Patañjali on the Pre-Pāṇinian Anubandhas Ṅ and C

by

M. D. Balasubrahmanyam

1.0 Although the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A.) is " das älteste grammatische Lehrbuch, welches vollständing auf uns gekommen ist "[1], Pāṇini's algebraic formulae represent an antique tradition of the grammatical literati to which belong Āpiśali, Kāśyapa, (Kāśakṛtsna ?), Gārgya, Gālava, Cākravarmaṇa, Bhāradvāja, Śākalya, Śākaṭāyana, Sphoṭāyana and Senaka. However, Pāṇini (P.) superseded his predecessors by his sober linguistic description which, to one of the modern structuralists, " is a body of method derived from theory and *nct* a set of procedures "[2].

1.1 That P. incorporated in his mechanistic presentational procedures some of the *termini technici* employed by his precursors, is shown by Kātyāyana (Kāt.) the Vārttikakāra, Patañjali (Pat.) the Mahābhāṣyakāra, and subsequent glossers like Jayāditya the Vṛttikāra, and Kaiyaṭa. One such technical term is the *anubandha* (rendered as exponent in this paper) which— P. abbreviated as IT[3] —represents a code of arbitrary, small, significant, metalinguistic symbols whose grammatical operations are described in P.'s system. To quote RENOU,[4]

> Anubandha "élément annexé, exposant, indice grammatical "
> ...se dit de certains phonemes.. qui, gén. en postposition, s'attachent à divers éléments grammaticaux, accréments, suffixes, substituts, thèmes et racines, affin d'en préciser les modalités d'emploi et not, de fournir des indications sur le ton, le degré vocalique, le mode de flexion ou de dérivation.

1.2 The influence of pre-Pāṇinian exponents on P.'s grammar has been admitted in a few places by Pat. and the later descendants of the mighty schoolmen of the *Vyākaraṇaśāstram*. The internal evidence furnished by the A., though warrants such a deduction as has been candidly admitted by Pat. when he uses the phrase *pūrva-sūtra-nirdeśa-*, still it is not manifestly clear whether the ancient Sūtrakāras too regarded anubandhas as ITs— which, together with the *anuvṛtti* procedure, contributes to the famed brevity of P.'s grammar—and whether the grammatical operations of the exponents occurring in the rules of P.'s precursors were given the exact effect to by P. in his own system.

---

1. BÖHTLINGK, *Pāṇini's Grammatik*, Einleitung, viii (1964).
2. HALLIDAY " Categories of the theory of Grammar ", *Word*, 17.3 (1961) 249.
3. For clarity, I have inserted IT in capitals.
4. *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*, I.30 (1942).

1.3 As regards the view that the useful function assigned to various ITs by P. is absolutely identical with the purpose achieved by P.'s predecessors in the employment of exponents, we find diverging opinions among the Indian Vaiyākaraṇas. CHATTERJI's[5] argument has been that in most of the older anubandhas retained by P., the indicatory significance is the same in P. as in the older grammatical systems. BHATTACHARYA[6], on the other hand, is inclined to say that the pre-Pāṇinian anubandhas and P.'s ITs are not the same. ABHYANKAR[7] thinks that the *Uṇādi* list of suffixes, the *Mahābhāṣya* and other grammatical systems furnish the evidence that the pre-Pāṇinists employed ITs for purposes similar to those found in P.'s grammar. CHATURVEDI[8] regards the technical term IT as peculiar to P.'s system of grammar.

2.0 The Pāṇinian commentators seem to lend some support to the belief that the purpose of the notations $\tilde{N}$ ($Sya\tilde{N}$), K ($phaK$, $thaK$,), T (yuT), C (yuC), $\dot{N}$ ($au\dot{N}$) and C (CIT) in the A. is identical with that of these exponents taught in the *sūtras* of pre-Pāṇinists.[9] The ITs attached to suffixes in the rules—*prācāṁ ṣpa taddhitaḥ* (A. 4, 1, 17), *udīcāṁ iñ* (A. 4, 1, 153), *prācām avṛddhāt phin bahulam* (A. 4, 1, 160)—according to SHASTRI[10], are really taught by different predecessors of P. In all probability, Pat. might have been personally acquainted with the actual use of some of the exponents in the works of pre-Pāṇinian grammatists, though he does not name the Sūtrakāras from whom, presumably, P. might have borrowed them.

