CrossMark

Classical Sāṃkhya on the Relationship between a Word and Its Meaning

Ołena Łucyszyna

Abstract   The aim of this article is to reconstruct the classical Sāṃkhya view on the relationship between a word and its meaning. The study embraces all the extant texts of classical Sāṃkhya, but it is based mainly on the *Yuktidīpikā*, since this commentary contains most of the fragments which are directly related to the topic of our research. The textual analysis has led me to the following conclusion. It is possible to reconstruct two different and conflicting views on the relationship between a word and its meaning from the classical Sāṃkhya texts. The first view, the source of which is the *Yuktidīpikā*, is that all words are conventional in their origin. It resembles the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of the primary linguistic convention and the conventional origin of all words. The second view, which is the implication of the Sāṃkhya idea of the authorless Vedas we can reconstruct on the basis of the majority of the classical Sāṃkhya commentaries (including the *Yuktidīpikā*), is that the relationship between a word and its meaning is natural. This view is probably influenced by Mīmāṃsā. Both of these views are hardly compatible with the Sāṃkhya teaching. It seems like classical Sāṃkhya, not having created its own detailed theory, oscillated between different conceptions.

Keywords   Sāṃkhya · Language · Word (*śabda*) · Meaning (*artha*) · Primary language convention

Introduction: The Aim of this Research and the Primary Sources on which it is Based

The nature of the relationship between a word (*śabda*) and its meaning (*artha*) was vividly discussed in Indian philosophy. The main contributors to this discussion

O. Łucyszyna (✉)
The University of Humanities and Economics in Lodz, Łódź, Poland
e-mail: o_lutsyshyna@yahoo.co.uk; olutsyshyna@ahe.lodz.pl

were Mīmāṃsā, which held that the relationship was natural (*autpattika*), and its rival Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, which defended the theory of a conventional (*sāmayika*) origin of this relationship.

The aim of my study is to reconstruct the classical Sāṃkhya view on the nature of this relationship. Classical Sāṃkhya is treated in this paper as a single tradition, and my approach to this tradition is synchronic.[1] In my study I take into account all the available classical Sāṃkhya texts, but it is based chiefly on the *Yuktidīpikā*, the most extensive and profound commentary of the classical Sāṃkhya, since this commentary provides the main material for our analysis. The extant classical Sāṃkhya texts are the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK) by Īśvarakṛṣṇa (ca. 350–450 CE)[2] and the following eight commentaries on it: the commentary which survived in the Chinese translation of Paramārtha[3] (P; composed ca. 500 CE; translated into Chinese by Paramārtha between 557 CE and 569 CE), *Sāṃkhyavṛtti* (SVṛ; ca. 500–600 CE), *Sāṃkhyasaptativṛtti* (SSVṛ; ca. 500–600 CE), *Sāṃkhyakārikābhāṣya* (or *Gauḍapādabhāṣya*; GB; ca. 500–600 CE) by Gauḍapāda, *Yuktidīpikā* (YD; ca. 600–700 CE), *Jayamaṅgalā* (JM; ca. 700 CE or later), *Māṭharavṛtti* (MV; ca. 800 CE or later) by Māṭhara, and *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī* (TK; ca. 841 CE or ca. 976 CE) by Vācaspati Miśra.

What is the classical Sāṃkhya view on the relationship between a word and its meaning? It is difficult to reconstruct this view for the following reasons. First, the authors of the classical Sāṃkhya texts do not express their point of view directly. Second, they also do not say what they mean by 'word' and what they mean by 'meaning'. Third, the view on the relationship between a word and its meaning that can be reconstructed on the basis of these texts seems not to be consistent.

Before I proceed to the reconstruction of the classical Sāṃkhya view on the word–meaning relationship, I shall, first, make some observations on the classical Sāṃkhya understanding of sound and word and, second, touch upon the issue of meaning (*artha*) in classical Sāṃkhya.

A Note on the Sāṃkhya Understanding of Sound and Word

As to word, in the YD we find 2 brief mentions concerning its nature: according to the YD, phoneme (*varṇa*), word (*pada*), sentence (*vākya*), verse (*śloka*), and book (*grantha*) are modifications (*vikāra*; see YD 34)[4] or manifestations (*abhivyakti*; see YD 29)[5] of sound (*śabda*; *dhvani*). By *śabda* the author means the quality of the gross elements (*bhūta*, *mahābhūta*). According to Sāṃkhya, sound is an inseparable

---

[1] Cf. the approach of Larson (Larson and Bhattacharya 1987, p. 47).

[2] The dates of all the Sāṃkhya and Yoga texts mentioned in this paper are given according to Larson and Bhattacharya (1987, pp. 15–18, 19–22). On the date of the *Yiktidīpikā* see also careful and valuable observations of Mejor (2004, pp. 399–433).

[3] The Sanskrit original of this text is lost. I rely on the French translation of Takakusu (La Sāṃkhyakārikā étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise 1904) and the reconstruction into Sanskrit prepared by N. Aiyaswami Sastri (*Suvarṇasaptati Śāstra* 1944).

[4] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 218, vv. 9–10.

[5] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 207, vv. 29–31.

quality (*guṇa*) of the gross element of ether (*ākāśa*) (it is a view of the P, the SVṛ, the SSVṛ, the GB, and the MV) or each of the five gross elements, that is, of ether, air, fire, water, and earth (it is a view of the YD, the JM, and the TK) (see classical Sāṃkhya commentaries to *kārikā*s 22, 26, and 38).[6]

It is worth noting that Sāṃkhya, like Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and unlike Mīmāṃsā, does not draw a distinction between word sounds and non-linguistic sounds. In Mīmāṃsā language sounds are distinguished from non-linguistic sounds, that is, acoustic tones (*nāda*; *dhvani*) through which language sounds and words are manifested; word sounds and words are permanent (eternal), while acoustic tones arise and cease to exist immediately after their emergence. In YD 34 the author uses the word '*dhvani*' as a synonym of '*śabda*'.[7] Also in a polemic with a Buddhist opponent in which the author of the YD (see YD 10) disagrees with him that sounds and words are momentary (*kṣaṇika*) in their nature, the author does not make any distinction between linguistic and non-linguistic sounds.[8]

The Meaning of 'Meaning' (*artha*) in Classical Sāṃkhya

What did classical Sāṃkhya authors understand by 'meaning'? Their texts do not provide enough material for the reconstruction of the classical Sāṃkhya theory of meaning. They do not explicate Sāṃkhya comprehension of meaning. In the YD we find some examples of the meanings of words. These examples embrace the main structural principles of Sāṃkhya ontology (*tattva*)[9] and other things that really exist, perceptible as well as imperceptible (a cook, a cutter,[10] a tree,[11] heaven,[12] etc.). Besides the passages containing these examples, there are also some other contexts in the YD which indicate indirectly that by word meaning the author understands a thing that really exists.[13]

Can we conclude on the basis of these passages that by 'meaning' Sāṃkhyas understood the individual? In my opinion, rather not. The texts of other schools of

---

[6] In Sāṃkhya all the gross elements are perceptible by ordinary people and constitute an essential unity with their qualities (they are not different from their qualities), from which it follows that sound must be perceptible everywhere the gross element(s) being its bearer is/are present. One of the important gaps in the Sāṃkhya teaching is that Sāṃkhya does not explain why sound, being an inseparable quality of the perceptible gross element(s) (in fact, a quality undistinguishable from its bearer), is not always perceptible when its bearer is present.

[7] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 218, vv. 9–10.

[8] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 130, vv. 4–14 and p. 131, vv. 5–19.

[9] Introduction to the YD (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 7, vv. 23–26). The YD gives more extensive explanations of most of the *kārikā*s than other classical Sāṃkhya commentaries, therefore in my references to the YD I indicate, besides the number of the *kārikā*, the page and the verse number of the edition of the YD.

[10] Introduction to the YD (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 7, vv. 19–20).

[11] YD 6 (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 101, v. 6).

[12] YD 6 (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 101, vv. 6–7).

[13] See polemics in which the author argues that authoritative verbal testimony cannot be reduced to inference (YD 6; *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 101, v. 16–p. 105, v. 9), as well as polemics where the author defends the view that comparison (*upamāna*) is not a separate source of valid knowledge (*pramāṇa*) (YD 4; *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 70, v. 25–p. 72, v. 21).

