REMARKS ON THE SIKSHAS.

BY DR. F. KIELHORN, DECCAN COLLEGE, PUNA.

Since the publication of Professor Haug's valuable essay on the nature and value of the accents in the Veda, I have been enabled to collect from various parts of India a large number of Sikshas, some of which appear to be very little, if at all, known to Sanskrit scholars, and it was my intention to publish critical editions of such of them as scemed to deserve to be made more generally accessible. Unfortunately most of the MSS. which I have collected, even the best and oldest of them, are so incorrect that I feel inclined to postpone the task of editing any of them for the present. What I cannot but consider as wrong readings occur with such uniformity and, if I may say so, regularity in the several copies of one and the same work as to render it probable that the text has been corrupt for several centuries; and although it would no doubt be possible, by conjecture and by means of such corrections as might be suggested by a comparison of other Sikshas, to produce in many cases a readable text, * I much doubt whether the adoption of such a course would be likely to meet with the approval of careful and conscientious scholars, and whether the result would be satisfactory.

There is another reason which makes me

An example will illustrate my meaning. My copy
 M of the Mendakt siisha reads verse IV. 9 as follows:—
 इनिर-अस बस्केन न परं याजनाद्वजन ।

न हि पाणिईता बाणी प्रयोगान्वक महित ॥

A copy of the original of my MS. M was sent to Berlin, and from it Prof. Weber gave an account of the Mtmlaki SikshA in an appendix to his casesy on the Pratijnashtra. Professor Weber saw that the verse as given above must be corrupt, and after consulting Professor Roth he adopted the conjectures of the latter and printed the verse as follows:—

श्रीरध्वसु मार्गेण न परं योजनाद्वुजेत्।

न हि ग्लानिहता वाणी प्रयोगान्वनुमहिति ॥

This is no doubt readable Sanskrit, but it certainly is no longer a verse of the Maniuki Silski.

As the compound letter क्य in MS. M is always written क्या, the third word of the first line is really बक्येंग, a reading which is given by both my MSS. C and B, but which I at present do not understand; if I considered right simply to admit the reading of another sikeld, I should adopt that of the Miraltya-iikeld श्रानेट्यम् बतंत, but I cannot yet bring myself to believe that बतेंत should in the Mds/4kt sikeld have been altered to व्यक्षण.

The case is less hopeless with the second line; here C reads पाणिहिंसा and B पाष्ट्रचहिंसा; which readings, to-

hesitate to publish the materials which I have collected, and one which mainly induces me to write these lines. The chief object of nearly all the Sikshas accessible to me is no other than to lay down rules for the proper recitation of the Vedas. They not only state in a general way the qualities, both bodily and mental, of which he who wishes to recite the Vedas should necessarily be possessed; they not only tell us how the reciter of the sacred texts should prepare himself for his task; but they also lay down the most minute rules for the pronunciation of certain sounds and combinations of sounds, for the musical modulation of the voice, for the right postures of the body, for the motions of the hands and fingers which must accompany and which form an essential part of the recitation, &c. These rules it may be easy enough to understand when one has seen them illustrated in practice, but I doubt whether any one who has not actually and repeatedly heard and seen the Vedas recited would be able not merely to translate, but to explain them satisfactorily. For a European scholar, aided by the bare texts or even by commentaries, to do so, appears, so far as my own experience goes, to be impossible,+

gether with that of M, point to पार्टिंगहता; this actually does occur in the Nacediya-siksha, and this I do adopt for the Mandalt siksha.

† As Professor Weber (On the Pentijalsátra, p. 75) wishes to know whether the Sikshks lately discovered in India throw any light on the verse describing the pronuciation of the masal sound called ranga which occurs in the Penintyl Sikshki, I may venture to select his interpretation of that particular verse as an instance of how things occasionally may be misunderstood.

