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1 Introduction

1.1 Bhaṭṭa Jayanta and the Nyāyamañjarī (NM)

The Nyāyamañjarī (henceforth NM) is a treatise on the tenets of Nyāya, the system of epistemology, dialectics and logic traditionally rooted in the Nyāyasūtra (NS). It was written by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta in the ninth century CE.¹

The NM is composed of 12 chapters. In NM 3 to 6, about one third of the whole work, Jayanta examines in depth the epistemology of śabda (on this term, see Sect. 2). The present paper is grounded on a survey of a selection of re-use of texts in the sphoṭa section of NM 6. By “re-use” I mean the adoption of previously existing textual passages and ideas, as a general and widely encompassing term. Verbatim re-use will be here called “quotation”, in cases where I am confident that Jayanta is consciously quoting existing texts.

This particular section of the NM consists of an investigation on the aetiology of śabda-produced knowledge, in which Jayanta stages a debate among Vyākaraṇa and Mīmāṃsā schools. There are three main reasons behind the choice of this particular section: first, my critical edition of this portion, based on all the available manuscripts,² is at an advanced stage, so its text is for the purposes of this paper more reliable than that of other parts of the NM; secondly, with a well structured sequence of arguments and counter-arguments, such as that of this section of the NM, it is easier to assess the function of textual re-use in Jayanta’s system; thirdly, in the course of the editing process, I had already identified a significant amount of re-used passages and their sources, which allows me to invest time and energy in evaluating re-uses, rather than in tracing them.

1.2 Truth-Values, Epistemic Function, and Symbolic Effect of Re-used Texts

In the analysis and classification I will mostly focus on the quality and the context of re-uses. Following in part the scheme for a classification of citations devised by Moravcsik and Poovanalingam (1975) and the classification by symbolic functions, introduced by Small (1978), I will classify re-uses in the NM by asking the following questions about Jayanta’s intentions:

(1) Truth value: Is the re-use confirmatory or negational? In other words, did Jayanta consider the re-used passage true or false?
(2) Symbolic value: Which tradition, author, or idea does the re-used text stand for?

Moravcsik and Poovanalingam (1975, p. 88) envision four dichotomies in their scheme: (1) conceptual/operational, (2) organic/perfunctory, (3) evolutionary/juxtapositional, (4) confirmatory/negational. Of these four, (1) is ignored here,

¹ For evidence about the date and other biographic information on Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, also known as Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, see Slaje (1986, p. 245 ff.), Potter (1995, pp. 345–346), Dezső (2005, Introduction), Kataoka (2007), Slaje (2012).
² For a list and description of extant NM manuscripts, see Graheli (2012a).
since it is specific to the natural sciences. (2) and (3) would both be relevant, but for want of space they will need to be addressed elsewhere. (4) is here discussed and implemented in terms of truth-value.

As for the symbolic function, it was introduced by Small (1978, p. 328):

[Previous] studies have missed the role citations play as symbols of concepts or methods. This cognitive function arises from the formal requirement imposed on the scientist-author of embedding his references to earlier literature in a written text. This leads to the citing of works which embody ideas the author is discussing. The cited documents become, then, in a more general sense, ‘symbols’ for these ideas.

[...] In the tradition of scholarship, the references are the ‘sources’ which the author draws upon to give further meaning to his text. Reversing this view, as I am suggesting here, the author is imparting meaning to his ‘sources’ by citing them.

[...] In general, [by ‘symbolic’] I mean that an object ‘stands for’ an idea; for citations, the cited document is the ‘object’ and the ‘idea’ is expressed in the text which cites it.

When applied to the re-use of texts in the NM, the term “symbolic” can encompass at least three different levels, the first two intended by the author, the third probably accidental:

- By re-using texts, Jayanta not only imparted authority to his own arguments, but also reassessed the relation of his tradition with other ones. Re-used ideas and words stand for symbols of those authors’ tenets, and those authors represent symbols of their respective traditions.
- By quoting a certain author Jayanta may intend to assign him a symbolic status of trustworthy authority (āpta), and to his statement a status of śabdapramāṇa.
- By arranging textual passages in a new order (see Sect. 4), Jayanta endowed them with new meanings.

While analyzing the context and the structure of re-uses, I will therefore try to identify the tradition, author, and concept symbolized by the cited text.

1.3 Contents of this Paper

The epistemology of śabda is not only the subject matter of NM 6, but also, in the hypotheses explored in this paper, the conceptual basis of Jayanta’s re-use of sources. Therefore, in Sect. 2 a brief sketch of the epistemology of śabda is provided.

In the sphota section of NM 6 Jayanta hardly ever re-uses material from his own tradition. The reasons behind this absence of Nyāya sources are explored in Sect. 3.

---

3 A concise yet exhaustive survey on the use of the term “symbol” can be found in Eco (1996, pp. 199–225). Symbols as “linguistic signs which are conventional and arbitrary” (see pp. 210–211), according to Eco already used by Aristotle in a similar sense, seem particularly relevant in the present application of the NM.
Further clues about Jayanta’s attitude in relation to his own tradition can be derived from some introductory verses of the NM. The most relevant passages are examined in Sect. 4.

Section 5 is a synopsis of the structure of śphoṭa section of NM 6, needed to facilitate the comprehension of my analysis of the style and the epistemic value of re-uses. Arguments for and against the śphoṭa theory are staged as an articulate dialog between Vaiyākaraṇas and Mīmāṃsakas. Accordingly, in Sects. 7 and 8, textual re-uses in the whole śphoṭa section are surveyed in two distinct parts.

For a more exhaustive assessment of Jayanta’s modality of re-use, I decided to compare his treatment of Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa sources with that of Nyāya ones, and since Nyāya sources are almost absent in NM 6, in Sect. 9 some NS and NBh re-uses from other parts of the NM are also examined.

2 The Epistemology of śabda

In Nyāya an authoritative instance of śabda must come from a source that satisfies the criteria of trustworthiness. If textual re-use has epistemic purposes, therefore, clarity about the identification of the source and its authoritativeness becomes particularly relevant. The formal style of a quotation, moreover, may reflect an appreciation or criticism of the source, in conformity with the assessment of a given quotation as representing an accepted truth or a false tenet. To contextualize the survey of quotations in the NM, some basic notions related to śabda epistemology are discussed next.

2.1 Comprehension, Knowledge, and Their Object

In most cases I will leave untranslated the terms śabda and artha, in want of English equivalents that can give justice to their technical and polysemous usages. Also, the two terms are not always treated homogeneously in Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa. As a general orientation, in the present context śabda is to be understood as “epistemic linguistic expression”, i.e., “linguistic expression having the purpose of conveying knowledge”, and its artha as “object of epistemic linguistic expression”. Although śabda is often rendered with “word” or, at best, “linguistic expression”, and artha with “meaning”, such equivalents fail to convey the epistemic import of these terms.

In the use of Sanskrit expressions such as śabdabodha, śabdārthapratīti, śabdārthasampratipratiyaya, padārthapratipatti, vākyārthapratipatti, etc., the distinction between understanding words and knowing from words is not explicit and is philosophically problematic. As noted by Matilal and Chakrabarti (1994, Introduction, pp. 9–11), in Nyāya literature the implied assumption is that verbal knowledge (śabdabodha) is “knowledge derived from the words of a truth-teller”, rather than “understanding of words”, although in English translations a tendency to render śabda and artha in the latter context seems prevalent.
The conflation of “comprehension of words” and “knowledge from words” that we witness in Sanskrit literature, however, may not necessarily be a philosophical flaw, if we consider how comprehension is a fundamental and inextricable part of word-derived knowledge.4

2.2 Śabda in Nyāya

In NBh ad 1.1.7, śabda as an instrument of knowledge is defined as follows:

śabda is the instruction (upadeśa) of a trustworthy instructor. It is of two kinds, since it can have either a perceivable or an imperceivable artha.

āptopadeśaḥ śabdah // sa dvividho drṣṭādrṣṭārthatvāt //

The trustworthiness of the source concerns language in general, so that it is considered the ground for the validity of both common and Vedic language. Unlike in Mīmāṃsā, in Nyāya the authority of the Veda is also founded on the trustworthiness of their source:

And that [Veda] is a valid source of knowledge because its trustworthy instructor is a valid source.

[...] tatprāmāṇyam āptaprāmāṇyāt //

A trustworthy instructor is defined as follows:

Trustworthy is the instructor (upadeṣṭṛ) who has directly experienced the essential property (dharma) [of things], and is moved by the desire to describe [things] as they are or they are not.

āptah khalu sākṣātikṛtadharmaḥ yathādrṣṭasyādṛṣṭasya cikhyāpayiṣayā prayaukta upadeṣṭā /

Being grounded on the utterance of a trustworthy instructor, śabda can by no means be considered permanent (nitya) by the Naiyāyikas, since such an utterance must have occurred at some point in time. Moreover, the relation between śabda and artha is considered conventional, rather than natural, because it is based on stipulations (saṅketa) established by divine or human beings (NBh ad 2.1.55–56).