Indian philosophy, for example, the texts of Nyāya, contain fragments in which the authors give as examples of meanings concrete individual things, e.g., gayal (the forest cow) (*gavaya*), *mudgaparṇī* and *māṣaparṇī* (these are plants) (Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya* and Uddyotakara's *Nyāyavārttika* I, 1, 6), food, fire, sword (*Nyāyabhāṣya* II, 1, 53), but from this it does not follow that the authors of these Nyāya texts understand by 'meaning' a concrete individual thing. According to these Nyāya authors, the word means (i.e., denotes, stands for, refers to, designates), first, the concrete individual thing (*vyakti*),[14] second, the 'form' (*ākṛti*), and third, the universal (*jāti*) (see *Nyāyasūtras*, *Nyāyabhāṣya*, and *Nyāyavārttika* II, 2, 59–69).

What else can we say about the Sāṃkhya understanding of meaning? It is almost certain that we can exclude the possibility that the authors of classical Sāṃkhya believed the universal to be the meaning of the word. In YD 28 the author rejects the view that the universal (*sāmānya*) can exist and be perceived as something distinct from the individual thing.[15] The author rejects here the view of Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas, which hold that the universal (*sāmānya*, *jāti*) is a separate entity, existing even when the concrete individual which is its seat does not exist. From YD 15[16] it follows that Sāṃkhyas understand the universal as 'a similarity of form'/'a similarity of nature'/'likeness' (*sārūpya*).[17] It is difficult not to agree with the scholars that Sāṃkhya metaphysics has no place for universals understood as realities that can exist separately from concrete individual things (Frauwallner 1973, p. 314; Maas 2010, p. 385), that at best Sāṃkhya could accept universals as general notions (Kumar 1983, pp. 136–137, 300),[18] and that Sāṃkhyas "do not appear to have given considerable thought to the problem of universal" (Kumar 1983, p. 300).[19]

As for the word '*sāmānya*', being a common Indian term denoting the universal, in Sāṃkhya it is an important term applied to *prakṛti*. In Sāṃkhya in most cases it can be translated with one of the following words: 'common', 'general', 'universal', 'commonness', 'universality', 'generality'. This term is used when *prakṛti* is characterized, first, as something 'common' to all unliberated *puruṣa*s (that is, as the common object of experience of all unliberated *puruṣa*s, as well as the common cause of all the subtle and gross bodies with which the *puruṣa*s not liberated from *saṃsāra* are connected), second, as the 'common', or universal cause of everything (of all the things of the visible and invisible world) except *puruṣa*, third, as

---

[14] The notion of individual thing (the individual, the particular) very often embraces not only individual substance. In Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika it embraces also action and quality, in Sāṃkhya—property in the widest sense of this word.

[15] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 202, vv. 2–8.

[16] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 143, vv. 14–25.

[17] The Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā opponents of Sāṃkhya ascribe the view that the universal is *sārūpya* to Sāṃkhya philosopher Vindhyavāsin (ca. 300–400 CE). See Chakravarti (1951, p. 143), Kumar (1983, pp. 136, 300), Larson and Bhattacharya (1987, pp. 144–145), Takenaka (1977, pp. 505, 502–501).

[18] "At best … Sāṃkhya would sanction it a 'notional existence'" (Kumar 1983, p. 137).

[19] See also Harzer Clear: "The theory of universals and particulars was not one that developed within the Sāṅkhya school. At the time of Vindhyavāsin, the Sāṃkhya school incorporated notions which belonged to other schools. … Among these were the notions of universals and particulars" (Harzer Clear 1990, pp. 334–335, note 9).

something having 'common' nature with her products (namely, the nature of three *guṇa*s), fourth, as something 'general', or undifferentiated. This term is also applied to some products of primordial creative matter when Sāṃkhya authors want to emphasize their undifferentiated nature (first of all it concerns *tanmātra*s) or the fact of their being the 'common' cause of or having the 'common' nature with other products of *prakṛti*. In some fragments the term "*sāmānya*" is used in several of these senses. For the above usages of the word *sāmānya* see, for example, SK 11 together with the commentaries to this *kārikā*, as well as YD 15,[20] YD 16,[21] YD 38.[22,23]

All of this indicates that classical Sāṃkhya does not accept the universal as a separate ontological category.[24] Can we suppose that Sāṃkhyas by meaning understood a notion, or the universal possessing only a 'notional existence'?

I think it is not very probable, because the so-called 'orthodox' (*āstika*) *darśana*s, to which Sāṃkhya belongs, defined the meaning as the universal (*sāmānya, jāti, ākṛti*), the individual (the particular) (*vyakti, dravya*), or all of these three things: the universal (*jāti, sāmānya*), the individual (*vyakti*), and the 'form' (*ākṛti*). None of these three things was considered to possess a 'notional existence' only. Mīmāṃsakas claimed that the meaning of a word is the universal (*ākṛti*) (see Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* I, 3, 30–35 together with the Śabara's commentary *Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya*). Śaṃkara and most Advaita Vedantins after Śaṃkara held, like Mīmāṃsakas, that the meaning of a word is the universal (*ākṛti*) (so far as empirical word usage—*vyavahāra*—is concerned) (see Potter 1981, p. 56).

---

[20] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 143, vv. 14–25.

[21] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 164, vv. 16–30.

[22] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 224, v. 25–p. 225, v. 2.

[23] On the meaning of the term '*sāmānya*' when this term is applied to *prakṛti* and its products see: Malinar (1999, pp. 619–643).

[24] I would like to note that my observations on the classical Sāṃkhya view of the universal have a preliminary character, and that this matter requires a separate research. The following fragments of classical and post-classical Sāṃkhya confirm that we should be careful in our conclusions. In TK 27 Vācaspati Miśra, trying to incorporate the Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika version of the theory of two stages of perception, that is, indeterminate (*nirvikalpaka*) and determinate (*savikalpaka*) perception, into Sāṃkhya epistemology, uses the word *sāmānya* in the same sense in which the Sāṃkhya opponents used it. Vācaspati Miśra says that at the first stage the qualifiers (*viśeṣaṇa*), namely, the universal (*sāmānya*), etc., and their bearer, qualificand (*viśeṣya*), are perceived separately, and on the second stage *manas* establishes the relation between the qualifiers and the qualificand (*viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣya-bhāva*). It follows from this that the universal is understood as the real that has its own existence and can be perceived as something distinct from the individual. Such an interpretation of the universal is alien to Sāṃkhya; it looks like a mechanical borrowing from other schools, since it is hardly possible to fit it in the Sāṃkhya doctrine. The conception of two stages of perception—*nirvikalpaka* and *savikalpaka*—is taken up also by Aniruddha in his *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* (ca. 1400–1500 CE), the earliest and the most important commentary to the *Sāṃkhyasūtras* (ca. 1400–1500 CE), the main text of post-classical Sāṃkhya (see *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* I, 89). (For a detailed analysis of the fragments of the TK and the *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* in which the authors speak about the two stage perception see my article in the Ukrainian language: Lutsyshyna 2011.) It is worth noting that the post-classical Sāṃkhya texts *Sāṃkhyasūtras* and *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* contain a passage where the authors present their view on the universals (V, 91–92). The passage is difficult to interpret. It seems that for the Sūtrakāra and Aniruddha the universals (*sāmānya*) are something more than general notions: they make an intriguing statement that the universals, though they are not eternal, possess 'stability' (*sthiratā*).

According to many authors of Nyāya, the word meaning is threefold: the word means the individual (*vyakti*), the 'form' (*ākṛti*), and the universal (*jāti*, *sāmānya*) (see *Nyāyasūtras*, *Nyāyabhāṣya*, and *Nyāyavārttika* II, 2, 59–69).[25] According to Navyanyāya, the word means the individual as qualified by the universal (section *Jātiśaktivāda* of Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi*—see Saha 2001). It is difficult to make generalizations about the views of the Grammarians (Vaiyākaraṇas), but I shall venture to state that most of these philosophers identify the word meaning as the universal (*jāti*, *ākṛti*), the individual (*dravya*), or both of them—see, for instance, the publications of Dravid (1972, pp. 225–226), Coward and Raja (2001, p. 6), Raja (2001a, p. 194, 2001b, pp. 116–117), Sajdek (2011, pp. 53–54), Houben (1995, pp. 87–95). Bhartṛhari the Grammarian in the *Jātisamuddeśa* of his *Vākyapadīya* claims that the meaning of a word is the universal (*jāti*); he also discusses different views of the earlier Grammarians (*Vākyapadīya* III, 1, 2–13).

