PATRICK OLIVELLE

SANSKRIT COMMENTATORS AND THE TRANSMISSION OF TEXTS: HARADATTA ON ĀPASTamba DHARMASŪTRA

In my recent article “Unfaithful Transmitters” (Olivelle 1998) I drew attention to the pervasive mistrust of ancient Indian commentators as reliable guides to understanding ancient Indian texts prevalent among western scholars, a mistrust that spilled over into doubts about the reliability of the textual transmission mediated by these commentators and more broadly into a mistrust of the scribal tradition as such. Drawing on examples of “critical editions” of Upaniṣadic texts, especially Böhtlingk’s (1889) edition of the Chāndogya Upanisad, and the readings preserved by the commentator Śaṅkara, I tried to show there that western, primarily European, philologists were often less faithful transmitters of Upaniṣadic texts than the Indian scribes and commentators they so often criticized. Native commentators and theologians did not, as often assumed, carelessly or deliberately change the received texts to suit their doctrinal or grammatical tastes.

In this paper I return to that theme and this time examine closely the manner in which Haradatta, the commentator of the Āpastamba Dharmasūtra, explained and transmitted that ancient text. Just as it is unfair to indict all western scholars because of the excesses of some, so it is not my intention to present Haradatta as typical of all Indian commentators. If the “Orientalist” debate has taught us anything, it is to treat traditional Indian authors as individuals, to restore “agency” to them. They are not all alike; there are good and not so good commentators. Haradatta is one of the best. Yet, I do not think that he is unique or atypical; he is good, but he also represents well the tradition from which he comes.

Haradatta is what we would call today a “close reader” of the text. He does not let even the slightest irregularity, peculiarity, or quirk go unnoticed. He points out the presence or the absence of a visarga or an anusvāra (something even those of us who dabble in collating manuscripts are prone to overlook), the shortening or lengthening of a vowel, whether an “n” is dental or retroflex, whether a letter is “v” or “b” or “p”, and so on. In short, he takes the text he received from the

tradition of scribes and reciters seriously and reverentially, even when he happens to disagree with it.

This stands in sharp contrast, once again, to Böhtlingk (1885b), who wrote an article reviewing Bühler's edition (1st ed. 1868) and translation (1882) of Apestamba, an article that also contains another "close reading" of the text. I do not want to demonize Böhtlingk; in many instances he suggests prudent and sometimes ingenious emendations. I have given in the notes his observations and emendations on the passages commented on by Haradatta. One can readily see from them that on the whole the cavalier attitude of Böhtlingk towards the received text stands in sharp contrast to that of Haradatta. This is evident also from his Euro-centric remarks in the introduction to his article:

Before starting to discuss the individual śūtras, I am obliged to state my position about the commentator Haradatta. In spite of all of his scholarship, he cannot make any claims of authority in matters of language, because he lacks the European critical attitude. Bühler, a scholar and grammarian of the first rate, reveres Haradatta to the extent that he follows him unquestioningly. And that even when he finds himself in a conflict with his own knowledge of the language. I am glad to acknowledge archaisms, provided that it is possible to find an analogy from other older or contemporary writings. In the case of an alleged archaism that is completely isolated and for which a single manuscript offers the correct grammatical form, whether it be of a different manuscript family or whether it be resolved by itself only with a slight change, I would not hesitate to endorse it. My conscience does not allow me to attribute a gross grammatical error to an old author arbitrarily. It has been established that many mistakes adhere even to the oldest Indian texts, in spite of the agreement with manuscripts and commentators. Why then should the younger texts, which were not kept so scrupulously, be so inviolable that a European, who has devoted himself for over fifty years to Sanskrit studies, should not counter Haradatta in matters of language?

To give some coherence and structure to my analysis, I will present the material I have gleaned from Haradatta's commentary under three rubrics: A) variant readings preserved by Haradatta; B) Haradatta's explanations of difficult and possibly erroneous readings that he encountered in the transmitted text; and C) Haradatta's broader observations and explanations.

A. VARIANTS PRESERVED BY HARADATTA

I

I have collected 31 variant readings of the text preserved by Haradatta. First, I present a set of texts where Haradatta presents a reading which he presumably prefers, but acknowledges that it is a minority reading by giving the more common reading.
1) Āp 1.5.23: sarvāṇāṃ suyaktāḥ 'adhyaṇād anantaro 'adhyaśe ("He shall remain fully attentive all day long and at the time of vedic study never let anything distract him from his lesson"). Haradatta notes that the common reading for adhyāše is adhyāṣet, calling the final 't' either erroneous or a vedic peculiarity: adhyāṣet iti prāyaṇa paṭhantā tatra taṅkāro 'papāthas chāndasas vā. Bühler (1932, 11) notes, correctly I believe, that the 't' was probably introduced by the doubling of the initial 't' of tathā, which is the first word of the text sūtra. In many manuscripts sūtras are neither numbered nor separated by dandas but run continuously. Haradatta’s explanation may be faulty, but he is careful to note the variant.

2) Āp 1.8.2: māyā śāiptamukha upalanti kāṇcuky upānavahī pāthukā ("He may wear a necklace; apply lotions on his face, oil on his hair and beard, collyrium [on his eyes], and oil [on his body]; and wear a turban, a lungi, a jacket, sandals, and shoes"). Haradatta notes the variant compound form kāṇcukopānahī, providing a Pāṇinian (5.4.106) explanation of that form, but he calls the non-compound form the common reading and provides an explanation of the long initial vowel of kāṇcuki: prasiddhe pāthā kāṇcukam eva kāṇcukam tadānā kāṇcuki.

3) Āp 1.31.19: divādityah sattvāni gopāyati naktam candramās tasmād uñāvāsyāyāṁ niśāyān svādhiyāt itamav gupṭim icchet prayātyabrahmacāryakāle caryayā ca ("During the day the sun protects creatures, and during the night, the moon. Therefore, on the night of the new moon he should try his very best to guard himself by keeping himself pure and chaste and by performing rites appropriate for the occasion"). Haradatta sees clearly the grammatical problems posed by the last phrase containing an impossible compound. Indeed, all the manuscripts of Bühler’s edition have this reading; only one gives Haradatta’s preferred reading written above the line. Haradatta prefers the grammatical prayātyabrahmacāryabhyaṁ kāle caryayā ca, calling it the reading that accords with the meaning: avam tāvad arthānurūpah pāśah. But he confesses that the more difficult reading is the way the sūtra is actually recited, calling it either a careless mistake or a vedic form: adhyāyamans tu pramādaś chāndasas vā.

4) Āp 2.5.2: adhiṣṭa cāviprakramanaṁ sadyah ("After completing the vedic study he should not go away immediately"). Haradatta observes that the more common form has 'i' after 'm' (i.e., cāviprakramanam), which, he says, is either a vedic form or an error, but in any case has the same meaning: prāyaṇa makāraṁ param ikāram adhiṣṭate |
5) Ap 2.6.13: adhyayanasaṁyutiḥ castratehā ("In his case [i.e., when a guest is a Vedic student], however, there is the additional requirement to perform the Vedic recitation along with him"). Haradatta prefers the reading samyuti with a short 'a' but acknowledges that in the common reading the prefix sam has a long 'ā', which he takes to be a Vedic peculiarity: prasiddhe tu pāṭhe pūrvapadāntasya samaṁ kārasya chāndaso dirghah.

