The Aṣṭādhyāyī as a Case in Textual Criticism
(Part 2)

by

Ashok Aklujkar

1.1 In the first part of this paper, which will be presented elsewhere on account of its nature and length, I have pointed out that a comprehensive objective textual criticism of Pāṇini's ("P", in abbreviation) *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (abbreviated henceforth to "*A*") is still a desideratum, and have delineated what this textual criticism would involve. In the second part being presented here, I wish to expand upon one aspect of the programme outlined in the first part. This aspect is that of secondary[1] textual criticism.

1.2 In explaining the considerations of which a scholar attempting a secondary textual criticism of the *A* should be aware, I shall choose as examples those rules of P which have emerged, as a result of Hartmut SCHARFE's noteworthy study *Pāṇini's Metalanguage*, as containing an anomaly of wording. The intention behind such a choice is twofold :

> (*a*) To establish the claim I made in reviewing SCHARFE's study in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (1977), p. 305 a, namely that " the possibility of textual corruption, when explored judiciously and rigorously, does yield straightforward and convincing explanations of some of the anomalies that SCHARFE so painstakingly brings to our attention ".

> (*b*) To illustrate how important a criterion ' consistency with P's practice elsewhere ' would be in secondary criticism—how a diligent editor would derive considerable benefit from a

---

1. In using the adjective " secondary ", I am deliberately steering clear of the usual distinction between lower and higher textual criticism. While attempting a textual study of any work I find it convenient to distinguish between what is explicitly available in the sources (manuscripts, commentaries, etc.) of textual study and what is implicit and hence needs to be recovered. I think such a distinction does justice to the nature of materials available in the Indian tradition, which in most instances consist of individual works and text-based direct as well as indirect commentaries to them, and goes a long way towards adapting the science of textual criticism to the Indian scene. It has the additional merit of separating sharply what the editor supplies from what the editor is supplied with. Secondary textual criticism, for example, includes emendation, commonly thought of as part of lower textual criticism, as well as tracing of the sources of the edited work, tracing which is generally held to be a constituent of higher textual criticism.

word-index[2] of the *A*, once all that the manuscripts and other sources supply explicitly has been utilized in accordance with the principles of textual criticism.[3]

2.1   (SCHARFE 1971 : 8 b :) The form *śnasoḥ* in 6.4.111 *(śnasor al-lopaḥ)* has been a puzzle to the students of P for a long time. As the rule pertains to *śna,* the class-sign of the seventh class of roots, and the root *as,* one expects *śnāsoḥ.* The attempts made so far to render *śnasoḥ* acceptable are in effect an acknowledgement of its strangeness; they can hardly be called explanations.   The *Kāśikā* remarks *śnasor iti para-rūpaṁ śakandhvādiṣu draṣṭavyam.* Viṭṭhala's *Prasāda* on the *Prakriyākaumudī* and the *Bālama-noramā* and *Tattva-bodhinī* commentaries on the *Siddhānta-kaumudī* simply echo this line. Puruṣottama-deva merely protects himself from the possible charge of failing to notice the peculiarity. He has nothing more to say than *śnasor iti para-rūpatvaṁ sautratvāt.* Most other recognized Sanskrit commentators, as far as I can ascertain, do not even take the trouble of indicating that there is a problem here. Of the modern scholars, BÖHTLINGK observes after giving the forms 6.4.111 is supposed to derive : " Dieser Ausfall ist im Sūtra schon durch *śnasoḥ* ausgedruckt; das *a* erleichtert hier nur die Aussprache. "   SCHARFE (1971 : 8 b) follows suit and turns BÖHT-LINGK's observation into a piece of evidence supporting his theory of an auxi-liary vowel.[4] Yudhishthira Mimamsaka (1963 / saṁvat 2020 : 224) thinks that the *s* in *śnasoḥ* stands for *as,* as Āpiśali is known to have accepted *s* instead of *as* as the root.

