Chapter V

TECHNICAL TERMS AND THE M.Bh.

GENERAL REMARKS

In every branch of knowledge, there are certain words, which convey a specific sense in that branch. Pāñini also has used certain terms in a technical sense. Thus the terms, which are restricted in their significance, are given the name sahjā-sabda or technical term. The characteristic of technical terms is discussed in the M.Bh. under P.I.1.1. The Vārtika-kāra has raised the following two objections in that sūtra:

1. There should be a sahjā-adhikāra-rule like वृddhi before the word vṛddhi etc. for showing that the word vṛddhi in the present rule is a technical term. Otherwise, one cannot have a clear conception of words like vṛddhi, etc. being technical terms. Even when the sahjā-adhikāra-rule is added a clarification will have to be made as to which word is sahjā or technical.

1 "संवाधिवर्गः संशास्त्रित्यस्यः"

Vart. 1, M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.

2 "संहासंश्रेष्ठसः"

Vart. 3, M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.
term and which word is its bearer (saṁjñin). How can it/made out that the word vṛddhi is the technical term, while the words āt and aic are the bearers of that technical term? In answer to these questions, Kātyāyana himself has stated that the word standing for the technical term will be made out from the usage of the revered preceptor. In other words, terms like vṛddhi denotes a saṁjñā and not a saṁjñin as is evident from the usage of the revered preceptor (Pāṇini). Similar is the case with all proper names both popular and Vedic, as for instance, in the world parents of a new-born baby name the child as Devadatta or Yajñadatta in a closed room viz. their residence and by their use, other people understand that it is his name. Similar is the case in this science of grammar. In connection with this very rule, some interpreters interpret the present rule I.1.1

1

काचार्याचारात संसारिविद्या यथा तोर्कित्वादेवः

on P.I.1.1.

2

लोके तास्यनाथारातीसु कुस्त्य वालस्य संस्कृतेवाहारे नाम
कपालिः - वेयवती वशात्वत हरिः। तत्तत्सारायथास्बधिं धर्मस्ति
इवमस्त्संस्कृतिः।

M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.
to mean that the word vrddhi is a technical term, while the vowels ā, ai and au, are its saṃjñins. Other scholars, however, quote the rule "सिस्तंखरिणिः परस्नेपेषु" VII.2.1 and cite the vowels ā, ai and au, mentioned in the rule I.1.1, as the substituents prescribed by the word vrddhi in the rule VII.2.1. The conclusion deduced from the above discussion in the M.Bh. in regard to the distinction between saṃjñā and saṃjñin, is as follows:—that, by means of which things are communicated is the technical term, while those things which are communicated are the saṃjñins or bearers of that name. The Vārtikakāra has suggested two more characteristics in order to distinguish between saṃjñā and saṃjñin more clearly: (1) Sahjnā is that which has no form (anākṛti) while those which possess forms, are the bearers of the name (saṃjñin). Even in the world, the

1 तेन मन्वायं यथा प्रत्यावर्त्ते सा संस्का वे प्रतीवर्त्ते से संस्का:।
M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.

2 "बनाकृति: " (Vart. 6)
यथा बनाकृति: संस्का, बनाकृतिभवः संस्का:। चत्रेके चि
ि बनाकृतिका मांसापिण्डवं वेदयत हति संस्का किष्के।
M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.
name Devadatta is given to a mass of flesh having a certain form, (2) or the technical term should be indicated by attaching a particular sign, so that a word possessed of such a sign would be regarded as a technical term.

Patanjali has suggested a few more characteristics, whereby saṅjñā and saṅjñāni are clearly recognized. He has stated that the sūtra I.1.1 definitely makes mention of the term vṛddhi and its saṅjñānis, since, there is noticed an apposition of two words, which are both put in the same case, and this apposition is seen in two cases: (1) When the two words are related to each other as the qualification and qualified or (2) when they are related as the name and the named (saṅjñā saṅjñābibhāva). Now,

1

"निषेण वा"  (Vart. 7)

अवयव विद्ययां चिन्तं यथार्थं हत्यं चिन्तन संहिता।

M.Bh. I.1.1.

