



CSL

The Department of Public Instruction, Bombay

TARKA-SAMGRAHA

OF

ANNAMBHATTA

WITH THE AUTHOR'S OWN DIPIKĀ, AND
GOVARDHANA'S NYĀYA-BODHINI

EDITED WITH CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES

BY THE LATE

YASHWANT VASUDEV ATHALYE, M. A., LL. B.

TOGETHER WITH

INTRODUCTION AND ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE TEXT

BY

MAHADEV RAJARAM BODAS, M. A., LL. B.,

Vakil, High Court, Bombay

REVISED AND ENLARGED

Second Edition-Re-impresion

1930

(All rights reserved)

Price Two Rupees eight annas

Bombay Sanskrit Series No. IV





CSL

160
N 30 A T

160
Ann
N 30 T

18143

Ann-T.

Printed by Dr. V. G. Paranjpe, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt., at the
Bhandarkar Institute Press, 198 (17) Sadashiv Peth,
Poona No. 2, and published by
Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, M. A., Ph. D., at the
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona No. 4

1369

Contents.

Preface to the Second Edition	...	V
Extract from Preface to the First Edition	...	VII
Introduction	...	IX
Annambhatta and his works	...	LX
Abbreviations	...	XXI
TEXT AND COMMENTARIES	...	1-68
NOTES	...	69-372

Sect. 1 मङ्गलम्	...	69	Sect. 29 परत्वापरत्वे	...	167
" 2 पदाथाः	...	73	" 30 दुरुत्वम्	}	...
" 3 द्रव्याणि	...	76	" 31 द्रवत्वम्		
" 4 गुणाः	...	81	" 32 स्नेहः	...	169
" 5 कर्माणि	...	87	" 33 शब्दः	...	170
" 6 सामान्यम्	...	89	" 34 बद्धिः	...	173
" 7 विशेषाः	...	93	" 35 अनुभवः	...	180
" 8 समवायः	...	96	" 36 अनुभवभेदाः	...	183
" 9 अभावाः	...	99	" 37 करणम्	...	186
" 10 पृथिवी	...	103	" 38 कारणम्	...	192
" 11 आपः	...	110	" 39 कार्यम्	...	196
" 12 तेजः	...	111	" 40 कारणानि	...	206
" 13 वायुः	...	114	" 41 करणम्	...	210
" 14 आकाशम्	...	126	" 42 प्रत्यक्षम्	...	211
" 15 कालः	...	129	" 43 संनिकर्षः	...	221
" 16 दिक्	...	132	" 44 अनमानम्	...	233
" 17 आत्मा	...	134	" 45 स्वार्थं परार्थं च	...	251
" 18 मनः	...	145	" 46 पञ्चावयवाः	...	262
" 19 रूपम्	...	151	" 47 परीमशः	...	279
" 20 रसः	}	...	" 48 लिङ्गम्	...	281
" 21 गन्धः			" 49 पक्षः	}	...
" 22 स्पर्शः			" 50 सपक्षः		
" 23 पाकजापाकजत्वम्	...	156	" 51 विपक्षः	...	290
" 24 संख्या	...	159	" 52 हेत्वाभासाः	...	293
" 25 परिमाणम्	...	163	" 53 सव्यभिचारः	...	298
" 26 पृथक्त्वम्	...	164	" 54 विरुद्धः	...	302
" 27 संयोगः	...	"	" 55 सत्प्रातिपक्षः	...	303
" 28 विभागः	...	106	" 56 असिद्धः	...	305

Sect. 57 बाधितः	... 315	Sect. 73-74 आत्मगुणाः	... 361
„ 58 उपमानम्	... 327	„ 75 संस्कारः	... 362
„ 59 शब्दः	... 329	„ 76-79 कर्मसामान्य-	
„ 60-61 आकाङ्क्षा- याग्यता-संनिधयः	... 341	समवायविशेषाः	... 364
„ 62 वाक्यम्	... 344	„ 80 अभावः	... 364
„ 63 शाब्दम्	... 347	„ 81 उपसंहारः	... 368
„ 64 अप्रमा	... 354	Appendix A	... 373
„ 65 स्मृतिः	... 358	Appendix B	... 374
„ 66-73 सुखादयो गुणाः	... 360	Appendix C	... 375
		Index	... 380



CSL

Preface to the Second Edition*

The first edition of this book was published in 1897 and was soon out of print. Annambhaṭṭa's work having been appointed a text-book for examinations by Bombay and other Universities, there was a great demand for a second edition, but various reasons interrupted the work of revision. It was at first intended to omit the *Nyāyā-Bodhinī* which had nothing special about it, and insert in its place *Tarka-Dīpikā-Prakāśa* of *Nilakaṇṭha* and also a few useful extracts from other commentaries by way of footnotes; but as the plan would have increased the bulk of the volume it was abandoned and the text of the first edition was retained. Three additional copies, marked Q, U and W, were available for consultation and the necessary corrections and additions suggested by them have been made in the text, more particularly in the *Nyāyā-Bodhinī*. Copies U and W especially afforded considerable help in settling many doubtful passages of this commentary, and many of their variants have been adopted in this edition. The new commentaries published in W were also useful in clearing ambiguities in the text of the *Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā*, and the text may now therefore be said to be finally settled for all practical purposes.

The most important addition to the Notes was a literal translation of the text of the *Saṃgraha*, printed in italics at the top of each section, which will be found useful to students. Ambiguities and mistakes left in the hurry of the first edition have now been removed as far as possible, and many passages in the Notes have been re-written for the purpose. Some paragraphs had to be renumbered and some sections have been rearranged. The portion of the preface in the first edition dealing with the author has been placed after the Introduction, and another portion dealing with Mss. collated for the text has been transferred to

*In the present re-issue no change has been made except that the transliteration of Sanskrit has been brought into conformity with modern practice and that some of the obvious misprints and errors have been corrected. The time at the disposal of the Department was short and thanks are due to Prof. Dravid for having corrected the proofs carefully and expeditiously.— Superintendent, Publication Department, B.O.R.I.



the end as Appendix C. The Index at the end is a new feature added in this edition.

The Introduction required very few alterations. Where new facts have been brought out by later reseraches additional foot-notes have been inserted at the proper places. The discovery of unknown Jain and Buddhistic literature in India as well as in Tibet and China by the researches of distinguished scholars like Dr. Sarat Chandra Das and Mahāmahopādhyāya Satisa Chandra Vidyabhushana is likely to throw new light on many dark spots in the history of Indian philosophy, and many of our current notions are also likely to be altered. All speculations on this subject must therefore be accepted as only provisonal at present. It would be a very interesting and instructive study to trace the gradual development of many philosophical problems, such as the atomic theory, the identity of cause and effect, the Nyāya syllogism, and the notion of *Abhāva*. But until fuller materials are available, it will be worse than useless to indulge in idle guesses. It is now fully recognized that Indian philosophical systems are not the creations of individual promulgators, but organic growths from out of various currents of thoughts germinating through ages and collected in the Brāhmanas, the Aranyakas and the more ancient Smrtis and Purāṇas. A critical and comparative study of these philosophies will assuredly reveal the lines of this growth as well as its reaction on the religious development of the Hindus. It is to be hoped that Indian scholars will devote greater attention to the study of this aspect of Indian Philosophy.

Bombay,
30th September 1918 }

M. R. BODAS



Extract from the Preface to the First Edition

(Dated March 1897)

.....
.....
A few words as regards the explanatory and critical notes appended to this edition will suffice. The chief aim in writing these annotations was to make them as exhaustive as the limited scope of a book mainly intended for students would permit. The notes will not appear disproportionate to the text, if the difficulty of the subject as well as the want of a proper guide to these systems are taken into account. The notes are designed to give the student a tolerably complete and accurate idea of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems as a whole; and hence many topics, although omitted or only cursorily glanced at in *Annambhaṭṭa's* work, have been discussed in the notes, because they form essential ingredients of the systems. Manuals like the *Tarka-Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā* are to be studied only as stepping stones to the knowledge of a great and intricate science; and the notes have been written with a view to facilitate the further progress of the student as much as possible.

An attempt has been made in the *Introduction* prefixed to this edition to trace the gradual development of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* literature from the age of the *Sūtras* upto the latest period. A historical sketch like this is sure to give the students a better notion of these systems than any amount of study of isolated works. The attempt is of course only tentative, but it at least opens a vast field for inquiry which may be profitably pursued in future. It was at first intended to discuss some of the more important doctrines of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems in the *Introduction*, especially with reference to their evolution and bearing on the general course of thought in India. The task, however, was found to be too vast for such a work as the present and the plan had to be abandoned for want of space: but a few hints of the kind will be found in the notes in their proper places.

It will not be proper to conclude this preface without briefly explaining the circumstances under which this work is published. The present edition of *Tarka-Saṃgraha* with commentaries and notes was undertaken by the late Mr. Y. V. Athalye more than twelve years ago and it was an ambition of his life to devote all his leisure time to the writing of the notes so as to make them really exhaustive and useful, not only to students in Indian Colleges, but also to advanced scholars. He saw that in order to popularise the study of *Nyāya* it was necessary to clear the many disputed points that beset the path of a conscientious student and to place the cardinal doctrines of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* philosophy in their true light. No man was better fitted for such a work than Mr. Athalye, whose profound scholarship and legal acumen enabled him at once to unravel the intricacies of the *Nyāya* logic. Pressure of official and other business, however, hardly left him any time to complete a task upon which he had set his heart. The work had to be constantly put aside, and consequently much labour and time were wasted in these interruptions; while latterly ill health made him more and more unable to bear the strain of a continuous effort. In spite of these difficulties he hoped to bring out this edition at an early date, and would have done so had not premature and almost sudden death carried him off at a time when he was most wanted. He had however left ample materials behind him, which required only a final revision and arrangement to make the book acceptable to the public; and so it was resolved to publish it as a posthumous work.....

.....

.....

.....



Introduction.

*A Historical Survey of Indian Logic.*¹

"THE foundation of logic as a Science," says Ueberweg, "is a work of the Greek mind, which, equally removed from the hardness of the Northern and the softness of the Oriental, harmoniously united power and impressibility."² The supple mind of the Oriental is said to be wanting in the mental grip and measure required for strictly scientific thinking. Ueberweg, when he laid down the above proposition, was not wholly ignorant of the existence of *Nyāya* philosophy, but his knowledge of it seems to have been very meagre. Had he known some of the standard works of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems, he would not have passed such a sweeping remark about the incapacity of the Oriental mind to develop a rigorous science like Logic. The same ignorance has led many eminent writers to belittle Indian philosophies in general or, where striking coincidences are discovered between Greek and Indian speculations, to assume a Grecian importation of philosophical ideas into India at some ancient time. Thus Niebuhr unhesitatingly asserts that the close similarity between Indian and Greek philosophies cannot be explained "except by the intercourse which the Indians had with the Græco-Macedonic kings of Bactria."³ On the other hand, there are writers like Gorres who as positively declare that the Greeks borrowed their first elements of philosophy from the Hindus. Max Müller is probably nearer the truth in saying that both Greek and Indian philosophies were autochthonic, and that neither of the two nations borrowed their thoughts from the other.⁴ As the human mind is alike everywhere, it is quite possible that philosophers in both India and Greece unconsciously adopted the same mode

¹ This paper was read by me at a meeting of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society on the 24th September 1896 and is published in the Journal of the B. B. R. A. Society, Vol XIX p. 306.

² Dr. F. Ueberweg : *System of Logic* p. 19.

³ Thomson's *Laws of Thought*, Appendix p. 285.

⁴ Thomson's *Laws of Thought*, Appendix p. 285.

of reasoning and arrived at similar results quite independently. A closer study of Indian philosophical literature is already producing a conviction among European scholars that it is tolerably indigenous and self-consistent, and that it does not need the supposition of a foreign influence to explain any portion of it. It should also be noticed that notwithstanding many coincidences between the Indian and the Grecian currents of philosophical thought there are several features in each so peculiar as to make any inter-communion between them highly improbable. The fact, for instance, that Indian Logic retained a close similarity to Pre-Aristotelian Dialectics up to a very late time is a legitimate ground for believing that the influence of Aristotle's works was never felt in India. Besides, as a history of Indian philosophy is still unwritten, and will probably remain so for years to come, it is advisable for every student to keep an open mind on the subject. Preconceived theories, however ingenious or plausible, are more likely to mislead than help such investigations. We shall therefore assume, until the contrary is indubitably proved, that Indian philosophy, including Indian logic, is a home-grown product, created by the natural genius of the people and capable of historical treatment.

That it is possible to write a history of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* philosophies will be readily admitted; but a history of philosophy, such as it ought to be, presupposes a good many things, which may not find universal acceptance. It assumes, for instance, that the Indian systems of philosophy were gradually evolved out of a few broad principles by a succession of writers and under particular circumstances. The idea that philosophical speculations in India were the spontaneous brain-creations of a few mystic Brahmans, dreaming high thoughts in lonely forests and totally unaffected by the passing events of the world, must be discarded once for all. There is no reason why philosophy in India should have followed a different course from what it did in Greece and other civilized countries. Systems of philosophy are as much liable to be influenced by past and contemporary events as any other branch of science or literature; and Indian



philosophy should be no exception to the rule. But the task of writing such a history is beset with innumerable difficulties. The chief of these is the absence of any reliable historical data which might serve us as landmarks in the ocean of Sanskrit literature. Not only are the dates of the principal writers and their works unknown, but even the existence of some of them as historical personages is doubted. Many of these works, again, are not available for reference,¹ while of those that are printed or can be procured in Ms. only a few have yet been critically studied. European scholars are still too much engrossed in their Vedic and antiquarian researches to devote serious attention to a systematic study of Indian philosophies; while as to native Pandits, however learned the very notion of a history of philosophy is foreign to their minds. There are works in Sanskrit, like the *Sarva-Darśana-Saṃgraha* of *Mādhavācārya* and the *Ṣaḍ-Darśana-Samuccaya* of *Haribhadra Sūri*, which profess to treat of all current systems of philosophy; but the historical view is totally absent in them. There the systems are arranged either according to their religious character or according to the predilections of the author. In modern times, scholars like Colebrooke, Weber, Hall and Bannerjee have made some valuable contributions, but many of their opinions and criticisms are now antiquated and stand in need of revision in the light of further researches. A good deal has also been added to our knowledge of the Buddhistic literature, but even there the attention of scholars has not yet been sufficiently directed to its philosophical portion. It is not possible, therefore, under these circumstances, to do more than throw out a few hints which, while dispelling some of the prevalent errors on the subject, will serve as a basis for future inquiries in the same direction. The following pages will not have been written in vain if this aim is even partially achieved.

The value of a history of philosophy will be appreciated by those who know how much our knowledge of Greek

¹ Most of the writings of eminent Buddhist logicians like *Dinnāga* and *Dharmakīrti* are now available only in Chinese and Tibetan translations, their Sanskrit originals having been apparently lost. See Sadajiro Sugiura's *Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan*.

philosophy has been deepened by the accounts left by Plato, Xenophon and Thucydides. Systems of philosophy as well as individual doctrines are never the products of personal caprice or of mere accident; they are evolved out of a long chain of antecedent causes. They are in fact the tangible manifestations of various latent forces which mould the character and history of the nation. There could have been no Aristotle without a Plato or a Socrates, and no Socrates without the Sophists. A knowledge of this sequence is therefore essential to a true appreciation of every system and every doctrine, an isolated study of them being either insufficient or misleading. Besides, theories and schools are often the work not of one individual or of one age, but of a succession of thinkers who fashion and refashion them, as it were, until they become worthy of general acceptance. Such seems to have been the case with doctrines of God, of causality and of creation, in India as well as in Greece. The true aim of a history of philosophy may be explained in the words of Zeller:—

“The systems of philosophy, however peculiar and self-dependent they may be, thus appear as the members of a larger historical inter-connection; in respect to this alone can they be perfectly understood; the further we follow it the more the individuals become united to a whole of historical development, and the problem arises not merely of explaining this whole by means of the particulars conditioning it, but likewise of explaining these moments by one another and consequently the individual by the whole.”¹

A history of Indian philosophy, such as would fulfil this purpose, is not of course possible in the present rudimentary state of Indian chronology. Still even a crude attempt of that kind will give truer insight into each system or each doctrine than can be got by a study of isolated works. The need of such a connected view of philosophy is all the greater in the case of systems like the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśeṣika* whose real merits



lie hidden under a heavy load of scholastic surplusage. They have not the halo of religion and mysticism which makes the *Vedānta* and the other theological systems so attractive to students of Hindu philosophy, while the scholastic subtleties of the most modern *Nyāya* writers, such as *Śiromaṇi* and *Gadādhara*, inspire positive terror in untrained minds. If the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems, therefore, are to be popularized and their value to be recognized, it is necessary to divest them of their excrescences. A large mass of rubbish is to be found in the works of modern *Naiyāyikas*, and the task of extracting the pure ore out of it is very difficult; but it is worth performing. The process of sifting and cleaning will have to be repeated several times before we can really understand some of the profoundest conceptions that are interwoven in these systems. Philosophy is the stronghold of Hinduism, and the system of *Nyāya* forms as it were the back-bone of Hindu philosophy. Every other system accepts the fundamental principles of *Nyāya* logic, while even where there are differences, the dissentients often borrow the very arguments and phraseology of the *Nyāya* for their own purpose. A study of the *Nyāya* as well as *Vaiśeṣika* system is therefore a necessary step to a popular understanding of most of the systems. It forms as it were an introduction to the general study of philosophy, and hence no scholar who would seek the truth in the latter can afford to neglect them.

Among the numerous systems of philosophy that have been evolved in India during the last three thousand years, the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* occupy a unique position, both on account of their cardinal doctrines and of the mass of learning that has accumulated around them. A general view of these doctrines will not, therefore, be out of place in a sketch like this. *Nyāya*, which is the more compact and perhaps also the more modern of the two, is much more a system of dialectics than one of philosophy. The aphorisms of *Gotama* and the works founded on them treat no doubt of metaphysical and theological questions occasionally, but

they come in rather as digressions than as inseparable parts of the system. The *Vaiśeṣika*, on the other hand, is essentially a system of metaphysics with a disquisition on logic skilfully dovetailed into it by later writers. It is these peculiarities which have earned them the name of logical systems and which distinguish them from each other as well as from other systems of Indian philosophy. These peculiarities must be carefully noted, for inattention to them has led many to misunderstand the true scope and function of these systems.¹

Gotama begins by enumerating 16 topics, which have been erroneously called *padārthas*.² These topics are not a classification of all sublunary things or categories. They look like headings of so many chapters in a treatise on logic. Of these the first nine, viz. प्रमाण, प्रमेय, संशय, प्रयोजन, दृष्टान्त, सिद्धान्त, अवयव, तर्क, and निर्णय, constitute what may be called logic proper, while the last seven may be collectively termed illegitimate or false logic. प्रमाण includes the four proofs, *Perception, Inference, Comparison and Word*;³ while प्रमेय comprises all objects which are known by means of those proofs, viz. soul, body, organ, material qualities, cognition, mind, effort, fault, death, fruition, pain and salvation.⁴ These multifarious things have obviously nothing in common except the capacity of being known by one or other of the above proofs; and *Gotama* accordingly treats of them only in that light. He rarely troubles himself about the nature or form of these things, or of their production and destruction, as *Kaṇāda*, for instance, does. This is the reason why *Gotama's* definitions of soul, cognition, mind, etc., only tell us how they are known, but say nothing as to what kind of things they are. *Gotama's* theory of knowledge is essentially material. *Perception* is a physical process consisting in the contact of organs with their appropriate objects;⁵ while *Inference*, which is threefold,

1 Logic in Sanskrit is designated by various names, such as *Nyāya*, *Hetu-Vidyā*, *Hetu-Sāstra*, *Ānvīkṣikā*, *Pramāṇa-Sāstra*, *Tattva-Sāstra*, *Tarka-Vidyā*, *Vādārtha* and *Phakkikā-Sāstra*. Some of these names are found in works of 4th and 5th centuries B. C.

2 G. S. I, 1, 1.

3 G. S. I, 1, 3.

4 G. S. I, 1, 9.

5 G. S. I, 1, 4.

springs from *Perception*.¹ *Comparison* and *Word* are of course exceptional cases, and may be called imperfect inferences. Having thus dealt with the chief ingredients of knowledge, namely, the proof and its object, *Gotama* describes several accessories to knowledge, *viz.*, doubt, aim, instance or precedent, general truths, premises, hypothetical reasoning and conclusion. Doubt and aim as incentives to every inquiry are necessary to knowledge. Precedents and general truths form the material, while premises and hypothetical reasoning are the instruments of acquiring fresh knowledge. Conclusion is the final and combined product of all these things.² The seven topics forming the second group have a negative function in logic, namely, of preventing erroneous knowledge. By exposing errors they teach us how to avoid them. They are rather like weapons for destroying the enemy's fortress than tools to build one's own. Continued argument (वाद), sophistry (जल्प), wrangling (वितण्डा), fallacies (हेत्वाभास), quibbling (उल्ल), far-fetched analogies (जाति), and opponent's errors (निग्रहस्थान)—all these are useful where the object is to vanquish an opponent or to gain a temporary triumph; but they do not legitimately belong to the province of logic. *Gotama's* treatise may therefore be appropriately called the theory and practice of controversy rather than a science of logic. It resembles in this respect the dialectical work of Zeno who founded the sophistic dialectics in Greece.

The system, however, underwent considerable modifications in later times. The sixteen *padārthas* were practically ignored, and the theory of the four proofs absorbed almost the whole attention of later *Naiyāyikas*. The philosophical views of *Gotama* mostly came out in the digressions which are numerous in his work. They are generally introduced by way of illustrations to his method; and yet his followers have accepted these views as cardinal principles and built a regular system of philosophy upon them. The most cha-

1 G. S. I., 1, 5.

2 See for definitions of these, G. S. I, 1, 23-32, 40, 41.

racteristic of these doctrines are the non-eternity of sound¹ the agency of God,² the theory of atoms,³ the production of effects,⁴ and its corollary, the reality of our knowledge. From the fragmentary discussions on these points contained in *Gotama's* work the modern *Āyīyāyikas* have evolved elaborate theories which have made the system what it is. The radical and realistic tendency of these later doctrines came at every step into conflict with the more orthodox views of the two *Mīmāṃsās*.

The system of the *Vaiśeṣikas* is even more radical than the *Nyāya*. As a system of philosophy, the *Vaiśeṣika* is more symmetrical and also more uncompromising. Its enumeration of the six categories,⁵ with the seventh *Abhāva* added afterwards, is a complete analysis of all existing things. These categories again are not enumerated for a special purpose only, like the 16 *padārthas* of *Gotama*; but they resolve the entire universe, as it were, not excepting even the Almighty Creator, into so many classes. *Kaṇāda's* categories resemble in this respect those of Aristotle. *Gotama* treats of knowledge only, but *Kaṇāda* deals with the wider phenomena of existence. The first three categories, Substance, Quality, and Motion, have a real objective existence and so form one group designated अर्थ by *Kaṇāda*.⁶ The next three, Generality, Particularity, and Intimate Union, are products of our conception and may be called metaphysical categories, while the last one, Negation, appears to have been added afterwards for dialectical purposes. The nine substances comprise all corporeal and incorporeal things, and the twenty-four qualities exhaust all the properties that can reside in substance. बुद्धि is a quality of the Soul, and the whole theory of knowledge therefore consists in the production of this quality in its substratum, the Soul. The process by which the cognition of an external object is produced in the Soul is something like printing or stamping on some soft material. Mind is the movable joint between the Soul and the various organs which carry those impressions from ex-

1 G. S. II, 3, 13-40.

3 G. S. IV, 2, 4-25.

5 V. S. I, 1, 4.

2 G. S. IV, 1, 19-21.

4 G. S. IV, 1, 22-54.

6 V. S. VIII, 2, 3.



ternal objects. Logic as a science of knowledge falls under बुद्धि, and is so treated in all *Vaiśeṣika* treatises. *Vaiśeṣikas* recognize only the first two of the four proofs mentioned by *Gotama*,¹ and they differ from the *Naiyāyikas* on some other points also. What specially distinguishes the *Vaiśeṣikas*, however, is their remarkable power of analysis; and their system may for that reason be appropriately called analytical philosophy. They divide and subdivide each class of things, and dissect every notion into its minutest components. No doubt the process of analysis is sometimes carried to an extreme where it ends into fruitless distinctions, but its influence on philosophical speculations in general must have been enormous. It is this feature of the *Vaiśeṣika* system that has made it the source of all liberal thought in Indian philosophy. None are so unreserved in their speculations, and none are such powerful critics of time-worn prejudices as the followers of *Kaṇāda*. No wonder then that they were looked upon with distrust by the orthodox school, and were labelled *Ardha-Vaiśeṣikas* (Semi-Buddhists) by their opponents.² The *Vaiśeṣikas* never declared any open revolt against orthodox faith, nor is there any reason for supposing that *Kaṇāda* or his immediate followers were atheists; but the tendency of their doctrine was none the less unmistakable. As the devout Lord Bacon produced a Hume and a Voltaire in Europe, so the *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines must have led ultimately to many a heresy in India, such as those of the *Bauddhas* and the *Jainas*.

A remarkable feature of both the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśeṣika* systems, as in fact of all the Indian systems of philosophy, is the religious motive which underlies them. Religion is the incentive to all these speculations, and religion is also the test of their truth and utility. Salvation is the goal which both *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* promise the people as the reward of a thorough knowledge of their respective sys-

1 B. P. Ben. ed p. 213.

2 Saṅkarācārya · *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya* II. 2. 18.



tems.¹ Amidst all the differences one idea appears to be common to all the ancient Indian systems, namely, that knowledge is the door and the only door to salvation. Opinions only differ as to what things are worth knowing. Consequently the bitterest controversies have raged among these rivals as to what things ought to be known for the speedy attainment of salvation. These controversies usually take the form of attacks on the rival classifications of categories as being either defective or superfluous or illogical. Another effect of the religious character of these systems is the discussion of many apparently irrelevant topics which have made them look somewhat heterogeneous and unsystematic. The many digressions in the works of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* as well as their followers are easily understood if we look to the bearing which those topics have upon the end and aim of philosophy. Take for instance the controversy about non-eternity of sound.² What has the eternity of sound to do with logic? An inference would be just as right or wrong whether the words conveying it are eternal or not. But the question of the eternity of sound is vitally connected with the infallibility of the *Vedas* which are final authority in all matters of doubt; and all orthodox systems, therefore, must have their say on the point. We thus find that questions of the most diverse character are discussed wherever the context leads to them while others more closely related to the subject are neglected. Each system has consequently become a mixture, as it were, of the fragments of several sciences such as logic, metaphysics, psychology, and theology. This is not however a weakness as some superficial critics have supposed. It arises from the very conception of a *Darśana*, and could never have been avoided by those who in these systems sought to provide a complete guide, as it were, to the road to salvation. Indian philosophy is not singular in this respect. Everywhere philosophy grows out of religious instincts. The sense of dependence on supernatural powers and a desire to conciliate them were the first incentives

1 G. S. I, I, 1; V. S., I, 1, 4.

2 G. S. II, 2, 13.



which led men at a very early period to think of their religious well-being. "Philosophy," says Zeller, "just begins when man experiences and acts upon the necessity of explaining phenomena by means of natural causes."¹ The *R̥gveda*, the *Br̥hmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads* abound in passages showing how in India this feeling grew in intensity until it became the ruling passion of the Brahmins. Salvation was the sole purpose of life, and knowledge of the universe was the means to it. The ancient *Upaniṣads* were the repositories of the speculations which rose like bubbles out of this fermentation of thought, and which appear to have ultimately crystallized into the various systems of philosophy.² In Greece philosophy tended to become more and more ethical and worldly; in India it could never free itself from its religious setting. This is the reason why in spite of additions and modifications Indian *Darśanas* never lost their original character completely. A history of each of these systems is therefore a history of its gradual evolution within certain limits, while its relations outside of them remained practically unchanged.

The period before the rise of Buddhism is almost a blank page. We know nothing of it except that a large amount of free speculation must have been stored up at that time in the *Br̥hmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*. The only system which dates prior to Buddhism is the *Sāṅkhya*, and possibly the *Vaiśeṣika* also; but all the other *Darśanas* are presumably of a post-Buddhistic origin, at least in the form in which we possess them. In fact the very notion of a system seems to be post-Buddhistic. The severe conflict between Buddhism and Brahmanism which stirred men's minds in the century after Buddha's death must have compelled both the parties to systematize the doctrines and express them in a compact methodical form.

¹ Zeller; *Outline of Greek Philosophy*, p. 6.

² See my paper entitled "A Brief Survey of the *Upaniṣads*" J. B. B. R. A. Society, Vol. XXII. p. 67.

The same cause or causes which led the Buddhists to collect their ethical and philosophical teachings in their *suttas* during the period which elapsed between the first and the second Council must have also induced their Brahman rivals to compose similar works for the defence of Vedic orthodoxy. The two collections of aphorisms belonging to the Prior and the Posterior *Mīmāṃsās* and known by the names of *Jaimini* and *Bādarāyana* respectively have a strong controversial flavour about them, and appear to be the first products of this reaction against Buddhism. The aphorisms of *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* could not have been of any prior date, and as we do not know of any *Nyāya* or *Vaiśeṣika* works older than these *Sūtras*, the history of those systems may safely be said to begin in the 5th or the 4th century before Christ.

Roughly speaking, the literature of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems extends over a period of 22 centuries, that is, from about the 4th century B. C. till very recent times, of which the last two hundred years, not being distinguished by any original works, may be left out of account. The history may be divided into three periods: the first from about 400 B. C. to 500 A. D., the second from thence to 1300 A. D., and the third after that till the end of the last century. The only known representatives of the first period are the two collections of aphorisms going under the name of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* respectively, and perhaps the scholium of *Praśastapāda* also; but there must have existed other works now lost. The second period is pre-eminently distinguished by a series of commentaries on these *Sūtras* beginning with *Vātsyāyana* and comprising several works of acknowledged authority. The third period saw the introduction of independent treatises and commentaries on them which at last dwindle down into short manuals like *Tarka-Saṃgraha* and *Tarka-Kaumudī*. These three periods also mark three successive stages in the development of the two systems. The first may be called the age of the formation of doctrines in the *Sūtras*; the second that of their elaboration by commentators; and the third that of their systematization by writers of special treatises. The



first is characterised by great originality and freshness, the second by a fulness of details and the third by scholastic subtlety ultimately leading to decadence. These divisions may sometimes overlap, for we have treatises like *Tārkikarākshā* and *Sapta-padārthī* before the 14th century, so we have commentaries on the *Sūtras*, like *Śaṅkara Miśra's Upaskāra*, and *Viśvanātha's Vṛtti*, written afterwards. This does not however affect our general conclusion that the writings of the 14th century and onwards are in marked contrast with those of the preceding age. The exact duration of these periods may have varied a little in the case of the two systems, but the order is the same. The mutual relation of these two systems, however, appears to have changed at different times. During the first period they seem to have been two different systems, independent in origin but treating of the same topics and often borrowing from each other. *Vātsyāyana* regards them as supplementary.¹ In the second period, however, they become somewhat antagonistic, partly owing to an accumulation of points of difference between the two, and partly on account of the alliance of the *Vaiśeṣikas* with the Buddhists. The third period saw the amalgamation of the two systems, and we come across many works, like the *Tarka-Saṅgraha* for instance, in which the authors have attempted to select the best portions of each and construct from these fragments a harmonious system of their own. This is a curious phenomenon, no doubt, and we do not yet sufficiently know the causes which brought about these successive changes in the attitude of the exponents of these two systems towards each other; but the fact is important in as much as it must have been a powerful factor in moulding both of them. At any rate it accounts for the difficulty, which every student meets with at the threshold, whether to regard these systems as really supplementary or antagonistic to each other. They are spoken of as both, and yet no Sanskrit writer seems to have perceived the inconsistency of doing so. The only explanation that can at present be suggested is that the

1 *Vāt.* on G. S. I., 1, 4.

twins after quarrelling for some time reunited under the influence of a reaction.

Having premised so much we may proceed to consider the three periods in order; and the first thing we shall have to do is of course to fix the age of the *Sūtras* of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda*. They are the recognized basis of the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśeṣika* systems, and they are, so far as we know, the oldest works on those systems. Not that they were the first of their kind; perhaps they were preceded by cruder attempts of the same sort that have perished; perhaps the present works are improved editions of older ones. For all practical purposes, however, the works of *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* may be taken as the starting points for the two systems. Now before adverting to the evidence that exists for determining the dates of these two *Sūtras* it is necessary to notice one or two misconceptions that would otherwise hinder our task. The first of these is the confusion that is often made between the system and the *Sūtra* work expounding it; and the second is a similar want of distinction between the system as a whole and the particular doctrines composing it. The three things, *viz.*, *Gotama's* work, the *Nyāya*-system, and the individual doctrines embodied in it, are quite distinct, and ought not to be confounded with one another. They may for aught we know have originated at different times, and no inference can therefore be safely drawn as to the probable date of the one from any ascertained fact relating to the other. The fact for instance that some of the *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines are controverted in *Bādarāyaṇa's* *Brahma-Sūtras*¹ has been made the ground for inferring that *Kaṇāda's* *Sūtras* were composed prior to those of *Bādarāyaṇa*, and yet there are cogent reasons for believing that they were of a much later origin. We must therefore suppose that the doctrines controverted in *Brahma-Sūtras* existed prior to their incorporation into a regular system as set out in *Kaṇāda's* work. Similarly many of the arguments as to the relative priority of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems are based on assumptions made from some doctrines of the one being cited or refuted by the other. Such argu-

¹ *Brahma-Sūtras*, II, 2, 11, *et. seq.*



ments however are misleading and often produce confusion. The *Nyāya* doctrine of असत्कार्यवाद must have existed before the rise of Buddhism and even before the formation of the *Sāṅkhya* system, the oldest works of which controvert it. Does it follow therefore that *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* preceded both the *Sāṅkhyas* and the *Bauddhas*? And if so, how are we to account for the fact that several doctrines of the *Sāṅkhyas* as well as the *Bauddhas* are in their turn quoted in the *Sūtras* of both these authors? Here is a dilemma which can only be solved by supposing that the doctrine of असत्कार्यवाद and many others like it subsequently adopted by the *Naiyāyikas* and *Vaiśeṣikas* must have formed topics of hot discussion long before the *Sūtras* of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* were composed. In like manner, even supposing that the system as such existed at or before a particular date it will not be right to argue that *Kaṇāda's Sūtras* also must have existed at that time.¹ Nor should it be supposed that the whole system as conceived later is to be found in these works. Many doctrines now looked upon as cardinal principles of *Vaiśeṣika* philosophy, are conspicuous by their absence in *Kaṇāda's* work, such as, for instance, *Abhāva* as a seventh category, the last seven qualities, and the doctrine of *Viśeṣa*.² This much however is certain, that when the *Sūtras* were composed the two systems had assumed a definite form which was never to be substantially changed. There are important gaps that were filled up afterwards; but the skeleton is there and it is the skeleton that gives shape to the body. The process may have been something like this. First bold thinkers started theories of their own on the burning questions of the day, and then these theories after much discussion crystallized into specific doctrines such as those of असत्कार्य, समवाय and others. The ancient *Upaniṣads* abound in passages in which we find such definite principles being actually worked out of a mass of general speculations. The next step is for some eminent

1 Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 354, Cowell's note.