2.3 Differences in Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa

In Mīmāṃsā, śabda is accepted ipso facto as natural and unalterable (Mīmāṃsāsūtra 1.1.5, see ŚBh, p. 28), so issues related to its development or aetiology are deliberately ignored as pointless. The possibility of an author is irrelevant for its

---

4 The Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā traditions are counted by Julie Jack (1994) among exponents of what she labels “Uniqueness School”, according to which there is a “uniqueness of knowing from words as a form of knowledge,—its irreducibility either to perception or to inference […]” (1994, p. 165). In her essay she also explores the problematic overlap of comprehension, judgment, and rational belief in verbal testimony.
validity as an instrument of knowledge (which in Mīmāṃsā is, specifically, knowledge of dharma) and for its reality, i.e. its relation with a (mental or concrete) object. The fixedness (nityatā) of such a relation necessarily implies the permanence of śabda: the idea that śabda is ephemeral, common to most opponents of Mīmāṃsā, is rejected in Mīmāṃsāsūtra 1.1.18:

[śabda] must be permanent (nitya) [in relation to its artha], because [its] appearance is for the purpose of [communicating with] someone else.

nityas tu syād darśanasya parārthatvāt

If śabda were ephemeral, how could there be a continuous and consistent intersubjectivity of speakers and hearers, who comprehend a same expression in the same way? To account for the sheer phenomenon of communication, the relation of a śabda with an artha must be understood as stable and permanent.

In Bhārtrhari’s philosophy of grammar, the ultimate reality (paramārtha) is a non-dual śabdatattva, while all dualities and differences, including the distinction into śabda and artha, appear as such only on the relative level of worldly interactions (vyavahāra), and not in an absolute, real sense (see VP, 1.1).

Moreover, since the ultimate reality is śabda, true knowledge must be grounded in it (VP, 1.131):

In this world there is no cognition without the comprehension of śabda. Every knowledge shines as if penetrated by śabda.

na so 'sti pratayo loke yah śabdānugamād rte /
anuviddham iva jñānaṃ sarvam śabdena bhāsate //

Jayanta sums up Bhārtrhari’s philosophy of śabda as follows (NMVā II, pp. 156,19–157,1):

The non-dual Absolute, śabda, whose apparent differences are caused by traces of a beginning-less nescience, is deceptively perceived as if related to the artha. There is actually no signified thing separated from the signifier. Therefore, this signified-signifier (vācyavācaka) subdivision, which is merely theoretical, is nothing but nescience used as a tool to achieve awareness (vidyā).

The non-dual reality is śabda, so in Bhārtrhari’s perspective Nyāya concepts such as “trustworthy instructor” and “conventional meaning” are fictional ones. Also the śabda-artha dichotomy is imaginary, since such duality does not exist in reality. The segmentation of language into sentences, words, and phonemes is an artificial operation, certainly useful for didactic purposes, but ultimately unreal.

2.4 The Oral and Written śabda

Traditionally, in India, śabda typically pertains to the realm of orality, while present analyses of textual re-use mostly concern written literature. It is debatable to what

5 The distinction between the oral and written nature of śabda is not always made, e.g. in Saksena (1951, pp. 38, 46), who interprets śabda as “verbal or written authority” or “verbal or written testimony”. Bhattacharyya (1994, p. 76) points to an important difference, relevant to the context of the NM, between spoken and written expressions: “Whether what is spoken endures when speaking is over is debatable;
extent Jayanta used written sources or, rather, had them committed to memory when he wrote the NM.

We also do not know how works such as the NS or the NBh were originally composed and, if orally composed, when they began to be preserved and transmitted in written form. However, judging from the epistemic importance of śabda and from teaching and learning habits in traditional circles witnessed in modern times, it is possible that the performative tradition of these works was mainly oral, and that they were often memorized and taught without much reliance on writing. For easily memorizable works, such as those in aphorisms and verses, the written record was probably perceived as secondary. In other words, the authority of orally taught truths, passed on from teacher to pupil, was probably superior to that of written ones.

As for large and digressive works such as the NM, they were more likely composed in written form to begin with and were not commonly meant to be memorized in their entirety. If this is the case, then, also the purpose of their written transmission must have been different. In 1472 CE, Śītikāntācārya Svāmin, the learned copyist of the oldest extant NM manuscript, wrote in his colophon (P, fol. II 271r,1) that the NM had been copied by him for teaching purposes (śīyān adhyāpayitum).

In any case, what is the epistemic role of written words for Jayanta? During his refutation of the sphoṭa, he makes clear that written letters convey knowledge of the artha indirectly, through an inferential process:

[…] Therefore the knowledge of the artha caused by the ink traits is based on the inference of the phonemes (tasmād varṇānumānapurassaraiva rekhābhito ०ṛthāvagatīḥ).

It thus seems theoretically acceptable to consider writing as leading to an instance of epistemically effective śabda. Just like the perception of phonemes assists the hearer in knowing from śabda, so can the perception of the ink traits assist an inference of those very phonemes, which again assists the hearer in knowing from śabda. One should also keep in mind that in Nyāya epistemology the possibility of knowing one and the same object through different instruments of knowledge (pramāṇasamplava) is acceptable (NMVa I, pp. 87–93). Furthermore, loud reading of a written source, either by the teacher to the pupils or on one’s own, may also play a role in these considerations.

3 Why did Jayanta Use Mīmāṃsā Sources?

Before Jayanta, in Nyāya sources, there had been no focus on the sentence, with linguistic analyses mostly concerned with words and their link to external things. In NM 5 (NMVa II, pp. 135,15–136,10), after examining various theories on sentence

Footnote 5 continued
what is written survives the act of writing. So all written words exist side by side […]”. Mohanty (1994, p. 31) suggests slight modifications in the utterer-conditions to make room for written testimony as śabda.

6 This, incidentally, would also explain the absence of a manuscript tradition of the NS independent of the NBh in the early stage of the transmission.
signification, Jayanta explained why he could not fully count on his own tradition on this matter, and, implicitly, why he largely drew from Mīmāṃsā theories:

[Objection:] The authors of the [Nyāya]sūtra and of the [Nyāya]bhāṣya have not described the artha of the sentence anywhere: from where shall we learn about the nature of the artha of the sentence, in order to expound it? [Counter-objection:] […] this discipline of reasoning (ānvikṣikī) is the science of means of knowledge, not the science of the artha of the sentence.

[Objection:] Yet, if such is the case, why was the artha of the word taught, [by the sūtra] “the artha of the word, however, is the individual thing, [its] conformation (ākrti), [its] universal character (jāti)” [NS 2.2.66]? [Counter-objection:] This is a good point. That effort, however, was done by the author of the [Nyāya]sūtra in order to establish the epistemic validity of śabda, and to calm down protests that there is no contact between śabda and artha.

[Objection:] Yet, if this is the case, without an external object as the artha of the sentence the epistemic foundation of the science would remain shaky, so an effort should be done also in this area. [Counter-objection:] True. The author of the [Nyāya]sūtra, by teaching only the artha of the word, meant to take care [also] of that [artha of the sentence], so he did not teach the artha of the sentence separately from that of the word. Therefore, his idea is that the very artha of the word is the artha of the sentence; […] not that the artha of a single word is the artha of the sentence; rather, the artha of several words is the artha of the sentence.

In this passage, Jayanta stressed the epistemic focus of the Nyāya discipline. Also, he apparently endorsed a realist epistemology in which the artha is external and real (bāhya and vāstava). Lastly, he hinted at the strategy that he was going to adopt to explain the transaction from word to sentence signification, on the one hand respecting the letter of the NS (2.2.66), were the artha of the word is defined, and on the other integrating a modified version of the Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsā theory of sentence signification in the Nyāya system.7

4 Jayanta on Re-use and Originality

In the introductory verses of the NM (NMVa I, pp. 2–4), there are further indications about Jayanta’s relation with his own tradition, a source of many of his re-uses. In verse 4 he traced back the Nyāya tradition to sage Akṣapāda, to whom the NS is attributed, and in verses 7–9 he portrayed the tradition of Nyāya as the source of his tenets, claiming for himself only the merit of having craftily re-ordered pre-existing notions:8

7 On the rival Mīmāṃsā theories of abhihitānvaya and anvīṭābhiddhāna, and on Jayanta’s understanding of these, see Kunjunni Raja (1963, p. 215) and Graheli (forthcoming).
8 Besides Jayanta, other well-known authors, such as Abhinavagupta, have portrayed themselves as mere re-arrangers of traditional tenets. This typical self-description by three heterogeneous authors such as Jayanta, Abhinavagupta, and Jīva Gosvāmin, is compared and related to the issue of novelty and repetition in Graheli (2008).
This superior essence was collected in the forests of the herbs of Nyāya. It was extracted like butter from the milk of reasoning (ānvikṣikī). How could I be capable of even envisioning a new topic? Here my only concern is a variety (vaicitrya) in arrangement of the [traditional] statements. Flower chaplets crafted in the past can generate new interest if their very flowers are recomposed on a new string.

