



**HAL**  
open science

## A case of Vyākaraṇic oxymoron: the notion of Anvarthasaṃjñā

Emilie Aussant

► **To cite this version:**

Emilie Aussant. A case of Vyākaraṇic oxymoron: the notion of Anvarthasaṃjñā. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 2007, 35 (2), pp.133-147. 10.1007/s10781-007-9011-y . halshs-00220442

**HAL Id: halshs-00220442**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00220442>**

Submitted on 5 Nov 2008

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# A CASE OF VYĀKARAṆIC OXYMORON: THE NOTION OF *ANVARTHASAMJÑĀ*<sup>1</sup>

Emilie Aussant<sup>2</sup>

## Abbreviations

<i>A</i>	<i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i>
<i>KV</i>	<i>Kāśikāvṛtti</i>
<i>MBh</i>	<i>Mahābhāṣya</i>
<i>MbhD</i>	<i>Mahābhāṣyadīpikā</i>
<i>PIŚ</i>	<i>Paribhāṣenduśekhara</i>
<i>PM</i>	<i>Padamañjarī</i>
<i>Pr</i>	<i>Pradīpa</i>
<i>Ud</i>	<i>Uddyota</i>
<i>VP</i>	<i>Vākyapadīya</i>
<i>vt</i>	<i>Vārttika</i>

## Introduction

Numerous studies have dealt with Pāṇinian grammatical terminology,<sup>3</sup> each of them proposing still more elaborate classifications. Curiously, however, few were interested in the very word that designates the metalinguistic units, namely *saṃjñā*.<sup>4</sup> Literally, *saṃjñā* (feminine root stem with the value of an action noun, derived from the root *jñā-* “to know, to understand” and combined with the preverb *sam-*) expresses the fact of “knowing, understanding in a common way” and then, as action nouns often acquire a resultative value, “that which is known or understood by the whole of a community”. This literal meaning is present throughout the grammatical discourse for most items designated by *saṃjñā*, namely technical terms (grammatical or not), autonyms, proper names, expressions whose meaning cannot be derived by analysis and conventional words whose gender and/or number cannot be anticipated.<sup>5</sup> All these items are indeed linked with convention, one way or another.

The Pāṇinian tradition distinguishes several types of *saṃjñās* such as *śabdasaṃjñā* “name of a linguistic form” (example: *vākya* “analytic expression, sentence”), *arthasaṃjñā* “name of the (linguistic-form) meaning” (example: *vibhāṣā* “option”), *bhāvinī saṃjñā* “subsequent technical term” (example: *saṃprasāraṇa*, a technical term for phonemes *iK* as substitutes of phonemes *yaN*), etc. Here I will focus on one of them: the *anvarthasaṃjñās*.

<sup>1</sup> I thank Arlo Griffiths, Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani for their remarks.

<sup>2</sup> emilie.aussant@linguist.jussieu.fr

<sup>3</sup> Cf. particularly Chatterji (1933, 1946, 1964), Sarma (1940), Chaturvedi (1940), Agrawala (1940, 1950), Renou (1942), Keith (1945), Venkatacharya (1947), Abhyankar (1961), Sen (1962), Sarma (1964), Bhattacharya (1966), Narayana Murti (1969, 1972), Katre (1968-71), Palsule (1966, 1969), Cardona (1970), Scharfe (1971), Bhandarkar (1972), Wezler (1976), Dvivedi (1978), Kiparsky (1979), Singh (1979), and Bandyopadhyay (1994).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Palsule (1966), Aussant (2005) and Candotti (2006).

<sup>5</sup> Which can be exemplified respectively by: *vṛddhi* (grammatical technical term designating *ā - ai - au* vowels), *gha* (grammatical technical term designating, according to the *sūtra* 1.1.22 of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (*A*), affixes of degrees of comparison *taraP* and *tamaP*), *hantiḥ* (presented as *saṃjñā* of *hantiḥ*, i.e. as autonym, in the *Mahābhāṣya* (*MBh*) on the *vārttika* (*vt*) 11 *ad A* 1.1.62, vol. 1 p. 163), *devadatta* or *ḍittha* (individual proper names), *araṇyetilakāḥ* (expression of which the meaning (“an unexpected event”) cannot be derived by analysis (literal meaning: “wild sesame”)), *dārāḥ* “wife” (masculine, plural).

One of Pāṇini's major preoccupation is the absence of redundancy, which has brevity as a consequence. If, in the beginning, the brevity is not an aim in itself, the tradition quickly develops it into a compositional norm for technical treatises composed in the *sūtra* genre.<sup>6</sup> Technical terms do not escape this development towards extreme condensation. Here I quote a passage from Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (*MBh*)<sup>7</sup> evoking this principle:

*tatra tv etāvān sandehaḥ kaḥ saṃjñī kā saṃjñeti / sa cāpi kva sandehaḥ / yatrobhe samānākṣare / yatra tv anyataral laghu yal laghu sā saṃjñā / kuta etat / laghvartham hi saṃjñākaraṇam / (MBh on vt 7 ad A 1.1.1, vol. 1, p. 39)*

But in this case, there is an uncertainty: which is the bearer of the technical term? which is the technical term? – Where else [is] this uncertainty [found again]? – When the two [words in question have] the same number of syllables. But where one is shorter, it is this which is the technical term. – Why is this? – [Because] the creation of a technical term aims at economy.

Some, like Haradatta in his *Padamañjarī* (*PM*),<sup>8</sup> go even further, by saying:

*ekākṣarā saṃjñā kāryā // (PM on KV ad A 2.1.5, vol. 2, p. 18)*  
A technical term should be made monosyllabic.

