



Title	Linga in the Vaiśeṣika and the Mīmāṃsā
Author(s)	Adachi, Toshihide
Citation	待兼山論叢. 哲学篇. 1992, 26, p. 27-41
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/4028
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

***Linga* in the Vaiśeṣika and the Mīmāṃsā**

Toshihide ADACHI

[1] In the 1920's Hakuju Ui and Herman Jacobi¹⁾ had already pointed out that the *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* (VS) is critical of the Mīmāṃsā school in regard to the following three points: 1) the meanings of *dharma* in the opening sūtras,²⁾ 2) the matter of the eternity of *śabda* (sound, word), 3) the *apauruseya-tva* (not being compiled by a man) of the Veda.³⁾ In order to more clearly understand the fundamental difference between these two schools, we must analyze not only the three above-mentioned points, but also the difference of the meanings of *liṅga* in their sūtras, because unlike the just mentioned three points, the word *liṅga* is found throughout the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtra* (MS) and the VS as an original concept in both of them.⁴⁾

To research the concepts of *liṅga* in these two schools reveals their essential difference. The Mīmāṃsā school regards the Veda as the one and only source of *dharma* (cf. MS 1.1.3-4) whereas the Vaiśeṣika school holds that direct perception through experience is the most reliable means of cognition. The purpose of this paper is to make it clear that their respective concepts of *liṅga* reflect these essential positions of these two schools.

[2] First of all, in the MS the word *liṅga* mostly indicates a passage of the Veda.⁵⁾ Śabara usually refers to a passage of the Veda as *liṅga* when commenting on a sūtra in which the word *liṅga* occurs. Particularly the word *liṅga* used in such fixed phrases as 'liṅga-darśanāc ca' or 'liṅgāc ca'⁶⁾ denote a passage of the Veda without exception.

Let me give MS 1.1.23 as an example. This is the last sūtra in the section concering the *śabda-nitya-tva*.

liṅgadarśanāc ca. (MS 1.1.23)

“And because we find a *liṅga* [in the Veda].”

*liṅgam caiva bhavati, vācā virūpa nityayeti / anyaparam hīdām
vākyām vāco nityatām anuvadati / tasmān nityah śabdaḥ /*
(Śabara's *Bhāṣya* ad MS 1.1.23)

“And also a *liṅga* exists [besides the preceding reasons]. *Vācā virūpa nityayā'* (O *Virūpa*, by the eternal word) (*Rg-veda* 8.75.6, *Taittirīya-samhitā* 2.6.11.2, etc.) — Though the topic [of this passage] is different [from the eternity of word], this passage actually explains the eternity of a word. Therefore a word is eternal.”

As is shown in this example, these two fixed phrases are used as a reason-phrase (and mostly as the last of more than two reason-phrases). In this way, the MS presents a passage of the Veda as a reason for a proposition, and calls such a Vedic passage *liṅga*. In addition to the MS, about half of the *liṅgas* in the *Brahma-sūtra* are also used in this way.⁸⁾

[3] We notice, however, that the way *liṅgas* are used in the MS can also be found in VS 2.2.37, 4.2.9 and (5.2.11).⁹⁾ For example, VS 4.2.9 reads: *santy ayonijā vedalingāc ceti* “Also [we can know that] there exist non-viviparous beings because of a *liṅga* in the Veda.” Candranānda presents a following passage as the *Veda-liṅga*: *candramā manaso jātah* “the moon was born from *manas*” (*Rg-veda* 10.90.13, *Atharva-veda* 19.6.7, etc.). The usage of *liṅga* in this sūtra is not different from the usage in the MS.

We must, however, pay attention to the respective reasons why the Veda can be *liṅga* for these two schools. In the

Mīmāṃsā school, since *śabda* is eternal (cf. MS 1.1.6–23) and the Veda is considered to be not of human origin (cf. MS 1.1.27–32), the Veda is authoritative.