2

हर्षं तस्यपि भूतं साधारणाः त्रिविशेषणमेवाप्रसंगमितः च। द्वयंकेतु भवति। .... विशेषणोऽवक्षेत्राय, संहितांसंहिताय। ....... अपोर्भ्यं प्रतिपत्तिवर्षिणः विशेषणोऽक्षेत्राय भवति।

नायेश्चयः प्रतिपत्तिवर्षकं । तत्स्यात् संहितासंहिताय।

"M.Bh. on P.I.1.1."
out of the two cases, if it be said that they are related as the qualification and the qualified, it would not be possible, because the relation between the qualification and qualified exists between two things which are known or between two words, whose meaning is known to the people already. In the present case, the meaning of the word, ādaic, in the rule I.1.1 is not known. It follows consequently that the words vrddhi and ādaic are definitely connected by the relationship of the name and the named. Patañjali has further stated that in the case of the present rule, the word vrddhi is the technical term and the word ādaic is the bearer of that name, because, sañjñas are adopted for the sake of brevity, hence where one has a smaller number of syllables and another a larger number of syllables, the former is sañjña and the latter is a sañjñin. Patañjali has mentioned the next characteristic feature possessed by a sañjñin or name: that sañjñas like vrddhi and guṇa are repeatedly mentioned in the treatises of grammar while

---

1. यज्ञ हू अन्नकारणं चलय सा संवा।

M. Bh. on P. I. 1.1.

2. अष्टव शास्तिन्व: संवा मर्मात्म! वृद्धिविन्नवाक्ति नापेश्वरः।

ibid.
such is not the case with their corresponding saññins.

The next characteristic feature of a sañña is that what is stated first in a sūtra is a bearer of sañña, while what is mentioned later is the name or sañña, as in (adeṅguṇah). But the rule (vrddhirādaic) forms an exception, as the word vrddhi here comes first. This reverse order in P.I.1.1 is intended for a specific purpose viz. for making an auspicious beginning of his work by the use of the word vrddhi.

Patanjali has divided saññas into two classes: krtrima or artificial and akṛtrima or popular names current in society. In the M.Bh. on P.I.4.23 he has stated that in grammar ideas are expressed either through

1

Ibid.

2

Ibid.

3

Ibid.

Ibid.

M.Bh. on P.I.4.23 and also M.Bh. on P.I.2.53.
such words, as are current in the ordinary speech of the people in those senses, e.g. *pasuḥ*, *apatyam*, *devatāḥ*, etc. or through *kṛtrima-saḥjñās* (technical expressions) like *ṭi*, *ghu*, *bha*, etc. By *kṛtrima-saḥjñā* he refers to those terms, whose meaning is not understood from the usage in the word. They are coined by the grammarians to meet the peculiar needs of grammar. Following the view of Patañjali, Bhartṛhari has divided sahketa or convention into two classes: one eternal and the other of modern origin (*ādhnika*). The latter includes the technical terms which are used with their restricted sense in the treatises of the science and art. Classifying the words into four categories as *jñātiśabda*, *guṇaśabda*, *kriyāśabda* and *yadṛcchā śabda*, Patañjali has included the technical terms in the last group as *Nāgeśabhaṭṭa* has stated in the Uddyota

1 In the Nyāyam system of Philosophy all technical terms are called *ādhnika-saḥketa* i.e. the word in which the *saḥketa* (expressive power) is of modern origin. Cf. SM on Kārikā 80.

1a

In the Nyāyam system of Philosophy all technical terms are called *ādhnika-saḥketa* i.e. the word in which the *saḥketa* (expressive power) is of modern origin. Cf. SM on Kārikā 80.

1a

In the Nyāyam system of Philosophy all technical terms are called *ādhnika-saḥketa* i.e. the word in which the *saḥketa* (expressive power) is of modern origin. Cf. SM on Kārikā 80.

1a

In the Nyāyam system of Philosophy all technical terms are called *ādhnika-saḥketa* i.e. the word in which the *saḥketa* (expressive power) is of modern origin. Cf. SM on Kārikā 80.