2 V. S. I., 1, 4; I., 1, 6; I., 2, 3.

teacher to adopt and develop some of these doctrines and form a school which might in time grow up into a system. The difference between a school and a system is that of degree. A school adopts a theory about a particular phenomenon, while a system aims at explaining consistently the whole order of nature by reducing several of these theories into harmony. *Audulomi*, *Kāśakṛtsna*, *Bādari* and many others whose names occur in the philosophical *Sūtras*, seem to have been founders of the schools which preceded the regular systems. The system when thus formed required an authoritative exposition, and many must have been the failures of inferior persons, before a master mind like *Gotama* or *Kaṇāda* could produce a work that would live into futurity. The present *Sūtras* of *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* must, therefore, be regarded as representing the end rather than the commencement of this evolutionary process. They did not originate the systems, they only stereotyped them, by giving them as it were a body and shape. Besides, it is probable that the fashion of propounding philosophical systems in the form of *Sūtras*, if not the systems themselves, came into vogue after the rise of *Buddhism*. The ethical teachings of *Gautama Buddha* were expressed in the shape of pithy sentences which were easy to remember and possessed a certain attraction for the popular mind. The Brahmins, probably with a desire to beat their rivals with their own weapons, composed *Sūtras* on their own philosophical systems modelled on the Buddhistic *suttas*, and possessing in some cases literary finish of a very high order. The necessity of meeting their opponents in controversies which became frequent from this time compelled the orthodox philosophers to put their cardinal doctrines in a definite shape; and this they did by expressing them in an incisive and dogmatic form so as to produce immediate conviction. The uncompromising tone and rigid logic of these post-Buddhist *Sūtras* are in strong contrast with the loose reasoning and poetical imagery which abound in earlier philosophical books, such as the *Upaniṣads*. While morality was the stronghold of the Buddhists, philosophy was their weakest point in these early times;



naturally the shrewd Brahmins cultivated this latter branch with the greater vigour in order to outshine their rivals. The *Sūtras* of *Jaimini* and *Bādarāyaṇa* must have been composed with some such object in view; and the example, once set, was of course followed by other teachers belonging to the orthodox party.

It is difficult to determine the chronological order of the several systems of philosophy, and the attempts hitherto made have not been very successful. The *Sāṃkhya* system and many of the doctrines of the *Vaiśeṣikas*, if not the whole of their system, are most probably Pre-Buddhistic. The *Vaiśeṣika* system pre-supposes the *Sāṃkhya*, and there is evidence to show that the *Vaiśeṣika* not only preceded Buddhism and Jainism, but directly contributed to the rise of those sects, many of their peculiar dogmas being closely allied to *Vaiśeṣika* theories. The Buddhistic doctrines of total annihilation, for instance, is only a further and an inevitable development of the *Vaiśeṣika* doctrine of असत्कार्यवाद; while the categories or *Padārthas* of the latter find their counterpart in the five *Astikāyas* or essences of the *Jainas*. The atomic theory moreover is largely adopted by the *Jainas*, and even enters into their legendary mythology. The epithet *Ardha-Vaiśeṣikas* or Semi-Buddhists, contemptuously bestowed upon the *Vaiśeṣika* by *Śaṅkarācārya*,¹ concealed a historical truth, if the *Vaiśeṣikas* as suggested above were the half-hearted precursors who by their materialistic speculations paved the way for the extreme radicalism of *Gautama Buddha*. The *Vaiśeṣika* school is specifically named in the sacred texts of the *Jainas* and also in the *Lalita-Vistāra*.² Several of their doctrines are refuted in *Bādarāyaṇa's Brahma-Sūtras*, and it is possible that they may have existed then in some systematic form. As to the other systems, the two *Mīmāṃsās* appear to have come immediately after the rise of Buddhism and before the advent of the *Nyāya* and the *Yoga*. Neither

1 See foot-note *supra*.

2 Weber: *History of Indian Literature*, p. 236, foot-note.



Bādarāyaṇa nor *Jaimini* refers to any peculiar *Nyāya* doctrine, while the few aphorisms in *Bādarāyaṇa*'s work which mention *Yoga* look like interpolations. It will be shown presently that *Gotama* himself borrows from *Bādarāyaṇa*'s work.¹

Looking to the *Sūtras*, however, the two *Mīmāṃsā* collections appear to be the oldest of them, while the works of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* come next in succession. The date of *Jaimini* and *Bādarāyaṇa*, who quote each other and might have been contemporaries, is not yet settled. They are certainly aware of the Buddhistic sect, many of whose doctrines they quote and refute.² The two *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras* therefore could not have been composed before the 6th century B. C. They may for the present be assigned to the 5th or the earlier part of the 4th century B. C. The *Sūtras* of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* must be still later productions, as will appear from a comparison of them with the *Brahma-Sūtras*. The opening *sūtras* of both *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* appear to recognize the *Vedāntic* doctrine of knowledge being the means to salvation; while throughout their works whenever they treat of soul, salvation, pain, knowledge, and such other topics, their language seems to be strongly tinged with *Vedāntic* notions. The phraseology is often the same, and in several places even direct references to the *Brahma-Sūtras* may be detected in these works. For example the *Vaiśeṣika sūtras*, अनित्य इति विशेषतः प्रतिषेधभावः and अविद्या³ appear to be answers to *Bādarāyaṇa*'s objections to the eternity of atoms⁴; while the *Sūtra* अहमिति शब्दस्य व्यतिरेकाद्वागमिकम्⁵ is evidently aimed at the *Vedāntic* view explained in the four preceding *sūtras*, that the Soul is to be known only through *Śruti*.⁶ Similarly V. S. IV, 2, 2-3 controvert the *Vedāntin*'s view that our body is formed by

1 Garbe holds that *Vaiśeṣika* was prior to *Nyāya*: Vide. Die Sāṃkhya Philosophie, p. 116.

2 *Brahma-Sūtra* II, 2, 18, et seq; *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* 1, 2, 33; see also Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I, p. 354.

3 V. S. IV, 1, 4-5.

4 *Brahma-Sūtra* II, 2, 14-15.

5 V. S. III, 2, 9.

6 Cf. also G. S. III, I. 28-30.



the union of five or three elements.¹ Again many of the terms used by *Kaṇāda* such as अविविधा, लिङ्ग, प्रत्यगात्मा, and व्याख्यात, appear to be borrowed from *Bādarāyaṇa*. The same holds good of *Gotama*. In several places he propounds views very similar to well-known *Vedāntic* doctrines²; while a comparison of G. S. III, 2, 14 with *Brahma-Sūtra* II, 1, 24 will show that *Gotama* borrows even illustrations and arguments from *Bādarāyaṇa*.³ G. S. II, 1, 61-67⁴ would likewise show that *Gotama* was also posterior to *Jaimini*. It may be argued that the borrowing may have been on the other side, or that the particular *sūtras* may be later additions. But we must in such cases judge by the whole tone and drift of the authors. While in all the cases noted above the topics form essential parts of the two *Mīmāṃsā* systems, they come only incidentally in the works of *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama*. We can, therefore, confidently assert that the works of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda*, as we have them at present, cannot be older than the 4th century B. C.

The question as to the relative priority of these two systems *per se* is beset with many difficulties. Opinions have been advanced on both sides. *Candrakānta Tarkālamkāra*, in the preface to his edition of *Vaiśeṣika-sūtras*, strongly contends for the priority of *Vaiśeṣika* system, while others maintain the opposite view.⁵ Goldstücker calls the *Vaiśeṣika* only a branch of the *Nyāya* without deciding their relative priority; while Weber is undecided on the point. Much of the confusion, however, on this point can be avoided by making a distinction, as already noted, between the *Vaiśeṣika* system and the *Vaiśeṣika Sūtras*. There are strong grounds for believing, as Mr. *Tarkālamkāra* contends, that the *Vaiśeṣika* system preceded *Gotama's* and yet the *Sūtras* of *Kaṇāda*, or at least many of them, may be of a

1 *Brahma-Sūtra* II, 2, 21-22.

2 Cf. G. S. IV, 1, 64.

3 क्षीगविनाशे कारणानुपलब्धिवद्ध्युत्पत्तिवच्च तदुत्पत्तिः । *Gotama-Sūtra*; उपसंहार-दर्शनान्तेति चेन्न क्षीरवादि । *Brahma-Sūtra*.

4 विध्यर्थवादानुवादमवचनविनियोगात् G. S. II, 1, 61.

5 Bhīmācārya : *Nyāya-Kos'a*, Intro., p. 2-3, note.

6 Goldstücker's *Pāṇini*, p. 153.

7 Weber : *History of Indian Literature*, p. 245.

later date. The fact that, while *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines are noticed in *Bādarāyaṇa's* *Brahma-Sūtras*, *Gotama's* system is not even once alluded to, shows that some *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines at least were promulgated not only before *Gotama* but even before the composition of the *Brahma-Sūtras*. *Vātsyāyana's* remark that omissions in *Gotama's* work are to be supplied from the cognate system of the *Vaiśeṣikas* may likewise be taken to imply that that system existed before *Gotama's* time¹; while the latter's reference to a प्रतितन्त्रसिद्धान्त² by which he probably means doctrines taught by some allied school such as the *Vaiśeṣikas* would support such an inference. The posteriority of *Gotama* may also be inferred from the fact that many topics summarily disposed of or imperfectly discussed by *Kaṇāda* are fully treated by him, as for instance, inference, fallacies, eternity of sound, and the nature of soul. It is true that some of these arguments would also prove that *Kaṇāda's* *sūtras* were anterior to *Gotama's* work, and it is possible that a collection of *Vaiśeṣika* *sūtras* was known to *Gotama*. But we must also take account of the fact that several *sūtras* in the present collection of *Kaṇāda's* aphorisms appear to be suggested by *Gotama's* work.

V. S. III, 2, 4,³ for instance, is clearly an amplification of G. S. I, 1, 10.⁴ V. S. III, 1, 17⁵ again gives an illustration of the अनैकान्तिक fallacy, although the name, strange to say, is nowhere explained throughout *Kaṇāda's* work. The word is, however, used by *Gotama* as a definition of सव्यभिचार, and it is possible that the author of the *Vaiśeṣika* *sūtras* borrowed it from him, and wrongly used it as the name of the fallacy. These *Sūtras*, therefore, if

1 *Vat.* on G. S. I, 1, 4.

2 G. S. I, 1, 29.

3 प्राणापाननिर्मषोन्मषजीवनमनोगतीन्द्रियान्तराविकाशः सुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नाश्रमिने लिङ्गानि *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra*.

4 इच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नसुखदुःखज्ञानान्यात्मनो लिङ्गमिति¹. *Gotama-Sūtra*

5. यस्माद्विषाणो तस्माद्देहिनि चानैकान्तिकस्योदाहरणम् ।

6. अनैकान्तिकः सव्यभिचारः G. S. I, 2, 46.

not the whole work of *Kaṇāda*, must have been composed after *Gotama's* work was published. Now there are good reasons for suspecting that *Kaṇāda's* work, as we have it at present, contains a large number of aphorisms which have been either modified or added in after times. A comparison of *Kaṇāda's sūtras*, as found in our printed editions, with the *Bhāṣya* of *Prasastapāda* shows that many of the *sūtras* are not explained by the scholiast and were probably unknown to him.¹ Moreover, all these suspicious aphorisms relate to topics that look like having been suggested afterwards. The practice of making such interpolations in ancient works is not uncommon in Indian literature. The *Sāṃkhya-Sūtras* are notoriously modern productions, though ascribed to an ancient Ṛṣi; and even the *Brahma Sūtras* of *Bādarāyaṇa* lie under the suspicion of being tampered with. The loose and unsystematic arrangement of the *Vaiśeṣika* aphorisms must have considerably facilitated the task of an interpolator, while such liberties could not have been easily taken with the more compact and finished production of *Gotama*.²

The most reasonable conclusion that may be drawn from the foregoing facts is that, although we can say nothing definite about an original collection of *Vaiśeṣika* aphorisms, the present work of that name is comparatively modern. We have no materials at present to fix its probable age. *Kaṇāda* is a mythical personage and is variously styled *Kāśyapa*, *Kaṇabhakṣa* or *Kaṇabhuk*. The latter

1 See the excellent conspectus showing the *sūtras* corresponding to each section of *Prasastapāda's* scholium, prefixed to the Benares Edition of that work.

2 Mahāmahopādhyāya Satischandra Vidyabhushan thinks that only the 1st book of *Nyāya-Sūtras* was composed by *Akṣapāda*, while the 2nd, 3rd and 4th books bear marks of different hands. The later books contain passages from *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* of *Yogācāra* Buddhistic school, the *Mādhyamika Sūtra* of *Nāgārjuna* and *Śataka* of *Āryadeva*, all composed about 300 A.D. *Vātsyāyana* is said to have collected all the later additions together. See Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume p. 161.

3 P. B. Ben. ed. p. 200; V. S. Up. Calc. ed. p. 160-1; *Trikāṇḍa-Śeṣa*.

two appellations are, of course, paraphrases of *Kaṇāda*, which literally means "an eater of seeds or atoms."¹ The name is said to be derived from his having lived upon picked-up grain-seeds while practising austerities; more probably it is a derisive appellation invented by antagonists for his atomic theory. The system is also called *Aulūkyā Darśana*,² and a pretty old tradition is told that God Mahādeva pleased by the austerities of the sage *Kaṇāda* appeared to him in the guise of an owl and revealed the system which the latter subsequently embodied in the *Sūtras*.³ A Rṣi named *Ulūka* is mentioned in the *Māhābhārata*, but nothing can be said as to what connection he had with the *Vaiśeṣika* system. The name *Aulūkyā* is, however, considerably old, being mentioned by *Udyotakūra* and *Kumārila*. The name *Vaiśeṣika* occurs even in the scholium of *Prasastapāda*, who also refers to the tradition about God Mahādeva just mentioned.⁵ *Vāyu-Purāṇa* makes *Akṣapāda Kaṇāda* and *Ulūka* sons of *Vyāsa*,⁶ but no reliance can be placed on such an authority.

It has been already shown that the present collection of *Vaiśeṣika* aphorisms is posterior to the 4th century B. C., and the references to it contained in *Vā'syāyana's* commentary on *Gotama's* work prove that it must have existed before the 5th century A. D. *Vātsyāyana* mentions it as समानतन्त्र, enumerates the six categories⁷ and actually quotes one aphorism of *Kaṇāda*.⁸

1 Sugiura on the authority of a Chinese work *Iṣiki Jutsuki* says he was called rice-eater because he used to go out and eat rice obtained from women, while he was called *Ulūka*, because he lived in a mountain and was very ugly. Vide Sugiura's *Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan* p. 14.

2 Sarv. D. S. Calc. ed. p. 110.

3 Bhīmācārya : *Nyāya-Kośa*, Intro p. 2.

4 *Nyāya-Vārtika*, Bibl. Ind. p. 168 ; *Tantra-Vārtika* I., 1, 4.

5 P. B. Ben. ed. p. 234.

6 See the verse quoted in P. B. Ben. ed. Intro p. 10.

7 असत्यव्यद्वि द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायाः प्रमेयम् । तद्वेदेन चापरिसङ्ख्येयम् ।
Vat. on G. S. I, 1, 9.

8 यस्माद्विषाणी तस्मादश्च इति (V. S. III., 1. 16) किमनुमानमिति चेत् सन्तानोपपत्तिरुपपादितः शब्दसन्तानः etc. । *Vat.* on G. S. II, 2, 36.

This is the utmost that we can say with certainty about the age of *Kaṇāda's* work. The date of *Prāśastapāda*, the earliest scholiast of *Kaṇāda*, is equally uncertain. He cannot be the same as the *Riṣi Prāśasta* mentioned in the *Pravīrādhyāya* of *Baudhāyana-Sūtra*, for *Baudhāyana-Sūtra* being composed before the 4th century B. C.,¹ *Prāśastapāda* and a fortiori *Kaṇāda* would have to be placed long before that time. *Prāśastapāda* has also been identified with *Gotama*, the author of *Nyāya-Sūtras*,² but it seems to be a mistake. So no inference as to the age of the *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtras* can be drawn from the date of the commentator. The six categories as well as the proofs are mentioned in the medical work of *Caraka*, who has been identified with *Patañjali*, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*.³ But even if this identity is correct, the original work of *Caraka* having been subsequently recast and enlarged by *Dṛḍhabala*, particular passages from it cannot be relied upon for historical purposes.

Happily we can obtain better results in the case of *Gotama's* work. That it is posterior to the rise of Buddhism is evident on its face, for Buddhistic doctrines are expressly mentioned therein.⁴ It is also, as has been already shown, later than the latter part of the fifth century B. C., the time of *Bādarāyaṇi's* *Brahma-Sūtras* which, while refuting *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines, make no mention of the cognate school of *Naiyāyikas*. Goldstücker says that both *Kātyāyana* and *Patañjali* knew of the *Nyāya Sūtras*.⁵ Now *Patañjali* is said to have written his great work about 140 B. C.;⁶ but *Kātyāyana's* date is not so certain. According to a story told in *Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara*, *Kātyāyana* was a pupil of *Upavarṣa* and a minister of king *Nanda* who reigned about 350 B. C.⁷ Goldstücker makes light of the authority of

1 Bühler : Sacred Laws (S. B. E. Series) Part I *Āpastamba*, Intro. p. XXII.

2 Bhīmācārya : *Nyāya Koṣa* Intro. p. 2.

3 *Parama-Laghu-Maṇjūṣā*. A verse said to be from *Yogabīja* calls *Patañjali*, a writer on three sciences, grammar, medicine, and Yoga.

4 G. S. III, 2, 11-13. 5 Goldstücker's *Pāṇini*, p. 157. 6 Ibid p. 234

7 *Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara* 1, 5; Max Müller : *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 240.

Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara, but it is hard to believe that such a story could have got currency without some sort of foundation. If the story is true, the *Nyāya-Sūtras* would have to be placed before 353 B.C. *Kātyāyana*'s date is now generally taken to be about the middle of the 4th century B. C.¹; and so *Gotama* will have to be placed before that time. There is another fact which confirms this conclusion. *Śabara Svāmin*, the scholiast on *Jaimini's Sūtras*, often quotes an ancient author whom he calls *Bhagavān Upavarṣa*, and who must have, therefore, lived a long time before him. This *Upavarṣa* is said to have written commentaries on both the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*.² If he be the same as the reputed teacher of *Kātyāyana* above mentioned, he must have lived in the first part of the 4th century B. C.³ Now a passage quoted by *Śabara Svāmin* from the commentary of this *Upavarṣa*⁴ shows that he was intimately acquainted with *Gotama's* system and largely adopted its doctrines. *Gotama's* work must, therefore, have been composed before the 3rd century B. C., that is, it belongs to the 4th century B. C.⁵

There is another piece of evidence, which, though apparently conflicting with the above conclusion, really supports it. *Āpastamba*, the author of the *Dharma-Sūtra*, knew both the *Pūrva* and the *Uttara Mīmāṃsā* systems, but not the *Nyāya*.⁶ It is true that *Āpastamba* in two passages of

1 Eggeling's *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (S. B. E. Series) Intro. p. 30.

2 Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I. p. 357.

3 Another story in Somadeva-Bhaṭṭa's *Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara* makes him live in Pāṭaliputra during the reign of Nanda, i. e. about 350 B. C; but no reliance can be placed on the chronological data furnished by this book in the absence of other evidence.

4 *Ś'abara-Bhāṣya Bibl. Ind.* p. 10; for an English translation of the passage see Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I. p. 328.

5 This conclusion will not be affected by any date that may be assigned to Pāṇini. Goldstücker places Pāṇini long before the rise of Buddhism and holds that he did not know *Gotama's* work. Pāṇini mentions the word तर्क but only in the sense of a syllogism or rather a thesis, such as those in Jaimini's work. See Goldstücker's *Panini*, p. 152.

6 Bühler; *Sacred Laws* (S. B. E. Series) Part I *Āpastamba*, Intro. p. xxvii.

his work uses the word न्याय and न्यायवित् respectively¹; but there he clearly refers to *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*, and not to the system of *Gotama*. Nor is this use of the word uncommon in ancient writings. The fact that the word न्याय, which was subsequently monopolized by the followers of *Gotama*, is applied by *Āpastamba* to the system of *Jaimini*, shows that at his time *Gotama*'s system was either unknown, or at least so new as not to have attained any wide celebrity. *Āpastamba* according to Bühler must have lived before the third century B. C. and even 150 or 200 years earlier;² but his knowledge of the two *Mīmāṃsā*'s shows that he could not have lived long before 400 B. C. *Gotama*'s work must therefore be assigned to the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 4th century B. C.

It is needless to state after this that our *Gotama* is quite different from *Gotama* the author of a *Dharma Sūtra*, who preceded *Baudhāyana* and was *a fortiori* prior to *Āpastamba*³; nor has he anything to do with the mythical sage of that name mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* as the son of *Utathya* and the husband of *Ahilyā*. Nothing is known about the personality of our author, and it is even doubtful whether his real name was *Gotama* or *Gautama*. Being a Brahman he could not have belonged to the race from which the founder of Buddhism sprang. He is also called *Akṣapāda* or *Akṣacaraṇa*, but the origin of the name is not known. Some have conjectured that the epithet was a nick-name given to *Gotama* for his peculiar theory of sensual perception, and means one who stands or walks upon organs of sense (अक्ष); but there is no authority for this. At any rate the author, whoever he may be, possessed great originality and a grasp of general principles that enabled him to systematize the science of logic for the first time. He cannot, however, be said to have founded it, for logical rules seem to have prevailed even before his time. *Manu* proclaims the need of reason for a correct understanding of the sacred law⁴, while

1 *Āpastamba-Dharma-Sūtra* II, 4, 8, 13; and II, 6, 14, 13.

2 Bühler: *Sacred Laws* (S. B. E. Series) Part I, *Āpastamba*, Intro. p. xliii.

3 *Ibid.* p. xx and lv.

4 *Manu-Smṛiti* xii, 106.

Bādarāyaṇa goes to the other extreme of declaring the utter futility of our reasoning power to discover truth.¹ Besides, it is quite obvious that, unless the art of reasoning had been practised for a long time previous, and had been considerably developed, neither the philosophical speculations in the *Upaniṣads* nor the rise of heretical sects, such as the *Cārvākas*, *Bauddhas* and *Jainas*, could have been possible. What then did *Gotama* achieve? What is his place in the history of Indian logic? This is an interesting question, and would, if satisfactorily answered, throw a flood of light on the early history of Indian philosophy.

Gotama was certainly not the pioneer. The very fact that he has evolved a logical system complete and well knit in all essential respects would lead us to suspect that he must have used materials left by his predecessors and profited by their errors. This is not a mere inference however, for *Vātsyāyana* in his Commentary on G. S. I, 1, 52 actually tells us that there was a school of *Naiyāyikas* who required ten premises in a syllogism, and that *Gotama* reduced their number to five.² This is quite probable, for Indian systematists always favour brevity, and even *Gotama's* five premises were subsequently reduced by others to three. *Gotama*, therefore, must have been preceded by other labourers in the same field whose works have been eclipsed by his superior treatise. External evidence would lead us even a step further. The two passages from *Āpastamba Dharma-Sūtra*, referred to above, show that the word न्याय was formerly applied to *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*. Similarly passages are also found in many ancient *Smṛtis* and also some modern works in which the same word or its derivatives are used in connection with *Jaimini's* system. So late a writer as *Mādhavācārya* calls his epitome of *Jaimini's* work न्यायमाला-विस्तर, while many other *Mīmāṃsā* works have न्याय as part of their title. The various theses propounded in *Jaimini's* work are called *Nyāyas*, and even *Pāṇini* uses the word

1 *Brahma-Sūtra* II, 1, 11.

2 *Vāt.* on G. S. I, 33.



in a similar sense.¹ How then are we to explain the fact that a word so generally used by the *Mīmāṃsakas* came afterwards to designate the rival and totally dissimilar system of *Gotama*. As a general rule we find that when a new school arises it coins its own phraseology to distinguish itself from its predecessors. In this case, however, the followers of *Gotama* appropriated an old word, and that word stuck to them so fast as to become afterwards their exclusive property. The explanation, it seems, lies in the fact that the science of logic which afterwards developed into a separate system was originally the child of *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*.

Analogy of other arts and sciences points to the same conclusion. All sciences in India appear to have sprung out of sacrificial necessities. Astronomy was founded on the rules by which Vedic *Rsis* ascertained the correct time for performing periodical sacrifices, from the movements of heavenly bodies. While medicine had its germ in the analysis of the properties of *Soma* plant and other sacrificial substances, music was first cultivated by the *Udgātṛ* priest for singing his *Sāman* hymns, and a knowledge of agriculture and geometry was found to be essential in constructing the sacrificial pandal and the *Vedā*. It is probable, therefore, that the art of reasoning also originated in some requirement of the all-important sacrifice. Such requirements were mainly two, the correct interpretation of Vedic texts on which the due performance of the sacrifices depended, and victory in the philosophical and other discussions which were usually held in the intervals of sacrifice. It was a special function of the *Brahman* priest to give decision on any disputed points that might arise in the course of a sacrifice, and this he could not have done unless he was a master of ratiocination. Such decisions, which may be likened to the chairman's rulings in a modern assembly, are scattered through the ancient *Brāhmaṇas*, and are collected together as so many *Nyāyas* in the ancient *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* aphorisms of *Jaimini*. The philosophical disquisitions were collected in the various

Upaniṣads and produced the system of *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā*. *Jaimini* lays down many rules of exegesis which seem to be the direct progenitors of the logical rules of *Gotama*. The various tests for instance illustrated in the third chapter of *Jaimini*'s attempt to determine whether a rite or a *Vedic* direction is principal or auxiliary are only so many varieties of inference. The लिङ्ग so often mentioned by *Jaimini* must have suggested the हेतु and अपदेश of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* respectively. We may therefore suppose that it is the *Mīmāṃsakas* who, first prompted by exegetical necessity, developed sundry rules of logic which they illustrated by means of what they called *Nyāyas* or theses. When therefore *Manu* or *Āpastamba* speaks of तर्क or न्याय we must understand by the term these rules of inference as applied to Vedic interpretation. The utility of these rules for other purposes, founded as they mainly are on the broad basis of common sense, could not but have been perceived very soon and naturally taken advantage of. This secularization so to say of these exegetical rules of *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* gave birth to a science which was at first known by the name of आन्वीक्षिकी. It probably got its modern appellation of *Nyāya*, when *Gotama* raised it into a philosophical system by including in his treatise disquisition on sundry metaphysical topics, such as the origin of knowledge, eternity of sound, nature of proof and the agency of God. If this hypothesis is correct, we can form a tolerably clear idea of the task *Gotama* set before himself and which he has performed so admirably. From a bundle of experimental rules which were known only as a secular art called आन्वीक्षिकी and said by some to be subsidiary to अथर्ववेद *Gotama* evolved a system which at once became the rival of the two *Mīmāṃsās* and which from thence forward exercised a strong sway over generations of Indian Pandits. *Gotama* can very well be compared in this respect with Aristotle or Immanuel Kant. Nay in one sense his influence has been even greater; for Kant and Aristotle failed to supplant their predecessors completely, while *Gotama* constructed a new system, as it were, which eclipsed all previous attempts and which has from his time become the sole standard for posterity.



The work of Gotama differs in many respects from that of *Kaṇāda*. While the former is methodical and details a system of logic practically complete, the latter discloses no consistent aim and no arrangements of parts. It has the appearance of a loose bundle of critical notes on the principal philosophical topics of the day. This fact raises a doubt as to whether *Kaṇāda's* aphorisms were ever the real basis of the *Vaiśeṣika* system as we find it now. The oldest exponent of the complete system as described in all modern *Vaiśeṣika* works is *Prāśastapāda*, and he may, for aught we know, be its real founder also. The supposition is not so improbable as it might appear at first sight. Almost all the peculiar doctrines that distinguished the later *Vaiśeṣikas* from the *Naiyāyikas* and other schools are to be found in *Prāśastapāda's* work and are conspicuously absent in *Kaṇāda's Sūtras*. The doctrines about द्वित्व, पाकजोत्पत्ति, विभागजविभाग, and several others, which are regarded as peculiarities of the *Vaiśeṣika* system, are not even touched upon in *Kaṇāda's* aphorisms, although they are pretty fairly discussed in *Prāśastapāda's Bhūṣya*. The seven categories on which the whole *Vaiśeṣika* system is based are probably an afterthought; and even the doctrine of विशेष which according to some gave the name to the system appears to be a later development. *Kaṇāda* restricts the word अर्थ (categories properly so called) to three things only, द्रव्य गुण and कर्म;¹ *Prāśastapāda* enlarges the number to six, and some later author added अभाव.²

It is true that the aphorism धर्मविशेषप्रस्तुताद् द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायानां पदार्थानां साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयससिद्धिः³ enumerates the six categories; but this aphorism is most probably a later interpolation. It is inordinately long, unlike other aphorisms of *Kaṇāda*, and contains a number of distinct propositions that would

1 अर्थ इति द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु । V. S. VIII, 2, 3.

2 Several Mss. of *Prāśastapāda's Bhūṣya* end with the colophon इति प्रशस्तपादविरचितं द्रव्यादिषट्पदार्थभाष्यं समाप्तम्.

3 V. S. I. 1, 4.

have sufficed for half a dozen *Sūtras*. Besides it is very awkwardly worded if not positively ungrammatical. A comparison of this aphorism with the opening passage of *Prāśastapāda*'s scholium leaves hardly any doubt about its spuriousness. *Prāśastapāda*'s passage runs thus:—
द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्याविशेषसमवायानां षण्णां पदार्थानां साधर्म्यवैधर्म्यतत्त्वज्ञानं निःश्रेयसहेतुः । तच्चेश्वरचोदनमित्युक्ताद्धर्मादेव ।¹

Now one of these two passages must be an adaptation of the other. According to *Kiraṇāvali* this passage of *Prāśastapāda* explains only the first three *sūtras* of *Kaṇāda*, which implies that the fourth *sūtra* quoted above was unknown to the scholiast. Hence if *Kiraṇāvali* is to be believed, the aphorism must be the later of the two. *Śrīdhara*, the author of *Nyāya-Kandaṭī*, speaks to the same effect. In introducing the last sentence he says that it was added to remove any apparent inconsistency between the preceding sentence and *Kaṇāda*'s second aphorism यतोऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः । The inconsistency is that while according to the scholiast knowledge of categories is the means of निःश्रेयस, *Kaṇāda* speaks of it as resulting from धर्म; and this inconsistency is removed by the scholiast by adding that the knowledge of categories itself springs from धर्म as revealed in divine commandments. So according to *Śrīdhara* this last clause is an addition of the scholiast intended to remove the apparent inconsistency, and yet it is summed up in the opening words of the fourth *Sūtra*, धर्मविशेषप्रसूतात्. Either these words or the whole aphorism must therefore have been suggested by *Prāśastapāda*'s passage. If the aphorism, as it stands now, had existed before, there would have been no सूत्रविरोध and therefore no necessity for *Prāśastapāda*'s additional clause तच्चेश्वरचोदनामित्युक्ताद्धर्मादेव. We must, therefore, suppose that the aphorism was added by some later writer in order to supply what appeared to him an oversight of *Kaṇāda*. Besides, the fact that there should have been even the suspicion of a contradiction between the enumeration of six categories and *Kaṇāda*'s second *sūtra* proves that the six

categories were not thought of by *Kaṇāda* and were for the first time mentioned by his scholiast, *Prasastapāda*. We must, therefore, construe the aphorism अर्थ इति द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु¹ as implying that *Kaṇāda* mentioned only three categories to which the scholiast added three more, while the seventh was added still later.² If any doubt is felt on the point, a critical examination of the aphorisms which are supposed to define सामान्य and विशेष will dispel it. These aphorisms speak of विशेष as well as of सामान्य in a way quite different from the later conceptions of the two categories. Aphorisms सामान्यं किंशेष इति बुद्धयपेक्षम् and अन्यत्रान्येभ्यो विशेषेभ्यः are especially significant. The first shows that *Kaṇāda* used the word विशेष as a relative term opposed to सामान्य, meaning that the notions of *genus* and *differentia* are always relative, and that the same property may be a *genus* with respect to one class, and a *differentia* with respect to another class of things. घटत्वं, for instance, is a *genus* as including all jars under one class, and a *differentia* as distinguishing all jars from other substances, as cloth and men. The second aphorism shows that *Kaṇāda* distinguishes *ultimate difference* of things from other *differentiae* by giving to the former the special name of अन्यविशेष. It is these *ultimate differences* that are denoted by the later *Vaiśeṣikas* by the category विशेष; and the fact that *Kaṇāda* regards them only as one species of *differentia* shows that he did not include them in a separate category having absolute and not merely relative existence. The conclusion is irresistible that the अन्यविशेष, which were at first only one kind of *differentia*, were afterwards developed into an independent category. The notions of सामान्य and समवाय can also be shown to have originated in the same way.³

It will be thus seen that, unlike *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika* was never given out to the world as a cut and dry system. It was gradually evolved as the ever-flowing stream of controversy

1 V. S. VIII. 2. 3.

2 V. S. I. 2. 3-6.

3 Similarly while *Kaṇāda* mentions only 17 qualities, the scholiast adds seven more, गुह्यत्वं and others, making in all 24, which number has been accepted by all later writers.

suggested new points or disclosed the faults of old ones. *Praśastapāda* thus occupies a somewhat intermediate position between *Kaṇāda* and his later commentators. He is sufficiently removed in time from *Kaṇāda* to call him a *muni* and a disciple of *Maheśvara*,¹ while he himself is regarded almost as a semi-mythical personage by later writers. His age cannot, however, be ascertained even approximately. The earliest known commentary on *Praśastapāda*'s work is that of *Śrīdhara* who gives his own date as 991 A.D. He must also have preceded *Śaṅkarācārya* who seems to quote from him several times. The opinion ascribed by *Śaṅkarācārya* to the *Kaṇāda* school are all found in *Praśastapāda*'s work². *Śricaraṇa*, in his commentary on *Śārīraka-Bhāṣya* called *Prakāṭārtha*, says that a particular view criticised by *Śaṅkara* belongs to the older school of *Vaiśeṣikas* though opposed to that contained in *Rāvaṇas Bhāṣya*. The view referred to is propounded by *Praśastapāda* who must therefore be older than *Rāvaṇa*.³ This *Bhāṣya* of *Rāvaṇa* which may be a commentary either on *Kaṇāda*'s *Sūtras* or *Praśastapāda*'s own work, is not available, nor is its date known. *Udayana*'s *Kiraṇāvali* is, however, said to have been based upon it.⁴ If this *Rāvaṇa* is the same as the reputed author of a commentary on *Rgveda*, he appears to have been a very ancient author, and *Praśastapāda* must be still older. Moreover, if *Praśastapāda* was, as suggested above, the first to enumerate the six categories, he must have preceded *Vātsyāyana* who mentions them.⁵ Nothing more definite can be said on the point for the present, and we must, therefore, leave *Praśastapāda*'s date too as one of the uncertainties of Indian chronology.