After comparing the Nyāya system to a mighty tree cared for by Aksāpāda, Jayanta depicted himself as merely capable of a partial view of its full richness:

In fact, the tall tree of logic laid down by Aksāpāda bears a load of fruits oozing thick nectar. I will gently shake it, being incapable of climbing on it. [Thus] I cannot even see its full burden of riches.

To sum up, Jayanta planned his NM as a new structure built with tenets of a rich pre-existing tradition, without any claim for originality, except for the arrangement of the presentation.

5 The Argumentative Structure of the sphaṭa Section of NM 6

To examine the formal aspect of quotations and other re-uses, and to assess their epistemic value, the context of the argumentative structure is crucial. The sphaṭa section of NM 6 can be segmented in five argumentative steps: problem, thesis, first antithesis, second antithesis, synthesis (sketched in Fig. 1).

- The topic is introduced by the philosophical problem (saṃśaya) that is going to be dissected and settled: in the epistemic process of knowing something upon hearing a linguistic expression, what is precisely the cause of knowledge of an artha? Is it the ephemeral phonemes, as claimed in Nyāya (pratijñā, thesis)? Or is it the indivisible entity called sphaṭa, as claimed in Vyākaraṇa (pūrvapakṣa, first antithesis)? Or is it the permanent phonemes, as claimed in Mīmāṃsā (uttarapakṣa, second antithesis)?
- The thesis is that phonemes are heard in sequence form words and sentences, and thus they collectively cause knowledge of an object, though phonemes are not permanent entities, but rather ephemeral ones.
- The first antithesis (pūrvapakṣa) is the solution of the problem as proposed in Vyākaraṇa, based on Bhartrhari’s holistic theory of meaning.
- The second antithesis (uttarapakṣa), which refutes the first one, is the solution of the problem as proposed in Mīmāṃsā, largely based on Kumārila’s atomistic arguments.
- The synthesis (siddhānta) consists of a minor modification of the Mīmāṃsā arguments, to suit the Nyāya needs.

---

9 On the evolution from Ānvikṣikī to Nyāya, see Preisendanz (2009).
10 “Atomism” and “holism” are here used as relative terms: Kumārila has an atomistic perspective in relation to Bhartrhari, but Nyāya views before Jayanta could be considered more atomist than Kumārila’s. On the use of the terms “holism” and “atomism” in relation to the context and composition principles and to the Indian theories of meaning, see Matilal and Sen (1988, p. 84).
The thesis and the two antitheses are in turn structured in a dialogic form of progressive objections (pakṣa), counter-objections (pratipakṣa), and verdicts (nirṇaya), so that in the first antithesis the objections and the verdicts are Bhartrāhari’s, while the counter-objections are (mainly) Kumārila’s; in the second antithesis the roles are reversed. The problem, the thesis, and the synthesis are presented very concisely, while the two antitheses form the bulk of the section.

6 Re-uses in the NM

In the following, a selection of re-uses in defense and refutation of the sphoṭa are documented in tabular form. For pragmatic reasons, I limited myself to re-uses of the Śābarabhāṣya (ŚBh), Ślokavṛttika (ŚV), Ślokavṛttikatātparyāṭikā (ŚVTT),11 and Vākyapadīya (VP). I ignored other sources such as the Brhatī (Brḥ) and the

---

11 The debt of Jayanta to Umveka’s commentary is clear from many passages (see Sects. 7.1, 7.3, 7.6, 8.1, and 8.2 below). In a number of occasions (GBh, pp. 24.14, 149.4, 182.17), Jayanta’s commentator, Cakradhara, also noticed the connection and explicitly mentioned Jayanta’s references to Umveka.
Sphoṭasiddhi (SphS). The list of re-uses presented here is a selection without claims of exhaustiveness, as there are less evident re-uses which were discarded, and other possible ones that may have escaped my attention.

Re-uses are sorted according to their sequence of occurrence in the NM and are grouped in tables on the basis of the argumentative structure of the NM. Each table is contextualized by a brief synopsis of the philosophical issues at stake, and followed by some comments on the interesting features of the re-uses.

The first column contains the origin of the text re-used by Jayanta, with the reading of the most reliable edition available to me (NS, NBh, ŚV Ra, ŚVTT, VP; for quotations from parts of the ŚV not covered by ŚV Ra, I used ŚV Dvā instead); manuscript research on these sources, although important for a conclusive assessment, was not feasible at this stage. The second indicates the truth value (True/False) from the source viewpoint. The third, fourth and fifth columns contain the re-use as found in the NM, subclassified into three segments: the re-use (sequentially numbered for cross-reference purpose in this paper) preceded or followed by pre- and post-quote markers, when present; re-used expressions, including also differently inflected stems, are shown in bold face. Lastly, the sixth and the seventh columns indicate the truth value from the point of view of the symbolic speaker, and the tradition symbolized by the statement (Vyākaraṇa/Mīmāṃsā/Nyāya).

All the NM passages reproduced in this paper refer to the pagination of NM Va. Whenever other relevant witnesses—namely NM 3a, the Nyāyamaṅjarī (GBh) and the important manuscripts (P and C)—have substantive variants that differ from NM Va, such readings are either received in the text or shown in critical notes below the tables.

7 First Antithesis: Re-use in Defense of the sphoṭa

7.1 Phonemes do not Cause Verbal Knowledge

Vaiyākaraṇas maintain that phonemes cannot convey meaning, neither independently nor collectively. Independent phonemes are just meaningless parts of words. And if a word is considered a collection of phonemes, one must explain if they function simultaneously or in sequence, and both options are not tenable.

The simultaneous existence of phonemes is ruled out in (1). The only possibility of a simultaneous utterance of the phonemes composing a word would be that each

12 Although in the NM there are no explicit references to Mandana or to the SphS, there are some instances that suggest some relation. The most striking one is the argument in NM Va, 150,13–14, where eke, contrasted to apare, i.e. to Bhartṛhari, may refer to Maṇḍana Miśra. The SphS, 89,4–6 reads: yathā ratnaparīkṣānāṁ parīkṣāmāṇasya prathamāsamadhiṣṭamāntāṁ anupākhyātaṁ anupākhyeyyārūparatrayopā-hitasamāsārūpaḥ suṣeṣāṁ buddhau kramaḥ ca cetasī cakāṣāḥ ratnataṭtvaṁ. The NM reads: yathā ratnaparīkṣānāṁ prathamāsamadhistamānam aniṣṭamānāṁ api punāḥ punāḥ parīkṣāmāṇāṁ caram ca cākṣāṁ nirvadayaṁ ratnataṭtvaṁ. The terminological similarity is noteworthy. I could not find this jewel/jeweller comparison in early sources, except for Vācaspati Miśra’s Tattvabindu (see TB, p. 70), for which there are arguments in favor of its posteriority in respect to the NM.

13 A detailed explanation of the criteria for selecting relevant NM witnesses is provided in Graheli 2012b.
of a group of speakers simultaneously utters one of the phonemes composing the word, which is absurd (2). So, since a plurality of phonemes is uttered by a single speaker, there must necessarily be a chronological sequence of phonemes in such an utterance (3) (Table 7.1).

In (1), the link with Kumārila’s statement is more evident in the variant of P, with the reading sattā, in place of satām of the NM editions. For both opponents, as well as for Jayanta, (1) denies the possibility of the simultaneous existence of the phonemes forming a word. Although because of different reasons, for all of them it is true that by itself a group of phonemes can not cause verbal knowledge. For Mīmāṃsakas śabda is permanent and thus an ontological simultaneity of phonemes is acceptable, but phonemes need to be uttered and grasped in order to be effective, and they are uttered and grasped in sequence. Also for Vaiyākaraṇas śabda is permanent, but an ontological simultaneity of phonemes is impossible because phonemes are ultimately fictional entities. For Naiyāyikas a simultaneous existence of phonemes is simply not possible, due to the ephemeral nature of śabda.

In (2) the absurdity of many people simultaneously pronouncing different phonemes of a same word is stated, and this is obviously shared by all. (3) is also true for everyone involved here, because if a single person utters a series of phonemes there must necessarily be a sequence.