On the other hand, the Vaiśeṣika school regards the Veda as follows: “the arrangement of the sentences in the Veda is based on *buddhi* (*buddhipūrvā vākyakrtir vede*)” (VS 6.1.1), and the *buddhi* is not ours, but *rṣi*’s (cf. VS 6.1.2).¹⁰⁾ Thus, for the Vaiśeṣikas the authority of the Veda does not come from its eternity and non-human-origin, but from the *buddhi* (cognitive activity) of *rṣis*.

That is to say, the most reliable means of cognition is the Veda itself for the Mīmāṃsā, but *buddhi* for the Vaiśeṣika.

[4] The difference in the two standpoints is seen more directly in the form of controversy in the VS, where *liṅga* means a ‘mark’ as a proof of inference. This usage of *liṅga* is standard in the VS, and all the examples,¹¹⁾ except VS 2.2.37 and 4.2.9 mentioned above, can be understood in this meaning.

In the VS, this kind of *liṅga* is divided into two: 1) *drṣṭam liṅgam* and 2) *adrṣṭa-liṅgam*. Prśastapāda’s twofold division of *anumāna* into 1) *drṣṭam* and 2) *sāmānyato-drṣṭam* (PDh (N): 205, PDh (K): 203) seems to be based on this division.¹²⁾ Of these two kinds of *liṅga*, the typical example of *drṣṭam liṅgam* is the *liṅgas* of a cow, i. e., ‘horns’ etc. (VS 2.1.8), and the representatives of *adrṣṭa-liṅgam* are *liṅgas* of the six unseen substances. When such unseen substances as *vāyu* (wind) are explained in the VS, their *liṅgas* are always given at the head of their paragraph. Among these *adrṣṭa-liṅgas*, the VS discussed in particular those of *vāyu* and *ātman* (2.1.15–19 & 3.2.6–14), because *vāyu* is the first of these unseen substances in the order of the nine substances, and because the existence of *ātman* is one of the main subjects in Indian philosophy.

The *liṅga* of *vāyu* is *sparsa* (touch) (VS 2.1.9–10). This

liṅga is analyzed by an opponent as follows:

*vāyuy iti sati sannikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād drṣṭam liṅgam na
vidyate* (VS 2.1.15)

“[In the case of cow, there exists the direct perception such as ‘this is a cow’ when a visual organ touches a cow, but] there does not exist the direct perception that [this is] *vāyu* [even] when [skin] touches [*vāyu*]. Therefore [in the case of *vāyu*] a visible *liṅga* (*drṣṭam liṅgam*)¹³⁾ [such as ‘horns’ in the case of a cow] does not exist.”

sāmānyato drṣṭāc cāviśeṣah (VS 2.1.16)

“Moreover, [even if you try to infer the basis of ‘touch’] by means of [the inference named] ‘seen in common’ (*sāmānyato drṣṭa*), [we can know] no distinction [of *vāyu* from ‘ether’ etc. as the basis of ‘touch’, because ‘ether’ etc. are also imperceptible in the same way as *vāyu* is]. [Therefore, we cannot infer *vāyu* through ‘touch’.]”

tasmād āgamikam (VS 2.1.17)

“Consequently [the statement “(This is) *vāyu*” is] grounded on sacred Scriptures.”

In 2.1.15 the opponent first states the non-existence of *drṣṭam liṅgam* and in 2.1.16 he then insists that the existence of *vāyu* can not be established even by *sāmānyoto drṣṭa* which is a means to know the existence of the basis of *adrṣṭa-liṅga*. After having shown in these two sūtras that the *liṅga*-theory of the Vaiśeṣika is not efficient in proving the existence of the basis of the *liṅga*, he finally concludes in 2.1.17 that the knowledge of *vāyu* is nothing but *āgamika*, i. e., being grounded on sacred Scriptures (=the Veda).¹⁴⁾ This objection is not a denial of the existence of *vāyu*, but it concerns a method of cognition.¹⁵⁾

It is supposed by some scholars¹⁶⁾ that the opponent here is a Mimāṃsaka because of the opponent's conclusive assertion. This supposition is well supported by my analysis above of the *liṅga* in the MS, where the Veda is *liṅga*. Therefore, we can regard the objection in 2.1.15-17 as the Mimāṃsā's criticism¹⁷⁾ of the Vaiśeṣika's *liṅga*-theory, in which things and phenomena like *sparśa* are acknowledged as *liṅga*.