1 P. B. Ben. ed. pp. 1 and 329.

2 Cf. the passages in *Śārīraka-Bhāṣya* (Anandashram ed. pp. 514-5, and p. 519) with the passages in P. B. Ben ed. p. 48 and p. 328 respectively.

3 *Praśastapāda* has also been referred to as प्रशस्तचरण, and प्रशस्तदेव and some even identify him with Gotama. See *Vindhyesvarīprasāda*'s Intro. to *Vaiśeṣika Darśana* (Bibl. Ind. ed.).

4 P. B. Ben ed. Intro. p. 12 note.

5 Vāt. on G. S. I, 1, 9.

6 If *Caraka*, the writer on medicine, is correctly identified with *Paṭanjali*, *Praśastapāda* must be anterior to him. See p. XXXI *supra*.



The age of commentaries proper begins with *Vātsyāyana*, otherwise known as *Pakṣila-Svāmin*, whose commentary on *Gotama's* work is the oldest known work of the kind we now possess.¹ *Vātsyāyana* must have lived about the end of 5th century A. D. for he preceded the well-known Buddhist teacher *Diṇnāga* who is said to have lived in the early part of the 6th century.² *Diṇnāga* was succeeded by the celebrated author of *Udyota* who is mentioned by *Subandhu* writing in the 7th century.³ *Udyotakāra* is said to have written his work to dispel the errors of *Diṇnāga* and others, and *Vācaspati* in his *Tikā* adds that his principal object was to defend *Vātsyāyana* against the attacks of *Diṇnāga*.⁴

According to the Jain *Śloka-Vārtika*, *Udyotakāra* was in his turn answered by *Dharmakīrti*.⁵ Now *Dharmakīrti* is known to have lived in the first half of the 7th century.⁶

1 Was *Vātsyāyana* a Buddhist? Some have supposed him to be so because his work does not begin with a prayer to any of the Hindu deities. But the epithet *Svāmin* as well as the fact that the Buddhist writer *Diṇnāga* controverts his views should leave no doubt about his orthodoxy. He was also called *Dramila* (*Dravida*?) or *Pakṣilasvāmin*. He was a native of *Conjeeveram* and lived about A. D. 400, i. e. a century before *Diṇnāga* and *Vasubandhu*. See S. C. Vidyabhūṣaṇ's *Indian Logic, Mediaeval School*, pp. 68-72.

2 Max Müller. *India, What can it teach us?* 1st ed. p. 320. *Diṇnāga* is said to have introduced the universal proposition न्यायि into the Indian syllogism for the first time.

3 *Vasavadattā* (Calc. ed. p. 235) has न्यायस्थितिमिवोद्योतकरस्वरूपम्। See also Dr. Hall's Preface to his edition of that work. *Udyotakāra* was called *Bhāradvāja* and lived at *Thaneshwar* near *Delhi*. He was a preceptor of the *Pāśupata* sect.

4 See quotation at P. B. Ben. ed. Intro. p. 10. *Udyotakāra* himself says:—

यदक्षपादः प्रवरो मुनीनां शमाय शास्त्रं जगतो जगाद ।

कुतार्किकाज्ञाननिवृत्तिहेतुः करिष्यते तस्य मया निबन्धः ॥

Also see Weber, *Zeitschr. D. M. G.* XXII. 727, and Colebrook *Miscellaneous Essays* Vol. I p. 282, Cowell's note.

5 J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol XVIII. p. 229.

6 Ibid. p. 90. Dr. Satiscandra Vidyabhushana thinks that *Dharmakīrti* and *Udyotakāra* were contemporaries and flourished about 633 A. D. See *Indian Logic, Mediaeval School*, p. 105, and *Bhandarkar Memorial Volume*, p. 164.

Tarka-Saṃgraha.

Diñnāga and *Udyotakāra* therefore must have belonged to the 6th, and *Vātsyāyana* at the latest to the end of the 5th century. *Vātsyāyana* is not, however, the earliest scholiast on *Gotama's Sūtras*. The alternative interpretations of G. S. I. 1, 5, given by him show that the traditional meaning was obscured at his time, and that several writers before him had interpreted the *Sūtras* in different ways. The interval between *Gotama* and *Vātsyāyana* is considerable and could not have passed without producing some notable writers; yet no relics of the period appear to have been left behind. Either the Scythian inroads which ravaged the country from the 1st century B. C. to the 4th century A. D. must have swept away all literary records of the period or some unknown cause must have lulled philosophical activity for the time.

After *Udyotakāra* there seems to have occurred another long gap in the succession of orthodox *Nyāya* writers until the end of 10th century, when a revival took place under the influence of the author of न्यायकन्दली which is the earliest known commentary on *Prāśālapāda's Bhāṣya*. *Śrīdhara* wrote at least three other works named अद्वयसिद्धि, तत्त्वबोध, and तत्त्वसंवादिनी. The absence of any eminent *Nyāya* or *Vaiśeṣika* writer between *Udyotakāra* and *Śrīdhara* makes it highly propable that the tradition was broken in the interval. This interregnum so to say is the more inexplicable as the period was one of intense intellectual activity. Controversies between the Brahmins as represented by the *Mīmāṃsakas* and *Vedāntins* on the one hand and the Buddhists and the Jains on the other occupy almost the whole of this period; and it is strange that the followers of *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* did not freely enter into the fray. *Vātsyāyana* and *Udyotakāra* set the ball of controversy rolling, but no *Nyāya* or *Vaiśeṣika* writer seems to have taken up the cudgels on their behalf immediately after *Dharmakīrti's* strictures. The task of answering the great Buddhist writer was left to *Mīmāṃsakas* like *Kumārila*, *Śaṅkarācārya* and *Maṇḍana*, who were by no means favourable either to the *Nyāya* or to the *Vaiśeṣika* system. *Dharmottara* defended *Dharmakīrti* against the criticisms of *Kumārila* and *Maṇḍana*, and we again



find *Śrīuḥara*, a *Naiyāyika*, answering *Dharmottara*. Though the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems had thus no spokesman of their own during this interregnum, the individual doctrines inculcated by them were not a bit neglected. They were fully handled by the rival disputants as if they had by that time become the common property of all schools. The *Mīmāṃsakas* strongly controverted the doctrine of non-eternity of sound, and the *Vedāntins* criticized the atomic theory. The *Prābhākaras* started novel views about *Samavāya*, while all the schools fought over the proper number and nature of proofs. The answer to these criticisms came partly from the Buddhists and the Jains and partly from the later *Nyāya* writers. The fact seems to be that at this time the *Nyāya* and much more the *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines, despite smaller differences, found their strongest supporters among the Buddhists and the Jains, many of whose tenets closely resembled the peculiar doctrines of the *Vaiśeṣikas*. The *Nyāya-Bindu*, for instance, which can now be safely ascribed to *Dharmakīrti*,¹ is a purely *Vaiśeṣika* treatise while the *Pramāṇa-Samucchaya* of *Diṇnāga* and *Dharmakīrti*'s *Vārtikas* on it must also have been largely indebted to previous *Vaiśeṣika* works. This must also be the reason why *Vaiśeṣikas* were at this time looked upon almost as heretics.²

The alliance of the *Vaiśeṣikas* with the Buddhists and the evident tendency of many of their theories towards atheism and materialism alarmed the orthodox writers of the *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vedānta* schools who at once consigned them to the purgatory of non-believers. *Śaṅkarācārya* calls them *Ardha-Vaiśeṣikas* (Semi-Buddhists), while *Kumārila* brackets them with *Sākyas* as heretics who are frightened

1 JBBRAS. Vol. xxx p. 47. and S. C. Vidyabhuṣana's *Indian Logic, Medieval School* p. 109.

2 For a detailed account of Jaina and Buddhist Logicians, see Dr. Satiscandra Vidyabhuṣana's *Indian Logic, Medieval School* and for Chinese and Japanese writers see Sugira's *Hindu Philosophy as preserved in China and Japan*.

out of their wits by the advent of the faithful *Mīmāṃsakas*. And yet a glance at *Prāśastapāda's Bhāṣya* will show that the *Vaiśeṣikas* were at least as orthodox and as decidedly anti-Buddhistic as either the *Mīmāṃsakas* or the *Vedāntins*. *Prāśastapāda* begins with a prayer to God and concludes by ascribing the origin of the world as well as of the *Vaiśeṣika* system to Maheśvara. He accepts the authority of *Śruti* and occasionally controverts the views of the Buddhists. The notion of *Vaiśeṣikas* being heretical probably originated in the din of controversy between the Buddhists and the *Mīmāṃsakas*, and the prejudice thus created stuck to them for a long time afterwards. The system of *Nyāya*, however, seems to have escaped the stigma of heresy, probably owing to its comparative neglect in this period. The controversies of this period mainly raged round metaphysical and theological questions which were monopolized by the *Vaiśeṣika*, while the purely logical part of *Gotama's* system did not provoke much opposition. Only one doctrine of the *Nāyāyikas* was made the subject of controversy, namely the theory of a personal Creator of the universe. This doctrine was strongly advocated by the sect of *Pāśupatas*, and various sub-sections of *Bhāgavatas*. These theistic Schools probably derived their inspiration from *Gotama's* work, but they very soon became distinct religious sects.¹ On the whole it appears that, although there is a lack of special *Nyāya* or *Vaiśeṣika* works in this period, the various doctrines laid down by *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* were fully threshed out and underwent additions and alterations which were not even dreamt of by previous writers.

The interregnum from *Udyotakāra's* time to the end of the 10th century may have been produced by various causes which cannot be known at present; nor can we say for certain how the subsequent revival was brought about. Perhaps learned men at this time were too much occupied with religious and sectarian disputes to attend to the drier subtleties of logic. The fact, however, cannot be denied, for while none of the known works of *Nyāya* or *Vaiśeṣika* proper can be

assigned to the interval between the 7th and the 10th centuries, the succeeding age is marked by such an inrush of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* writers as more than atoned for the inactivity of the previous period. The most notable productions of this later age are a series of commentaries on the works of *Praśastapāda* and *Vātsyāyana* who had then come to be looked upon as ancient authorities to be explained and enlarged with reverence, rather than criticized or corrected by abler successors. In this later period boldness and originality of thought dwindle in proportion to an increase of scholastic subtlety. The range of topics is limited, but each is treated with a greater fullness and ingenuity. There is a distinct tendency towards scholasticism, which afterwards assumed such abnormal proportions in the Nuddea school, but the change was not completed till four centuries later. It may be described as an age of transition from the genuine philosophy of mediæval India to the scholastic verbiage of modern times; and it is a striking fact that this age nearly coincides with the growth of scholasticism in mediæval Europe. It is not a little remarkable that the history of Indian logic bears in this respect a close analogy to the progress of thought in Europe. If *Gotama* lived about the same time as Aristotle, *Vātsyāyana* was probably the contemporary of Boethius and the Revivalists; while the modern *Ācāryas*, such as *Śrīdhara*, *Vācaspati* and *Udayana* flourished in the same age which produced Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus in the West. Are we then to suppose that human mind in India as well as in Europe passed successively through the same phases of philosophic development and nearly at the same rate of progress? The question is difficult to answer, but the coincidences are none the less interesting.

The first writer of this age of revival was *Śrīdhara* who wrote his *Nyāya-Kandalī* in 991 A. D.¹ *Śrīdhara*

1 See P. B. Ben. ed. p. 331. The colophon contains the line, अधिकदशो-
 त्रनवशतशकाब्दे न्यायकन्दली रचिता । which gives Śāke 913 i. e. 991 A. D. as
 the date of the composition of the work. Bhandarkar (Report on Search
 of Sk. Mss. for 1883-4 p. 314) reads the line as अधिकदशोत्तर, which gives
 the date Śāke 910 or 988 A. D., but this must be a mistake, for the word
 अधिक is inexplicable without त्रि.

takes great pains to refute the opinions of *Kumārila* and *Sureśvara* alias *Maṇḍana* on the one hand as well as *Dharmot-tara* on the other, a fact which seems to show that *Śrīdhara* was the first eminent *Nyāya* writer after them. *Rājaśekhara*, a Jain commentator on *Nyāya-Kaṇḍalī*¹ mentions three other commentaries on *Praśastapāda*'s *Bhāṣya*, besides *Śrīdhara*'s work, viz., the *Vyōmavātī* of *Śivācārya*, the *Kiraṇāvalī* of *Udayana* and the *Līlāvatī* of *Śrī Vatsa* or *Vallabha*, all of which were written after *Śrīdhara*'s work but before the end of the 13th century. The chronological order of these writers may be fixed as *Śrīdhara*, *Vallabha*, *Udayana*, and *Śivāditya*. All of them came to be looked upon as eminent authorities and honoured with the title of *Ācārya*. Each of them was distinguished for some new conception, or original treatment of old topics. The works of *Vallabha* and *Śivāditya* are not yet available so as to enable us to form any definite opinion about them, but their views are frequently quoted and criticized in later works. *Udayana*'s *Kiraṇāvalī* was probably left unfinished by the author, as all the Mss. hitherto available contain only the chapters on द्रव्य and गुण. *Śrīdhara* lived as stated above at the end of the tenth century. He was followed by *Vācaspati Miśra* in the 11th century, who wrote commentaries on all the principal philosophy systems, and whose works have been deservedly held in the highest estimation by the succeeding generations.² *Vācaspati*, the author of *Bhāmātī* and *Sāṃkhya-Tattva-Kaumudī*, wrote an equally able commentary on the *Vārtikas* of *Udyotakāra*, called *Vārtika-Tātparyā-Tikā* and this *Tikā* of *Vācaspati* became the text of another commentary, *Tātparyā-Parīśuddhi* by *Uddyana*.⁴

1 P. B. Ben. ed. Intro. p. 19.

2 See the opening passage of *Tarka-Dīpikā*—p. 1, and Note thereon, p. 72 infra.

3 J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. XVIII. p. 90. Cowell in the preface to his translation of *Kusumāñjali* tries to prove that *Vācaspati* lived in the 10th century; but his view cannot be accepted as *Vācaspati* quotes राजवातिक of King Bhoja who reigned in A. D. 993. Satiscandra Vidya-bhūṣana also places *Vācaspati* in 976 A. D. when he is said to have composed his *Nyāya-sūci-nibandha*.

4 Bhandarkar. Report on search of Sk. MSS. for 1883-4, p. 81.



Udayanācārya, the author of *Kiraṇāvalī* and *Parīśuddhi* lived, therefore, some time after *Vācaspati*, and may be assigned to the end of the 12th century.¹ *Udayana* is the greatest *Naiyāyika* writer of this age. He combines in himself the two-fold character of an eminent dialectician and a religious revivalist, and has consequently become the centre of a number of traditions which have perhaps little foundation in fact. A story, for instance, is told of his having once made a pilgrimage to the temple of Jagannath, where he found the temple-door shut against him. On this the irate *Naiyāyika* addressed the following couplet to the Deity :—

ऐश्वर्यमदमत्तोऽसि मामवज्ञाय वर्तसे ।

उपस्थितेषु बौद्धेषु मदघीना तव स्थितिः ॥²

“Infatuated with omnipotence as thou art, thou treatest me with contempt; but (remember) when the heretics approach, thy very existence depends upon me.”

This irreverent apostrophe was probably founded on the fact that *Udayana* wrote two well-known treatises to prove the existence of God and to refute the atheistical objections of the *Bauddhas* and other heretics. These treatises, respectively known as *Kusumāñjali* and *Bauddha-dhukkāra*, though small, prove *Udayana* to be a very acute and powerful writer. *Udayana* is said to have carried on a vigorous crusade against the *Bauddhas* and the *Jainas*; and if Monier Williams is right in assigning the complete decay of Buddhism in India to the beginning of the thirteenth century,³ *Udayana* must have taken a leading part in giving the death-blow. At any rate the great prominence given in all the later works to ईश्वरकारणवाद or the doctrine of a personal Creator of the Universe may be ascribed to *Udayana*'s influence. It is

1 Cowell's Preface to his translation of *Kusumāñjali*, p x; J. B. B. R. A. S. Vol. XVIII. p. 89, 90. Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa places him about 984 A. D. on the authority of a verse in his *Lakṣaṇāvalī*. Vide *Bhandarkar Memorial Volume* p. 165.

2 Nehemiah Gore's *Rational Refutation of Hindu philosophy* translated by F. Hall, p. 6, note. 3 Monier Williams : *Buddhism*, p. 170.

highly probable that *Udayana's* works gave a strong impetus to the *Śaiva*, *Vaiṣṇava* and other theistic sects which arose in large numbers at this time. *Naiyāyikas* amongst all the Indian systematists were from henceforward the strongest supporters of monotheism, and the Nuddea School in later times produced one of the greatest leaders of a modern theistic movement, viz., *Caitanya* of Bengal.

Tradition ascribes to *Udayana* the first conception of the idea of uniting the two sister systems of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* into one harmonious whole. *Udayana's* extant works do not however support this theory, although it is not improbable that he threw out hints to that effect, which led some later writer to make the experiment. The earliest known work in which the two systems are found actually combined, as in many later works, is the *Sapta-Padārthī* of *Śivāditya Miśra*,¹ and it is possible that he was the first to put the idea into practice. *Śivāditya* is also the first writer to mention *Abhāva* as the seventh category and to introduce a systematic discussion of logical questions, der बुद्धि. *Sapta-Padārthī* may, therefore, be regarded as the model of all such later manuals as *Tarka-Saṃgraha*, *Tark Kaumudī* and *Tarkāmṛta*.

As to *Vallabhāchārya* his exact date is uncertain, but he appears to have preceded the author of *Sapta-Padārthī* if not also *Udayana*. This seems probable from the mention of *Nyāya-Līlāvatī* in a Canarese poem named *Darśana-sāra* written by a contemporary poet in praise of King *Singhaṇa* of the Yādava dynasty of Devagiri, who reigned from A. D. 1210 to 1247. *Darśanasāra* also mentions *Udayana*

1 A MS. of Jinavardhana's commentary on *Sapta-Padārthī* is in the Deccan College Library. This Jinavardhana lived in *Samvat* 1471. Peterson mentions a MS. of सप्तपदार्थवृत्ति named मितभाषिणी by *Mādhava-Sarasvatī*, as dated *Samvat* 1405. See Report of the Search of Sanskrit MSS. for 1896 p. 24. Also Bhandarkar's Report for 1882-83 p. 25. Prof. Ghate mentions a third Commentary पदार्थचन्द्रिका by Śeṣānanta. Prof. Ghate places *Udayana* in 984 A. D. and *Gangeśa* in the 11th Century, and *Sivāditya* between the two. J. B. B. R. A. Society XXIII p. 34.

2 Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 82.



and some other writers;¹ but nothing further can be said about it until the work is available to the public. It is superfluous perhaps to remark that this *Vallabha*, the author of *Nyāya-Līlāvātī*, was quite a different personage from the great Vaiṣṇavite reformer of that name who flourished in the 15th century.²

A host of smaller writers such as *Varadarāja* and *Mallinātha* may be mentioned as belonging to this second period, but they do not seem to have left any lasting mark on subsequent literature. The period may be roughly said to have closed about the beginning of the 14th century. It is marked by a great activity in the beginning and at the end, with an intervening blank which lasted for about 3 centuries and which sharply divides the older from the later school of writers. The conflict of opinions between the *Vaiśeṣikas* and the *Naiyāyikas* as well as the differences between the ancient and the modern schools of *Naiyāyikas*, which are so frequently discussed in modern works, seem to have originated in this period; and it was perhaps the growth of these minute differences that created at the end of this period a reaction in favour of amalgamating the two systems. This attempt at amalgamation, however, produced an effect exactly contrary to what was intended, for it stereotyped the differences instead of removing them. We find that in this period almost all the principal doctrines were evolved and the details were worked out, on which the dialecticians of the third period were exclusively to spend their scholastic ingenuity and produce volumes after volumes without making any real progress. With *Udayana* and *Śivāditya* we lose sight of writers who deserve

1. I am indebted for this information to my friend Mr. K. B. Pathak formerly of the Deccan College. He saw a Canarese Ms. of श्रीनसार in the library of Brahma-Sūri Sāstri of Śravana Belgole in Mysore territory. It is not known when the book was written, but the author appears to have been a cotemporary of सिद्धघण.

2. Another writer Jayanta wrote *Nyāya-Mañjarī* an independent Commentary on *Nyāya-Sūtras*. He was a native of Kashmir and lived in the 11th century. He quotes Vācaspati and refutes Buddhists.

to be called *Ācāryas*, as having aimed at originality and written epoch-making books. The class of *Ācāryas*, or masters, was henceforward to give place to that of mere *Upādhyāyas* or ordinary pundits. The race of giants was to be succeeded by a remarkably versatile and disputatious troop of dwarfs. Philosophy lost its freshness as well as its charm, and gradually degenerated into a bundle of endless controversies.

The end of the 14th century saw the commencement of the third period of *Nyāya* literature; and *Gaṅgeśa*, or *Gaṅgeśopādhyāya*, the author of *Tattva-Cintāmaṇi* may be said to be its oracle. He founded a new school of text-writers and commentators who afterwards came to be known as the Nuddea school owing to their having chiefly flourished in the tols of Nuddea or Navadwīpa in Lower Bengal. The distinguishing features of the writers of the school were their overwhelming pride, an abnormal development of the critical faculty, and a total disinclination to go out of the narrow grooves of traditional doctrines. The original *Sūtras* and the scholia on them recede into background, while *Gaṅgeśa's* work itself becomes the centre of a mass of literature unparalleled in any other country or age. Here we see at one and the same time scholasticism at its climax and true philosophy at its lowest depth. We might wade through volumes of controversial jargon without coming across a single flash of deep thought or real insight into the nature of things. Mere conventionalities and distinctions without a difference are the weapons in this wordy warfare, with which one disputant tries to defend his thesis or to vanquish a rival. It may be doubted if either the writer or the reader is made a whit the wiser by all this labour.

All the writers of this school are not however equally faulty in this respect. The earlier ones especially show a considerable freedom of thought which is quite refreshing. The most notable of this kind is *Gaṅgeśopādhyāya*, the founder of the Nuddea school, whose exact date is not known, but who probably lived about the end of the 14th century. *Gaṅgeśa* quotes *Vācaspati*, while his son *Vardha-*

māna wrote commentaries on *Udayana's Kiraṇāvalī* and *Vallabha's Līlāvatī*. *Gaṅgeśa* must have therefore lived after the 12th century. *Gaṅgeśa* was followed by two writers of note, *Jayadeva* and *Vāsudeva*. According to Burnell *Jayadeva*, otherwise known as *Pakṣadhara Miśra*, wrote his *Manyā-loka*, a commentary on *Gaṅgeśa's Tattva-Cintāmaṇi* about 5 centuries ago, that is, about the middle of the 14th century, but this is highly improbable.¹ *Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma*, a fellow student of *Jayadeva* and the author of a commentary on *Gaṅgeśa's* work, had four pupils of whom the first *Gaurāṅga*, popularly known as *Caitanya*, the celebrated religious reformer in Bengal, was born about 1485 A. D.² Both *Sārvabhauma* and *Jayadeva* must, therefore, have lived in the latter part of the 15th century, and *Gāṅgeśa* at least a generation or two earlier. *Jayadeva* is said to have studied *Tattva-Cintāmaṇi* with his uncle *Harimiśra*, which shows that *Gaṅgeśa's* work was already a standard book in the first half of the 15th century. We shall not be wrong therefore in placing *Gaṅgeśa* in the latter part of the 14th century at the latest.³

Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma must have been a remarkable man, for all of his pupils distinguished themselves in dif-

1 Burnell, Catalogue of Tanjor MSS. Vol. II., p. 117. *Jayadeva* was noted for his intellectual powers. He got the nickname पक्षर for having mastered a difficult book in a fortnight. He is probably the same as the author of प्रसन्नराव but is different from the poet who composed गीतगोविन्द. *Raghunātha Śiromaṇi* is said to have been his pupil for some time.

2 Cowell (Colebrook's *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 281) gives the date of *Caitanya's* birth as 1489 ; but see Bose's *History of Hindu Civilization*. Vol. I. p. 42. *Caitanya* died in A. D. 1527. *Vindhyeśvariprasād* quotes a verse current among Nuddea Pundits शाके मुनिव्योमयुगेन्दुगण्ये पुण्ये त्रिधौ फाल्गुनपौर्णमास्याम् । त्रैलोक्यभायोदयपुण्यकीर्तिर्देवः शचीनन्दन आबिरासीत् । Here the word युग may mean two or four and so will give either Śaka 1207 or 1407 as the date of *Gourāṅga's* birth. See Intro. to *Vaiśeṣika Dars'ana* (*Bibl. Ind. ed.*) p. 32.

3 Prof. Ghate places *Gaṅgeśa* in the 11th century on the authority of a Ms. of *Jayadeva's Āloka* transcribed in *Lakṣmana Samvat 159* corresponding to A. D. 1267. See JBBRAS. XXIII p. 93 and *Vindhyeśvariprasād's* Intro. to *Vaiśeṣika Dars'ana* (*Bibl. Ind.*) p. 32.

ferent fields. The first, *Caitanya*, founded a *Varṇava* sect which soon spread over the whole province of Bengal and revolutionized as it were the religious life of the people. The fact is noteworthy that the greatest exponent of the doctrine of faith in modern times received his early training in the dialectics of *Nyāya* philosophy. The devout mind of *Caitanya* must have no doubt recoiled from the scholastic subtleties of *Gaṅgeśa*, but they could not have failed to influence many of his views. *Vāsudeva*'s second pupil *Raghunātha*, otherwise known as *Tarka-Śiromaṇi* or simple *Śiromaṇi*, wrote *Ādihiti*, the best commentary on *Gaṅgeśa*'s *Tattva-Cintāmaṇi*, and is acknowledged to be the highest authority among the modern *Naiyāyikas*. The third was *Raghunandana*, the lawyer and the author of a commentary on *Jimūta-vāhana*'s *Dāya-vibhāga*, and is now held to be the best current authority on the Bengal School of Hindu law. The fourth, *Kṛṣṇānanda*, also wrote works on charms and other kindred subjects. All these writers being contemporaries of *Caitanya* must have flourished in the beginning of the 16th century. *Raghunātha Śiromaṇi* wrote besides *Ādihiti* commentaries on *Udayana*'s works and a few other treatises, one of which is *Padārtha-Khaṇḍana* or a refutation of *Vaiśeṣika* categories. He was succeeded by a series of commentators whose sole ambition seems to have been to make the *Ādihiti* as unintelligible and terrible to the student as possible. *Raghunātha*'s immediate successors were *Mathurānātha*, *Harināma Tarkālaṅkāra* and *Jagadīśa*, who were followed by their respective pupils, *Raghudeva* and *Gaṇādhara*. *Gaṇādhara* may be called the prince of Indian schoolmen, and in him the modern *Nyāya* dialectics reached its climax. He was such a thorough-going *Naiyāyika* that when asked to think of the prime cause of the universe on his death-bed, instead of contemplating God he is said to have repeated the words पीलवः पीलवः पीलवः ; (atoms atoms, atoms) ! His sixty-four treatises or *Vādas* as they are called on as many topics noticed in *Tattva-Cintāmaṇi* form a continuous commentary on *Śiromaṇi*'s *Ādihiti* and *Jayadeva*'s *Āloka* ; but several of them are not



yet available. *Gadādhara* having come about two generations after *Raghunātha* must be assigned to the end of the 16th or the beginning of the 17th century. He was thus nearly contemporaneous with Lord Bacon whose denunciations of scholasticism may be most appositely illustrated by extracts from *Gadādhara's* writings. Akbar's was an august age in India, and scholars like *Gadādhara* found a congenial atmosphere in the peaceful times of the great and enlightened Mogul ; but Akbar's death put an end to all dreams of a revival of letters. The wars and anarchy of the next two centuries afforded little scope for the cultivation of philosophy, and we accordingly find that even scholastic *Nyāya* could not flourish after *Gadādhara*.

The generation next after *Gadādhara* is represented by two writers standing on a somewhat lower level but equally famous. These were *Śaṅkara Miśra*, the author of *Upaskāra*, a commentary on *Kaṇāda's Sūtras*, and *Viśvanātha* who wrote *Siddhānta-Muktāvali* and *Gotama-Sūtra-Vṛtti* which is a commentary on *Gotama's* aphorisms. *Śaṅkara Miśra* was a pupil of *Raghudeva*, the fellow student of *Gadādhara*. There is some doubt as to the date of *Viśvanātha*, but he most probably belonged to this age.¹

It is remarkable that the *Sūtras* of both *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* should have attracted the attention of commentators at about the same time. *Śaṅkara-Miśra* and *Viśvanātha* who respectively commented upon the works of *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* greatly resembled each other and were probably contemporaries. A kind of reaction against the excesses of *Gadādhara* seems to have led these writers to seek the fresher fountains of the *Sūtras*. Another sign of this reaction was the production of manuals adapted to the understanding of the beginners and explaining the latest ideas in the simplest language. The *Bhāṣā-Pariccheda*, the *Tarka-Saṁgraha*

¹ Rudrabhaṭṭa, brother of *Viśvanātha*, wrote a commentary on *Raghunātha's Dīdhiti*, called *Raudrī*. MSS. of two of Rudrabhaṭṭa's works are mentioned by Afirecht (Catalogus Catalogorum) as dated 1640 and 1657 respectively.

and the *Tarkāmṛta* are instances of this class of books, which must have come as a relief to those students of *Nyāya* who were hitherto lost in the mazes of *Pañca-Lakṣaṇī* and *Daśa-Lakṣaṇī*. In course of time these manuals too were overloaded with commentaries, but fortunately the commentaries on them, except perhaps two, never became as popular as the originals. The two exceptions are *Viśva-nātha's Siddhānta-Muktāvalī* and *Annambhātṭa's Tarka-Dīpikā* which being written by the authors of the original works are more like larger editions of those texts than mere explanatory glosses. These manuals proved very handy and useful to students, but they also marked the lowest watermark of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems. Henceforward all originality was dead and the writers chiefly aimed at explaining the ideas of their predecessors instead of expounding their own. The *Upādhyāyas* were now succeeded by writers whose high-sounding names were in strange contrast with the worth of their productions. *Kroḍas* or annotations became plentiful, but original thinking was dead and gone completely. Even these are now rare, and the once famous class of *Naiyāyikas* is in danger of being extinct for ever.

The preceding resumé of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* literature brings out, it is hoped, at least the one fact that that literature is as capable of a historical treatment as any other class of writings. It is the story of a gradual development of two philosophical systems which, springing out of a few elementary notions, attained their present proportions after many vicissitudes and in the course of several centuries. There must have been during this time considerable additions and alterations in the fundamental doctrines as conceived by the founders of the systems. The original nucleus was comparatively small, but the accretions and out-growths seem to have assumed in time quite large proportions. What an amount of earnest thought and labour must have been devoted to this work of elaborating complete systems out of a few primary principles! It was a process of evolution brought about partly by the natural law of growth and partly by the mutual action and reaction of the several systems of Indian philosophy. In the beginning the chief rivals of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems were the *Sāṃkhya*s, whose

theory of the anti-production reality of effects was diametrically opposed to the *Naiyāyika* doctrine of non-existent effect. Later they encounter the more formidable critics of the *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vedānta* schools who differed from them in so many particulars that a severe conflict between the rivals was inevitable. The *Mīmāṃsakas* affirmed the eternity of sound, while the *Naiyāyikas* denied it. The first enumerated six proofs, the *Naiyāyikas* four, and the *Vaiśeṣikas* only two. The *Naiyāyika* assumed a personal Creator, the Vedāntins an impersonal *Brahman*, while the *Mīmāṃsakas* would recognize nothing but the eternal Vedas. Again the Vedāntins derived all creation from one universal spirit, the *Naiyāyikas* from hard minute atoms. The former were idealists *par excellence*, the latter out and out realists. The doctrines of the former always tended towards mysticism and idealism, those of the latter towards materialism and disbelief. It was natural that systems so widely divergent should come into conflict with each other. The long-continued controversies between these rivals systematically influenced the tenets of all of them. While the Vedāntins incorporated much of the logic of the *Naiyāyikas* into their works, the latter did not disdain to borrow many of the theological views of the former. It would be absurd therefore to expect that any of these systems as propounded in modern works would agree in all respects with the views of the ancient authors. The *Naiyāyikas* themselves recognize this fact by contrasting wherever necessary the views of the moderns with those of the ancients. It is also noteworthy that there is no sharp line dividing the ancient and the modern schools of *Naiyāyikas*. Sometimes the terms are applied to the *Vaiśeṣikas* and *Naiyāyikas* respectively; sometimes to older authors like *Vātsyāyana* and *Prasastapāda*, as opposed to the later ones of the *Nāgārjuna* school; and occasionally even in that school to an author of *Didhiti* as dissenting from *Gaṅgeśa*. As an instance of the last, the student may compare the two definitions of *करण*, one insisting upon the qualification *व्यापारवत्* and the other making proximity to the effect the sole test of ca

tion.¹ The line dividing the ancients and the moderns has thus continuously moved forward and forward, thereby showing that the *Naiyāyikas* themselves acknowledged a progressive development of their philosophy. It ought to be an interesting study to mark the successive stages of this development, and discover the causes that may have led to them. The time may come when a deeper knowledge of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* literature will enable us to solve this problem.

