



International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519

IJSR 2017; 3(6): 141-143

© 2017 IJSR

www.anantaajournal.com

Received: 24-09-2017

Accepted: 25-10-2017

Sooraj RS

Research Scholar,

Department of Sanskrit Sahitya,

Sree Sankaracharya University

of Sanskrit, Kalady, Kerala,

India

Development of concept of *Pada* in Nyāya philosophy

Sooraj RS

Introduction

For every philosophical systems concept of Pramāṇas are the most important part of its discussion. Nyāya Scholars especially Navyanyāya scholars accepted the Four pramāṇas, viz. pratyakṣa, anumāna, upamāna and śabda.

śabda pramāṇa is one of the most important means among them. While discussing the śabda pramāṇa we get some linguistically important concept like *Pada Padātha Padārthañjana Śābda bodha, Vākhya* etc. are presented by Naiyāyikas. These concepts are most important in linguistic as well as in Navyanyāya philosophy. Here an attempt is made in this paper to present development of Concept of *Pada* in Navyanyāya Philosophy through the ages. The analysis of *Pada* occupies a very important role in the Nyāya-vaiśeṣika philosophy. It goes as back as the *Nyāyasūtras* of Gautama. Though Gautama had dealt with the *Pada* in few sūtras.

We get Naiyāyikas earliest definition of *Pada* from Gautama's *Nyāyasūtra* as “*Te vibhaktyanta padam*”¹ here *te* means varṇah i.e phoneme ending in an inflectional suffix are *pada*. So according to Gautama a finished form is a *pada*. Basically this definition does not differ from that given by Panini in his *Aṣṭadhyāyī*. It is as “*suptingantam padam*”². The essential nature of a word lies in its meaning, which according to the Navya Naiyāyikas, is expressed through the peculiar expressive known as Śakti.

Naiyāyikas are of the view that is the word (*pada*) and not the letters (varṇas) constitute the real unit of language. They refute the ‘Varṇavada’ of the Mīmāṃsikas on ground that individual taken singly and separately do not convey the sense.²

Vātsyāyana in his *Nyāyasūtrabhāṣya* refers as “*yadhā darśanam vikṛtā varṇā vibhaktyanta padasamñjā bhavanti*”³

Vācaspati miśra in his *Nyāyavrtikatātparyatīka* refers *pada* as a term which used to refute the concept of ‘Sphoṭa’. It is as “*Ta eva varṇāh eva vibhaktyantah santa padam natu tadatiriktam sphoṭākhyāyam*”⁴

Sri Venkatanātha in his *Nyāyapariśudhi*, which is a *mīmāṃsā* text, it referred as “*pramāṇikapadavyavahāraṇiṣayah padam*”⁵. What is used in an authentic discourse is called a word or *pada*.

¹ Singh, Udaya Narayan, *Nyāyasūtra of Gautama*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratistan, Delhi, 1993.p.137.

² Ibid.

³ Misra, Sachidanand, *Nyayadarsana- The sutra of Goutama and Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*, Bharatiya Vidyaprakasan, Delhi 1999, p.219.

⁴ Takur, Ananthlal Misra, *Nyāya Vṛtika Tika of Vacaspati*, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Delhi, 1996, p.427.

⁵ Dvivedi, sivaprasad Acārya, *Śrī Venkatanātha Viracita Nyāyapariśudhi*, Chaukhamba Vidhyabhavan, Varanasi, 1992., p.269

Correspondence

Sooraj RS

Research Scholar,

Department of Sanskrit Sahitya,

Sree Sankaracharya University

of Sanskrit, Kalady, Kerala,

India

In *Nyāyakośa* of Bhīmācārya gives the definition of pada, as “*vākyahyadeśa padam iti kecitāhuh* //”. Some Naiyāyikas hold the view that a part of a sentence is a *pada*. But this definition is ambiguous. Here the word *ekadesa* is not referring clearly.⁶

Laghusidhānta kaumudi defines *pada* as “*subantam tingantam ca pada samñja syāt*”⁷

Tarkasamgraha of Annambhaṭa refers *pada* as “*saktam padam*”⁸ *pada* or word is expressed through the peculiar expressive known as *Sakti*.

Srīrāmaśāstri in his *Tarkasamgrahasarvasva*, which is a commentary of *Tarkasamgraha*, which defined *pada* as “*padam lakṣyati saktamiti | naiyāyikamate śaktasyaiva padatvena suptingantānām vibhaktīnām kṛtāti pratyayānāca padatvam abhīmatam* //”⁹

In *Gautama sūtravṛtti*, *pada* is defined as “*vṛttimatvam padatvam* //” that which possesses a *vṛtti* is a *pada*¹⁰. *Vṛtti* is a relation between word and its meaning. *Vṛtti* is of two kinds’ *śakti* and *lakṣaṇa*. “*vṛttisca śaktīlakṣaṇ anyetasambandhāh* //”¹¹.