[5] To this objection, the Vaiśeṣika school answers as follows:

sāṃjñākarma tv asmadviśiṣṭānām liṅgam (VS 2.1.18)

“[Your assertion is] not [right]. The deed of naming [*vāyu* ‘*vāyu*’] [which is done] by more excellent people than we, [such] is the *liṅga* [of *vāyu*].”

pratyakṣapūrvakatvāt sāṃjñākarmaṇaḥ (VS 2.1.19)

“Because the deed of naming is dependent on direct perception.”

Candrānanda regards these two sūtras as establishing the *pariṣeṣa* (elimination) which assists and accomplishes the *sāmānyato drṣṭa* in 2.1.16. It is necessary for the establishment of *pariṣeṣa* to limit objects to a fixed number. The Vaiśeṣika acknowledges only nine substances. Candrānanda interprets these two sūtras as a proof of non-existence of a tenth substance, commenting on *liṅga* in 2.1.18 as ‘*navānām eva dravyānām bhave liṅgam*’ (the *liṅga* which shows that only nine substances exist). As Nozawa points out (1989: 169–170, 172–175, 1991: 29–30, 32–34), this interpretation agrees with Dignāga's for the most part (cf. PSV (K): 109b6–111a5, (V): 28b3–29b8, Kitagawa 1965: 79ff, Hayes 1980: 249–252).

But in my opinion this is not the original intention of the

sūtras. First, it is hardly possible to read limitations on the number of substances in the statement of VS 2.1.18 itself. Secondly, we cannot find *pariśesa*-inference in VS 3.2.6–8 paralleling 2.1.15–17. Thirdly, *avīśeṣa* in 2.1.16 surely make sense without assuming a tenth substance. Lastly, in spite of Dignāga's interpretation (PSV (K): 110a2–3, (V): 28b6–7), VS 2.1.10 is not considered to be a part of *pariśesa*-inference. Therefore, it can hardly be understood that VS 2.1.18–19 refers to limitations on the number of substances.¹⁸⁾

If Candrānanda's interpretation is denied in this way, how should we understand these two sūtras?

It is true that these sūtras seem not to be an answer to the objection. In fact, they do not directly refer to the relationship between 'touch' (*liṅga*) and 'wind' (*liṅgin*), which is the main point of the objection. But this answer makes sense when we take the objection quoted above to be a denial of inference.

The objection in VS 2.1.15–17 was that inference is not valid to prove the existence of invisible objects like *vāyu*¹⁹⁾ and that their existence can be known on the ground of the Veda. The answer to this objection ought to be the establishment of the possibility of inference. Indeed, these two sūtras seem to state the possibility of inference. Their intention will be as follows; So long as the name (*vāyu*) exists, someone must have done the deed of naming (*vāyu* 'vāyu'). So long as someone named it, he must have directly perceived it, because it is impossible to name something without perceiving it directly, just as in the case of the deed of naming a new-born child (*nāma-karana*) (cf. C's *Vṛtti ad* 2.1.19). That is to say, as long as direct perception is acknowledged as valid and the name of an object exists, it is possible to infer the existence of the unseen object through the *liṅga* which is *saṃjñā-karman*.²⁰⁾ In this way, VS 2.1.18–19 serves as an answer to the objection.

