

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 interessierte westliche Leser nicht entgehen lassen sollte. Im Gegensatz zum deutschen Sprachraum erfreuen sich in Japan historische Stoffe in Literatur, Film und Fernsehen grosser Beliebtheit. Das Staatliche Japanische Fernsehen NHK sendet jedes Jahr eine sich über zwölf Monate hinwegziehende 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 Person Shibas, seine Schreibhaltung und Bedeutung in der japanischen Literaturgeschichte und Gesellschaft. Es bietet zudem einen erleichterten Zugang zum vorliegenden, aus einem fremden Kulturkreis stammenden Werk. Um den Genuss der Lektüre zu steigern, empfiehlt es sich, das Nachwort zuerst zu lesen.

Ursula Koike-Good

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

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 fulfil 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 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 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 *ssś* konnte ich an folgende Publikationen anknüpfen: *tpr* mit den Kommentaren *tbhr*, *vaid* und *māh* ...[:] *vyāś* ...[:] *kś* ...[:] *kaṇś* ...[:] *vāś* ...[:] *bhvś* ... Weiterhin ... *śsu* ...[:] *śamś* ...[:] *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.

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.

¹ The Hamburg ms is "Hamburg [Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek] (cod. Palmbibl. 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.

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 Ūruttiṭi?), 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,² 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 *udāhariṣyamaḥ* introducing [221], against *nirūpayati* to introduce [124] and following śloka, besides numerous occurrences of *āha*.

² See however note 1, above.

Occasionally RS points to a difference between Pārisīkṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa, without discussing its relevance for the question of authorship. Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā] zu, da [Pārisīkṣā] 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 Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā. However, it is equally possible to look upon these four verses as belonging to the Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā. Indeed, the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa speaks of “the agreement with the established conventions of grammar etc.” (*vyākaraṇādīśāstrasiddhasamketānusāra*) as an argument justifying certain expressions (p. 41). Many technical terms introduced in the Pārisīkṣā 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 (Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā 25, covers all vowels, but nothing in the Pārisīkṣā tells us why. The commentary explains the expression (*akārādya-ukāraparyanta svara*; p. 43), and is clearly aware that it needs explanation.

Under Pārisīkṣā 27 it similarly explains *ac* (*svara*) and *hal* (*vyañjana*).³ 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 kaṇṭhe 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 kaṇṭhe nādaḥ kriyate*. Yet the Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa introduces this verse with the words: ... *nādāday[ah]* ... *ucyante* “*nādasya*” *iryādinā*, 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*⁴ in Pārisīkṣā 53, *atyupasaṃhṛte hanū* in 54, *nātvivaste hanū* in 57; against *hanū* ... *atyupasaṃhṛtau* ... *vivṛtau* etc. in Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa 48 (p. 52 l. 11 f.).

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

4 This should of course be *hanū upasaṃhṛtatare*, dual *ū* being *pragṛhya* (Pāṇini 1.1.11). Is this a mistake?

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 *nāṭivastam avarṇe hanvoṣṭham nātyupasaṃhṛtam*, which RS translates: “Bei den *a*-Vokalen 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 oṣṭhahānu nāṭivastam*) but for the fact that the Pārisīkṣā, 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 Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā, 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 Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā 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.

Pārisīkṣā 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”. Pārisīkṣā 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 āṛṣetyādi vijñeyam*.⁵ It seems unlikely that the commentator describes his own language as *ārṣa*.

Pārisīkṣā 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”.⁶ 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 Pārisīkṣā 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 Pārisīkṣā could be older than the commentaries on the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, discussed above, is not without consequences. RS draws in the introduction to the Pārisīkṣā 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

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

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

[Śikṣā], die nur auf [Vaidikābharāṇa] zurückzuführen sind ...” After some examples and remarks RS concludes: “ich [halte] es für wahrscheinlich, dass zu den Vorlagen der [Pāriśikṣā] ebenfalls [Vaidikābharāṇa] zählt”.

Why not assume the opposite, that the Vaidikābharāṇa 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 [Taittiriya-Prātiśākhya], der [Vyāsaśikṣā] und des [Vaidikābharāṇa]. Die [Pāriśikṣā] kann hier nicht zugleich von [Vyāsaśikṣā] und [Vaidikābharāṇa] 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 Vaidikābharāṇa 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 abhinidhāṇaḥ* (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 Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa cites the Vaidikābharāṇa, but this proves nothing with regard to the relationship between Pāriśikṣā and Vaidikābharāṇa. Or does RS take it for granted that Pāriśikṣā and Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa have the same author? As so often, RS remains vague.

The Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa 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 Vaidikābharāṇa and the Tribhāṣyaratna respectively: *nirvacanaṃ tu gatitayā karmapravacanīyatayā vā padāntarair upasṛjyanta ity upasargāḥ/ yajurvedaṣṭaye 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 Yājuṣabhūṣaṇa] 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 “[Vaidikābharāṇa] 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 Vaidikābharāṇa 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 anusvāraḥ* “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 angesetzten Wz. *dhī* (aus *dhā*) entwickelt.” However, etymology is differentiated in India from grammar, and does not require strict derivations.⁷