How did philosophers of the sister Yoga *darśana* explain the meaning of 'meaning' (*artha*)? In the Yoga texts I dealt with (the *Yogasūtras*, the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya*, Vācaspati Miśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī*, and the *Rājamārtaṇḍa* by Bhoja Rāja) I have found only one small fragment where the author says what he means by 'meaning': commenting upon *Yogasūtras* III, 17, in the *Rājamārtaṇḍa* (ca. 1150 CE) Bhoja Rāja explains *artha* as *jāti-guṇa-kriyā-ādi* ('the universal, the quality, action, etc.'). It follows from this that according to Bhoja Rāja the word means both the universal and the particular. This small fragment is not enough for making any definite conclusions about the Yoga theory of meaning.

The *Yogasūtras* speak about the erroneous identification of *śabda* ('word'), *artha* ('meaning'), and *pratyaya* ('notion', 'idea'), which should be distinguished from one another (III, 17). As an example of 'meaning' (*artha*) the commentators give a real empirical cow, possessing a dewlap and other necessary attributes of a cow (see the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya*, the *Tattvavaiśāradī* and the *Rājamārtaṇḍa* on *Yogasūtras* III, 17). In all the four Yoga texts mentioned a meaning of a word is clearly distinguished from a notion produced by a word in our mind. Bhoja Rāja explains *pratyaya* as "knowledge, that is, the modification of the intellect in the form of the object" (*jñānaṁ viṣaya-ākārā buddhi-vṛttiḥ*) (*Rājamārtaṇḍa* III, 17). The above distinction between the word meaning and the mental idea evoked by the word implies that the Yoga philosophers did not identify a meaning as a notion.

Thus we can say, generally, that according to philosophers representing Brahmanical *darśana*s, including philosophers of Yoga, a sister *darśana* of Sāṃkhya, the meaning of a word, be it the universal, the 'form', or the particular, is a thing of the external world,[26] but not a notion or something that exists only in our thought. I think we can sum up that the theories of meaning of Brahmanical philosophies of language are referential.[27] I do not claim that the philosophers in all

---

[25] The sūtras of Vaiśeṣikas seem to be silent about the meanings of words (see *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* VII, 2, 14–20).

[26] For Advaita it is the world which is real from the lower, relative standpoint.

[27] I do not agree with the following generalization made by Raja (1969, p. 25) concerning the Indian philosophy of language: "The Indian conception of the relation between *śabda* and *artha* (word and sense) is quite analogous to de Saussure's definition of a linguistic sign as a relation between the *signifiant* and the *signifié*. … Here it must be noted that both the *signifiant* and the *signifié* are psychical entities … .

the contexts by 'meaning' (*artha*) understand a referent, that is, the thing to which the word refers in the existent world; I claim that in the cases when the philosophers express their view on the word meaning directly they identify the meaning with the referent. I assume that in some contexts, speaking about 'meaning' (*artha*), they speak about sense. There is no doubt that the philosophers distinguished between an existent thing to which the word refers and the notion produced in our mind by this word. This mental image evoked by a word was very often called *jñāna*, which is usually translated as 'knowledge', though *jñāna* embraced not only valid knowledge, but also erroneous knowledge, doubtful knowledge, and some other mental states. I think that here, in this distinction between the knowledge or notion produced by the word and the thing for which the word stands in the existing world, lies the root of the sense–reference distinction in Indian philosophy, rightly pointed out by some scholars inquiring into the philosophy of language of Indian philosophers: see, for example, the publications of Siderits (1986, 1991, pp. 65–86), Taber (1989, 2002), Ganeri (1996, 2011), Houben (1995, pp. 33–35). However, we should remember that, unlike certain Western philosophers, Indian philosophers never claimed that the word meaning had two distinct elements; the sense–reference distinction did not have the status of theory—it was only implicitly present in the Indian philosophy of language.

Taking into account all the above, we can suppose that for Sāṃkhya the meaning is a thing that really exists. It is barely possible that Sāṃkhya understood the meaning as a notion or something that exists only in our thought, though we cannot entirely exclude this possibility. We can also suppose that Sāṃkhya understood the meaning as the particular, not as the universal.[28] The classical Sāṃkhya texts on which this research is based do not contain material sufficient for drawing any definite conclusions about the Sāṃkhya understanding of meaning.

Footnote 27 continued

… A fundamental identity of opinion is often concealed by divergent and overlapping terminologies. Thus the *artha* or sense appears as *signifié* in de Saussure, *thought* or *reference* in Ogden-Richards, *mental content* in Stern, *sense* in Gombocz, *idea* in Roudet, *concept* in Weisberger and *meaning* in Gardiner." I agree with the careful observation of Siderits (1991, p. 65): "It is generally accepted that Indian philosophers of language do not posit sense as a component of the meaning of an expression in addition to its reference. … We find instead a more or less pure reference theory of meaning: the meaning of an expression is that entity which the expression designates. … I shall nonetheless argue that, predominant though the reference theory might be in their tradition, certain Indian philosophers of language were still forced to recognize something akin to sense as a distinct element in meaning. That the sense–reference distinction was never extensively made use of by Indian philosophers of language is clear; I shall not be concerned to dispute this … ."

[28] The following evidence concerning the Sāṃkhya view before Īśvarakṛṣṇa's SK can support our hypothesis: "According to Kumārila in his *Ślokavārttika* and his commentator, Umbeka (*ākṛtivāda*, 76 and 65), Vindhyavāsin accepted Vārṣagaṇya's interpretation of *vyaktivāda*, or the notion of particularity (in contrast to *ākṛti* or 'genus' or 'class') with respect to the meaning of words …" (Larson and Bhattacharya 1987, pp. 144–145). However, views of classical Sāṃkhya can differ from views of these Sāṃkhya philosophers.

Classical Sāṃkhya Texts about the Relationship between a Word and Its Meaning

Evidence for Sāṃkhya's Accepting the Conventional Origin of the Relationship between a Word and Its Meaning

Evidence 1

This view can be reconstructed on the basis of two fragments of the YD (which contain evidence 1 and evidence 2).

In the *Introduction* to the YD we find the following fragment:

A name (*saṃjñā*) is a word used for revealing (*pratyāyana*) the [thing] named (*saṃjñin*). It is of two kinds: based on the [etymological] meaning (*artha-nibandhana*) and based [merely] on the own form [of the word] (*svarūpa-nibandhana*). Of these [the name] based on the [etymological] meaning refers to fulfilling purpose (*artha-kriyā*) [by the thing named, referring to it] by force of the meanings (*artha-vaśena*) [of the meaningful component parts of the name]. It encompasses the specific features of the thing (*artha-svarūpa*), such as [its] class, etc. (*jāti-ādi*), [and] reveals the [thing] named exactly (*eva*) in that form (*tathā-bhūtam*) as (*yathā*) [its etymological] meaning (*artha*) [implies]. These are the examples: *a cook, a cutter*. However, [the name] based on [its] own form [only] is merely a means of revealing the [thing] named (*saṃjñi-pratyāyana-upāya-mātram*); it serves [for revealing this thing] through the own form [of the word] only (*svarūpa-mātra-upakārin*) [and] reveals the [thing] named without [relying on] the meanings of the component parts [of the word] (*vinā-avayava-arthaṃ*), by force of the [language] convention (*samaya-vaśād*) [only], even though [the thing named] is not such (*atathā-bhūtam*) [as the name implies]. These are the examples: *an elephant ear* (*gaja-karṇa*), *a horse ear* (*aśva-karṇa*). The blessed supreme seer (*parama-ṛṣi*) [Kapila], having grasped the own nature (*svarūpa*) of all the principles (*tattva*) through the seer's cognition (*ārṣeṇa jñānena*),[29] with great care bestowed (*vidadhat*) names, so there are no words based [merely] on [their] own form [in Kapila's original teaching]. For example, *pradhāna* is called so because [all her] products are primarily placed (*pradhīyante*) in her (*atra*), *puruṣa* is called so because he rests in the body (*puri śete*), and so on. Also the teachers (*ācārya*) who follow his [that is, Kapila's] doctrine have no regard for producing (*vidhāna*) new names, because they well communicate (*saṃvyavahāra*) through these very [names].[30]

---

[29] As it follows from the YD (see YD 4), the seer's cognition of Kapila is a supernatural cognition which has the nature of direct insight. This cognition is beyond the *pramāṇa*s, that is, it is not obtained through the sources of valid knowledge (it is called *apramāṇa-pūrva*, which literally means 'not preceded by a *pramāṇa*'). The seer's cognition of Kapila is inborn and does not require any means (*sādhana*) for its arising (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 67, v. 20–p. 68, v. 2; p. 68, vv. 10–13; p. 75, vv. 19–24).

