zu verdanken, dass Japan ohne aufreibenden Bürgerkrieg zu einer neuen
Regierungsform fand und den Sprung in die Neuzeit schaffte.

Shibas Werk bewegt sich ausschliesslich im Rahmen des oberen
Schwert- und Hofadels. Dieses Milieu und die auch in der Übersetzung
nachvollzogene gehobene Sprache macht die Lektüre zwar anspruchsvoll,
verleiht ihr aber einen besonderen Reiz, den sich der historisch inter-
essierte westliche Leser nicht entgehen lassen sollte. Im Gegensatz zum
deutschen Sprachraum erfreuen sich in Japan historische Stoffe in Litera-
tur, Film und Fernsehen grosser Beliebtheit. Das Staatliche Japanische
Fernsehen NHK sendet jedes Jahr eine sich über zwölf Monate hinweg-
ziehende Serie zu einem historischen Thema. Die Folge von 1998 trägt den
Titel "Tokugawa Yoshinobu", nicht zuletzt in Gedenken an den 1996
verstorbenen Schriftsteller Shiba Ryōtarō. Das interessante Nachwort
Eduard Klopfensteins behandelt die Personen Shibas, seine Schreibhaltung
und Bedeutung in der japanischen Literaturgeschichte und Gesellschaft. Es
bietet zum einen einen erleichterten Zugang zum vorliegenden, aus einem
fremden Kulturkreis stammenden Werk. Um den Genuss der Lektüre zu
steigernd, empfiehlt es sich, das Nachwort zuerst zu lesen.

Ursula Koike-Good

STAUTZEBACH, Ralf. Pāriśiṣkā and Sarvasaṃmaṭaśiṣkā. Rechlaute-
Südasienforschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 163.) VI
+ 419 pp.

In the Foreword to Veda-Laṅkāṇa: Vedic Ancillary Literature, A De-
scriptive Bibliography compiled by K. Parameswara Aithal (Franz Steiner,
Stuttgart, 1991), A. Wezler recalled that the Vedic ancillary texts known
by the name Veda-Laṅkāṇa "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 Śiṅgars which he intended to edit. This list
includes the items Pāriśiṣkā Savyākhyā and Sarva-saṃmaṭa-śiṣkā
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 Heidel-
berg, where it has been accepted as dissertation in 1993; the University of
Heidelberg is the institution with which also the author of Veda-Laṅkāṇa is
associated.

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

It goes without saying that the book under review leans heavily on
Aithal's Veda-Laṅkāṇa, sometimes to the extent of being rather unintelli-
gible without it. Consider, for example, the ms-basis on which the edition
of the Pāriśiṣkā and of its commentary Yājuṣabhāṣaṇa has been prepared.
In the relevant section "Zur Texterstellung" we read (p. 13): "Der im fol-
genden wiedergegeben Text der [Pāriśiṣkā] mit dem Kommentar [Ya-
juṣabhāṣaṇa] gründet sich bis auf [Pāriśiṣkā] 265-84 auf einer Deva-
garikopie des Grantha-Ms. MD 924 in [Sanskrit Texts on Phonetics (Lo-
kesh Chandra 1981)] 317-94. Es ist trotz mehrfachen Bemühungen von
Herrn Dr. Aithal nicht gelungen, anderer Mss.-Kopien zu dieser śiṅgar hab-
haft zu werden." This manuscript, then, contains both text and comment-
tary. 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,
wenng auch der letzte Vers nicht abschliesset." None of this is very clear,
until one looks up Pāriśiṣkā in Aithal’s Veda-Laṅkāṇa (p. 429-432), where
not only various mss of Pāriśiṣkā and Yajuṣabhāṣaṇa (or both) are men-
tioned and briefly described, but also the concluding verses in the Hamburg ms quoted.\(^1\)

Also elsewhere the clarity of presentation leaves to be desired. There can of course be no doubt that the Šiksās 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 pārśu und ssś konnte ich an folgende Publikationen anknüpfen: tpr mit den Kommentaren thbr, void und māh ...[;] vās ...[;] ks ...[;] kauḥ ...[;] vās ...[;] bhv ... Weiterhin ... śśu ...[;] śam ...[;] kṣ ...[;] [d]ie āṛś ...[;] [d]ie siddḥ ...” 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.