Here we find a difference in the definition. Earlier definitions are in term of form but this definition is in term of reference. So here we can say that a meaningful unit is a *pada*, “*Śaktam padam*”. This definition is given by Annambhaṭa in *Tarkasamgraha* i.e which is possessed of *śakti* is *pada*. *śakti* is that a power of a word by virtue of which it refers to an object and cause its remembrance (*smṛti*).

Tarkasamgraha defines *sakti* as “*asmāccabdādayamartho bodhavya itīsvarechā śakti* //”¹². *Nyāyasidhāntamuktāvali* defines *śakti* as “*sācāsmāt padādayamartho bodhavyetī svarchārūpa* //”¹³.

Dinakaritīka refers that *śakti* is that a power of a word by virtue of which it refers to an object and cause its remembrance (*smṛti*). “*śakti padārtha smṛi janakam* //”¹⁴

śakti is the expressive power of a word and *lakṣaṇa* the secondary power of a word. Rhetoricians recognize a third kind of *vṛtti* known as *vyañjana*. Navya Naiyāyika has used the term *śakti* and *samketa* as synonyms.

Gautama Sūtravṛtti is said that *pada* being possessed of a *vṛtti*. This covers both the term *śakti* and *lakṣaṇa*. But Annambhaṭa has used the specific term as *śakti*. Some have confused by this

definition given in *Gautamasūtravṛtti* i.e whether a word having a secondary power (*lakṣaṇa*) is a *pada* or not. But it is clear because unless a word has an expressive power, it cannot have a secondary power. Because *lakṣaṇa* is a relation with primary meaning. *Nyāyasidhāntamuktāvali* referred it as “*lakṣanāsakhyasambandhastātparyānupapattitah* //”¹⁵

We can observe that a Naiyāyikas earlier definition of *pada* was framed in terms of form. But the later Naiyāyikas define it in terms of meaning. So that the concept of *pada* is changed totally. According to Gautama ‘*rāmah vanan gachati*’ consist of three *padas* namely *rāmah vanam* and *gachati*. But for Navya naiyāyikas it consist of six *padas* namely *rām*, the nominative suffix-ah, *vana*, the accusative suffix-am, the root-gam and the personal ending-ti.¹⁶ So the minimum meaningful unit is a *pada* according to navya naiyāyikas.

Different kinds of *Pada*

Naiyāyikas recognize three kinds of *śakti* i.e capacity of a word to generate the meaning viz. *yoga*, *rūḍhi* and *yogarūḍhi*. Tarkadīpika of Annambhaṭa refer “*Navyamate śakti trividah, yoga, rūḍhi, yogarūḍhi ca | tatrādi pācakādi padeṣu, dvitīya ghatādi padeṣu, tritīya pācakādi padeṣu* //”¹⁷

Some recognizes a fourth kind of *śakti* also viz. *Yaugikarūḍhi* -

“*atra yaugikarūḍhi turiyāpi sakti asti iti kecit vadanti* //”¹⁸

Accordingly words have been denoted into the following kinds *rūḍha* *yaugika*, *yaugirūḍha*, *yaugikarūḍha*. *Rūḍha* is that a kind of word the meaning of which is fixed by convention. Srīkanta dīkṣita in his *tarkaprakāśa* refer *rūḍha* as –

“*rūḍham sanketatvāt nāma saiva sañjete kīṛtyate* //”¹⁹

Yaugika is that kind of word the meaning of which is determined by the meanings of parts. Acārya nīlkaṇṭha in his *Nīlakantī* refers *yaugika* as, -

“*atra pacati iti vyutpatyā prakṛtipratyayādīnā pākartham bodhyate* //”²⁰

Yaugirūḍha is the meaning of which is determined partly by the union (*yoga*) of parts and partly by the convention (*rūḍha*). Visvanātha pañcana in his *sidhāntamuktāvali* refers *yaugarūḍha* as –

“*avayavaśakti viṣaye samudāyaśaktirapyasti* //”²¹

¹⁵ Ibid, p.36.

¹⁶ Studies in Indian Linguistics, p.220.

¹⁷ Trends of linguistics analysis in Indian Philosophy.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Karikavali, p.30

⁶ Dalai, B.K., *Studies in Indian Linguistics*, Bharatiya kala Prakasan, Delhi, 2007, p.219

⁷ Misra, Gomati prasasastri, *Laghusidhāntakaumudi*, Chaukhamba surabharati prakasan, Varanasi, 2011, p.11

⁸ Vangiya, Sri Satkarisarma, *Śrī Annambhaṭa virachita Tarkasamgraha*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Samsthan, Varanasi, 1997, p.66.

⁹ Trends of linguistics analysis in Indian Philosophy, Chaukhamba Orientalia, Varanasi, 1981, p.16.