The verse itself is as follows :-

यथा सीराष्ट्रिका नारा अर्ग (v. n. तकें) इत्यभिभावत । एवं रङ्के विजानीयात्खे अर्ग इव खेदगा ॥

and it was originally translated by Prof. Weber thus:—
'Just as the women of Surashtra address (?) with the word (?) असान्।

'Just so one ought to know the mange, e.g. से अर्थ इस ।'
At p. 270 of vol. IV. of the Indische Studies a second
translation is projected, which we may omit here; but
we cannot altogether disregard the third interpretation at
p. 380 of vol. IX. of the same periodical, chiefly on account
of the note appended to it, the sense of which is abortly
this:—that both the readings अर्थ कार्य तर्म in the first line
give no sense; that we have to read देश इन्यूनिश्वती; that
स्मिर्ट is the Greek word xaipers; that the Surfahra woman of
old used to greet one another with the Greek word xaipe

Professor Hang has been present at the recitation of one or two Vedas, and he has in consequence been able to correct several erroneous views conceived by other scholars in Europe and America, and I have myself had opportunities of becoming acquainted with the recitation of the Riareda. But this is not sufficient. What we want is an accurate, minute, and intelligible description of the manner in which the several Vedas are recited in the different parts of India, and this can only be given by native scholars. The subject is not one of very great importance, and the task by no means an easy one, but only when it has been accomplished can we hope to be able to explain all the details! of the Sikshas as they ought to be explained, if it should be considered worth while to explain them at all.

Professor Haug, in the essay mentioned above, has arrived at the conclusion that the Sikshas are decidedly older than the Pratisalingas, and that the doctrines contained in the former were incorporated and further developed in the latter. Dr. Burnell (On the Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians, p. 47) has adopted the same view, and, if I understand him rightly, has ascribed the Sikshas, or at any rate their doctrines, to a school of grammarians which is said to have preceded that of Panini. My own investigations, and the perusal of a larger number of treatises than were accessible to Prof. Haug or Dr. Burnell, have led to the conclusion that the views expressed by both scholars require to be considerably modified before they can be accepted.

To disprove the view taken by Professor

and that finally their manner of pronouncing the final letter of this particular Greek word *xaupeus* or *xaupe* is prescribed by the Sikshá to be the right way of pronouncing the range sound of the Vedas.

Years ago, when conversing with a native friend of mine who was to have been a reciter of the Rigveda, I asked for his explanation of the above verse, and what I learnt from him was that the range ought to be pronounced like the final sound of the word 看新其 when shouted by dairy-women in the street. Had I had any doubt as to the correctness of this explanation it would have been removed by the following passage from the commentary on the Sarvasanmata-sikshā which I subsequently received from Maisur:—

सौराष्ट्रंश उत्पन्ना की तकविकयणार्थ यथा तको इति कांस्य-प्वनिसमं भावत एवं वेदे अप रङ्काः मयोक्तव्याः । वेद उदाहत्य

दर्शवति । खं अरो इव केदयेति ।। See Rigreda viii. 77, 3.

I could quote many instances to show that I do not exaggerate, but one must suffice here. Several sikshas

Haug that the Śikshás (i.e. all the Śikshás which are known to exist) are older than the Prátišā-khyas, it would suffice to state that one of the most important Šikshás, and one the value of which appears to have been considered sufficiently great to ensure for its author the title of Šikshákara κατ ἰξοχήν,—I mean the Vyása-šikshá—follows the Taittiriya-prátišákhya so closely as to be in many respects little less than a metrical version of the latter, and that 'Sannaka and the rest,' the authors of the Prátišákhyas. are actually quoted in the Yajňavalkya, or, as it is also called, Kátyáyana-šikshá. §

I might also point to passages of the Sarvasammata and other Sikshās in which the Prātisākhyas are likewise cited, and in which their authority over that of the Sikshās is extolled, as in the following lines:—

शिक्षा च प्रातिशाख्यं च विरुध्येते परस्परम् । शिक्षेत्र दुर्वलेखाडुः सिंहस्येत मृगी यथा ।।

But it appears to me that such distinct references to the *Prátišákhyas* are by no means required to prove the comparatively recent date of all the *Sikshûs* that have up to the present been discovered. A perusal of the more important treatises of this branch of Sanskrit literature, and a comparison of their form and contents, have ended, so far at least as I am concerned, in the conviction that, notwithstanding the high-sounding and ancient names which most of them bear, they are modern compilations, as a rule executed with very little skill.