To sum up the argument examined above, the passage VS

2.1.15-19 reveals the fundamental difference in the basic means of cognition between the Mīmāṃsakas and the Vaiśeṣikas; the Veda for the former, *pratyakṣa* for the latter. At the same time, VS 2.1.18-19 shows that inference of an invisible object holds good if the direct perception of it (which is, of course, not an ordinary person's, but that of a *rṣi*) has been realized.

[6] The *liṅgas* of *ātman* (soul) are *prāṇa* (exhalation) and *apāṇa* (inhalation) etc. (VS 3.2.4)²¹. These *liṅgas* are criticized by an opponent in VS 3.2.6-8, which is exactly the same as the opponent's statement on the *liṅga* of *vāyu* (2.1.15-17) except the first word.

yajñadatta iti sati sannikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād drṣṭam liṅgam nāvidyate (VS 3.2.6=2.1.15)

“There does not exist a direct perception such as ‘[this is *ātman* called] Yajñadatta,’ [even] when [a visual organ] touches [Yajñadatta who is exhaling and so on]. Therefore, [in the case of *ātman*] a visible *liṅga* (*drṣṭam liṅgam*) does not exist.”

sāmānyato drṣṭāc cāviśeṣah (VS 3.2.7=2.1.16)

tasmād āgamikam (VS 3.2.8=2.1.17)

The opponent's criticism is that the *liṅgas* of *ātman* cannot prove the existence of *ātman* because of the uncertainty of the connection between those *liṅgas* and *ātman*. In reply to the objection, Kaṇāda tries to prove that those *liṅgas* are connected with *ātman* through the medium of the word ‘I’ as follows: (V=Vaiśeṣika, O=Opponent)

V: *aham iti śabdavyatirekān nāgamikam* (VS 3.2.9)

“Because of the exclusion [of the other substances like

‘earth’ etc. in regard to the basis of ‘exhalation’ etc.] by the word ‘I’, [it is possible to infer the existence of *ātman* by the *lingas* such as ‘exhalation’ etc.]. Therefore [the knowledge that *ātman* exists is] not grounded on sacred Scriptures.”

O: *yadi ca drṣṭapratyakṣo 'ham devadatto 'ham yajñadatta iti* (VS 3.2.10).

“If [it is acknowledged that the word ‘I’] denotes²²⁾ [something] cognizable because of [expressions] such as ‘I am Devadatta’ or ‘I am Yajñadatta’,

O: *devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīti copacārāc charīra-pratyakṣah* (VS 3.2.11).

“[we can conclude that the word ‘I’] denotes a body [which is cognizable] because of indirect expressions (*upacāra*)²³⁾ such as ‘Devadatta goes’ or ‘Viṣṇumitra goes’.”

V: *sandigdhas tūpacārah* (VS 3.2.12)

“But the indirect expression is obscure (*sandigdha*) (i. e., not settled on one conclusion (*anaikāntika*))²⁴⁾ [because it can actually indicate either a body or a soul].”

V: *aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāntara-pratyakṣah* (VS 3.2.13)

“[The word] ‘I’ denotes another thing (=*ātman*) [than a body] since [the word ‘I’] is applied to an individual and is not applied to other [people]. [If the word ‘I’ denoted a body, we would use it on others, too.]”

V: *na tu śarīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayor jñānaviśeṣah* (VS 3.2.14)

“[We can] not [know] the difference between Yajñadatta’s

thought and Viṣṇumitra's thought by the difference between their bodies. [Therefore the word 'I' denotes another thing than a body.]"