6) Ap 2.7.7: yad anuśīthaty uđavasyat eva tāt (“When he rises [as his guest gets up to leave], it constitutes the final rite of the Soma sacrifice”). Haradatta thinks that the reading should have the prefix ut after anu (i.e., anūtiṣṭhāti), but acknowledges that experts (śīṣṭa) read it differently: prāyaṇočchabdaṁ śīṣṭā na paṭhanti kevalam anuśābdan eva paṭhanti | tatrāpy arthah sa eva.

7) Ap 2.26.8: tatra yan masyate tais tat pratidāpyam (“[Security officers] must be forced to make good anything that is stolen within those [limits]”). Haradatta notes that generally the last word was pronounced with a ‘v’ rather than a ‘p’ (i.e., pratidāvyam): prāyaṇa daṇḍosyaṇa vaṅgāraṇ paṭhanti.

8) Ap 2.27.7: niyamārmbhanā hi varṣīyān abhyudaya evamārmbhanānād āpatyāḥ (“for the happiness resulting from following this restriction is far greater than that resulting from children obtained by following that custom [i.e., levirate"]”). Haradatta notes that āpatyāḥ is the common reading, although āpatyāḥ is his preferred reading: āpatyāḥ iti paṭahah | āpatyāḥ iti prāyaṇa paṭhanti.

II

Then there are the occasions when Haradatta records variants without indicating whether they were common or not. Here he appears to accept the possibility that the variants are also correct and frequently explains their formations.

9–11) Ap 1.7.21: we have here the form dhāryam. Haradatta appears to prefer the reading dharmam, but explains the other form: dhārmyapāṭhe svārīhe svaṁ (i.e. the 'ya' suffix with vṛddhi of the initial vowel and having the same meaning as the original word:
Panini 5.1.123–124). A similar preference for dharmya is seen at Ap 1.15.22 and 2.26.9, where Haradatta glosses dharmya with dharmya.

12) Ap 1.10.2: vairamanayo gurusv asatkya aupakaranam iti tryahah ("[Vedic recitation is suspended] for three days after the conclusion of the annual course of vedic study, the death of an elder, an ancestral offering made on the eighth day after the full moon, and the commencement of the annual course of vedic study"). Haradatta prefers the locative vairamanayo,8 but notes that in the variant the nominative stands for the locative: prathamanantapateh saapi maryarthe prathama.

13) Ap 1.31.4: devatahidhama caryayatoh ("[Let him refrain from] pronouncing the name of a god while he is impure"). Haradatta gives the variant apihama, which he considers to have an identical meaning: apihama iti api pate esa evarthah.

14) Ap 1.32.27: nāvam ca sāmśayikim ("[He should avoid] using an unsafe boat"). Haradatta prefers the reading with the normal accusative nāvam (from it nāv), yet gives the alternate form nāvam, which he takes to be the genitive plural, with the explanation that "among boats" one should avoid one that is unsafe; nāvam iti sāmśayikim nāvam madhye sāmśayikim nāvam varjaya. The form nāvam, however, as Bühler (1892, 54) has pointed out, is probably the accusative of the vedic/prakritic nāvā.

15) Ap 2.11.17: brāhme vivāhe bandhusūlaśrutārogyanī buddhav ā prajāśatvakarmabhyah pratipadayaec chakvivisayenaśamkrtya ("At a 'Brahma' marriage, he should inquire about the groom's family, virtue, learning, and health; adorn the girl with jewelry to the best of his ability; and give her for bearing children, for companionship, and for carrying out rituals"). Haradatta’s reading, also recorded in several manuscripts of Bühler’s edition, is: prajāṁ sahatvakarmabhyah. But he acknowledges the reading adopted by Bühler, saying: prajāśatvakarmabhyah iti pate prajārtham sahatvakarmārtham ceti.

16) Ap 2.16.2: prajāniḥśreyasa ca ("[Manu created the śrádáha ritual] also for the prosperity of the people"). Haradatta reads prajāniḥśreyasā ca,8 in keeping with classical Sanskrit; -śreyasa, however, as Bühler has pointed out, is a vedic instrumental possibly giving the reason. Haradatta gives this lectio difficilior also, giving his own explanation of this strange formation, as well as that of another commentator: prajāniḥśreyasāya tādāthye caurthi | prajānam niḥśreyasārtham | niḥśreyasa cetipāthe chāndaso
yakarasya cakāraḥ | aparā āha chāndaso lingavyatayah | praṇātimiṣreyasam cāsy ākaṃ karmānaḥ phalam iti. We have here two explanations of the difficult form. Haradatta takes the final ca to be part of the word (niḥṣreyasa,ca), and explains that the ya of niḥṣreyasadāya is represented here as ca, a Vedic peculiarity! The other opinion he cites takes the word to be a feminine nominative; the change of gender being attributed again to Vedic speech.

17) Āp 2.17.1: khaḍgopastarane khaḍgamāṇaḥ, senānātyaṃ kālaṃ (“With the meat of a rhinoceros offered on a rhinoceros skin, the gratification of ancestors] lasts an unlimited time”). Haradatta preferred a different reading for anāntyaṃ; different manuscripts of the commentary give his reading as either ayanam kālaṃ or anantam kālaṃ (given his explanation of the variant. I think his reading was the latter). He records, however, also the other reading: anāntyaṃ iti pāṭhe svārīthe yañ (see above A: 9–11).

18–19) Āp 2.17.22: here we have a reference to jyeṣṭhasāmakah (“a man who sings the Jyeṣṭha Sāmba’s”) in a list of “people who purify a row of eaters” (pāṅkitaśvāna). Haradatta records the variant jyeṣṭhasāmikah with the comment: jyeṣṭhasāmika iti pāṭhe vṛihyādīrūt than [-ika suffix of possession for words beginning with vṛih; Pāṇini 5.2.116]. Some versions of this sutra also contains the compound srotiyaputraḥ. Haradatta notes this as an addition: srotiyaputra ity api pāṭhanī | tad ādorārtham draṣṭavyam.

20) Āp 2.19.1: gaurasarṣapāṇāṃ cāṇāni kārayitva pāṇiḍādam prakāśya nukham karṇām prāśya ca ... (“[A man who wants to be prosperous] should get some white mustard seeds made into powder; rub it on his hands, feet, face, and ears, eat it ...”). Haradatta records a variant of prāśya with a dental ‘s’: prāsyetī pāṭhe prāsyed vikireṣ (“scatter”).

21) Āp 2.19.4: na caḥyenaḥ bhoktavyah (“and no one else should eat from [one’s eating bowl]”). Haradatta prefers the neuter reading bhoktavyam, but gives also the masculine reading adopted by Bühler: bhoktavya iti pratīgāpāṭhe ’py esa evārthah.

22) Āp 2.20.15–16: nakhaśe ca nakhavādatanaṃ | sphaṭanāṃ cākāraṇāti (“[He should refrain from] making noises by striking the nails against each other and cracking the finger joints without a good reason”). Haradatta records a variant (also found in some manuscripts) that joins the two sūtras by making a compound of the final and initial words of the two: vādanasphaṭanānāṃ samāsapaṭhe ’py esa evārthah.
Finally, there are numerous other occasions when Haradatta gives variant readings but clearly states which of them is correct and which is wrong.

23) Āp 1.5.16: duksināṁ bāhum śrotasanam prasārya brāhmaṇo bhivādayita ... prāṇjaliṁ10 (“With joined hands, let a Brahmin greet by stretching his right hand level with his ears . . .”). Haradatta prefers the reading prāṇjaliḥ, calling it the correct reading: yuktaḥ pāṭahā.