The foregoing observations have been mostly based on material obtainable from the literature of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems themselves; but works belonging to other philosophical systems as well as the vast literary treasures produced in ancient and mediæval India will, if properly examined, yield still more important data for a history of Indian philosophy. A comparison of Greek logic with the logic of the *Nyāya* must also be very instructive. Such a comparison will not only show how similar ideas and modes of thought occurred almost simultaneously and in the same historical order to thinkers in two such distant countries as India and Greece, but it may also throw new light on some of the dark chapters in the history of Indian Logic. Space will not, however, permit me to enter into these interesting inquiries at present; and I must content myself with noting only one important fact which cannot be decently passed over in such a sketch as this. I, of course, refer to the striking resemblance which the syllogistic method of the *Nyāya* bears to the Pre-Aristotelian dialectics in Greece. Zeno the Eleatic was the founder of this latter, and Zeno must have been a contemporary of *Gotama*, or of at least some of his immediate predecessors.² Zeno's work, which is divided into three parts—upon consequences, upon the interrogatory method of disputation, and upon sophistical problems respectively—has many points of similarity with that of *Gotama*, while the interrogatory method, cultivated by Zeno's fol-

1 For a discussion of these two views, see Notes on Sec. 37, pp. 186-90, *infra*.

2 Whateley; *Elements of Logic*, p. 3.



lowers, the sophists, and brought to perfection in Plato's Dialogues, was almost identical with the syllogistic process of the *Naiyāyikas*. The essence of this method consisted in driving an opponent to a point where he was either totally silenced or the absurdity of his position became self-evident. So far as the *Naiyāyikas* were concerned this was not an accidental feature, for they have laid down a special rule that no premise in a syllogism can proceed without having a previous *आकाङ्क्षा* or doubt, presumably started by an opponent in the controversy. Take the stock-example, "Mountain is fiery." "Why?" "Because it has smoke." "What then?" "Wherever there is smoke, etc.," and so on, every premise being a reply to some previous question, assumed until the imaginary querist has no more questions to ask. This is exactly the way Socrates used to argue with his real interrogators, or Euclid proved his theorems of geometry. Obviously this method is better suited for controversy than for purely didactic reasoning; and consequently we find that Indian thinkers who came after the *Naiyāyikas* such as the *Bauddhas* and the *Vedāntins* modified it to a considerable extent just as Aristotle did in Greece.¹ The tripartite syllogism of Aristotle was nothing more than a readjustment of the ancient dialectical syllogism, although Aristotle himself made too much of it and expected from it results which it was incapable of producing. Similarly those who claim superiority for the Aristotelian over the five-membered syllogism of the *Naiyāyikas* forget that both are mere instruments or mechanical aids for thinking, and as such cannot by themselves furnish an absolute guarantee for truth. Both have their peculiar merits as well as drawbacks, and consequently both must be judged from their proper standpoints. Aristotle distinguished between the dialectic and the apodictic, *i. e.* the old and the new or his own syllogism, by asserting that the former proceeded from mere belief or an assumed hypothesis while the latter was based on scientific

1. Colebrooke thinks that the three-membered syllogism of the later *Vedānta* was borrowed from the Greeks, but this is mere guess. See *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 356.



truth. There is much force in this distinction, and it may to some extent apply to the five-membered syllogism also. But Aristotle's criticisms can no longer be accepted without reservation even with respect to doctrines intimately known to him. Much less can he be accepted as a safe guide in adjudging the merits of Indian logic.

It will not be proper to conclude this introductory sketch without noticing one more objection that is often advanced against the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems, namely that their heterogeneous character detracts considerably from their value as systems of pure logic. Indian logicians, say these objectors, have by their frequent digressions on metaphysical and other topics, such as the categories, the sources of knowledge and the theory of atoms, been led into treating the strictly logical questions either perfunctorily or in a wrong manner altogether. On a closer consideration, however, this heterogeneity of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems will be found to have been inevitable. The narrow conception of logic as being only a theory and art of proof and nothing more is no longer tenable. Modern investigations, such as those of Kant, Ueberweg and others, show that the purely logical questions are inseparably connected with others comprehended in the wider province of metaphysics. The best answer to the above objection can therefore be given in the words of an eminent modern writer :—

"Start as we may," says Prof. Adamson, "in popular current distinctions, no sooner do logical problems present themselves than it becomes apparent that, for adequate treatment of them, reference to the principles of ultimate philosophy is requisite; and logic, as the systematic handling of such problems, ceases to be an independent discipline and becomes a subordinate special branch of general philosophy."

And again the same writer remarks :—

"Any criticism of a general conception of logic or special application thereof which does not rest upon criticism

1. Prof. Adamson in his Art. *Logic* in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed. Vol. XIV p, 781.



of the theory of knowledge implied in it must be inept and useless. It will also have become apparent that a general classification of logical schools as opposed to the reference of these to ultimate distinctions of philosophical theory is impossible."¹

[.]
The *Naiyāyikas* seem to have arrived at the same conclusion at an early period, and faced it boldly by embodying their views on all cognate and interdependent questions in a fairly consistent system. *Gotama* and *Kaṇāda* were not therefore such fools in mixing logical and metaphysical topics in their works as some of their modern critics would believe them to be. Logic is no longer regarded as a theory of proof only; it is a theory of knowledge in general, and as such treats of many psychological and metaphysical topics which do not fall within the domain of the narrower science. Looked at from this standpoint *Gotama's* conception of his subject will be found to be remarkably accurate and just. Let us first understand him; and there will be then time enough to pick holes in his monumental work.²

1. See *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed. Vol. XIV, p. 799.

2. Max Müller in noticing my Brief Survey of Indian logic remarks at p. 476 of his *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy* "But unfortunately that period in the historical development of the Nyāya which is of the greatest interest to ourselves, namely that which preceded the composition of the Nyāya-Sūtras, had by him (i. e. myself) also to be left a blank, for the simple reason that nothing is known of Nyāya before *Gotama*." It should be remembered, however, that Nyāya was recognised as a separate system only after *Gotama* and that all traces before him must be sought in the general philosophical literature such as the *Upaniṣads*.

Annambhatta and his works.

Annambhatta, the author of the *Tarka-Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā*, shares the fate of many Sanskrit writers of being known only in his works. The name itself looks anomalous, and is either a contraction of *Ananta Bhatta* or a sanskritized form of the Canarese name *Anna Bhatta*. Little do we know about him, and that little mostly consists of traditions which cannot be accepted as true without the strongest corroboration. Mr. R. B. Godbole, in his 'Dictionary of Modern History of India'¹, gives a detailed account of our author without however mentioning the source of his information. According to him, *Annambhatta* was a Tailang Brahman by birth and resided in a village named *Garikapāda*, formerly in the possession of Nizam Ali. He lived in the 15th century at the time of the Chalukyas, studied *Nyāya* at *Kaundīyapura* or *Kondu Vidu* for 12 years and became a famous *Naiyāyika*. He established a College for teaching *Nyāya* in his native town where he instructed his pupils in a graduated series of *Nyāya* works consisting of *Tarka-Saṃgraha*, *Tarka-Dīpikā*, *Siddhānta-Muktāvalī* and *Gadādhari*. He had many children none of whom survived him, and is said to have travelled out of his village only once in his life when he visited the shrine of Mallikārjuna at the advanced age of 55. From this it would appear that *Annambhatta* was posterior to both *Gadādhara* and *Viśvanātha*, which is very probable; but then he could not have lived in the 15th century as stated by Mr. Godbole. It has been shown elsewhere,² that *Gadādhara* must have flourished in the latter part of the 16th century and *Viśvanātha* one generation later. Obviously *Annambhatta* who taught the works of these writers could not have lived before the beginning of the 17th

1. R. B. Godbole : भरतखंडाचा ऐतिहासिक कोष P. 10.

2. See Introduction p. LIII Supra.

century. Another of Mr. Godbole's statements, viz. that *Annambhaṭṭa* travelled only once in his life, is contradicted by a tradition embodied in a well-known couplet that has passed into a proverb, काशीगमनमात्रेण नाक्षंभट्टायते द्विजः meaning that a man does not become a great scholar like *Annambhaṭṭa* simply by going to Benares. If the verse refers to the author of the *Tarka-Saṃgraha*, he must have visited and studied at Benares. The proverb would also show that he became famous for his learning at a very early period, a conclusion which is strengthened by the fact that his works became very popular and have been in use as elementary text-books in all parts of India. No reliance can therefore be placed on Mr. Godbole's account, and in the absence of any other authentic source of information we are left to such meagre data as are supplied by the writings of *Annambhaṭṭa* himself.

Apart from such vague traditions, we can unhesitatingly say that *Annambhaṭṭa* is comparatively a modern writer. He belonged to the class of manual writers, who mostly flourished after the 16th century and whose chief aim was to simplify the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems by pruning all superfluous technicalities out of them, and bringing them within the comprehension of beginners. The *terminus ad quo* of our author may for the present be fixed at about 1600 A. D., the time when *Gadādhara* flourished. *Annambhaṭṭa* rarely refers to any previous writer or work that might enable us to fix his age accurately. He however notes the controversy about व्यापारवत् करण, first started by *Raghunātha*, the author of *Didhiti*¹; while in another passage of the *Dipikā*, he seems to quote directly from the *Didhiti*, for the sentence प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकारोप्य° etc., which occurs at the bottom of p. 62 *infra* and which is misread in many Mss. of *Dipikā*, appears to have been taken from a corresponding passage in the *Didhiti*.² It has been shown elsewhere that *Raghunātha Śīromani*, the author of *Didhiti*, lived in the first quarter of the 16th century.³ The *Didhiti* must have been written about 1520 A. D. and *Annambhaṭṭa* neces-

1 Page LIII *supra*.

2 See Note 5 under Sect 80 p. 371, *infra*.

3 See Introduction p. LII *supra*.

sarily came after it. *Gadādhara* came two generations after *Raghunātha* with whose grand pupil *Raghudeva* he was contemporary. *Gadādhara* therefore lived about the end of the 16th century, either in *Mithilā* or *Nuddea*; and if it be true that *Annambhaṭṭa* taught his works in his own college in the far-off town of *Kaundīnypura*, some time must have elapsed between *Gadādhara* and *Annambhaṭṭa* to allow the fame of the former's works to reach the Southernmost province of India. The story of *Annambhaṭṭa* teaching *Gadādhara*'s work in his College derives support from another tradition, according to which the *Tarka-Dīpikā* was specially composed for the use of those who could not understand *Gadādhara*'s larger work and came to be called बालगदाधरी on account of its being an epitome of the erudite commentary of the great schoolman. It may be therefore fairly presumed that *Annambhaṭṭa* lived some time after *Gadādhara* i. e. after 1600 A.D. If *Viśvanātha*, the author of the *Siddhānta-Muktāvalī* also preceded him, this *terminus* will have to be shifted still further. *Viśvanātha* and his brother *Rudrabhaṭṭa*, who wrote a commentary on the *Dīdhiti*, lived most probably in the first quarter of the 17th century,¹ and *Annambhaṭṭa* could not have lived earlier.

The *terminus ad quod* of our author may be fixed at 1700 A. D. The *Tarka-Saṃgraha* must have become a standard work, and a difficult one also in the latter part of the 18th century, since *Śrīkṛṣṇa Dhūrjati* wrote his commentary called *Siddhānta-Candrodaya* about that time for the instruction of *Rājasiṃha*, son of King *Gajasiṃha*, who flourished in 1774 A. D. The *Tarka-Candrikā* by *Vaidyanātha Gadgil* seems to be an earlier commentary on the *Tarka-Saṃgraha*, for a Ms. of it in the Deccan College Library gives, as the date of its composition, Śake 1644 i. e. 1722 A. D. This *Vaidyanātha* is probably identical with *Tatsat Vaidyanātha*, the pupil of *Nāgeśa* and the author of a commentary on his *Udyota*. *Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa* is known to have been invited to a grand sacrifice in 1714 by *Savai Jayasiṃha*, and his pupil *Vaidyanātha* may therefore

¹ See Introduction p. LIII. *supra*.



have written his commentaries in the next decade. Obviously *Annambhatta* must have lived before this time. The evidence of Mss. of the *Turka-Saṃgraha* is conclusive on the point. Stein mentions a Ms. of T. S. dated 1740 A. D. and another of T. D. dated 1735 A. D.¹ The oldest known Ms. however of these two works is the one now in the possession of Dr. Jacobi of Bonn and marked J in the present edition. It is dated Śake 1634 i. e. 1712 A. D. As this Ms. contains several corrections and marginal additions, it will not be wrong to assume that the two works were written several years before they were copied. Hence we can safely place *Annambhatta* before the beginning of the 18th century. The period from A. D. 1625 to A. D. 1700 is neither too long nor too short to cover one lifetime, and if we can place *Annambhatta* between these two *termini* the result ought to be regarded as pretty satisfactory under the present circumstances. Besides, if Mr. Godbole's statement that *Annambhatta* visited *Mallikāṛjuna* temple at the age of 55 has any foundation, he must have lived upto an advanced age and may, for aught we know, have covered the whole of the period above indicated.

All attempts to push *Annambhatta*'s date before the first quarter of the 17th century must therefore fail. The colophon of a Ms. of T. S. mentioned by Weber² is said to give the date 1425 A. D. which if true would conclusively prove him to have lived at least two centuries before the time we have assigned to him. But this is not possible. The verse runs thus :—

तपोमास्यासिते कृष्णे चन्द्रनागाब्धिचन्द्रकैः ।

वाराणस्यां मिते वर्षे स्वार्थमिन्दुर्लिलेख वै ॥

Here the expression चन्द्रनागाब्धिचन्द्रकैः has been incorrectly taken to mean *Saṃvat* 1481 or 1425 A.D. अब्धि ought to be taken for 7 and not 4, and then the date becomes 1725 A. D., making the Ms. 12 years later than that of Dr.

1 Stein:—*Catalogue of Sk. Mss. at Jammu*,

2 Weber's *Berlin Catalogue*, No 683, p. 203.

Jacobi. Whatever uncertainty may still remain on the point, one thing is unquestionable that *Annambhaṭṭa* could have by no means been anterior to *Raghunātha* whose date is now tolerably settled.¹ It has also been suggested that the *Tribhuvana-Tilaka* of Kanchi mentioned in T. D.² may be some king contemporary with our author; but this is also not possible, for no king of that name is to be found in the genealogies of Kanchi after the 12th century. Even if the *Tribhuvana-Tilaka* be a real personage he must have lived before the 10th century, for the illustration in T. D. is literally copied from *Śrīdhara's Nyāya-Kandalī* which was written in 991 A. D.³ No inference can therefore be drawn from the mention of *Tribhuvana-Tilaka* as to the date of our author.

Annambhaṭṭa was the son of *Tirumala*, who is styled *Ācārya* and whose name is preceded by the honorific title of अद्वैतविद्याचार्य in the colophons of several of our author's works. The colophon,⁴ which by-the-by has been most useful in proving the identity of the several *Annambhaṭṭas*, is found only in Dr. Jacobi's copy of *Tarka-Dīpikā* (marked J). It however occurs at the end of two other works of *Annambhaṭṭa*, namely *Mitākṣarā*, which is a commentary on the *Brahma-Sūtras* of *Bādarāyaṇa*, and the fragment of a grammatical work named *Vivaraṇodyotana* or *Bhāṣya-pra-dīpodyotana* consisting of annotations on *Kaṇyāṭa's* celebrated gloss on *Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya*. *Tirumala*, father of *Annambhaṭṭa*, appears to have been a *Rgvedī Smārta* Brāhmaṇa, learned in the Vedānta philosophy and descended from a great man named *Rūghava* who performed a *Soma* sacrifice. It is not known whether *Tirumala* wrote any works, but several authors of that name are mentioned by Aufrecht. *Annambhaṭṭa* appears to have been an all-round scholar, for he has left works on at least four sciences, namely *Nyāya*, *Vedānta*, *Vyākaraṇa* and *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*. Besides the *Tarka-Saṃgraha* and the *Tarka-Dīpikā*, Aufrecht

1 See Introduction p. LIII *supra*.

2 See p. 50 *infra*.

3 See Introduction p. XLV *supra*; P. B. Ben. ed. p. 6.

4 See p. 67 *infra*

mentions the following works as having been composed by Annambhaṭṭa :—¹ 1 *Mitākṣarā*, 2 *Tattva-Bodhinī-Tikā*, 3 *Nyāya-Parīṣiṣṭa-Prakāśa* and 4 *Subodhinī-Sudhāsāra*, otherwise called *Rāṇakojjivini*. Of these the first is a short commentary on Bādarāyaṇa's *Brahma-Sūtras* and is undoubtedly written by the author of the *Tarka-Saṁgraha*, since it has the same colophon² as is found in our Ms. of the *Dīpikā* marked J. As to the other three nothing can be said with certainty as I have not been able to procure any copy of them. The second appears to be a commentary on some work named *Tattva-Bodhinī*, and Aufrecht marks it as a *Nyāya* work, apparently on the authority of Oppert.³ Aufrecht does not however mention any *Nyāya* work of the name *Tattva-Bodhinī*, and possibly both he and Oppert were misled. We know only three works bearing the name *Tattva-Bodhinī*, namely, a commentary on *Saṁkṣepa-Śārīraka* by *Nṛsiṁha*, a Tantric work by *Kṛṣṇānanda*, and thirdly a commentary on *Bhaṭṭoji's Siddhānta-Kaumudī*. So Annambhaṭṭa's *Tikā* may be a commentary on either the first or the last. Or it is also possible that a Ms. of Annambhaṭṭa's *Vivaraṇodyotana*, presently to be mentioned, has been mistaken by Oppert for an independent work of this name. The third work, *Nyāya-Parīṣiṣṭa-Prakāśa*, is said to be a commentary on Udayanācārya's *Nyāya-Parīṣiṣṭa* and may possibly be Annambhaṭṭa's *Magnum Opus* on the *Nyāya* system. The fourth is said to be a commentary on *Rāṇaka* or *Nyāya-Sudhā* of *Someśvara* which in its turn is a commentary on the *Tantra-Vārtika* of *Kumārila*. Besides these, Aufrecht and Hall mention two other works on grammar called *Kātyāyana-Prāṭisākhya-Vyākhyāna* and *Mahā-Bhāṣya-Vivaraṇodyotana* written by an author named Annambhaṭṭa.⁴ The author of the first of these was a pupil

1 Aufrecht ; *Catalogus Catalogorum*.

2 This colophon is repeated at the end of each chapter in a Ms. of the work which I had seen.

3 Aufrecht ; *Catalogus Catalogorum* p. 20.

4 Hall: *Bibliographical Index of Indian Philosophical systems* pp. 68, 69.

of *Sumaṅgala* and may or may not be the same as the son of *Tirumala*. But the second work *Vivaraṇodyotana* also called *Bhāṣyapradīpodyotana* which consists of notes on *Kaiyaṭa*'s commentary on *Patañjali*'s *Mahābhāṣya* can now be safely ascribed to the author of the *Tarka-Dīpikā*. Two Mss. of a fragment of this *Udyotana* are mentioned in Hultzscht's recent Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. in Southern India (Vol. I. p. 66), the colophon at the end of which tallies exactly with that found at the end of the *Dīpikā* and the *Mitākṣarā*. Hall's later opinion therefore that this *Udyotana* was written by some other *Annambhaṭṭa* cannot be accepted. Candraśekhara Śāstri of Madras mentions two other works of *Annambhaṭṭa* : *Tattva-Cintā-maṇyūloka-Siddhāntajana* and a *Brahmasūtra-Vṛtti* ; while he calls *Mitākṣarā* a gloss on *Pāṇini*'s *Sūtras* according to *Kāśikā*. *Annambhaṭṭa* thus appears to have been a versatile writer, since he has written at least three works on *Nyāya*, one on *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*, one or two on *Vedānta*, and two if not three on grammar. *Annambhaṭṭa* is also said to have had an elder brother *Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa* who wrote *Siddhānta-Ratna*, a commentary on *Bhaṭṭoji*'s *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*.

Of all the works of *Annambhaṭṭa*, only the *Tarka-Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā* appear to have attained any wide celebrity. They are the most popular works of their kind, and they have been for several generations used as text-books for beginners. The *Tarka-Saṃgraha* is a model work, because it combines in a remarkable degree the three essential qualities of a good manual, namely, brevity, accuracy and lucidity. It was intended to supply an easy compendium of the main principles of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems, and the author has done his work admirably. Of course the work is not entirely free from faults. Some of its passages are marred by ambiguities of language or confusion of thought such as make them almost unintelligible without the aid of a teacher or a commentary ; and even positive errors have crept in in one or two places. These occasional lapses were however inevitable, because they are mostly due to the author's anxiety to avoid all subtleties and controversial topics that may be beyond the comprehension of beginners. The attempt

to frame broad and accurate definitions without descending into the niceties of scholastic *Nyāya* was a difficult one, and it is highly creditable to our author that he has succeeded even so well. Passages like those referring to करण, परामर्श, सोपाधिक, and तर्क, as well as several others in the *Dīpikā* only prove that even a clear-headed writer like *Annambhaṭṭa* could not avoid some of the pitfalls that are so plentiful in the path of a student of *Nyāya*.

The most glaring fault of the *Tarka-Saṃgraha*, however, is that it errs too much on the side of brevity; and the defect is sought to be cured by supplying some of the deficiencies in the *Dīpikā*. In fact, the *Dīpikā* is more like a revised and enlarged edition of the original than a mere commentary upon it. It appears to have been written some time after the *Saṃgraha*, for in several places the author introduces additions and corrections in the commentary, which are obviously later thoughts but which could not be conveniently inserted in the text after its circulation. The clause अनन्यथा-सिद्धत्वे सति¹ which is proposed to be added to the definition of कारण is one instance out of many showing how serious omissions in the text are supplied in the commentary. The way in which some of the new topics are introduced in the *Dīpikā* also shows that they were most probably suggested when the author was actually teaching his primer. It is not therefore unreasonable to suppose that the *Dīpikā* came to be written when the author saw by experience the necessity of elucidating the many obscurities that remained in the *Saṃgraha*. The practice of writing a commentary on one's own work was not uncommon among *Nyāya* writers. In mediæval times *Diñnāga* and *Dharmakīrti* had written commentaries on their own works. Similarly *Varadarāja* the author of *Tārkika-Rakṣā* wrote its commentary the *Vyākhyā*, and *Viśvanātha*, the author of *Bhāṣā-Pariccheda* and *Siddhānta-Muktāvali* imitated him. *Annambhaṭṭa* seems to have taken *Viśvanātha's* works as his models.

Although *Annambhaṭṭa* rarely quotes or refers to any previous writer, there can be no doubt that he was aware of

¹ See T. D. p. 26 *infra*.



the latest views on the many controversial points. He does not slavishly follow any particular master, nor does he confine himself wholly to any of the ancient or modern schools of *Naiyāyikas*. He chooses his doctrines from all writers with the sole view of constructing a fairly consistent and intelligible system. As the *Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā* are professedly mixtures of both the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśeṣika* systems, the author borrows from writers of both schools; but unlike others who have adopted the same plan, he generally adheres to *Gotama's* views with respect to matters coming under logic proper, i. e. in the sections treating of *Buddhi* and its subdivisions, but follows *Kaṇāda* in the rest of the book. In cases of conflict between the ancient and modern *Naiyāyikas* he mostly prefers the ancient view as being the simpler or more striking, and generally adopts the older definitions as far as possible. He has greater sympathy with the older *Acāryas* than with the modern ever-innovating writers of the Nuddea school. But although a conservative in this sense he generally keeps an impartial attitude and steers clear of all disputes without identifying himself with any particular side. It is this characteristic which distinguishes his works from other manuals, and which makes them as primers for beginners preferable even to the otherwise superior treatises of *Viśvanātha*.

Instances of specific borrowing are too numerous to mention. Many of his definitions of categories and their subdivisions he has copied literally from the scholium of *Praśastapāda*, e. g., those of द्रव्य, रूप, रस, गन्ध, स्पर्श, संख्या, परिमाण, विशेष, and several others. Sometimes he adopts the emendation suggested by *Śrīdhara*, and sometimes he rejects *Praśastapāda's* definition in toto in favour of a modern one, e. g. in the case of आत्मा and बुद्धि. Occasionally he borrows even long passages from *Praśastapāda*, e. g. the passage beginning with सा द्विविधा in Sec. 10 p. 6 *Infra*. He also appears to have borrowed largely from the writings of *Śrīdhara*, *Udayana* and *Śivāditya*, as well as the principal writers of the Nuddea school, *Gaṅgeśa*, *Raghunātha* and *Gadādhara*. Outside the circle of *Nyāya* writers, *Annambhatta* has the



greatest sympathy with the *Vedānta* school. He often quotes the views of the *Mīmāṃsakas*, and even inserts a short disquisition on विधि in the concluding portion of the *Dīpikā*.

Besides the *Tarka-Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā*, the present edition includes another commentary on the *Saṃgraha* named *Nyāya-Bodhinī* by Govardhana. It does not possess any peculiar feature that requires special notice. It is on the whole rather discursive, treating of some topics elaborately and omitting others altogether. Nothing is known about the writer; but from his work he appears to have been well-versed in the subtleties of the later *Nyāya*. He is apparently different from the writer of a commentary on *Keśavamisra's Tarka-bhāṣā*. He makes valuable suggestions here and there, but his frequent indulgence in scholastic hair-splitting makes the work somewhat difficult for novices. The obscurity of the style and the want of a reliable Ms. are also great drawbacks in the case of this commentary. It is included in this edition for two reasons, first because it is taught to advanced pupils in many parts of India, and secondly because it will familiarize students with the controversial method and formulæ of the modern *Naiyāyikas*.

The popularity of Annambhaṭṭa's works can be best measured by the host of writers who have commented upon them. The commentaries on the *Saṃgraha* are too numerous to notice here, but a list of them, complete as far as our present knowledge goes, is given in Appendix B. Only two of these need special mention, the *Vākya-Vṛtti* of Meru Śāstri, and the *Siddhānta-Candrodaya* of Śrīkṛṣṇa Dhūrjati. The former is very short but always to the point, and usually gives the meaning of the author in a few pithy sentences. The writer was a celebrated Pundit of modern times, and his remarks in cases of doubt or ambiguity are entitled to great weight. The *Siddhānta-Candrodaya* being perhaps too copious and exhaustive is useful to beginners but not always reliable. The best guide to the *Saṃgraha* and the *Dīpikā*, however, is the *Tarka-Dīpikā-Prakāśa* of Nīlakaṇṭha, popularly known as *Nīlakaṇṭhī*.

Tarka-Saṃgraha.

Nilakanṭha appears to be a recent author. According to Pundit Mukunda Jha of Darbhanga he was a son of Rāma-bhatta surnamed Paṇi of Kaundinya gotra and was born in Āndhra country. In his later years he lived at Benares and died in 1840. His son *Lakṣmī-Nṛsiṃha* who also lived and died at Benares wrote a commentay, *Bhāskarodayā* on *Nilakanṭha's Prakāśa*.

ABBREVIATIONS.

- B. P.**—*Bhāṣā-Pariccheda* by Viśvanātha Pañcānana, edited and translated by Dr. E. Roer (*Bibliotheca Indica*).
- Brahm. Sūt.**—*Brahma-Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa with the scholium of Śaṅkarācārya.
- Brih. Up.**
Brih. Ār. Up. } *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*.
- Din.**—*Dīnakarī* or *Siddhānta-Muktāvalī-Prakāśa* by Divākara Bhaṭṭa.
- G. S.**—*Gotama-Sūtra* or Gotama's Aphorisms of Nyāya.
- J. B. B. R. A. S.**—Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
- Jaimi. S.**—Jaimini's *Sūtras* on *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā*.
- Kath. Up.**—*Kāthopaniṣad*.
- Kūś.**—*Kuśumāñjali* of Udayanācārya edited and translated by E. B. Cowell. (Calc. 1864.)
- N. B.**—*Nyāya-Bodhinī* by Govardhana.
- Nil** or **Nilakantha**.—*Tarka-Dīpikā-Prakāśa* by Nilakantha.
- Nyāya-B.**—*Nyāya-Bindu* edited by Dr. P. Peterson (*Bibli. Ind.*)
- Nyāya-B. T.**—*Nyāya-Bindu-ṭīkā* (by Dharmottarācārya edited by Dr. P. Peterson.
- Nyāya-K.**—*Nyāya-Kośa* by Bhīmācārya 2nd ed. (Bombay Sanskrit Series.)
- P. B.**—*Prāśastapāda's Bhāṣya* with Śrīdhara's *Nyāya-Kandalī* edited by Vindhyeśvarīprasād (Vizianagaram Series, Benares.)
- Sāṅkhya-T. K.**—*Sāṅkhya-Tattva-Kaumudī* by Vācaspati-miśra edited by Tārānāth Tarka-Vācaspati (Calc. 1871.)
- Sarv. D. S.**—*Sarva-Darśana Saṁgraha* by Mādhavācārya (Calc. ed.)
- S. C.**—*Siddhānta-Candrodaya*, a commentary on *Tarka-Saṁgraha* by Śrīkṛṣṇa Dhūrjati.



- S. M.**--*Siddhānta-Muktāvalī* by Viśvanātha Pañcānana.
S. P.--*Sapta-Padārthī* by Śivāditya.
T. A.--*Tarkāmṛta* by Jagadīśa.
T. B.--*Tarka-Bhāṣā* by Keśava Miśra, edited by S. M. Paranjpe (Poona.)
T. D.--*Tarka-Dīpikā*.
T. K.--*Tarka-Kaumudī* by Laugākṣi Bhāskara, edited by M. N. Dvivedi (Bombay Sanskrit Series.)
T. S.--*Tarka-Saṁgraha*.
Vat.--Vātsyāyana's Commentary on *Gotama-Sūtra* edited by Jībananda (Cal. 1874.)
Ved. Par.--*Vedānta-Parībhāṣā*, by Dharmarājādhvarīndra (Cal. ed.)
V. S.--*Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra* or Aphorisms of *Vaiśeṣika* philosophy by Kaṇāda.
V. S. Up.--*Vaiśeṣika-Sūtrapaskāra* by Śaṁkara Miśra, edited by Jaya Nārāyaṇa Tarka Pañcānana (Cal. 1861).
V. S. Vritti.--*Vaiśeṣika-sūtra-Vṛtti* by Viśvanātha Pañcānana (Cal. ed.)
V. V.--*Vākya-Vṛtti*, a commentary on *Tarka-Saṁgraha* by Meru Śāstri (Bombay 1873).
-

अथ

तर्कसंग्रहः

तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिन्या च सहितः

[१]

निधाय हृदि विश्वेशं विधाय गुरुवन्दनम् ।

बालानां सुखबोधाय क्रियते तर्कसंग्रहः ॥

अथ तर्कदीपिका

विश्वेश्वरं साम्बमूर्तिं प्रणिपत्य 'गिरं गुरुम् ।

टीकां शिशुहितां कुर्वे तर्कसंग्रहदीपिकाम् ॥

चिकीर्षितस्य ग्रन्थस्य निर्विघ्नपरिसमाप्त्यर्थं शिष्टाचारानुमितश्रुतिबोधितकर्तव्यताकमिष्टदेवतानमस्कारलक्षणं मङ्गलं शिष्यशिक्षार्थं निबन्धंश्चिकीर्षितं ग्रन्थादौ प्रतिजानीते—निधयेति ।

ननु मङ्गलस्य समाप्तिसाधनत्वं नास्ति । मङ्गले कृतेऽपि किरणावल्यादौ समाप्त्यदर्शनात् मङ्गलाभावेऽपि कादम्बर्यादौ समाप्त्यदर्शनादन्वयव्यतिरेकव्यभिचारादिति चेन्न । किरणावल्यादौ विघ्नबाहुल्यात्समाप्त्यभावः । कादम्बर्यादौ तु ग्रन्थाद्वहिरेव मङ्गलं कृतमतो न व्यभिचारः ॥

ननु मङ्गलस्य कर्तव्यत्वे किं प्रमाणमिति चेत् । न । शिष्टाचारानुमितश्रुते-

1 Nil gives as v. l. गिरं गुरुं and explains it निखिलविद्यानामुपदेष्टारम्. Y also reads गिरं.

2 A and F read निर्विघ्नपरिसमाप्त्य°, but all other copies omit निर्विघ्न°; P has असमाप्ति°.

3 M has बौद्धग्रन्थादौ for कादम्बर्यादौ in this and the following instance. F and Q interchange

कादम्बर्यादौ and किरणावल्यादौ, retaining the remaining sentence as above. N reads differently मङ्गलाभावेऽपि किरणावल्यादौ समाप्त्यदर्शनात् मङ्गलसत्त्वेऽपि कादम्बर्यादौ समाप्त्यदर्शनात्, and gives the other v. l. in a footnote. See Note loc, cit,

रेव 'प्रमाणत्वात् । तथाहि—मङ्गलं वेदबोधितकर्तव्यताकं, अलौकिकावि-
गीतशिष्टाचारविषयत्वात् दर्शादिवत् । भोजनादौ व्यभिचारवारणाया-
लौकिकेति । रात्रिश्राद्धादौ व्यभिचारवारणायाविगीतेति । शिष्टपदं स्पष्टा-
र्थम् । “न कुर्यान्निष्फलं कर्म” इति जलताडनादेरपि निषिद्धत्वादिति ॥

तर्कसंग्रह इति । तर्क्यन्ते प्रतिपाद्यन्त इति तर्का द्रव्यादिसप्त-
पदार्थास्तेषां संग्रहः संक्षेपेण स्वरूपकथनं क्रियत इत्यर्थः । कस्मै प्रयो-
जनायेत्यत आह—सुखबोधायेति । सुखेनानायासेन बोधः पदार्थ-
ज्ञानं तस्मा इत्यर्थः ॥ ननु बहुषु तर्कग्रन्थेषु सत्सु किमर्थमपूर्वग्रन्थः
क्रियत इत्यत आह—बालानामिति । तेषामतिविस्तृतत्वाद्बालानां
बोधो न भवतीत्यर्थः । ग्रहणधारणपटुर्बालः न तु स्तनन्धयः । किं
कृत्वा क्रियत इत्यत आह—निधायेति । विश्वेशं जगन्नियन्तारं शिवं
हृदि निधाय नितरां स्थापयित्वा सर्वदा तद्ग्रहणपरो भूत्वेत्यर्थः ।
गुरुणां विद्यागुरुणां वन्दनं नमस्कारं विधाय कृत्वेत्यर्थः ॥

अथ न्यायबोधिनी

अखिलागमसंचारि श्रीकृष्णाख्यं परं महः ।

ध्यात्वा गोवर्धनसुधीस्तनुते न्यायबोधिनीम् ॥

चिकीर्षितस्य ग्रन्थस्य निर्विघ्नपरिसमाप्त्यर्थमिष्टदेवतानमस्कारात्मकं
मङ्गलं शिष्यशिक्षार्थं ग्रन्थादौ निवध्नाति निधायेति ॥

[२]

द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायाभावाः सप्त पदार्थाः ॥

त. दी.—पदार्थान्विभजते—द्रव्येति । पदस्यार्थः पदार्थ इति व्युत्प-
त्त्याभिधेयत्वं^१ पदार्थसामान्यलक्षणम् ॥ नन्वत्र विभागादेव सप्तत्वे सिद्धे
सप्तग्रहणं व्यर्थमिति चेत् । न । अधिकसंख्याव्यवच्छेदार्थत्वात्^४ ॥ नन्वति-

1 Some Mss. add “समाप्तिकामो
मंगलमाचरेत्” इति श्रुतेः । but
the addition is not warrant-
ed as the context refers to
अनुमितश्रुति only.