However, the fact is that Pāṇini resorts to technical terms<sup>9</sup> that do not obey this principle: cf. *sarvanāman* “pronoun” (literally “name for all”), or *avyaya* “indeclinable” (literally “which does not vary”). These terms are called *mahatī saṃjñā* or *mahāsaṃjñā* “long technical term” or additionally, from the *Pradīpa* (*Pr*)<sup>10</sup> of Kaiyaṭa onwards, *gurusamjñā* “heavy technical term”.<sup>11</sup> The Pāṇinian tradition, from the *Mahābhāṣya* onwards, justifies the use of such terms arguing that Pāṇini chose these terms, and not more economical ones, to indicate that they should be taken in their etymological/first meaning.<sup>12</sup> Grammarians describe them as *anvarthasaṃjñās* “technical terms [used] in conformity with their [etymological/first] meaning”.

<sup>6</sup> This principle of economy is evoked in the metarule (122 in *PIŚ*, vol. 1, p. 115): *ardhamātrālāghavena putrotsavaṃ manyante vaiyākaraṇāḥ //* “Grammarians consider that the economy of a half-mora gives as much delight as the birth of a son.”

<sup>7</sup> Patañjali's *MBh* (2nd century BC) is the commentary on Kātyāyana's *vt* (3rd century BC), which provide commentary on a part of Pāṇini's *A* (5th -4th centuries BC).

<sup>8</sup> Haradatta's *PM* (11th century AD?) is a commentary on the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (*KV*) (7th century AD), which is a complete commentary on the *A*.

<sup>9</sup> According to some paṇḍits, all the technical terms of the *A*, except those like *ṭi - ghu - bha* and acronyms like *aiC*, etc. which are used for mnemonic purposes and which are meaningless, are employed in conformity with their etymological meaning. It is always possible to justify the use of a term, which exists in the common usage otherwise, as a technical term. The choice of the word *vṛddhi*, for example, which literally signifies “growth” and which designates, in the *A*, phonemes *ā - ai - au*, is justified in so far as the meaning of “growth” refers to the growth of the said phonemes, “bigger” or more “inflated” than the corresponding vowels *a - e - o* (*guṇa* degree). Besides, this meaning of “growth”, which opens the treatise, gives in advance an auspicious value to the composition. Chatterji (1964, p. 48 and following) succeeds in explaining the use of all the technical terms of the *A*, including that of the term *bha*, seeing in it the first syllable of *bhaṅga* (“interruption, contraction”) or *bhagna* (“interrupted”) for, he says, “before the adjunction of weak endings the stem often undergoes reduction or syncope.”

<sup>10</sup> Kaiyaṭa's *Pr* (11th century AD?) is a complete commentary on the *MBh*.

<sup>11</sup> Note that the term *gurusamjñā* can also be taken as signifying “technical term of the *gurus* (i.e. the masters)”, even if this interpretation does not seem to have been retained by the tradition.

<sup>12</sup> I specify “etymological/first” because the meaning of some long technical terms is not necessarily their etymological meaning; it can be the meaning attributed by ancient masters, as we will see under Section “The *Uddyota* of Nāgeśa”.

When a word is used in conformity with its etymological/first meaning, it signifies that there is a direct correspondence between what the word signifies and its referent: the etymological/first meaning of the term constitutes a description of some feature of its referent, that is to say, it makes it possible to identify the latter. So, *anvarthasamjñās* such as *sarvanāman* and *avyaya* are terms with a descriptive contents. Therefore, long technical terms (*mahatī samjñās*) can be distinguished from “classical” (or non-*anvartha*) *samjñās* because they are used in conformity with their etymological/first meaning, whereas “classical” *samjñās*, which are conventional terms, are devoid of descriptive contents and therefore, they do not reveal any attribute of the object they denote. This non-descriptive feature of “classical” *samjñās* is explained by the initial act of naming that associated them to a particular bearer, an act of naming that is an *ad hoc* convention.

The *anvartha-samjñā* compound, associating the two contradictory terms *anvartha* (*anurtha* “[used] in conformity with his [etymological/first] meaning”) and *samjñā* (which implies the idea of a convention), therefore appears to be quite intriguing. The question is: is it relevant to focus on this contradiction or is it only a false problem?

The aim of this paper is to answer the above question and this implies to grasp somewhat better the use of this notion by the Pāṇinian grammarians. To do so, I have studied the main texts of the Pāṇinian tradition, having in mind the following questions: did the Pāṇinian grammarians deal with this notion and, if so, in what terms? Did they perceive the contradiction raised by the association of the terms *anvartha* and *samjñā*?

The most interesting discussions about the issue of *anvarthasamjñās* occur in the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* (*MBhD*)<sup>13</sup> and the *Vākyapadīya* (*VP*)<sup>14</sup> of Bhartṛhari, Kaiyaṭa’s *Pradīpa* and finally, Nāgeśa’s *Uddyota* (*Ud*).<sup>15</sup> As far as I know, there is no major discussion concerning nouns used in conformity with their etymological/first meaning in the *Mahābhāṣya*. The theme is evoked on several occasions, but the discussion, which is always presented in the same manner, never takes up the problem raised by the compound *anvarthasamjñā*. I quote one of these passages:<sup>16</sup>

*athavā mahatīyaṃ samjñā kriyate samjñā ca nāma yato na laghīyaḥ / kuta etat / laghvarthaṃ hi samjñākaraṇam / tatra mahatyāḥ samjñāyāḥ karaṇa etat prayojanam anvarthasamjñā yathā vijñāyeta / samkhyāyate’nayā samkhyeti / ekādīkayā cāpi samkhyāyate // (MBh on vt 4 ad A 1.1.23, vol. 1, p. 81)*

Or else, this long technical term (i.e. *samkhyā* “number [noun]”) is created; and a technical term is a noun in comparison with which there is nothing shorter. – Why is this? – [Because] technical terms are created with a view to shortness. In this case, the aim of the creation of long technical terms is that one understands that these are technical terms [used] in conformity with their [etymological/first] meaning: *samkhyā* [signifies] “that by which one counts”. And one counts with [numbers like] *eka* “one”.