24) Āp 1.6.28: ceṣṭati ca cikīŗsam tacchaktiviseye (“And when the teacher is doing something, he should, if he is capable, offer to do it himself”). Haradatta records the participial reading cikīrsan, but also gives the optative reading, which he takes to be the correct one: cikīraṁ iti tu yuktaḥ pāṭahā.11

25) Āp 1.17.37: pañcanakhanāṁ godhakacchapaśūvīṣchalyaka ... (“Animals with five nails are forbidden, with the exception of the monitor lizard, tortoise, porcupine, hedgehog, . . .”). Haradatta sees śūvīṣchalyaka (or -sāryaka) as the correct form but records what he takes to be the erroneous reading: eke tu cha karāṁ paṭhanti chakarart purvam ikāram.

26) Āp 2.10.11: nyāstāyudhaprakīṁkeśaṇeṣeṇa prāṇjalparanāyāvṛtiṇāṁ āryā vedham paṇicaksae (“Āryas condemn the killing of those who have thrown down their weapons, who have disheveled hair, who fold their hands in supplication, or who are fleeing”). Haradatta accepts this as the correct reading but records what he regards as an erroneous variant that dissolves the long compound with visarga at the end of each word: nyāstāyudhaḥ prakīṁkeśa iti visaryaṇiṁ kecid vadaṁ [or paṭhanti] | so ’papāṭah.

27) Āp 2.17.22: In this list of individuals who are paṅkṭipāvana (cf. A: 18–19) we read: vedādhyāyī antācānapatruṣ (“a man who recites the Veda, a son of a vedic savant”). Haradatta finds an erroneous variant which adds iti between the two words: vedāadhyāyī atyāpy anta [variant asayāntaram] itiśabadhaḥ paṭhanti | so ’papāṭah.

28) Āp 2.20.18: yokta ca dharmayuktēṣu dravyaparītēṣu ca (“He should be a man who applies himself to acquiring wealth in righteous ways”). Haradatta observes that one ca is meaningless and that it is omitted by some: ekas ca sa bhādo ’narthakah| kecina naiva paṭhanti. All the manuscripts used by Bühler (1932) have both ca, and Haradatta does not make it clear which of the two should be deleted. Since all five sūtras preceding this (2.26.13–17) and the four following
it (2.26.19–22) have ca as the second word, I would conclude that the offending ca is the last.

29) Ap 2.26.6: sarvato vojanaṃ nāgarām taskarebhīyo rakṣyam (“They must protect a town from thieves up to a yojana on all sides”). Haradatta notes the incorrect variant: rakṣyam ity apanāthaḥ.

30) Ap 2.27.5: avasīṣṭam hi paratvaṃ pāneḥ (“[Levirate is forbidden] for with respect to the husband all are equally outsiders”). Haradatta notes the incorrect variant: avasīṣṭam ity apanāthaḥ.

Perhaps the greatest insight into the research conducted by Haradatta in writing his commentary is provided by the following passage, and for that reason I want to discuss it in greater detail.

31) Ap 2.17.25: anyatra rāhudarśanāt (“except when there is a lunar eclipse”). Haradatta has a long comment on the authenticity and the meaning of this sūtra given at the end of his comments on sūtra 24. I quote it in full:

anumānam “anyatra rāhudarśanāt” iti pañohati | “na ca naktam” [sūtra 23] ity asyāraṇavaḥ rāhudarśane rakṣam api kuryeta | udyās tu etat prāyena | na pañohati | ity etat pratyāhănaṃ na vyakhyatam | pratyāhă “na ca naktam” ity etat pratyāhănaṃ na vyakhyatam | pahyārmanam tu “na ca naktam” ity asyārnāmām pahyārmanam yaktaṃ.

Immediately after this [i.e., after sūtra 24], (some) read “except when there is a (lunar) eclipse”. This is an exception to “An ancestral offering should not be performed after nightfall” [sūtra 23]; that is, when there is a (lunar) eclipse, one may perform it even at night. The northeners for the most part, however, do not read this. Accordingly, it has not been commented on by earlier (commentators). On the contrary, they have explained the (sūtra) “An ancestral offering should not be performed after nightfall” as referring to a lunar eclipse. If it is to be read, however, it should properly be read immediately after the (sūtra) “An ancestral offering should not be performed after nightfall” [that is, if we accept sūtra 25, then it should come after sūtra 23 and not after 24, which reads “and once it is started the performer should not eat until it is completed”].

This comment shows that Haradatta had taken the trouble to check the readings of Apastamba preserved in the north. It is unclear what part of India “north” refers to, and whether Haradatta is referring to northern manuscripts or to actual recitations in northern schools, a question I will return to in the conclusion. He does, however, appear to privilege the northern tradition at least in this case. The comment also shows that Haradatta had access to and utilized earlier commentaries.12

The expressionatham ca (“accordingly”) in the statement that the earlier commentators have not commented on in this sūtra appears to indicate that the reason for their ignoring it is that fact that it was absent in the northern recension. If this is true, then we can draw a couple of conclusions. First, Haradatta locates these “early commentators” in the
north. Second, he thus privileges the northern tradition of transmission over the southern, with which he was probably more familiar.

B. EXPLANATIONS OF DIFFICULT OR UNGRAMMATICAL READINGS

Haradatta was a close reader of the text, whether it was in manuscript form or orally recited by experts, a question I will return to later. Whenever he found an unusual or ungrammatical reading, he did not, as Böhtlingk often does in his critique of the critical editions of Apastamba and Vasiṣṭha prepared by Bühler and Führer, change the received readings to suit a preconceived notion of grammatical correctness. Instead, Haradatta attempted to explain the difficult readings. Sometimes he calls them vedic peculiarities (chandasa) or erroneous readings (apapaṭha), but he never changes them. I have noted 58 such instances.

1) Āp 1.1.27; ā śoḍaśād brahmaṇasyānātayayah (“In the case of a Brähmin there is no lapse [in postponing vedic initiation] until the sixteenth year”). Haradatta comments on the irregular long no of anātayaya, calling it either an accidental or a secondary formation.13 We have two somewhat different versions of Haradatta’s text in the two editions: Bühler (1892) anātayā 'nātikramah sa evātāyah | yātṛcchikā dirghaḥ | aṅgo va prayogaḥ; Kashi Sanskrit Series edition: atayā 'ṅtrikramah | sa evātāyah tudabhaṅgo ‘ṅṭayāyaḥ | yātṛcchikā dirghaḥ aṅgo va praśālesaḥ.

2) Āp 1.2.13; pādūnam (‘An initiated person should reside as a student in his teacher’s house for forty-eight years or “for one-quarter of that time”). The normal form with regular sandhi would be pādūnam (pādā + ānām), and Haradatta explains the irregularity: pādenonam pādūnam | pararipam śakandhvāditvāḥ (cf. Kātyāyana’s Vārttikaka and Patañjali on Panini 6.1.94; see also B 6 for pararipam).14

3) Āp 1.2.21; aṭhāḥsaṇāśāyī (“[A student should] occupy a lower seat and bed [than his teacher]”). The grammatically correct form with regular sandhi should be aṭhāḥsaṇāśāyī, and there appears to be a second sandhi of a + ā in the received form [cf. B 23]. Haradatta thinks this is a mistake or a vedic peculiarity: aṭhāḥśabdaśya savarnad residences [cf. Panini 6.1.101] chāndasam apapaṭho va.