G reads पदार्थाः सप्तैव.

3 A F M and P add लभ्यते and
also insert इति before it.

4 A F and P add न्यून before अधिक
unnecessarily; Y Z read लब्धे
for सिद्धे; Q has किमर्थं for
व्यर्थम्.

रिक्तः पदार्थः प्रमितो न वा । नाद्यः प्रमितस्य निषेधायोगात् । नान्त्यः प्रति-
योगिप्रमितिं विना निषेधानुपपत्तेरिति चेत् । न । पदार्थत्वं द्रव्यादिसप्तान्यत-
मत्वव्याप्यमिति व्यवच्छेदार्थत्वात् ॥ 'ननु सप्तान्यतमत्वं सप्तभिन्नभिन्नत्व-
मिति वक्तव्यम् । एवं च सप्तभिन्नस्याप्रसिद्धत्वात्सप्तान्यतमत्वं कथमिति
चेन्न द्रव्यादिसप्तान्यतमत्वं द्रव्यादिभेदसप्तकाभाववत्त्वमित्युक्तत्वात् ।
एवमग्रेऽपि द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

न्या. बो.—अथ पदार्थान्विभजते—द्रव्येति ॥ तत्र सप्तग्रहणं पदा-
र्थत्वं द्रव्यादिसप्तान्यतमत्वव्याप्यमिति व्याप्तिलाभाय । ननु शक्तिपदार्थ-
स्याष्टमस्य सत्त्वात्कथं सप्तैवेति । तथाहि वह्निसंयुक्तेन्धनादौ सत्यपि मणि-
संयोगे दाहो न जायते तच्छून्ये तु जन्यते । अतो मणिसमवधाने
शक्तिर्नश्यति । मण्यभावदशायां दाहानुकूला शक्तिरुत्पद्यत इति कल्प्यते ।
तस्माच्छक्तिरतिरिक्तपदार्थ इति चेन्न । मणेः प्रतिबन्धकत्वेन तदभावस्य
दाहकारणत्वेनैव निर्वहे मणिसमवधानासमवधानाभ्यामनन्तशक्तितत्तद्ध्वं-
सतत्तत्प्रागभावकल्पनाया अन्याय्यत्वात् । तस्मात्सप्तैव पदार्था इति सिद्धम् ॥

[३]

तत्र द्रव्याणि पृथिव्यप्तेजोवाय्वाकाशकालदिगात्ममनांसि नवैव ॥

त. दी.—द्रव्यं विभजते—तत्रेति । तत्र द्रव्यादिमध्ये द्रव्याणि
नवैवेत्यन्वयः । कानि तानीत्यत आह—पृथिवीत्यादि । ननु तमसो
दशमद्रव्यस्य विद्यमानत्वात्कथं नवैव द्रव्याणि ।^१ तथाहि नीलं तमश्चलती-
त्यबाधितप्रतीतिबलानीलरूपाधारतया क्रियाधारतया च द्रव्यत्वं ताव-
त्सिद्धम् । तत्र तमसो नाकाशादिपञ्चकेऽन्तर्भावो रूपवत्त्वात् । अत एव न
वायौ^२ स्पर्शाभावात्सदागतिमत्त्वाभावाच्च । नापि तेजसि भास्वरूपाभावा-

1 Q. omits इति वक्तव्यम् and sub-
stitutes तदर्थत्वात् for इत्युक्तत्वात्.
L omits the whole passage
from ननु to उक्तत्वात्; Nil. also
appears to have had doubts
about its authenticity. See
Note loc. cit.

2 A and F add after तथाहि a verse

तमः खलु चलं नीलं परापराविभाग-
वत् । प्रसिद्धद्रव्यवैधर्म्यान्निवेभ्यो भे-
त्तुमर्हति; but it seems to be in-
terpolated from some other
commentary. J omits तथाहि
also.

3 A and J omit स्पर्शाभावात्.

दुष्णस्पर्शाभावाच्च । नापि जले शीतस्पर्शाभावाच्चीलरूपाश्रयत्वाच्च । नापि पृथिव्यां गन्धवत्त्वाभावात्स्पर्शरहितत्वाच्च । तस्मात्तमो दशमद्रव्यमिति चेन्न । तमसस्तेजोऽभावरूपत्वात् । तथाहि—तमो हि न 'रूपवद्रव्यमालोकासहकृतचक्षुर्ग्राह्यत्वादालोकाभाववत् । रूपद्रव्यचाक्षुषप्रमायामालोकस्य कारणत्वात् । तस्मात्प्रौढप्रकाशकतेजःसामान्याभावस्तमः । तत्र नीलं तमश्चलतीति प्रत्ययो भ्रमः । अतो नव द्रव्याणीति सिद्धम् ॥

द्रव्यत्वजातिमत्त्वं गुणवत्त्वं वा द्रव्यसामान्यलक्षणम् ॥ लक्ष्यैकदेशावृत्तित्वमव्याप्तिः यथा गोः कपिलत्वम् । अलक्ष्यवृत्तित्वमतिव्याप्तिः यथा गोः शृङ्गित्वम् । लक्ष्यमात्रावर्तनमसंभवः यथा गोरेकशफत्वम् । एतद्वृषणत्रयरहितो धर्मो 'लक्षणम् । स एवासाधारणधर्म इत्युच्यते । लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकसमनियतत्वमसाधारणत्वम् । व्यावर्तकस्यैव 'लक्षणत्वे व्यावृत्तावभिधेयत्वादौ चातिव्याप्तिवारणाय तद्विन्नत्वं धर्मविशेषणं देयम् । व्यवहारस्यापि लक्षणप्रयोजनत्वे तु न देयम् । व्यावृत्तेरपि व्यवहारसाधनत्वात् ॥ ननु गुणवत्त्वं न द्रव्यसामान्यलक्षणम् । आद्यक्षणे उत्पन्नविनष्टद्रव्ये चाव्याप्तेरिति चेन्न । गुणसमानाधिकरणसत्ताभिन्नजातिमत्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् ॥ नन्वेवमप्येकं रूपं रसात्पृथगिति व्यवहाराद्रूपादावतिव्याप्तिरिति चेन्न । एकार्थसमवायादेव तादृशव्यवहारोपपत्तौ गुणे गुणानङ्गीकरणात् ॥

न्या. बो.—द्रव्याणि विभजते—पृथिवीति । नन्वन्धकारस्य दशमद्रव्यस्य सत्त्वात्कथं नवैवेति । तथाहि नीलं तमश्चलतीति प्रतीतेर्नीलरूपाश्रयत्वेन क्रियाश्रयत्वेन च द्रव्यत्वं सिद्धम् । न च क्लृप्तद्रव्येष्वन्तर्भावात्कुतो दशमद्रव्यत्वमिति वाच्यम् । आकाशादिपञ्चकस्य नीरूपत्वाद्वायोरपि नीरूपत्वान्न तेष्वन्तर्भावः । तमसो निर्गन्धत्वाच्च पृथिव्यामन्तर्भावः ।

1 A F and Q. read रूपि for रूपवत्.

2 A F and Q here insert यथा गोः साक्षादिमत्त्वम्, while P and Y have यथा गोः साक्षादिमत्त्वे सति शृङ्गित्वम्; but the words are found in no other copy.

3 Nil. notices लक्ष्यत्वे as v. l. for लक्षणत्वे, and remarks that the two readings are identical in sense.

4 M adds संयोगसमवायिकारणतावच्छेदकतया द्रव्यत्वजातिः.

तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिण्या च साहितः

जलेतेजसोः शीतोष्णस्पर्शवत्त्वान्न तयोरन्तर्भावः । तस्मात्तमसो दशम-
द्रव्यत्वं सिद्धमिति चेन्न । तमसस्तेजोऽभावत्वेनैवोपपत्तावतिरिक्तद्रव्यकल्प-
नायां मानाभावात् । न च विनिगमनाविरहात्तेज एवान्धकाराभावस्व-
रूपमिति वाच्यम् । तेजसोऽभावस्वरूपत्वे सर्वानुभूतोष्णस्पर्शस्याश्रय-
बाधाद्रव्यान्तरकल्पने गौरवात् । 'तस्मादुष्णस्पर्शरूपगुणाश्रयतया तेजसो
द्रव्यत्वं सिद्धम् । तमसि नीलरूपप्रतीतिस्तु 'आन्तिरेव दीपापसरणक्रि-
याया एव तत्र भानात् ॥

[४]

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शसंख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापर-
त्वगुरुत्वद्रवत्वस्नेहशब्दबुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नधर्माधर्मसंस्का-
राश्चतुर्विंशतिगुणाः ॥

त. दी.—गुणं विभजते—रूपेति । द्रव्यकर्मभिन्नत्वे सति सामा-
न्यवान्गुणः । 'गुणत्वजातिमान्वा । ननु लघुत्वमृदुत्वकठिनत्वादीनां विद्य-
मानत्वात्कथं चतुर्विंशतिगुणा इति चेन्न लघुत्वस्य गुरुत्वाभावरूपत्वात्
मृदुत्वकठिनत्वयोरवयवसंयोगविशेषरूपत्वात् ॥

[५]

उत्क्षेपणावक्षेपणाकुञ्चनग्रसारणगमनानि पञ्च कर्माणि ॥

त. दी.—कर्म विभजते—उत्क्षेपणेति । संयोगभिन्नत्वे सति
संयोगासमवायिकारणं कर्म । कर्मत्वजातिमद्वा ॥ ननु अमणादेरप्यति-
रिक्तस्य कर्मणः सत्त्वात् 'पञ्चेत्यनुपपन्नमिति चेन्न' । अमणादीनामपि गम-
नेऽन्तर्भावान्न पञ्चविधत्वविरोधः ॥

[६]

परमपरं चेति द्विविधं सामान्यम् ॥

- 1 U and W read स्पर्शश्रयद्रव्यं.
- 2 U has नीलत्वादि and W adds एवं कर्मवत्ताप्रतीतिरपि.
- 3 N here adds सामान्यवानित्युक्ते द्रव्यकर्मणोरतिव्याप्तिरतस्तन्निरासार्थं द्रव्यकर्मभिन्नत्वे सतीति । द्रव्य-कर्मभिन्न इत्युच्यमाने सामान्यादि-

व्यतिव्याप्तिरत उक्तं सामान्यवानिति
but the passage is neither
noticed by Nil. nor found in any
other copy.

4 A and F add एव after पञ्च.

5 Some Mss. omit this sentence.

त. दी.—सामान्यं विभजते—परमिति । परमधिकदेशवृत्ति ।
अपरं न्यूनदेशवृत्ति । सामान्यादिचतुष्टये जातिर्नास्ति ॥

[७]

नित्यद्रव्यवृत्तयो विशेषास्त्वनन्ता एव ॥

त. दी.—विशेषं विभजते—नित्येति । पृथिव्यादिचतुष्टयस्य
परमाणव आकाशादिपञ्चकं च नित्यद्रव्याणि ॥

[८]

समवायस्त्वेक एव ॥

त. दी.—समवायस्य भेदो नास्तीत्याह—समवायस्त्विति ॥

[९]

अभावश्चतुर्विधः । प्रागभावः प्रध्वंसाभावोऽत्यन्ताभावोऽन्यो-
वयाभावश्चेति ॥

त. दी.—अभावं विभजते—अभावेति ॥

[१०]

^१गन्धवती पृथिवी । सा द्विविधा नित्यानित्या च । ^२नित्या
परमाणुरूपा । अनित्या कार्यरूपा । ^३पुनस्त्रिविधा शरीरेन्द्रियवि-
षयभेदात् । शरीरमस्मदादीनाम् । इन्द्रियं गन्धग्राहकं घ्राणं नासा-
न्यति । विषयो मृत्पाषाणादिः ॥

त. दी.—तत्रोद्देशादिक्रमानुसारात्पृथिव्या लक्षणमाह—गन्धव-
तीति नाम्ना पदार्थसंकीर्तनमुद्देशः । उद्देशकमे च सर्वत्रेच्छैव निया-
मिका । ननु सुरभ्यसुरभ्यवयवारब्धे द्रव्ये परस्परविरोधेन गन्धानुत्पादाद-
व्याप्तिः । न च तत्र गन्धप्रतीत्यनुपपत्तिरिति वाच्यम् । अवयवगन्धस्यैव तत्र

1 A D F K Q W and X add
तत्र before गन्धवती; See note
loc. cit.

2 A and B add इति after च.

3 All copies except A B and F
omit सा before पुनः; see Note
loc. cit.

प्रतीतिसंभवेन चित्रगन्धानङ्गीकारात् ॥ किं चोत्पन्नविनष्टघटादावव्याप्तिरिति चेन्न गन्धसमानाधिकरणद्रव्यत्वापरजातिमत्त्वस्यैव विवक्षितत्वात् । ननु जलादावपि गन्धप्रतीतिरतिव्याप्तिरिति चेन्न अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां पृथिवीगन्धस्यैव तत्र भानाङ्गीकारात् । ननु तथापि कालस्य सर्वाधारतया सर्वेषां लक्षणानां कालेऽतिव्याप्तिरिति चेन्न सर्वाधारताप्रयोजकसंबन्ध-भिन्नसंबन्धेन लक्षणस्याभिमतत्वात् ॥

पृथिवीं विभजते—सा द्विविधेति । नित्यत्वं ध्वंसाप्रतियोगित्वम् । ध्वंसप्रतियोगित्वमनित्यत्वम् ॥ प्रकारान्तरेण विभजते—पुनरिति । आत्मनो भोगायतनं शरीरम् । यदवच्छिन्नात्मनि भोगो जायते तद्भोगायतनम् । सुखदुःखान्यतरसाक्षात्कारो भोगः ॥ शब्देतरोद्भूतविशेषगुणानाश्रयत्वे सति ज्ञानकारणमनःसंयोगाश्रयत्वमिन्द्रियत्वम् । शरीरेन्द्रियमिन्द्रियो विषयः । एवं च गन्धवच्छरीरं पार्थिवशरीरम् गन्धवदिन्द्रियं पार्थिवेन्द्रियम् गन्धवान्विषयः पार्थिवविषय इति तत्तल्लक्षणं बोध्यम् ॥ पार्थिवशरीरं दर्शयति—शरीरमिति । पार्थिवेन्द्रियं दर्शयति—इन्द्रियमिति । गन्धग्राहकमिति प्रयोजनकथनम् । घ्राणमिति संज्ञा । नासाग्रेत्याश्रयोक्तिः । एवमुत्तरत्रापि ज्ञेयम् । पार्थिवविषयं दर्शयति—विषयेति ॥

न्या. बो.—गन्धवतीति । गन्धवत्त्वं पृथिव्या लक्षणम् । लक्ष्या पृथिवी । पृथिवीत्वं लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकम् । यद्धर्मावच्छिन्नं लक्ष्यं स धर्मो लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकः । यो धर्मो यस्यामवच्छेदकः सा तद्धर्मावच्छिन्ना लक्ष्यता । तथा च लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकं पृथिवीत्वं लक्ष्यता पृथिवीत्वावच्छिन्ना । एवं शीतस्पर्शादिलक्षणेपु जलादीनां लक्ष्यता जलत्वादीनां लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकत्वं च बोध्यम् ॥

[११]

शीतस्पर्शवत्य आपः । ता द्विविधाः नित्या अनित्याश्च । नित्याः परमाणुरूपाः । अनित्याः कार्यरूपाः । पुनस्त्रिविधाः शरीरेन्द्रियवि-

षयभेदात् । शरीरं वरुणलोके । इन्द्रियं रसग्राहकं रसनं जिह्वा-
ग्रवर्ति । विषयः सरित्समुद्रादिः ॥

त. दी.—अपां लक्षणमाह—शीतेति । उत्पन्नविनष्टजलेऽव्याप्ति-
वारणाय शीतस्पर्शसमानाधिकरणद्रव्यत्वापरजातिमत्त्वे तात्पर्यम् । शीतं
शिलातलमित्यादौ जलसंबन्धादेव शीतस्पर्शभानमिति नातिव्याप्तिः ।
अन्यत्सर्वं पूर्वरीत्या व्याख्येयम् ॥

[१२]

उष्णस्पर्शवत्तेजः । तद्विविधं नित्यमनित्यं च । नित्यं परमाणु-
रूपम् । अनित्यं कार्यरूपम् । पुनस्त्रिविधं शरीरेन्द्रियविषयभेदात् ।
शरीरमादित्यलोके । इन्द्रियं रूपग्राहकं चक्षुः कृष्णताराग्रवर्ति ।
विषयश्चतुर्विधः । भौमदिव्यौदर्याकरजभेदात् । भौमं वन्द्यादिकम् ।
अविन्धनं दिव्यं विद्युदादि । भुक्तस्य परिणामहेतुरौदर्यम् । आ-
करजं सुवर्णादि ॥

त. दी.—तेजसो लक्षणमाह—उष्णस्पर्शवदिति । उष्णं जल-
मिति प्रतीतेस्तेजःसंबन्धानुविधायित्वान्नातिव्याप्तिः । विषयं विभजते—
भौमेति । ननु सुवर्णं पार्थिवं पीतत्वाद्भुत्वाद्धरिद्रादिवदिति चेन्न ।
अत्यन्तानलसंयोगे सति घृतादौ द्रवत्वनाशदर्शनेन जलमध्यस्थघृतादौ
द्रवत्वनाशदर्शनेन असति प्रतिबन्धके पार्थिवद्रव्यद्रवत्वनाशामि-
संयोगयोः कार्यकारणभावावधारणात् । सुवर्णस्यात्यन्तानलसंयोगे सत्य-
नुच्छिद्यमानद्रवत्वाधिकरणत्वेन^१ पार्थिवत्वानुपपत्तेः । तस्मात्पीतद्रव्य-
द्रवत्वनाशप्रतिबन्धकतया द्रवद्रव्यान्तरासिद्धौ नैमित्तिकद्रवत्वाधिकरण-
तया जलत्वानुपपत्तेः रूपवत्तया वाय्वादिष्वनन्तर्भावात् तैजसत्व-
सिद्धिः । तत्रोष्णस्पर्शभास्वरूपयोरुपष्टम्भकपार्थिवरूपस्पर्शाभ्यां प्रतिब-
न्धादनुपलब्धिः । तस्मात्सुवर्णं तैजसमिति सिद्धम् ॥

1 A B and X add प्राप्तिः after
आदित्यलोके.

2 A inserts घृतवत् after °त्वाधि-
करणत्वेन.

[१३]

रूपरहितस्पर्शवान्वायुः । स द्विविधो नित्योऽनित्यश्च । नित्यः परमाणुरूपः । अनित्यः कार्यरूपः । पुनस्त्रिविधः शरीरेन्द्रियविषयभेदात् । शरीरं वायुलोके । इन्द्रियं स्पर्शग्राहकं त्वक्सर्वशरीरवर्ति । विषयो वृक्षादिकम्पनहेतुः ॥

शरीरान्तःसंचारी वायुः प्राणः । स चैकोऽप्युपाधिभेदात्प्राणापानादिसंज्ञां लभते ॥

त. दी.—वायुं लक्षयति—रूपरहितेति । आकाशादावतिव्यासिवारणाय स्पर्शवानिति । पृथिव्यादावतिव्यासिवारणाय रूपरहितेति । ननु प्राणस्य कुत्रान्तर्भाव इत्यत आह—शरीरेति । स चेति । एक एव प्राणः स्थानभेदात्प्राणापानादिशब्दैर्व्यवह्रियत इत्यर्थः । स्पर्शानुमेयो वायुः । तथाहि—योऽयं वायौ वाति सत्यनुष्णाशीतस्पर्शो भासते स स्पर्शः कचिदाश्रितो गुणत्वाद्वूपवत् । न चास्य पृथिव्याश्रय उद्भूतस्पर्शवतः पार्थिवस्योद्भूतरूपवत्त्वनियमात् । न जलेतेजसी अनुष्णाशीतस्पर्शवत्त्वात् । न विभुचतुष्टयं, सर्वत्रोपलब्धिप्रसङ्गात् । न मनः परमाणुस्पर्शस्यातीन्द्रियत्वात् । तस्माद्यः प्रतीयमानस्पर्शाश्रयः स वायुः ॥ ननु वायुः प्रत्यक्षः प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयत्वाद्धटवदिति चेन्न । उद्भूतरूपवत्त्वस्योपाधित्वात् । यत्र द्रव्यत्वे सति वहिरिन्द्रियजन्यप्रत्यक्षत्वं तत्रोद्भूतरूपवत्त्वमिति घटादौ साध्यव्यापकत्वम् । यत्र प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयत्वं तत्रोद्भूतरूपवत्त्वं नास्तीति पक्षे साधनाव्यापकत्वम् । न चैवं तत्तवारिस्थतेजसोऽप्यप्रत्यक्षत्वापत्तिः । इष्टत्वात् । तस्माद्रूपरहितत्वाद्वायुरप्रत्यक्षः ॥

इदानीं कार्यरूपपृथिव्यादिचतुष्टयस्योत्पत्तिविनाशक्रमः कथ्यते । ईश्वरस्य चिकीर्षावशात्परमाणुषु क्रिया जायते । ततः परमाणुद्वयसंयोगे सति द्यणुकमुत्पद्यते । त्रिभिर्द्यणुकैर्यणुकम् । एवं चतुरणुकादिक्रमेण महती पृथिवी महत्य आपो महत्तेजो महान्वायुरुत्पद्यते । एवमुत्पन्नस्य कार्यद्रव्यस्य संजिहीर्षावशात्परमाणुषु क्रिया । क्रियया

परमाणुद्वयविभागे सति द्यणुकनाशः । ततरूयणुकनाशः । ततश्चतुर-
णुकस्येत्येवं महापृथिव्यादिनाशः ॥ असमवायिकारणनाशाद्द्वयणुकनाशः
समवायिकारणनाशात्त्रयणुकनाश इति संप्रदायः । सर्वत्रासमवायिकार-
णनाशाद्द्रव्यनाश इति नवीनाः ॥

किं पुनः परमाणुसद्भावे प्रमाणम् । उच्यते । जालसूर्यमरीचिस्थं
सूक्ष्मतमं यद्रज उपलभ्यते तत्सावयवम् चाक्षुषद्रव्यत्वात्पटवत् । त्र्यणु-
कावयवोऽपि सावयवो महदारम्भकत्वात्तन्तुवत् । यो द्यणुकावयवः स
परमाणुः । स च नित्यः । तस्यापि कार्यत्वेऽनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् । सृष्टिप्रलय-
सद्भावे “ धाता यथा पूर्वमकल्पयत् ” इत्यादिश्रुतिः प्रमाणम्^१ । सर्व-
कार्यद्रव्यध्वंसोऽवान्तरप्रलयः । सर्वभावकार्यध्वंसो महाप्रलय इति विवेकः ॥

न्या. बौ.—एवं पृथिव्यादि त्रिकं निरूप्य वायुं निरूपयति—
रूपरहितेति । रूपरहितत्वे सति स्पर्शवत्त्वं वायोर्लक्षणम् । सतिसप्त-
म्या विशिष्टार्थकतया रूपरहितत्वविशिष्टस्पर्शवत्त्वं वायोर्लक्षणम्^२ । विशे-
षणानुपादाने स्पर्शवत्त्वमात्रस्य लक्षणत्वे पृथिव्यादित्रिकेऽतिव्याप्ति-
स्तद्वारणाय विशेषणोपादानम् । तावन्मात्रोपादान आकाशादिपञ्चकेऽ-
तिव्याप्तिस्तलापि रूपरहितत्वस्य सत्त्वात् । अत उक्तं स्पष्टेति । अति-
व्याप्तिर्नामालक्ष्ये लक्षणसत्त्वम् । यथा गोः शृङ्गित्वं लक्षणं कृतं चेद-
लक्ष्यभूतगोभिन्नमहिष्यादावतिव्याप्तिस्तत्रापि शृङ्गित्वस्य विद्यमानत्वात् ।
अव्याप्तिर्नाम लक्ष्यैकदेशावृत्तित्वम् । लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकाश्रयीभूते कचिल्लक्ष्ये
लक्षणस्यासत्त्वमेवाव्याप्तिरित्यर्थः । यथा गोनीलरूपवत्त्वं कृतं चेच्छे-
तगवि नीलरूपाभावादव्याप्तिः । असंभवो नाम लक्ष्यमाले कुत्रापि
लक्षणासत्त्वं यथा गोरेकशफत्वं गोसामान्यस्य द्विशफत्वेनैकशफवत्त्वस्य

1 A F N Q and W add after
this तथा च मेरुसर्पयोरपि समान-
परिमाणत्वापत्तिः, F reads 'पत्तेः',
N has तुल्यत्वप्रसङ्गः for समान-
परिमाणत्वापत्तिः, while Q, has तु-
ल्यपरिमाणापत्तेः, but as all other
copies omit the sentence it
seems to be an interpolation.

2 A O N P Y Z put the first
part of the sentence in the
form of a पूर्वपक्ष as ननु सृष्टिप्र-
लयसद्भावे किं प्रमाणम्; A O K Z
omit ननु; A K Y read मानम्
for प्रमाणम्.

3 V and W omit this sentence.

कुत्राप्यसत्त्वात् । अतिव्याप्त्यव्याप्त्यसंभवानां 'निष्कृष्टलक्षणान्युच्यन्ते ।
लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकसमानाधिकरणत्वे सति लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकवच्छिन्नप्रति-
योगिताकभेदसमानाधिकरण्यमतिव्याप्तिः । अव्याप्तिस्तु लक्ष्यतावच्छे-
दकसमानाधिकरणत्वे सति लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभाव-
प्रतियोगित्वम् । असंभवस्तु लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकव्यापकीभूताभावप्रति-
योगित्वम् ॥

[१४]

शब्दगुणमाकाशम् । तच्चैकं विभु नित्यं च ॥

त. दी.—आकाशं लक्षयति शब्दगुणमिति । नन्वाकाशमपि किं
पृथिव्यादिवन्नाना । नेत्याह—तच्चैकमिति । भेदे प्रमाणाभावादित्यर्थः ।
एकत्वादेव सर्वत्रोपलब्धेर्विभुत्वमङ्गीकर्तव्यमित्याह—विभ्विति । सर्व-
मूर्तद्रव्यसंयोगित्वं विभुत्वम् । मूर्तत्वं परिच्छिन्नपरिमाणवत्त्वं क्रियावत्त्वं
वा । विभुत्वादेवात्मवन्नित्यमित्याह—नित्यं चेति ॥

न्या. बो.—आकाशं लक्षयति । शब्दगुणकमिति । अत्र गुणपद-
माकाशे शब्द एव विशेषगुण इति द्योतनाय न त्वतिव्याप्तिवारणाय ।
समवायेन शब्दवत्त्वमात्रस्य सम्यक्त्वात् । तदुक्तं । रूपं गन्धो रसः स्पर्शः
स्नेहः सांसिद्धिको द्रवः । बुद्ध्यादिभावनान्ताश्च शब्दो वैशेषिका गुणाः ॥
तच्चैकमिति । अनेकत्वे मानाभावादिति भावः विभ्विति । सर्वमूर्त-
द्रव्यसंयोगित्वं विभुत्वम् । मूर्तत्वं च क्रियाश्रयत्वम् । पृथिव्यप्तेजोवायु-
मनांसि मूर्तानि । पृथिव्यप्तेजोवाय्वाकाशपञ्चकं भूतपदवाच्यम् । भूतत्वं
नाम बहिरिन्द्रियग्राह्यविशेषगुणवत्त्वम् ॥

[१५]

अतीतादिव्यवहारहेतुः कालः । स चैको विभुर्नित्यश्च ॥

त. दी.—कालं लक्षयति—अतीतेति । सर्वाधारः कालः सर्व-
कार्यनिमित्तकारणं च ॥

न्या. बो.—कालं लक्षयति—अतीतेति । व्यवहारहेतुत्वस्य लक्षणत्वे व्यवहारहेतुभूतघटादावतिव्यासिस्तद्वारणाय अतीतेतिविशेषणोपादानम् ॥

[१६]

प्राच्यादिव्यवहारहेतुर्दिक् । सा चैका विभ्वी नित्या च' ॥

त. दी.—दिशो लक्षणमाह—प्राचीति । दिगपि कार्यमात्रे निमित्तकारणम् ॥

न्या. बो.—दिशो लक्षणमाह—प्राच्येति । उदयाचलसंनिहिता दिक्प्राची । अस्ताचलसंनिहिता दिक्प्रतीची । मेरोः संनिहिता दिगुदीची । मेरोर्व्यवहिता दिगवाची ॥

[१७]

ज्ञानाधिकरणमात्मा । स द्विविधः परमात्मा जीवात्मा' च । तत्रेश्वरः सर्वज्ञः परमात्मैक एव । जीवात्मा प्रतिशरीरं भिन्नो विभुर्नित्यश्च ॥

त दी.—आत्मनो लक्षणमाह—ज्ञानेति ॥ आत्मानं विभजते—स द्विविध इति । परमात्मनो लक्षणमाह—तत्रेति । नित्यज्ञानाधिकरणत्वमीश्वरत्वम् ॥ नन्वीश्वरस्य सद्भावे किं प्रमाणम् । न तावत्प्रत्यक्षम् । तद्धि बाह्यमाभ्यन्तरं वा । नाद्यमरूपिद्रव्यत्वात् । नान्त्यमात्मसुखादिव्यतिरिक्तत्वात् । नाप्यनुमानं लिङ्गाभावादिति चेन्न । क्षित्यङ्कुरादिकं कर्तृजन्यं कार्यत्वाद्दृढवदित्यनुमानस्य प्रमाणत्वात् ।

1 A B C F Q and X read नित्या विभ्वी च but the reading adopted in the text is better as it agrees with the definitions of काल and आत्मा.

2 A B X जीवात्मा परमात्मा च; C G, जीवः for जीवात्मा.

3 A B add सुखदुःखादिरहितः after एव.

4 A F and Q insert नाप्यागमस्तथाविधागमाभावात् after लिङ्गाभावान्, but the words appear to be interpolated and are inconsistent with the Vedic text cited further on. Z has नाप्यनुमानं सादृश्याभावात् नापि शब्दः शब्दस्य वेदात्मकस्येश्वरोक्तत्वेन प्रामाण्यादीश्वरासिद्धौ तत्प्रामाण्यासिद्धेः.

उपादानगोचरापरोक्षज्ञानचिकीर्षाकृतिमत्त्वं कर्तृत्वम् । उपादानं समवा-
यिकारणम् । सकलपरमाण्वादिसूक्ष्मदर्शित्वात्सर्वज्ञत्वम् । “यः सर्वज्ञः
स सर्वविद्” इत्याद्यागमोऽपि तत्र प्रमाणम् ॥

जीवस्य लक्षणमाह—जीव इति । सुखाद्याश्रयत्वं जीवलक्षणम् ।
ननु “मनुष्योऽहं ब्राह्मणोऽहम्” इत्यादौ सर्वत्राहंप्रत्यये शरीरस्यैव
विषयत्वाच्छरीरमेवात्मेति चेन्न । शरीरस्यात्मत्वे करपादादिनाशे सति
शरीरनाशादात्मनोऽपि नाशप्रसङ्गात् । नापीन्द्रियाणामात्मत्वम् । तथात्वे
“योऽहं घटमद्राक्षं सोऽहमिदानीं त्वचा स्पृशामि” इत्यनुसंधाना-
भावप्रसङ्गादन्यानुभूतेऽन्यस्यानुसंधानायोगात् । तस्माद्देहेन्द्रियव्यतिरिक्तो
जीवः । सुखदुःखादिवैचित्र्यात्प्रतिशरीरं भिन्नः । स च न परमाणुः
शरीरव्यापिसुखाद्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गात् । न मध्यमपरिमाणः । तथा सत्य-
नित्यत्वप्रसङ्गेन कृतनाशाकृताभ्यागमप्रसङ्गात् । तस्मान्नित्यो विभुर्जीवः ॥

न्या. बो.—आत्मानं निरूपयति—ज्ञानाधिकरणमिति ।
अधिकरणपदं समवायेन ज्ञानाश्रयत्वलाभार्थम् ॥

[१८]

‘सुखाद्युपलब्धिसाधनमिन्द्रियं मनः । तच्च प्रत्यात्मनियतत्वाद्-
नन्तं परमाणुरूपं’ नित्यं च ॥

त. दी.—मनसो लक्षणमाह—सुखेति । स्पर्शरहितत्वे सति
क्रियावत्त्वं मनसो लक्षणम् । मनो विभजते—तच्चेति । एकैकस्या-
त्मन एकैकं मन इत्यात्मनामनेकत्वान्मनसोऽप्यनेकत्वमित्यर्थः । परमा-
णुरूपमिति । मध्यमपरिमाणत्वेऽनित्यत्वप्रसङ्गादित्यर्थः । ननु मनो
नाणु किन्तु विभु स्पर्शरहितद्रव्यत्वादाकाशवदिति चेन्न । मनसो विभुत्व
आत्ममनःसंयोगस्यासमवायिकारणस्याभावाज्ज्ञानानुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात् । न
च विभुद्वयसंयोगोऽस्त्विति वाच्यम् । तत्संयोगस्य नित्यत्वेन सुषु-
प्त्यभावप्रसङ्गात् । पुरितद्व्यतिरिक्तप्रदेश आत्ममनःसंयोगस्य सर्वदा

विद्यमानत्वात् । अणुत्वे तु यदा मनः पुरीतति नाड्यां प्रविशति तदा सुषुप्तिः । यदा निःसरति तदा ज्ञानोत्पत्तिरित्यणुत्वसिद्धिः ॥

न्या. बो.—मनो निरूपयति सुखादीति । उपलब्धिर्नाम साक्षात्कारः । तथा च सुखादिसाक्षात्कारकारणत्वे सतीन्द्रियत्वं मनसो लक्षणम् । इन्द्रियत्वमात्रोक्तौ चक्षुरादावतिव्याप्तिरतः पूर्वदलम् । विशेष्यानुपादान आत्मन्यतिव्याप्तिरात्मनो ज्ञानादिकं प्रति समवायिकारणत्वात् । अत इन्द्रियत्वोपादानम् ॥

[१९]

चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यो गुणो रूपम् । तच्च शुक्लनीलपीतरक्तहरितकपिश-
चित्रभेदात्सप्तविधं पृथिवीजलतेजोवृत्ति । तत्र पृथिव्यां सप्तविधम् ।
अभास्वरशुक्लं जले । भास्वरशुक्लं तेजसि ॥

त. दी.—रूपं लक्षयति—चक्षुरिति । संख्यादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय मात्रपदम् । रूपत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय गुणपदम् । प्रभाभित्तिसंयोगेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यजातिमत्त्वं वाच्यम्^१ । रूपं विभजते—तच्चेति ॥ नन्वव्याप्यवृत्तिनीलादिसमुदाय एव चित्ररूपमिति चेन्न रूपस्य व्याप्यवृत्तिनियमात् । ननु चित्रपटेऽवयवरूपस्य प्रतीतिरस्त्विति चेन्न । रूपरहितत्वेन पटस्याप्रत्यक्षत्वप्रसङ्गात् । न च रूपवत्समवेतत्वं प्रत्यक्षत्वप्रयोजकं गौरवात् । तस्मात्पटस्य प्रत्यक्षत्वानुपपत्त्या चित्ररूपसिद्धिः ॥ रूपस्याश्रयमाह—पृथिवीति । आश्रयं विभज्य दर्शयति—तत्रेति ॥

1 A, B, X read अभास्वरं शुक्लं and भास्वरं शुक्लं च respectively; J, K, have the same as A without the last च; E, G, H have शुक्लं भास्वरं. The reading adopted in the text is that of C, D, and Sc., and is preferred as making the sense clearer, अभास्वर and भास्वर, when prefixed to शुक्लं, serve to distinguish the particular kind of शुक्लत्वं of जल from

that of तेजस्; while, taken separately, they can give proper sense only if construed as adverbs modifying शुक्लं.