Had Professor Haug confined himself to state that the contents of the Sikshās may in the main be as old as those of the Prātišākhyas, I

contain a verse in which the reciter is warned against seven different wrong positions of the hands or fingers:—

चलुनीवा रफुटी दण्डी स्वस्तिको मुष्टिरेव च । एते वे इस्तदोबाः स्युः पर्शुच्छेदस्तु सप्तमः ॥

To know the exact meaning of each of the terms contained in this verse is of course a matter of very small importance; but conjecture in a case like this would, in my opinion, he worse than useless.

§ The Vydsa-iikshā actually refers to the Prātiāl-khyas in the following lines:—

मध्यमां बृत्तिमालस्थ्य चैवं कालाः शृतिश्विताः । प्रातिज्ञास्यादिषु द्यात्र बृत्तिः साप्यवलस्थिता ॥ The verse from the Fijiavalkya-šikshā alluded to in

the above in my MSS. reads thus:—
हुमें नकार यत्स्वार रञ्जनित शीनकादय:

एवं रहें विजानीयात्र त्वा भीरिव विन्दति ॥ See Rigveda, X. 146, 1. should have felt little hesitation in agreeing with him: for there are traces in the latter to show that the principal doctrines embodied in our present Sikshûs were not unknown at the time when the Pratisakhyas were composed. || But I am again obliged to differ from Professor Haug when he maintains that the teachings of the Sikshas have been more fully developed in the Prátisákhyas. On whatever point I have compared the doctrines of both classes of works, I have almost in every instance been driven to the conclusion that the teachings of the Sikshas are fuller and more minute than those of the Pratisakhyas,-that the former give much of detail which, if not unknown, has at any rate found no place in the latter. What do the Pratisakhyas teach us regarding the denotation of the svaras by means of the hands and fingers, about which the Sikshas have so much to sav, and about which they give such minute rules? All I can find are one or two short rules in the Vájasaneyi-prátisákhya, which contain hardly more than ten words. Why was Professor

|| That sikshas in verse were in existence when Patanjali composed his great commentary on Kutyāyana's Varttikas, seems to me very probable; for the verse which he quotes when explaining the term सङ्गादि of the Varttika आकृत्युपदेशास्त्रिद्धिति चन्सङ्गादीनां प्रतिचेष: in the introductory Ahnika

> प्रस्तं निरस्तमविलम्बितं निर्हत-मम्बुकृतं 'मातमथो विकस्पितम् । , संदष्टमेणीकृतमधेकं दुर्त विकाणमेताः स्वरदोषभावनाः॥

has all the appearance of being a Siksha-verse, even in this particular that the first line violates the metrical rules.

The Loc. cit. p. 57, note 1. In my own copies of the Mandaki Siksha the optional name for Pakawati is not Madhya, but Yaramadhya.

उभाभ्यामेव हरवाभ्या यवमध्यां विनिर्दिशेत्। ताभ्यामेव त दीर्योभ्यां विश्वया सा विवीतिका ॥

The Sarvasammata-siksha has for vatsanusrita 'vatsanusriti,' which is also found in the Vyasa-siksha.