7 Cp. Bronkhorst, 1984.

nāt te pare (dhe) sati tarhy anantāt/
(kramāt) kagau dvāy api cāgamau stah//

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 Pāriśikṣā 249, too. Consider to begin with the first line of the commentary on [248-249]: *idaidaya ikārapūrva aikārapūrvo yo yakāro dvirūpau dviṭvaṃ na bhajen nāpadyate* A note attached to the word *dvirūpau* says: “ms: *dvirūpau dvi*”. This allows us to conclude that RS planned to correct this reading—no doubt into *dvirūpaṃ dviṭ aṃ*, which alone makes sense—but somehow forgot to do so. This sentence, thus emended, paraphrases the expressions *dvirūpaṃ* 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: *sparsōttarasthe* A note gives the ms reading, which is: *visargottarasthobhadvirūpya*/. This cannot, of course, be the correct reading, but it does contain similarities to the missing expressions *na bhajet* and *dvirūpaṃ*. RS changed the beginning on the basis of its citation in the commentary (*ūṣmasparśottarasth[e]*, where *ūṣma* occurs at the end of the first half of [249]). If we add *na bhajet dvirūpaṃ*, we arrive at: *sparsōttarasthe na bhajet dvirūpaṃ*, which is metrically impeccable, and which makes perfect sense in its context.

An interesting case is to be found under Pāriśikṣā 144. The Śikṣā reads: *ivarnakotor yavakārabhāve yaḥ svaryate kṣaipra udāttayoḥ syāt* “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 *ivarnakotoḥ* “in the place of *i* or *v*” had to be expressed, in the following passage: *ivarnakotor iti kim/ ‘eta etān’* (TS 6.6.8.3), ‘*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 *udāta*: ‘*etā etān*’, ‘*asāv ādityaḥ*’ 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

9 Besides *idaidaya[h]*, cited from Pāriśikṣā 248. I have no idea how to understand this form.

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 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*.¹⁰ The Taittirīya Prātiśākhya prescribes elision of *y* and *v* by sūtra 10.19, but adds (10.20) that Ukhyā 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.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 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.

Some suggested improvements in the edition:

(Note 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	prāripsitasya	→	prāripsitasya (?)
p. 41 l. 2	ākḥā	→	ākhyā
p. 43 l. 21	procyamānā	→	procyamāne
p. 46 l. 11	ṣaḍviṃśati	→	ṣaḍviṃśatir
p. 47 l. 7	vyākheyatayā°	→	vyākhyeyatayā°
p. 49 l. 5	nādasya	→	nādas tu (?)
p. 50 l. 26	‘nupradhānaṃ	→	‘nupradānaṃ
p. 54 l. 4	ekāntarasya	→	ekāntaras tu (?)
p. 65 l. 25	kaṇṭhaṃ sthānaṃ	→	kaṇṭhaḥ sthānaṃ
p. 65 l. 27	kaṇṭhasthānaṃ	→	kaṇṭhaḥ sthānaṃ

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

11 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°.

(in these last two cases the correct reading might conceivably be *kaṇṭha sthānam*, in accordance with *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya* 9.1)

p. 67 l. 12	vargavatsthānayogo	→	vargavat sthānayogo
p. 67 l. 12	mukhaśabdenātra	→	mukhaśabdenātra
p. 69 l. 27	uktaprakāraṇe	→	uktaprakaraṇe
p. 86 l. 1	madhyakasya	→	madhyamasya (?)
p. 87 l. 23	śabdasyodātta°	→	śabdasyodātta°
p. 89 l. 19-20	°pradhānyotkarṣāl	→	°prādhānyotkarṣāl
p. 94 l. 11	eta etān	→	etay etān
p. 99 l. 26	bhihate	→	'bhihaṭe
p. 100 l. 20	sa idhānaḥ	→	sa idhānaḥ
p. 109 l. 12	sya dhūrṣam ity°	→	sya dhūrṣad ity° (?)
p. 117 l. 2	svaro na sandhānapade vi°	→	svāro na sandhau na pade vi°
p. 117 l. 24	svaraḥ	→	svāraḥ
p. 120 l. 3	ce	→	ca
p. 123 l. 11	prakārena	→	prakāreṇa
p. 128 l. 4	gakārasya	→	gakāraḥ sa (?)
p. 134 l. 32-33	nānte pare sati tarhy anantāt kagau, dvāv api cāgamau staḥ		
	→ nāt te pare (dhe) sati tarhy anantāt/ (kramāt) kagau dvāv api cāgamau staḥ//		
p. 136 l. 7	kim artham	→	kimartham
p. 136 l. 8	tatraśikṣ°	→	tatra śikṣ°
p. 137 l. 23	prathamsparsaḥ	→	prathamasparsaḥ
p. 139 l. 4	sparsōttarasthe ...	→	sparsōttarasthe (na bhajed dvirūpam)
p. 139 l. 5	dvirūpau	→	dvirūpam

Other corrections:

p. 47 l. 23	śabdasyodbhāva	→	°dbhava
p. 47 l. 34	1.12.12	→	2.4.2
p. 109 l. 22	hastinī	→	hastinī
p. 132 l. 29	lakṣyānuśara	→	lakṣyānusāra
p. 290 l. 35 (n. 7)	nicht nicht	→	nicht

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

- BRONKHORST, Johannes (1984): "Nirukta, Uṇādi Sūtra, and Aṣṭādhyāyī." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27, 1-15.
- FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain (1988): *Grammaire sanskrité 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 Vaidikābharana of Gārgya Gopāla Yajvan, with an English Introduction, and Sanskrit Introduction by K. Raṅgacārya. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985.
- WHITNEY, William D. (1868): *The Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, with its commentary the Tribhāṣyaratna: Text, Translation and Notes*. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1973.
- AAWL Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse
- Jg. Jahrgang
- P. Pāṇinian sūtra
- TS Taittirīya Saṃhitā

Johannes Bronkhorst