2.2   What all these scholars do not seem to have realized is that all such comments make P a rather unpredictable whimsical fellow who would suddenly opt for an uncommon sandhi, decide to exercise unspecified prero-gatives as a sūtra author, or take fancy for someone else's lexical units.[5] Needless to say, this is not the P that most of the *A* presents to us. Note

---

    2. As is well-known to students of P, such word-indices are already available in the works of BÖHTLINGK (1887a, reprint 1964), PATHAK-CHITRAO (1935), and KATRE (1968–69).   They may have to be revised after the stage of primary textual criticism is completed, but, as the present paper will indicate, even in their present form they are very useful tools.

    3. It is possible that the primary stage of the comprehensive textual study I have advocated in the first part of this contribution will make some of the following examples inappropriate. A principled consultation of manuscripts and other sources may establish that the emendation I have suggested in a certain rule is already available explicitly in the sources and is objectively the strong reading—that there is in fact no real change of read-ing involved, or that the objectively strong reading of sources is better than my emen-dation, or that P did not author the rule.

    4. I intend to discuss the weaknesses of this theory elsewhere.

    5. The few other cases in which, according to Yudhishthira Mimamsaka (Saṁvat 2020 : 223–4), P uses a predecessor's technical or metalinguistic term, although he has a term of his own for the same, also need to be investigated.

also that P does not shorten *aṣ* to *s* in a rule of similar nature like *ghv·asor ed dhāv abhyāsa-lopaś ca* (6.4.119). In my view, the puzzle posed by *śnasoḥ* has a rather simple, usual kind of solution : The reading is a result of corruption. Is it not significant that Patañjali discusses, at least three times, the presence of *t* in *at* (changed by sandhi to *al*) of 6.4.111. but not even once indicates that there is something peculiar about *śnasoḥ*? Obviously, the reading he knew was what we expect and need, namely *śnāsoḥ*.[6] Sometime between Patañjali and the *Kāśikā* authors this *śnāsoḥ* seems to have changed into *śnasoḥ* either in the *A* manuscripts or the *Bhāṣya* manuscripts.[7] Nor is such a change unattested in manuscripts. There are literally hundreds of instances of shortening of vowels at the hands of copyists for anyone who would care to look at or to compile critical editions. The shortening is all the more likely when the consonant sign (न in this instance) includes a straight line and is followed by the straight line indicating आ (ना to न or इना to इन).

3.1 (SCHARFE 1971 : 15 b :) The preceding was a case in which the awkwardness of their explanations and the possibility of a much simpler and probable explanation were not realized by scholars. In certain other cases, one's analysis must be of the more difficult stylistic kind. Consider, for example, the following rules in which the root *dṛś* is mentioned :

1.3.57	:	*jñā-śru-smṛ-dṛśāṁ sanaḥ*
3.1.47	:	*na dṛśaḥ*
3.1.137	:	*pā-ghrā-dhmā-dhet-dṛśaḥ śaḥ*
3.2.36	:	*asūrya-lalāṭayor dṛśi-tapoḥ*
3.2.60	:	*tyad-ādiṣu dṛśo 'nālocane kañ ca*
3.2.94	:	*dṛśeḥ kvanip*
3.4.29	:	*karmaṇi dṛśi-vidoḥ sākalye*
6.1.58	:	*sṛji-dṛśor jhaly am akiti*
6.4.62	:	*sya-sic-sīyuṭ-tāsiṣu bhāva-karmaṇor upadeśe 'jjhana-graha-dṛśāṁ vā ciṇvad iṭ ca*
7.2.65	:	*vibhāṣā sṛji-dṛśoḥ*

---

6. As stated in the first part of the present contribution, a critical edition of the *Mahābhāṣya* based on a wider consultation of manuscripts than KIELHORN's is a desideratum. Although the present *Bhāṣya* editions read *śnasoḥ* in quoting or referring to P's rule, it is possible that *śnāsoḥ* is the objectively stronger reading of *Bhāṣya* manuscripts and the editors have not reported it because of the influence of other sources of the Pāṇinian tradition on their minds.

7. The editions of *Cāndra Vyākaraṇa* read *śnasoḥ* in 5.3.104 corresponding to P 6.4.111. If the available version of the *Cāndra* in fact antedates the *Kāśikā*, as KIELHORN and others have argued, and if LIEBICH, on whose edition the other editions of the *Cāndra* are based, is accurate in his reporting of the reading, then one could say that the change of *śnā⁰* to *śna⁰* took place in the period between Patañjali and *Cāndra*.