• Instead of the term korint (loc. cit. note 2) of the Mandaki and Yajiawalkya-siksha, other Sikshas have karenu. See, e.g., Sarvasammata-siksha:—

करेण १इयोथॉग करिणा लहकारयो : । हरिणी रज्ञसानां च हारिता लज्ञकारयो : । या तृ इंसपदा नाम सातु रेफपकारयो : ॥ and Fydsz-संkshû:-

स्वरभिकः करेणू से होध्यों तः कविणी भवेत्। हरिणा ज्ञाबसीध्यों से लकारी हारितोच्यते॥

† A knowledge of the Sikshûs might have rendered assistance to the editors of the Pratisakhyas, excellently as the latter have been edited, or it would at any rate

Haug himself the first to point out the different kinds of vivritti ¶ and of svarabhakti * so accurately described and classified in nearly every Sikshā? Is there any Prātišākhya which more accurately or more fully treats of the svarita than the Sikshās do, any one which tries to describe the relation of the so-called four accents to the seven musical notes in the manner in which this is done in the Sikshās? The Prātišākhyas do teach much that is not to be found in the Sikshās, but on no one point do they teach more on what it is the object and the business of the latter to give information.†

The Sikshás are manuals intended to teach the proper manner of reciting the Vedas, and inasmuch as the compiler of a manual has to adapt himself to the capacities and previous mental training of those for whom his work is designed, it is natural that the Sikshákáras should have given to their teachings the simplest possible form, that they should have illustrated them by examples which even the uneducated might be supposed to be familiar with, and

have guarded them against occasional rash statements. The commentary on the Taittir. Prát. XIX. 3 states that the word III is synonymous with III (II), upon which Professor Whitney remarks: "In yanu as a synonym of surviti, and meaning 'circumflex,' I cannot in the least believe." Indian, like other commentators, are not infallible, but in this instance the commentator was right, for in defining the Prailishtx scarit the Valsa-iikshā says—

उन्नोत्वात्रीच उत्वे स्यात्प्रश्लिष्ट : संधितो यमः

The commentator is right, too, when he states that HAM (not merely describes the nature of the survita, but) is actually another term for FARM; this likewise can be proved from the Sishis.

That the term धृत, by itself, is synonymous with प्रचय appears from the following verse of the Vyása-sikshá:—

स्वारः शीर्षे मुखे अप्युचप्रचयौ निहती हृदि। नीचोचरवारधृतास्वित विज्ञेयाः प्रजापती॥

This passage will show that the reading of the MSS. of the Pāṇiniya-iikishā, v. 43, धृते च, ought not to have been altered to धृतच, and that the word उपान्तम-च should have been translated by 'the ring and the middle fingers.' (Incl. Stud. vol. IV. p. 365.) The following verses of the Bharat thh Ishya called Straspatiheid yabhāshma, the author of which professes to have stadied the Sikshās of Pāṇini, Nārada, and Āpiāsli, are evidently based on the verse of the Pāṇiniya-iikihā referred to in the above:—

अङ्कारय मुखायेग तर्जनीयूलसारणात्।

बदात्तः स स्वरो नाम वेदविश्विरदाहतः॥ कनिष्ठामूलसंस्पर्जादनुदात्त इति स्वृतः। स्वरिता अनामिकामूलसंस्पर्जायः स्वरो भवेतू॥ मध्यमामूलतो विधात्मचितं स्पर्जनादपि। that as a rule they should have avoided, so far as it was possible, the strict terminology and the concise forms of the grammatical schools, even when the temptation of employing the latter was by no means a slight one. The simpler their treatises, the more homely their illustrations,—the better they would serve their purpose. For it can hardly be doubtful that in the recitation of the Vedas, as in a thousand other things, India of old did not differ greatly

from India as we find it at present, and that the ancient Vedapáthakas were as ignorant in everything except their own profession as their successors are to-day. To adduce the less strict or less technical terminology of the Sidshaks as a proof for an antiquity higher even than that of Panini, or at all to consider these treatises as the production of a school of grammarians, appears to me to be misunderstanding their nature and the purpose for which they have been composed.