## The *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* and the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari

### The *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*

The context of the passage quoted below is the following: the concerned *sūtra* is *A 1.1.38*,<sup>17</sup> which assigns the technical term *avyaya* “indeclinable” (literally “which does not vary”) to

<sup>13</sup> Bhartṛhari’s *MBhD* (5th century AD) is an incomplete and corrupt commentary on the *MBh*.

<sup>14</sup> Bhartṛhari’s *VP* (5th century AD) is a treatise of grammatical philosophy.

<sup>15</sup> Nāgeśa’s *Ud* (17th -18th centuries AD) is a complete commentary on the *Pr*.

<sup>16</sup> The other passages are the following: *MBh ad A 1.1.27*, vol. 1, p. 88-89; *MBh ad A 1.1.38*, vol. 1, p. 96; *MBh ad A 1.2.43*, vol. 1, p. 215; *MBh ad A 1.4.23*, vol. 1, p. 324; *MBh ad A 1.4.83*, vol. 1, p. 346; *MBh ad A 2.1.5*, vol.1, p. 378; *MBh ad A 3.1.1*, vol. 2, p. 3 and *MBh ad A 3.1.92*, vol. 2, p. 76.

certain linguistic units. In his comment on *vārttika* 6, Patañjali says that this term is a *mahatī samjñā* and ends his remark with the sentence mentioned above: *tatra mahatyāḥ samjñāyāḥ karaṇa etat prayojanam anvarthasamjñā yathā vijñāyeta / na vyetīty avyayam iti //* “In this case, the aim of the creation of long technical terms is that one understands that these are technical terms [used] in conformity with their [etymological/first] meaning: *avyaya* [signifies] “which does not vary”.” Bhartṛhari comments as follows on this remark:

*anvarthasamjñā yathā vijñāyeta / nanu cānvarthasamjñāyām kalpyamānāyām arthe pāratantryam āpadyamānā svarūpādhiṣṭhānā na bhavatīti samjñātvam durlabham / athārthanirapekṣā svarūpamātranibandhanā arthopādānam alabhyam / ucyate / loke dviprakarā samjñā / sati ca nimitte nimittaprasaktā na tu nimittam abhidhadatī pravartate / yathā vāsudevasya śrīkṛṣṇa iti nāmadheyam sati kṛṣṇagune kṛtam na tu kṛṣṇaśabdah kṛṣṇayogam pratyāyayan pravartate / kadācit gaurasyaiva kṛṣṇa iti samjñā kriyate / evam iyam avyayasamjñā nimittenānāgamanena prayuktā anabhidhadatī anānāgamanam pravṛtteti / asyānumānam mahattvakaraṇam yasyānānāgamanam asti tasyeyam samjñēti / yasya tu nānāgamanam asti na tasyeti / (MBhD on MBh on vt 7 ad A 1.1.38, 1990, p. 11-12)*

*anvarthasamjñā yathā vijñāyeta* – But, one would say, if [*avyaya* “indeclinable”] is understood as a technical term [used] in conformity with its [etymological/first] meaning, it becomes dependent on its meaning [and] will no longer have its own form as a basis; it is therefore difficult [to say that it is] a technical term. If it has its mere own form as a basis, it is independent from its meaning and one cannot take its meaning into account. – One answers: there are two kinds of *samjñās* in common usage (i.e. *anvarthasamjñās* and *samjñās*). And when a cause [of application of the word] exists, [the word] is used because of this cause, but it does not express [equally] this cause. Vāsudeva, for instance, is named *kṛṣṇa* (“black”) when the property of being dark-skinned exists [in Vāsudeva], but the word *kṛṣṇa* [taken as a proper name] is not used to make the connection with the dark [color] understood. Sometimes, the name *kṛṣṇa* designates precisely [a] fair-skinned [person]. In the same way, this technical term *avyaya* is used because of the cause which is the absence of change; not designating the absence of change, it is used. From the creation of a heavy technical term, one infers that this [*avyaya* term] is the technical term for something which does not change, but it is not [the technical term] for something which changes.

The interest of this passage is two-fold:

- first, the objection formulated at the beginning expresses very clearly the contradiction underlined above: how is it possible to say, of one and the same term, that it is conventional (*samjñā*) AND used in conformity with its etymological/first meaning (*anvartha*)? Besides, the beginning of the passage teaches us that the fact of being a *samjñā* is characterized by the fact of being independent of its etymological/first meaning which has as a correlate the fact of being based on its mere own form. This is a fundamental idea because it explains where the conventional feature of all kinds of *samjñās* comes from;<sup>18</sup>
- second, this passage explains, once again in a very clear way, the functioning of the terms used in conformity with their etymological/first meaning. When the word *kṛṣṇa* is used as the name of a dark-skinned person, that is, when it is an *anvarthasamjñā*: (1) the property of being dark-skinned, which conforms or corresponds to the

<sup>17</sup> A 1.1.38: *taddhitaś ca asarvavibhaktiḥ //* “[The technical term *avyaya* denotes] also [derivatives ending in a] *taddhita* (affix) after which not all endings [are introduced].”

<sup>18</sup> For a detailed study of this idea, cf. Aussant (2005). When I say “all kinds of *samjñās*”, I mean the main types of items that the denomination *samjñā* designates, that is: technical terms, autonyms and proper names.

etymological/first meaning of the name, is the cause of application (*pravṛttinimitta*)<sup>19</sup> of the name, (2) the name is used according to this cause of application and (3) the name does not denote the property of being dark-skinned but the individual who possesses such a property. When the word *kṛṣṇa* is used as the name of a fair-skinned person, that is, when it is a “classical” *saṃjñā*: (1) there is no property, in the denoted particular, which conforms to the etymological/first meaning of the name, (2) the proper name is then used according to its mere own form and (3) the name refers to the individual who has received this form as name.