[30] *saṃjñipratyāyanārthaḥ śabdaḥ samjñā / sā ca dvividhā / arthanibandhanā svarūpanibandhanā ca / tatrārthanibandhanārthavaśenārthakriyāpekṣā / jātyādyarthasvarūpāntarbhāvī yathārthas tathābhūtam*

This fragment is a part of the larger passage in which the author presents characteristics of a genuine *tantra*, arguing that the SK composed by Īśvarakṛṣṇa possesses all of them. The author says that one of the components of a *tantra* is 'name' (*saṃjñā*).[31] The author describes two types of names, arguing that Īśvarakṛṣṇa's treatise SK, which is a genuine *tantra*, is based on the proper (that is, meaningful) names/special terms (*saṃjñā*). It follows from this fragment that the Sāṃkhya doctrine presented in the works of different Sāṃkhya teachers, to which Īśvarakṛṣṇa, the author of the SK, belongs, is based only on those special terms which were given originally by Kapila (who is according to Sāṃkhya tradition the founder of Sāṃkhya), for the author says that the later teachers being the followers of Kapila's doctrine do not produce any new special terms of the Sāṃkhya system.

The author says that there are two categories of names (*saṃjñā*): 'based on the [etymological] meaning' (or 'based on the meanings [of the meaningful parts of which the word consists]') (*artha-nibandhana*) and 'based [merely] on the own form [of the word]' (*svarūpa-nibandhana*). The first category includes names with such an etymological meaning that reveals the specific features of the thing named. The author of the YD gives the following examples: '*pācaka*' ('a cook'), '*lāvaka*' ('a cutter'); *pradhāna* is called so because "[all her] products are primarily placed in her" (*pradhīyante 'tra vikārāḥ*); *puruṣa* is called so because he "rests in the body" (*puri śete*).[32,33] The second category embraces names with such an etymological meaning which says nothing about the nature of the thing. The examples given by the author are '*gaja-karṇa*', literally meaning 'an elephant ear', and '*aśva-karṇa*', literally meaning 'a horse ear', being the botanical names of the plants or the proper names.

The author says that Kapila's original teaching is based on *artha-nibandhana* names only, and that the supreme seer (*ṛṣi*) Kapila "bestowed" (*vidadhat*) them "with great care" (*prayatnataḥ*), after "having grasped the own nature (*svarūpa*) of all the principles (*tattva*) through the seer's cognition (*ārṣeṇa jñānena*)". It is clear that all names given by Kapila (these are the names of the *tattva*s and probably also other terms of the Sāṃkhya system) are based on his direct insight into the essence of things denoted by them. Kapila's cognition of the nature of all the Sāṃkhya *tattva*s (the main structural principles of Sāṃkhya ontology) should be interpreted as

---

Footnote 30 continued

eva saṃjñinaṃ pratyāyayati / tad yathā pācako lāvakaḥ iti / svarūpanibandhanā punaḥ saṃjñipratyāyanopāyamātraṃ svarūpamātropakāriṇī vināvayavārthaṃ samayavaśād atathābhūtam api saṃjñinam pratyāyayati / tad yathā gajakarṇo 'śvakarṇa iti / prayatnato bhagavataḥ paramarṣer ārṣeṇa jñānena sarvatattvānāṃ svarūpam upalabhya saṃjñāṃ vidadhato nāsti svarūpanibandhanaḥ śabdaḥ / tad yathā pradhīyante 'tra vikāra iti pradhānam / puri śete iti puruṣa ity ādi / tanmatānusāriṇām apy ācāryāṇāṃ tābhir eva saṃvyavahārān nāsty apūrvasaṃjñāvidhānaṃ praty ādaraḥ / (Yuktidīpikā 1998, p. 7, vv. 16–27.)

[31] About these components, one of which is the terminological name/the special term, see entries *Tantraguṇaḥ, Tantrayuktiḥ* (Oberhammer et al. 1996, pp. 109–112), and *Saṃjñā* (Oberhammer et al. 2006, pp. 219–223).

[32] Literally: 'rests ($\sqrt{śī}$) in the fortress (*pur*)'.

[33] The author gives the popular traditional etymologies of '*pradhāna*' and '*puruṣa*'. These etymologies are not correct from the point of view of scientific linguistics. They express certain religious or philosophic beliefs.

a direct insight into the nature of all things, for 25 *tattva*s, being the ultimate objects of knowledge, embrace everything that exists.

What can we say about the relationship between a word and its meaning on the basis of this fragment? I think we can conclude that all words are conventional in their origin, because Kapila's creating the Sāṃkhya terms should be understood as establishing the primary linguistic convention. First I shall try to prove that Kapila's act in regard to the special terms of the Sāṃkhya system is an act of *creation* of these terms, that is, an act of establishing the linguistic *convention*. Next I shall attempt to prove that the convention established by Kapila is a *primary* linguistic convention.

What are the arguments confirming that Kapila does not manifest already existing names but *creates* them? The action of Kapila in regard to the names is denoted by the word '*vidadhat*' (literally: 'distributing'; 'granting', 'bestowing'; 'producing', 'creating'), being a derivative (a present active participle) of the verb '*vi-√dhā*'. The verb '*vi-√dhā*' has a wide range of meanings. To this range the following meanings belong: 'to distribute'; 'to grant', 'to bestow'; 'to produce', 'to create'. Does Kapila disclose already existing names or create them? Answering this question is of great importance for clarifying the author's view on the relationship between a word and its meaning. If we accept that Kapila *creates* the names, we can say that Kapila is the author of the linguistic convention. If we assume that Kapila only discloses already existing names to the future users of language, we can say that the connection between these names and their meanings is natural, namely, exists independently of the will of Kapila or any other person. Below I present the arguments for interpreting Kapila's act as an act of *creation* of names. I shall attempt to prove that the *artha-nibandhana* names bestowed by Kapila are conventional in their origin; the relationship between these words and their meanings, though not random, is nevertheless not inborn, not eternal, and not inseparable.

First, in the same fragment, in a similar and close context, there is another derivative of the verb '*vi-√dhā*', that is, '*vidhāna*', which means in this context 'creation'. It denotes the action of the 'teachers' (*ācārya*) in regard to Sāṃkhya terms, and it is clear from the context that the author of the YD speaks here about the possibility of *creation* of new terms by Sāṃkhya teachers. This appearance of '*vidhāna*' in the same context in the meaning of 'creation' can be considered an argument for interpreting the action of Kapila as *creation* of names.

Second, there is no meaning which conveys the idea of manifesting, disclosing, or revealing among the main dictionary meanings of the verb *vi-√dhā*. If the author intended to convey the idea of manifesting by Kapila already existing names, he would probably use some other expression. If we take the first dictionary meaning 'to distribute' as the meaning intended by the author of the YD, we cannot make a conclusion that the relation between the words bestowed by Kapila and their meanings is natural. The idea of 'distribution' of names seems to be incompatible with the idea of the natural relationship between these names and their meanings, for names which are naturally and inseparably connected to their meanings need no 'distribution'.

Third, the author says that Kapila creates (*vi-√dhā*) the names 'with great care' ('with special effort', 'carefully') (*prayatnataḥ*). Special effort, care, or carefulness is more needed in the case of *creation* of names than in the case of merely making them manifest.

Fourth, the author does not say a word about Kapila's knowledge of already existing names. It does not follow from Kapila's cognition of all things that he also cognizes names existing independently of his will, for in Indian philosophy a person (or persons) possessing knowledge of things can play the role of the creator (or the creators) of words naming these things. For example, in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika cognition of things is the basis of creation of their names. As it follows from *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* II, 1, 17–19, names (*saṃjñā*) of things imperceptible by ordinary people are created by persons "distinguished from ourselves" (*asmad-viśiṣṭānām*) on the basis of their perception of these things. In the later texts of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika all-knowing Īśvara creates names, being the author of the primary linguistic convention (see, for example: Candrānanda's *Vaiśeṣikasūtravṛtti* II, 1, 18–19; *Nyāyamañjarī* of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (Potter et al. 1977, pp. 371, 377–378; Vācaspati Miśra's *Nyāyavārtti-katātparyaṭīkā* II, 1, 52–56; Śaṅkara Miśra's *Upaskāra* VII, 2, 20 and II, 1, 18–19). It does not follow from Īśvara's omniscience that he manifests names which exist independently of his will.