**Table 7.1** The theory of phonemes is wrong

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| yaugapādyāghīteṣ ca samudāyau na sidhyataḥ / na sattāyaugapadasya vyavahāraṅgatesyate // (ŚVdvā, vākyā 7cd–8ab) | True | (1) na caksurādīnām iva varṇānāṃ kāraṅkau, yenāgṛhitānām eva sattā yaugapadyā- mātrār arthaṇāya-vyānāṅgam syāt / etad apy aghātāmānām (NMVa II, p. 145,6–7) | True | Vyā. |
| yaugapadyām ca śakyatvān naiva teśām ihāśritam / kartrbhedaḥ ca tatra syān na caivaṁ drṣyate ’bhidhā // (ŚVra, sphota 72) | True | (2) tatrānekaśaṣṭha-sāṅitām kolāhalasvabhāvatvāśaiva svarūpaḥbheva eva duravagama (NMVa II, p. 145,12–13) | True | Vyā. |
| vaktraikatve nimite ca krame sati niyāmakam / prayuṇāyasya yat pārvam vyṛdeḥbhyāḥ kramadarsānam; vaktur ekaṭvāc ca varṇānām avasyambhāvī krame [...] (ŚVhu, sphota 71; ŚVTT, sphota 71) | True | (3) ekavaktra-prapra- yuktānāṃ tu prayatnahstānakaraṇa- kramāparityāgāḥ āvāśyambhāvī kramāḥ / NMVa II, p. 145,16–17 | True | Vyā. |

\[a\] sattā \(P\); satām NMGa NMVa; sato C \[b\] tatrāneka] P C NMdvā; tatra ekadāneka NMVa
7.2 The Last Phoneme does not Cause Knowledge

Conceding that phonemes do not convey meaning, neither independently nor collectively, the Mīmāṃsakas argue that the perception of the last phoneme triggers verbal knowledge, while assisted by the memory of previous phonemes (4). This, however, is unacceptable, because such memory would be caused by a mental disposition (saṃskāra), which would be in turn produced by the perception of each phoneme. But memory and mental dispositions are not accepted as instruments of valid knowledge, so this theory is not sound (Table 7.2).

The tenet expressed here is true for Mīmāṃsakas, but false for Vaiyākaraṇas.

Table 7.2 The theory of the last phoneme is wrong

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| pūrvavāraṇa-janitasamskārasahito 'ntyovarṇah pratīyakah (ŚBh ad 1.1.5, p. 55,1–2) | True | yad apy ucyate | (4) pūrvavāraṇa-janitasamskārasahito 'ntyovarṇah pratīyakah | iti tad apy ayuktam | False | Vyā. |
| a pūrva] P C; pūrvapūra NMVā • b 'ntyovarṇah] P C NMVa; antyavārṇah NMVā |

7.3 A Cognition Made of Memory and Perception is Impossible

The passage quoted in (4) has been interpreted by Kumārila by postulating a single, variegated cognition embracing the memory of the past phonemes and the perception of the last one, to avoid the issue raised by the Vaiyākaraṇas, namely that memory or mental dispositions of past phonemes cannot cause valid knowledge. But, argue the Vaiyākaraṇas, such a variegated and unitary cognition is also impossible, because mental dispositions cannot possibly produce a single cognition together with sense organs: mental dispositions cause recollections, while sense organs cause perceptions (Table 7.3).

Table 7.3 The variegated cognition is impossible

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| citrattpām ca tām buddhim saṇḍasadvarṇagocarām / (SVVa, sphaṭa 111ab); apare tu samskāratarayajanyān varnasmanaranāpām saṅkalanātmikām icchanti (ŚVṬṬ, sphaṭa 112) | True | atha vadet | (5) saṅkalanājānānam ekam sadasadvarṇagocarāṃ citrākārama b bhaviṣyatī / tadāpūrūḍhāś ca varṇā artham pratīyayasyanti / (NMVā II, p. 146, 18–19) | tad api durāsāmātram | False | Vyā. |
| a citrākāram] C; om. NMVa; NMVā; P n.a |
In (5) the two concepts of a variegated (citrarūpā) and cumulative (saṅka-
lanātmikā) cognition used by Kumārila and Umveka as two alternative scenarios in
the theory of phonemes, seem to be reduced to a single one by Jayanta. The notion,
in any case, is false from the Vaiyākaraṇas’s point of view.

7.4 Language Acquisition does not Justify the Existence of Phonemes

In defense of the theory of phonemes, Mīmāṃsakas claim that language-produced
knowledge requires linguistic competence, which is acquired through the repeated
observation of a given pattern of phonemes in relation to their artha (6–7) (Table 7.4).

From the Vaiyākaraṇas’ point of view it is false that language acquisition occurs
through phonemes.

7.5 The Theory of Phonemes is not Supported by Common Usage

People commonly say that “from śabda we know an artha”, where the use of the singular,
“from śabda”, matches the unity of the sphoṭa, not a plurality of phonemes (Table 7.5).

From the Vaiyākaraṇa’s point of view it is correct that common usage favors the
sphoṭa, so (8) is true. The same argument was present in the source in the form of an
objection, and thus considered false there.

Table 7.4 Language acquisition does not require phonemes

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| sambandhagrahaṇavaśena varṇānāṁ arthapratipādacatvam | True | nanu (6) vyupttivaśena śabdo ‘ṛthaprtyāyakatāṁ” upayāti / vyupttata ca ye b yāvanto yatkrāmakā’ varṇā yamā artham abhivadanto dṛṣṭāh, te tāvantas tatkrāmakās tam artham abhivadisyanti (NMVa II, p. 147,11–13) | iti | False | Vyā. |
| yāvanto yādṛśā ye ca yadartha-pratipādena / varṇāḥ prajñātasaṁ-marthiyāś te tathāvi-vabodhakāḥ // (ŚVT. sphoṭa 69) | True | tad | (7) yāvanto yādṛśā ye ca yadartha-pratipādena / varṇāḥ prajñātasaṁ-marthiyāś te tathāvi-vabodhakāḥ // (NMVa II, p. 146,15–16) | iti duravagāmā hi varṇavartanī | False | Vyā. |

a pratyaţyayakatāṁ] P NMGa NMVā; grāhakatāṁ C • b ye] P C; om. NMGa NMVā • c yatkrāmakā] P C NMGa; yatkrāmā NMVā • d yam] P C NMVā; yad NMVā • e tat] P NMGa NMVā; tāvat C
7.6 Phonemes do not Qualify as śabda

To argue that śabda must by definition be audible, and that phonemes are audible while the sphoṭa is not, does not make sense, because audibility is not an exclusive character of phonemes (9) (Table 7.6).

The Mīmāṃsaka may argue that although it is not an exclusive characteristic, it is still the main one, and that the phonemes are audible while the sphoṭa is not. Yet, the characteristic mark of śabda is not the mere audibility, but rather, its capacity to cause knowledge of the artha (10–11). And such character belongs to the sphoṭa, not to phonemes.

People are erroneously led to think that phonemes are the cause of verbal knowledge only because the sphoṭa manifests through articulated language, but actually this idea is the result of a false-cause fallacy (12) (Table 7.6).

It is false, from the Vaiyākaraṇa’s viewpoint, that the audibility of phonemes qualifies them as śabda (9).

(10) and (11) are false for the Mīmāṃsakas and true for the Vaiyākaraṇas, who have the interest of underscoring causality of cognition over audibility. (12), which is true for the Mīmāṃsakas, is rejected by Vaiyākaraṇas as false.

7.7 The Theory of the sphoṭa is not Anti-economic

The Mīmāṃsakas object that if the sphoṭa is manifested by phonemes, as maintained by some Vaiyākaraṇas (see above, footnote 12 on the SphS), a criticism moved against the theory of phonemes stands also against the theory of the sphoṭa, which basically adopts the theory of phonemes with its implications and on top of it postulates a further entity (13–14) (Table 7.7).

The economy of the theory of phonemes in (13) and (14) is true for the Mīmāṃsakas, but false for the Vaiyākaraṇas.

7.8 The sphoṭa is Manifested by Articulated Sound

According to other Vaiyākaraṇas, however, this is not true: the sphoṭa is not manifested by phonemes, but rather by phonetic sounds (dhvani), i.e., the combined result of breath, articulation, etc., which in any case do not have ultimate ontological status (15) (Table 7.8).