4) Āp 1.3.22; aṅgāṃṣnanaḥ (“[He shall] not be lethargic”). Haradatta notes the irregular insertion of an anusvāra before the sibilant, calling it again either an error or a vedic peculiarity: aṭrāṃsvāraḥ chāndasas papāṭha va.
5) Āp 1.4.1: yad ucchiṣṭam prāśāīti (“When he eats [his teacher’s] leftovers”). The correct form should be prāśāīti, and Haradatta calls the irregular palatal “ś” a vedic form, since the dental “n” and “t” are not changed into palatalas after “ś”: ṇakārāprāḥas chāndasah sādīti [Pāṇini 8.4.44] ścuvapratīṣedhāt.16

6) Āp 1.5.7: yad kim ca samāhito brāhma py ācāryād upayukte ... (“Whatever other science besides the Veda a steadfast man learns from his teacher ...”). Haradatta notes the elision of the initial “a” in pi ( = api) and seeks to explain it in two ways: 1) the final vowel of the preceding word and the initial vowel of api coalesce to take just the form of the latter vowel (pararūpa: thus abraham + api = abrahamapi rather than abrahamāpi, as in the example karka + andhu = karkandhu (“well”, rather than karkāndhu); b) the loss of the initial “a” of api as in the examples pihita etc.: pararūpa karkandhuvat | aper akāralośa vā pihitapiaddhādivat (see B: 2).17

7) Āp 1.6.28 [cf. A: 24]: Haradatta notes the parasmatipada form of the present participle locative cesāti, which he considers irregular: vyaṭayaṇa parasmatipadam.

8) Āp 1.6.36: bhuktvā cāsya sakāśe nānūthāyocchiṣṭam prayaccheśā (“After he has eaten in his [teacher’s] presence, moreover, he should not give away his leftovers without first getting up”). Haradatta notes the irregular lengthening of “ū” in antūthāya calling it a vedic peculiarity: antūthāya chāndasah dirghaḥ.

9) Āp 1.7.11: rajastvalo rakṣadān satyaśādyād tī hi brāhmaṇām (“A Brāhmaṇa states: ‘He shall keep his body dirty, his teeth stained, and his speech true’”). Haradatta notes the rare form rakṣadān, calling it a vedic form for the common rakṣadanta (see also B: 53): chāndasah damādesah paṇibiladanta ity arthaḥ.

10) Āp 1.7.27: Haradatta notes the singular form dāre in this sūtra and considers it an irregular vedic form: dāre ity ekavacanam chāndasam (see also B: 45).

11) Āp 1.8.15: The text contains the term vyupajāva (“whispering”), with several manuscripts recording the more regular form vyupajāpa. Haradatta accepts the former reading and considers the “v” to be a vedic peculiarity or an error: vyupajāvah karnayor mahur mahur jaṭpanam | vakāraś chāndasah ‘pādāha vā.

12) Āp 1.8.19: This sūtra contains the expression prācāryāyopasamgrhya (“having clasped the feet of his teacher’s teacher”). Haradatta notes the dative case when we should have expected the accusative, remarking: prācāryāya dvityārthe caturthī.19
13) śāpa 1.8.22: mūhūmś cācāryakulam darśanārtho gacchati (“He shall go frequently to visit his teacher’s family”). The term mūhūmś has two irregularities: long “ū” and the anusvāra before the sibilant (see above B: 4). Haradatta thinks that this form is vedic and further that the usual repetition of this term has been omitted here: mūhūmś cety anusvāradīghau chāṇḍasau | viṃṣalopadā ca tatra draṣṭavyah | mukur mukr ii viṃṣāṣṭiṃ.

14) śāpa 1.9.14–15: antahkṛtāṃ | antaśāṇḍālāṃ (“[Vedic recitation is suspended in a village] in which there is a corpse or a Cāṇḍāla”). Haradatta notes the anomalous nominative endings of the two compounds, where we should have expected locative endings, and explains that the nominatives are used here with a locative meaning or the compounds are adverbial: ubhayaśatra prathamā saptanyarthe avyayībhāvo vā vibhaktyarthe draṣṭavyah.

15) śāpa 1.9.21: svapnaparyantam vidyutī (“When there is lightning, [vedic recitation is suspended] until he has slept”). Haradatta thinks that the correct form should be the feminine svapnaparyantam, agreeing with rātram of the previous sūtra, and considers the transposition of the short and long vowels between the final and the penultimate syllables an error or a vedic irregularity: anyo dirghah | upāntyoya hrasvaḥ | viṃṣalopadā ca tatra draṣṭavyah.

16) śāpa 1.10.18: adhiśāñesu vā yatrānyo vyāveyyād etam eva ṭabdāṃ utsṛjādhiśīla (“Likewise, when someone comes when they are engaged in vedic recitation, he [they] may continue the recitation only after that person utters the same words [i.e., ‘adhiśīla’]”). Haradatta notes that the plural in adhiśāñesu is superfluous or non-essential (the rule applies even when a single person is reciting) and that the verb, which should have been in the plural, is in the singular because the rule is directed at each reciter individually: bahuvaṃcaṃ atantarām | pratyekāṃ upadeśād ekavacanaṃ | adhiśiśīrān.

17) śāpa 1.10.19: This sūtra contains the word salāvṛkī. Haradatta notes that the normal spelling is salāvṛkī, but accepts the short initial vowel here as an exception: ināro yatin salāvṛkībhya ityādau [TS 6.2.7.5] darśanāt sarvātraśāmāh svaro dirghah | sar evāvan hrasvaḥ [variant viṃṣāṭaḥ] prayuktaḥ. It is remarkable that Haradatta does not simply make this easy change but takes the trouble to note this insignificant variant.

18) śāpa 1.11.13: yathā pādpaprakṣānottādanāntaneṇuṇāṇīti (“[During private activities] such as washing the feet, massaging, and applying oil [one should not recite the Veda]”). Here we have the irregular retroflex “ṛ” in anulepanāṇīti. What a careful reader Haradatta
must have been to note this minor irregularity! (see also B: 20, 42) He considers it either "fortuitous" or an error: natvam ākasmikam apapāho vā.

19) Āp. 1.11.31: Haradatta notes the irregular masculine gender of the samāhāradvandva compound pratsūryamatsyāh ("a parhelion and a comet"), which should have been in the neuter: samāhāradvandva chāndaso lingavyatyayaḥ.

20) Āp. 1.12.8: āryasamayo hy aghyamānakāraṇaḥ ("for that accepted practice of the Aryas has no tangible motive"). Here again Haradatta carefully notes the irregular dental "n" in aghyamāna and sees it as a vedic peculiarity: sûtre aghyamānkāraṇa iti ṇatvābhāvas chāndasah.

21) Āp. 1.16.2: āsīnas trir ācāmed dhūdayaṅgāḥbhir ādbhih ("Seated on his haunches, let him sip three times with water sufficient to reach his heart"). The grammatical object here is put in the instrumental, and Haradatta sees it as an irregular: ādbhih triyā drityārthe.

22) Āp. 1.16.3: trir oṣṭhau parimṛjet ("He should wipe his lips three times"). Haradatta is uncomfortable with the form parimṛjet [6th class verb] and glosses it with parimṛjyaḥ [2nd class].


24) Āp. 1.19.12: nāmaṇiyogapūrvam iti hārītaḥ ("[One may eat food received unasked] but not if it is received subsequent to an invitation, according to Hārīta"). Haradatta notes the irregular double negative ananiyoga, which is used, he thinks, to emphasize the original positive meaning: nivedanam niyogas tadabḥāvo niyogah | punar nāmanī samāsaḥ | dvau nairu prakṛtaḥlhaṁ atīśayena gamayataḥ.

25) Āp. 1.19.15: this sûtra contains the expression yācann anrtasāṅkare ("A supplicant [rubs his sin off] on the man who makes false promises"). Haradatta notes the anomalous saṅkara for saṅgara, taking it to be a vedic form: katāras tu chāndasah.