1a

In the Nyāyam system of Philosophy all technical terms are called *ādhnika-saḥketa* i.e. the word in which the *saḥketa* (expressive power) is of modern origin. Cf. SM on Kārikā 80.
thereon. Hence the technical terms may be called by the word yadṛcchāśabda.

The purpose of Pāṇini in giving sañjñā rules is to illustrate a thing very briefly. The Śivasūtras have great value for making sañjñās like an, ac, etc. by the help of Pāṇini’s rule I.1.71. Patañjali has expressly said in the M.Bh. on P.VIII.2.1 that sañjñā and Paribhāṣā rules have been composed absolutely for the sake of other rules. They do not teach any new grammatical operation independently. They merely help in interpreting the vidhi and niśedha rules.

Pāṇini has made an honest effort throughout his work to make it as short as possible. Keeping this view in mind, he has coined the briefest possible technical terms for his grammar like ti, ghu, bha, etc. Patañjali has generally pointed out that the sañjñās (technical terms) should be so coined that there should be no form shorter than them. Sometimes, however, Pāṇini has used comparatively

---

1 संसापरिषापारां हि अल्पाल्पारारा इन्न स्वातम्येक वाक्यावर्ग कारणोऽधिकतमाः पद्मपाल्लेखेऽ इति: ।
   M.Bh. on P.VIII.2.1.

2 यथवेगं हि संसारारभमपि संस्कृत नाम बलो न श्रावत:।
   M.Bh. on P.I.1.27 and on others.
longer technical terms, which are considered to have been taken from the works of his predecessors with a view to make those terms easily understandable. For instance, the term avasāna, is found in the sense of 'the end of the word' in R.Pr. I.15 and it is also used in the sense of 'pause' in the same work in XVIII.47 and also in other works. Panini has used the word 'avasāna' in the sense of 'the end of a word or a sentence'. Dr. K.C. Chatterji points out that though Virāma contains a lesser number of syllables than avasāna and though Virāma must have been more easily understood in his day than avasāna, since he explains avasāna by Virāma, still he uses avasāna throughout his work and not Virāma cf. his use of Vibhāṣa for na vā.''

It is also very interesting to note here, that in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, Panini has used some technical terms,

1 The word avasāna is used in the sense of pause in 'नवेक्षनान्य कृष्णवागानान् ' Rg.Pr.XVIII.47
and in the sense of the end of a word in 'तुलियं आस्त्र्यवर्गं ' Rg. Pr.I.15. Uvāta has explained the word avasāna thereon 'पवाक्षाने कर्तनानान्'

Cf. Dr. K.C. Chatterji - Technical terms and technique of Sanskrit grammar, p. 255.

2 Ibid., p. 256.
which are mono-syllabic like ति, घु, भा, etc. and on the other hand, there are several technical terms, which contain from two to seven syllables. In regard to such dual uses, the following questions strike the mind of readers. Why has Pāṇini adopted two methods in the case of technical terms? Why has he not used mono-syllabic technical terms throughout his work? Is it true that in the use of long technical terms, Pāṇini has merely followed his predecessors? These questions are really very difficult to answer.

Dr. K. C. Chatterji thinks in regard to these questions that "in spite of his passion for brevity he uses technical terms of five, six and seven syllables, out of deference to his teachers or the school he was following, or it may be that these technical terms had taken such a firm hold on his mind that he could not bring himself to discard them and consciously or unconsciously he made use of them in his आषाढ्यायिनी to the great discomfiture of his commentators."

On the other hand, Dr. Burnell gives the following reason for Pāṇini's use of longer technical terms in the

Aṣṭādhyāyī: "had he restricted himself to his own symbols, his meaning would not have appeared at all in these particular sūtras and thus he was compelled to use the older terms or sacrifice his principle of the utmost possible conciseness of expressions."