Fifth, this fragment brings to mind some parallels between the role of all-knowing Kapila, who is characterized in the YD (see YD 1 and 69) as "born at the beginning of the world" (*viśva-agra-ja*),[34] and the role of omniscient Īśvara in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, who creates names at the beginning of a new cycle of existence of the world. Kapila is the knower of all things; he creates the names on the basis of direct insight into the *own nature* (*svarūpa*) of the things he names. This knowledge is necessary for giving correct, that is, meaningful names—the names which convey information about the specific features of the things named. In Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika omniscient Īśvara is the author of the primary linguistic convention which is established (re-created) by him according to his will at the beginning of a new cycle of existence of the world. In fact, the Vedas and the language convention established by Īśvara are the same in all the creations. The following fragment from *Nyāyamañjarī* of Nyāya philosopher Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, cited by Pollock (1985, p. 516), illustrates the Nyāya idea of the persistence of the Vedas: "All sciences have existed, precisely like the *vedas*, from the first creation. People, however, ascribe them to one or another human author who has sought to abbreviate or expand them." Though the Vedas and the primary language convention are the same in all the creations (in this sense we can say that they are persistent), they are dependent on the will of Īśvara, who is identified by the adherers of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika as their author, and for this reason the relationship between a word and its meaning established by Īśvara is considered as conventional.

Taking into account these arguments, I am inclined to think that the author of the YD implies that the Sāṃkhya terms bestowed by Kapila are conventional in their origin. The interpretation of Kapila's action (denoted by the derivative of the verb *vi-√dhā*) in regard to these terms as *creation* of them seems to be more natural and

---

[34] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 8, v. 20; p. 267, v. 14.

substantiated than any other interpretation. Though the names bestowed by Kapila are not accidental (for they convey information about the specific features of the things named), they are *created* by him (in accordance with his knowledge of these things) and therefore conventional in their origin.[35]

It is clear from this fragment that Kapila creates core terms of the Sāṃkhya system: Kapila creates names for the *tattva*s and probably also other special terms of the Sāṃkhya doctrine. For the Sāṃkhyas their own system is the highest science: one can attain the highest goal—*mokṣa*—only through this science (see SK 2, 69, and 70 together with the commentaries to these *kārikā*s). They ascribe to their own system the status of the Veda or even higher (see P 69 and SVṛ, SSVṛ, JM, and MV 70). In YD 2 the author says that the highest goal prescribed in Sāṃkhya is the same as the highest goal prescribed in *śruti*, and that the Sāṃkhya path of liberation through knowledge (*jñāna*) is considered in *śruti* the sole path which leads to the permanent and complete elimination of all kinds of suffering (*duḥkha*). The author claims that Sāṃkhya is the Vedic doctrine, for the highest goal prescribed in Sāṃkhya, as well as the Sāṃkhya path of realization of this goal, are the same as the highest goal and the path of its realization prescribed in the Upaniṣads, which are the quintessence of the Vedas.[36] From all this we can conclude that according to the Sāṃkhyas the special terms of the Sāṃkhya system are the same as the special terms of the Vedas, that is, of the Vedic science of liberation through knowledge which is considered by the Sāṃkhyas the highest science of the Vedas. Thus Kapila appears at the beginning of the world cycle (as it is mentioned above, he is characterized in the YD as "born at the beginning of the world") and *creates the basic Sāṃkhya-Vedic terms*. The Vedas are often believed to appear at the very beginning of each creation. If the basic Sāṃkhya-Vedic terms are conventional in their origin, this convention cannot be other convention than the primary linguistic convention. As it has been mentioned above, the role of Kapila is similar to the role of omniscient Īśvara in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, which creates names (establishes the primary linguistic convention) and the Vedas at the beginning of a new cycle of existence of the world. In Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika the words of the Vedas are the words created by Īśvara, that is, the words of the primary linguistic convention.

To sum it up, the convention of Kapila, who creates the special terms of the Sāṃkhya system, is the primary linguistic convention. If the primary linguistic convention takes place, then all words are conventional in their origin.

---

[35] *Artha-nibandhana* words, though conventional in their origin, are not random. It may turn out to be fruitful to compare this idea of convention which is based on the nature of a thing and is therefore not random with Plato's idea of the relationship between a word and its meaning. Perelmuter (1980) in his profound and careful research devoted to Plato's linguistic views writes that in the dialogue *Cratylus* Plato holds the view that the relationship between a word and its meaning (that is, the thing denoted by it), though established by convention, is not *merely* conventional (random), for it is based on the nature of the thing.

[36] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 50, v. 12–p. 54, v. 16.

Evidence 2

The second evidence for Sāṃkhya's acceptance of the conventional origin of the relationship between a word and its meaning we find in YD 6. It is in the passage devoted to polemics in which the author argues that authoritative verbal testimony (*āpta-vacana*; *śabda*; *āgama*) is irreducible to inference (*anumāna*).[37] Refuting an opponent's view that authoritative verbal testimony is a kind of inference, the author tries to show that the relation between a word and its meaning, unlike the relation between a logical sign (*liṅga*) and the thing to be proved by it (*sādhya*; *liṅgin*) in an inference, is not inseparable and natural. The author says that the same word can be connected with different meanings, that is, denote different things, and the same thing can be denoted by different words. He holds that the same word in different places (regions) and different times can have different meanings, and the same meaning can be conveyed by different words. Moreover, the author adds, the word's use in one or another meaning depends on the intention (*iṣṭa*; *abhiprāya*; *apekṣā*) of the speaker. The author gives concrete examples to support his point of view. The author contrasts the relationship between a word and its meaning with the inseparable relationship between a logical sign and the thing to be proved by it in an inference. He notices that smoke cannot be separated from fire, which essentially distinguishes the relationship between smoke and fire from the relationship between a word and its meaning. Contrasting the logical sign with the word, the author says that "the logical sign is natural" (*svābhāvikaṁ liṅgam*),[38] that is, it is by its nature and inseparably connected to the thing to be proved by it (*sādhya*); by saying this, the author implies that the relationship between a word and its meaning, unlike the relationship between a logical sign and the thing to be proved by it, is not natural and inseparable. The author notices that a word is capable of denoting every thing, and this universal denotative power of a word is limited by man (*puruṣa*). He ends the fragment which interests us with the following words:

> It is not so that just as one word (*śabda*) uttered in the world, depending on [its] usage by man (*puruṣa-viniyoga-apekṣa*), is capable of denoting every thing, in the same manner one logical sign (*liṅga*) is capable of making known every thing through some reasoning. Therefore [authoritative] word (*śabda*) is not a logical sign.[39]

> Evidence Which Does not Agree with the Theory of the Conventional Relationship between a Word and Its Meaning and Imply That This Relationship Is Natural

Classical Sāṃkhya texts provide the evidence which seems to contradict the theory of the conventional origin of the relationship between a word and its meaning, implying that this relationship is natural. This evidence is the idea of the authorless

---

[37] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 101, v. 12–p. 103, v. 7.

[38] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 102, v. 7.

[39] *yathā caikaḥ śabdo jagaty evam uditaḥ puruṣaviniyogāpekṣaḥ sarvam artham abhidhātuṁ samartho <na> tathaikaṁ liṅgaṁ kayācid yuktyā sarvārthapratyayanasamartham / tasmān na śabdo liṅgam /* (*Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 103, vv. 4–7.)

Vedas we find in most of the classical Sāṁkhya texts. The author of the YD and Vācaspati Miśra in the TK state directly that the Vedas have no author (YD 5[40]; TK 2 and 5). Four other classical Sāṁkhya commentators, though they do not formulate their view explicitly, suggest that the Vedas are authorless (see SVṛ 5, SSVṛ 5, GB 5, MV 5). A detailed analysis of these classical Sāṁkhya fragments, containing the idea of the authorless Vedas, is presented in my article "Classical Sāṁkhya on the Authorship of the Vedas", published in the "Journal of Indian Philosophy" (Lutsyshyna 2012).

If the Vedas are authorless, that is, not created by some author, human or divine, the following question arises: how do they come into existence? There were philosophers, for example, Śaṅkara and adherers of his Advaita, Bhartṛhari the Grammarian and his followers, who accepted the concept of a periodic re-manifestation of the authorless Vedas. This concept was probably shared also by Sāṁkhyas: they held that the Vedas arise from *prakṛti* spontaneously at the beginning of a new cycle of existence of the world. It is worth noticing that according to the *Sāṁkhyasūtra*s and Aniruddha's commentary to it called the *Sāṁkhyasūtravṛtti*, which are important post-classical Sāṁkhya texts, the authorless, but uneternal Vedas evolve from *prakṛti* spontaneously (see *Sāṁkhyasūtra*s and *Sāṁkhyasūtravṛtti* V, 46–50).