Not only some modern scholars²⁵⁾ but also Śridhara²⁶⁾ etc. interpret this series of arguments about *aham* as another proof of the existence of *ātman* apart from such *liṅgas* as 'exhalation' etc... But this interpretation does not agree with the context of the sūtra itself, because *nāgamika* in VS 3.2.9 shows that this sūtra is a response to the objection asserted in 3.2.6-8 and that the argument about *aham* in 3.2.9-14 is a continuation of 3.2.6-8. Candrānanda also, as the conclusion of this argument, states in his commentary on VS 3.2.14 that the word *aham* is valid as an mediator between *ātman* and the *liṅgas* such as 'exhalation' etc.²⁷⁾ These facts mean that the opponent in 3.2.6-8 is the same as that in 3.2.9-14, that is to say, that the opponent in the argument about *aham* is not a person who denies the existence of *ātman* like a Buddhist, but the opponent who asserts *āgamika* in VS 3.2.8, i. e., a Mīmāṃsaka.

Therefore we can interpret the argument in VS 3.2.6-14 as follows: This is an argument between the Vaiśeṣika school, which argues that 'exhalation' etc. are the *liṅgas* of *ātman* by presenting the word *aham* as a mediator and attempts to attest the efficiency of its *liṅga*-theory, and the Mīmāṃsā school, which, arguing that the word *aham* denotes a body, criticizes the validity of the *liṅga* held by the Vaiśeṣika and asserts that one can know the existence of *ātman* only on the ground of sacred Scriptures.

[7] Through these investigations, we have made clear the following points:

First, in the MS, the word *liṅga* mainly means a Vedic passage which is valid to prove a proposition.

Secondly, though such usage of the word *liṅga* can be found a few times in the VS, too, there is a difference between the Mīmāṃsā and the Vaiśeṣika as to the grounds on which a Vedic passage becomes a valid means of cognition. For the Mīmāṃsā, the authority of the Veda comes from its eternity and non-human-origin: while for the Vaiśeṣika, from the *buddhi* of *r̥sis*.

Thirdly, the VS usually uses the word *liṅga* as meaning things and phenomena by which ordinary people can infer unseen objects. Concerning this kind of *liṅga*, we can see the Mīmāṃsā's criticism and the Vaiśeṣika's answer in VS 2.1.15–19 and 3.2.6–14.²⁸⁾

Lastly, as a general conclusion, it can be pointed out that the usage of the word *liṅga* in the MS and the VS reflects the fundamental standpoints of these two schools and that in the stage of the VS the Vaiśeṣika school was more closely related to the Mīmāṃsā as a critic than it has been regarded until now.

Notes

* The present paper is a revised and enlarged English version of my article "Vaiśeṣikasūtra no veda-kan to liṅga." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies)*, 35–2 (1987) pp. 990–988.

- 1) Ui 1924: 29–42, 56–64. Jacobi 1929: 159–160, 162–164.
- 2) The first three of the five questions about *dharma* such as *ko dharmaḥ* which Candrānanda poses in his *Vṛtti ad* VS 1.1.1 are the same as the first three of the five questions about *dharma* in Śabara's *Bhāṣya ad* MS 1.1.1 (p. 10^{2–3}).
- 3) The eternity of *śabda* is discussed in MS 1.1.6–23 and VS 2.2.30–43: the *apauruṣeya-tva* of the Veda in MS 1.1.27–32 and VS 6.1.1–2.
- 4) Frauwallner (1961: 118) points out that the sūtras which treat the *śabda-nitya-tva* in the MS do not belong to the oldest layer of the MS. In addition to this, Frauwallner (1984) and Wezler

(1982: 671–674) insist that VS 1.1.1–3 which explain the *dharma* did not belong to the original VS.

