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1. Introduction

"Samsarga-maryādā" (SM) is an enigmatic term used by Naiyāyikas in the theory of verbal understanding. Later Naiyāyikas, such as Raghunātha (fl. 1510) and Gadādhara (fl. 1660), use the term many times, but do not explain what it is. As the term is always used in the instrumental case, along with the verb "bhāsate" (to appear in mind) or "labhyate" (to be obtained), it is also possible to interpret "samsarga-maryādayā" as an adverbial expression. Scholars have presented various interpretations of this term.

Previously, it was believed that Raghunātha was the first to use this term, but I have found earlier mentions of it in the unpublished portion of the Śabdamanyāloka (Āloka), a commentary on Gaṅgeśa’s (fl. 1320) Tattvacintāmaṇi (TC) written by Jayadeva, a.k.a. Pakṣadhara Mīśra (fl. 1470). Even though Jayadeva does not define the SM either, this new material helps us to inquire into its meaning. I will examine previous studies of the SM through this light.

2. Preliminaries

The meaning of a sentence is the structure of the word meanings. For example, from the sentence “ghaṭam āṇayati,” we can understand the structure “ghaṭa-niṣṭha-karmatva-nirūpaka-āṇayana-anukūla-kṛtimat.” The nodes of the structure (ghaṭa, karmatva, āṇayana, and kṛti) are expressed by words or morphemes (padas), but how can we understand their relations (niṣṭhatva, nirūpakatva, anukūlatva, and -mattva)? Mīmāṃsakas maintain that the relations are also expressed by words, through the denotation (abhidhā) according to the Prabhākaras, or through the indication (lakṣaṇā) according to the Bhāṭṭas. Jayanta of the Nyāya school rejected both of these views, and postulated the
special power or function of words to interrelate their meanings; he called this
"tātparya-śakti." It is generally recognized that Navya-naiyāyikas also explain our
verbal understanding in a similar way, but using the notion of SM instead of tātparya-
śakti. The opening passage of Gadādhara's Vyūtpattivāda is thought to state this position.
It says, "In verbal understanding, the relation of a word meaning with another word
meaning appears in mind by the SM" (p. 2: śābdabodhe caikapadārthe 'parapadārthasya
saṁsargah saṁsargamaryadayā bhāsate).

Research by contemporary scholars has indicated two features of the SM: (1) It is an
objective factor that plays the same role as that Jayanta's tātparya-śakti plays; and (2) it
is reducible to the ākāṅkṣā. The first point here describes its function, and the second
defines its nature. The ākāṅkṣā is understood by early Naiyāyikas such as Udayana as
the mutual ontological expectancy between word meanings, such as an action and its
object. For Gaṅgeśa, it is the syntactico-semantic expectancy between words, such as a
transitive verb and a noun that expresses the object. Later Naiyāyikas define ākāṅkṣā as
the juxtaposition of words in a specific order. It is the third sense of ākāṅkṣā that is
considered to be the nature of the SM. This interpretation was stated by commentators
on the Vyūtpattivāda, and perhaps it has dominated the understanding of the notion of
SM to the present.

There are a few scholars, however, who do not agree with the above elucidation. G.
Bhattacharya (1980) argues that it cannot be the ākāṅkṣā. Gerschheimer (1996: 95) offers
the most radical criticism. He does not recognize the SM as an objective factor. Instead,
he interprets the expression "saṁsarga-maryādayā" in the sense of "en tant que saṁsarga"
or "sur le mode de saṁsarga," assuming that maryādayā is synonymous with vidhayā. He
quotes from a couple of texts that attest his assumption.

In the next section, I will reconsider the above discussion in the light of Jayadeva's
passages.

3. "Saṁsarga-maryāda" in the Šabdamanvāloka

There are two passages where Jayadeva mentions the SM. The complete text of the
chapters that contain these passages is available in my online edition of the Āloka.

(a) Āloka, 15a (On TC 4(1), pp. 77–79): api ca āhaṁ ānayatītyādivekyo āhaṁ
nayanavānivasaya-kaṅkṛtimān ityādyanvayabodhe padārthe padārthe viśeṣanām tadubhayasaṁsargaḥ saṁsarga-
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maryādayā bhāsata ity anubhavaḥ. padārthaṇākṣaṇe padapākṣaṇe cāṇūmaṇe naikapadārtha-
syāparapadārtho viśeṣaṇatayā bhāsate, kī tu sādhyatayā samsarga eveti pratayavaicītryād eva
śabdo mānam iti saṅkeṣeṇah.

This is Jayadeva’s argument refuting Vaiśeṣika’s view that the verbal understanding is a type of inference. Jayadeva’s wording is close to the opening statement of Gadādhara’s Vyutpattivāda mentioned above.