The idea of the authorless Vedas, reemerging from *prakṛti* at the beginning of a new creation, seems to be incompatible with the theory of a primary linguistic convention as a source of language. This idea implies that the relationship between a word and its meaning is natural and stable: language sounds and words from which the Vedas consist are the products of a natural development of *prakṛti* (ungoverned by any consciousness); they reappear from *prakṛti* at the beginning of each new creation and preserve stability till the next periodic dissolution (*pralaya*) of the world.

If Sāṁkhya in some passages of its texts tended to accept this view, it was probably influenced by Mīmāṁsā which held that word sounds, words, and the Vedas are eternal, that is, have neither beginning nor an end. In the context of Sāṁkhya, which accepts, unlike Mīmāṁsā, the concept of periodic dissolutions of the world, this stability of language sound, word, and the Vedas can be understood not as *eternal* actual existence but as duration from the beginning of creation to the *pralaya* and reappearance from *prakṛti* (where they subsists in a potential state during the *pralaya*) at the beginning of a new cycle of existence of the world.

Is such a view compatible with the Sāṁkhya teaching? This view, influenced by the Mīmāṁsā conception of language sound and word, seems to be incompatible with the Sāṁkhya doctrine. In Mīmāṁsā each language sound and word, though it is not always manifested (a speaker is needed to manifest it, namely, to make it perceptible), is always existent as a separate entity and never loses its identity; words preserve their identity and connection with their meanings also before and after their manifestation by the speaker. According to Sāṁkhya, an unmanifested state of every thing originated from *prakṛti*, including sounds and words, is a state of

---

[40] *Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 87, vv. 8–9.

its dissolution into its material cause, that is, a state of its essential unity with its material cause and non-distinction from it.[41]

What is the immediate material cause of language sounds and words? It is hardly possible to give a clear, unambiguous answer to this question on the basis of the classical Sāṁkhya texts. On one side, according to the YD, the phoneme (*varṇa*) and the word (*pada*) are modifications (*vikāra*)[42] or manifestations (*abhivyakti*)[43] of sound (*śabda*) which is a quality of the gross element(s), and it follows from this that the unmanifested state of different language sounds and words is a state of their non-distinction from the gross element.

On the other side, there are reasons for interpreting the unmanifested state of sounds and words as a state of their latent (potential) existence in the *tanmātra* of sound (*śabda-tanmātra*) or each of the five *tanmātras*[44] (and not in the gross element). As it follows from the passage of YD 38 in which the author comments on the third line of SK 38 where the *bhūta*s are characterized as *viśeṣa* ('differenti-ated'), the qualities of the *bhūta*s are 'differentiated', that is, we can distinguish many different sounds, touches, colours, tastes, and smells within the *bhūta*s.[45] If different sounds exist in the gross elements in the manifest state, then the unmanifest state of these sounds should be interpreted as a state of their potential existence in the *tanmātra*(s), for the *tanmātra*s are immediate material causes of the *bhūta*s. Moreover, in YD 38 the author suggests that those products of *prakṛti* which are modifications of the gross elements (like cow, etc.) arise due to the joining together of several different gross elements.[46] But language sounds and words are not combinations of several gross elements (like a cow, a pot, or a tree), for sound is only a quality of the gross element(s). It can follow from this that language sounds and words are not modifications of the gross element (they are the gross element itself), but modifications of the *tanmātra*.

The state of potential existence of sounds or words in the *tanmātra* is a state of their unity with it, that is, a state of their dissolution in the *tanmātra*. In the state of

---

[41] See the classical Sāṁkhya commentaries to *kārikā* 15 of Īśvarakṛṣṇa's SK, namely, the fragment of these commentaries in which the Sāṁkhya authors comment on the fifth (the last) SK argument for *avyakta*'s ('the unmanifest', by which the unevolved *prakṛti* is meant) being the ultimate material cause. It follows from the commentaries that things originated from *prakṛti* in a state of their dissolution into their material cause are not distinct from this cause, that is, do not exist as separate entities. Thus all the gross material things which consist of the five gross elements (*bhūta*, *mahābhūta*) in the state of unity with their immediate material cause are not different from the gross elements, the five gross elements in this state are not different from *tanmātra*s, etc. In most of the commentaries it is said that different entities in the state of their dissolution into their immediate material cause are *indistinguishably* (*avibhāgaṁ*) united with it (see P, SVṛ, SSVṛ, GB, and MV 15).

[42] See YD 34 (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 218, vv. 9–10).

[43] See YD 29 (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 207, vv. 29–31).

[44] The author of the YD states forth quite original conception of the *tanmātra*s, which is untypical for Sāṁkhya, for we do not find this conception in other classical Sāṁkhya commentaries. According to the YD, not only the gross elements which arise from the *tanmātra*s but also the *tanmātra*s themselves possess qualities (*guṇa*), and sound is a quality of each of the five *tanmātra*s (not only of the *śabda-tanmātra*) (*Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 225, vv. 15–19). This untypical understanding of the *tanmātra*s is highlighted by Bronkhorst (1999, p. 26).

[45] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 225, v. 19–p. 227, v. 16.

[46] *Yuktidīpikā*1998, p. 226, v. 12–13.

dissolution in the *tanmātra* sounds and words lose their peculiarities and mutual distinctions. It is said in the YD that the *śabda-tanmātra* is an undifferentiated principle of sound, that is, there are no specific sounds within it (it is not an aggregate of specific, distinct sounds or words). Sāṃkhya calls the *tanmātra*s 'undifferentiated' (*aviśeṣa*) principles (see SK 34 and 38 together with the commentaries to these *kārikā*s). An important piece of evidence confirming that there are no different sounds within the *śabda-tanmātra* is given in the YD, in its commentary on the 38th *kārikā* of the SK. Explaining the first line of the 38th *kārikā* where the *tanmātra*s are characterized as *aviśeṣa*, the author states that "there is no differentiation (*viśeṣa*) within the same kind" (*tulya-jātīya-viśeṣa-anupapatti*) in the case of the *tanmātra*s. As to the *śabda-tanmātra*, the author says that specific sounds (sounds possessing any distinctive features) do not exist within it.[47]

Taking into account these aspects of the Sāṃkhya teaching, we can conclude that it is hardly possible to agree the Mīmāṃsā conception of language sound, word, and the Vedas with the Sāṃkhya doctrine.

---

[47] The YD commentary on the first line of SK 38, which sounds *tanmātrāṇy aviśeṣāḥ* ("the *tanmātra*s are undifferentiated"), is translated and analyzed by Bronkhorst (1999, p. 25). My rendering of the first line of SK 38 and of some terms differs from the rendering of Bronkhorst, but there is no need to accentuate these differences here. I shall cite his careful translation of this important fragment together with a part of his commentary: "Sāṃkhya Kārikā 38 begins with the words *tanmātrāṇy aviśeṣāḥ* "The 'ones without specific features' (*aviśeṣa*) are the *tanmātra*s". The Yuktidīpikā comments:

Those indeed are the ones without specific features. Which are the *tanmātra*s? They are *śabdatanmātra*, *sparśatanmātra*, *rūpatanmātra*, *rasatanmātra*, and *gandhatanmātra*. Why are they [called] *tanmātra*s? Because specific features of the same kind are not possible [in them]. When there is no difference of kind, e.g. sound, no other specific features—such as the accents called *udātta*, *anudātta*, *svarita*, or the being nasal—are found in it, and that is why it is [called] *śabdatanmātra* (approx. 'sound and nothing but that'). In the same way [there are no specific features] such as 'soft', 'hard' etc. in the *tanmātra* of touch; [no specific features] such as 'white', 'black' etc. in the *tanmātra* of colour; [no specific features] such as 'sweet', 'sour' etc. in the *tanmātra* of taste; [and no specific features] such as 'fragrant' etc. in the *tanmātra* of smell. For this reason only the general feature of each quality is present in the [*tanmātra*s], no specific feature; and this is why those 'ones without specific features' are the *tanmātra*s.