2.1 Pat. draws our attention to the conveniently postulated pre-Pāṇinian exponents $\dot{N}$ and C by a more sophisticated discussion on the implications of these ITs under the rules: *auña āpaḥ* (A. 7, 1, 18) and *citaḥ* (A. 6, 1, 163) respectively.

P. teaches that $\bar{i}$ ($\acute{S}\bar{i}$) is substituted for the dual terminations *au* (of the nominative and accusative cases) after a paradigm which has the feminine suffix *ā* at its final position by A. 7, 1, 18 (the $\acute{S}\bar{i}$ recurring from *jaśaḥ śi* A. 7, 1, 17). It should be observed here that, as pointed out by

---

5. *Technical Terms... of Sanskrit Grammar*, 304 (1948).

6. " Some chief Characteristics of Pāṇini ... " JOI II. 172–3, Baroda, 1952–3.

7. " Technical terms of the *Aṣṭādhāyī* " 9th AIOC 1202, Trivandrum, 1937.

8. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, 63 (1961).

9. For the commentorial notes on the ITs by Pat., Kaiyaṭa, Jinendra Buddhi and Hardatta, see under A. 4, 1, 98; 2. 45; 47; 6,1,44 and 1,1,27. Cf. M. D. SHASTRI, ' The relation of Pāṇini's technical devices... predecessors ", 4th AIOC II.472, Allahabad, 1928.

10. *Ibid.*

Kaiyaṭa, P. has nowhere else enunciated the IT Ṅ with *au* except in *auṄ*
of A. 7, 1, 17:

> na kvacid auṅ iti rūpaṁ vijñātam abhūt...
>
> (*Pradīpa*, PMB VII.22) [11]

Hence raising the question,

> kim artho ṅakāraḥ,

Pat. replies :

> sāmānyagrahaṇārthaḥ.

Evidently *auṄ* designates both the nominative (nom.) and accusative (acc.)
dual endings. These endings being *ṄIT*, naturally the augment *yā* (*yāṬ*)
will be prescribed before the case morphemes (in the case of *ā*-stems)
in accordance with the rule *yāḍ āpaḥ* A. 7, 3, 113. In order to prohibit the
augmentation, the Ślokavārttikakāra contends that, since *auṄ* is not a *ṄIT*
affix, A. 7, 3, 113 connot operate here. The velar nasal (*Ṅ*) simply indicates
au, and it (*Ṅ*) should not be treated as IT in the technical Pāṇinian sense.
Alternatively he regards *auṄ* as *au*, the peripheral *Ṅ* serving the purpose of
facilitating articulation. He makes another suggestion *ad rem* that *auṄ* may
be considered the affix of the dual for the nom. and acc. in accordance with
the grammar(s) of Pūrvasūtrakāra(s). But the grammatical operations
prescribed for the Pāṇinian *ṄIT* differ from those of the pre-Pāṇinian
exponent *Ṅ* [12]. He explains these ideas in the following verse :

> *ṅittve vidyād varṇa.nirdeśa.mātraṁ*
> *varṇe yat syāt tac ca vidyād tad ādau |*
> *varṇaś ca ayaṁ tena ṅittve'py adoṣo*
> *nirdeśo'yaṁ pūrva.sūtreṇa vā syāt ||*
>
> (VMB III. 247, 15-6).