26) Āp. 1.20.6: na dharmadharmam ca carata āvam sva iti ("Dharma and Adharma do not go around saying, 'Here we are!'"). Haradatta notes the vedic form āvam for the regular āvam and comments: āvam iti chāndasam rāpam | bhāṣyaṁ tu prathamāyaś ca āvivacane bhāṣyaṁ iti (Pāṇini 7.2.88) āvam prāṇośi.
27) Āp 1.21.8 contains the compound brahmajīhan. Haradatta thinks that this should be in the masculine and comments: brahmajīhan uṣṭa uṣūraṇe bhāve ghan | chāndaso lingavatayāyah.

28) Āp 1.21.9: A list of women with whom sex is forbidden contains the compound gurūśakhi ("female friend of a female guru") with the irregular short final "i", which Haradatta takes to be Vedic:29 sakhiśābdesāya chāndaso hrasvah.

29) Āp 1.22.1: contains the expression adhyātmikān yogān ("disciplines pertaining to the inner self"). Haradatta takes the short initial vowel to be Vedic:30 adhyātmikān chāndaso vrddhiyabhayāh.

30) Āp 1.23.6 contains the expression sāvagānī. Haradatta explains this unusual form:31 sāvagānī saraśmāi hitāh sāvagā ātmā tan gacchati prāprīti.

31) Āp 1.24.11 contains the expression savaśīradhvajāh ("a man who carries a skull as a banner") with the irregular elision of the final “s” of śiras. Haradatta takes this also to be a Vedic peculiarity: savaśīro dhvajō yasya sa savaśīradhvajāh | sālopaś chāndasah.

32) Āp 1.28.20: strīyās tu bhātṛavyatikrame kṛcchradvādāsārātrābhṛyaśvas tāvāntam kālam ("Women who abandon their husbands, on the other hand, should perform the twelve-day arduous penance for the same length of time"). Most extant manuscripts have regularized the reading to either bhātṛvyatikrame32 or bhātṛ vyatikrāme. Haradatta's comment on this is ambiguous, Bühler's edition reading: bhātṛvyatikramā iti cāndaso repahalopah, whereas the Kashi Sanskrit Series ed. reads: bhātṛvyatikrama iti chāndaso repahalopah. Haradatta simply states that there is an elision of “i” without specifying whether it is that before “i” in the stem bhātṛ or after “u” of the genitive bhātṛ. Given that all the Grantha manuscripts (which, as Bühler acknowledges, are more trustworthy that the Devanāgarī ones) used by Bühler, as well as the parallel passage in Hiranyakāṣi Dharmasūtra, contains the repah above “i”, I feel that the form intended by Haradatta is probably bhātṛvyatikrame, and I have adopted this in my new edition of Apatamba (Ollivette, forthcoming). Further, in Grantha, even more than in Devanāgarī, the signs for “u” and “i” can be confused with each other. In any case, Haradatta carefully notes the loss of the repah, calling it a Vedic peculiarity.

33) Āp 1.29.9 contains the unusual verbal form sanpratyaṇapatsyata. Haradatta takes this as an aorist expressing the hope for the future, noting the irregular insertion of “y” after the sibilant, which he takes to be a Vedic peculiarity or an error: sanpratyaṇapatsyata |
āśansāyāṃ bhūtavac ceti [Pāṇini 3.3.132] bhaviśyayai luñ | sakārat paro yakāraś chāndasaḥ 'papāṭho vā.

34) Āp 1.29.15 contains the word abhīcāra (“sorcery”) with the irregular lengthening of “i”. Haradatta explains this formation by citing Pāṇini, according to whom the final vowel of a prefix is lengthened diversely before a word formed with the kṛt suffix “a”: abhīcāra eva abhīcāraṇāḥ | upasargasya ghāṇy amanasye bahulaṃ iṣi [Pāṇini 6.3.122] dirghaḥ.

35) Āp 1.30.2 likewise contains parimāṇa with the irregularly lengthened “i”. Haradatta explains this as a vedic peculiarity: parimāṇam eva parimānam | chāndasaḥ dirghaḥ.


37) Āp 1.30.12: anūdbhāsi vāso vasā (“‘He should wear clothes that are not shiny’”). Haradatta notes the irregular lengthening of “u” in anūdbhāsi and calls it a vedic form:34 anūdbhāsi chāndasaḥ dirghaḥ.

38) Āp 1.30.17: svāṃ tu chāyāṃ avamehet (“He may, however, discharge urine in his own shadow”). Haradatta is quite observant here in noting the omission of “c” before “ch” (i.e., tucchāyam) and sees it as a vedic peculiarity: chāndasaḥ tucchabhah.53

39) Āp 1.31.12 contains the word praśātam with the irregular long “a”, which Haradatta takes to be vedic: praśātam praśāsam | chāndasaḥ dirghaḥ.

40) Āp 1.31.19: This sūtra, which we have already examined (A: 3), contains the irregular form svādhīyas in place of sādhīyas (“exceedingly”). Haradatta notes the insertion of “v” and calls it vedic:36 svādhīyas vakāraś chāndasaḥ.

41) Āp 1.31.22 contains the irregular gerund skupnava (probably meaning to pick the teeth). If the verb is √skubh, the gerund should be skubhva; and if the verb is √sku, it should be skunvā.37 Haradatta notes the anomaly and offers two possible solutions: a vedic peculiarity of substituting the surd “p” for “bh” (if the root is √skubh), or the addition of the letter “p” (if the root is √sku): skupnveti skubhnoteh kṛtvaprayaye chāndasam bhakārasya cartvam | skuntero vā pakāra upajanaḥ.

42) Āp 1.32.5: anāvihṣrāganulepanaḥ svāt (“Let him not appear in public wearing a garland or anointed with oil”). Here again, as in Āp 1.11.13 (see B: 18), we have the irregular retroflex “n”
in anulepāṇa. Haradatta refers to his earlier explanation: nātvam pūrvavat.

43) Āp 1.32.16: kamam apaśrayata (“He may, if he so wishes, rest leaning against something”). Haradatta takes the regular form of the verb to be śrayata and notices two irregularities: the doubling of “ś” and the omission of “y”: tattvam rephalopās chāndasāḥ tathā śakārasya dvīrvacanam.

44) Āp 1.32.25 spells the name dharmaprahrāda, instead of the more common dharmaprahältā. Haradatta notes the irregularity as vedic: prahrādaśābde hakārāt para rephalas chāndasāḥ.

45) Āp 2.1.17: Here, as earlier at Āp 1.7.27 (see B: 10), Haradatta takes the singular dāreṇa as a vedic peculiarity, since the word dāra is normally declined in the plural: chāndasam ekavacanam | niyam bahuvaścavānto hi dārasabdaḥ.

46) Āp 2.5.9 contains the compound bhṛukṣepāṇa with the irregular short “u”, which Haradatta explains as a vedic peculiarity: bhṛukṣepāṇaṁ bhṛukṣepaḥ chāndaso hrasvavah.

47) Āp 2.5.17: riye vā jāyāṁ (“He may optionally have sex) with his wife during her season”). Haradatta notes the irregular riye in place of the normal riye, taking the omission of “y” to be vedic: riya iti riipasiddhih | atra yaśopas cāndasāḥ.