It deserves to be noted in this connection that mono-syllabic technical terms like ti, ghu, bha, etc. used by Pāṇini are generally arbitrary. They do not convey any literal sense but only a technical sense. On the other hand, the long technical terms used in the Aṣṭādhyāyī like sarvāman, karmapravacanīya, avyaya, etc. convey the technical sense along with their etymological sense. Thus in using long technical terms, Pāṇini must have meant that those particular terms should not be applied to words, if they do not possess the etymological sense of these terms. Therefore it may be supposed here, that in using long technical terms, Pāṇini has not only followed his predecessors, but those terms are also thought as really significant and therefore unavoidable. This supposition gets further support from the M.Bh.

---

1 Dr. Burnell - in "The Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammar", p. 21.
Patanjali in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.27 has discussed this problem and has clearly stated that Pāṇini has used a long technical term like sarvanāman, although a technical term should be as concise as possible on account of the fact that the purpose of coining a sañjña or technical term is no other than to facilitate the operation of rules (sāstrāpravṛtti). Hence, the purpose of using a long technical term is that the term should be taken as self-explanatory (anvartha). Nāgaraṇa Bhāṭṭa says in this connection that anvarthasañjña means a technical term which is yogarūḍha. That is to say, that an anvarthasañjña will denote its technical sense along with its etymological sense. Since the term sarvanāman, is an anvartha sañjña (self-explanatory term) it would restrict the sūtra I.1.27, which sanctions sarvanāma-sañjña.

The sūtra I.1.27 would be applied to the words - sarva, viśva, etc. only when those words stand for all the

1

2

M.Bh. on P.I.1.27.

Uddyota thereon.
objects denoted by them. In other words, the rule I.1.27 would not be applied to those words, which have merely verbal similarity. Hence the words - sarva, viśva, etc. when they are used as proper nouns or as subordinate to other words (upasarjana), they cannot be taken as sarvanāman.

Similarly Patanjali has stated in the M.Bh. on P.I.4.83 that since Panini has given a long term as (karmapravacaniya it must be taken to be an anvartha-saṁjñā (self-explanatory term) denoting the sense: "Karma proktavantah" which means karmapravacanīyas are those, which suggest the relation of a verb, which is not now used. Kaiyata says thereon that the saṁjñā is adopted only for the sake of brevity, therefore, it should not be longer than a word consisting of more than one or two syllables.

1 किम् यति संहा त्रिम्बकेष ! बन्ध्यसंहै यथा विशालेत्
कर्म प्रोक्तवन्तः कर्मप्रक्ष्णीया हि ! ....... ये अभ्रुष्ण्यमानस्तः
श्रृहपाहुः !
M.Bh. on P.I.4.83.

2 शास्त्रार्थेऽस्तु संशास्त्रपपुस्य, शास्त्रवक्ष्यं पुकार्या
स्वस्त्र वा संहा कार्यवान् भवः , and also
अध्यमुग्यं बध्यन्त वा भुजः बध्योपल्पत्तिनिविनत्ता या
संहा सा बन्ध्यसंहैः !
Pradipa on the M.Bh. on P.I.4.83.
Patanjali has recorded the use of terms consisting of more than one syllable in the conventional as well as literal sense about a dozen times, still, there are some long technical terms like 'Sarvanamasthana', 'Pratipadika', 'Sarvadhatauka', 'Ardhadhatauka', etc. used by Pāṇini as technical terms and Patanjali is silent about them. No doubt, with regard to those terms later commentators also have remarked that Pāṇini has used such long technical terms only because those terms were used by his predecessors and were current in his time. But Sṛstidhara, a Bengali commentator of the seventeenth century, has proved that those long technical terms used by Pāṇini are not devoid of purpose. They are significant or self-explanatory terms.

1  महत्रैं संसा फ़िं'ते।

M.Bh. on P.I.1.23 and also cf. the M.Bh. on P.I.1.27, I.1.38, I.2.32, I.2.43, I.4.23, I.4.83, II.1.5, III.1.1, III.1.92.

It should be noted in this connection that the question often raised by Patanjali about the use of long technical terms of Pāṇini, clearly shows that Patanjali holds the view that Pāṇini has used the long technical terms not only because he wanted to follow his predecessors, but also because those technical terms in a way were necessary to his grammar. If Patanjali had thought that Pāṇini only followed his predecessors in using long technical terms the question about the purpose of using of those terms of Pāṇini, would not have been raised by him.