7.3.78 : *pā-ghrā-dhmā-sthā-mnā-dāṇ-dṛśy-arti-sarti-śada-sadaṁ*
               piba-jighra-dhama-tiṣṭha-mana-yaccha-paśyarcha-dhau -
               śiya-sidāḥ

7.4.16 : *ṛ-dṛśo 'ṅi guṇaḥ*

Here, 1.3.57, 3.1.47, 3.1.137, 3.2.60, 6.1.58, 6.4.62, 7.2.65 and 7.4.16 form one group, and 3.2.36, 3.4.29 and 7.3.78 form the other. The forms *dṛśām, dṛśaḥ* and *dṛśoḥ* occurring in the first group clearly pre-suppose a stem *dṛś*. The stem evident in the other group, on the other hand, is *dṛśi*. Further, the first group can be divided into two sub-groups : one consisting of 1.3.57, 3.1.137, 6.1.58, 6.4.62, 7.2.65 and 7.4.16 in which *dṛś* is a member of a compound, and the other consisting of 3.1.47 and 3.2.60 in which *dṛś* is employed by itself.

3.2 Once such a stylistic analysis is attempted, two conclusions seem inevitable :

> (*a*) P uses the stem *dṛś* at the end of a compound and the stem *dṛśi* in a non-final position.

> (*b*) The sūtra 3.2.94, *dṛśeḥ kvanip*, is odd in that its wording does not stylistically agree with that of 3.1.47 and 3.2.60 as one would expect. Either the form *dṛśeḥ* is later or the form *dṛśaḥ* in 3.1.47 and 3.2.60 is later. I think the former is the case. When P has to decline a root-name or mention a single root, he uses the form ending in a consonant.[8] For example, *bhajo ṇviḥ* (3.2.62), *chandasi sahaḥ* (3.2.63). Thus, stylistic study will enable us to decide that probably the original form of 3.2.94 was *dṛśaḥ kvanip*.

4.1 (SCHARFE 1971 : 13 b :) In some cases, a consideration of diction and the author's usual style will be a mere beginning. Textual issues that may arise will not be resolved unless observations of a subtler kind are made. I would like to clarify this statement with the examples of *A* 3.4.79, 4.4. 108, 6.4.67 etc. Let me begin with a general observation: P's practice is to refer to *e* and *o* by suffixing the time-marker *t* and to refer to *ai* and *au* without affixing any such marker. As evidence, I cite :

> (*a*) 1.1.11 : *id-ūd-ed dvi-vacanaṁ pragṛhyam*[9]
>   3.4.90 : *ām etaḥ*
>   3.4.93 : *eta ai*

---

8. The obvious exceptions are roots which do not end in a consonant and to which no marker is affixed, e. g., *i* is mentioned as *eḥ* in P 3.3.56.

9. From 1.1.11, 5.4.11, 6.4.119, and 7.2.103, in which simple *e* could have been employed but has not been employed, it is obvious that the addition of *t* is not motivated only by consideration of facility in inflection or of avoidance of obscuration through sandhi, etc.

	3.4.96	:	vaito 'nyatra
	5.4.11	:	kim-et-tiṅ-avyaya-ghād āmv adravya-prakarṣe
	6.4.119	:	ghv-asor ed dhāv abhyāsa-lopaś ca
	7.2.5	:	h-m-y-anta-kṣaṇa-śvasa-jāgṛ-ṇi-śv-ed-itām
	7.3.103	:	bahu-vacane jhaly et
	7.4.52	:	ha eti
	8.2.81	:	eta id bahu-vacane
	8.3.99	:	eti saṁjñāyām agāt
(b)	1.1.15	:	ot[10]
	6.1.93	:	oto 'ṁśasoh
	6.3.112	:	sahi-vahor od a-varṇasya
	7.3.71	:	otaḥ śyani
	8.2.45	:	od-itaś ca
	8.3.20	:	oto gārgyasya
	8.4.28	:	upasargād anot-paraḥ[11]
(c)	3.4.93	:	eta ai
	3.4.95	:	āta ai
	4.1.36	:	pūta-krator ai ca[12]
(d)	4.1.38	:	manor au vā
	7.1.34	:	āta au ṇalaḥ
	7.2.107	:	adasa au su-lopaś ca[13]