Questions relating to the Pārśīkṣā 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 Pārśīkṣā 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.

---

\(^1\) The Hamburg ms is “Hamburg [Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek] (cod.Palmbl. III 8/133)” and is described separately on p. 549-550 of Aithal’s Veda-Lakṣaṇa (item 1195: Veda-Lakṣaṇa (HB)). Strangely, the Pārśīkṣā is not found among the 39 texts which this codex is here stated to contain.

---

The question is taken up in a short section, § 2.8 on p. 26-27 (“Sind Verfasser von [Pārśīkṣā] 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 varnakrama 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 Ayyānār (of Uruttiti?), 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 Pārśīkṣā,\(^2\) but not the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa. This same ms does however contain commentaries on other Šiksās (e.g., the Sarvasmāntaśiksā-vyākhyā), If Cakra the son of Rāma had composed both Pārśīkṣā 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 Pārśīkṣā 168 explicitly identifies the son of Rāma as the author of the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa, a commentary on the Pārśīkṣā (...rūmasūnu viracite pārśīkṣāvyākhyānaḥ abhūte ... 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 udāhariṣyānāḥ introducing [221], against nirūpayāti to introduce [124] and following ślokas, besides numerous occurrences of āha.

---

\(^2\) See however note 1, above.
Occasionally RS points to a difference between Pārīśikṣā and Yājuśabhaṣaṇa, without discussing its relevance for the question of authorship. Pārīśikṣā 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 Pārīśikṣā] zu, da [Pārīśikṣā] 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 Pārīśikṣā 3 announces an enumeration of sounds (varṇasamānmāya), but that no such list is given in that text. The Yājuśabhaṣaṇa, 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 Pārīśikṣā. However, it is equally possible to look upon these four verses as belonging to the Pārīśikṣā 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 Pārīśikṣā. Indeed, the Yājuśabhaṣaṇa speaks of “the agreement with the established conventions of grammar etc.” (vyākaranādāśāstraśastraḥṣastraḥśastraḥ) as an argument justifying certain expressions (p. 41). Many technical terms introduced in the Pārīśikṣā 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 (Pārīśikṣā 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 Pārīśikṣā 25, covers all vowels, but nothing in the Pārīśikṣā tells us why. The commentary explains the expression (akāraḍāya-ukāraparyanta svara; p. 43), and is clearly aware that it needs explanation.

Under Pārīśikṣā 27 it similarly explains ac (svara) and hal (vyātījana). 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 Pārīśikṣā 43-44 which, even more strangely, seems to be confirmed by the commentary. We read there: nādasya samvrtte kānthe śvānas 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 Taittiriya-Prātiśākhyya has indeed samvrtte kānthe nādaḥ kriyate. Yet the Yājuśabhaṣaṇa introduces this verse with the words: ... nādasya[ah] ... ucyante “nādasya” ityādān, 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 Yājuśabhaṣaṇa found the incorrect reading nādasya in his ms. (The correct reading may have been nād además, nādaḥ ca, or something of the sort.) This in its turn is only possible if the author of the Yājuśabhaṣaṇa was not identical with the author of the Pārīśikṣā. Once again the situation might be further clarified by a detailed inspection of other mss.

[A similar situation occurs in Pārīśikṣā 51, but this time without confirmation by the commentary. The reading ekāntarasya does not seem to make sense, and the corresponding sūtra of the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhyya (2.25) has ekāntarasa tu. The Yājuśabhaṣaṇa appears to cite the text as ekāntara 11. It would have been appropriate to explain why ekāntaras has been maintained, but RS has not done so.]

It is also interesting to see that the term hanu “jaw” is feminine in the Pārīśikṣā, but masculine in the Yājuśabhaṣaṇa (except where the latter cites the former). Cp. hanupasāṃśhṛtate in Pārīśikṣā 53, atypupasāṃśhṛte hanu in 54, nātivaste hanu in 57; against hanu ... atypupasāṃśhṛta ... vivṛtav etc. in Yājuśabhaṣaṇa 48 (p. 52 l. 11 f.).