(b) Āloka, 32b (On TC 4(1), pp. 227–228): sambhavatya arthasādhutve kathāṃ śabdasaṅdhutvam ity
arucer āha. yad veti. na caivaṃ karmadhāraye ’pi viśeṣaṇavibhaktyarthe ’bhedē lakṣaṇā mantavyeti
niśādasthapatyadhikaranavirodhah, karmadhāraye ’bhedasya samsāramaryādayā bhānābhi-
upagamād iti bhāvah.

This is a passage in the section that discusses the relation between the meanings of the two words in apposition, e.g., “niśa ghaṭata.” Some maintain that the relation (namely, abheda or non-difference) between the word meanings (namely, nila and ghaṭa) is not expressed by any linguistic element, but still the listener can somehow understand it. On the other hand, others think that the ending (vibhakti) added to the qualifier denotes this relation. Jayadeva gives the above passage to support the second position. The passage tells that, the non-difference is expressed by the ending in the case of sentences, but this is not so in the case of Karmadhāraya compounds; it is accepted that the non-difference is understood by the SM in that case.

The TC has the separate section of Karmadhāraya compound (TC 4(2), pp. 777–785). We may expect Jayadeva to use the notion of SM in that section to explain what the “accepted” theory is, but he does not mention the term SM there, even though he repeats substantially the same thing as in passage (b).⁶ He simply says that the non-difference is just “experienced” (anubhava-siddha), without disclosing how we can experience it, as if we naturally understand the relation. From this, we can assume that he recognizes the SM as the governing principle of our natural understanding of the relation between word meanings. Maryādā means a rule or a law. The translations of the SM as “the law of association,”⁷ “the relational appropriateness” or “the governing principle of syntactico-semantic expectancy”⁸ present similar interpretations.

However, Gerschheimer’s assumption that *maryādā is synonymous with *vidhayā
(as . . .), which opposes the above interpretation, also works well as far as the above passages are concerned. Jayadeva contrasts the understanding of word meaning
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(padārtha) with that of relation (sāṃsarga),\(^9\) and he explains the understanding of relation as sāṃsargamaryādayā bhānā\(^6\) in passage (b). What he intends here may be that the non-difference is understood not as a word meaning but as a relation. If we apply this interpretation to passage (a), we can derive the sense that the relation between the qualifier and the qualificandum appears not as a word meaning, but as a relation. A comparison of passage (b) and Gaṅgeśa’s text on which passage (b) is given also supports Gerschheimer’s assumption. Gaṅgeśa contrasts the understanding through indication (lakṣaṇā) with *anvaya-prakāṛatvena bhāna*, which probably means the understanding of something as a relation (anvaya), not as a node (anvaya-pratijōgīn).\(^10\) Jayadeva’s sāṃsarga-maryādayā bhānā\(^6\) can be considered as a paraphrase of this *anvaya-prakāṛatvena bhāna*.

I do not find anything that denies Gerschheimer’s assumption in the texts of Gaṅgeśa and Jayadeva; still there remain some reasons for doubt. It is difficult to explain why Jayadeva never says “sāṃsargataya” while he says “viśeṣanataya bhāsate” in passage (b); he neither says “padārthamaryādayā” to mean “as a word meaning.” To interpret maryādā as a rule or a law may be more convincing.

Lastly, let us consider how to understand particular relations when they are not expressed by words. We actually connect the word meanings by particular relations such as non-difference, causality (janakātva), objectfood (viṣayatva) and the like, but how do we identify the relation? It is not warranted to reduce it to the ākāṅkṣā as later scholars do. Jayadeva, as well as Gaṅgeśa, does not explain this point explicitly. He just emphasizes our actual experience (anubhava) and natural understanding (vyutpatti). Our experience may be the only identifier, as Rucidatta suggests.\(^11\) In this regard, Jayadeva states the interesting view that only the non-difference type of relation can be understood between the meanings of nominal stems.\(^12\) It seems intuitively reasonable for us to naturally understand the non-difference of two word meanings that appear in mind in succession. The SM or the “law of association” may be established by observations of this kind of experiences.

**4. Conclusion**

I compared two views about the SM: the traditional view in which the SM is regarded as an objective factor, and Gerschheimer’s view that sāṃsarga-maryādayā means “as a
relation.” Both of the interpretations hold good as far as the newly found earliest mentions of the SM by Jayadeva are concerned, but I tentatively support the traditional view and translation of it as the “law of association.”

However, there are the cases in later literature, quoted by Gerschheimer, in which maryādā is hardly understandable as a law. There is also the statement of Mathurānātha (fl. 1650) in which “maryādayā seems to mean neither “as . . .” nor “by the law of . . .”” Further study of this term from a historical perspective will probably give us better, hopefully correct, understanding of it.

---

Notes

Abbreviations
Āloka₂, Āloka of Jayadeva on TC. In TC.
Prakaśa, Prakāśa of Rucidatta on TC. In TC.
Rahasya, Rahasya of Mathurānātha on TC. In TC.
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