According to Kaiyaṭa, *Ṅ* is not at all an IT in P.'s system, and it is
ragged around the edge of *au* to serve the purpose of unambiguity; so he says
in the *Pradīpa* (PMB, *supra*) :

> ...ṅakāras tv asandehārtho na anubandhārthaḥ

which is glossed by Nāgeśa as under :

> *asandehārtha iti.* ' āv ' ity ucyamāne kim ayam ' āv '
> uta ' au ' iti sandehaḥ syād iti bhāvaḥ. (*Uddyota, supra*).

If *au* were to be read without the IT, the *sūtra* A. 7,1,18 would have
to be formulised : **āvapaḥ*. Consequently the doubt would arise whether
the bound morpheme here is *au* (*au + āpaḥ*, the *ayavāyāva* Sandhi operating

---

11. For the text and the commentaries on the *Mahābhāṣyam* used in this paper,
the following editions have been consulted: KIELHORN's edn. 1885 (= VMB); Pt. G.
SHASTRI's edn., 1938 (= PMB) and Pt. B. Jośi's edn., 1945 (=PVMB). For *Nyāsa*
see K. C. CHAKRAVARTI (Ed.), vol. II. Rajshahi, 1919.

12. Cf. VASU, *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, II. 1323 (1962) and CHATTERJI,
op. cit., 302-4.

by A. 6,1,78) or *āv (*āv + āpaḥ*). A convenient solution to this Sandhi *à double entente* is provided by postposing *Ṅ* to *au*.

Pat. concludes his discussion on A. 7,1,18 (*VMB, supra,* 11–2) with the observation,

athavā (atha vā) pūrva.sūtra.nirdeśo'yaṁ pūrvasūtreṣu ca
ye'nubandhā na tair iha it.kāryāṇi kriyante :

Or perhaps, this (*Ṅ* or *auṄ*) is an enunciation of the previous aphorists. And (in fact,) the anubandhas (occurring) in the rules of (P.'s) predecessors do not function as ITs here (that is to say, the anubandhas of the predecessors are not meant for the grammatical operations prescribed for ITs in P.'s system).

2.2 The traditional explanation of Pat. is corroborated by Jinendra Buddhi (*Nyāsa* II.2, 632) who quotes the rule, *āvauṭāvauṅ* from one of the older grammatists. This may be supplemented with Kaiyaṭa's explanation which runs thus :

pūrvācāryair dve api dvivacane ṅitau paṭhite. na ca iha
kvacid apy auṅ.pratyayo'sti, sāmānyagrahaṇārthaṁ ca pūrva-
sūtra.nirdeśaḥ, tena yaḥ pūrva.sūtre auṅ tasya grahaṇaṁ
bhavati iti prathamā.dvitīyā.dvivacanayor grahaṇa.siddhiḥ.

(*Pradīpa*, PMB VII.23).

It seems perspicuous from the explanations suggested above that *Ṅ* might have been appended to *au* by the pre-Pāṇinian mnemotechnists for the purpose of *sāmānyagrahaṇa-*, and P. has naturally borrowed *auṅ* from his predecessors. Nevertheless the situation is distinct enough to allow of an immediate observation : it would be difficult to make a categorical statement, by going through the discussions of the subsequent Pāṇinīyas on A. 7,1,18 that the exponents of the pre-Pāṇinian times and ITs in the *Lebenszeit* of P. could have similar functions.

3.0 Judging from Pat.'s evidence explicitly presented on a single occasion (*citaḥ* A, 6,1,163: the last vowel of a form containing an element which has *C* as IT, is high-pitched), one may be tempted to brush aside the general notion that the technical term IT belongs only to P.'s system. Quite in keeping with his usual tendency to urge an alternation of a given rule of P., Kāt. reads the *vārttikam*,

citaḥ saprakṛter bahvakajartham,

under A.6,1,163. He reformulates P.'s rule *citaḥ* as *citaḥ saprakṛteḥ* for the purpose of including the suffixes *bahuC* and *akaC* (: *bahuj artham akaj arthaṁ ca*). The entire stem (including the nucleus and the peripheral morpheme) should be treated as an oxytone. Instances of this treatment may be seen in *bahu.kṛtám, bahu.bhuktám*—wherein *bahuC* is preposed to the nucleus—and *uccaká-, nicaká-, sarvaká-, viśvaká-* in which *akaC* is postposed to the stem.