3 Surprisingly, the commentary on Pārīśikṣā 135 explains the plural acab as acādasyah svarah.
4 This should of course be hanu upasāṃśhṛtate, dual ā being pragṛhya (Pāṇini 1.1.11). Is this a mistake?
In this context we also consider the relationship between Pāṇīśikṣā 48 and the way it is explained in the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa. The Śīkṣā reads nātiyastam avarthe hanvoṣtham nātyupasamhṛtaṁ, which RS translates: “Beside the a-Vokalen sind die Kiefer und Lippen nicht zu weit geöffnet und nicht zu sehr angenehrt”. This line is literally identical to Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya 2.12 (avarthe nātyupasamhṛtaṁ oṣṭhabhau nātiyastam) but for the fact that the Pāṇīśikṣā, unlike the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya, is metrical. Both the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa and the commentaries on the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya interpret this statement in such a manner that the two adjectives concern different sounds: short a on the one hand, long ā and phata a on the other. The Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa cites even another part of the Pāṇīśikṣā 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 Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya) the commentator appears to go against the text he comments. If we draw the same conclusion in the case of the Pāṇīśikṣā, 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 Pāṇīśikṣā was not influenced by any of the three surviving commentaries on the Taittiriya-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 Pāṇīśikṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa wished to imitate the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya and one of its commentaries (the Vaidikābharaṇa). But this alternative would seem to be less convincing than the thesis of double authorship.

Pāṇīśikṣā 167 contains an obscure reading. RS presents it in the form apparently accepted by the commentator: ... nityātācyate ‘sau kvacid eña otaḥ. The problem lies in the last two words, which in the ms have the form eṣa otaḥ. Neither reading is new, but the commentator explains: eḥa oṣṭha ekāreṇa okāreṇa. This leads RS to the paraphrase “der nityakampana [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 Śīkṣā, and indeed that the words of the Śīkṣā must here be corrupt. The commentator forces an impossible interpretation on a nonsensical reading, which implies that he is different from the Śīkṣākāra.

Elsewhere the commentator explains a grammatically incorrect line as being ārṣa “usage of the seers”. Pāṇīśikṣā 183 concludes with the words: evāṃ ca saptasvarabhaktayā udāhṛatā “So sind Beispiele für die 7 svarabhaktis gezeigt worden”. The commentator observes: aṣṭa svarabhaktayā iti vaktavye svarabhaktiryā ṛṣeyādi vijñeyā. It seems unlikely that the commentator describes his own language as ārṣa.

Pāṇīśikṣā 244-245 express the following: “Ein tonlos unspiritueller Verschlusslaut am pada-Ende wird vor ś oder s aspiriert”. However, “[d]er K[ommentar] führt weiterhin Beispiele zur Aspiration innerhalb eines pada auf: samvatharam, tattvāṃ. Dem entspricht die Regelung in [Sarvasaṃmata-Śiśṭa] 19-20.1”. 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 ś are characterized as apadāntavartin. It seems certain that commentator and Śīkṣākāra 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 Pāṇīśikṣā 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 Pāṇīśikṣā could be older than the commentaries on the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya, discussed above, is not without consequences. RS draws in the introduction to the Pāṇīśikṣā attention to its similarity with that Prātiśākhya. He then states (p. 24-25): “In einigen Fällen flossen hierbei Interpretationen ein, die [Tribhāṣyaratina] und [Vaidikābharaṇa] (i.e., the two commentaries on the Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya of that name, JB) gleichermassen entsprechen ... . Unter den Auslegungen zum [Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya] geben insbesondere jene einen Impuls zur Bewertung der

---

5 A similar remark might have been appropriate under Pāṇīśikṣā 179, which contains apparently an accusative plural svarabhaktayās (udāḥarisyē svarabhaktayās tāḥ). Instead the commentator repeats the phrase without grammatical remarks.

6 RS adds a reference to “āṃś 10-1”. Since this abbreviation does not occur in the list of abbreviations at the end of his book, this reference remains obscure.