48) Āp 2.6.17: udāhṛtya annāvy avekṣetedam bhṛyaś idāśm iti (“When the food has been dished out, he should look at it, thinking: ‘Is this portion larger or this?’ ”). Haradatta notes that when there is an act of reflection between two alternatives, in ordinary Sanskrit (bhṛṣṇā) only the first alternative is subject to pūtā (prolacion indicated by the number 3). He explains the two pūtās in the sūtra as a vedic peculiarity: vicāre pūtah [cf. Pāṇini 8.2.97] | pūram ut bhāsāyam iti [Pāṇini 8.2.98] etat avekṣitam | chāndaso evāyam pravogyah.

49) Āp 2.7.13: vṛātya tarpayamṣtī iti (“Vṛātya, let this refresh you”). Haradatta sees the insertion of the anusvāra and the sibilant into the regular tarpayantu as a vedic peculiarity:39 anusvārasatārav chāndasau.

50) Āp 2.8.11 contains the word śikṣā (“phonetics”) with a long “ī”. Haradatta explains this, citing Pāṇini 6.3.109 that permits the elision and mutation of letters when they are found in vedic usage: prṣodarādītvād dīrghah.

51) Āp 2.9.4 contains the word aprāṭhādīyām (“forgetting”) with a long “ī”, which Haradatta explains as vedic: prater dīrghas chāndasau.
52) Āp. 2.10.11 contains the word parāñāvṛti ("fleeting") with the unusual insertion of "n", which Haradatta again explains as vedic: parāñāvṛti iti ṣakaraś chāndasaḥ.

53) Āp. 2.12.22 contains the compound sṝavada ("man with black teeth") without the usual final "n" (see B: 9), an elision that Haradatta takes to be vedic: vibhaṣa sṝavāroṣkāhyāṇi iti [Pāṇini 5.4.144] dattādesaḥ tasya lopaś chāndasaḥ.

54) Āp. 2.13.6 contains the irregular nominative plural of the present participle bibhṝantaḥ for the regular bibhṝataḥ. Haradatta takes the insertion of "n" to be vedic: bibhṝantaḥ chāndaso num bibhṝataḥ.

55) Āp. 2.21.4 contains the word anuśargah with the irregular long "i", which Haradatta takes to be vedic: anuśargah chāndaso dirghaḥ.

56) Āp. 2.23.12: tataḥ param anantyaṃ phalam svargyāśādālam śṛṇyate ("Thereafter, the Vedas declare, they obtain an eternal reward designated by the term 'heaven'"). Haradatta sees the insertion of "y" into anantya into svarga as either a vedic peculiarity or an error: anantyaṃ svaryaṃ iti yakāraś chāndasa upajano 'papātavo vā.

57) Āp. 2.27.17 contains the compound caksunirodha for the regular caksunirodha ("blindfolding") with the irregular omission of "s" of caksus, which Haradatta takes to be vedic: caksunirodha iti rephalopaś chāndasaḥ.

58) Āp. 2.29.13: lokṣṇakarmacāt tu somāpyate ("But by acting according to the markers one can master [dharma]"). Haradatta gives two explanations for the irregular karmacāt, which, as Bühler points out, was probably caused by a Prakritic doubling of the "t" of the following tu. The doubling of "t", according to Haradatta, is either a vedic peculiarity or there is the insertion between karmacāt and tu of the particle āt ("immediately"); karmacāt tv iti dvitikārapānī yam ārṣah | ād iti vā nīpātasya prāṣṭeṣah | sa ca sadya ity asyartane draṣṭavyah.

C. EXPLANATIONS WITHOUT EMENDATIONS

The care with which Haradatta transmits and explains the received text is demonstrated also in numerous explanations where the received text is not to his liking. But even here Haradatta does not simply emend the text but tries his best to draw out from the text what he perceives to be its proper meaning. Some of these explanations we have already seen in the preceding discussion. I cite here 15 additional cases.
1) Āp 1.8.26: antevāṣya anantevāṣi bhavati vinihātāma gurūv anaiṇūṇam āpadyamanāh (“A pupil ceases to be a pupil when he is inattentive to his teacher and so becomes a dolt”). Haradatta understands this text differently, and his interpretation requires the final participle to be in the causative at least implicitly: āpadyamanā ity antarbhāvitanayarthah ... gurūv anaiṇūṇam āpādyayati.

2) Āp 1.13.16: vṛddhanāṁ tu (“[Obedience is not required] also towards older [fellow students]”). Haradatta, as the context clearly requires, wants ca (“and”, “also”) in place of tu (“but”, “however”) and comments tuṣ cāṛthe | vṛddhanāṁ cāntevasināṁ na gaitr vidyate.

3) Āp 1.14.4: na cāsmin dosam paśyet (“[When someone asks him for instruction, he should not spurn him] provided he does not see any fault in him”). The context clearly calls for “if” and Haradatta interprets ca (“and”) to mean ced (“if”), citing grammatical precedence: ca iti vipātoasti | nipātair vyaḍadhiḥ tāva cā vececcavacaccayatram iti [Pāṇini 8.1.30] | sa cedarthā vrata.

4) Āp 1.32.24: mūlaṁ tūlaṁ vṛhati (“It tears up his root and sprout ...”). Haradatta’s comment on this passage shows how careful he was in preserving the text, here the danger being that “v” be changed to “b” or a similar cognate letter. He carefully notes that the reading should be “v”: vṛhati utpātyati dantoṣṭhīyo valāraḥ.

5) Āp 2.2.4: yauheṣuṣadhiṣvanaspaṭāṁ bijasya kṣetra kṣetra māviṣēse phalaparivṛddhir evam (“This is similar to the way the seeds of plants and trees, when they are sown on a well-plowed field, increase their fruit”). The context is how the transmigratory process works. Haradatta wants a ca after yathā so as to connect this to the preceding and thinks that it has been dropped: cauḥo tira draṣṭāvah | yathā cōṣadādhipāto yathā ... 

6) Āp 2.3.8: api vāṣṭanīṇa eva parvasu vā vaperan (“Alternatively, they may shave only on the eighth day of each fortnight or on new- and full-moon days”). Now, normally one does not shave oneself but gets a barber to do it. So, generally the verb is in the causative. Haradatta explains that the causative is implied here, especially because the causative was used in the preceding śūtra: vaperann iti antarbhāvitanayarthah | vāpazerann ity arihah | tathā ca iti samanavahāpanam iti [Āp 2.3.7] pārvara niṣpravahah.

7) Āp 2.4.24: brāhmaṇa ācāryaṁ smaryate tu (“Tradition says that only a Brahmin can be a teacher”). Haradatta points out that tu has here a restrictive meaning and further that it is in the wrong
place, since it should come immediately after the first word: \textit{tuśabdo vadhāraṇartho bhinnakramaśca | brāhmaṇa eva ...}

8) \textit{Āp 2.5.7: anyam vā samudetam} (“[He should do the same] also for any other distinguished guest”). Haradatta notes that \textit{vā} here should have the meaning of combination (i.e., \textit{api, ca}): \textit{vāsābdah samuccaye | anyam apy evam evačameyey}. 