2 N has विशेष्यपदं देयं for चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यजातिमत्त्वं वाच्यम्. C, Y, Z omit the sentence प्रभाभित्ति &c.; while A omits the next sentence रूपं &c. G, L, M, P and W omit both sentences.

न्या. बो.—रूपं लक्षयति—चक्षुर्मात्रेति । चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यत्वविशिष्टगुणत्वं रूपस्य लक्षणम् । विशेष्यमात्रोपादाने रसादावतिव्याप्तिः । अतश्चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्येति । तावन्मात्रोपादाने रूपत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिः । यो गुणो यदिन्द्रियग्राह्यस्तन्निष्ठा जातिस्तदभावस्तदिन्द्रियग्राह्य इति नियमात् । तद्वारणाय विशेष्योपादानम् । चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यत्वं नाम चक्षुर्भिन्नेन्द्रियाग्राह्यत्वे सति चक्षुर्ग्राह्यत्वम् । मात्रपदानुपादाने संख्यादिसामान्यगुणेऽतिव्याप्तिः संख्यादावपि चक्षुर्ग्राह्यत्वविशिष्टगुणत्वस्य सत्त्वात् । अतस्तद्वारणाय मात्रपदम् । संख्यादेश्चक्षुर्भिन्नत्वगिन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वाच्चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यत्वं नास्ति । अतीन्द्रिये गुरुत्वादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय चक्षुर्ग्राह्येति । अत्र लक्षणे ग्राह्यत्वं नाम लौकिकप्रत्यक्षविषयत्वम् । अग्राह्यत्वं नाम तदविषयत्वम् । तथा च चक्षुर्भिन्नेन्द्रियजन्यत्वाच्चाभात्काराविषयत्वे सति चक्षुर्जन्यचाक्षुषप्रत्यक्षविषयत्वमिति फलितार्थः । ननु प्रभाभित्तिसंयोगे रूपलक्षणस्यातिव्याप्तिस्तस्य चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यगुणत्वादिति चेन्न । गुणपदस्य विशेषगुणपरत्वात् । न चैवं विशेषगुणघटितलक्षणे संख्यादावतिव्याप्त्यभावान्मात्रपदवैयर्थ्यमिति वाच्यम् । जलमात्रवृत्तिसांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय तदुपादानात् ॥ अथवा चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यजातिमद्गुणत्वस्य लक्षणत्वान्न प्रभाभित्तिसंयोगादावतिव्याप्तिः संयोगत्वजातेश्चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यत्वाभावाद्धटपटसंयोगस्य त्वगिन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वात्तद्वतजातेरपि त्वगिन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वात् । अत्र जातिघटितलक्षणे गुणत्वानुपादाने चक्षुर्मात्रग्राह्यजातिमति सुवर्णादावतिव्याप्तिः । अतस्तद्वारणाय तदुपादानम् ॥ एवं रसादिलक्षणे विशेषणानुपादाने लक्ष्यभिन्नगुणादावतिव्याप्तिः । विशेष्यानुपादाने लक्ष्यमात्रवृत्तिसत्त्वगन्धत्वादावतिव्याप्तिः । अतो विशेषणविशेष्ययोरुभयोरुपादानम् ॥

[२०]

रसनग्राह्यो गुणो रसः । स च मधुराम्ललवणकटुकषायतिक्तभेदात्पट्विधः । पृथिवीजलवृत्तिः । पृथिव्यां पट्विधः । जले मधुर एव ॥

त. दी.—रसं लक्षयति—रसनेति । रसत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिपरिहाराय

गुणपदम् । रसस्याश्रयमाह—पृथिवीति ॥ आश्रयं विभज्य दर्शयति
—पृथिव्यामिति ॥

[२१]

घ्राणग्राह्यो गुणो गन्धः । स च द्विविधः सुरभिरसुरभिश्च ।
पृथिवीमात्रवृत्तिः ॥

त. दी.—गन्धं लक्षयति—घ्राणेति । गन्धत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय
गुणपदम् ॥

[२२]

त्वगिन्द्रियमात्रग्राह्यो गुणः स्पर्शः । स च त्रिविधः । शीतोष्णा-
नुष्णाशीतभेदात् पृथिव्यप्तेजोवायुवृत्तिः । तत्र शीतो जले । उष्णस्ते-
जसि । अनुष्णाशीतः पृथिवीवाय्वोः ॥

त. दी.—स्पर्शं लक्षयति—त्वगिति । स्पर्शत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय
गुणपदम् । संयोगादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय मात्रपदम् ॥

न्या. बो.—स्पर्शं लक्षयति—त्वगिन्द्रियमात्रग्राह्य इति । अत्रापि
मात्रपदं 'संख्यादिसामान्यगुणादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय । अन्यविशेषणकृत्यं
पूर्ववद्बोध्यम् ॥ ग्राह्यत्वपदार्थोऽपि पूर्ववत्प्रत्यक्षविषयत्वरूप एव बोध्यः ॥

[२३]

रूपादिचतुष्टयं पृथिव्यां पाकजमनित्यं च । अन्यत्रापाकजं
नित्यमनित्यं च । नित्यगतं नित्यम् । अनित्यगतमनित्यम् ॥

त. दी.—पाकजमिति । पाकस्तेजःसंयोगः । तेन पूर्वरूपं नश्यति
'रूपान्तरमुत्पद्यत इत्यर्थः । अत्र परमाणुष्वेव पाको न द्यणुकादौ ।
आमपाकनिक्षिप्ते घटे परमाणुषु रूपान्तरोत्पत्तौ श्यामघटनाशे पुनर्द्यणु-

1 V reads संख्यादावतिव्याप्ति°
which is perhaps preferable.
2 N Z and Nil. omit पाक.
Other readings are आपाक and
अपाक; but all are equally un-

satisfactory. The one adopted
in the text may mean a fur-
nace if interpreted as a Bahu-
vrihi compound; आमस्य (घटस्य)
पाको यास्मिन्.

कादिक्रमेण रक्तघटोत्पत्तिः । तत्र परमाणवः समवायिकारणम् । तेजः-
संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणम् । अदृष्टादिकं निमित्तकारणम् । द्यणुकादिरूपे
कारणरूपमसमवायिकारणम् इति पीलुपाकवादिनो वैशेषिकाः । पूर्वघटस्य
नाशं विनैवावयविन्यवयवेषु परमाणुपर्यन्तेषु च युगपद्रूपान्तरोत्पत्तिरिति
पिठरपाकवादिनो नैयायिकाः । अत एव पार्थिवपरमाणुषु रूपादिकमनित्य-
मित्यर्थः ॥ अन्यत्रेति । जलादावित्यर्थः । नित्यगतमिति । परमाणुगत-
मित्यर्थः ॥ अनित्यगतमिति । द्यणुकादिनिष्ठमित्यर्थः । रूपादिचतुष्टय-
मुद्भूतं प्रत्यक्षमनुद्भूतमप्रत्यक्षम् । उद्भूतत्वं प्रत्यक्षप्रयोजको धर्मः । तद-
भावोऽनुद्भूतत्वम् ॥

न्या. बो.—रूपादिचतुष्टयं पृथिव्यां पाकजमिति । एतत्तत्त्व-
निर्णयश्चेत्थम् । पाको नाम विजातीयतेजःसंयोगः । स च नानाजा-
तीयः । रूपजनको विजातीयः संयोगस्तदपेक्षया रसजनको विजा-
तीयः । एवं स्पर्शादावपि । एवंप्रकारेण भिन्नभिन्नजातीयाः पाकाः
कार्यवैलक्ष्येन कल्पनीयाः । तथाहि तृणपुञ्जनिक्षिप्त आम्नादौ
उष्मलक्षणविजातीयतेजःसंयोगात्पूर्वहरितरूपनाशे रूपान्तरस्य पीता-
देरुत्पत्तिः पूर्वहरसस्याम्लस्यैवानुभवात् । कचित्पूर्वहरितरूपसत्त्वेऽपि
रसपरावृत्तिर्दृश्यते विजातीयतेजःसंयोगरूपपाकवशात्पूर्वतनाम्लरसनाशे
मधुररसस्यानुभवात् । तस्माद्रूपजनकापेक्षया रसजनको विलक्षणः ।
एवं गन्धजनको विलक्षण एवाङ्गीकार्यो रूपरसयोरपरावृत्तावपि पूर्व-
गन्धनाशे विजातीयतेजःसंयोगेन सुरभिगन्धोपलब्धेः । एवं स्पर्श-
जनकोऽपि पाकवशात्कठिनस्पर्शनाशे मृदुस्पर्शानुभवात् । तस्माद्रूपादि-
जनका विजातीया एव पाका यथाकार्यमुन्नेयाः । अत एव पार्थिवपरमा-
णूनामेकजातीयत्वेऽपि पाकमहिम्ना विजातीयद्रव्यान्तरानुभवः । यथा
गोभुक्ततृणादीनामापरमाण्वन्तं भङ्गे तृणारम्भकपरमाणुषु विजातीयतेजः-
संयोगवशात्पूर्वरूपादिचतुष्टयनाशे तदनन्तरं दुग्धे यादृशं रूपादिकं
वर्तते तादृशरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शजनकास्तेजःसंयोगा जायन्ते । तदुत्तरं
तादृशरूपसादय उत्पद्यन्ते । तादृशरूपादिविशिष्टपरमाणुभिर्दुग्धद्यणुक-
मारभ्यते । ततरूपणुकादिक्रमेण महादुग्धारम्भः ॥ एवं महादुग्धारम्भकैः

परमाणुभिरेव दध्यारभ्यते । एवं पाकमहिम्नैव दध्यारम्भकैः परमाणु-
भिर्नवनीतारम्भ इति दिक् ॥

[२४]

एकत्वादिव्यवहारहेतुः^१ संख्या । नवद्रव्यवृत्तिरेकत्वादिपरार्ध-
पर्यन्ता । एकत्वं नित्यमनित्यं च^२ । नित्यगतं नित्यमनित्य-
गतमनित्यम् । द्वित्वादिकं तु सर्वत्रानित्यमेव ॥

त. दी.—संख्यां लक्षयति—एकत्वेति ॥

[२५]

मानव्यवहारकारणं परिमाणं । नवद्रव्यवृत्तिः । तच्चतुर्विधम्
अणु महदीर्घं ह्रस्वं चेति ॥

त. दी.—परिमाणं लक्षयति—मानेति । परिमाणं विभजते—
तदिति । भावप्रधानो निर्देशः । अणुत्वं महत्त्वं दीर्घत्वं ह्रस्वत्वं चेत्यर्थः ॥

[२६]

पृथग्व्यवहारकारणं पृथक्त्वं । सर्वद्रव्यवृत्तिः ॥

त. दी.—पृथक्त्वं लक्षयति—पृथगिति । इदमस्मात्पृथगिति व्य-
वहारकारणमित्यर्थः ॥

[२७]

संयुक्तव्यवहारहेतुः संयोगः । सर्वद्रव्यवृत्तिः ॥

त. दी.—संयोगं लक्षयति—संयुक्तेति । इमौ संयुक्ताविति व्यवहा-

1 A B C insert असाधारण be-
tween व्यवहार and हेतु here and
in the following definitions of
परिमाण, पृथक्त्व and संयोग, but
the reading of the majority of

copies is preferred. See Note
loc. cit.

2 A B insert सा before नवद्रव्य-
वृत्तिः

3 O E K X omit नित्यमनित्यं च,

रहेतुरित्यर्थः । संख्यादिलक्षणेऽपि सर्वत्र दिक्कालादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय-
साधारणेति पदं देयम् ॥ संयोगो द्विविधः कर्मजः संयोगजश्च । आद्यो
हस्तक्रियया हस्तपुस्तकसंयोगः । द्वितीयो हस्तपुस्तकसंयोगात्कायपुस्तक-
संयोगः । अव्याप्यवृत्तिः संयोगः । स्वात्यन्ताभावसमानाधिकरणत्वमव्या-
प्यवृत्तित्वम् ॥

[२८]

संयोगनाशको गुणो विभागः । सर्वद्रव्यवृत्तिः ॥

त. दी.—विभागं लक्षयति—संयोगेति । कालादावतिव्याप्तिवार-
णाय गुण इति । रूपादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय संयोगनाशक इति । वि-
भागोऽपि द्विविधः कर्मजो विभागजश्च । आद्यो हस्तक्रियया हस्तपुस्तक-
विभागः । द्वितीयो हस्तपुस्तकविभागात्कायपुस्तकविभागः ॥

न्या. बो.—विभागं लक्षयति—संयोगेति । संयोगनाशकत्वविशि-
ष्टगुणत्वं विभागस्य लक्षणम् । विशेषणमात्रोपादाने क्रियाया अपि संयो-
गनाशकत्वात्तत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणाय गुणत्वं विशेष्यम् ॥

[२९]

परापरव्यवहारासाधारणकारणे^१ परत्वापरत्वे । पृथिव्यादिचतुष्ट-
यमनोवृत्तिनी^२ । ते द्विविधे दिक्कृते कालकृते च । दूरस्थे दिक्कृतं
परत्वम् । समीपस्थे दिक्कृतमपरत्वम् । ज्येष्ठे कालकृतं परत्वम् ।
कनिष्ठे कालकृतमपरत्वम् ॥

त. दी.—परत्वापरत्वयोर्लक्षणमाह—परेति । परव्यवहारासाधारण-
कारणं परत्वम् । अपरव्यवहारासाधारणकारणमपरत्वमित्यर्थः । परापरत्वे
विभजते—ते द्विविधे इति । दिक्कृतयोरुदाहरणमाह—दूरस्थ इति ॥
कालकृते उदाहरति—ज्येष्ठ इति ॥

1 H J omit असाधारण, but most of the copies agree in retain-
ing it.

2 E G H J and X omit पृथिव्यादि
etc.

[३०]

आद्यपतनासमवायिकारणं गुरुत्वं । पृथिवीजलवृत्ति ॥

त. दी.—गुरुत्वं लक्षयति—आद्येति । द्वितीयादिपतनस्य वेगा-
समवायिकारणत्वाद्देगेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणायद्येति ॥

न्या. बो.—गुरुत्वं लक्षयति—आद्येति । द्वितीयादिपतनक्रियायां
वेगस्यैवासमवायिकारणत्वात्तत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणायद्येति । उत्तरत्र स्यन्दन
आद्यविशेषणमपि पूर्ववदेव योजनीयम् ॥

[३१]

आद्यस्यन्दनासमवायिकारणं द्रवत्वं । पृथिव्यप्तेजोवृत्ति । तद्द्वि-
विधं सांसिद्धिकं नैमित्तिकं च । सांसिद्धिकं जले नैमित्तिकं पृथि-
वीतेजसोः । पृथिव्यां घृतादावग्निसंयोगजन्यं^१ द्रवत्वम् । तेजसि
सुवर्णादौ^२ ॥

त. दी.—द्रवत्वं लक्षयति—आद्यस्यन्दनेति । स्यन्दनं स्रवणम् ।
तेजःसंयोगजन्यं नैमित्तिकद्रवत्वम्^३ । तद्विन्नं सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वम् । पृ-
थिव्यां नैमित्तिकद्रवत्वमुदाहरति^४—घृतादाविति । तेजसि तदाह—
सुवर्णादाविति ॥

[३२]

चूर्णादिपिण्डीभावहेतुर्गुणः स्नेहः । जलमात्रवृत्तिः ॥

त. दी.—स्नेहं लक्षयति—चूर्णेति । कालादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय
गुण इति । रूपादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय चूर्णादीति^४ ॥

न्या. बो.—स्नेहं लक्षयति—चूर्णादीति । चूर्णादिपिण्डीभावहेतुत्वे
सति गुणत्वं स्नेहस्य लक्षणम् । पिण्डीभावो नाम चूर्णादिर्धारणाकर्षणहेतु-
भूतो विलक्षणः संयोगः । तादृशसंयोगे स्नेहस्यैवासाधारणकारणत्वम् । न

1 C D E J read 'संयोगजं.

2 B omits तेजसि सुवर्णादौ.

3 G J Y Z omit द्रवत्व after

नैमित्तिक.

4 A G J Y Z read पिण्डीभावेति;

A has गुण for रूप wrongly.

तु जलादिगतद्रवत्वस्य । तथा सति द्रुतसुवर्णादिसंयोगे चूर्णादेः पिण्डी-
भावापत्तेः । अतः स्नेह एवासाधारणकारणम् । विशेषणमालोपादाने काला-
दावतिव्याप्तिस्तद्वारणाय विशेष्योपादानम् । वस्तुतस्तु द्रुतजलसंयोगस्यैव
पिण्डीभावहेतुत्वम् । स्नेहस्य पिण्डीभावहेतुत्वे मानाभावात् । जले द्रुतत्व-
विशेषणात्करकादिव्यावृत्तिः ॥

[३३]

श्रोत्रग्राह्यो गुणः शब्दः । आकाशमात्रवृत्तिः । स द्विविधो ध्व-
न्यात्मको वर्णात्मकश्चेति । ध्वन्यात्मको भेर्यादौ । वर्णात्मकः
संस्कृतभाषादिरूपः ॥

त. दी.—शब्दं लक्षयति—श्रोत्रेति । शब्दत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय
गुण इति । रूपादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय श्रोत्रेति ॥ शब्दस्त्रिविधः । संयोगजो
विभागजः शब्दजश्चेति । तत्राद्यो भेरीदण्डसंयोगजन्यः । द्वितीयो वंश
उत्पाद्यमाने दलद्वयविभागजन्यश्चटचटाशब्दः । भेर्यादिदेशमारभ्य श्रो-
त्रपर्यन्तं द्वितीयादिशब्दाः शब्दजाः ॥

न्या. बो.—शब्दं लक्षयति—श्रोत्रेति । शब्दत्वेऽतिव्याप्तिवार-
णाय गुणपदम् । रूपादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय श्रोत्रेति । स त्रिविधः । संयो-
गजो विभागजः शब्दजश्चेति । भेरीदण्डसंयोगजन्यो भाङ्कारादिशब्दः ।
हस्ताभिघातसंयोगजन्यो मृदङ्गादिशब्दः । वंशे पाठ्यमाने दलद्वयविभाग-
जश्चटचटादिशब्दः । शब्दोत्पत्तिदेशमारभ्य कर्णविवरपर्यन्तं वीची-
तरङ्गन्यायेन कदम्बमुकुलन्यायेन वा निमित्तपवनेन शब्दधारा
जायन्ते । ततोत्तरशब्दे पूर्वशब्दः^१ कारणम् ॥

[३४]

सर्वव्यवहारहेतुर्बुद्धिर्ज्ञानम् । सा द्विविधा स्मृतिरनुभवश्च ।

1 V has उत्तरोत्तरशब्दे पूर्वपूर्वशब्दः.

2 O K add गुणः after हेतुः A E

G X read हेतुर्ज्ञानं बुद्धिः. See
Note loc. cit.

संस्कारमात्रं जन्यं ज्ञानं स्मृतिः । तद्विन्नं ज्ञानमनुभवः ॥

त. दी.—बुद्धेर्लक्षणमाह—सर्वेति । ^१जानामीत्यनुव्यवसायगम्यज्ञानत्वेमेव लक्षणमित्यर्थः । बुद्धिं विभजते—सेति ॥ स्मृतेर्लक्षणमाह—संस्कारेति । भावनाख्यः संस्कारः । संस्कारध्वंसेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय ज्ञानमिति । घटादिप्रत्यक्षेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय संस्कारजन्यमिति । प्रत्यभिज्ञायामतिव्याप्तिवारणाय मात्रेति^२ ॥ अनुभवं लक्षयति—तद्विन्नमिति । स्मृतिभिन्नं ज्ञानमनुभव इत्यर्थः ॥

न्या. वो.—बुद्धेर्लक्षणमाह—सर्वेति । व्यवहारः शब्दप्रयोगः । ज्ञानं विना शब्दप्रयोगासंभवाच्छब्दप्रयोगरूपव्यवहारहेतुत्वं ^३बुद्धेर्लक्षणम् । बुद्धिं विभजते—सा द्विविधेति ॥ स्मृतिं लक्षयति—संस्कारेति । बहिरिन्द्रियाजन्यत्वविशिष्ट^४संस्कारजन्यत्वविशिष्टज्ञानत्वं स्मृतेर्लक्षणम् । विशेषणानुपादाने प्रत्यक्षाद्यनुभवेऽतिव्याप्तिः । तद्वारणाय विशेषणोपादानम् । संस्कारध्वंसेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय विशेष्योपादानम् । ध्वंसं प्रति प्रतियोगिनः कारणत्वात्संस्कारध्वंसेऽपि संस्कारजन्यत्वस्य सत्त्वात् । प्रत्यभिज्ञायामतिव्याप्तिवारणाय मात्रपदम् ॥ अनुभवं लक्षयति—तद्विन्नमिति । तद्विन्नत्वं नाम स्मृतिभिन्नत्वम् । स्मृतिभिन्नत्वविशिष्टज्ञानत्वमनुभवस्य लक्षणम् । तत्र विशेषणानुपादाने स्मृतावतिव्याप्तिः । विशेष्यानुपादाने घटादावतिव्याप्तिः । अतस्तद्वारणाय विशेषणविशेष्ययोरुभयोरुपादानम् ॥

1 J omits मात्र, while the word and the commentary on it are added in G in a marginal note. S. C. also notices the omission of the word in several MSS., while the absence of the sentence referring to it in several copies of T. D. makes it probable that the word may not have existed originally. It is however retained in accordance with Nil. See Note on मात्र *loc. cit.*

2 N and Q add कालादावतिव्या-

प्तिवारणाय ज्ञानमिति । रूपादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय सर्वव्यवहरिति; while Q has गुण for ज्ञान; but the passage is not found anywhere else, nor noticed, by Nil.

3 A C J L P Y Z omit this sentence, and G adds it in the margin; but it is retained on the authority of M N Q W and Nil.

4 All copies except V read ज्ञानस्य.

5 C K R omit बहिरिन्द्रियाजन्यत्वविशिष्ट.

[३५]

स द्विविधो यथार्थोऽयथार्थश्च । तद्वति तत्प्रकारकोऽनुभवो यथार्थः
यथा रजत इदं रजतमिति ज्ञानम् । स एव प्रमेत्युच्यते । तदभाव-
वति तत्प्रकारकोऽनुभवोऽयथार्थः । यथा शुक्ताविदं रजतमिति
ज्ञानम् ॥

त. दी.—अनुभवं विभजते—स द्विविध इति । यथार्थानुभवस्य
लक्षणमाह—तद्वतीति । ननु घटे घटत्वमिति प्रमायामव्याप्तिः घटत्वे
घटाभावादिति चेन्न । यत्र यत्संबन्धोऽस्ति तत्र तत्संबन्धानुभव इत्यर्थोद्ध-
टत्वेऽपि घटसंबन्धोऽस्तीति नाव्याप्तिः । स इति । यथार्थानुभव एव
शास्त्रे प्रमेत्युच्यत इत्यर्थः । अयथार्थं लक्षयति—तदभाववतीति । न-
न्विदं संयोगीति प्रमायामतिव्याप्तिरिति चेन्न । यदवच्छेदेन यत्संबन्धाभाव-
स्तदवच्छेदेन तत्संबन्धज्ञानस्य विवक्षितत्वात् संयोगाभावावच्छेदेन संयोग-
ज्ञानस्य अमत्वात् संयोगावच्छेदेन संयोगसंबन्धस्य सत्त्वात् नातिव्याप्तिः ।

न्या. बो.—अनुभवं विभजते—स द्विविध इति । यथार्थानुभवं
लक्षयति—तद्वतीति । तद्वतीत्यत्र सप्तम्यर्थो विशेष्यकत्वम् । तच्छब्देन
प्रकारीभूतो धर्मो धर्तव्यः । तथा च तद्वद्विशेष्यकत्वे सति तत्प्रकारकत्वं यथा-
र्थानुभवस्य लक्षणम् । उदाहरणम् । रजत इदं रजतमिति ज्ञानम् । रजतत्व-

1 C H J K omit this sentence;
E G Q X have instead यथार्थं
घट इति; B adds सत्य before रजत.

2 The reading in all copies of
T. S. and T. D. except J is सैव;
but स एव is adopted as being
grammatically more correct.

3 Q omits अनुभवः while C E
have तत्प्रकारकश्च.

4 C H J F and Q omit this
sentence. D adds further रज-
तत्वाभाववति शुक्तौ रजतत्वप्रकारक-
ज्ञानमयथार्थज्ञानं; but this as

well as A's addition सैवाप्रमे-
त्युच्यते seem to be interpola-
tions.

5 G reads यदभावः for यत्संबन्धा-
भावः.

6 A has संयोगज्ञानस्य प्रमात्वात् for
संयोगसंबन्धस्य सत्त्वात्; J reads
वियमानत्वात् for सत्त्वात्.

7 V adds ज्ञान before प्रकारीभूतः,
perhaps better.

8 S T and W read तत्प्रकारत्वे स-
त्यनुभवत्वं, perhaps better.

वद्विशेष्यकत्वे सति रजतत्वप्रकारकं ज्ञानम् । तद्वन्निष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपित-
तन्निष्ठप्रकारिताशालित्वमिति निष्कर्षः । अन्यथा यथाश्रुते रङ्गरजत-
योरिमे रजतरङ्गे इत्याकारकसमूहालम्बनभ्रमेऽतिव्याप्तिः । तत्रापि
रजतत्ववद्विशेष्यकत्वरजतत्वप्रकारकत्वयोः रङ्गत्ववद्विशेष्यकत्वरङ्गत्व-
प्रकारकत्वयोश्च सत्त्वात् । उक्तनिष्कर्षे तु दर्शितभ्रमे नातिव्याप्तिः । रज-
तत्वप्रकारताया रजतत्ववद्रजतविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वाभावात् । एवं रङ्गत्वप्र-
कारताया रङ्गत्ववद्रङ्गविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वाभावाच्च । किं तु समूहालम्बने
भ्रमस्य रङ्गांशे रजतत्वावगाहित्वेन रजतांशे रङ्गत्वावगाहित्वेन च रजत-
त्वप्रकारतायाः रङ्गत्ववद्विशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वात् । एवं रजतांशे रङ्गत्व-
प्रकारताया रजतत्ववद्विशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वाच्चेति^१ ॥

अयथार्थानुभवं लक्षयति—तदभाववतीति । अत्रापि पूर्ववत्त-
दभाववद्विशेष्यतानिरूपिततन्निष्ठप्रकारताशालिज्ञानत्वं विवक्षणीयम् ।
अन्यथा रङ्गरजतयोरिमे रङ्गरजते इत्याकारकसमूहालम्बनप्रमायामिति-
व्याप्तिरेतत्समूहालम्बनस्य रजतरङ्गोभयविशेष्यकत्वेन रजतत्वरङ्गत्वो-
भयप्रकारकत्वेन च रजतत्वाभाववद्रङ्गविशेष्यकत्वरजतत्वप्रकारकत्वयोः
रङ्गत्वाभाववद्रजतविशेष्यकत्वरङ्गत्वप्रकारकत्वयोश्च सत्त्वात् । उक्तनि-
ष्कर्षे तु न तत्रातिव्याप्तिः । तादृशप्रमायाः^२ रजतांशे रजतत्वावगाहित्वेन
रङ्गांशे रङ्गत्वावगाहित्वेन च रजतत्वप्रकारताया रजतत्वाभाववद्रङ्ग-
निष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वाभावादेवं रङ्गत्वप्रकारताया रङ्गत्वाभाववद्रजत-
निष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितत्वाभावाच्च । उदाहरणम् । यथा शुक्ताविति ॥

[३६]

यथार्थानुभवश्चतुर्विधः प्रत्यक्षानुमित्युपमितिशाब्दभेदात् । त-
त्करणमपि चतुर्विधं प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानशब्दभेदात् ॥

त, दी. यथार्थानुभवं विभजते—यथार्थेति । प्रसङ्गात्प्रमाकरणं
विभजते—तत्करणमिति । प्रमाकरणमित्यर्थः । प्रमायाः करणं प्रमाण-
मिति प्रमाणसामान्यलक्षणम् ॥

1 W reads differently ; U adds

नानामुख्यविशेष्यताशालिज्ञानं स-

मूहालम्बनं.

2 The reading is taken from W.

न्या. बो.—यथार्थानुभवं विभजते—यथार्थानुभव इति । तत्कर-
णमिति । फलीभूतप्रत्यक्षादिकरणं चतुर्विधमित्यर्थः । प्रत्यक्षादिचतुर्विध-
प्रमाणानां प्रमाकरणत्वं सामान्यलक्षणम् । एकैकप्रमाणलक्षणं तु
वक्ष्यते प्रत्यक्षज्ञानेत्यादिना ॥

[३७]

असाधारणं कारणं 'करणम् ।

त. दी.—करणलक्षणमाह—असाधारणेति । ^१साधारणकारणे
दिकालादावतिव्याप्तिवारणायसाधारणेति ॥

न्या. बो.—करणलक्षणमाह—असाधारणमिति । व्यापारवदसा-
धारणं कारणं करणमित्यर्थः । असाधारणकारणत्वं च ^२कार्यत्वव्याप्य-
धर्मावच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपितकारणताशालित्वम् । यथा दण्डादेर्घटादिकं
प्रत्यसाधारणकारणत्वम् । कार्यत्वव्याप्यधर्मो घटत्वादिरूपधर्मः तद-
वच्छिन्नकार्यता घटे । तन्निरूपितकारणता दण्डे । अतो घटं प्रति द-
ण्डोऽसाधारणकारणम् । भ्रम्यादिरूपव्यापारवत्त्वाच्च करणम् । साधारण-
कारणत्वं कार्यत्वावच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपितकारणताशालित्वम् । यथा ईश्व-
रादृष्टादेः कार्यत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रत्येव कारणत्वात्साधारणकारणत्वम् ॥

[३८]

कार्यनियतपूर्ववृत्ति 'कारणम् ।

1 All copies except B and K insert व्यापारवत् before असाधा-
रण; in J the word is added in
margin, apparently by another
hand. But the प्रतीक in all
copies of T. D. and the remarks
of S. C. conclusively show that
it did not exist originally. On
this see Note *loc. cit.* G
adds तज्जन्यत्वे सति तज्जन्यजनको
व्यापारः, but the addition is
unwarranted.

2 N here inserts चक्षुषा घटप्रत्यक्षे
जननीये चक्षुःसंयोगरूपो व्यापारः ।
तत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणाय व्यापारवदि-

त्यपि देयम्. Y adds घटं प्रति कपा-
लद्वयसंयोगवारणाय व्यापारवदिति;
but neither passage is found in
any other copy.