Why not assume the opposite, that the Vaidikabharana was influenced by the Pāraśīkṣā? The question is discussed, in the usual cursory manner, in the section dealing with the relationship between Pāraśīkṣā and Vyāsa-śiṣṭa. We read here (p. 25): "Dass letztere keineswegs der [Pāraśīkṣā] folgt, zeigt [Pāraśīkṣā] 239-40. Dieser Vers vereinigt bei der Definition eines Augmentes die Darstellung des [Tattiriya-Pāraśīkṣā], der [Vyāsa-śiṣṭa] und des [Vaidikabharana]. Die [Pāraśīkṣā] kann hier nicht zugleich von [Vyāsa-śiṣṭa] und [Vaidikabharana] übernommen worden sein, da beide grundsätzlich verschiedene Ansätze vorbringen." This statement is not further explained, neither here nor under Pāraśīkṣā 239-40. And indeed, it is not easy to find what part of the Vaidikabharana supposedly exerted an influence here. The most likely candidate, as far as I can see, is the phrase: sa khalv abhinidhāna ity ucye/ abhinidhiyate prakṣīpyata ity abhinidhānā (Shama Sastri & Rangacarya, 1906: 379). Something similar occurs in Pāraśīkṣā 240: sa cābhinidhiyate trābhinidhānā ucye. But obviously no Sanskrit author needs another text in order to link abhinidhāna with abhinidhiyate. It is true that the Yājuṣābhūṣana cites the Vaidikabharana, but this proves nothing with regard to the relationship between Pāraśīkṣā and Vaidikabharana. Or does RS take it for granted that Pāraśīkṣā and Yājuṣābhūṣana have the same author? As so often, RS remains vague.

The Yājuṣābhūṣana 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 Pāraśīkṣā 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 Vaidikabharana and the Tri-bhāṣyaratna respectively: nirvacanaṃ tu gatiyā karmapravacanīyatayā vā padāntarair upastiyatā ity upasargāḥ/ yajurvedaviśaye upasargaḥ 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 (upastiyante) mit der Eigenschaft als gati oder als karmapravacanīya'. [The Yājuṣābhūṣana] verlässt nun den Bereich grammatischer Argumentation und fährt fort: 'Im Bereich der [Yajurveda] sind nur diese (ge-meint sind offensichtlich die im Vers genannten) als Präpositionen anzunehmen. ...' In a note (no. 26 on p. 288) RS observes that the commentary here "[Vaidikabharana] und [Tri-bhāṣyaratna] sinnwidrig zusammengestellt hat." He then explains: "Nach Vorgabe des Merkspruches haben Präpositionen des Typs gati als ... upasarga zu gelten. Es müsste dann aber nach [Pāraśīkṣā] 234 anu chandāmsi zu anu cchandāmsi 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 Vaidikabharana and from the Tri-bhāṣyaratna have here "sinnwidrig" been combined. Note also that the Yājuṣābhūṣana 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 Paññihin terminology is used.

The same attitude with regard to etymologies shows itself under Pāraśīkṣā 15-16. The commentary contains the following etymological explanation (p. 40): anuvvaryate paścārdhe svaravad uccāryata ity anuvsvāraḥ "Weil er in der letzten Hälfte (anu) wie ein Vokal (-svaryate) ausgesprochen wird, heisset er anuvśūrā." A note (no. 5 on p. 288) comments: "Dieser Satz kann als Ergänzung der anuvśūrā-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.

Pāraśīkṣā 133 explains the expression dhaivata with the help of the verbal form abhīsandhiyate. RS comments (p. 89): "Der Name [dhaivata] wird offenbar als derivative vṛddhi aus einer angesetzten Wz. dhī (aus dhī) entwickelt." However, etymology is differentiated in India from grammar, and does not require strict derivations.