9) \textit{Āp 2.6.5: svadharmayuktam kuṭumbinam abhyāgacchaiti dharmapuraskāro nāṇaprayojanah so 'tīthi bhavati} (“When such a man comes to the home of a householder devoted to the dharma proper to him – and he comes for no other purpose than to discharge the dharma – then he is a ‘guest’”). Haradatta sees the need for the correlative \textit{yathā} at the beginning to grammatically complete this sentence: \textit{ādito yacchabdo drastavyah ante sa iti darśanāt}

10) \textit{Āp 2.8.6: dācīrya riyik snātaka rōjā vā dharmayuktah} (“Among people deserving a cow and honey mixture: a ‘teacher, an officiating priest, a bath-graduate, and a king who follows the Law’”). Here also Haradatta sees \textit{vā} as having the meaning of \textit{ca}: \textit{vāsābdah samuccaye.}

11) \textit{Āp 2.13.2: dāyenāvāyatiṃkramaś cobbhayoh} (“And neither parent may deprive such a son of his share in the estate”). Haradatta understands this \textit{sūtra} differently: “[Sons have the right] to the estate, if they do not sin against either parent”.\textsuperscript{45} Hence he has to interpret \textit{ca} to mean “if” (see above C. 3): \textit{ca iti cedarthi | avāyatiṃkramaś cet | yaddi te mātaraṃ pitaraṃ ca na vyaitikrameyah.}

12) \textit{Āp 2.13.6: apramatta rakṣatha āntum etam} (“Diligently guard this progeny of yours”). Haradatta carefully notes the indicative when we should expect the verb to be in the imperative, even though the difference in the two forms is minimal (the aspirate “\textit{tha}” for the non-aspirate “\textit{ta}”), and states that the indicative here carries an imperative meaning.\textsuperscript{46} \textit{rakṣatha | lodarthi lat | rakṣatyarthah.}

13) \textit{Āp 2.15.12} contains the words \textit{desataḥ kālātah śucaṭah, etc.} 
Haradatta explains that these ablative/adverbial endings carry a locative meaning: \textit{sepamyaśtarthe tasil}

14) \textit{Āp 2.20.2: samudetāṃ ca bhajayen na cātadgūnyocchistam dadyuh} (“He should feed only individuals who possess the required qualities, and not give any leftover food to anyone who does not possess the same qualities”). Here we have a verb in the singular followed by one in the plural. Haradatta explains: \textit{dadyur iti bhāvavacanaṃ tathāvidhakartvabahuḥvāpakaṃ.}

15) \textit{Āp 2.27.1: carīte yathāpurāṃ dhrāmad dhi sambandhah} (“Once [the expiation] has been performed, [the guardians should treat them]
as before, for their relationship is based on dharma”). Haradatta notes the ablative in place of the normal instrumental: \textit{tritiyārthe pancami} | dharmena sambandho bhavati.

D. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Haradatta was a careful and observant reader of the text – that much is clear. It is also clear that the tradition of textual transmission, whether it was oral, written, or a combination of both, from which Haradatta received his text was an extremely faithful one, preserving not only the substance of Āpastamba’s text but also the unusual and extraordinary readings. It is apparent that Haradatta had conducted meticulous research prior to writing his commentary; he not only notes variant readings from different sources from his southern homeland but also consulted the text as handed down in the north. It is, therefore, remarkable that except for a single sūtra (Ap 2.17.25: A: 31), Haradatta did not find substantial differences in the various recensions to which he had access.

Haradatta was also a faithful transmitter of the text that he received from a tradition of reciters and scribes. Unlike Böhtlingk, Haradatta never changes a reading, even when he suspects that it may simply be an error. He notes the erroneous reading even when he presents the correct one, the \textit{yuktaḥ pāṭhaḥ}. Only in the eight cases listed under section A-III, however, does Haradatta state outright that a particular reading is wrong (\textit{apapāṭha}). When he encountered other variant or difficult readings, Haradatta employs a variety of strategies. When he records the common readings which were at variance with what he himself preferred (see A-I), he gives no explanation four times, calls a reading either “erroneous” or “vedic” three times and simply “vedic” once. In other variants listed under section A-II, Haradatta gives no explanation twelve times and only once calls a reading “vedic”. It is in his treatment of difficult or ungrammatical readings where he found no variants that Haradatta resorts to the “vedic” explanation most frequently. Of the 58 cases noted in section B, he calls 37 “vedic”, 6 “vedic” or erroneous”, provides explanations for 11, calls 3 “accidental” or “erroneous”, and leaves one unexplained. Without the benefit of historical linguistics, this is the best Haradatta could do. Some of the difficult forms can be better explained as dialectical variants, an area of Sanskrit studies that has seen spectacular growth in recent years. Haradatta’s faithfulness to the received text, however, has preserved these unusual forms for such scholarly scrutiny.
In researching the transmission of Āpastamba’s text, did Haradatta use manuscripts or oral transmission among experts or within vedic sākhās? This is a question that is significant not only for this text but also for the broader issue of textual transmission in medieval India. The term used for “variant reading” is pāṭha. Although this term directly indicates an oral reading, like its English counterpart, the term acquired a broader meaning including a “reading” in written form in a manuscript. So, when Haradatta says adhyayīved iti prāyenā pāṭhanti (see A: 1), it is not clear whether he is referring to oral recitation or to manuscripts. Haradatta’s use of the verb adhi √/i to refer to variant readings, however, appears to suggest that at least sometimes he is referring to oral transmission. Thus, at Ap 1.3.1.19 he says about the usual reading adhiyamānas tu pramādaś chāndasa vā (see A: 3). Likewise, at Ap 2.5.2 we have prāyenā maśārīt param ikāram adhiyate (see A: 4). The use of eke pāṭhanti (A: 25), śiṣṭah na pāṭhanti (A: 25), and udacyās prāyenā na pāṭhanti (A: 31) with reference to variant readings also suggest orality.46 Taking all this into consideration, it appears that Haradatta gathered his readings at least partly from the oral traditions found either among śāstric experts or in vedic sākhās. This is the conclusion drawn also by Bühler (1892, vii–viii): “Haradatta certainly consulted for particularly difficult passages men acquainted with oral tradition of the Āpastambiyas and able to recite their Śūtras . . . No ingenuity of interpretation can convert Śiṣṭas into palm-leaves”.

Critical edition of texts is a modern concept, and certainly Haradatta was not attempting such a project. Yet he appears to share the major goal of critical editions – to present the best possible reconstruction of the text, including the preservation of difficult and variant readings. Haradatta’s aim was probably to help his readers sort out the different readings that may have been present in both manuscripts and in oral traditions and to establish an authoritative text by explaining the difficulties he found in the received text. But in doing so he has also preserved for future scholars invaluable data regarding the state of Āpastamba’s text around 1100 C.E.

NOTES

1 Haradatta is also credited with commentaries on Āpastamba Gṛhyaśūtra, Āpastamba Mantrapūthā, Aśvalayana Gṛhyaśūtra, and Gaṅgāda Dharmasūtra. He is also the author of the Padamājari, a commentary on the Kāśika commentary on Pāṇini. The editor of this text (Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1981, p. ix), P. Sir Rama Ranjan, assigns Haradatta to 1100 C.E., whereas Kane (1975, 746) dates him 1100–1300 C.E. in the Padamājari and gives some details of his life.
His father was Padmakumāra, his mother Śrī, and his older brother Angikumāra. His vidyācārī was Pāṇātīja. He belonged to the Tamil region.

2 Böhltingk 1885, 517. Translated with the assistance of Edeltraud Harzer.

3 Haradatta comments: kāṇeṣuṣaṁ copānae ca kāṇeṣuṣaṁpanānām dhāveśe, cūdāsahānād (Pāṇini 5.4.106) iva ac sāmaśāntah tad aśyāstītī kāṇeṣuṣaṁpanāhī.

4 For an explanation of this word, see below B: 40.

5 This reading is adopted by Böhltingk (1885b), but rightly rejected by Bühler (1886b).

6 Böhltingk (1885b) takes this to be the “correct” reading.

7 Böhltingk (1885b) accepts this reading.

8 Böhltingk (1885b) also endorses the view of the nominative in the middle of locatives. Bühler (1886b), however, shows that such mismatches of cases are common in Āpastamba, as at 1.11.31 and 2.26.20, where we have the substantive and its adjective in different cases. See also the different numbers in subjects and verbs at 1.1.27–29 and 1.2.5.