We are primarily interested in the *śabdatanmātra*. It is here presented as sound without the specific features that may accompany sound. It is, moreover, different from the quality sound. The quality sound, we may assume, possesses all the specific features which the *śabdatanmātra* is here stated not to possess" (Bronkhorst 1999, p. 25).
The Sanskrit original of this fragment of the YD (*Yuktidīpikā* 1998, p. 224, v. 19—p. 225, v. 2):

... te khalv aviśeṣāḥ /
kāni punas tanmātrāṇīti /
ucyate śabdatanmātraṃ sparśatanmātraṃ rūpatanmātraṃ rasatanmātraṃ gandhatanmātram iti /
kathaṃ punas tanmātrāṇīti /
ucyate tulyajātīyaviśeṣānupapatteḥ / anye śabdajātyabhede 'pi sati viśeṣā udāttānudāttasva-ritānunāsikādayas tatra na santi / tasmāc chabdatanmātram / evaṃ sparśatanmātre mṛdukaṭhinādayaḥ / evaṃ rūpatanmātre śuklakṛṣṇādayaḥ / evaṃ rasatanmātre madhurāmlādayaḥ / evaṃ gandhatanmātre surabhyādayaḥ / tasmāt tasya tasya guṇasya sāmānyam evātra na viśeṣa iti tanmātrāṇy ete 'viśeṣāḥ /

Conclusion and Perspectives for Future Research

It is possible to reconstruct two different and conflicting views on the relationship between a word and its meaning on the basis of the classical Sāṃkhya texts. The first view, which we can find in the YD, is that all words are conventional in their origin. According to the YD, Kapila, who is identified by the Sāṃkhya tradition as its founder, is the author of the primary linguistic convention. The second view is that the relationship between a word and its meaning is natural. It is the implication of the Sāṃkhya idea of the authorless Vedas which can be reconstructed on the basis of the majority of the classical Sāṃkhya texts (the YD and five other commentaries: the SVṛ, the SSVṛ, the GB, the MV, and the TK). This idea of the authorless Vedas, evolving from *prakṛti* at the beginning of a new creation, implies that the relationship between a word and its meaning is natural and stable: it follows from this idea that language sounds and words from which the Vedas consist are the products of a natural development of *prakṛti* (ungoverned by any consciousness), reappearing from *prakṛti* at the beginning of each new creation and preserving stability till the next periodic dissolution (*pralaya*) of the world.

Which of these views is really Sāṃkhya's, and which of these views is more compatible with the Sāṃkhya doctrine? It is difficult or maybe even impossible to answer these questions. The first of these views resembles the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of the primary linguistic convention and the conventional origin of all words. It seems not to agree with the Sāṃkhya idea that all things which evolve from *prakṛti* (including words) are the products of its spontaneous development, not governed by any consciousness (see SK 57 and the commentaries to this *kārikā*).[48] The second Sāṃkhya view on word and the relationship between a word and its meaning is probably influenced by Mīmāṃsā.[49] This view is incompatible with the Sāṃkhya doctrine, for in this doctrine there is hardly any place for word or sound preserving its identity (its nature of being this very word or sound, distinct from other words and sounds) in the unmanifested state. It seems like classical Sāṃkhya, not having developed its own detailed theories of sound, word, and the relationship between a word and its meaning, oscillated between different views.[50] Answering

---

[48] Our ordinary observations, indicating that such things as books, pots, etc., come into existence due to the conscious efforts of some author, contradict this Sāṃkhya idea.

[49] About the Mīmāṃsā influence on the fragments of the YD and the TK in which the authors of these commentaries state that the Vedas have no author see my article (Lutsyshyna 2012, pp. 461–463, 465).

[50] I shall venture to say that the sister Yoga *darśana* also did not develop a consistent and detailed view on the relationship between a word and its meaning, oscillating between different theories. According to the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* (see I, 27), the relationship between a word and its meaning (*śabda-artha-saṃbandha*) is permanent (*sthita*), and convention (*saṃketa*) is understood in this text not as an act of agreement being an act of creation of the relation between a word and its meaning unrelated before this act, but as an established usage of words (established custom of usage of words). It is said that the relation between a word and its meaning is not created by convention but only made known through it. This understanding of a language convention is similar to its understanding by Bhartṛhari the Grammarian and his followers (about Bhartṛhari's and Helārāja's notion of language convention see the article of Houben 1992). In the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* the relation between a word and its meaning is compared to the relation between a father and his son; the author implies that this relationship is natural. It is said that the language convention is the same in all the creations (*sarga*). In the context of Yoga teaching, like in the context of Sāṃkhya, this permanent relationship should be understood as existing from *pralaya* to *pralaya* and

the questions formulated above could be an area for future research. This research should include a careful examination of pre-Īśvarakṛṣṇa Sāṃkhya material, post-classical Sāṃkhya texts, texts of the sister Yoga *darśana*, as well as evidence presented in the texts which do not belong to the Sāṃkhya or Yoga *darśana*.

References and Abbreviations

Sāṃkhya Sanskrit Texts and Abbreviations

GB. *Sāṃkhyakārikābhāṣya*, or *Gauḍapādabhāṣya* = *The Sāṅkhya Kārikā with an exposition called Candrikā by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, and Gauḍapādācārya's commentary* (1883). Edited by Becanarāma Tripāṭhī. Benares: Messrs. Braj B. Das & Co. (Benares Sanskrit Series. No. 9.)

JM. *Jayamaṅgalā* = *Sāṃkhyakārikā of Śrīmad Īśvarakṛṣṇa with the Māṭharavṛtti of Māṭharācārya and the Jayamaṅgalā of Śrī Śaṅkara* (1970). Edited by Viṣṇuprasāda Śarmā [MV] and Satkāriśarmā Vaṅgīya [JM]. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series. No. 56.)

MV. *Māṭharavṛtti*—see JM. *Jayamaṅgalā*.

P. The commentary translated into Chinese by Paramārtha = (1) La Sāṃkhyakārikā étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise (II). Traité sur les « Septante d'or » (Suvarṇasaptati) ou Traité sur la philosophie Sāṃkhya (Sāṃkhyaśāstra) traduit par Paramārtha (1904). Traduit de chinois par Junjiro Takakusu. Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient 4, pp. 978–1064. (2) *Suvarṇasaptati Śāstra. Sāṅkhya-Kārikā-Saptati of Īśvara-Kṛṣṇa with a commentary* (1944). Reconstructed into Sanskrit from the Chinese translation of Paramārtha and edited with English notes, introduction and appendices by N. Aiyaswami Sastri. Tirupati: Tirūmalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Press. (Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series 7). (3) The Sāṃkhya Kārikā studied in the light of its Chinese version (1932, 1933). Translated [from the French translation of Takakusu] by S.S. Suryanarayanan [known also as S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri]. *Journal of the Madras University* 4(Supplement); 5, pp. 81–114.

Sāṃkhyasūtras and *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* = *Aniruddha's commentary and the original parts of the Vedāntin Mahādeva's commentary to the Sāṃkhya Sūtras* (1888). Edited with indices by R. Garbe. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Footnote 50 continued

reappearing from *prakṛti* at the beginning of a new cycle of existence of the world. Though according to the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* the relationship between a word and its meaning is permanent and natural, Vācaspati Miśra in his Yoga commentary *Tattvavaiśāradī* (see I, 27) mentions that the language convention is reestablished by Īśvara at the beginning of every new cycle of existence of the world in accordance with the convention of the previous creations. It is hardly possible to agree the idea of the natural relationship of a word and its meaning with this role of Īśvara. These Yoga fragments are difficult to interpret. They require a detailed and profound analysis. Comparison of Sāṃkhya and Yoga views on word and the relationship between a word and its meaning can be fruitful and helpful in clarifying the point of view of both of these schools, though we should always be careful in trying to reconstruct ideas of one *darśana* on the basis of ideas of other *darśana*. It is worth noticing that there are evident parallels between the role of Īśvara in Yoga and the role of Kapila in Sāṃkhya which they have in expounding Yoga/Sāṃkhya teaching for the sake of liberation of all beings suffering in *saṃsāra* (see *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* I, 25).

SK.   *Sāṃkhyakārikā = Īśvarakṛṣṇa:Sāṃkhyakārikā* (1998). Edited by Ferenc Ruzsa. http://gretil. sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskr/6_sastra/3_phil/samkhya/isvskaru.htm. Accessed 5 December 2011.

SSVṛ.   *Sāṃkhyasaptativṛtti = Sāṃkhya-Saptati-Vṛtti (V1)* (1973). Edited by Esther A. Solomon. Ahmedabad: Gujarat University. (Bibliotheca Indica. New Series. No. 688.)

SVṛ.   *Sāṃkhyavṛtti = Sāṃkhya-Vṛtti (V2)* (1973). Edited by Esther A. Solomon. Ahmedabad: Gujarat University.

TK.   *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī = Sankhyatatwa Koumudi by Bachaspati Misra* (1871). Edited with a commentary by Taranatha Tarkavachaspati. Calcutta: Sucharu Press.

YD.   *Yuktidīpikā = Yuktidīpikā. The most significant commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā* (1998). Critically edited by Albrecht Wezler and Shujun Motegi (Vol. I). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 44.)