From here to the end of the first antithesis, all re-uses are of Vaiyākaraṇa texts, and thus true also in the sources.
Table 7.6 Phonemes are not šabda

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| śrotagrahaṇe hy arthe leke śabdaśabdaḥ | True | nanu | (9) śrotagrahaṇe hy arthe śabdaśabdaḥ prasiddhāḥ | naitad | evam | False | Vyā. |
| ato gakārādvīyatirikto 'nīyo gośabdo 'sti yato 'ṛthropatipattiḥ syāt | False | | (10) tasmād yato 'ṛthropatipattiḥ sa śabdāḥ | True | Vyā. |
| atha gaur ity etasmin viṁśate śro tre bahavo 'ṛthey prāthibhāsante / tatra kas teśāṁ śābda ity upakramya yena ccaśrārthapratyaya bhavati sa śabda ity upasamahātām / (ŚVT, sphiṭa 3) | False | | (11) atha gaur ity atra śro tre prāthibhāse bahavo 'ṛthyā prāthibhāsante / tatra kas teśāṁ śabda ity upakramya yato 'ṛthropatipattih sa śabda ity upasamārthate (NMVa II, p. 149, 11–12) | True | Vyā. |
| na gauṇo 'ksareṣu nimittabhaṅvah, tadbhāve bhavat tadbhāve cābhavat (ŚBh 1.1.5, p. 58,3–4) | True | nanu ca | (12) iyam arthropatitir vajraste bhavantah abhavante bhavantī teṣv abhavante cābhavante (NMVa II, p. 149,15) | ucyate / […] idam tv anyathāsid- dham | False | Vyā. |

Table 7.7 The argument of economy is not valid

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| yasyānavaṇavavah sphiṭo vyājyate vānabuddhibhiḥ / so 'pi paryavanyogena naivātena vīmucyata // (SVV, sphiṭa 91) | True | nanu […] | (13) yasyānavaṇavah sphiṭo vyājyate vārṇabuddhibhiḥ / so 'pi paryavanyoga naivātena vīmucyata (NMVa II, p. 150,7–8) | iti […] | naiṣa dosaḥ | False | Vyā. |
| nanu samśākara- kalpanāṁ adṛṣṭa kalpanā / ucyate / śabdakalpanāṁ sa ca śabdakalpana ca (ŚBh 1.1.5, p. 54,10) | True | bhāsyakṛti | (14) nanu samśākara- kalpanāṁ adṛṣṭa kalpanāṁ aśaṅkya pravidiḥ ca śabdakalpana ca (NMVa II, p. 150,9–10) | iti naiṣa dosaḥ | False | Vyā. |
7.9 The Sentence is the Linguistic Unity

Not only are phonemes unreal, even words are fictional abstractions (16). The sentence is not a whole made of parts; rather, it belongs to a class of its own (17). One may argue that there is a one-to-one correspondence between each phonemic string and its respective *artha*, but this is not true; for instance (18), in unrelated words like *kūpa*, *yūpa*, and *sūpa*, we see that some phonemes are identical, yet there is no similarity in meaning (Table 7.9).

7.10 Words are Fictional Abstractions

The signification of words is thus a fictional device, like that of roots and suffixes. Words are an abstraction, useful for didactic purposes, etc., but devoid of ontological status (19–20) (Table 7.10).

### Table 7.8 The manifestation of the *sphoṭa*

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|--------------|
| indriyasaiva saṃskārah śabdasyaiobhayasya vā / kriyate dhvanimbhir vādās trayo 'bhivyaktivādinām // (VP, 1.80) | True | (15) dhvanaya eva sphoṭasya vyanjakāh (NM^Va^ II, p. 151,2) | | | True | Vyā. |

\[^a\] sphoṭasya] P C; sphoṭasya ca NM^Ga^ NM^Va^

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|--------------|
| padāṇi vākye tāṇy eva vāraṇās te ca pade yadi / vāraṇaṇaḥ vāraṇabhaṭanāṃ bhedah syāt paramāṇuvat // (VP, 2.28) | True | (16) avayacakalpanāyām hi yathā vākyasvāyavāvāh padāṇi, padāṇām vārayā vāraṇāḥ, evam vāraṇānām āpy avayavair bhavayavām / (NM^Va^ II, p. 153,12–13) | | | True | Vyā. |
| gavaye narasimhe cāpy ekajñānād rte yathā / bhāgaṃ jāyantarasyaiva sadṛṣaṃ pratipadyate // (VP, 2.90) | True | (17) artho 'pi vākyasyaika eva narasimhākāraḥ / jāyantarām hi narasīṃho nāma / na tatra^b narārtho nāpi simhāṛthah / (NM^Va^ II, p. 154,2) | | | True | Vyā. |
| na kūpasūpayūpānām anvayo 'ṛthsaya drṣyate / ato 'ṛthantaravācitvam samghātasūyāva gaṃyate // (VP, 1.69) | True | (18) na, kūpayūpasūpānām^c anekākṣarānugame^d 'py arthānugamabhāvāt / (NM^Va^ II, p. 154,12) | | | True | Vyā. |

\[^a\] 'pi] P NM^Ga^ Va; 'pi ca C •^b^ na tatra] P C NM^Ga^; tatra na NM^Va^ •^c^ yūpasūpānām] P C; sūpayūpānām NM^Ga^ NM^Va^ •^d^ anekākṣarānugame] P; ekākānugame C; ekākṣarānugame NM^Ga^ NM^Va^
In (20), remarkably, while in C and GBh only the second hemistich of VP 3.1.1 is present, in P and in the vulgata also the first hemistich is present. C and GBh, when reading together, are evidence of an earlier stage of the NM transmission.

In (20), remarkably, while in C and GBh only the second hemistich of VP 3.1.1 is present, in P and in the vulgata also the first hemistich is present. C and GBh, when reading together, are evidence of an earlier stage of the NM transmission.

Table 7.10  Words are abstractions

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| yathā pade vibhajyante prakṛtiprayatayādayah / apoddhāras tathā vākye padānām upapadyate // (VP, 2.10) | True | (19) kalpanāmātraṁ tv etad iyaṁ prakṛtir esa pratāyaya iti / evam padānām api vākyāt kalpanayaiva a apoddhāraḥ / (NMVa II, p. 155,11) | True | Vyā. |
| apoddhṛtyaiva vākyebhyah prakṛtiprayatayādivad iti // (VP, 3.1.1cd) | True | (20) apoddhṛtyaiva b vākyebhyah prakṛtiprayatayādivad // (NMVa II, p. 155,12–13) | iti | True | Vyā. |

a vākyāt kalpanayaiva] C; vākyāt kalpanayoddhāraḥ P; vākyārthaparikalpanayaiva NMGa NMVa • b apoddhṛtyaiva] C GBh; padam kaiścid dvidhā bhinnam caturdhā pañcadhāpi vā / apoddhṛtyaiva P NMGa NMVa

Table 7.11  The absolute unity, śabda

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| anādinidhanam brahma śabdātattvam yad āksaram / vivartate 'rthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yataḥ // (VP, 1.1) | True | (21) śabdabrah- maivedam advayam a anādyavidyāvāsanopā- plavamānābhedam arthabhāvāna vivartate / (NMVa II, pp. 156,20–157,1) | True | Vyā. |
| na so 'sti pratyaayo loke yah śabdānamgūrmed rtē / anvuvighdam iva jānāṇām sarvām śabdena bhāsate // (VP, 1.131) | True | (22) vāgrūpatā tu b tattvaṁ sarvaṁ pratyaye, tadanapāyī / (NMVa II, p. 157,3) | True | Vyā. |
| vāgrūpatā ced utkramed avadobhayaśā śāsvati / na prakāśāḥ prakāśātāhāḥ prayatvamarsini // (VP, 1.132) | True | (23) vāgrūpatā ced utkramed avadobhayaśā śāsvati / na prakāśāḥ prakāśatahāḥ prayatvamarsini // (NMVa II, p. 157,5–6) | iti d | True | Vyā. |

a advayam] P NMGa NMVa; om. C • b tu] P C; om. NMGa NMVa • c sarvatra] P C; sarva NMGa NMVa • d iti] NMGa NMVa; om. P C
7.11 Śabda is the Absolute, Indivisible Reality

The absolute reality is an indivisible śabda, while fictional differences are nothing more than instruments to move towards an awareness of the śabda unity, or didactic means to describe language (21–23) (Table 7.11).

7.12 The Threefold Manifestation of śabda

Even if in reality it is one and indivisible, śabda manifests in the world of phenomena in three aspects, vaikhāri, madhyamā, and paśyantī (24–27) (Table 7.12).

8 Second Antithesis: Re-use in the Refutation of the sphoṭa

With the exception of (40) below, in this section both re-uses and sources are arguments presented from the Mīmāṃsaka viewpoint, so they express true concepts both in the source and in the re-use.
8.1 Sequential Phonemes Can Cause a Cumulative Cognition

In response to the Vaiyākaraṇas’ objections (see Table 7.1), the Mīmāṃsakas argue that the sequential utterance of phonemes is not an issue: although phonemes are uttered and grasped in sequence, they still are, collectively, the cause of verbal