9 Böhltingk (1885b) accepts this reading without hesitation and sees no reason to accept the difficult reading.

10 It is unclear from the manuscript tradition whether Haradatta’s reading of the variant was prāyaścaṃ or prāyaśchiti.

11 Böhltingk (1885b) proposes to emend the text here to reflect this “correct” reading.

12 Because of the use of the plural here, Bühler (1892, vi) concludes that Haradatta had access to at least three previous commentaries; if there were only two he would have used the dual. This may be somewhat of a stretch, since commentators often use the honorific plural. But Bühler is on firmer ground when he shows that Haradatta refers to at least three opinions of his predecessors, using the words aparāh, anve, and arne at Ap 1.5.2, and anve, ete, and arne at Ap 1.17.22.

13 Böhltingk (1885b) dismisses this reading, taking it to be merely a scribal error for anātiṣṭaya, and cites Baudhāyana Dharmaśāstra 1.3.12 in support. Bühler (1886b) defends the reading anātiṣṭaya, explaining that there is a negative particle arne beside a, an, and na.

14 Böhltingk (1885b) dismisses this, saying: “pādonam wird wohl die richtige Lesart sein”.

15 Böhltingk (1885b) dismisses the reading with an anātiṣṭaya, saying: “agānisaṣṭa kann auch nach Haradatta eine falsche Lesart sein, und darin hat er gegen Bühler Recht”. Böhltingk does not note that Haradatta thinks that it could also be a vedic form.

16 Böhltingk (1885b) dismisses this as a false archaism and wants here to follow the majority opinion of the manuscripts. But Haradatta is older than our oldest manuscript, and Bühler (1892, 8) is right in following his testimony about this difficult reading, saying: “Die Form ist Prākritisch. Similarily the Pāli patho presupposes a Sanskrit form prāśīḥ”.

17 Here too Böhltingk (1885b) dismisses Haradatta’s explanation and reverts to the regular reading: “(a)bhrāmaṇa pi is trite. Haradatta fehlhaft für (a)bhrāmaṇā”.

18 Böhltingk (1885b) accepts this as the correct reading, noting “vyapajāna is ja auch nach Haradatta möglicherweise eine falsche Lesart”. Once again Böhltingk ignores the fact that Haradatta considers the possibility that it is a vedic form.

19 Böhltingk (1885b) cannot accept this anomaly: “Dies upasamgrha in derselben Stüra das eine Mal mit dem Acc. und das andere Mal mit der Dativ construirt würde, ist doch beinah unglaublich. Man sehe prācāryam upasamgrha”.
26 Böhtlingk (1885b) dismisses this form, saying “nahúš ca sicherlich fæhlerhaft für nahúš ca.”
21 Böhtlingk (1885b) emends the nominatives to locatives antahsēve and antasaicandāle, saying that the anusvāra and “e” sign are easily confused! Bühler (1866b) rightly observes that such a mistake is only possible in Devaśāgari and not in the southern scripts.
22 Böhtlingk (1885b) takes -paryantam to be the correct form and, as Bühler (1866b) has pointed out, erroneously thinks that Haradatta’s reading is -paryantān rather than – paryāntam. When Haradatta says that “the last is long and the penultimate is short” he is talking about what the reading in his eyes should be, the reverse is the actual reading which Haradatta found in his sources and which he took to be a vedaic peculiarity of a mistake.
23 Bühler (1892) in his edition reads anupānāni. Haradatta’s comment on Āp 1.3.125 (see B:42), where there is no ambiguity since the reading is the singular anupānāh, makes it clear that the retroflex should be the penultimate ‘n’ and not the final.
25 Böhtlingk (1885b) dismisses Haradatta’s explanation and emends to the regular neuter form, because -matyakī can easily be read as -matyāca (in the suśra ca follows). Here again Böhtlingk is thinking only of Devaśāgari; in Grantha the two forms are quite distinct.
26 Böhtlingk (1885b) wants to adopt the regular reading with the retroflex “n”, referring the reader to Patañjali on Pāṇini 6.3.109. Grammatical correctness was always uppermost for him.
27 Böhtlingk (1885b) objects to the double negative and suggests nānaumiyagapīram. Bühler (1866b) correctly points out that this would give a meaning opposite to the one that is intended.
28 Böhtlingk (1885b) rejects this claim: “Dass sankara die ältere Form für sangara sein solle, will mir nicht einleuchten”. Could this confusion between “g” and “k” be influenced by Tamil, which does not have the soft “g”?
29 This is rejected by Böhtlingk (1885b), who wants to accept the regular sākhi as at Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra 2.2.13.
30 Böhtlingk (1885b) calls this form “die schlechtere Lesart”.
31 Böhtlingk (1885b) calls it “wohl nicht richtig”.
32 Böhtlingk (1885b) rejects the irregular reading of Bühler’s edition and accepts the regular bhūtryayēkrama.
33 Böhtlingk (1885b) rejects this interpretation and wants to make a compound of the two words: viśvāvatena.
34 Böhtlingk (1885b), on the other hand, calls it merely an error for the regular anudbhāṣā.
35 Böhtlingk (1885b) dismisses Haradatta’s comment: “Die Bemerkung Haradatta’s, das tu chāyām ein Archaismus für tu chāyām sei, ist ganz unwahrscheinlich”.
36 Böhtlingk (1885b) rejects this explanation as “laughable” and emends it to the regular sādhiyāeh. Bühler (1866b), however, points out that Winternitz also found a parallel form in the Apastamba Grhyasūtra.
This is adopted by Böhtlingk (1885b); see also Böhtlingk 1885d.

Böhtlingk (1885b) rejects this reading and emends the text against the testimony of all the manuscripts: "Wolte ich auch dem kühnen Haradatta den unwiss kern noch besonders, dass tarpayas eins der Hauptwörter vom tarpayas sei, so müsste ich doch fragen wie tarpayas zu der Bedeutung tarpayastu oder tarpayastu, welche, und was ist am Schluss hier bedeutet solle. Die richtige Lesart tarpainas tewi oder tarpainas tevi liegt doch wahrscheinlich nahe genug."

Böhtlingk (1885b) takes this to be simply an error for śūkṣa.

Böhtlingk (1885b) restores the regular ākhyātāh. Böhtlingk (1885b) prefers the regular ananta and svarga.

As we have seen, Haradatta knows his Paññini well and cites his rules in support of his explanations. Besides those cited here, Haradatta cites Paññini or grammatical rules at Ap. 1.128; 1.2.21; 1.3.26; 1.4.15; 1.4.19; 1.5.1; 1.5.23.

I follow Böhtlingk’s (1885b, 519) convincing argument. Haradatta has misunderstood this passage, and Bühler follows him in this labored translation: “That pupil who, attending to two (teachers), accuses his (principal and first) teacher of ignorance, remains no (longer) a pupil.” This interpretation of Haradatta is followed by Bühler. My interpretation of the sūtra is based on the view of another commentator cited by Haradatta.

Böhtlingk (1885b) simply changes it to rakṣa deva.


The last example raises the question as to how Haradatta knew that the sūtra in question was not found among the northerners. Aside from the memory of experts from the north whom Haradatta could have consulted, the only other way he could have come to this conclusion was by knowing that certain manuscripts were from the north, either because they were located there or were written in the northern script, such as Nāgarī or Sāradā.
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