2 Cf. K.C. Chatterji - Technical Terms and Technique of Sanskrit Grammar, p. 35.
It may be stated in the light of the discussion held above that in the use of long technical terms, Pāṇini had two ideas in mind. Firstly, those terms were considered by him, in a way indispensable, as they alone could convey the special senses to meet the peculiar demands of his grammar. Secondly as those terms were also used by his predecessors, he considered it advisable to use those very words, instead of coining new words, which would have imposed an unnecessary burden upon his readers.

Moreover, it is obvious from the study of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, that Pāṇini has used three kinds of technical terms in his work. Firstly, there are certain terms which are invented by him. Such terms are generally in mono-syllabic form and they are defined by him as follows: *Taraptamapauḥḥah*, *Dāḍhāghvādāp*, *Yaci bham* etc. Secondly, he has taken over certain technical terms from earlier works, where those terms were used and were still current in his time. In many cases of this kind he has used them in a modified sense and in so doing, he has given his own definition of those technical terms in order to convey the modified senses. Thirdly, there are technical terms taken over by Pāṇini from the works of his predecessors and hence used by him without giving any definition. He did not think it necessary to define them as they conveyed the same sense in which they were current.
Such terms are, for instance, 'Prathamā', 'Dvitīyā', etc. all the names of the case-suffixes, and Nāman, Auh, Ah etc. with regard to these technical terms commentators have generally remarked, that they are the technical terms of old grammarians (Prācām sahjdā). Dr. Burnell thinks that those terms belong to the Aindra school of grammar. It may be said here that those technical terms were current in Pāṇini's time and hence he has used them in his Āṣṭādhyāyī without giving any definition.

It deserves to be noted that from the M. Bh. on P. I. 2. 53, and the gloss of Kaiyāṭa thereon Prof. Goldstücker arrives at the conclusion that Pāṇini does not define those technical terms, which admit of an etymology and which are known and settled otherwise. His conclusions are given in the following four propositions:

1. "That his (Pāṇini's) grammar does not treat of those sahjnās or conventional names, which are known and settled otherwise."

2. "That this term sahjnā must be understood in our rule to concern only such conventional names as have an etymology."

---

1 The Aindra school of grammar, p. 21.

2 Pāṇini - His Place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 127.
(3) "That it applies also to grammatical terms, which admit an etymology, but not to those which are merely grammatical symbols."

(4) "That such terms as tī, ghu, and bha were known and settled before Pāṇini's grammar, but that nevertheless they are defined by Pāṇini because they are not etymological terms."

Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar has rightly pointed out in regard to the above propositions of Prof. Goldstücker that "We perfectly agree with statement No. 1 if it be separated from No. 2 and not interpreted according to the sense of the word sañjñā given in the latter."

It is also very strange to note that Prof. Goldstücker considers the definition of terms like upasarjana, upasarga, Avayā, Dhātu, Prātipadika, etc. given by Pāṇini to be no definition. There is no evidence to confirm this view, and on the other hand, it is as good a definition as that of tī, ghu, bha, etc. It is very difficult to decide why the sūtra of Pāṇini - 'aco antyādīti' I.1.64 (Yaci bham) I.4.18, etc. should be taken as

1 The Indian Antiquary, Vol. VI, p. 109.
definition of the terms 'ṭi' and 'bha' respectively and the sūtras I.2.43, I.4.59, I.1.37, I.3.1, I.2.45, which sanction respectively upasarjana, upasarga, āvyaya dhatu and Prātipadika saṁjaṇās should not be treated like that. The wording of the latter group of the sūtras is similar to that of the former group of the sūtras.

Dr. K. C. Chatterji has studied the statements of Prof. Goldstucker about the technical terms and has expressed his view as follows:

1 "We fail to see how such conclusions can be drawn from the simple statement of the Bhāṣyakāra. In the present state of our knowledge it is very difficult to say whether āti, ghu, gha and bha existed before Pāṇini. They are not found in the Nirukta nor in the Kātantra."