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| ekasādhanaṃsthāḥ ca vyāpārāvayavā yadā / svarūpato nirūksyante yaugapadyam asat tadā // kīṃ punar bahavo bhinnā- bhinnasādhanaṃ- śītāḥ / bhaveyur yaugapadyena vyāpārāh kramavartinah // (ŚVRa, sphoṭa 77–78) | True | (28) tathaikānuvāka- grahane samsthanāṃ kramabhāvinināṃ api sāmastye sati sāmārthyaṃ, ekayāpi̊ saṃsthanāya vināa tadāmukhi̊ karanāsaṃ- bhavād / (NMVa II, p. 160,6–7) | True | Mim. |
| darśapūrṇamāsābhāyām ity upapadasamar- pitasāhityetikartā- vyatāvīśītānāṃ āgneyādīnāṃ ekapreryavi- śesāntotpāda- katvān kramena, karanānāṃ āgneyādīnāṃ kṣanīktavān yaugapadyāsambhavāt / (ŚVTṬ, sphoṭa 74) | True | (29) vede ‘pi darśapūrṇamāsābhāyām ityāḥ atrae itaretaraya- gasāmśinā dvandvē samarpitāhityānāṃ āgneyādīyāgānāṃ pakāsādvaya’praya- jatvēnā cāparihārāya kramāṇām ekādhikāra- sampādaḥkatvām ḍṛṣṭam / (NMVa II, p. 160,8–10) | True | Mim. |
| abhyāse ca indravyavādīnāṃ ekādhikāraniṃsāpa- katvām / loke ‘pi padādhyayanādīnāṃ ekānūvāka- grahanasādhakatvam / (ŚVTṬ, sphoṭa 74) | True | (30) tathā ain- drāvyavāṃ grhnāti, āśvacānāṃ grhnāti iti somagraha’- grahaṇābhāya- sānām samastānām kramabhāvināṃ caikapradhānani- rvartakatvāṃ ḍṛṣṭam iti / (NMVa II, p. 160,10–12) | True | Mim. |

a ekayāpi] P C; ekayā NMVa; NMVa b vinā] P C NMVa; om. NMVa c āmukhi] P NMVa; abhimukhi C d ity] P NMVa; om. C NMVa e atra] P; om. C NMVa f dvaya] P C; dvaye NMVa g graha] P C; om. NMVa

A. Graheli
knowledge. Instances of collective and sequential causes that bring about a cumulative effect are well known, as in the case of drills to memorize verses (28) or of intermediate sacrifices (29–30) in the economy of the main one (Table 8.1).

8.2 Dispositions and Memory in the Theory of Phonemes

The principle that the perception of the last phoneme triggers verbal knowledge, aided by the memory of the previous phonemes (31), which was quoted and refuted by the Vaiyākaraṇas (see Table 7.2), actually stands valid. Objections on the capacity of dispositions to produce verbal knowledge do not hold, if we understand “mental disposition” as vāsanā, a quality of the self. From observation we know that perceptions cause dispositions, and observation is a universal instrument of knowledge (33). And it would be silly to ask “From where does such a mental disposition arise?”, because everyone knows that mental dispositions are caused by perception (34) (Table 8.2).

(31) was also quoted above (see Table 7.2). In that occasion the line in favor of atomism was not credited, unlike here. It could be because of the obviousness of the source, but it is quite likely that the absence of credits had rhetoric implications: the honorific tatrabhāvātā stresses the authoritativeness of the statement, while in

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| pūrvavarnajā-nitasamskārasahito 'ntyovarnah (ŚBh ad 1.1.5, p. 55,1–2) | True | (31) pūrvavarna-janitasamskārasahito 'ntyovarnah (NM Va II, p. 163,14) | iti tatrabhāvātā māmāṃsābhā-ṣyaktā vāraṇitam | True | Mīm. |
| athavā gakārādivijñānajani-tvāvāsanām evāha bhāṣyakāraḥ sāṃskārasabdēna / tadvīṣṭāsvayai-vāntyāvayava-syārthaprātipattau hetutvam smanānyathānupapat-tipramānakam / (ŚVTT, sp̄hoṭa 99) | True | (32) […] varṇāṃubhava-sāṃskṛtamateh pumsaḥ arthaprajitirvāsanāt / na hi smaranaśaktih saṃskāraḥ / kin tv ātmaguno vāsanākhyah / sa ca smṛtim ivārthaprajitīm api janaityum utsahate (NM Va II, p. 164,7–8) | True | Mīm. |
| sarvatra no darśanaṃ pramāṇam / (ŚBh ad 1.1.5, p. 53,1–2) | True | (33) sarvatra no darśanam pramāṇam / (NM Va II, p. 164,9) | True | N. |
| tad uktam / vastudharmo hy esa yaḥ anabhava-paṭīyān smṛtibhājaḥ ādhatte iti / (ŚVTT, sp̄hoṭa 100, found also in PST, Ch. 1, Part 1, 1.5, p. 49,10) | True tathā cāhuḥ | (34) vastudharmo hy eṣa, yad anubhavaḥ paṭīyān smṛtibhājaḥ ādhatte / (NM Va II, p. 164,18–19) | iti | True | Mīm. |

a 'ntyovarna-] P C; 'ntyavarṇa NM Ga NM Va
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the previous case, where the argument is developed from the Vaiyākaraṇas’ perspective, the authoritativeness of the source was meant to be undermined.

In (32) Jayanta gives a Vaiśeṣika twist to the word saṃskāra used by Śābara, interpreting it as the quality of the self called vāsanā. The latter term is also used by Umśveka in the immediate context.

8.3 The Theory of Phonemes is More Economical

Alternatively, the Mīmāṃsakas may concede that mental dispositions do not cause knowledge of the artha directly. Yet, they can do it through memory: mental dispositions of the past individual phonemes in sequence, together with the perception of the last one, cause a new mental disposition that produces the memory of the full word, which in turn causes the knowledge of the artha. When the Vaiyākaraṇas argue that this theory is anti-economical, the Mīmāṃsakas, with Śābara, reply that they are postulating a single entity (the mental disposition), while the Vaiyākaraṇas necessarily must postulate two (the sphoṭa and the mental dispositions, through which the sphoṭa manifests) (35).

When the Vaiyākaraṇas claim that, at least, they did not violate the law that mental dispositions cause only memory, the Mīmāṃsakas reply that they did indeed violate it, because when they deal with the cause of the manifestation of the sphoṭa (see Table 7.8), they have to explain it in a similar way. In addition, they postulate the sphoṭa (36).

And the explanation of the gradual manifestation of the sphoṭa does not hold, because knowledge of an artha is not a gradual, but rather a sudden phenomenon (37) (Table 8.3).

| Table 8.3 The economy of the theory of phonemes |

| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|---------------|
| śabdakalanāyāṃ sa ca śabdakalanā ca / (ŚBh ad 1.1.5, p. 54,10) | True | uktam atra sugṛhitānām bhāṣyakārena (35) | śabdakalanāyāṃ sa ca śabdakalanā ca (NMVa II, p. 166,3) | iti | True | bhāṣyakārena (Mīm.) |
| sadbhāvavatirekau ca tathāvayavavarjanaṁ / tavādhikāṇaṁ bhavet tasmād yatno sv arthagūpyasī // (ŚVa, sphonita 94) | True | tad uktam (36) | sadbhāvavatirekau ca tathāvayavavarjanaṁ / tavādhikāṇaṁ bhavet tasmād yatno sv arthagūpyasī // (NMVa II, p. 167,1–2) | iti | True | Mīm. |
| alpiyāsāpi yatnena śabdam uccaritaṁ matī / yadi vā naiva grhnāti varṇaṁ vā sakalam sphutam // (ŚVa, sphonita) | True | yathoktam (37) | alpiyāsāpi yatnena śabdam uccaritaṁ matī / yadi vā naiva grhnāti varṇaṁ vā sakalam sphutam // (NMVa II, p. 167, 11–12) | True | Mīm. |

\(^{a}\) uccaritaṁ P C; uccāritaṁ NMGa NMVa
8.4 The Sequence is a Property of Phonemes

The sequence is just a property of phonemes, so no entity needs to be postulated in addition to the phonemes (38) (Table 8.4).

8.5 The *sphoṭa* does not Qualify as *śabda*

Phonemes are the only basic linguistic elements, other fictional entities are not required (39); *śabda* is said to be of two types, articulated and not articulated, and the *sphoṭa* is neither of these two (40) (Table 8.5).

(40) is one of the rare cases, in NM 6, in which Jayanta quotes from his own tradition.

| Source                              | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use                  | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------|-------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| dvaye saty api tenātra vijñeyo 'rthasya vācakaḥ / varnāḥ kim nu kramopetāḥ kim nu varnāśrayaḥ kramāḥ // kramavatām āgam iti kim yuktisādhyaṭā / dharmamātram asau teśām na vastvantaram isyate // (ŚVṛDi, śabdāntyatā 285–286) | True       | tatra     | (38) dvaye saty api tenātra vijñeyo 'rthasya vācakaḥ / varnāḥ kim nu kramopetāḥ kim nu varnāśrayaḥ kramāḥ // kramavatām āgam iti kim yuktisādhyaṭā / dharmamātram asau teśām na vastvantaram isyate // (NMVa II, p. 169,12–15) | True | Mim. |

| Source                              | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use                  | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------|-------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| parasparānapekṣāś ca śrotrabuddhyā svarūpataḥ / varnā evaśaśiṣyante na pūrvāparavastunī // (ŚV Ka, *sphoṭa* 9) | True       | tad uktam | (39) parasparānapekṣāś ca śrotra"budhyā svarūpataḥ / varnā evaśaśiṣyante na pūrvāparavastunī // (NMVa II, p. 172, 14–15) | iti | True | Mim. |
| dvividhaḥ cāyaṁ śabdo varṇātma dhvanimātraś ca / (NBh ad 2.2.40) | True       | tad uktam | bhāsyakṛtā              | (40) dvividhaḥ cāyaṁ śabdo varṇātma dhvanimātraś ca / (NMVa II, p. 173,7) | iti | True | bhāsyakṛt (Nyā.) |

\[a \Śr̥\] P C NM\textsuperscript{Ga}; śrautra NM\textsuperscript{Va} \[b \cāyaṁ\] P NM\textsuperscript{Ga} NM\textsuperscript{Va}; tv ayaṁ C
8.6 The Smallest śabda Unity is the Phoneme

While in short words such as “cow” there is an impression of unity due to the brevity of the sound, there are many long words, such as “Devadatta” where the differences of sounds composing the word are clearly audible (41).

