

The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra, critically edited and translated by **C. G. Kashikar**, 4 vols., Kalāmūlaśāstra Series, vols. 35–38, New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003, pp. xlv + 275; pp. vii + [276]-787; pp. xi + [788]-1313; pp. ix + [1314]-1844. ISBN 81-2081852-0 (set), Rs. 4200.00

Reviewed by Leonid Kulikov

Leiden University

The book under review has appeared as volumes 35 through 38 in the prestigious Indian Kalāmūlaśāstra series, which publishes Sanskrit texts with translations. The editor, Cintāmaṇi Gaṇeśa Kashikar [Kāśīkar] (b. 1910), is an authoritative Indian Sanskritist and a connoisseur of Vedic texts and Vedic ritual, particularly well-known by his studies on Śrautasūtras. He has now presented to the scholarly audience a new edition and the first English translation of one of the most important texts of the Śrautasūtra period.

The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra (hereafter, BaudhŚS), belonging to the Taittirīya school of the Black Yajurveda, is one of the oldest Śrautasūtras (being, in all probability, even older than some of the late Brāhmaṇas, such as Gopatha- and Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa) and, no doubt, one of the most important texts of the late Vedic period in general. With its 29 Praśnas, or ‘chapters’, this text is also one of the largest texts of this period. Willem Caland’s editio princeps (anticipated by Caland’s monograph (1903), which represents an extensive introduction to his edition) appeared nearly 100 years ago and has remained until now the only edition of the BaudhŚS. In 1982, Caland’s edition was reprinted with a six page appendix, prepared by Radhe Shyam Shastri on the basis of a number of sources, including some studies on Śrautasūtras by Kashikar. This appendix contains a number of emendations to the published text.

The book opens with an Introduction (pp. xi–xlv), offering a general survey of the text and containing remarks concerning the text’s historical and cultural context, as well as certain stylistic and linguistic aspects. The reader is presented with a short outline of the Baudhāyana corpus and the general characteristics of the text, which is qualified as a *pravacana* (“a discourse which is orally delivered”, p. xii), as opposed to a *sūtra* in the strict sense of the word. The next section, 3, is dedicated to the authorship of the BaudhŚS. After an extensive discussion of the division of the text, Kashikar arrives at the conclusion that only its initial part, the main Sūtra (= Praśnas, or Chapters, I–XIX), could have been written by Baudhāyana himself (considered by the Indian tradition to be the author of this Śrautasūtra). The three

other parts of the text, Dvaidha (Chapters XX-XXIII), Karmānta (Chapters XXIV-XXVI), and Prāyaścitta (Chapters XXVII-XXIX), have been written by his pupils and/or his followers. On the basis of an analysis of quotations from other Taittirīya texts, Kashikar claims that the redaction of the Saṃhitā, as well as most parts of the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka, was complete by the time of the creation of the BaudhŚS. He also notices borrowings from other schools of the Black Yajurveda, Kāthaka, and Maitrāyaṇī, but calls into question Caland's hypothesis about the close connection with the Kāṇva recension of Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (which belongs to the Black Yajurveda tradition), made in the Introduction to Caland's edition of this text (1926).

Section 6 mentions several linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of the BaudhŚS, reproducing some of the forms and constructions listed by Caland (1903: 41–65) under the headings “Grammatisches”, “Stilistisches” and “Lexikographisches”.¹ We should recall that, as early as in the course of preparation of the editio princeps, but after the publication of its first volume (and thus after the publication of Caland's Introduction (1903)), Caland changed the numbering of chapters and sections on the basis of a new manuscript (from Mackenzie collection). Caland explains in his introduction to the second volume of the edition (p. iii): “I have adopted the arrangement of the materials as given by this ms. In consequence of this arrangement, the one adopted previously has been abandoned: thus the numbering of the praśnas and partially that of the adhyāyas in the text coming after gavām ayana [= BaudhŚS 16.13–23. – LK] is wholly different from the numbering followed by me in citing passages from Baudhāyana in my above paper on this sūtra [= Caland 1903. – LK].” Quite annoyingly, when reproducing selected forms and constructions from Caland's (1903: 41ff.) list, Kashikar seems to have ignored this fact and did not take the trouble to recheck the references to the text in order to bring them into correspondence with the final system of division.² This exercise is left to the reader to perform.