4.2   On the background of these sūtras, the following sūtras stand out as containing unexpected readings :

(a)	3.4.79	:	ṭita ātmane-padānāṁ ṭer e
	6.4.67	:	er liṅi
(b)	4.4.108	:	samānodare śayita o codāttaḥ
(d)	7.1.84	:	diva aut
	7.3.118–		
	119	:	aud ac ca gheḥ[14]

---

10. Sūtras 1.1.15 and 6.3.112 establish that *t* is appended even in the nominative case and that it has not been introduced only for ease in inflection.

11. The *Kāśikā* reads *upasargād bahulam*. The reading in the *Mahābhāṣya* and Böhtlingk's edition is as given here.

12. The form *ais* in 7.1.9 is due to the fact that a substitution for the whole grammatical element *bhis* is to be taught.

13. *auṭ* in 4.1.2. *auś* in 6.1.21 and *auṅ* in 7.1.18 are the result of special considerations. Hence they should be left out here.

14. The *Bhāṣya* seems to have read 7.3.116 to 119 (according to KIELHORN (1885 : 192 and 1887 : 180) 7.3.117 to 119) as one continuous sentence and then suggested *yoga-vibhāga* for it. In the *Kāśikā*, the *yoga-vibhāga* is accepted. Accordingly, *auṭ* is rule 7.3.118 for it and *ac ca gheḥ* 7.3.119.

It is obvious that a change in the wording of other rules to make the wording of these rules consistent would amount to an uneconomical and highly arbitrary procedure. Rather, it is in these rules that the possibility of emendation should be studied. Some context-specific considerations of a subtler kind indeed enable us to justify an emendation.

4.3   The rule which follows *ṭita ātmane-padānāṁ ṭer e* is *thāsaḥ se.* If the original wording of the former was — *ṭer et*, the combination in a continuous recitation[15] of *A* rules would have been *et thāsaḥ* Such a combination would rather easily simplify itself into *e thāsaḥ*,[16] unless a determined effort was made to pronounce the *t* of *et* and to follow it by a break *(virāma)* of some kind. We should not be surprised if in a rare instance a slip was made in the long tradition of the *A* and the first of the two dentals, which differ only in the feature of aspiration, was dropped.

4.4   Applying similar reasoning, we can conclude that it is probable that original reading of 4.4.108 was *samānodare śayita oc codāttaḥ* and that *oc co°* could have been inadvertently simplified into *o co°*.

4.5   As to 6.4.67, *er liṅi*, an original of the form *el liṅi* (resulting by regular sandhi from *et liṅi*) should not be deemed improbable. The change of *l* to *r* and *r* to *l* noticed in the case of many sanskrit words is common knowledge.

4.6   In the case of *diva aut* (7.1.84), where consistency requires that *t* should be absent and the reading should be *diva au*, note the two rules which follow : *pathi-mathy-ṛbhukṣām āt* and *ito 't sarva-nāma-sthāne.* The *tapara-karaṇa* present in the three forms *āt*, *it*, and *at* could have brought about a *tapara-karaṇa* of *au* too.

4.7   Lastly, the text of 7.3.118–119, *aud ac ca gheḥ*, seems to have been a matter cf doubt at least from the time of Patañjali. It is significant that in Patañjali's improved formulation, *au ḍic ca gheḥ*, of the rule there is no *t* after *au*.[17]

---

15.   By continuous recitation I mean the practice of reciting rules in the sequence in which they appear. Such recitation is done by Pāṇinīyas even today. Given the importance of order in the application of P's rules, it follows that his rules were to be memorized in the order in which they appear. Continuous recitation would be a natural means of such memorization. Its acceptance as a practice expected by P, however, does not imply acceptance also of the view that P foresaw freedom on the part of his readers in breaking up his *sūtra-pāṭha*. Although Kātyāyana and Patañjali have occasionally availed themselves of such freedom, it cannot be that P granted or even anticipated such freedom.