The Vyākaraṇaṇas proposed the *reductio ad absurdum* that if sentences are made of words and words are made of phonemes, also phonemes must have parts. But parts of phonemes are never perceived: a phoneme is either fully perceived, or it is not perceived at all (42) (Table 8.6).

| Table 8.6 | The smallest unity of śabda |
|-----------|-----------------------------|
| Source    | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
| śaighṛyād alpāntaratvāc ca gośābde sā bhaved api / devadattādśabdeṣu sphiṣṭo bhedāḥ pratiyatě // (ŚVṛa, ṣphoṭa 121) | True | (41) bhinnājupālese tu devadatta ity ādau nānāśaṅkaraṅghan eva vilambitam anubhūyate / (NMVā II, p. 174,12–13) | True | Mim. |
| alpīyaśāpi yatnena śabdam uccaritam matiḥ / yadi vā naiva grhnāti varṇam vā sakalam sphiṣṭam // (ŚVṛa, ṣphoṭa 10) | True sūktam hy etat\(^i\) | (42) alpīyaśāpi yatnena śabdam uccaritam b matiḥ / yadi vā naiva grhnāti varṇam vā sakalam sphiṣṭam // (NMVā II, p. 179,17–18) | True | Mim. |

\(^{a}\) sūktam hy etat\(^j\) P; uktaṃ hy etat C; tathā hy uktaṃ etat NMVā • b uccaritam\(^j\) P C; uccāritaṃ NMGa NMVā

While in short words such as “cow” there is an impression of unity due to the brevity of the sound, there are many long words, such as “Devadatta” where the differences of sounds composing the word are clearly audible (41).

The Vyākaraṇaṇas proposed the *reductio ad absurdum* that if sentences are made of words and words are made of phonemes, also phonemes must have parts. But parts of phonemes are never perceived: a phoneme is either fully perceived, or it is not perceived at all (42) (Table 8.6).

| Table 9.1 | Re-uses from the NS |
|-----------|-----------------------------|
| Source    | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
| pratyakṣānumāno-pamāṇaśabdaḥ pramāṇāni (NS, p. 1.1.4) | True | tad āha sūtrakāraḥ | (43) pratyakṣānumāno-pamāṇaśabdaḥ pramāṇāni // (NMVā I, p. 71,6) | True | Aksapāda |
| […] tattvajñānānāṁ niḥśreyasādhi-gamah (NS, p. 1.1.1) | True | aksapādas tāved evam upadiṣṭavān | (44) ātmajñānāṁ niḥśreyasādhi-gamah (NMVā II, p. 469,19–10) | iti | True | Aksapāda |
| tattvādhya-vasyāyāsāṃraksanārthām jalpavitaṇde bijapraprahasam-raksanārthām kaṇṭakaśākkhā-varanāvat (NS, p. 4.2.50) | True | samāhitam etad bhagavatā sūtrakareṇaiva | (45) tattvādhya-vasyāyāsāṃraksanārthām jalpavitaṇde bijapraprahaṃ-raksanārthām kaṇṭakaśākkhā-varanāvat (NMVā II, p. 468,3–4) | iti | vadatā | True | Aksapāda |
### Table 9.2 Uncredited re-uses from the NBh

| Source | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| tattvasya jñānam niḥśreyasasyādhitam | True | (46) tattvasya jñānam niḥśreyasasyādhitam | True | Nyā. |
| | | nihśreyasasyādhitam iti karmani śaṣṭhyau (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 2,11) | | |
| samśayādayaḥ hi yathāśambhavam pramāṇesu prameyeyo | True | (47) samśayādayas tu pādaṛthā yathāśambhavam pramāṇesu prameyeyo | True | Nyā. |
| | | samśayādayaḥ hi yathāśambhavam pramāṇesu prameyeyo (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 2,17–18) | | |
| | | | | |
| tatra nānupalabdhvā / pravartate / kim tu saṃśayite / samśayā / prameyeśu / (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 3,3–4) | True | (48) tatra nānupalabdhvā / pravartate / kim tu saṃśayite / samśayā / prameyeśu / (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 3,3–4) | True | Nyā. |
| | | | | |
| trividhā cāsya śāstrasasya pravrṛtitar udddeśo lākṣaṇam parikṣā ceti / (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 8,7–9) | True | (49) trividhā cāsya śāstrasasya pravrṛtitar udddeśo lākṣaṇam parikṣā ceti | True | Nyā. |
| | | udddeśo lākṣaṇam parikṣā ceti / nāmadheyena padārthamātrasyā-bhidhiḥānam uddṛṣṭaḥ / tattvavyavasthitāya dhammā lākṣaṇam / lakṣītasya yathālākṣaṇam upapadyate na veti pramānair avadhārām parikṣā / (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 8,7–9) | | |
| Source | Truth val. | Pre-quote | Re-use | Post-quote | Truth val. | Point of view |
|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|--------------|
| pradīpah sarvavidyānām upāyaḥ sarvakarmanāṁ / āśrayah sarvadharmānāṁ vidyoddese prakīrtitā // (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 5,19–20) | True | āha ca bhāṣyakāraḥ | (50) pradīpah sarvavidyānām upāyaḥ sarvakarmanāṁ / āśrayah sarvadharmānāṁ vidyoddese parīksitā // (NMV 1, p. 28,14–15) | iti | True | Vātsyāyana |
| āgnir āptopadesāt prayāyaṃ amutsāṅgir iti / prayāśidadātā dhūmadarśanānumīyate / prayāśamena ca prayākṣata upalabhyyate / vyavasthā punah āgniḥotram juhuyāt svargakāma iti / laukikasya svarge na lingadarśanaṁ na prayākṣam / stanayitnusābde śṛtyāmaṇe śabdhāhetāv anumāṇam / tatra na prayākṣam nāgamaḥ / pānau prayākṣata upalabhīmaṇe nānumāṇam nāgama iti / (NBh ad 1.1.3, p. 9,11–16) | True | tad udāhāraṇam - tu bhāṣyakāraḥ pradarsītavān | (51) āgnir āptopadesāt prayāyaṃ 'mutreti / prayāśidadātā dhūmadarśanānumīyate / prayāśannatareṇa upalabhyata ityādi / kvačit tu vyavasthā dṛṣyate yathā āgniḥotraṃ juhuyāt svargakāma iti asmadādēr āgamaṃ eva ṣīhānam, na prayākṣānaṃnābhyām / stanayitnusābdaśravaṇāt taddhetuparijñānam anumāṇād eva, na prayākṣāga-mābhhyām / svahastādau tu prayākṣād eva prayātiḥ, na śabdanumāṇābhhyām (NMV 1, p. 93,5–13) | iti | True | Vātsyāyana |
| yat punar anumāṇam prayākṣāga-maviruddham nyāyābhāṣāḥ sa iti (NBh ad 1.1.1, p. 3,13–14) | True | bhāṣyakāreṇa uktam | (52) yat punar anumāṇam prayākṣāga-maviruddham nyāyābhāṣāḥ sa (NMV 1, p. 293, 14–15) | iti | True | Vātsyāyana |
9 Re-use from Nyāya Sources

In Tables 9.1–3 there is a small sample of re-uses from the NS and the NBh, as a term of comparison with the above-listed sources from other traditions. In Table 9.1, three quotations of the NS are shown, as an example of the many occurring in the NM. In Table 9.2, there are some re-uses from the NBh without an explicit mention of the NBh author. Finally, in Table 9.3, a few NBh re-uses with an explicit attribution are listed.

10 Conclusions

In Tables 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3 some characteristics of all the above re-uses are summarized for a better appreciation of specific patterns. The sequential number is shown in bold typeface when the re-use is a quotation. The context shows how re-uses constitute the back-bone of the whole argumentation in favor and against the sphoṭa. It would be possible, indeed, to make sense of the main structure of the sphoṭa section just by following the concatenation of arguments present in the quotations. The sequence of the arguments, however, differs from that found in previous sources, so Jayanta’s claim of his role as a re-arranger seems corroborated by this survey.