## The *Vākyapadīya*

The two *kārikās* quoted below belong to the second *kāṇḍa* of the *Vākyapadīya*, and more precisely to a sequence of seven stanzas (from II.368 to II.374) devoted to the functioning of *saṃjñās*.

*saṃjñā svarūpam āśritya nimitte sati laukikī /  
kā cit pravartate kā cin nimittāsannidhāv api // (II.370, p. 92)*

Some *saṃjñā* of common usage, being based on its own form, applies itself [to its bearer] when there is a cause [of application], another [applies to its bearer] even when there is no cause [of application].

In his *Ṭīkā*,<sup>20</sup> Puṅyarāja comments on this *kārikā* in the following way:

*sarvasaṃjñāśabdānāṃ svarūpam eva pravṛttinimittam boddhavyam / tasmin sati  
kutra cid arthānugatam nimittam vidyate kutra cit tasyābhāva eva ditthādāv iti kaiś cit  
tatrāpy ucyata eva // (Ṭīkā, p. 150)*

One has to understand that it is the own form only which is the cause of application of all words called *saṃjñā*. This being so, sometimes, the cause [of application, which is such a property of the object] is in correspondence with the [etymological/first] meaning [of the word and] sometimes, there is no such thing (i.e. there is no correspondence between such a property of the object and the etymological/first meaning of the word), as in the case of *Ḍittha*, etc. Some say [that] talking of this also (i.e. they consider that even in the case of an *anvarthasaṃjñā*, the existence or non-existence of a correspondence is possible).

*śāstre 'pi mahatī saṃjñā svarūpopanibandhanā /  
anumānam nimittasya saṃnidhāne pratīyate // (II.371, p. 93)*

In the treatise (of Pāṇini) also, a heavy technical term is based on its own form. [But when a cause of application belonging to the object] is present, one infers this cause [as playing a role in the application of the name].

Commentary of Puṅyarāja:

*na kevalam tatraikākṣarāṇāṃ svarūpam eva pravṛttinimittam vidyate yāvan  
mahatīnām api svarūpam evopanibandhanaṃ pravṛttinimittam boddhavyam (...) /  
(Ṭīkā, p. 150)*

One learns that the cause of application [of a technical term] is its own form alone, not only when [the technical term] is monosyllabic, but also [when it is a] long [technical

<sup>19</sup> The cause of application of a word is equivalent to its connotation (as a synonym of “comprehension” or “intension”). On this point, cf. Aussant (2005, p. 163-169).

<sup>20</sup> *Ṭīkā* of Puṅyarāja (1000? AD), is a commentary on the second *kāṇḍa* of the *VP*.

term]; one has to understand that the cause of application has the own form alone as a basis.

These two *kārikās* and their commentary<sup>21</sup> thus deal with the *saṃjñās* of common usage, that is, proper names, and with the technical terms used in conformity with their etymological/first meaning. These passages give us an essential piece of information: all the *saṃjñās*, including the *mahatī saṃjñās* (i.e. *anvarthasaṃjñās*), have, as a cause of application, their own form. To this general semantic-referential functioning a precision is added: when the *saṃjñā* is provided with an etymological/first meaning, a correspondence between this meaning and a property of the *saṃjñin* is possible. In this case, the own form still plays a major role in the semantic-referential functioning of the item. In other words, the etymological/first meaning of the *anvarthasaṃjñās* plays only a minor role in their semantic-referential functioning. Whether used in conformity with their etymological/first meaning or not, first of all *saṃjñās* have their own form as a cause of application. And if the semantic motivation of these *anvarthasaṃjñās* has only a secondary function, it is because even these *saṃjñās* possess -above all- a conventional nature.

## The *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa

I quote below two extracts from the *Pradīpa*, selected for their transparency.

The context of the first one is the following: the concerned *sūtra* is *A* 1.1.23,<sup>22</sup> which assigns the technical term *saṃkhyā* “number [noun]” to the words *bahu*, *gaṇa* and to words ending in affixes *vatU* and *Ḍati*.<sup>23</sup> The *Mahābhāṣya* starts from an objection according to which the term *saṃkhyā*, the ordinary word for “numeral”, has to be inserted in the definition, otherwise numerals such as *eka*, etc. will not be covered by the technical term *saṃkhyā*. Finally, it is established that the ordinary word *saṃkhyā* does not have to be included in the definition because the technical term *saṃkhyā* is an *anvartha* and, therefore, first of all (or, one could say, automatically) it denotes those items that correspond to its etymological/first meaning (namely, numerals such as *eka*, etc.). Then its denotation is explicitly restricted by the rule: among the words that express an indefinite quantity such as *bhūri* “numerous, abundant”, etc., only *bahu*, *gaṇa* and words ending in *vatU* / *Ḍati* affixes (as expressing an indefinite quantity and not something else like size or association), will be denoted by *saṃkhyā*:

*atha veti / nanu mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇāt tadarthānugatānām upāttānām eva saṃjñinām bhavatu saṃjñā yathā sarvādīnām eva sarvanāmasaṃjñā na tv adhikānām / tena bahugaṇaśabdayoḥ saṅghavaipulyavacanayoḥ saṃjñā mā bhūt / ekādīnām tu katham syāt / naiṣa doṣaḥ / ihānvarthasaṃjñākaraṇena tāvad anurūpaḥ saṃjñī sarva ākṣipyate / tenaikādīnām tāvad grahaṇam bhavati paścād bahugaṇavatuḍatīti bhūryādinivṛtyarthaṃ niyamārthaṃ vyākhyāyate / ata eva saṅghavaipulyavṛtyor bahugaṇaśabdayoḥ saṃjñā na bhavati / (Pr on MBh on vt 4 ad A 1.1.23, vol. 1, p. 309-310)*

*atha vā* – But, one will say, because of the creation of long technical terms, the technical term will apply only to bearers regarded as being linked with the meaning of this [term], as the technical term *sarvanāman* only [applies to] *sarva*, etc. and not to

<sup>21</sup> I do not present the extracts of the *Vṛtti* (a commentary on the 1st and 2nd *kāṇḍas* of the *VP*, the identity of whose author is still controversial) relating to these two *kārikās* for they are uncertain and do not really illuminate the facts.