Below, I will briefly comment on two interesting features of the verbal system of the BaudhŚS. A remarkable anomaly mentioned in Caland's list is the abnormally long (vr̥ddhi) grade optative (class II present) that is attested for a few roots in *u/ū*: *nu - pra-ṇauyāt* ‘he should perform Praṇava’, *sū - pra-sauyāt* ‘he should bid’, and *yu - pra-yauyāt* ‘he should stir’³ (instead of the regular zero grade forms *-ṇuyāt*, *-suyāt*, and *-yuyāt*). Apparently, all these forms result from an expansion of the special sub-type of the class II present (known as the ‘Narten present’ in Indo-European scholarship) to some weak forms of the paradigm, viz. to

¹ Note an inaccuracy in Caland's (1903: 43) list repeated by Kashikar (p. xxv): the form *akṛṣi* (BaudhŚS 26.12), i.e., 1sg.med. of the sigmatic aorist (‘aorist 4’) of the root *kṛ* ‘make’, is erroneously qualified as a *sa*-aorist (‘aorist 7’).

² Thus, for instances, references should be changed for two of the three optatives in *-auyāt* (on which see below): read XXIII.7 instead of XXV.7 for *pra-sauyāt* and XXV.32 instead of XXVII.35 for *pra-yauyāt*.

³ The last form also occurs with another preverb, *sam* (in BaudhŚS 16.4 and 24.36; see Gotō 1997, 1027).

the optative. This irregularity is unknown in most (all?) other Vedic texts,⁴ thus it might be considered to be a feature particular to the BaudhŚS.

Another remarkable form is the medio-passive *i*-aorist *apūri* (made from the secondary root *pūr* 'become full'), attested at BaudhŚS 20.1. Interestingly, this form is also found in another Śrautasūtra of Taittirīya, Vādhulasūtra (probably being nearly as old as the BaudhŚS, see below); see Kulikov 2001: 308.

The discussion of linguistic and stylistic peculiarities is followed by a short survey of commentaries on the BaudhŚS, the oldest of which, Bhavasvāmin's bhāṣya, is dated to the 8th century A.D.

The extensive Section 8 (p. xxxi-xl) deals with the chronology of the BaudhŚS, which is compared to some other Vedic as well as post-Vedic texts. Kashikar convincingly demonstrates that the BaudhŚS is older than most other Śrautasūtras of the Taittirīya, except for the nearly contemporary Vādhulasūtra, which seems to be older than the younger parts of the BaudhŚS (Dvaidha, Karmānta and Prāyaścitta), but younger than the main Sūtra (= Chapters I-XIX). The two attested Śrautasūtras of the Maitrāyaṇī school, the Mānava and Vārāha, must be younger than the BaudhŚS, while the Śrautasūtra of the Kaṭhaka school (which is only preserved in fragments quoted in other texts), according to Kashikar, must be dated to the same or an even earlier period as the BaudhŚS. Kashikar dates the BaudhŚS to the period between 800 and 600 B.C. Geographically, the homeland of the BaudhŚS is tentatively determined as North-Western part of India, where the Taittirīya and other schools of the Black Yajurveda are localized. Kashikar suggests that Baudhāyana lived in Panjāb; later his followers migrated southwards.

The Introduction is followed by the text of the Śrautasūtra. In accordance with the common practice adopted in editions of the Kalāmūlaśāstra series, the Sanskrit text (in Devanāgarī) is printed on the left side (i.e. on even pages), whilst the English translation runs on odd pages. Footnotes to the English translation contain, in particular, information about the sources of the mantras quoted in the text.

The book concludes with a glossary of terms (vol. IV, p. 1809–1837) and a bibliography (p. 1839–1844).

The edition is qualified as 'critical' by Kashikar, but in fact it can be considered as such only with reservations. In the editorial Preface, we read the following: "As a result of my close study of the text in all aspects and the numerous variant readings, I have improved the text at numerous places. [...] In my notes to the translation I have noted all such places where I have chosen a reading different from that of Caland's printed text. The text printed herein is thus, the *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* text in a revised form" (p. v). Apart from these footnotes (which are in fact not so numerous), there is no critical apparatus in the proper sense of the

⁴ Note that another Śrautasūtra of the Taittirīya school, Bhāradvāja, attests the regular form *pra-suyāt*; see Gotō 1997, 1027.

word (which is probably dictated by general requirements of the series). Thus, those wishing to consult variant readings have to address Caland's editio princeps.

As usual in editions of the Kalāmūlāsāstra series, the Sanskrit text is beautifully printed. Unfortunately, it is not free of distracting blunders. Judging from, the mostly correct, translations by Kashikar, many of them are mere typos due to careless printing and/or proof-reading rather than to re- or misinterpretation of the corresponding forms by the editor.