- 5) As exceptions, e. g., MS 8.3.3–4, 9.1.45.
- 6) *liṅga-darśanāc ca*: MS 1.1.23, 2.2.8, 2.3.9; 15, 3.3.42, 3.4.36; 45, 3.5.51, 3.6.13; 26, 3.7.5, 3.8.27, 4.1.10; 23, 5.3.18, 5.4.4, 6.1.18; 52, 6.6.17, 6.7.17; 7.1.19, 7.2.10, 7.3.15, 8.1.4; 8.4.13; 20, 9.2.22, 9.3.2; 5; 28, 10.1.5; 21; 41, 10.3.49, 10.4.5, 10.5.2; 51; 74; 87, 10.6.26, 10.8.26, 11.2.33; 46, 11.3.28, 11.4.12, 12.2, 10, 12.4.4. *liṅgāc ca*: 3.2.8, 3.3.3, 5.3.38, 7.3.8, 7.4.14, 8.2.28.
- 7) Renou points out that *liṅga* in the ritual literature means ‘a characteristic element’ or ‘la “caractéristique” d’un mantra’, which is usually the name of a deity (1941–42: 153–154 (note 2), Renou & Silburn 1954: 71). However, the *liṅgas* in *Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra* 1.8.37 and 12.6.30 indicate a passage of the Veda as is the case in the MS. Furthermore, the *liṅga* in MS 3.3.14 is defined as one of the six means supporting the *viniyogavidhi*. As to this *liṅga*, see *Artha-saṃgraha* (p. 12 & 16ff), Kane 1962: 1309–11, Yoshimizu 1987.
- 8) BS 1.1.22; 31, 1.3.15; 35, 1.4.17; 20, 2.3.13; 15*, 3.2.11; 26, 3.3.44*, 3.4.34*; 39*, 4.1.2*, 4.3.4*, 4.4.21*. The *liṅga* in the sūtras marked with an asterisk is used in the same way as in the MS.
- 9) VS 5.2.11: *vaidikām ca*. C’s *Vṛtti* on it: *vaidikām vākyām ... liṅgam*.
- 10) VS 6.1.2: *na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṅgam rṣeh*. This sūtra is rather hard to understand. Candrānanda identifies the *liṅga* in the sūtra with *vijñāna*. But from the context, this sūtra should be interpreted as follows: ‘And [the arrangement of the sentence in the Veda] does not [arise] from our *buddhi*. [Therefore this arrangement is] a *liṅga* [of the existence] of a *rṣi*.’ This interpretation is supported by the anonymous commentary (VS (M): 58).
- 11) VS 1.2.18, 2.1.8; 9; 10; 14; 15; 18–21; 26; 2.2.1; 6; 12; 30; 37, 3.2.1; 4; 6, 4.1.2, 4.2.9, 5.2.10, 6.1.2; 3, 7.1.29, 9.20.
- 12) See, Nozawa 1983: 142, 145 & note 42, Nozawa 1989: 163–166, Nozawa 1991: 25–27 & note 5.
- 13) As to its substantial meaning, see Nozawa 1991: 21.
- 14) There is no example of *āgama* which means the Veda in the MS,

where it is usually called *śruti* etc. However, *āgama* is sometimes used in the meaning of sacred Scriptures in general including the Veda. Cf. e.g., *Manu-smṛti* 12.105–106, *Vākyā-paṭīya* 1.30, 1.148, 2.489, *Tarkajvālā ad Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā* 8.17, Śaṅkara's *Bhāṣya ad BS* 2.1.11 etc. (cf. Nakamura I: 255, Nakamura IV: 155–159). Vātsyāyana also uses *āgama* or *āgamika* in the meaning '(based on) verbal testimony' in his *Bhāṣya ad NS* 2.1.17 (NS (C): 440).

15) Candrānanda replaces *āgamika* with *pravāda-māṭra* (a mere rumor). On the basis of this interpretation, Wezler states that the opponent is fictitious because 'it can hardly be assumed that an adherent of a rival school ever denied the existence of the 'substance' wind alone' (1983: 50). But C's replacement is a forced one. Cf. note 28 below.

16) Uj 1926: 520, Nozawa 1991: 29, cf. Nakamura I: 484–485.

17) I have not yet found such a criticism in the Mīmāṃsā literature. However, the assertion that some objects cannot be inferred by *laukikām liṅgam* is found in *Vākyā-paṭīya* 3.14.321 (=3.1021) (cf. Nakamura IV: 155–157).