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 Yājuṣabhūṣāṇa (under Pārīśikṣā 39-40) contains the following passage (p. 47 l. 4-7): dvividhayā śabdo nityah kāryaḥ ceti tatra nityah sarvadeśavyāpya avyakta ekah śabdo brahmyah abhidhikyate/tasmāt kāryaḥ śabda utpadyate/ sa vyaktaḥ kvācikto 'nantabhadā ca/ tasya varṇādhyasatyopattir iva vyākhyeyatayābhidhikyate/. 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 Sprachläute. 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 manifest sound does not contain (enthält) the phonemes, but is made up of them (varṇādhyaka). The expression (utpattir) vyākhyeyatayābhidhikyate, 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 (vyākhyeyata) in connection with the object of a verb. It seems that RS has difficulties with such constructions in general. Under Pārīśikṣā 41-42 he paraphrases praintiyatayā śrīyate 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 nādasva and ekāntarasva in Pārīśikṣā 43 and 51 respectively, considered above. Also the line idaiddvityedrasavadvahnisamjñāh in Pārīśikṣā 83 seems to me hard to construe; the obvious emendation idaiddvityedrasā vahnisamjñāḥ would go against the metre. Gakārasya in Pārīśikṣā 229 must be something like gakārāḥ sa, as is confirmed by the commentary. A particularly striking example is svāro na sandhānapade visargah in Pārīśikṣā 198, which must be svāro na sandhau na pade visargah. 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 korrupt” without specifying what is wrong with it, nor proposing any emendation.

Pārīśikṣā 241 reads, in RS’s edition: nānte pare saī tirhy anantarī kagau, dvāv api cāgamau stah. 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 ṇ and t. The rule in its present form says nothing of the kind, but a simple emendation from nānte to ṇānte te (confirmed by the commentary: ṇākārād iti kim and te takārē ... pare saī) 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 many of the surrounding verses) if only some additional syllables be provided. The metrical scheme in its present, unsatisfactory, state is:

\[---\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-/\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)---\]

By adding the three syllables in brackets, this becomes:

\[---\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-/\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)---\]

which is a perfect upajāti. On the basis of the elements presented in the commentary, but that are missing in the incomplete verse, one can make the following conjecture as to its full form:

nānte te pare (dhe) saī tirhy anantarī/
(kramā) kagau dvāv api cāgamau stah//

8 Under Pārīśikṣā 41-42 RS paraphrases again varṇāmaka as “Sprachlaut enthal-
There is of course no guarantee that this is the correct reading (which can be checked, and possibly refuted, with the help of the other mss of the text known to exist), but unlike the text presented by RS, it may well be.

A reasonable conjecture might have been made in the case of Pārīśikṣā 249, too. Consider to begin with the first line of the commentary on [248-249]: idādāya ikārāpūra aikārāpūrvo yā yākāro dvirīpau dvivām na bhajen nāpadyate ... A note attached to the word dvirīpau says: “ms: dvirīpau dvi”. This allows us to conclude that RS planned to correct this reading—no doubt into dvirīpam dvīt ām, which alone makes sense—but somehow forgot to do so. This sentence, then emended, paraphrases the expressions dvirīpam and na bhajet, 9 which one would therefore expect to find in the passage commented upon. They are not there, but the edited version contains a lacuna, which we must consider in some detail. The second half of [249] reads, in the edition: sparsottarasthe ... A note gives the ms reading, which is: visargottarasthobhadvirīpāya/. This cannot, of course, be the correct reading, but it does contain similarities to the missing expressions na bhajet and dvirīpam. RS changed the beginning on the basis of its citation in the commentary [ūmasparsottarasthe], where āma occurs at the end of the first half of [249]). If we add na bhajed dvirīpam, we arrive at: sparsottarasthe na bhajed dvirīpam, which is metrically impeccable, and which makes perfect sense in its context.

An interesting case is to be found under Pārīśikṣā 144. The Śikṣā reads: ivrnakotx yokvārahrāhe yah svrayyate kṣaipra udātahāy svā “When there is y or v in the place of udāta i or u, the [resulting] svārīta is [called] kṣaipra”. The commentary raises the question why ivrnakotx “in the place of i or v” had to be expressed, in the following passage: ivrnakotx iti kin/ ‘ata etān (TS 6.6.8.3), ‘asvodītyah’ (TS 2.1.2.4), ‘samvatthā’ (TS 1.5.1.1), ‘s@m vadanete’ (TS 4.2.6.5). RS paraphrases: “Gegenbeispiele: (a) andere Laute als i oder u tragen den udāta: ‘etā etān’, ‘asvodītyah’ 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: ‘asvodītyah’, ‘samvatthā’ and ‘s@m vadanete’ all contain y or v that do not replace i or u. What about the first example? It clearly has to read ‘etāy etān’, 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 lopah śākalyasya.10 The Taittirīya Pārīśikṣāya 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 Pārīśikṣā and of its commentary did not necessarily always know, or accept, the reading of the Taittirīya texts known to us.11

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 Pārīśikṣā and Sarvasaṃmatāsikṣa, 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.