Other Literature

Bronkhorst, J. (1999). Studies on Bhartṛhari, 8: *Prākṛta dhvani* and the Sāṃkhya *tanmātras*. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 27*(1–2), 23–33.

Chakravarti, P. (1951). *Origin and development of the Sāṃkhya system of thought*. Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing and Publishing House Limited.

Coward, H. G., & Raja, K. K. (Eds.). (2001). *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies*. Vol. V: *The philosophy of the Grammarians*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Dravid, R. R. (1972). *The problem of universals in Indian philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Frauwallner, E. (1973). *History of Indian philosophy.* Vol. I: *The philosophy of the Veda and of the Epic— The Buddha and the Jina—The Sāṃkhya and the classical Yoga-system* (Translated from original German into English by V. M. Bedekar; Introduction by L. Gabriel). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Ganeri, J. (1996). Meaning and reference in classical India. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 24*(1), 1–19.

Ganeri, J. (2011). *Artha: meaning. Testimony and the theory of meaning in Indian philosophical analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harzer Clear, E. (1990). Īśvarakṛṣṇa's two-level-perception: propositional and non-propositional. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 18*(4), 305–340.

Houben, J. E. M. (1992). Bhartṛhari's *Samaya* / Helārāja's *Saṃketa*. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 20*(2), 219–242.

Houben, J. E. M. (1995). *The Saṃbandha-Samuddeśa (Chapter on relation) and Bhartṛhari's philosophy of language*. Groningen: Egbert Forstein. (Gonda Indological Studies. Vol. II.)

Kumar, S. (1983). *Sāṃkhya thought in the Brahmanical systems of Indian philosophy*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.

Larson, G. J., & Bhattacharya, R. S. (Eds.). (1987). *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies.* Vol. IV: *Sāṃkhya: A dualist tradition in Indian philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Lutsyshyna 2011 = Луцишина, Олена Анатоліївна (2011). Невизначене (*nirvikalpaka*) та визначене (*savikalpaka*) сприйняття у класичній та постанкласичній санкх'ї. *Східний світ*, 2011(2), pp. 186–193.

Lutsyshyna, O. (2012). Classical Sāṃkhya on the authorship of the Vedas. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 40*(4), 453–467.

Maas, P. A. (2010). Valid knowledge and belief in classical Sāṃkhya-Yoga. In Piotr Balcerowicz (Ed.), *Logic and belief in Indian philosophy* (pp. 383–392). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Private Limited. (*Warsaw Indological Studies*. No. 3.)

Malinar, A. (1999). *Prakṛti* as *sāmānya*. *Asiatische Studien, LIII*(3), 619–644.

Mejor, M. (2004). Some observations on the date of the *Yuktidīpikā* (*A propos* of the new edition). In P. Balcerowicz & M. Mejor (Eds.), *Essays in Indian philosophy, religion and literature* (pp. 399–433). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Mīmāṃsāsūtras—see *Śābarabhāṣya*.

Nyāyasūtras, *Nyāyabhāṣya*, *Nyāyavārttika* and *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā = Nyāyadarśanam: with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyaṭīkā and Viśvanātha's Vṛtti.* (1936, 1944). (Chapter I, section I) critically edited with notes by Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha

and (chapters I-ii–V) by Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha and Hemantakumar Tarkatirtha. With an introduction by Narendra Chandra Vedantatirtha. Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing & Publishing House. (Calcutta Sanskrit Series 18, 29.)

Oberhammer, G., Prets, E., & Prandstetter, J. (1996). *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien. Ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie.* Band 2: *U–Pū.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften; Philosophische-Historische Klasse; Denkschriften 248; Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 17.)

Oberhammer, G., Prets, E., & Prandstetter, J. (2006). *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien. Ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie.* Band 3: *Pra–H.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften; Philosophische-Historische Klasse; Denkschriften 343; Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 49.)

Perelmuter = Перельмутер, И. А. (1980). Платон. In А. В. Десницкая, С. Д. Кацнельсон (Eds.), *История лингвистических учений. Древний мир* (pp. 130–156). Ленинград: «Наука».

Pollock, S. (1985). The theory of practice and the practice of theory in Indian intellectual history. *Journal of the American Oriental Society, 105*(3), 499–519.

Potter, K. H. (Ed.). (1981). *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies.* Vol. III: *Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṁkara and his pupils.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Potter, K. H., Bhattacharya, J. V., & Arya, U. (1977). *Nyāyamañjarī.* Summary. In K. H. Potter (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies.* Vol. II: *Indian metaphysics and epistemology: The tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa* (pp. 343–394). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Raja, K. K. (1969). *Indian theories of meaning.* Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.

Raja, K. K. (2001a). Helārāja. Commentary on Bhartṛhari's *Trikāṇḍī.* Survey of philosophical topics. In H. G. Coward & K. K. Raja (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies.* Vol. V: *The philosophy of the Grammarians* (pp. 194–197). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Raja, K. K. (2001b). Philosophical elements in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya.* In H. G. Coward & K. K. Raja (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies.* Vol. V: *The philosophy of the Grammarians* (pp. 115–119). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Rājamārtaṇḍa = The Yoga aphorisms of Patañjali with the commentary of Bhoja Rāja (1883). Edited and translated by Rājendralāla Mitra. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal. (Bibliotheca Indica. New Series. Nos. 462, 478, 482, and 491–492.)

Śābarabhāṣya = The aphorisms of the Mīmāṁsā by Jaimini with the commentary of Śavara-Svāmin. Vol. I: *Adhyāyas I–VI* (1873). Edited by Maheśacandra Nyāyaratna. Calcutta: Gaṇeśa Press. (Bibliotheca Indica. New Series. Nos. 44, 85, 95, 101, 115, 142, 154, 174, and 208.)

Saha, S. R. (2001). *Tattvacintamāṇi.* Book four: verbal testimony (language). Section ten: verbal potency (II) (*jātiśaktivāda*). Summary by Sukha Ranjan Saha. In K. H. Potter & S. Bhattacharyya (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies.* Vol. VI: *Indian philosophical analysis: Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika from Gaṅgeśa to Raghunātha Śiromaṇi* (pp. 294–300). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.

Sajdek, P. (2011). *Spór o słowo. Obrona Maṇḍany Miśry teorii sphoṭy.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Siderits, M. (1986). The sense–reference distinction in Indian philosophy of language. *Synthese, 69*, 81–106.

Siderits, M. (1991). *Indian philosophy of language: Studies in selected issues.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Vol. 46.)

Taber, J. A. (1989). The theory of the sentence in Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and Western philosophy. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 17*(4), 407–430.

Taber, J. A. (2002). Mohanty on *śabdapramāṇa. Journal of Indian Philosophy, 30*(2), 161–190.

Takenaka, T. (1977). *Sāmānya, sārūpya,* and *sādṛśya* – Kumārila's criticism of the similarity theory (*Ślokavārttika, Ākṛtivāda,* kk. 65 cd. ff). *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, 26*(1), 505–500 (7–12).

Tattvavaiśāradī—see *Yogasūtras.*

Upaskāra—see *Vaiśeṣikasūtras.*

Vaiśeṣikasūtras = The Vaiśeṣika darśana, with the commentaries of Śaṅkara Miśra and Jayanārāyaṇa Tarka Pañcānana (1861). Edited by Jayanārāyaṇa Tarka Pañcānana. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal. (Bibliotheca Indica. No. 34.)

Vaiśeṣikasūtravṛtti = Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the commentary of Candrānanda (1961). Critically edited by Muni Śrī Jambuvijayajī. With the introduction by Anantalal Thakur. Baroda: Oriental Institute. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series. No. 136.)

Vākyapadīyam. Part III. Pada Kāṇḍa. Jāti, Dravya and Sambandha Samuddeśa with the commentary Prakāśa by Helārāja and Ambākartrī (1974). Edited by Raghunātha Śarmā. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya Press. (Sarasvatībhavana-Granthamālā. Vol. 91.)

Verpoorten, J.-M. (1987). *Mīmāṁsā literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz. (A history of Indian literature. Edited by J. Gonda. Vol. VI. Fasc. 5.)

Yogasūtras, *Yogasūtrabhāṣya*, and *Tattvavaiśāradī = Patañjalasūtrāṇi with the scholium of Vyāsa and the commentary of Vāchaspati* (1892). Edited by Rājārām Shāstrī Bodas. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt. (Bombay Sanskrit Series. No. XLVI.)