3 U and W have अतिरिक्त for
व्याप्य.

4 The reading in the text is
taken from G K Q X, as being
most probably the correct one.
A B C D F prefix अनन्यथा-
सिद्धि to कार्यनियत°. J adds the
word in margin. E has अन-
न्यथासिद्धत्वे सति नियत°, while
H reads कार्येऽन्यथासिद्धिशून्यत्वे
सति नियत°. See Note *loc. cit.*

त. दी.—कारणलक्षणमाह—कार्येति । पूर्ववृत्ति कारणमित्युक्ते रासभादावतिव्याप्तिः स्यादतो नियतेति । तावन्मात्रे कृते कार्येऽतिव्याप्तिरतः पूर्ववृत्तीति ॥ ननु तन्तुरूपमपि पटं प्रति कारणं स्यादिति चेन्न । अनन्यथासिद्धत्वे सतीति विशेषणात् । अनन्यथासिद्धत्वमन्यथासिद्धिविरहः । अन्यथासिद्धिश्च त्रिविधा । येन सहैव यस्य यं प्रति पूर्ववृत्तित्वमवगम्यते तं प्रति तेन तदन्यथासिद्धम् । यथा तन्तुना तन्तुरूपं तन्तुत्वं च पटं प्रति । अन्यं प्रति पूर्ववृत्तित्वे ज्ञात एव यस्य यं प्रति पूर्ववृत्तित्वमवगम्यते तं प्रति तदन्यथासिद्धम् । यथा शब्दं प्रति पूर्ववृत्तित्वे ज्ञात एव घटं प्रत्याकाशस्य । अन्यत्र क्लृप्तनियतपूर्ववर्तिनैव कार्यसंभवे तत्सहभूतमन्यथासिद्धम् । यथा पाकजस्थले गन्धं प्रति रूपप्रागभावस्य । एवं चानन्यथासिद्धनियतपूर्ववृत्तित्वं कारणत्वम् ॥

न्या. बो.—कारणं लक्षयति—कार्यनियतेति । कार्यं प्रति नियतत्वे सति पूर्ववृत्तित्वं कारणत्वम् । नियतत्वविशेषणानुपादाने पूर्ववर्तिनो रासभादेरपि घटादिकारणत्वं स्यादतो नियतेति विशेषणम् । नियतपूर्ववर्तिनो दण्डरूपादेरपि घटकारणत्वं स्यादतोऽनन्यथासिद्धपदमपि कारणलक्षणे निवेशनीयं दण्डरूपादीनामन्यथासिद्धत्वात् ॥

[३९]

कार्यं प्रागभावप्रतियोगि ॥

त. दी.—कार्यलक्षणमाह—कार्यमिति ॥

न्या. बो.—कार्यं लक्षयति—प्रागिति । प्रागभावप्रतियोगित्वं कार्यस्य लक्षणम् । उत्पत्तेः पूर्वमिह घटो भविष्यतीति प्रतीतिर्जायते । एतत्प्रतीतिविषयोऽभावः प्रागभावस्तत्प्रतियोगि घटादिरूपं कार्यम् ॥

[४०]

कारणं त्रिविधं समवाय्यसमवायिनिमित्तभेदात् । यत्समवेतं कार्यमुत्पद्यते तत्समवायिकारणम् । यथा तन्तवः पटस्य पटश्च स्वगतरूपादेः । कार्येण कारणेन वा सहैकस्मिन्नर्थे समवेतत्वे सति

तर्कदीपिकाया न्यायबोधिण्या च सहितः

यत्कारणं तदसमवायिकारणम्^१ । यथा तन्तुसंयोगः पटस्य तन्तुरूपं पटरूपस्य^२ । तदुभयभिन्नं कारणं निमित्तकारणम् । यथा तुरीवेमादिकं पटस्य ।

त. दी.—कारणं विभजते—कारणमिति । समवायिकारणस्य लक्षणमाह यत्समवेतमिति । यस्मिन्समवेतमित्यर्थः । असमवायिकारणं लक्षयति कार्येणेति । कार्येणेत्येतदुदाहरति तन्तुसंयोग इति । कार्येण पटेनैकस्मिन्स्तनौ समवेतत्वात्तन्तुसंयोगः पटस्यासमवायिकारणमित्यर्थः । कारणेन सहेत्येतदुदाहरति—तन्तुरूपमिति । कारणेन पटेन सहेकस्मिन्स्तनौ समवेतत्वात्तन्तुरूपं पटरूपस्यासमवायिकारणमित्यर्थः । निमित्तकारणं लक्षयति तदुभयेति । समवाय्यसमवायिभिन्नं कारणं निमित्तकारणमित्यर्थः^३ ॥

न्या. बो.—कारणं विभजते—कारणमिति । समवायिकारणं लक्षयति—यत्समवेतमिति ॥ यस्मिन्समवेतं सत् समवायेन संबद्धं सत् कार्यमुत्पद्यते तत्समवायिकारणमित्यर्थः । उदाहरणं—यथा तन्तव इति । तन्तुषु समवायेन संबद्धं सत् पटात्मकं कार्यमुत्पद्यते इति तन्तवः समवायिकारणमित्यर्थः । सामान्यलक्षणं तु समवायसंबन्धावच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपिततादात्म्यसंबन्धावच्छिन्नकारणत्वं समवायिकारणत्वमिति । समवायसंबन्धेन घटाधिकरणे कपालादौ कपालादेस्तादात्म्यसंबन्धेनैव सत्त्वात् । समवायसंबन्धावच्छिन्नघटत्वावच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपिततादात्म्यसंबन्धावच्छिन्नकारणतायाः कपालादौ सत्त्वलक्षणसमन्वयः । समवायेन जन्यभावत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति तादात्म्यसंबन्धेन द्रव्यस्यैव कारणत्वाज्जन्यभावेषु

1 E and Q supply यत् and तत् which though not absolutely necessary are inserted as making the sense clearer.

2 K reads पटगत रूपस्य.
N here adds इदं च कारणत्रयं भा-

वकार्यस्यैव । अभावस्य तु निमित्तमात्रम्, but the words are not found in any other copy.

4 W inserts here कपालत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नं

द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु त्रिषु द्रव्यमेव समवायिकारणम् । द्रव्ये द्रव्यावयवाः समवायिकारणम् । अतो गुणादावपि द्रव्यमेव समवायिकारणमित्याशये-
नाह पटश्च स्वगतरूपादेरिति । समवायिकारणमित्यनुषज्यते । असम-
वायिकारणं लक्षयति—कार्येणेति । 'असमवायिकारणं द्विविधम् ।
कार्येण सहैकस्मिन्नर्थे समवेतं सत् कारणमसमवायिकारणमित्येकम् ।
कारणेन सहैकस्मिन्नर्थे समवेतं सत् कारणमसमवायिकारणमित्यपरमि-
त्यर्थः । अत्र कारणेनेत्यस्य स्वकार्यसमवायिकारणेनेत्यर्थः । जन्य-
द्रव्यमात्रेऽवयवसंयोगस्यैवासमवायिकारणत्वात्पटात्मककार्ये तदवयवत-
न्तुसंयोगस्यैवासमवायिकारणत्वं दर्शयन्प्रथममुदाहरति—यथा तन्तु-
संयोगः पटस्येति । पटात्मककार्येण सहैकस्मिन्नर्थे तन्तौ समवेतं
सत् समवायसंबन्धेन वर्तमानं सत् पटात्मककार्यं प्रति तन्तुसंयोगात्मकं
कारणमसमवायिकारणमित्यर्थः । द्वितीयमसमवायिकारणं दर्शयति—कार-
णेन सहेत्यादिना । तदुदाहरति—तन्तुरूपमिति । ^१कारणेन पटरूप-
समवायिकारणीभूतपटेन सहैकस्मिन्नर्थे तन्तुरूपेऽर्थे समवेतं सत् समवा-
यसंबन्धेन वर्तमानं सत् तन्तुरूपं पटगतरूपं प्रति कारणं भवति ।
अतोऽसमवायिकारणं तन्तुरूपं पटरूपस्य । सामान्यलक्षणं तु समवाय-
संबन्धावच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपिता या समवायस्वसमवायिसमवेतत्वान्य-
तरसंबन्धावच्छिन्ना कारणता तदाश्रयत्वम् । ^२समवायसंबन्धावच्छिन्ना
कपालद्वयसंयोगनिष्ठा कारणता कपालद्वयसंयोगे वर्तते । एवमाद्यपतन-
क्रियायामाद्यस्यन्दनक्रियायां च गुरुत्वद्रवत्वे असमवायिकारणे भवतः ।
आद्यपतनक्रियां प्रत्याद्यस्यन्दनक्रियां प्रति च तयोः समवायसंबन्धेनैव
कारणत्वात् । अवयविगुणादौ त्ववयवगुणादेः स्वसमवायिसमवेतत्वसं-
बन्धेनैव कारणत्वात्तत्संबन्धावच्छिन्नकारणताश्रयत्वमवयवगुणादौ वर्तते ।
अवयवभूतकपालतन्तुरूपादेः स्वशब्दग्राह्यकपालरूपतन्तुरूपसमवायिक-

1 The following two sentences are omitted in C K R.

2 W reads differently.

3 Before समवाय° S T insert
द्रव्यासमवायिकारणीभूतावयवसंब-
न्धे तु समवायसंबन्धावच्छिन्नघट-

त्वावच्छिन्नकार्यतानिरूपित°, but
all other copies omit the
words. ST also read संयोगत्वा-
वच्छिन्ना for संयोगनिष्ठा. W
reads differently.

त. दी.—प्रत्यक्षलक्षणमाह—तत्रेति । प्रमाणचतुष्टयमध्य इत्यर्थः । प्रत्यक्षज्ञानस्य लक्षणमाह—इन्द्रियेति । इन्द्रियं चक्षुरादिकम् । अर्थो घटादिः । तयोः संनिकर्षः संयोगादिः तज्जन्यं ज्ञानमित्यर्थः ॥ तद्विभजते—'तद्विविधमिति । निर्विकल्पकस्य लक्षणमाह—निष्प्रकारकमिति । विशेषणविशेष्यसंबन्धानवगाहि ज्ञानमित्यर्थः ॥ ननु निर्विकल्पके किं प्रमाणमिति चेन्न । गौरिति विशिष्टज्ञानं विशेषणज्ञानजन्यं विशिष्टज्ञानत्वाद्दण्डीति ज्ञानवदित्यनुमानस्य प्रमाणत्वात् । विशेषणज्ञानस्यापि सविकल्पकत्वेऽनवस्थाप्रसङ्गान्निर्विकल्पकसिद्धिः ॥ सविकल्पकं लक्षयति—सप्रकारकमिति । नामजात्यादिविशेषणविशेष्यसंबन्धावगाहि ज्ञानमित्यर्थः । सविकल्पकमुदाहरति—यथेति ॥

न्या. वो.—षड्विधेन्द्रियभूतप्रत्यक्षप्रमाणस्य लक्षणमाह—तत्रेति । प्रमाभूतेषु प्रत्यक्षात्मकं यज्ज्ञानं चाक्षुषादिप्रत्यक्षं तत्पति करणं व्यापारवदसाधारणमिन्द्रियं भवति । अतः प्रत्यक्षज्ञानकरणत्वं प्रत्यक्षस्य लक्षणम् । आद्यसंनिकर्षातिरिक्तचतुर्विधसंनिकर्षाणां समवायघटितत्वेनेन्द्रियजन्यत्वाभावाद्वापारत्वं न संभवतीतीन्द्रियमनःसंयोगस्यैव षड्विधप्रत्यक्षे जननीय इन्द्रियव्यापारता बोध्या । मानसप्रत्यक्षे त्वात्मनःसंयोगस्यैव सा बोध्या ॥ प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणलक्षणमुक्त्वा प्रत्यक्षप्रमालक्षणमाह । इन्द्रियाथसंनिकर्षेति । आदौ लक्षणं जन्यप्रत्यक्षस्यैव लक्ष्यत्वाभिप्रायेण । ईश्वरप्रत्यक्षसाधारणं लक्षणं तु ज्ञानाकरणकम् । ज्ञानाकरणकमिति प्रत्यक्षप्रमालक्षणं । ज्ञानं व्याप्तिज्ञानं सादृश्यज्ञानं पदज्ञानं च तदेव करणं येषां तानि ज्ञानकरणकानि अनुमित्युपमितिशाब्दानि तद्विन्नत्वमित्यर्थः । प्रत्यक्ष इन्द्रियाणामेव करणत्वाच्च ज्ञानस्य करणत्वम्^१ । इदं लक्षणमीश्वरप्रत्यक्षसाधारणमीश्वरप्रत्यक्षस्याजन्यत्वात् । जन्यप्रत्यक्षस्यैव लक्ष्यत्वा-

1 A G J Y Z omit this sentence.

2 S U and W read बाह्य for षड्विध.

3 C K R V omit this sentence, and perhaps it is spurious. C here adds विशेष्यमात्रोक्तौ स्मृतावतिव्याप्तिविशेषणमात्रोक्तौ तद्धवसऽतिव्याप्तिर्ध्वंसं प्रति स्वप्रतियोगि-

नः कारणत्वादत उभयोरुपादानम्. V is nearly to the same effect.

4 The reading of U and W is adopted as being more intelligible. Other copies transpose the sentences. U adds श्लेषकं लक्षणमिदं very appropriately. See Note *loc. cit.*

मिप्रायेणोत्तरमाह—इन्द्रियार्थसंनिकर्षेति । जन्यप्रत्यक्षस्यैव लक्ष्य-
त्वाभिप्रायेणेदं लक्षणम् ॥ प्रत्यक्षं विभजते—निर्विकल्पकमिति ।
तल्लक्षयति—निष्प्रकारकमिति । प्रकारताशून्यज्ञानत्वमेव निर्विकल्प-
कत्वमित्यर्थः । निर्विकल्पके चतुर्थी विषयता स्वीक्रियते । न तु
त्रिविधविषयतामध्ये कापि तत्रास्ति । अतो विशेषणताशून्यत्वमिव वि-
शेष्यताशून्यत्वं संनिकर्षताशून्यत्वमित्यपि लक्षणं संभवति ॥ सविकल्पकं
लक्षयति—सप्रकारकमिति । विषयताया ज्ञाननिरूपितत्वात् ज्ञानस्य
विषयतानिरूपकत्वेन प्रकारतानिरूपकज्ञानत्वं सविकल्पकस्य लक्षणम् ।
एवं विशेष्यतानिरूपकज्ञानत्वं संनिकर्षतानिरूपकज्ञानत्वमित्यपि लक्षणं
संभवति । उदाहरणं यथेति । इदंत्वावच्छिन्नविशेष्यतानिरूपितादित्यत्र-
कारताशालिज्ञानं ब्राह्मणत्वप्रकारताशालिज्ञानं च सविकल्पकमित्यर्थः ॥

[४३]

प्रत्यक्षज्ञानहेतुरिन्द्रियार्थसंनिकर्षः षड्विधः । संयोगः संयुक्तस-
मवायः संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायः समवायः समवेतसमवायो विशे-
षणविशेष्यभावश्चेति । चक्षुषा घटप्रत्यक्षजनने संयोगः संनिकर्षः ।
घटरूपप्रत्यक्षजनने संयुक्तसमवायः संनिकर्षः चक्षुःसंयुक्ते घटे रू-
पस्य समवायात् । रूपत्वसामान्यप्रत्यक्षे संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायः
संनिकर्षः चक्षुःसंयुक्ते घटे रूपं समवेतं तत्र रूपत्वस्य समवायात् ।
श्रोत्रेण शब्दसाक्षात्कारे समवायः संनिकर्षः कर्णविवरवृत्त्याका-
शस्य श्रोत्रत्वात् शब्दस्याकाशगुणत्वात् गुणगुणिनोश्च समवा-
यात् । शब्दत्वसाक्षात्कारे समवेतसमवायः संनिकर्षः श्रोत्रसमवेते
शब्दे शब्दत्वस्य समवायात् । अभावप्रत्यक्षे विशेषणविशेष्यभावः
संनिकर्षो घटाभाववद्भूतलमित्यत्र चक्षुःसंयुक्ते भूतले घटाभावस्य

1 A B join the words in a com-
pound; J reads विशेषणता च for
विशेषणविशेष्यभावश्च.
K inserts ज्ञान after प्रत्यक्ष un-

necessarily.

3 K G read प्रत्यक्षे for प्रत्यक्षजनने,
and omit संनिकर्षः in the follow-
ing sentence.

विशेषणत्वात्¹ । एवं संनिकर्षपट्टजन्यं ज्ञानं² प्रत्यक्षम् । तत्करण-
मिन्द्रियम् । तस्मादिन्द्रियं³ प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणमिति सिद्धम् ॥

त. दी.—इन्द्रियार्थसंनिकर्ष विभजते—प्रत्यक्षेति । संयोगसंनिक-
र्षमुदाहरति—चक्षुषेति । द्रव्यप्रत्यक्षे सर्वत्र संयोगः संनिकर्ष इत्यर्थः ।
आत्मा मनसा संयुज्यते, मन इन्द्रियेण इन्द्रियमर्थेन ततः प्रत्यक्षज्ञानमु-
त्पद्यते । संयुक्तसमवायमुदाहरति—घटरूपेति । तत्र युक्तिमाह—चक्षुः-
संयुक्त इति । संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायमुदाहरति—रूपत्वेति । समवाय-
मुदाहरति—श्रोत्रेणेति । तदुपपादयति—कर्णेति । ननु दूरस्थशब्दस्य
कथं श्रोत्रसंबन्ध इति चेन्न वीचितरङ्गन्यायेन कदम्बमुकुलन्यायेन वा
शब्दाच्छब्दान्तरोत्पत्तिक्रमेण श्रोत्रदेशे जातस्य शब्दस्य श्रोत्रसंबन्धात्प्र-
त्यक्षत्वसंभवात्⁴ । समवेतसमवायमुदाहरति—शब्दत्वेति । विशेषणविशे-
ष्यभावमुदाहरति—अभावेति । तदुपपादयति—⁵घटाभाववदिति । भूतले
घटो नास्तीत्यत्र घटाभावस्य विशेष्यत्वं द्रष्टव्यम् । एतेनानुपलब्धेः प्रमाणा-
न्तरत्वं निरस्तम् । यद्यत्र घटोऽभविष्यत्तर्हि भूतलमिवाद्रक्ष्यत । दर्शना-
भावान्नास्तीति तर्कितप्रतियोगिसत्त्वविरोध्यनुपलब्धिसहकृतेन्द्रियेणैवाभा-
वज्ञानोपपत्तौ अनुपलब्धेः प्रमाणान्तरत्वासंभवात् । अधिकरणज्ञानार्थस-
पेक्षणीयेन्द्रियस्यैव करणत्वोपपत्तावनुपलब्धेः करणत्वस्यायुक्तत्वात्⁶ । विशे-
षणविशेष्यभावो विशेषणविशेष्यस्वरूपमेव नातिरिक्तः संबन्धः । प्रत्यक्षज्ञा-

1 K here adds भूतलस्य विशेष्यत्वा-
त्. As to the correct reading
of this passage, see Note *loc.*
cit.

2 J has पट्टजं.

3 J omits इन्द्रियं and reads प्रत्यक्षं
प्रमाणं for प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणं.

4 CGJLMNY omit शब्दात्,
and ACFLMPQ omit शब्दस्य,
but these are retained as help-
ing to make the sense clear.
For श्रोत्रदेशे P reads अन्यदेशे

which gives a somewhat
different though equally good
meaning.

5 A F Q here add भूतलं विशेष्यं
घटाभावो विशेषणं, which is un-
warranted and misleading.

6 N here inserts ननु विशेषणवि-
शेष्यभावसंनिकर्षस्य लक्षणानाक्रा-
न्तत्वात्कथं संबन्धत्वमिति चेन्न,
but the passage appears to be
interpolated.

SECT. 43.] तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिण्या च सहितः

३३

नमुपसंहरस्तस्य करणमाह—एवमिति । असाधारणकारणत्वादिन्द्रियं प्रत्यक्षज्ञानकरणमित्यर्थः । प्रत्यक्षमुपसंहरति—तस्मादिति ॥

न्या. बो.—चाक्षुषादिप्रत्यक्षकारणीभूतान् षड्विधसन्निकर्षान्विभजते—संयोग इत्यादिना । द्रव्यवृत्तिलौकिकविषयतासंबन्धेन चाक्षुषत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति चक्षुःसंयोगस्य कारणत्वम् । द्रव्यसमवेतवृत्तिलौकिकविषयतासंबन्धेन चाक्षुषत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति चक्षुःसंयुक्तसमवायस्य कारणत्वम् । द्रव्यसमवेतसमवेतवृत्तिलौकिकविषयतासंबन्धेन चाक्षुषत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति चक्षुःसंयुक्तसमवेतसमवायस्य कारणत्वम् । द्रव्यग्राहकाणीन्द्रियाणि चक्षुस्त्वङ्मनांसि त्रीण्येव । अन्यानि घ्राणरसनश्रवणानि तु गुणग्राहकाणि । अतस्त्वगिन्द्रियस्थले द्रव्यवृत्तिलौकिकविषयतासंबन्धेन त्वाचत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति त्वक्संयोगस्य कारणत्वम् । एवं द्रव्यसमवेतत्वाचत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति त्वक्संयुक्तसमवायस्य कारणत्वम् । द्रव्यसमवेतसमवेतोष्णत्वशीतत्वादिजातिस्पर्शनप्रत्यक्षे त्वक्संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायस्य कारणत्वम् । एवमात्मरूपद्रव्यमानसप्रत्यक्षे मनःसंयोगस्य कारणत्वम् । आत्मसमवेतसुखादिमानसप्रत्यक्षे मनःसंयुक्तसमवायस्य कारणत्वम् । आत्मसमवेतसमवेतसुखत्वादिमानसप्रत्यक्षे मनःसंयुक्तसमवेतसमवायस्य कारणत्वम् । रसनघ्राणयोस्तु रसगन्धतद्गतजातिग्राहकत्वेन द्वितीयतृतीययोः सन्निकर्षयोरेव रसगन्धादिप्रत्यक्षे हेतुता वाच्या । श्रवणेन्द्रियस्याकाशरूपत्वेन शब्दस्याकाशगुणत्वेन श्रवणेन्द्रियेण च समं शब्दस्य समवायः सन्निकर्षः । शब्दसमवेतशब्दत्वादिजातिविषयकश्रावणप्रत्यक्षे समवेतसमवायस्य हेतुता ॥ अभावप्रत्यक्षे विशेषणविशेष्यभावो नाम विशेषणतासन्निकर्षः ॥
१ पञ्चसन्निकर्षेषु मध्ये संयोगस्थाने संयुक्तपदं घटयित्वा समवायस्थाने समवेतपदं घटयित्वा अभावस्थले निर्वाह्यम् । तथाहि द्रव्याधिकरणका-

1 N adds प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणकरणत्वादि-
त्यर्थः

2 S T V omit this sentence.

3 The whole passage from पञ्च-

विध° to इति संक्षेपः seems to be corrupt. The reading of W is adopted as being the most intelligible.

भावप्रत्यक्षे संयुक्तविशेषणता । द्रव्यसमवेताधिकरणकाभावप्रत्यक्षे संयुक्त-
समवेतविशेषणता च । द्रव्यसमवेतसमवेताधिकरणकाभावप्रत्यक्षे संयुक्त-
समवेतसमवेतविशेषणता च संनिकर्षः । तत्र घटे घटत्वाभावः संयुक्त-
विशेषणतया गृह्यते । घटसमवेतघटत्वादौ पृथिवीत्वाभावः संयुक्तसमवेत-
विशेषणतया गृह्यते । घटसमवेतसमवेतरूपत्वादौ नीलत्वाभावश्च
संयुक्तसमवेतसमवेतविशेषणतया गृह्यत इति संक्षेपः ॥ इति प्रत्यक्षपरि-
च्छेदः समाप्तः ॥

[४४]

अनुमितिकरणमनुमानम् । परामर्शजन्यं ज्ञानमनुमितिः ।
व्याप्तिविशिष्टपक्षधर्मताज्ञानं परामर्शः । यथा वह्निव्याप्यधूमवा-
नयं पर्वत इति ज्ञानं परामर्शः^१ । तज्जन्यं पर्वतो वह्निमानिति ज्ञान-
मनुमितिः । यत्र यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निरिति साहचर्यनियमो व्याप्तिः ।
व्याप्यस्य पर्वतादिवृत्तित्वं पक्षधर्मता ॥

त. दी.—अनुमानं लक्षयति—अनुमितिकरणमिति । अनुमि-
तेर्लक्षणमाह—परामर्शेति । ननु संशयोत्तरप्रत्यक्षेऽतिव्याप्तिः स्थाणुपु-
रुषसंशयानन्तरं पुरुषत्वव्याप्यकरादिमानयमिति परामर्शे सति पुरुष ए-
वेति प्रत्यक्षजननात् । न च तत्रानुमितिरेवेति वाच्यम् । “पुरुषं साक्षात्क-
रोमि” इत्यनुव्यवसायविरोधादिति चेन्न । पक्षतासहकृतपरामर्शजन्यत्वस्य
विवक्षितत्वात् । सिषाधयिषाविरहसहकृतसिद्धयभावः पक्षता । साध्यसि-
द्धिरनुमितिप्रतिबन्धिका । सिद्धिसत्त्वेऽप्यनुमिन्यामितीच्छायामनुमितिद-
र्शनात् सिषाधयिषोत्तेजिका । ततश्चेत्तेजकाभावविशिष्टमण्यभावस्य दा-
हकारणत्ववत् सिषाधयिषाविरहसहकृतसिद्धयभावस्याप्यनुमितिकारण-
त्वम् ॥ परामर्शं लक्षयति—व्याप्तीति । व्याप्तिविषयकं यत्पक्षधर्मताज्ञानं

1. E and X omit ज्ञानं परामर्शः | omits अयम्,
and perhaps for the better; G

स परामर्श इत्यर्थः । परामर्शमभिनीय दर्शयति—यथेति । अनुमितिम-
 भिनयति—तज्जन्यमिति । परामर्शजन्यमित्यर्थः ॥ व्याप्तेर्लक्षणमाह—यत्रे-
 ति । यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निरिति व्याप्तेरभिनयः । साहचर्यनियम इति लक्षणम् ।
 साहचर्यं सामानाधिकरण्यं तस्य नियमः । हेतुसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ता-
 भावाप्रतियोगिसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्यं व्याप्तिरित्यर्थः । पक्षधर्मतास्वरूप-
 माह—'व्याप्यस्येति ॥

न्या. बो.—अनुमानं लक्षयति—अनुमितिकरणमिति । अनु-
 मितौ व्याप्तिज्ञानं करणं परामर्शो व्यापारोऽनुमितिः फलं कार्यमित्यर्थः ।
 परामर्शस्य व्याप्तिज्ञानजन्यत्वे सति व्याप्तिज्ञानजन्यानुमितिजनकत्वाच्च
 तज्जन्यत्वे सति तज्जन्यजनकत्वरूपव्यापारलक्षणमुपपन्नम् । अनुमिति-
 करणत्वमनुमानस्य लक्षणम् । अनुमानं च व्याप्तिज्ञानम् । एतस्य परा-
 मर्शरूपव्यापारद्वारानुमितिं प्रत्यसाधारणकारणतयानुमितिकरणत्वमुप-
 पन्नम् । परामर्शजन्यमिति । परामर्शजन्यत्वाविशिष्टज्ञानत्वमनुमि-
 तेर्लक्षणम् । तत्र ज्ञानत्वमात्रोपादाने प्रत्यक्षादावतिव्याप्तिरतस्तद्वारणाय
 परामर्शजन्यत्वे सतीति विशेषणोपादानम् । विशेषणमालोक्य परामर्श-
 ध्वंसेतिव्याप्तिरतस्तद्वारणाय ज्ञानत्वोपादानम् । अनुमितिलक्षणघटकी-
 भूतपरामर्शलक्षणमाचष्टे^१—व्याप्तिविशिष्टेति । व्याप्तिविशिष्टं च तत्पक्ष-
 धर्मताज्ञानं चेति कर्मधारयः । अत्र विशिष्टपदस्य प्रकारतापरत्वात् पक्षधर्म-
 ताया ज्ञानमित्यत्र षष्ठ्या विषयत्वबोधनात् पक्षधर्मतापदस्य पक्षसंबन्धा-
 र्थकत्वात्कर्मधारयसमासे समस्यमानपदार्थयोरभेदसंसर्गलाभेन च व्या-
 प्तिप्रकारकमिदं यत्पक्षसंबन्धविषयकं ज्ञानं तत्परामर्श इति लभ्यते ।

1 N here adds व्याप्यो नाम व्या-
 प्याश्रयः स च धूमादिरेव तस्य पूर्व-
 तादिनिरूपितवृत्तिर्बन्धं पक्षधर्मतेत्य-
 र्थः, but the wording of the
 sentence as well as its absence
 in any other copy prove its

spuriousness.

2 C K R Y omit the sentence
 अनुमिति—माचष्टे; and give the
 full definition of परामर्श in-
 stead of the following प्रतीक.

एवं सति धूमो वह्न्यप्य आलोकवान्पर्वत इति समूहालम्बनेऽप्युक्तप-
रामर्शलक्षणमस्तीत्यतिव्याप्तिः । तद्वारणाय पक्षनिष्ठविशेष्यतानिरूपितहे-
तुनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपितव्याप्तिनिष्ठप्रकारताशालिज्ञानं परामर्श इति
निष्कर्षः । एतादृशपरामर्शजन्यत्वे सति ज्ञानत्वमनुमितेर्लक्षणम् ।
अनुमितिपरामर्शयोर्विशिष्य कार्यकारणभावश्चेत्थम् । वह्नित्वावच्छिन्न-
संयोगसंबन्धावच्छिन्नविधेयतानिरूपित- पर्वतत्वावच्छिन्नोद्देश्यताशाल्यनु-
मितित्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति वह्नित्वावच्छिन्नप्रकारतानिरूपित-व्याप्तिताव-
च्छिन्नप्रकारतानिरूपित-धूमत्वावच्छिन्नप्रकारतानिरूपित-पर्वतत्वावच्छि-
न्नविशेष्यतानिरूपित-विशेष्यताशालिनिर्णयः¹ कारणम् । वह्नित्वावच्छि-
न्नप्रकारतानिरूपित-व्याप्तितावच्छिन्नविशेष्यताया धूमत्वावच्छिन्नविशेष्य-
तानिरूपित-व्याप्तितावच्छिन्नप्रकारतायाश्च अभेदानङ्गीकर्तुमते वह्नित्वा-
वच्छिन्नप्रकारतानिरूपित- विशेष्यत्वावच्छिन्नव्याप्तितावच्छिन्नप्रकारता-
निरूपित-विशेष्यत्वावच्छिन्नधूमत्वावच्छिन्नप्रकारतानिरूपित-पर्वतत्वाव-
च्छिन्नविशेष्यतानिरूपितविशेष्यताशालिनिर्णयः कारणमिति वाच्यम् ।
स च निर्णयो वह्न्यप्यधूमवान् पर्वत इत्याकारको बोध्यः ॥

यत्रेति । यत्रपदवीप्सावशात् धूमाधिकरणे यावति वह्निमत्त्वलाभात्
यावत्पदमहिम्ना वह्नेर्धूमव्यापकत्वं लब्धम् । तदेव स्पष्टयति-साहचर्यनि-
यम इति । नियतसाहचर्यं व्याप्तिरित्यर्थः । नियतत्वं व्यापकत्वं ।² साहचर्यं
सामानाधिकरण्यम् । तथा च धूमव्यापकवह्निसामानाधिकरण्यं व्याप्तिरि-
त्यर्थः । वह्नेर्धूमव्यापकत्वं च धूमसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगितानव-
च्छेदकधर्मवत्त्वम् । तथाहि धूमाधिकरणे चत्वरमहानसादौ वर्तमानोऽभावो
घटत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाभावः । न तु वह्नित्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिता-
काभावः । कुतः । चत्वरमहानसादौ वह्नेः सत्त्वात् । एवं सति धूमाधिक-
रणे पर्वतचत्तरादौ वर्तमानस्य घटाद्यभावस्य प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकं

1 The passage, which follows, seems to have been much tampered with. C K R V generally agree among themselves, though they materially differ

from the above.

2 The passage is taken from S and W, but is not found in other copies.

घटत्वादिकमनवच्छेदकं वहित्वं वहौ वर्ततेऽतो धूमव्यापकत्वं वहौ वर्तते । इयमन्वयव्याप्तिः सिद्धान्तानुसारेण । पूर्वपक्षव्याप्तिस्तु प्रतियोगिव्यधिकरण-साध्याभाववदवृत्तित्वम् । साध्यतावच्छेदकसंबन्धावच्छिन्न-साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताक-प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकसंबन्धावच्छिन्न-प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नवैय्यधिकरण्यावच्छिन्नाभाववन्निरूपितहेतुतावच्छेदकसंबन्धावच्छिन्न-वृत्तित्वावच्छिन्न-प्रतियोगिताकाभावो व्याप्तिरित्यर्थः । तच्च केवलान्वयिन्यव्याप्तमिति सिद्धान्तानुसरणम् ॥

[४५]

अनुमानं द्विविधं स्वार्थं परार्थं च । तत्र स्वार्थं स्वानुमितिहेतुः^१ । तथा हि स्वयमेव भूयो दर्शनेन यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निरिति महानसादौ व्याप्तिं गृहीत्वा पर्वतसमीपं गतस्तद्गते चाग्नौ सांदिहानः^२ पर्वते धूमं पश्यन्व्याप्तिं स्मरति यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निरिति । तदनन्तरं वह्निव्याप्यधूमवानयं पर्वत इति ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते । अयमेव लिङ्गपरामर्श इत्युच्यते । तस्मात्पर्वतो वह्निमानिति ज्ञानमनुमितिरुत्पद्यते^३ । तदेतत्स्वार्थानुमानम् ।

यत्तु स्वयं धूमादग्निमनुमाय परप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं पश्चादवयववाक्यं प्रयुङ्क्ते तत्परार्थानुमानम्^४ । यथा पर्वतो वह्निमानधूमवत्त्वात् । यो यो धूमवान्स वह्निमान् यथा महानसः । तथा चायम् । तस्मात्तथेति । अनेन प्रतिपादितालिङ्गात्परोप्यग्निं प्रतिपद्यते ॥

1 S W here add तथा च धूमव्यापकवह्निसामानाधिकरण्यं व्याप्तिरिति फालितम्.

2 D adds परार्थं परप्रतिपत्तिहेतुः.

3 A B C D F H have गत्वा for गतः probably substituted to avoid repetition of गत. For तद्गते H has तत आर्देन्धने, a further emendation not war-

ranted by the context.

4 C reads अनुमितिरूपम् for अनुमितिः ; X omits it.

5 A B C D read परं प्रति बोधयितुं which makes the construction awkward; J reads प्रतीति for प्रतिपत्ति, and C प्रयुज्यते for प्रयुङ्क्ते; G has पश्चादवयवोपेतं for पश्चादवयवं.

त. दी.—अनुमानं विभजते—अनुमानमिति¹ । स्वार्थानुमितिं दर्शयति—स्वयमेवेति । भूयोदर्शनेनेति । धूमाग्न्योर्व्याप्तिग्रहे साध्यसाधनयोर्भूयः² सहचारदर्शनेनेत्यर्थः । ननु पार्थिवत्वलोहलेख्यत्वादौ शतशः सहचारदर्शनेऽपि वज्रादौ व्यभिचारोपलब्धेर्भूयोदर्शनेन³ कथं व्याप्तिग्रह इति चेन्न व्यभिचारज्ञानविरहसहकृतसहचारज्ञानस्य व्याप्तिग्राहकत्वात् । व्यभिचारज्ञानं द्विविधम् निश्चयः शङ्का च । तद्विरहः कचित्तर्कात्कचित्स्वतः सिद्ध एव । धूमाग्न्यव्याप्तिग्रहे कार्यकारणभावभङ्गप्रसङ्गलक्षणस्तर्को व्यभिचारशङ्कानिवर्तकः ॥ ननु सकलवह्निधूमयोरसन्निकर्षात्कथं व्याप्तिग्रह इति चेन्न । धूमत्ववह्नित्वरूपसामान्यलक्षणप्रत्यासत्त्या सकलधूमवह्निज्ञानसंभवात् ॥ तस्मादिति । लिङ्गपरामर्शादित्यर्थः । परार्थानुमानमाह—यश्चिति ॥ यच्छब्दस्य तत्परार्थानुमानमिति तच्छब्देनान्वयः ॥ पञ्चावयववाक्यमुदाहरति—यथेति ॥

न्या. बो.—अनुमानं विभजते—स्वार्थमिति । स्वार्थानुमानं नाम न्यायाप्रयोज्यानुमानम् । तत्प्रयोज्यानुमानं परार्थानुमानम् ॥ न्यायत्वं च प्रतिज्ञाद्यवयवपञ्चकसमुदायत्वम् । अवयवत्वं च प्रतिज्ञादन्यतमत्वम् ॥

[४६]

प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनानि पञ्चावयवाः । पर्वतो वह्निमानिति प्रतिज्ञा । धूमवत्त्वादिति हेतुः । यो यो धूमवान्सोऽग्निमान्यथा महानस इत्युदाहरणम् । तथा चायमित्युपनयः । तस्मात्तथेति निगमनम् ॥

1 J Y omit this sentence. A adds स्वार्थानुमानं विविच्य दर्शयति—तथाहीति which is superfluous. F and Q here add तद्वैविध्यं दर्शयति—स्वार्थमिति । तत्रेति । उभयोरमध्य इत्यर्थः ।

2 The passage is taken from N. A omits the whole of it, while other copies retain भूयोदर्शनेनेति, omitting the latter part, which, however, appears to be

necessary to complete the explanation.