16.   Prakrit *ettha*, for example, changed into *ithe* of modern Marathi.

17.   This is according to KIELHORN's edition. In Kaiyaṭa's comment on 7.3.118–119 the reading is *auḍ ḍic....* at least in the edition published by Motilal Banarsidass (p. 240).

5.1   (SCHARFE 1971 : 12 a :) Anyone who has worked on even a few Sanskrit manuscripts can testify to the inconsistency noticed in the application of sandhi rules. *A* scribe's not being particularly aware of the importance of consistency or being careless in his assignment is one obvious cause of this phenomenon. However, even in the case of conscientious and learned copyists, an editor has to be aware of two understandable yet mutually contrary factors.   Since the common practice in Sanskrit sentence writing is to observe the rules of sandhi, scribes frequently effect sandhi where it is absent in their exemplar.   On the other hand, since they are engaged in the activity of copying and can concentrate at a given moment on only the manageable units of the exemplar, they frequently end up dissolving the sandhi of the original.   An awareness of this common phenomenon can be used to bring uniformity to the current sūtra-pāṭha.   P's practice is to overlook the rules of sandhi when observance of sandhi will result in a misunderstanding of the grammatical element or operation being taught.   This is as it should be according to common sense[18] and the distinction between object language and metalanguage.   Thus, when ādeśas or substitutions are given, obscuring or misleading sandhi is not allowed to take place.   Consequently, we read *jarāyā jaras anyatarasyām* (7.2.101), not *jaro 'nyatarasyām; bahuvacanasya vas-nasau* (8.1.21), not *vonasau.*   Given this procedure, the sūtra 6.1.63, *pad-dan-no-mās-hṛn-niś-asan-yūṣan-doṣan-yakañ-chakann-udannāsañ chas-pra-bhṛtiṣu* is suspect.   It obscures the forms of ādeśas at a number of places.   It does not indicate the lexical items for which substitutions are made, which is contrary to P's practice.[19]   It occurs after *aci śīrṣaḥ*, which, while treated as a sūtra in the *Kāśikā*, is a vārttika in the *Bhāṣya*.   Furthermore, the order of points in the *Bhāṣya* comment on it is strange.   The vārttika *padādiṣu māms-pṛt-snūnām upasaṁkhyānam* appears first, then a remark to the effect that *śasprabhṛtiṣu* is not necessary, and then the explanation of the vārttika *padādiṣu* given first.   This indicates confusion in the Bhāṣya tradition, which in turn gives rise to a doubt as to whether Patañjali looked upon 6.1.63 as a rule composed by P.

5.2   Applying the same consideration, we can determine that it could hardly have been P's intention to apply the rule 8 3.32, *ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam*, in the metalanguage.   The evidence collected by SCHARFE on p. 11a is sufficient to establish that the doubling of *ṅ* in P 8.1.28 (*ṅiṅ atiṅaḥ*) found in certain editions (e.g. the editions of the *Kāśikā* by SHOBHITA MISHRA and by ARYENDRA SHARMA and others) does not conform to P's practice.   Similarly, the occurrences of *tṛn* in *A* 2.3.69, 3.2.135, and 6.4.11 clearly indi-

---

18. If understanding occurs the accuracy, efficiency and efficacy of grammar will be sacrificed. Λ

19. The rules like 2.3.64 (*Kṛtvo'rtha—*) and 4.4.27 (*ojaḥ-saho'mbhasā—*)), in which sandhi is effected, do not involve *ādeśas*. The change of *śas* to *chaṣ* in 4.1.2 (*svau-jas-am-auṭ—* : SCHARFE 1971 : 12) and similar changes in rules listing or prescribing suffixes need further investigation.

cate that the doubling of *n* in 6.2.161 is due to the influence of *anna* which follows and could not have been a feature of P's own version of the rule.