¹⁰ Studies in Indian Linguistics, p.219.

¹¹ Lokamanidhala, Acarya, *Kārikavali*, Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakasan, Varanasi, 2009, p.5.

¹² *Śrī Annambhaṭa virachita Tarkasamgraha*, p.66.

¹³ Karikavali, p.6.

¹⁴ Trends of linguistics analysis in Indian Philosophy, p.15.

Yaugika rūḍa it is a compound of word the meaning of which is determined in a conventional way irrespective of the meaning of the component words that form the compound –

“yogenarūḍhyā ca paraspara sahakāreṇa artha pratipādakam ||”²²

Relationship between word and its meaning (*pada padārtha saṁbandham*)

The Naiyāyika hold that the relation is dependent on the will of God (isvarech) -

“sā ca asmādpadātayamartho bodhya iti īsvarecharūpa śaktih ||”²³

The Navya naiyāyika are of the view that this relation depend on the mere will, whether divine or human (icchāmātra) –

“navyāstu isvarecā na śakti kintu iccaiva ||”²⁴

The naiyāyika are of the opinion that the śakti does not lie in Ādhunikasanketa-

“ādhunika sanketite tu na saktiriti sampradāyah ||”²⁵

The Navya naiyāyika are of the opinion that even such words posse's -

“ādhunike nāmnī saktirastyeva ekādaso ahani pitā nāma kuryād iti isvarechāyah satvāt ||”²⁶

Some mīmāṃsakas regard the denotative capacity (Abhidāsakti) of a word as a separate entity –

“mīmāṃsakastu abhidā nāma padārthanatara sanketa grāhayam śakti iti āhuh ||”²⁷

According to Kumārila the relation between word and meaning is neither one of the difference (bheda) nor one of the identity (abheda) but one of the identity in difference (bhedābheda) –

“kaumārilamate padāt bhinnamabhinnam vākyam ||”²⁸

According to prābhakara and his followers the potency (śakti) of a word is of two kinds viz. Ānubhāvika and Smārika. –

“padaśakti dvividhā ānubhāvika smrika ca ||”²⁹

Conclusion

The concept of *pada* is the most important one in linguistics as well as in Nyāya vaisesika philosophy. The analysis of *pada* occupies a very important role in Nyāya philosophy. Mīmāṃsakas like Prābhakara and Bhāṭṭa hold the same view of *pada* in their own view. Vaiyākaraṇa's (grammarians) holds a deep discussion on this topic.

After analyzing this paper, we can see that there are differences in the definition of *pada* that which possessed by Naiyāyika and Navya naiyāyikas. Naiyāyika's definition is related to Vibhakti and like other “Te vibhaktiyanta padam which seems to relation with the concept of *pada* by vaiyākaraṇas. Navya Naiyāyika's definition is related to śakti (which is the expressive power of a word.) “śaktam padam”. This is related to Mīmāṃsakas definition of *pada*.

Naiyāyika and Navya naiyāyikas have their own view about concept of *pada* but it we can see the concept of development of *Pada* through the ages when the philosophy develops the concepts inside the philosophies become changeable and along with the changes the concept of *pada* varies.

By conclude it is seems that there are some relations with the concepts of *pada* in vaiyākaraṇas and Naiyāyikas, and Mīmāṃsakas and Navya Naiyāyikas.

References

1. Dalai BK. *Studies in Indian Linguistics*, Bharatiya kala Prakasan, Delhi, 2007.
2. Dvivedi, sivaprasad Acārya. *Śrī Venkītanātha Viracita Nyāyapariśudhi*, Chaukhamba Vidhyabhavan, varanasi, 1992.
3. Lokamanidahala, Acarya *Kārikavali*. Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakasan, Varanasi, 2009.
4. Misra, Gomatiprasasastri. *Laghusidhāntakaumudī*, Chaukhamba surabharati prakasan, Varanasi, 2011.
5. Misra, Sachidanand. *Nyayadarsana- The sutra of Goutama and Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*, Bharatiya Vidyaprakasan, Delhi, 1999.
6. Singh, Udaya Narayan. *Nyāyasūtra of Gautama*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratistan, Delhi, 1993.
7. Takur, Ananthlal Misra. *Nyāya Vṛttika Tika of Vacaspati*, Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Delhi, 1996.
8. Vangiya, Sri Satkarisarma. *Śrī Annaṁbhaṭa virachita Tarkasaṁgraha*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Samsthan, Varanasi, 1997.
9. Vangiya, Sri Satkarisarma. *Śrīmadannaṁbhaṭtaviracita Tarkasaṁgraha*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Samsthan, Varanasi, 1997.
10. Sooraj RS. Junior Research Fellow, Dept. of Sanskrit Sahitya, Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit, Kalady.

²² Ibid,p.31.

²³ Ibid,p.6.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Trends of linguistics analysis in Indian Philosophy,9.18.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.