<sup>22</sup> *A* 1.1.23: *bahugaṇavatuḍati saṃkhyā* // “[The technical term] *saṃkhyā* (“number [noun]”) [denotes the items] *bahu*, *gaṇa* [and those ending in] *vatU* and *Ḍati* [suffixes].”

<sup>23</sup> The affix *vatU* (= *vat*) is prescribed by the rule *A* 5.2.39 in order to form, from the pronouns *yad*, *tad* and *etad*, items such as *yāvat* “as large as”, *tāvat* and *etāvat* “that large/this large”. The affix *Ḍati* (= *ati*) is prescribed by the rule *A* 5.2.41 in order to form, from the pronoun *kim*, the item *kati* “how many?”.

other [terms].<sup>24</sup> Thus, the technical term (*saṃkhyā*) will not apply to the words *bahu* and *gaṇa* when they designate size [or] association. But how will (*saṃkhyā*) apply to *eka*, etc.? – There is no such problem (of non-application of the technical term *saṃkhyā* to *eka*, etc.). Because it is the creation of a technical term [used] in conformity with its [etymological/first] meaning here, every bearer corresponding [to this meaning] is involved. Thus, first there is application [of the technical term] to *eka*, etc. [and] then [it is said]: *bahugaṇavatudati* [which] is explained as aiming at the non-application [of the technical term] to *bhūri*, etc., [i.e.] as being for the sake of a restriction. This is why the technical term (*saṃkhyā*) does not apply to the words *bahu*, *gaṇa* when they express size [or] association.

The context of the second passage quoted below is the following: the concerned *sūtra* is *A* 1.1.27,<sup>25</sup> which assigns the technical term *sarvanāman* (literally “noun for all”, i.e. “pronoun”) to the class of items beginning with *sarva* (cf. *Gaṇapāṭha: sarvādīni*). One of the problems raised by this rule is that some items of this class, such as *sarva*, can be used as proper or individual names and, therefore, they no longer constitute a “noun or name for all”. A proposal is then made: the items taken as proper names should be excluded from the reading of the list. This proposal is finally rejected because, since the technical term *sarvanāman* is *anvartha*, only the items corresponding to its etymological/first meaning will be denoted by it. Kaiya<sup>2a</sup> discusses this latter idea as follows:

*yato na laghīya iti / śabdavyavahāro laghus tato’pi laghīyo nāma / tatra gurusamjñākaraṇāt sarvādīnām viśiṣṭo dharmo’numīyate – anūnam etāni samjñāpravṛttinimittena sarvanāmatvena yuktāni yatas tadanurūpā teṣāṃ samjñā kṛteti / (Pr on MBh on vt 6 ad A 1.1.27, vol. 1, p. 329)*

*yato na laghīya* – The use of a word is economical, [the use of] a name is much more economical. In this respect, from the creation of the heavy technical term [*sarvanāman*], one infers a peculiar property of [the forms] *sarva*, etc.: all these [forms] are provided with the quality of [being] a name for all, [a quality which is] the cause of application of [their] technical term (i.e. *sarvanāman* “name for all”); consequently, their name is used in conformity [with its etymological/first meaning].

Finally, I present another passage from the *Pradīpa*, whose interest consists in showing that the *anvarthasamjñās* are not always used in conformity with their etymological/first meaning. The context is the following: the concerned *sūtra* is *A* 1.2.43,<sup>26</sup> which “defines” the technical term *upasarjana* “subordinate”. One of the problems raised by this rule is the following: the compound *rājakumārīm* is formed from *rājñāḥ kumārīm*, according to the rule *A* 2.2.8.<sup>27</sup> The technical term *upasarjana* applies to *kumārīm* because the latter is indicated by the item *dvitīyā* (with a nominative case ending) in the rule *A* 2.1.24.<sup>28</sup> The technical term *upasarjana*

<sup>24</sup> The discussion relating to the technical term *sarvanāman* (prescribed by the rule *A* 1.1.27) will be explained at length in the introduction of the second extract of the *Pr* studied below.

<sup>25</sup> *A* 1.1.27: *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni* // “[The technical term] *sarvanāman* (“pronoun”) [denotes the class of items] beginning with *sarva* (“all”).”

<sup>26</sup> *A* 1.2.43: *prathamānirdiṣṭam samāsa upasarjanam* // “[The technical term] *upasarjana* [denotes the items] worded with the first [ending, in the rules related] to a compound.” Illustration: in the rule *A* 2.1.37 *pañcamī bhayena* // “[A word with a] fifth [case ending, i.e. ablative, constitute a determinative compound] with the word *bhayam* “fear”, the word *pañcamī*, occurring with a nominative case ending, stands for the subordinate member of the compound prescribed by the rule, like *vṛkaḥ* in the compound *vṛkabhayam* “fear of a wolf”.

<sup>27</sup> *A* 2.2.8: *ṣaṣṭhī* // “[A word with a] sixth [case ending, i.e. genitive case, form a determinative compound with a declined nominal item].”