6.1   Just as we should be aware of the role the predominant practice of sandhi plays, we should not lose sight of the fact that the *A* was maintained by a succession of scholars and scribes for whom memorization was a habit of the mind.   Anyone who has worked with traditional Sanskrit scholars, no matter what their field of specialization, knows how much they are devoted to committing things to memory and how easily, after a certain stage of preparation, they retain and relate sentences scattered in different parts of a work.   This attitude and this ability, well-cultivated in the Sanskrit tradition in general, are further emphasized in the study of P on account of the very nature of his wonderful work.[20]   One consequence of this fact is that a person copying a certain rule of the *A* is frequently likely to have a related rule at the back of his mind, which may affect the outcome.

6.2   An awareness of this possibility would prove helpful in the secondary textual criticism of the *A*.   Thus, 4.4.136, *matau ca*, is problematic in that *matau* is used in the sense *matv-arthe*.[21]   Since the rule teaches attaching of *gha (= iya)* suffix (to *sahasra* in order to derive *sahasriya*), there can be no doubt that *matau* does not mean when *matu* or *matup* follows (i.e. when the situation is **sahasramat*[22]); *matau* must mean ' where *matu* could have occurred — when the sense of matu is present, ' that is, *matv-arthe*.[23]   On the other hand, such a usage does not conform to P's practice.   In several other rules in which a statement of the type ' Grammatical operation ' *o* ' takes place, when the sense of *x* is present ' is necessary or advantageous, P employs compounds with *x* as the first member and *artha* as the second member.   In fact, almost nowhere has P employed a technical element without the addition of *artha* to refer to the meaning of that technical element. Thus, we have *liṅ-arthe* (3.4.7), *tum-arthāt* (2.3.15), *tum-arthe* (3.4.9), *kṛtyārthe* (3.4.14), *a-nyad-arthe* (6.4.60), *kṛtvo'rthe* (2.3.64, 8.3.43), *atas-artha-* ('2.3.30), khal-artha- (2.3.69, 3.4.70), *cvy-arthe* (3.4.62), *cvy-artheṣu* (3.2.56), *loḍ-artha-* (3.3.8) and *nā-dhārtha-* (3.4.62). Moreover, *matv-arthe* itself has been twice used by P, once in 1.4.19 and once in the not too distant 4.4.128.[24]   The *Kāśikā* too seems to have read *matv-arthe* in 4.4.136, for

---

20.   Since the derivation of object language forms takes place through a succes-sive application of rules and since conceptually related rules are scattered at many places in his work, one cannot understand or master P's grammar without extensive memo-rization.

21.   Reasoning similar to the one given below would apply also to P 5.2.59, *matau chaḥ sūkta-sāmnoḥ*.

22.   Such an expression is unlikely in the first place, since it goes against the general phenomenon in Sanskrit according to which one expects -*vat* after the stem *sahasra* ending in *a*.

23.   Cf. *Kāśikā* : *matv-arthe ca sahasra-śabdād ghaḥ pratyayo bhavati*.

24.   Böhtlingk's index somehow misses 4.4.128 under arthe. The rule is, how-ever, commented upon in the *Bhāṣya*.

whereas it specifically comments on *maye* of the almost immediately following (4.4.138) rule with the remark *maya iti mayad-artho lakṣyate*, it provides no similar gloss on *matau*; in fact, it contains no indication of *matau*, as it reads only *matv-arthe*. Nor is it likely that the authors of the *Kāsikā* read *matau* in 4.4.136, but tried to suppress the problem such a reading presents, for in a later rule (5.2.59), the *Kāsikā* does contain the remark *matāv iti matv-artha ucyate*. Not providing such explanation for an earlier rule like 4.4.136 seems especially improbable. Thus, there is enough evidence to establish that *matau ca* was originally and up to the time of the *Kāsikā*[25] *matv-arthe ca*. Now, the question is : how could *matv-arthe* have changed to *matau* ? It is not a change of the common transcriptional type.[26] I think the change has come about through a phenomenon described by one Sanskrit author as *vāsitāntaḥ-karaṇair lekhakais tathā likhitam*. In *matau bahv-aco 'n-ajirādīnām* (6.3.119), the form *matau* occurs appropriately. Under its influence,[27] first the *matv-arthe* of 5.2.59 seems to have been changed by scribes to *matau* (see note 25 above).[28] Then the reading *matv-arthe* of 4.4.136 seems to have undergone a change to *matau* under the influence of both 6.3.119 and 5.2.59, or either.