In the re-uses surveyed here there are always three subjects involved: besides Jayanta himself (the Nyāya exponent), in fact, a dialog is staged between a symbolic re-user and the utterer of a re-used source, in the present case alternatively the Vaiyākaraṇa or the Mīmāṁsaka. The symbolic re-user is in some cases explicitly
Table 10.1 *Sphoṭa* defense

| Author of source | Context of re-used passage | Symbolic re-user of text | Epist. val.: author of source | Epist. val.: symb. re-user | Epist. val.: Jayanta |
|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Kumārila         | Rejection of simultaneity of phonemes | Vṛ̣yā. | True | True | True |
| (2) Kumārila     | Rejection of simultaneity of phonemes | Vṛ̣yā. | True | True | True |
| (3) Kumārila, Umveka | Necessity of sequence of phonemes | Vṛ̣yā. | True | True | True |
| Śabara           | Process of signification of phonemes | yad ucyate (Śabara, Mīm.) | True | False | ? |
| Kumārila         | Variegated or cumulative sonic image | Vṛ̣yā. | True | False | ? |
| Umveka           | Phonemes are necessary to acquire language competence | Vṛ̣yā. | True | False | True |
| Kumārila         | Phonemes are necessary to acquire language competence | tad uktam (Kumārila, Mīm.) | True | False | True |
| Śabara           | Common usage of language supports the *sphoṭa* | Vṛ̣yā. | False | True | False |
| Śabara           | Phonemes are audible, thus they are śabda | Vṛ̣yā. | True | False | True |
| Śabara           | śabda is the cause of knowledge of the artha, i.e. the *sphoṭa* | Vṛ̣yā. | False | True | False |
| Umveka           | śabda is the cause of knowledge of the artha, i.e. the *sphoṭa* | Vṛ̣yā. | False | True | False |
| Śabara           | The phonemes as signifiers | Vṛ̣yā. | True | False | True |
| Kumārila         | The theory of phonemes is more economical | bhāṭṭa (Mīm.) | True | False | True |
| Śabara           | The theory of phonemes is more economical | bhāṣyaṅkṛ (Mīm.) | True | False | True |
mentioned, and in others clearly identifiable in the flow of the argument, according to his role in the debate either as proponent (pakṣin) or opponent (pratipakṣin).

Although the Mīmāṃsaka role in the staged debate is that of presenting a second antithesis (uttarapakṣa) and not a final verdict (siddhānta) one cannot fail to notice how Jayanta’s views are very close to the Mīmāṃsaka’s, so much so that in the present list of re-uses, insofar as the truth value of the statements, Jayanta almost invariably agrees with the Mīmāṃsaka. In these conclusive tables, the truth values seen from Jayanta’s viewpoint are in bold face, together with the truth values of those who agree with him.
Table 10.2 *Sphoṭa* refutation

| Author of re-used text | Context of re-used passage | Symbolic re-user of text | Epist. val. according to author of source | Epist. val. according to symbolic re-user | Epist. val. according to Jayanta |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| **Counter-verdict (Mīmāṃsaka)** |
| (28) Kumārila          | Phonemes in sequence produce a cumulative effect | Mim. | True | True | True |
| (29) Umveka            | Phonemes in sequence produce a cumulative effect | Mim. | True | True | True |
| (30) Umveka            | Phonemes in sequence produce a cumulative effect | Mim. | True | True | True |
| (31) Śabara            | The last phoneme triggers knowledge of the *artha* | tatrabhāvān mīmāṃsā-bhāsyakṛt (Mīm.) | True | True | True |
| (32) Umveka            | Dispositions are qualities of the self | Mim. | True | True | True |
| (33) Śabara            | Perception is the main instrument of knowledge | Mim. | True | True | True |
| (34) Umveka            | Perceptions produce dispositions, which produce memory | tathā cāhuḥ (Mīm.) | True | True | True |
| (35) Śabara            | The theory of phonemes is more economical | sugrhitānāma-bhāsyakāra, Mīm. | True | True | True |
| (36) Kumārila          | The theory of the *sphoṭa* is anti-economical | tad uktam (Kumārila, Mīm.) | True | True | True |
| (37) Kumārila          | A gradual manifestation of the *sphoṭa* is impossible | yathoktam (Kumārila) | True | True | True |
| (38) Kumārila          | The sequence is a property of phonemes, not an additional postulation like the *sphoṭa* | tatra coktam (Kumārila, Mīm.) | True | True | True |
| (39) Kumārila          | The *sphoṭa* does not qualify as śābda | tad uktam (Kumārila, Mīm.) | True | True | True |
| (40) Paksīlaśvāmin     | The *sphoṭa* does not qualify as śābda | bhāsyakṛt (Mīm.) | True | True | True |
| (41) Kumārila          | The smallest śābda unity is the phoneme | Mīm. | True | True | True |
| (42) Kumārila          | The smallest śābda unity is the phoneme | suktam hy etat (Kumārila, Mīm.) | True | True | True |
### Table 10.3  Nyāya sources

| Re-uses from the NS | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                     | Author of re-used text | Context of re-used passage | Symbolic re-user of text | Epist. val. according to author of source | Epist. val. according to symbolic re-user | Epist. val. according to Jayanta |
| (43) Aksapāda       | The instruments of knowledge | tad āha sūtrakāraḥ (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
| (44) Aksapāda       | Knowledge of the self leads to the sumnum bonum | aksapādas tāvad evam upadīṣṭavān (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
| (45) Aksapāda       | The purpose of jalpa and vitandā | samāhitam etad bhagavatā sūtrakāraṇa (Nyā.) | True | True | True |

### Uncredited re-uses from the NBh

| Uncredited re-uses from the NBh | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | Author of re-used text | Context of re-used passage | Symbolic re-user of text | Epist. val. according to author of source | Epist. val. according to symbolic re-user | Epist. val. according to Jayanta |
| (46) Vātsyāyana                 | The syntax of NS 1.1.1 | Nyā. | True | True | True |
| (47) Vātsyāyana                 | The relation of pramāṇa and prameya with the other padārthas | Nyā. | True | True | True |
| (48) Vātsyāyana                 | Inference is used to solve doubts | Nyā. | True | True | True |
| (49) Vātsyāyana                 | The three pravṛttis: uddeśa, laksāna and parikṣā | Nyā. | True | True | True |

### Credited re-uses from the NBh

| Credited re-uses from the NBh | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                | Author of re-used text | Context of re-used passage | Symbolic re-user of text | Epist. val. according to author of source | Epist. val. according to symbolic re-user | Epist. val. according to Jayanta |
| (50) Vātsyāyana                | Ānvīkṣiṭi is the supreme science | āha ca bhāṣyakāraḥ (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
| (51) Vātsyāyana                | The convergence of instruments of knowledge in a single object | tad udāhāraṇam tu bhāṣyakāraḥ pradarsitavān (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
| (52) Vātsyāyana                | Pseudo-inferences | bhāṣyakāreṇa uktam (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
| (53) Vātsyāyana                | Definition of pravṛtti | iti ca bruvaṇo bhāṣyakāraḥ (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
| (54) Vātsyāyana                | The scope of pseudo-logical reasons | iti bhāṣyakāravacanāt (Nyā.) | True | True | True |
Throughout the NM, when not explicitly credited to the author, quotations are almost invariably introduced by *tad uktam*, or, more rarely, *yathoktam*. The overwhelming percentage of quotations thus introduced is in verse or *sūtra* form. This *tad uktam* pre-quote expression can be considered Jayanta’s marker for a precise quotation, so much so that it may be used as a valuable clue to identify quotations from undetermined or lost works. Also, it is a signal that the specific tradition derived from the context, in the above cases Vyākaraṇa and Mīmāṃsā, is symbolized in the quotation. Unlike Śabara and Kumārila, Bhartrhari is never explicitly credited. Since Jayanta’s views are certainly closer to the Mīmāṃsakas’s, such explicit credits could by themselves be not only tokens of respect, but also of the trustworthiness of the source.

The almost invariable concomitance of the *tad uktam* formula with quoted verses and aphorisms may have several reasons. It is possible that verses were more suited for quotation purposes, for mnemonic reasons, and that therefore Jayanta thinks more appropriate to introduce them with an explicit “so it was said”. It is also possible that verses and aphorisms, since they were more easily memorized and thus faithfully transmitted, enjoyed a special status as *śabdaprāṇa* in Jayanta’s perspective.

It is remarkable how differently re-uses from Nyāya sources are treated. First of all, in these cases the *tad uktam* pre-quote is not systematically present anymore. There is a substantial amount of uncredited quotations from the NBh, which is all in prose, except for rare passages (see Table 10.3). Perhaps these passages were so well known to Jayanta and his audience to make irrelevant the necessity of credits, or perhaps in Jayanta’s understanding only versified passages were worthy of credits, but in some cases they could also be unconscious re-uses creeping in the NM. In the context of versification, I found (48) particularly interesting, where a prose passage of the NBh is integrated and completed in metrical form by Jayanta.

In relation to re-use in Nyāya literature, in any case, it seems that the impact of the oral tradition, and thus of massive portions of works committed to memory, must be taken into account.
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