<sup>28</sup> *A* 2.1.24: *dvitīyā śritātītapatitagatātyastaprāptāpannaih* // “[A word with a] second [case ending, i.e. accusative, form a determinative compound] with the words *śritah*, *aītah*, *patitah*, *gatah*, *atyastah*, *prāptah*,



applies also to *rājñah* because the latter is indicated by the item *ṣaṣṭhī* (with a nominative ending) in the rule *A* 2.2.8. Therefore, it is not possible to determine which one - whether *rājñah* or *kumārīm* - is the *upasarjana* and, therefore, which one has to be the first member in the compound, according to the rule *A* 2.2.30.<sup>29</sup> The solution adopted to solve this problem is to say that *upasarjana* is an *anvartha* technical term and, consequently, applies only to units corresponding to its etymological/first meaning: items which, *by their meaning*, appear as subordinate to the other item of the compound can thus be called *upasarjana*. But another problem emerges and is expounded by Kaiyaṭa in the extract below: some items, like *pūrva* in *pūrvakāyaḥ* (“the prior part of the body”, cf. *A* 2.2.1), *ardha* in *ardhapippalī* (“half a peppercorn”, cf. *A* 2.2.2) and *puruṣa* in *puruṣavyāghraḥ* (“strong like a tiger”, cf. *A* 2.1.56), though indicated by items with a nominative case ending in the rules prescribing the compounds, are not, by their meaning, subordinate to the other word of the compound. In these cases, it is the strength of the prescription of the technical term which explains its use:

*mahatī saṃjñeti / loke cāpradhānam upasarjanam ucyate ihāpi tathaiivāśrīyata ity arthaḥ / yady evaṃ pūrvakāyo’rdhapippalī puruṣavyāghra ity ādiṣu upasarjanasaṃjñā pradhānasya na prāpnoti / naiṣa doṣaḥ / anvarthasaṃjñā hi yatra so’rthaḥ sambhavati tatra pravṛttinimittāpekṣāḥ pravartante anyatra tu vidhānasāmarthyān nimittanirapekṣā yathā karmapravacanīyasaṃjñā svatyādīnām iti prathamānirdeśasāmarthyād ardhādīnām saṃjñā pravartate / (Pr on MBh on vt 5 ad A 1.2.43, vol. 2, p. 52)*

*mahatī saṃjñā* – The meaning is: in common usage, what is subordinate is called *upasarjana*; such is the case also here (i.e. in the treatise). If it is so, the technical term *upasarjana* risks not to apply to the main [term of the compound] in *pūrvakāyaḥ*, *ardhapippalī* [and] *puruṣavyāghraḥ*. There is no such problem (i.e. the technical term *upasarjana* still applies to *pūrva*, *ardha* and *puruṣa*). Technical terms [used] in conformity [with their etymological/first meaning] indeed apply according to their cause of application where that [etymological/first] meaning is possible, but elsewhere (i.e. where this etymological/first meaning is not possible), [the *anvarthasaṃjñās*] do not apply according to their cause [of application] but according to the strength of their prescription; thus, the technical term *karmapravacanīya* [applies] to *su-*, *ati-*, etc. [owing to the prescriptions I.4.94 and 95<sup>30</sup>]. The technical term [*upasarjana*] applies then to *ardha*, etc. according to the strength of the rule with the first ending (i.e. in the case of *ardha*, *A* 2.2.2).

Kaiyaṭa thus states that, in cases where the use of the *anvarthasaṃjñās* is not explained by their etymological/first meaning, it is the “strength of their prescription”, that is to say the initial act which has assigned them to the designation of a given object and which is an *ad hoc* convention, which fulfils this function.

## The Uddyota of Nāgeśa

The first two passages I quote below aim at showing that, according to Nāgeśa, it is the meaning that is spontaneously associated with the word rather than the etymological/first

*āpannaḥ.*”

<sup>29</sup> *A* 2.2.30: *upasarjanam pūrvam* // “[The item called] *upasarjana* [constitutes the] prior member [in a compound].”

<sup>30</sup> The technical term *karmapravacanīya* signifies literally “which announces/expounds the act”. *A* 1.4.94: *suḥ pūjāyām* // “[The technical term *karmapravacanīya* denotes the particle] *su* when it is used with the meaning of “excellence, praiseworthiness”. *A* 1.4.95: *atir atikramaṇe ca* // “[The technical term *karmapravacanīya* denotes the particle] *ati* when it is used with the meaning of “overstepping, exceeding” and also [with the meaning of “excellence”].”

meaning, which is at issue in the case of the *anvarthasaṃjñās*. Note however that these two meanings are not always distinct. When an *anvarthasaṃjñā* is used, one understands the meaning/object which, in the mundane context or in a particular domain, is usually or traditionally assigned to it.

*loke ceti / saṃjñāmahattvam etat padarūḍhyarthabhūtalaukikārthāparityāge hetur iti bhāvaḥ / (Ud on Pr on MBh on vt 5 ad A 1.2.43, vol. 2, p. 52)*

*loke ca* – The idea is: the length of the technical term is the reason why the usual meaning, which has become the conventional meaning of the word, is not discarded.

*bhāṣye anvartheti / laukikaḥ saṃkhyārūpo'rtho vacanaśabdenācyata iti bhāvaḥ / anvarthatvam atra lokaprasiddhārthatvam / (Ud on Pr on MBh on A 1.2.51, vol. 2, p. 82)*

In the *Bhāṣya*: *anvartha* – The idea is: the meaning of “number”, which belongs to common usage, is expressed by the word *vacana*.<sup>31</sup> The fact of being [used] in conformity with [its etymological/first] meaning, [corresponds] here [to] the fact of having a meaning established in common usage.