Pat., a thorough craftsman, removes the above difficulty by a logical interpretation of the rule. *citaḥ*—which, according to him, should mean *citvataḥ*. Concomitantly, he introduces two arguments here : (i) *matub lopo'tra draṣṭavyaḥ* : (In *CIT*) the invisibility of *matUP* should be seen (understood) and (ii) *āthavā a.kāro matvarthīyaḥ* : Or else, the *a* (of *cita-*) is intended to convey the sense of (the possessive bound morpheme) *mat* (*matUP*). To support the argument, Pat. (VMB III. 104,7) conclusively says,

PŪRVASŪTRANIRDEŚAŚ CA.   citvān cita iti :

And (here) is the specific mention in the aphorism(s) of the predessor(s). (The construction) *citaḥ* (is mentioned in the *pūrvasūtras*, and it) is synonymous with *citvān* (which has the same meaning as *citvataḥ*, i. e. *citaḥ* as suggested above). As a matter of fact, Pat. brings about three ideas here : (i) The expression (*citaḥ*) is borrowed from P.'s predecessors; (ii) In *citaḥ*, *-a-* is *matvarthīya-* and (iii) The nom. is used in the sense of genitive (gen.). Kāt.'s reformulation of the *sūtra*, therefore, is not necessary.

3.1   Pat. has taken recourse to an interpretative device by which he explains P.'s *citaḥ* as *citvān* (*citvataḥ*), obviously keeping in mind the nom. sg. prescription of the unnamed pre-Paninian schoolmaster(s). This interpretation presupposes the idea that, in certain contexts, what is read as nom. singular (sg.) in the rules of pre-Pāṇinists appears in the gen. sg. in P.'s system; accordingly Kaiyaṭa glosses :

> *pūrvasūtranirdeśa* iti. pūrva.vyākaraṇe prathamayā kāryī nirdiśyate. tena citvān samudāyo'ntodāttatvaṁ pratipadyata ity arthaḥ. (*Pradīpa*, PVMB V. 155-6).

Pat. makes similar comments on the rule, *ahno'dantāt* A.8, 4, 7 :

> na eṣā ahan śabdāt ṣaṣṭhī. Kā tarhi? ahna.śabdāt prathamā; pūrvasūtranirdeśaś ca. (VMB III. 455, 15-6).

Kaiyaṭa, in his gloss to Pat. on the above *sūtra*, candidly admits that the pre-Pāṇinian nom. sg. prescription appears in the gen. sg. in P.'s system, and he tritely remarks :

> *pūrvasūtranirdeśaś ca* iti. pūrvacāryāḥ kārya.bhājaḥ ṣaṣṭhyā na niradikṣan ity arthaḥ. (*Pradīpa*, PMB VIII. 217).

3.2   If one would believe in Pat.'s verbal testimony that *citaḥ* is a characteristic nom. sg. designation of the previous grammatist(s), one could probably maintain the hypothesis that the Pūrvācāryas knew the accent symbol *C* as an IT-notation, besides the terminology IT itself.

4. From the foregoing discussion of Pat. on the two anubandhas
$\dot{N}$ and C, we are lead to two considerations *argumenti causa* :

    (i) P. borrowed $\dot{N}$ from his predecessors who postposed it to
au for the purpose of *sāmānyagrahaṇa-*.   But this pre-
Pāṇinian $\dot{N}$ does not produce the $\dot{N}IT$ operations enjoyed by
P. in the A. wherein this exponent is associated with certain
morphophonemic changes, as seen in the *sūtras* A.1, 1, 5;
6, 1, 16; 4, 15; 24; 37; 42

<div align="center">and</div>

    (ii) P. has imported C from the source of Pūrvasūtrakāras who
might have regarded C not only as an IT, but also as an
accent-exponent.