Some suggested improvements in the edition:
(Not that no systematic search for errors has been made, and that the following enumeration merely lists some of the errors that a superficial reading brought to light.)

| p. 31 l. 1 | prārṣitasya | → | prārṣitasya (?) |
| p. 41 l. 2 | ākha | → | ākhya |
| p. 43 l. 21 | procyamāna | → | procyamāne |
| p. 46 l. 11 | śadvimśati | → | śadvimśatī |
| p. 47 l. 7 | vyākhyetatāya | → | vyākhyetatāya |
| p. 49 l. 5 | nādasya | → | nādas tu (?) |
| p. 50 l. 26 | 'nupradhānam | → | 'nupradhānam |
| p. 54 l. 4 | ekāntarasya | → | ekāntaras tu (?) |
| p. 65 l. 25 | kānthaṃ sthānam | → | kānthaṃ sthānam |
| p. 65 l. 27 | kāntaḥsthaṃ | → | kāntaḥsthaṃ |

9 Besides idādāya/, cited from Pārīśikṣā 248. I have no idea how to understand this form.

10 The Kāśikā under this rule gives, among other examples, the contrasting pair asō ādityah / asōv ādityah, precisely the quotation from the Taittirīya Samhitā also given in the Yājñavalihāsa. (This quotation has not been identified in Wilhelm Rau's Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti (1993).)

11 Note that the counterexample ta enam 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".
(in these last two cases the correct reading might conceivably be kaṇṭha sthānāṃ, in accordance with Taittirīya Prātiṣākhyā 9.1.)

p. 67 l. 12   varga/vatsthānayo /go → varga/vatsthānayo /go
p. 67 l. 12   mu/khaṣabdenātra → mukhaṣabdenātra
p. 69 l. 27   ukta/prakārāne → ukta/prakārāne
p. 86 l. 1    madhyakasya → madhyamasya (?)

p. 87 l. 23    śabdas/yodātā → śabdas/yodātā

p. 89 l. 19-20 *pradhānyotkarṣāl → *pradhānyotkarṣāl
p. 94 l. 11   eta etān → etay etān
p. 99 l. 26   bhihate → 'bhihate
p. 100 l. 20   sa iḥānāḥ → sa iḥānāḥ
p. 109 l. 12   sva dhūṣam ity* → sva dhūṣad ity* (?)

p. 117 l. 2    svāro na sandhānapade vi* → svāro na sandhau na pade vi*

p. 117 l. 24   svarāḥ → svarāḥ
p. 120 l. 3    ca → ca
p. 123 l. 11   prakārēṇa → prakārēṇa
p. 128 l. 4    gakārasya → gakārasya

p. 134 l. 32-33 nānte pare sati tarhy anantāt kagau, dvāv api cāgamau stāḥ

→ nānte pare (dhe) sati tarhy anantāt (kramāt) kagau dvāv api cāgamau stāḥ/

p. 136 l. 7    kim artham → kimartham
p. 136 l. 8    tatra/siks* → tatra/siks*

p. 137 l. 23   prathamsparśaḥ → prathamsparśaḥ
p. 139 l. 4    sparśottarasthe ... → sparśottarasthe (na bhajed dvirūpam)

p. 139 l. 5    dvirūpau → dvirūpam

Other corrections:

p. 47 l. 23    sbadasyodbhāva → *dbhava
p. 47 l. 34    1.12.12 → 2.4.2
p. 109 l. 22   hastiṇī → hastini
p. 132 l. 29   lakṣyānuṣāra → lakṣyānuṣāra
p. 290 l. 35   nicht nicht → nicht
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