In the three following passages, Nāgeśa declares that the *anvarthasaṃjñās* are equivalent to expressions called *yogarūḍha*, namely expressions provided with an “etymological (*yoga*) and conventional (*rūḍha*) [meaning]”.<sup>32</sup>

*evam ca saṃjñāyām sarvataḥ śabdavyavahārāl laghīyastvam siddham / laghvartham ity asya lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyartham ity arthaḥ / nanv anvarthasaṃjñātvaṃ nāma yogarūḍhatvam / tatra yogārthasya rūḍhyarthenaivānvayaniyamāt prthaguddeśyenānanvayāt katham sarvārthavācakānām eva saṃjñety ata āha anumīyata iti / (Ud on Pr on MBh on vt 6 ad A 1.1.27, vol. 1, p. 329)*

And it is thus established that, in the case of a technical term, the brevity is more important than in all uses of words [to denote the same object]. The meaning of *laghvartham* is: for the economical application of the treatise. But, one may object, the fact of being a technical term [used] in conformity [with its etymological/first meaning is equivalent to] being provided with an etymological and conventional sense. In these [conditions], since the etymological/first meaning is delimited by its association with the conventional meaning itself, [and since here] there is no association [of this etymological/first meaning] with the distinct object to which one refers, how can the technical term [*sarvanāman*] apply to forms [like *sarva*, etc.] which express the meaning of “all”? This is why (Kaiyaṭa) says *anumīyate*.

*nanv anvarthatvaṃ nāma yogarūḍhatvam evam ca katham yaugikārtham uddiśya saṃjñāvidhānam ata āha mahatyā iti / (Ud on Pr on MBh on vt 5 ad A 1.4.23,<sup>33</sup> vol. 2, p. 347)*

But, one will say, the fact of being a technical term [used] in conformity with [its etymological/first meaning] is equivalent to being provided with an etymological and conventional sense, and in this way, how can [this] technical term (i.e. *kāraka*) be

<sup>31</sup> The *sūtra* referred to here is A 1.2.51: *luPi yuktavad vyaktivacane //* “When [a secondary suffix] is elided, the gender (*vyakti*) and the number (*vacana*) [of the derivative] are congruent with those of the initial word.”

<sup>32</sup> The example quoted traditionally to illustrate this kind of meaning is *pañkaja* (literally “born in the mud”) which designates the lotus. The etymological meaning is really present for the lotus is a plant which is rooted in the mud; but it is also a conventional expression, in so far as all which is born in the mud is not named *pañkaja*. The compound *yogarūḍha* is frequently used by the Naiyāyikas, according to whom words are divided in four classes: *yaugika*, *rūḍha*, *yogarūḍha* and *yaugikarūḍha* (cf. Kunjunni Raja (1963, p. 46-47). In the grammatical sphere, as far as I can see, its first occurrences are in the works of Nāgeśa.

<sup>33</sup> The rule is A 1.4.23: *kārake //* “In the domain of *kāraka* (“participants in the action”).”

prescribed in reference to its [mere] etymological/first meaning? This is why (Kaiyata) says *mahatyāḥ*.

*evaṃ ca yogarūdhā saṃjñānvarthasaṃjñocyate / (Ud on Pr on MBh on A 1.4.83,<sup>34</sup> vol. 2, p. 423)*

And similarly, one calls ‘*anvarthasaṃjñā*’ a *saṃjñā* provided with an etymological and conventional sense.

This confirms the idea according to which, even in the case of the *anvarthasaṃjñās*, there is a part of conventionalism. And Nāgeśa explains this as follows:

*pūrvopātteti / yaugikārthasya śabdasya saṃjñātvēna viniyogakāle śabdasyaiva pravṛttinimittatvāṅgikareṇa pūrvopāttayaugikārthatyāgād ity arthaḥ // saṃjñānām kṛtrimatvāt tasya pūrvopāttatvaṃ bodhyam / (Ud on Pr on MBh on vt 8 ad A 3.1.1,<sup>35</sup> vol. 3, p. 9-10)*

*pūrvopātta* – The meaning is: because, when a word with an etymological/first meaning is used as a technical term, since only its form becomes a cause of application, there is abandonment of the etymological/first meaning perceived previously. Because of the artificial character of *saṃjñās*, one has to understand [its etymological/first meaning] being perceived previously.

Nāgeśa maintains in a completely clear way that the *anvarthasaṃjñās* also have their own form as a cause of application, in other words, as a connotation. The etymological/first meaning plays only a secondary role. In such a conception, the conventional meaning is the main one and the etymological meaning is subordinate to it.

## Concluding remarks

I will end this paper with two remarks:

1) The different passages studied here show that the contradiction a priori presented by the association of the terms *saṃjñā* and *anvartha* is, in the end, a false problem: according to the Pāṇinian grammarians quoted above, even when a *saṃjñā* is provided with an etymological/first meaning and its bearer (or one of its properties) is partly described by this meaning, this *saṃjñā* belongs, above all, to the domain of convention.

2) Palsule (1966, p. 65) suggests that *saṃjñās* should be regarded as “words whose etymological meaning is restricted by convention”. The passages examined in this paper tend to invalidate such a conclusion. The expression *yogarūdhā* can only describe *anvarthasaṃjñās*, “classical” *saṃjñās* being merely *rūdhā*.

---

<sup>34</sup> The technical term concerned here is *karmapravacanīya* “which announces/expounds the action”, defined in the *sūtras* following the rule *A 1.4.83: karmapravacanīyāḥ //* “[Here begins the section on] *karmapravacanīyas*.”

<sup>35</sup> The technical term concerned here is *pratyaya* “affix”, defined in the *sūtras* following the rule *A 3.1.1: pratyayaḥ //* “[The technical term] *pratyaya*.”