Therefore the conclusions about technical terms, drawn by Prof. Goldstucker and followed by Dr. Burnell are not acceptable at all, or it may be said in the words of Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar that "It will thus be apparent that Dr. Goldstucker's theory is based upon a mis-apprehension of a passage in Kaiyāta..." and again he remarks,

1 "Technical terms and technique of Sanskrit grammar", p. 6.

2 "The Indian Antiquary", pp. 111-112.
"We have no hesitation in saying that the translation (of the passage in Kaiyata) is totally wrong, and it is upon this mis-apprehension of the sense of the original that the Doctor's peculiar theory is based. We hope our readers will excuse us for the assurance with which I speak, for we feel that no native scholar acquainted with grammatical phraseology would ever think of translating or interpreting the passage thus."

Moreover, besides those technical terms used in the Astadhyayi, several other technical terms are found in the prose Vartikas as well as in the Kārikās. Kātyāyana, in his Vartikas, has frequently used such technical terms, as are not used by Pāṇini in the Astadhyayi and were used in Pre-Pāṇinian literature. It shows that Kātyāyana was fully acquainted with those terms and probably they were current among grammarians in his time. Patanjali has explained them and he himself has very rarely used such technical terms. The following technical terms, which are not used in the Astadhyayi, but are found in the M.Bh. would be sufficient to confirm the above view.

Pāṇini has used the terms ac and hal for vowel and consonant, respectively throughout his Astadhyayi and they are formed by taking two letters from the Śivasūtras,
while in the Vārtika, the term svara is used for vowel and Vyañjana for consonants. Patanjali has explained the term svara as 'svayam rajante', which shine by themselves. In other words, which can be pronounced without the help of the others. He has explained vyañjana as (anvag bhavati) which follows. (samāna for Pāñini's ak) (sandhyākṣara for े)

1. M.Bh. on P.I.2.29.

2. Patanjali's remark about consonant is very interesting:

M. Bh. on P.VI.1.2.

3. In the M. Bh. on S.S. 3 Vart. 6.

M. Bh. on S.S. 3 Vart. 1.

Pradipa thereon.
Ayogavāha is used in the sense of those letters, which are neither read in the Śivasūtras nor included in any Pratyāhāra, yet they serve the grammatical purposes, such as jihvāmūliya and upadhāniya etc.

2 Bhavantī for P. lat. 'Svastani for P. lut., Bhavi-

2a śyanti for P. ṉrt. 'Vināma for P. ṇatva,' 'Upagraha for P. ṉtmanepada and Parsmaipada'. Vikaraṇa for the suffixes which come between roots and suffixes.

3 Anubandha for P. it. Anuṣaṅga for P. upadhā. Ḍu for P. Ṛaṭṣaṅjñā.

1 M.Bh. on Ś.S. Vārt. 6 and के पुनर्वाचणाअा; ?

2 Cf. Vārt. 11 in the M.Bh. on P.II.3.1.

2a Vārt. 1 in the M.Bh. on P.III.3.15.

3 In the same Vārtika.

4 Vārt. 11 in the M.Bh. on Ś.S. 4.

5 Vārt. 5 M.Bh. on P.III.2.127.

6 Cf. Vārt. 2 in the M.Bh. on P.III.1.67.

7 Vārt. 8 in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.20.

8 Vārt. 2 in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.47.

9 Vārt. 43 in the M.Bh. on P.I.4.1.
In Kārikās some other terms are also used: 'parokṣa for P. liṭ.', 'Kārita to denote causal', 'cekri-yata and carkarita for yaṇanta and yaṅluganta'. La for p. lopa. Patañjali has used the term Saṅkrama and Kaiyāṭa explains that term as a technical term of old grammarians denoting kit and īṭ.

It is already stated that about the saṁjñā and the Paribhāṣā rules two alternative views are found in the M. Bh. viz. Yathoddeśa and Kāryakāla and any one of the two is adopted, which leads to the formation of the correct word.