Thus, as mentioned above, in 1982, Caland's edition of the text was reprinted with a list of emendations. Some of them are adopted in the present edition, but in a few cases they are not introduced into the printed text. Thus, for instance, in vol. I, p. 74, we read *khedo* (as it was the case in ed. Caland), although Kashikar's translation 'sweat' shows that he adopted the emendation *svedo* (made earlier by himself; see Kashikar 1970). Likewise, the emendation **balāsaḥ* (ibid.) 'consumption, phthisis', also made in Kashikar 1970, does not appear in the text, which reads *vilāsaḥ*, as it was in Caland's edition.

There are also readings not registered in the 1982 list, but apparently corrected by Kashikar during the preparation of the present edition, which, again, remain unchanged in the printed text. Thus, the text reads *viśvasya* (3.12; vol. I, p. 146, ed. Caland p. 83, l. 4), to be read *viśasva* 'enter' (as translated by Kashikar).

Finally, we also come across "new" misprints, such as *to* (2.6; vol. I, p. 78, ed. Caland p. 42, l. 15) for *ta* (sandhi form of *te*) 'thy, your' (correctly translated by Kashikar). In spite of the fact that these misprinted forms are correctly translated by Kashikar, the presence of such blunders in the edition is somewhat distracting.

The above-mentioned shortcomings do not of course diminish the importance of the editorial work made by Kashikar. The English translation is in general quite good,⁵ testifying to the enormous philological work that has been carried out by this scholar. (But note that it is mostly invisible to the reader, since the (foot)notes are reduced to a minimum.)

In summary, this long-awaited for publication fills a major gap in the study of Vedic texts, by offering for the first time a full translation of one of the largest Śrautasūtras. It is an outstanding addition to a similar work of the same genre carried out by Kashikar: the edition and translation of another Śrautasūtra of the Taittirīya school, Bhāradvāja (1964). It will certainly stimulate further research of the Śrautasūtra ritual in general, and philological

⁵ Of course, a translation of such an enormous text cannot be completely free of inaccuracies or (minor) mistakes, and it would hardly be fitting to enter into a detailed discussion of each and every one of them here. I should mention one such inaccuracy however: Kashikar's translates the mantra *imaṃ samudraṃ śatadhāram utsaṃ vyacyamānaṃ bhuvanasya madhye* (attested, with variants, in the Atharvaveda, and in all of the Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda, in particular in Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 4.2.10.2) in BaudhŚS 1.17 as 'the ocean, the hundred-streamed extending in the middle of the region'. The translation of *vyacyamāna* as 'extending' reproduces the erroneous analysis of this participle as belonging to *añc* 'expand, extend', which is shared by several Vedic scholars (Whitney, Keith to name but two). It was correctly explained by Hoffmann (1965, 173 [= *Aufs.* 1, 164]) as derived from the homonymous root *añc* 'bail' ('schöpfen'). Accordingly, the mantra should be translated as '... this ocean, the hundred-streamed fountain, being bailed in the middle of the world'.

studies on the Taittirīya Śrautasūtras (some of which have not yet been translated in their entirety). The book should be found on the most prominent shelf of any Indological library.

REFERENCES:

- The Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the Taittirīya saṃhitā*, ed. W. Caland, Bibliotheca Indica 163, Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1904–1924 (2nd ed. with new appendix containing many text improvements [prepared by Radhe Shyam Shastri], New Delhi).
- Caland, Willem 1903. *Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana*. Leipzig: Brockhaus (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 12/1).
- Gotō, Toshifumi 1997. Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 16. *chad*, 17. *chand/chad*, 18. *chard/chṛd*, 19. *dagh/dhag*, 20. *dveṣ/dviṣ*, 21. *bandh/badh*, 22. ¹*man*, 23. ²*man*, 24. *mnā*, 25. ¹*yav/yu*, 26. ²*yav/yu*, 27. *sanⁱ*, 28. *star/stṛ*, 29. *starⁱ/stṛⁱ*. *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka)* 22 (4), 1001–1059.
- Hoffmann, Karl 1965. Materialien zum altindischen Verbum [: 1. *añc* ‘schöpfen’ etc.]. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen (KZ)* 79, 171–191. [= *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Bd. 1, 162–182. Wiesbaden: Reichert]
- Kashikar C.G. 1970. “Pāpmano vinidhayah,” *Journal of the University of Poona. Humanities Section* 33, 45–60.
- Kulikov, Leonid 2001. *The Vedic -ya- presents*, PhD diss., Leiden University.