18) *Parīśeṣa*-inference is adopted in VS 2.1.24–26 where *śabda* is proved to be a *guṇa* of *ākāśa* and in VS 2.2.27–29 where it is proved to be *guṇa*. Limitations on the number of objects, however, do not come into question there either.

19) The objection in VS 2.1.15–17 can apply to all invisible substances.

20) Not *saṃjñā-karman* but *sparśa* is considered to be the basic *liṅga* of *vāyu*, because *sparśa* works for the inference of both an individual wind and wind in general. On the other hand, one should understand that *saṃjñā-karman* is a supplementary *liṅga* for the inference of the latter.

21) VS 3.2.4: *prāṇāpānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cety ātmaliṅgāni.*

22) As to the translation of 'pratyakṣa' in VS 3.2.10–11 & 13, see Nozawa 1988: 466–465, Nozawa 1991: 34–35. But, cf. Murakami 1990: 119–121.

23) An expression such as "Entertain a stick with food (*yāṣṭikām*

bhojaya)" is presented as an example of *upacāra* in *Nyāya-bhāṣya ad* NS 2.2.62 (NS (C): 663). Here a Brahmin is signified by the word 'stick'. *Devadatta* and *śarīra* in VS 3.2.11 are considered to correspond to the stick and the Brahmin in this example respectively.

- 24) Cf. VS 3.1.11–12 and C's *Vṛtti ad* 3.1.11.
- 25) Murakami 1975, Oetke 1988: 338–343; and also Ui 1917: 138, Faddegon 1918: 247ff, Potter 1977: 95.
- 26) PDh (N): 85²⁰ff.
- 27) C's *Vṛtti ad* 3. 2. 14: *evam ahaṁśabdena ekādhikaraṇatvāt sukhādaya ātmaviśayāḥ prāṇādayaś ca tannimittāḥ*.
- 28) Such a controversy does not appear in the literature of either the Mīmāṃsā or the Vaiśeṣika except for the VS as far as I research. The main reason may be because, introducing some philosophical concepts from the Vaiśeṣika in later ages, the Mīmāṃsā school came to hold a similar view to the Vaiśeṣika philosophy in some matters. For example, Vṛttikāra's inference-theory is close to that of the Vaiśeṣika (cf. PSV (V): 42al, PSV (K): 123b3, Frauwallner 1968: 86, 87, 97–98, Nozawa 1991: 28 & note 5), and the concept *liṅga* held by Kumārila is also similar to that of the Vaiśeṣika (cf. e. g., *Śloka-vārttika*, *anumāna-pariccheda*, kk. 4, 156). In addition Śabara proves the existence of *ātman* by using the *liṅdas* of *ātman* in VS 3.2.4 (pp. 72–73, Frauwallner 1968: 50, 51, 111).

Texts and Abbreviations

MS : Mīmāṃsā-sūtra, with Śabara's Bhāṣya, Ānandāśrama S. S., 97.

VS : Vaiśeṣika-sūtra, with Candrānanda's Vṛtti. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 136.

VS (M) : Vaiśeṣika-sūtra, with an anonymous commentary. published by Mithila Institute.

NS (C) : Nyāya-sūtra. Calcutta S. S., 18 & 29 (rep. Rinsen Sanskrit Text Series, 1).

BS : Brahma-sūtra, with Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya. ed. by J. L. Shastri,

Motilal Banarsi dass.

PDh (N) : Padārtha-dharma-saṁgraha, with Nyāyakandali, Vizianagram S. S., 4 (rep. Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, 13).

PDh (K) : Padārtha-dharma-saṁgraha, with Kiraṇāvali, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 154.

C : Candrānanda.

Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra: ed. by A. Weber. (rep. Vanarasi 1972).

Vākyā-padiya: Rau, W., *Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya*. Wiesbaden 1977.

PSV (K) : Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti, Karnakavarman's tr.

PSV (V) : Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti, Vasudhararakṣita's tr.

