

Ślokavārttika-sphoṭavāda vv. 5-9 and Sphoṭasiddhi v.3

Michiya KAWAJIRI

Maṇḍanamisra (A.D. 660-720), in his *Sphoṭasiddhi* (SS)¹⁾, quotes and criticises as many as 20 verses of sphoṭavāda of Kumārila's *Ślokavārttika* (sv)²⁾. When making criticisms on other schools in SS, Maṇḍana quotes the opinions of his opponents (pūrvapakṣa) before he declares his own views. But he quotes no verse from sv in SS. v. 3, where the definition of word is treated, although apparently there he criticises Mimāṃsaka (M)'s definition of word (śabda) that word is each phoneme (varṇa). There has been some pointing out that Maṇḍana's summary of M's definition given there is based on sv. vv. 5-9³⁾. It seems that, however, some differences can be seen between Maṇḍana's summary and sv. vv. 5-9.

In sv. vv. 5-9, Kumārila insists as follows⁴⁾:

Whether what is grasped by ears denotes the meaning of the thing mentioned or not, its 'wordness' is commonly experienced and not denied. If, on the other hand, it has no capacity of denoting the meaning, another entity should be postulated without referring to the common conception. Smoke, &c. is not a word though it denotes that there is fire, &c. And each individual phoneme cannot be said not to be a word even if it does not denote the meaning of the thing mentioned. We regard as a word what is grasped by the ears before the comprehension of the meaning but not what is not grasped even after the comprehension. It is neither what is grasped before each phoneme nor what is after, but is each phoneme itself not depending upon each other that is grasped by ears on the basis of its nature.

Maṇḍana's summary of M's definition of word is, it's true, on almost the same line with sv. vv. 5-9, but he refers to another aspect of the relation between a word and the thing mentioned (śabdārthasambandha). Maṇḍana says⁵⁾:

A thing other than phonemes that denotes the meaning is not a word before understanding the relation even if it should be grasped by ears, but it is called word after understanding the relation. So the same 'gauḥ' is and is not a word. This is not true, because the relation between a word and the thing mentioned is decided depending upon the common use. It is also commonly said that application of the word 'word' is committed only with what is grasped by ears.

Both grammarians (vaiyākaraṇa) and M admit that the relation between a word and the thing mentioned has no birth (autpattika) and that application (pravṛtti) of a word depends upon common use. Furthermore, according to M, when people learn the meaning of a word, they hear the use of that word of the elders (vṛddhavyavahāra), so people come to realize which word represents which meaning⁶. Based on this traditional theory of acquiring language skill, Maṇḍana adds to Kumārila's criticism on the definition of word of grammarians the idea of the relation between the word 'śabda' and what is mentioned by the word. From this Maṇḍana's view, people know that the meaning of the word 'śabda' is what is grasped by ears, i.e. a phoneme because the elders say that the word 'gauḥ' is the phonemes g, au and ḥ. In other words, any definition different from common use of the word cannot be accepted.

Thus Maṇḍana gives another point of view to sv. vv. 5-9. There Kumārila says that a word is each phoneme that can be grasped by ears, and Maṇḍana declares that the application of the word 'śabda' is committed only with what can be grasped by ears, as is quoted above, not with things from which we can know the meaning. In SS. v. 3, Maṇḍana defines word as 'the cause of producing decisions of the meaning (arth-āvasāyaprasavanimitta)⁷'. As a criticism on this definition, he adds aspect of the relation between the word 'śabda' and the thing mentioned. If this definition were accepted, the application of this word would not be committed before the meaning is comprehended.

Such Maṇḍana's interpretation may be thought to point out a logical difficulty. Both in sv. 5-9 and SS. v. 3, the chief problem is 'what is word in *gauḥ*? (gaur ity atra kaḥ śabdaḥ)' But this problem itself would

become baseless if it were not determined what śabda represents, because then śabda would not be word. Probably for the purpose of making this difficulty clear, Maṇḍana refers to the relation between the word 'śabda' and the thing mentioned.

Judging from above investigation, M's view referred to in SS. v. 3 seems not to be the same as that in sv. vv. 5-9. In sv., the only thing mentioned is that each phoneme is śabda whehter the meaning should be comprehended or not, in respect of the relation between general word and comprehension of the thing mentioned. On the other hand, in SS., the relation between the word 'śabda' and the thing mentioned by this word is also referred to. By giving such a double meaning to the term 'śabdārthasambandha', Maṇḍana reconstructs M's view as that of one of his opponents.

M's view referred to here, of course, agrees with that in sv. vv. 5-9 in many points. But strangely Maṇḍana does not quote them at all. In other sections of SS., he shows the views of his opponents by quoting their words. Why Maṇḍana does not take this style in SS. v. 3? This remains a question.

-
- 1) *Sphoṭasiddhi of Maṇḍanamiśra with the commentary Gopālikā (G) of Ṛṣiputra Parameśvara*. ed. by S. K. Ramanath Sastri, Masras University Sanskrit Series, No. 6, Madrass, 1931.
 - 2) *The Mīmāṃsāśloka-vārttika of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa with the Commentary Called Nyāyaratnākara by Pārtha Sārathi Miśra*, ed. by R. S. Tailanga, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, No. 3, Benares, 1898. pp.510-544.
 - 3) Parameśvara II quotes all these verses in his G. (SS. pp.11-14). Shoren Ihara declares that Maṇḍana's summary is completely same as Kumārila's view ("Supota Sonzai no Ronsho." Kyushu Daigaku Bungakubu 40 Shunen Kinen Ronbunshu, 1966, pp.146-147). On the other hand, Subramania Iyer refers to only sv. v. 9 (*Sphoṭasiddhi of Maṇḍana Miśra [English Translation]*, Deccan College Building Centerary Series 25, 1966, Ponna, p. 4).
 - 4) sv. pp.511-512.
 - 5) SS. pp.12-13.
 - 6) G. p.13.
 - 7) SS. p.10.

〈Key Words〉 Sphoṭasiddhi, Maṇḍanamiśra, Śloka-vārttika, sphoṭavāda
(Graduate Student, University of Tokyo)