## References

### Primary sources

- Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Roman Transliteration and English Translation by S.M. Katre, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.
- Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣyam with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. Notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. Bal Shastri, Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan, 2001 (1st ed.: 1938), 6 vol.
- The Mahābhāṣya-Dīpikā of Bharṭṛhari*. Critical Edition, with English Translation, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 8 vol. (*āhnika* 1, critically edited by J. Bronkhorst: Post-Graduate and Research Department Series 28, 1987; *āhnika* 2, critically edited by G.B. Palsule: Post-Graduate and Research Department Series 31, 1988).
- Bharṭṛharis Vākyapadīya*. Die Mūlakārikās nach den Handschriften hrsg. und mit einem Pāda-Index versehen, von W. Rau, Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1977.
- Vākyapadīya of Bharṭṛhari*. With the Commentary of Puṅyarāja and the ancient *Vṛtti – Kāṇḍa* II. Edited by K.A. Subramanya Iyer, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.
- The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojibhaṭṭa*. Edited and explained by F. Kielhorn, Bombay: The Indu Prakash Press, 2 vol. (vol. 1: 1868, vol. 2: 1874).

### Secondary sources

- Abhyankar, K.V. (1961). *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Agrawala, V.S. (1940). "Pūrvācārya saṃjñās for lakāras". *New Indian Antiquary* 3, pp. 39-40.
- Agrawala, V.S. (1950). "Pre-pāṇinian technical terms". In V. Bandhu (Ed.), *Siddha-bhārātī or the Rosary of Indology – Presenting 108 original papers on indological subjects in honour of the 60th birthday of Dr. Siddheshwar Varma*. Part II (pp. 135-137). Hoshiarpur: Vishveshwaranand Vedic Research Institute.
- Aussant, E. (2005). *La notion de saṃjñā dans la tradition grammaticale pāṇinéenne – Quand la forme du mot se fait sens*. PhD Thesis: Université de Paris III – Sorbonne Nouvelle (unpublished).
- Bandyopadhyay, P. (1994). "Some grammatical terms in Pāṇini". In B. Banerjee (Ed.), *Festschrift Chatterjee – Cultura Indica Tributes to an Indologist: Pr. Dr. Aśoke Chatterjee Sastri* (pp. 69-72). Delhi: Sharada Publishing House.
- Bhandarkar, R.G. (1972). "Review of Dr. Goldstücker's Pāṇini". In J.F. Staal (Ed.), *A reader on the Sanskrit grammarians* (pp. 72-78). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press (1st ed.: 1877, *Indian Antiquary* 6).
- Bhattacharya, R.S. (1966). "Saṃjñā-niṣpādaka-sūtrālocanam" (A survey of rules which serve to form terms called *saṃjñā*). *Sārasvatī Suśamā* 12-2: pp. 50-56, 12-3 and 4: pp. 69-75.
- Candotti, M.P. (2006). *Interprétation du discours métalinguistique: la fortune du sūtra A 1.1.68 chez Patañjali et Bharṭṛhari*. Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- Cardona, G. (1970). "A note on Pāṇini's technical vocabulary". *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda* 19, pp. 195-212.
- Chatterji, K.C. (1933). "Some technical terms of Sanskrit grammar". *Indian Historical Quarterly* 9, pp. 279-281.
- Chatterji, K.C. (1946). "Technical terms of Sanskrit grammar". *New Indian Antiquary* 8, pp. 51-53.
- Chatterji, K.C. (1964). *Technical terms and technique of Sanskrit grammar*. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press.

- Chaturvedi, S.P. (1940). "Technical terms of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*". In *Proceedings and Transactions of the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference 9 – December 1937* (pp. 1191-1208). Trivandrum: The Government Press.
- Dvivedi, H.P. (1978). *Studies in Pāṇini: Technical Terms of the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
- Katre, S.M. (1968-1971). *Pāṇinian Studies II-VII: Dictionary of Pāṇini*. Poona: Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 53-62-63-72-74.
- Keith, A.B. (1945). "Pāṇini's vocabulary", in *Bhārata-Kaumudī – Studies in Indology in Honour of Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji* (pp. 343-345). Allahabad: The Indian Press.
- Kiparsky, P. (1979). *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Poona: Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.
- Kunjunni Raja, K. (1963). *Indian Theories of Meaning*. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Narayana Murti, M.S. (1969). "Two versions of the ekasaṃjñādhikāra". *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* 12, pp. 75-83.
- Narayana Murti, M.S. (1972). "Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa on the primary denotation". *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* 15, pp. 87-98.
- Palsule, G.B. (1966). *Samjñānām in Pāṇini*. Poona: Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit 10.
- Palsule, G.B. (1969). "The Role of *kr-* in the Sanskrit Grammatical Terms". *Journal of the University of Poona* 29, pp. 11-29.
- Renou, L. (1942). *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*. Paris: Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, Librairie Honoré Champion Éditeur, 3 vol.
- Sarma, R. (1964). "Śabda-samjñā-vimarśaḥ". In *Citra-nibandhāvaliḥ – A collection of various learned papers* (pp. 11-26). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sarma, K.M.K. (1940). "Technical terms in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*". *Journal of Oriental Research* 14, pp. 259-267.
- Scharfe, H. (1971). *Pāṇini's Metalanguage*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Sen, S. (1962). "The names of the samāsas in Pāṇini's grammar", *Bulletin of the Philological Society of Calcutta* 3, pp. 90-92.
- Singh, J.D. (1979). "Technical Terms in Pāṇini". *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 8, pp. 7-16.
- Venkatacharya, T. (1947). "Anvarthāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ samjñāḥ". *Journal of the Sri Venkateswara Oriental Institute*, 8.1-8.2, pp. 1-23.
- Wezler, A. (1976). "Some observations on the grammatical terminology of Pāṇini", in *German Scholars in Indian 2: Contributions to Indian Studies* (pp. 361-379). Delhi: Max Müller Bhavan,