

REMARKS ON THE ŚIKSHĀS.

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 *Śikshās*, 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 seemed 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 *Śikshās*, 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 *Māṇḍūkī Śikshā* reads verse IV. 9 as follows:—

सन्निभसु वरगे न परं योजनानुजेत् ।

न हि पाणिहता वाणी प्रयोगान्वक्तुमर्हति ॥

A copy of the original of my MS. M was sent to Berlin, and from it Prof. Weber gave an account of the *Māṇḍūkī Śikshā* in an appendix to his essay on the *Pratijñāśāstra*. 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:—

सन्निभसु वरगे न परं योजनानुजेत् ।

न हि ग्नाहिता वाणी प्रयोगान्वक्तुमर्हति ॥

This is no doubt readable Sanskrit, but it certainly is no longer a verse of the *Māṇḍūkī Śikshā*.

As the compound letter वज in MS. M is always written व, the third word of the first line is really वरगे, a reading which is given by both my MSS. C and B, but which I at present do not understand; if I considered it right simply to admit the reading of another *Śikshā*, I should adopt that of the *Nirṇaya-śikshā* सन्निभसु वरते, but I cannot yet bring myself to believe that वरते should in the *Māṇḍūkī Śikshā* have been altered to वरगे.

The case is less hopeless with the second line; here C reads पाणिहता and B पाहिहता; 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 *Śikshās* 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 पाणिहता; this actually does occur in the *Nirṇaya-śikshā*, and this I do adopt for the *Māṇḍūkī Śikshā*.

† As Professor Weber (*On the Pratijñāśāstra*, p. 75) wishes to know whether the *Śikshās* lately discovered in India throw any light on the verse describing the pronunciation of the nasal sound called *raṅga* which occurs in the *Pāṇini-śikshā*, 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:—

यया सौराष्ट्रिका नारा अरौ (व. घ. तर्क) इत्यभिवाचनं ।

एवं रङ्गं विज्ञानीत्येव अरौ इव वेदया ॥

and it was originally translated by Prof. Weber thus:—

'Just as the women of Saurāṣṭra address (?) with the word (?) अरौ ।'

'Just so one ought to know the *raṅga*, e.g. खे अरौ इव ॥'

At p. 270 of vol. IV. of the *Indische Studien* a second translation is proposed, 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 shortly this:—that both the readings अरौ and तर्क in the first line give no sense; that we have to read खरा इत्यभिवाचनं; that खरा is the Greek word *χαίρειν*; that the Saurāṣṭra women of old used to greet one another with the Greek word *χαίρει* :

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 *Śikshās* were not unknown at the time when the *Prātisākhya*s were composed. || But I am again obliged to differ from Professor Haug when he maintains that the teachings of the *Śikshās* have been more fully developed in the *Prātisākhya*s. 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 *Śikshās* are fuller and more minute than those of the *Prātisākhya*s,—that the former give much of detail which, if not unknown, has at any rate found no place in the latter. What do the *Prātisākhya*s teach us regarding the denotation of the *svaras* by means of the hands and fingers, about which the *Śikshās* have so much to say, and about which they give such minute rules? All I can find are one or two short rules in the *Vājasaneyi-prātisākhya*, which contain hardly more than ten words. Why was Professor

Haug himself the first to point out the different kinds of *vivṛitti* ¶ and of *svarabhakti* * so accurately described and classified in nearly every *Śikshā*? Is there any *Prātisākhya* which more accurately or more fully treats of the *svārita* than the *Śikshās* 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 *Śikshās*? The *Prātisākhya*s do teach much that is not to be found in the *Śikshās*, 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 *Śikshās* 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 *Śikshākāras* 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

|| That *Śikshās* in verse were in existence when Patanjali composed his great commentary on *Sātyāyana's Vārtikas*, seems to me very probable; for the verse which he quotes when explaining the term *संवृतादि* of the *Vārtika* आकृत्युपदेशान्तिद्विमित् चसंवृतादीनां प्रतिषेधः in the introductory *Ahnikā*

प्रस्तं निरस्तमविलम्बितं निहतं—

मन्मकृतं ध्यातमथो विकल्पितम् ।

संदष्टमेणीकृतमर्धकं दुतं

विकार्यमेताः स्वरदाषभावनः ॥

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

¶ Loc. cit. p. 57, note 1. In my own copies of the *Mānḍūkī Śikshā* the optional name for *Pāṇini* is not *Mādhya*, but *Varamadhya*.

उभायामेव ह्रस्वाभ्या यवमभ्यां विनिर्दिशेत् ।

ताभ्यामेव तु दीर्घाभ्यां विज्ञेया सा यिजिह्विका ॥

The *Sarasammatā-śikshā* has for *vatsānusritā* 'vatsānusriti', which is also found in the *Vyāsa-śikshā*.

* Instead of the term *kaviṇi* (loc. cit. note 2) of the *Mānḍūkī* and *Vajrasūktika-śikshā*, other *Śikshās* have *kareṇu*. See, e.g., *Sarasammatā-śikshā* :—

करेण ह्रस्वायां कविणी लहकारयोः ।

हरिणी रसानां च हारिता लङ्कारयोः ।

या तु हंसपदा नाम सा तु रेफकारयोः ॥

and *Vyāsa-śikshā* :—

स्वरभक्तिः करेण रो ह्रांशं लः कविणी भवेत् ।

हरिणी सायसोभ्यां रो लकारं हारिताच्यते ॥

† A knowledge of the *Śikshās* might have rendered assistance to the editors of the *Prātisākhya*s, excellently as the latter have been edited, or it would at any rate

have guarded them against occasional rash statements. The commentary on the *Taittirīy Prāt.* XIX. 3 states that the word *यम* is synonymous with *स्वरित*, upon which Professor Whitney remarks: "In *yama* as a synonym of *svārita*, 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 *Prātisākhya* *svārita* the *Vyāsa-śikshā* says—

उच्चात्वाशीच उन्वे स्यात्प्रसिद्धः संधितो यमः

The commentator is right, too, when he states that *यवग* (not merely describes the nature of the *svārita*, but) is actually another term for *स्वरित*; this likewise can be proved from the *Śikshās*.

That the term *धृत*, by itself, is synonymous with *प्रचय* appears from the following verse of the *Vyāsa-śikshā* :—

स्वारः शीर्षे मुखे ऽप्युच्यते यौ निहतो हृदि ।

नीचोचरवारधृतौ चैव विज्ञेयाः प्रजापती ॥

This passage will show that the reading of the MSS. of the *Pāṇiniya-śikshā*, v. 43, धृतं च, ought not to have been altered to धृतव, and that the word *उच्चात्तमप्य* should have been translated by 'the ring and the middle fingers.' (Ind. Stud. vol. IV. p. 365.) The following verses of the *Dharmatishṭha* called *Sarasvatīhṛīyabhāṣana*, the author of which professes to have studied the *Śikshās* of *Pāṇini*, *Nārada*, and *Āpīali*, are evidently based on the verse of the *Pāṇiniya-śikshā* referred to in the above :—

अकृष्टय मुखाधेय तर्जनीमूलसारणान् ।

उदात्तः स स्वरो नाम वेदविशिष्टाद्वतः ॥

कनिष्ठामूलसंस्पर्शादनुदात्त इति स्थितः ।

स्वरितो ऽनामिकामूलसंस्पर्शायः स्वरो भवेत् ॥

मध्यमामूलतो विद्यामन्त्रितं स्पर्शनादपि ।

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 *Vedapāthakas* 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 *Sikshās* as a proof for an antiquity higher even than that of Pāṇini, 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.