Peking ed. Vol, 130.

Artha-saṁgraha: ed. by A. B. Gajendragadkar & R. D. Karmarkar. 1934. (rep. 1984 Delhi).

Secondary Literature

Faddegon, B., 1918. *The Vaiśeṣika-system*. Amsterdam.

Frauwallner, E., 1968. *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṁsā*. Wien.

_____, 1984, "Der ursprünglichen Anfang der Vaiśeṣika-Sūtren," In: *Nachgelassene Werke* I. Wien.

Hayes, R. P., 1980. "Dignāga's Views on Reasoning (*Svārthānumāna*)," *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 8-3, 219-277.

Jacobi, H., 1929, "Mīmāṁsā und Vaiśeṣika," In: *Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman*. Cambridge (Mass.), 145-165.

Kane, P. V., 1962. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. 5, Pt. 2. Poona.

Kitagawa, H., 1965, *Indo-koten-ronrigaku no kenkyū*. (rep. Kyoto 1985).

Murakami, S., 1975. "Vaiśeṣhika-tetsugaku ni okeru ātoman no ronshō," *Tōhoku-daigaku Bungaku-bu Kenkyū-nenpō* (*The Annual Reports of The Faculty of Arts and Letters, Tohoku University*), 25, 1-56.

_____, 1991. "Indo no shizen-tetsugaku ni okeru ningendan," In: *Indo-shisō ni okeru ningendan*. Kyoto, 67-141.

Nakamura, H., I. *Shoki-vēdānta-tetsugaku-shi*, Vol, I (*Shoki no vēdānta-tetsugaku*). Tokyo 1950 (rep. 1981).

_____, IV. *ibid.* Vol, IV (*Kotoba no keijijōgaku*). Tokyo 1956 (rep.

1981).

Nozawa, M., 1983. "Vaiśeṣika-gakuha no suiron-setsu," *Numazu-kōgyō-kōtō-senmon-gakkō Kenkyū-hōkoku (Research reports of Numazu Technical College)*, 18, 139-149.

_____, 1988. "Vaiśeṣikasūtra 3-2-6~14 no suiron-setsu," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies)*, 37-1, 466-461.

_____, 1989. "‘Vaishēshika-sūtora’ dai 2-1 shō no suiron-setsu," In: *Indo-tetsugaku to bukkyō*. Kyoto, 161-178.

_____, 1991. "Inferential Marks in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*," *Saṃbhāṣā* 12, 25-38.

Oetke, C., 1988. „Ich“ und das Ich. Stuttgart.

Potter, K. H., 1977. *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol, II, *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*. Delhi.

Renou, L., 1941-42. "Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire en sanskrit," *Journal Asiatique*, 233, 105-165.

Renou, L. & Silburn, L.. 1954. "Nirukta and Ānirukta in Vedic," In: *Sarūpa-Bhāratī: The Homage of Indology: Dr. Lakshman Sarup Memorial Volume*. Hoshiapur, 68-78.

Ui, H., 1917. *The Vaiśeṣika Philosophy*. (rep. Vanarasi 1962).

_____, 1924. *Indo-tetsugaku-kenkyū*, I. Tokyo (rep. 1944).

_____, 1926. *ibid.* III, Tokyo (rep. 1965).

Yoshimizu, K., 1987. "Mīmāṃsā-gakuha no seiteng-kaishaku-gaku ni okeru liṅga no kinō ni tsuite," *Tōyō-gakujutsu-kenkyū (The Journal of Oriental Studies)*, 26-2, 150-169.

Wezler, A., 1982. "Remarks on the Definition of ‘Yoga’ in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra," In: *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Canberra, 643-686.

_____, 1983. "A Note on Concept *Adṛṣṭa* used in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*," In: *Aruna-Bhāratī: Professor A. N. Jani Felicitation Volume*. Baroda, 35-58.

(Research Fellow, The Eastern Institute)