7.1   Regarding 3.3.172, *śaki liṅ ca*, again, one can rationalize the use of *śaki* for *śaky-arthe*. One may argue, for example, as follows : P twice (6.1.81, 7.3.68) uses the expression *śakyārthe* meaning ' in the sense " is possible " '. Perhaps he did not wish to use a confusingly similar expression *śaky-arthe* meaning ' in the sense of [the root] *śak* ', ' in the sense " is capable " '. Also, the immediate context (3.3.169–174) of 3.3.172 is sufficient to indicate that *śaki* signifies an upādhi, not an upapada. A literal interpretation of the rule ' when *śak* is upapada, *liṅ* also is used ' would not have made sense anyway, as *śak* is not an upapada but a verbal root to which suffixes are added and as the occasion evidently was not one of deriving the optative forms of *śak* which have been provided for elsewhere.

7.2   However, this line of reasoning leaves P guilty of three things :

      (a) He has used the locative of a technical element in a non-technical sense, contrary to his usual procedure,

      (b) has relied upon contextual implication, and

      (c) has violated his own practice of adding *artha*.

---

25.   On the other hand, P 5.2.59 (see Note 21 above) seems to have read *matv-arthe* for *matau* only until the time of Patañjali.

26.   I would account for *maye* of P 4.4.138, where one expects *mayaḍarthe* or *mayārthe*, in essentially the same manner as one outlined in the following lines.

27.   The occurrence of *matoḥ* in 4.2.72, 4.4.125, 5.3.65, 6.2.219 and 8.2.9 could have indirectly reinforced a form of *matu* in another case, namely the locative.

28.   Note that *matau* occurs in the initial position in the rules as *matv-arthe* does.

As is evident from the expressions *liṅ-arthe, tum-arthe,* etc., P almost invariabl) adds *artha* when he intends to refer to the meaning of a grammatical element. That verbal roots are no exception to this procedure is clear frcm *bhītrārthānām* (1.4.25), *rucy-arthānām* (1.4.33), *avid-arthasya* (2.3.51), *adhigartha-* (2.3.52), *krudha-maṇḍārthebhyaḥ* (3.2.51), *asty-arthesu* (3.3.146, 3.4.65) and perhaps *paśyārthaiḥ* (8.1.25). Besides, in 3.1.99 and 3.4.12, *śaki* stands for the root *śak* and does not mean 'in the meaning of [the root] *śak*'. It is probable, furthermore, that the occurrence of *śaki* in the initial position in the rules referred to influenced the initial *śaky-arthe* or, better, *śakyārthe.* of the original wording of 3.3.172 in the oral or manuscript tradition of the *A.* An explanation based on the influence of memorization thus seems better than the one amounting to rationalization given earlier.

8.1 The preceding discussion, I trust, has served to establish the claim made at the beginning of this paper. A careful utilization of the word-indices of P's work, coupled with an awareness of the factors which are likely to have played a role in the transmission of that work, will aid a critical student of P considerably in solving textual puzzles. A constant reference to what is implicit in the remarks of works such as the *Bhāsya* and the *Kāśikā* will frequently provide corroborative evidence. It would be misdirected research if we lulled ourselves into believing that the sources and signals left to us by the tradition have been exhausted, if we did not realise that the traditional observations and solutions can be pressed into service in an alternative, text-critical, and historical way, and if we went on proposing idiosyncratic solutions or solutions that resemble only the cosmetic kind of traditional solutions.[29]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

.For publication details of the works used in the preparation of this paper, see George CARDONA, *Pāṇini : A Survey of Research,* the Hague–Paris; Mouton, 1976. Trends in Linguistics, State--of-the-Art Reports 6.

-----

29. By "cosmetic kind" I mean the solutions implicit in such remarks as *sautratvāt* or *vicitrā hi sūtrasya kṛtiḥ,* which are in effect statements of the problems not a real way of solving them. Λ