.

Pāriśikṣā 241 reads, in RS's edition: *nānte pare sati tarhy anantāt kagau, dvāv api cāgamau staḥ*. This reading cannot be correct, for various reasons. To begin with, we learn from the commentary that this rule concerns the insertion of an augment *k* between *ñ* and *t*. The rule in its present form says nothing of the kind, but a simple emendation from *nānte* to *nāt te* (confirmed by the commentary: *ñakārād iti kim and te takāre ... pare sati*) solves this problem. However, problems remain. The rule remains metrically chaotic, and still does not express all the commentary ascribes to it. RS could, and should, have recorded this, but he doesn't. Even less does he point out that the rule does fit the *upajāti* metre (characteristic of

<sup>8</sup> Under Pāriśikṣā 41-42 RS paraphrases again *varṇātmaka* as "Sprachlaut enthaltend".



'*asāv ādityaḥ*' (TS 2.1.2.4), '*saṃyattāḥ*' (TS 1.5.1.1), '*saṃ vadante*' (TS 4.2.6.5). RS paraphrases: "Gegenbeispiele: (a) andere Laute als *i* oder *u* tragen den *udātta*: '*etá et 'ān*', '*as 'āv ādityáḥ*' etc. ..." He has clearly misunderstood the passage, for the context requires that the examples illustrate cases where there is *y* or *v* that do **not** replace *i* or *u*. Three of the four examples fit without difficulty: '*asāv ādityaḥ*', '*saṃyattāḥ*' and '*saṃ vadante*' all contain *y* or *v* that do not replace *i* or *u*. What about the first example? It clearly has to read '*etáy et 'ān*', with *y*. This may look strange at first sight, but is regular Pāṇinian sandhi for *ete etān*, elision of *y* being optional by P. 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*.<sup>10</sup> The Taittirīya Prātiśākhya prescribes elision of *y* and *v* by sūtra 10.19, but adds (10.20) that Ukhya disagrees with it. This example shows that the authors of the Pāriśikṣā and of its commentary did not necessarily always know, or accept, the reading of the Taittirīya texts known to us.<sup>11</sup>

To conclude. With some more attention to details the book under review might have been considerably improved. It is unlikely that someone else will anytime soon edit and interpret the Pāriśikṣā and Sarvasaṃmataśikṣā, so the book will, in spite of its shortcomings, become the basis of future studies concerning these Śikṣās and related issues. In the situation one can only advise its readers to use it with caution.

#### References:

- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1984): "Nirukta, Uṇādi Sūtra, and Aṣṭādhyāyī." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27, 1-15.
- Filliozat, Pierre-Sylvain (1988): *Grammaire sanskrite pāninienne*. Paris: Picard.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1993): *Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (AAWL Jg. 1993, Nr. 5.)
- Shama Sastri, R., and Rangacarya, K. (1906): *The Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya*. With the commentaries Tribhāṣyaratna of Somayārya and Vaidikābharaṇa of Gārgya

<sup>10</sup> The Kāśikā under this rule gives, among other examples, the contrasting pair *asā ādityaḥ* / *asāv ādityaḥ*, precisely the quotation from the Taittirīya Saṃhitā also given in the Yājuṣābhūṣaṇa. (This quotation has not been identified in Wilhelm Rau's *Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti* (1993).)

<sup>11</sup> Note that the counterexample *ta enaṃ bhiṣajyati* (TS 2.3.11.4) under [196-197] and in [207] shows that here a hiatus (and not *y*) separates the two vowels °*a e*°.

Gopāla Yajvan, with an English Introduction, and Sanskrit Introduction by K. Raṅgācārya. Reprint: Motilal, Banarsidass, 1985.

Whitney, William D. (1868): *The Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, with its commentary the Tribhāshyaratna: Text, Translation and Notes*. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1973.

Abbreviations:

AAWL	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse
Jg.	Jahrgang
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra
TS	Taittirīya Saṃhitā