3 M N omit वज्रादौ व्यभिचारोपलब्धेः, while J Y Z omit वज्रादौ only; L reads वज्रमणौ, P हरिके, and Q मण्णादौ.

4 The reading is that of D H K; J gives the same minus one सः and with महानसं. C E omit यथा महानसः, while A B F retain only the first three words.

त. दी.—अवयवस्वरूपमाह—प्रतिज्ञेति । उदाहृतवाक्ये प्रतिज्ञा-
 दिविभागमाह^१—पर्वतो वह्निमानिति । साध्यवक्त्या पक्षवचनं प्रतिज्ञा ॥
 पञ्चम्यन्तं लिङ्गप्रतिपादकं वचनं हेतुः । व्याप्तिप्रतिपादकमुदाहरणम् ।
 पक्षधर्मताज्ञानार्थमुपनयः । अबाधितत्वादिकं निगमनप्रयोजनम्^२ ॥

[४७]

स्वार्थानुमितिपरार्थानुमित्योर्लिङ्गपरामर्श एव करणम्^३ । त-
 स्माहलिङ्गपरामर्शोऽनुमानम् ॥

त. दी.—अनुमितिकरणमाह—स्वार्थेति ॥ ननु व्याप्तिस्मृतिपक्ष-

1 A G L P Y Z have विशेष for विभाग.

2 The passage from पञ्चम्यन्तं to the end appears to have been tampered with. All copies except G N and Z agree in reading it as above. N and Z give a materially different version:—पञ्चम्यन्तं तृतीयान्तं वा लिङ्गप्रतिपादकं वचनं हेतुः । व्याप्ति-प्रतिपादकं दृष्टान्तवचनमुदाहरणम् । व्याप्तिविशिष्टलिङ्गप्रतिपादकं वचनमुपनयः । हेतुसाध्यवक्त्या पक्षप्रतिपादकं वचनं निगमनम् । पक्षज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाप्रयोजनम् । लिङ्गज्ञानं हेतु-प्रयोजनम् । व्याप्तिज्ञानमुदाहरण-प्रयोजनम् । पक्षधर्मताज्ञानमुपनय-प्रयोजनम् । अबाधितत्वादिकं निगमनप्रयोजनम् । G and Q agree with this from व्याप्तिविशिष्ट° to the end. The repetitions and fuller explanation in this passage show that it is an interpolation. Nil. does not seem to be aware of it, especially its latter half begin-

ning with पक्षज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाप्रयो-जनम्. Having explained the definitions as read by N, Nil. notices the reading adopted in our text as a v. l. and remarks पक्षधर्मताज्ञानार्थमुपनय इति पाठे तु 'प्रयुज्यते' इति शेष-पूरणेन प्रदर्शितार्थ एव यथाकथं-चित् संगमनीयः । This shows that even Nil. found the text corrupt and was not satisfied with the reading usually met with. It is possible that some later writer corrected the loose definitions of उपनय and निगमन given by Annambhatta and the latter being retained, three more प्रयोजनघटित sentences were added to complete the list.

3 Curiously enough all copies except G K X read कारणं which is clearly a mistake. In J the vertical bar appears to have been erased afterwards;

धर्मताज्ञानाभ्यामेवानुमितिसंभवे व्याप्तिविशिष्टलिङ्गपरामर्शः^१ किमर्थमङ्गी-
कर्तव्य इति चेन्न । वह्निव्याप्यधूमवानयमिति शाब्दपरामर्शस्थले विशिष्टप-
रामर्शस्यावश्यकतया लाघवेन सर्वत्र परामर्शस्यैव करणत्वात् । लिङ्गं न कर-
णम् । अतीतादौ व्यभिचारात् । व्यापारवत्कारणं करणमिति मते परामर्श-
द्वारा व्याप्तिज्ञानं^२ करणम् । तज्जन्यत्वे सति तज्जन्यजनको व्यापारः ॥
अनुमानमुपसंहरति—तस्मादिति ॥

[४८]

लिङ्गं त्रिविधम् । अन्वयव्यतिरेकि केवलान्वयि केवलव्य-
तिरेकि चेति । अन्वयेन व्यतिरेकेण च^३ व्याप्तिमदन्वयव्यतिरेकि ।
यथा वह्नौ साध्ये धूमवत्त्वम् । यत्र धूमस्तत्राभिर्यथा महानस इ-
त्यन्वयव्याप्तिः । यत्र वह्निर्नास्ति तत्र धूमोऽपि नास्ति यथा म-
हाहद इति व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिः । 'अन्वयमात्रव्याप्तिकं केवलान्वयि
यथा घटोऽभिधेयः प्रमेयत्वात्पटवत् । अत्र प्रमेयत्वाभिधेयत्वयो-
र्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिर्नास्ति सर्वस्यापि प्रमेयत्वादभिधेयत्वाच्च । व्यतिरेक-
मात्रव्याप्तिकं केवलव्यतिरेकि यथा पृथिवीतरेभ्यो भिद्यते गन्ध-
वत्त्वात् । यदितरेभ्यो न भिद्यते न तद्गन्धवत् । यथा जलम् । न
चेयं तथा । तस्मान्न तथेति । 'यद्गन्धवत्तदितरभिन्नमित्यन्व-
यदृष्टान्तो नास्ति पृथिवीमात्रस्य पक्षत्वात् ॥

त. दी.—लिङ्गं विभजते—लिङ्गमिति ॥ अन्वयव्यतिरेकि लक्ष-
यति—अन्वयेनेति । हेतुसाध्ययोर्व्याप्तिरन्वयव्याप्तिः । तदभावयोर्व्याप्ति-
र्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिः ॥ केवलान्वयिनो लक्षणमाह—अन्वयेति । केवलान्व-

1 A F and Q omit the words
व्याप्तिलिङ्गं and विशिष्ट before
परामर्श.

2 After व्याप्तिज्ञानं A and F add
पक्षज्ञानं साध्यज्ञानं लिङ्गज्ञानं य-
त्किञ्चित्जन्यज्ञानमात्रं वा परामर्श-
व्यापारकम्.

3 For व्याप्तिमत् C reads यत्र

व्याप्तिस्तत्.

4 C here adds यत्सत्त्वे तत्सत्त्वमन्व-
यः । यद्भावे तद्भावो व्यतिरेकः,
but the words are found no-
where else.

5 C G H read ०रेभ्यः; F has इतर-
भेदवत्.

यिसाध्यकं केवलान्वये । अत्यन्ताभावाप्रतियोगित्वं केवलान्वयित्वम् ।
केवलान्वयेनमुदाहरति यथा षटोभिधेयः प्रमेयत्वादिति । ईश्वरप्रमावि-
षयत्वं सर्वपदाभिधेयत्वं च सर्वत्रास्तीति व्यतिरेकाभावः ॥ केवल-
व्यतिरेकिणो लक्षणमाह—व्यतिरेकेति^१ । केवलव्यतिरेकिणमुदाहरति
—पृथिवीति । नान्वतरभेदः प्रसिद्धो वा न वा । आद्ये यत्र प्रसिद्धस्तत्र
हेतुसत्त्वेऽन्वयित्वम् असत्त्वेऽसाधारण्यम् । द्वितीये साध्यज्ञानाभावात्कथं
तद्विशिष्टानुमितेः । विशेषणज्ञानाभावे विशिष्टज्ञानानुदयात् ।^२प्रतियोगि-
ज्ञानाभावाद्यतिरेकव्याप्तिज्ञानमपि न स्यादिति चेन्न । जलादित्रयोदश-
न्योन्याभावानां त्रयोदशसु प्रत्येकं प्रसिद्धानां मेलनं पृथिव्यां साध्यते ।
तत्र त्रयोदशत्वावच्छिन्नभेदस्यैकाधिकरणवृत्तित्वाभावान्वयित्वासाधा-
रण्ये । प्रत्येकाधिकरणे प्रसिद्ध्या साध्यविशिष्टानुमितिव्यतिरेकव्याप्ति-
निरूपणं चेति^३ ॥

न्या. बो—अन्वयेनेति । साध्यसामानाधिकरण्यरूपान्वयव्याप्ति-
मानित्यर्थः । व्यतिरेकेणेति । व्यतिरेको नामाभावः । तथा च साध्या-
भावहेत्वभावयोर्व्याप्तिर्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिः । इयं च व्याप्तिः यत्र यत्र
बह्वयभावस्तत्र तत्र धूमाभाव इति । यत्रपदवीप्सया बह्वयभाववति
यावति धूमाभावग्रहणे यावत्पदस्य व्यापकत्वपरतया धूमाभावे बह्वय-

1 A J Y Z omit this sentence. G replaces this and the next sentence by a single one व्यतिरेकि दर्शयति—व्यतिरेकमात्रेति

2 M inserts अभावज्ञानाभावेन after प्रतियोगिज्ञानाभावात्.

3 The concluding passage of T D beginning with तत्र is undoubtedly corrupt, and is absolutely unintelligible as it is read in most of the printed editions and Mss. Only N and J seem to give an appro-

ximately correct and intelligible reading. I have substituted भेद for साध्य and changed प्रत्येकाधिकरण° into °करणे on the single authority of N, because the emendations make the meaning clearer. J F and Q alone make नान्वयित्वासाधारण्ये part of the previous sentence as it certainly ought to be. F and Q insert साध्याभावव्यापकोद्भूताभा-प्रतियो-गित्वमिति before व्यतिरेक°. See Note loc. cit.

भावव्यापकत्वं लब्धम् । एवं च वह्न्यभावनिष्ठा व्याप्तिः स्वाश्रयीभूतवह्न्यभावव्यापकीभूताभावप्रतियोगित्वसंबन्धेन धूमनिष्ठतया गृह्यत इति व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिमत्त्वेन व्यतिरेकित्वेन धूमव्यापकवह्निसामानाधिकरण्यरूपान्वयव्याप्तिमत्त्वेनान्वयित्वेन च गीयते¹ । व्यतिरेकपरामर्शस्तु वह्न्यभावव्यापकीभूताभावप्रतियोगिधूमवान् पर्वत इत्याकारकः ॥

केवलान्वयिनो लक्षणमाह—अन्वयेति । व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिशून्यत्वे सत्यन्वयव्याप्तिमत्त्वं केवलान्वयित्वम् । साध्ये केवलान्वयित्वमभावाप्रतियोगित्वम् । तथा चाभावाप्रतियोगिसाध्यकत्वं केवलान्वयिहेतोर्लक्षणम्² । एतल्लक्षणं हेतोर्व्यतिरेकित्वेऽपि संगच्छते । साध्यस्य केवलान्वयित्वाद्यतिरेकव्याप्तेरभावादन्वयमात्रव्याप्तिकं केवलान्वयीति मूलोक्तलक्षणमुपपन्नम् । अत्यन्ताभावाप्रतियोगित्वं केवलान्वयित्वम् । न चैवमाकाशाभावे संयोगामावे चाव्याप्तिरिति वाच्यम् । स्वविरोधिवृत्तिमदत्यन्ताभावाप्रतियोगित्वस्यैव तदर्थत्वात् । एकजातीयसंबन्धेन सर्वत्र विद्यमानत्वं केवलान्वयित्वमिति नव्याः ॥ केवलव्यतिरेकिणो लक्षणमाह—व्यतिरेकेति ॥ अन्वयव्याप्तिशून्यत्वे सति व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिमत्त्वं केवलव्यतिरेकित्वम् । यथेति । अत्र पृथिवीत्वावच्छिन्नं पक्षः । पृथिवीतरजलादिभेदः साध्यः । गन्धवत्त्वं हेतुः । अत्र यद्गन्धवत्तदितरेभेदवदित्यन्वयदृष्टान्ताभावात् गन्धव्यापकेतरभेदसामानाधिकरण्यरूपान्वयव्याप्तिग्रहासम्भवात् नास्त्यन्वयव्याप्तिः ॥ किं तु यत्र यत्र पृथिवीतरभेदाभावस्तत्र तत्र गन्धाभावो यथा जलादिकमिति व्यतिरेकदृष्टान्तभूतजलादावितरेभेदाभावरूपसाध्याभावव्यापकता गन्धाभावे दृश्यते । इममेवार्थं मनसि निधाय यदितरेभ्यो न भिद्यते न तद्गन्धवद्यथा जलमिति ग्रन्थेन मूलकारो व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिमेव प्रदर्शितवान् । एवं व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिग्रहानन्तरम् इतरभेदाभावव्यापकीभूताभावप्रतियोगिगन्धवती पृथिवी इत्याकारकव्यतिरेकपराम-

1 S and W read the passage a little differently.

2 Instead of this sentence S and W have अथवा केवलान्वयिसा-

ध्यकत्वं तत् ।

3 W reads तथा च तयोः एकजातीयसंबन्धेन सर्वत्र विद्यमानत्वान्नाव्याप्तिः ।

ज्ञात् पृथिवीत्वावच्छिन्नोद्देश्यतानिरूपितेतरभेदत्वावच्छिन्नविधेयताका
पृथिवी इतरभेदवती इत्याकारकानुमितिर्जायत इति तत्त्वम् । 'यथा जल-
मिति । जलमितरभेदाभावव्यापकगन्धाभाववदिति । न चेयं तथेति । इतर-
भेदाभावव्यापकीभूतगन्धाभाववती न किंतु तदभावाभाववत्त्वाद्गन्धवती-
त्यर्थः । तस्मान्न तथेति । तच्छब्देन गन्धाभावाभावरूपस्य गन्धस्य परा-
मर्शेन तस्मादिति पञ्चम्यन्ताद्गन्धवत्त्वादित्यर्थोपलब्धेस्तथेतरभेदाभावव-
तीत्यस्यायं भावः । तथा चेतरेभेदाभावाभाववतीतरभेदवतीत्यर्थः ॥

[४९]

संदिग्धसाध्यवान्पक्षः । यथा धूमवत्त्वे हेतौ पर्वतः ॥

त. दी.—पक्षलक्षणमाह—संदिग्धेति । ननु श्रवणानन्तरभावि-
मननस्थलेऽव्याप्तिः । तत्र वेदवाक्यैरात्मनो निश्चितत्वेन संदेहाभावात्कि-
च प्रत्यक्षेऽपि वहौ यत्नेच्छयानुमितिस्तत्राप्यव्याप्तिरिति चेन्न । उक्तपक्ष-
ताश्रयत्वस्य पक्षलक्षणत्वात् ॥

न्या. बो.—पक्षलक्षणमाह—संदिग्धसाध्येति^१ । साध्यप्रकारक-
संदेहविशेष्यत्वं पक्षत्वम् । संदेहश्च पर्वतो वह्निमान्न वा इत्याकारकः । अनु-
मितेः पूर्वं साध्यसंदेहो नियमेन पक्षे जायत इत्यभिप्रायेणेदं लक्षणं प्राची-
नैः कृतम् । गगनविशेष्यकमेघप्रकारकसंदेहाभावदशायामपि गृहमध्यस्थ-
पुरुषस्य घनगर्जितश्रवणेन गगनं मेघवदित्याकारकानुमितिर्जायते । गग-
नत्वावच्छिन्नोद्देश्यतानिरूपितमेघवत्त्वावच्छिन्नविधेयताकानुमितिर्दर्शना-
त्प्राचीनमतं विहाय नवीनैरनुमित्युद्देश्यत्वं पक्षत्वमिति स्थिरीकृतम् ॥

[५०]

निश्चितसाध्यवान्सपक्षः । यथा तत्रैव महानसः ॥

त. दी.—सपक्षलक्षणमाह—निश्चितेति ॥

¹ The following passage seems to be corrupt. The reading of C K is adopted. S U and W

give a materially different reading.

न्या. बो.—सपक्षलक्षणमाह—निश्चितसाध्येति । साध्यप्रकारक-
निश्चयविशेष्यत्वं सपक्षत्वम् । निश्चयश्च महानसो वह्निमानित्याकारकः ॥

[५१]

निश्चितसाध्याभाववान्विपक्षः । यथा तत्रैव महाहृदः ॥

त. दी.—विपक्षलक्षणमाह—निश्चितेति ।

न्या. बो.—विपक्षलक्षणमाह—निश्चितेति । साध्याभावप्रकारक-
निश्चयविशेष्यत्वं विपक्षत्वम् । निश्चयश्च हृदो वह्न्यभाववानित्याकारकः ॥

[५२]

सव्यभिचारविरुद्धसत्प्रतिपक्षासिद्धवाधिताः पञ्च हेत्वाभासाः ॥

त. दी.—एवं सद्धेतुं निरूप्यासद्धेतुं निरूपयितुं विभजते—सव्य-
भिचारेति । अनुमितिप्रतिबन्धक्यथार्थज्ञानविषयत्वं हेत्वाभासत्वम् ।

न्या. बो.—एवं सद्धेतुं निरूप्य हेत्वाभासान्निरूपयति—सव्यभि-
चारेति । हेतुवदाभासन्त इति हेत्वाभासाः दुष्टहेतव इत्यर्थः । दोषाश्च
व्यभिचारविरोधप्रतिपक्षासिद्धिवाधाः । तद्विशिष्टा दुष्टहेतव इत्यर्थः ।
हेतौ दोषज्ञाने सत्यनुमितिप्रतिबन्धो जायते व्याप्तिज्ञानप्रतिबन्धो वा
जायते । अतो वादिनिग्रहार्थं वादिनोद्भावितहेतौ दोषोद्भावनार्थं दुष्टहेतु-
निरूपणमिति भावः ॥

[५३]

सव्यभिचारोऽनैकान्तिकः । स त्रिविधः । साधारणासाधा-
रणानुपसंहारिभेदात् । तत्र साध्याभाववद्वृत्तिः साधारणोऽनैका-
न्तिकः । यथा पर्वतो वह्निमान्प्रमेयत्वादिति प्रमेयत्वस्य वह्न्यभाव-
वति हृदे विद्यमानत्वात् । सर्वसपक्षविपक्षव्यावृत्तौऽसाधारणः ।

यथा शब्दो नित्यः शब्दत्वादिति । शब्दत्वं सर्वेभ्यो नित्ये-
भ्योऽनित्येभ्यश्च व्यावृत्तं शब्दमात्रवृत्तिः । अन्वयव्यतिरेकदृष्टान्त-
रहितोऽनुपसंहारी । यथा सर्वमनित्यं प्रमेयत्वादिति । अत्र सर्व-
स्यापि पक्षत्वाददृष्टान्तो नास्ति ॥

त. दी.—सव्यभिचारं विभजते—स त्रिविध इति । साधारणं
लक्षयति—तत्रेति । उदाहरति—यथेति । असाधारणं लक्षयति—स-
र्वेति । अनुपसंहारिणो लक्षणमाह—अन्वयेति ॥

न्या. बो.—सव्यभिचारं विभज्य दर्शयति—साधारणेति । सा-
धारणाद्यन्यतमत्वं सव्यभिचारसामान्यलक्षणम् । साधारणत्वं साध्याभाव-
वद्वृत्तित्वम्^१ । पर्वतो वह्निमान्प्रमेयत्वादित्यत्र प्रमेयत्वहेतौ वह्न्यभाववद्वृत्ति-
त्वरूपव्यभिचारे ज्ञाते वह्न्यभाववद्वृत्तित्वरूपव्याप्तिग्रहप्रतिबन्धः फलम् ।
असाधारण इति । सर्वसपक्षविपक्षव्यावृत्तत्वं साध्यवद्वृत्तित्वावच्छिन्न-
प्रतियोगिताकाभावः^३ । हेतौ साध्यासामानाधिकरण्ये निश्चिते साध्यसामाना-
धिकरण्यरूपव्याप्तिज्ञानप्रतिबन्धः फलम् ॥ अनुपसंहारिणं लक्षयति—
अन्वयेति । उभयदृष्टान्ताभावादन्वयव्याप्तिज्ञानव्यतिरेकव्याप्तिज्ञानोभय-
सामग्री नास्तीत्यर्थः । सर्वस्यैव पक्षत्वात् पक्षातिरिक्ताप्रसिद्धे-
रितिभावः ॥

[५४]

साध्याभावव्याप्तौ हेतुर्विरुद्धः । यथा शब्दो नित्यः कृतक-
त्वादिति । कृतकत्वं हि नित्यत्वाभावेनानित्यत्वेन व्याप्तम् ॥

त. दी.—विरुद्धं लक्षयति—साध्येति ॥

1 G J omit अनित्येभ्यश्च.

2 The passage from सव्यभिचारं
विभज्य to वृत्तित्वम् is not
found in C K R V.

3 The sentence is omitted in C
K R and V; U has निश्चित-
साध्यवद्वृत्तित्वम्.

न्या. बो.—विरुद्धं लक्षयति—साध्याभावव्याप्ति इति । साध्याभावव्याप्तिः साध्याभावनिरूपितव्यतिरेकव्याप्तिः साध्यव्यापकी-भूताभावप्रतियोगित्वम् । तथा च पक्षविशेष्यकसाध्याभावव्याप्यहेतु-प्रकारकज्ञानात्पक्षविशेष्यकसाध्यप्रकारकानुमितिप्रतिबन्धः फलम् ॥

[५५]

यस्य साध्यभावसाधकं हेत्वन्तरं विद्यते स सत्प्रतिपक्षः । यथा शब्दो नित्यः श्रावणत्वाच्छब्दत्ववदिति । शब्दोऽनित्यः कार्यत्वाद्वदवदिति ॥

त. दी.—सत्प्रतिपक्षं लक्षयति—यस्येति ॥

न्या. बो.—एवं सत्प्रतिपक्षेऽपि । विरुद्धसत्प्रतिपक्षयोर्विशेषस्तु विरुद्धे हेतोरेकत्वेन सत्प्रतिपक्षे हेतोर्द्वित्वेन च ज्ञातव्यः । सत्प्रतिपक्षं लक्षयति—यस्येति । साध्याभावसाधको हेतुः साध्यसाधकत्वेनोपन्यस्त इत्यसामर्थ्यसूचनमपि भवति ॥

[५६]

असिद्धस्त्रिविधः । आश्रयासिद्धः स्वरूपासिद्धो व्याप्यत्वासिद्धश्चेति । आश्रयासिद्धो यथा गगनारविन्दं सुरभ्यरविन्दत्वात्स-रोजारविन्दवत् । अत्र गगनारविन्दमाश्रयः । स च नास्त्येव । स्वरूपासिद्धो यथा शब्दो गुणश्चाक्षुषत्वात् । अत्र चाक्षुषत्वं शब्दे नास्ति शब्दस्य श्रावणत्वात् । सोपाधिको^३ व्याप्यत्वासिद्धः । साध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापक^४ उपाधिः । साध्यसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावाप्रतियोगित्वं साध्यव्यापकत्वम् । साधनवन्नि-

1 A B place यस्य after हेत्वन्तरं; B omits विद्यते; G has विद्यते यस्य.

2 Q has अनित्यः for गुणः, and adds रूपवत्.

3 A B C D F and Q insert हेतुः after सोपाधिकः.

4 C H Q U and W have व्यापक-त्वमुपाधिः, while E reads व्यापकत्वमुपाधित्वम्.

ष्टात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगित्वं साधनाव्यापकत्वम् । पर्वतो धूम-
वान्वाह्निमच्चादित्यत्राद्र्रेन्धनसंयोग उपाधिः । तथाहि^१ । यत्र धूमस्त-
त्राद्र्रेन्धनसंयोग इति साध्यव्यापकता । यत्र वह्निस्तत्राद्र्रेन्धनसं-
योगो नास्त्ययोगोलक आद्र्रेन्धनसंयोगाभावादिति साधनाव्याप-
कता^२ । एवं साध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापकत्वादार्द्रेन्धन-
संयोग उपाधिः । सोपाधिकत्वाद्वह्निमत्त्वं व्याप्यत्वासिद्धम् ॥

त. दी.—असिद्धं विभजते—असिद्ध इति ॥ आश्रयासिद्धमुदा-
हरति—गगनेति ॥ स्वरूपासिद्धमुदाहरति—शब्देति ॥ व्याप्यत्वा-
सिद्धस्य लक्षणमाह—सोपाधिक इति । उपाधिलक्षणमाह—सा-
ध्येति । उपाधिश्चतुर्विधः । केवलसाध्यव्यापकः पक्षधर्मावच्छिन्नसाध्य-
व्यापकः साधनावच्छिन्नसाध्यव्यापक उदासीनधर्मावच्छिन्नसाध्यव्यापक-
श्चेति । आद्य आद्र्रेन्धनसंयोगः । द्वितीयो यथा—वायुः प्रत्यक्षः^३ प्रत्यक्षस्पर्-
शाश्रयत्वादित्यत्र बहिर्द्रव्यत्वावच्छिन्नप्रत्यक्षत्वव्यापकमुद्भूतरूपवत्त्वम्^४ ।
तृतीयो यथा—प्रध्वंसो^५ विनाशी जन्यत्वादित्यत्र जन्यत्वावच्छिन्नानि-
त्यत्वव्यापकं भावत्वम् । चतुर्थो यथा—प्रागभावो विनाशी प्रमेयत्वादित्यत्र
जन्यत्वावच्छिन्नानित्यत्वव्यापकं भावत्वम् ॥

न्या. बो.—आश्रयासिद्ध इति । आश्रयासिद्धिर्नाम पक्षताव-
वच्छेदकविशिष्टपक्षाप्रसिद्धिः । यथा गगनीयत्वविशिष्टपक्षासिद्धेः सौर-

1 Some copies omit तथाहि.

2 CH K X and W omit इति
साधनाव्यापकता.

3 For प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयत्वात् C J L
M Y Z read प्रमेयत्वात् which is
perhaps better.

4 G here adds स इयामो मैत्रीतन-
यत्वादित्यत्र मैत्रीतनयत्वावच्छिन्न-

इयामत्वस्य व्यापकः शाकायाहार-
परिणतिभेदः । प्रकारान्तरेण तृतीयो
यथा; but this is undoubtedly
interpolated.

5 J N M Q and Y read प्रागभाव
for प्रध्वंस and are supported
by the high authority of Nil.
See Note loc. cit.

भ्यानुमितिर्न सम्भवति' । स्वरूपासिद्धिर्नाम पक्षे हेत्वभावः । तथा च हेत्व-
भावविशिष्टपक्षज्ञानात्पक्षविशेष्यकहेतुप्रकारकपरामर्शानुत्पत्त्या परामर्श-
प्रतिबन्धः फलम् ॥ व्याप्यत्वासिद्ध इति । प्रकृते धूमव्यापकत्वमाद्रे-
न्धनसंयोगे गृहीतं चेद्धूम आद्रेन्धनसंयोगव्याप्यत्वं गृहीतम् । एवं
वह्न्यव्यापकत्वमाद्रेन्धनसंयोगे गृहीतं चेद्धहौ तदव्याप्यत्वं गृह्यते तदेव
व्यभिचारित्वम् । तथा चोपाधिव्यभिचारित्वं साधने गृहीतं चेदुपाधिभू-
ताद्रेन्धनसंयोगव्याप्यधूमव्यभिचारित्वं गृहीतमेव । अनुमानप्रकारश्च
पूर्वानुमानहेतुं पक्षीकृत्य वह्निर्धूमव्यभिचारी धूमव्यापकाद्रेन्धनसंयोग-
व्यभिचारित्वाद्धटत्वादिवद्यो यत्साध्यव्यापकव्यभिचारी स सर्वोऽपि
साध्यव्यभिचारी । एवं प्रकारेण प्रकृतानुमानहेतुभूतपक्षे साध्यव्यभिचा-
रोत्थापकतया दूषकत्वमुपाधेः फलम् । तथा च धूमाभाववद्वृत्तित्वरूपधू-
मव्यभिचारे गृहीते वह्नौ धूमाभाववद्वृत्तित्वरूपव्याप्तिग्रहप्रतिबन्धः फलम् ।
न च व्याप्यत्वासिद्धेर्यव्यभिचाराभेद इति वाच्यम् । धूमाभाववद्वृत्तित्वाभा-
वाभावत्वेन व्याप्यत्वासिद्धत्वं धूमाभाववद्वृत्तित्वेन व्यभिचारत्वमिति
भेदात् ।

[५७]

यस्य साध्याभावः प्रमाणान्तरेण निश्चितः स बाधितः । यथा
वह्निर्नुष्णो द्रव्यत्वादिति । अत्रानुष्णत्वं साध्यं तदभाव उष्णत्वं
स्पर्शनप्रत्यक्षेण^४ गृह्यत इति बाधितत्वम् ॥

त. दी.—बाधितस्य लक्षणमाह—यस्येति । अत्र बाधस्य ग्राह्या-
भावनिश्चयत्वेन सत्प्रतिपक्षस्य विरोधिज्ञानसामग्रीत्वेन साक्षादनुमितिप्रति-

1 U and W read the passage differently.

2 C K R V omit the following two sentences.

3 K reads पदार्थत्वात् for द्रव्यत्वात्.

4 The reading adopted is that of A D E K; G H J read प्रत्यक्षेण

only which amounts to the same. B. has स्पर्शन प्रत्यक्षेण, and C स्पर्शनेन. S. C. seems to prefer the latter. Possibly both स्पर्शन and स्पर्शनेन may have been later insertions. See Note loc. cit.

तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिन्या च सहितः

बन्धकत्वम् । इतरेषां तु परामर्शप्रतिबन्धकत्वम् । तत्रापि साधारणस्या-
व्यभिचाराभावतया^१ विरुद्धस्य सामानाधिकरण्याभावतया^२ व्यापकत्वासि-
द्धस्य^३ विशिष्टव्यास्यभावतयासाधारणानुपसंहारिणोर्व्याप्तिसंशयाघाय-
कत्वेन च व्याप्तिज्ञानप्रतिबन्धकत्वम् । आश्रयासिद्धस्वरूपासिद्धयोः पक्ष-
धर्मताज्ञानप्रतिबन्धकत्वम् । उपाधिस्तु व्यभिचारज्ञानद्वारा व्याप्तिज्ञान-
प्रतिबन्धकः । सिद्धसाधनं तु पक्षताविघट(क ?)तया आश्रयासिद्धेऽन्तर्भव-
तीति प्राञ्चः । निग्रहस्थानान्तरमिति नवीनाः^४ ।

न्या. बो.—यस्येति । यस्य हेतोः साध्याभावः स च प्रमाणान्त-
रेण निश्चितः स बाधित इत्यर्थः । तथा च प्रात्यक्षिकसाध्याभावनिश्चयेन
साध्यानुमितिप्रतिबन्धः फलम् । बाधितसाध्यकत्वाद्धेतोर्हेतुरपि बाधित
इत्युच्यते ॥ इत्यनुमानपरिच्छेदः ॥

[५८]

उपमितिकरणमुपमानम् । संज्ञासंज्ञिसंबन्धज्ञानमुपमितिः । तत्क-
रणं सादृश्यज्ञानम् । अतिदेशवाक्यार्थस्मरणमवान्तरव्यापारः^५ ।
तथा हि 'कश्चिद्गवयशब्दार्थमजानन्कुतश्चिदारण्यकपुरुषाद्गोसदृशो
गवय इति श्रुत्वा वनं गतो वाक्यार्थं स्मरणगोसदृशं^६ पिण्डं
पश्यति । तदनन्तरमसौ गवयशब्दवाच्य इत्युपमितिरुत्पद्यते ॥

त. दी.—उपमानं लक्षयति—उपमितीति ॥

1 A and Q भाववत्तया.
2 The reading is that of N and Nil. A CLP omit प्राञ्चः leav-
ing इति which then becomes
redundant. G J Y Z omit इति
प्राञ्चः. A inserts न before
निग्रह° and M reads निग्रहस्था-
नानन्तरम् both of which are
clearly wrong.
3 Q N and W omit this sen-

tence. F omits the rest of the
passage.

4 A B D omit कश्चित्; K adds
पुरुषः; A B D and Q read वाच्यम्
for अर्थम्. N has पदार्थं for
शब्दार्थम्.

5 K H add वाक्यं after इति.

6 C adds विशिष्टं after सदृशं; H
reads सादृश्यविशिष्टं and A and
W सदृशपिण्डं; J omits पिण्डं.

न्या. बो.—उपमानं लक्षयति । उपमितिकरणमिति । उपमितिं लक्षयति—संज्ञासंज्ञीति । संज्ञा पदं । संज्ञी पदार्थः । तयोः संबन्धः शक्तिः । तथा च पदपदार्थसंबन्धज्ञानमुपमिति रित्यर्थः । उपमानमतिदेश-वाक्यार्थज्ञानम् । अतिदेशवाक्यार्थस्मरणं व्यापारः । उपमितिः फलम् । गोसदृशो गवयपदवाच्य इत्याकारकाद्गोसदृशत्वावच्छिन्नविशेष्यकगवय-पदवाच्यत्वप्रकारकं ज्ञानं जायते तदेव करणम् ॥ इत्युपमानपरिच्छेदः ॥

[५९]

आप्तवाक्यं शब्दः । आप्तस्तु यथार्थवक्ता । वाक्यं पदसमूहः । यथा 'गामानयेति । शक्तं पदम् । अस्मात्पदादयमर्थो बोद्धव्य इती-श्वरसङ्केतः' शक्तिः ॥

त. दी.—शब्दं लक्षयति—आप्तेति^१ । पदलक्षणमाह—शक्तमि-
ति । अर्थस्मृत्यनुकूलः पदपदार्थसंबन्धः शक्तिः । सा च पदार्थान्तरमिति
मीमांसकाः । तन्निरासार्थमाह—अस्मादिति । डित्थादीनामिव घटादी-
नामपि संकेत एव शक्तिः न तु पदार्थान्तरमित्यर्थः ॥ गवादिशब्दानां जाता-
वेव शक्तिर्विशेषणतया जातेः प्रथममुपस्थितत्वात् व्यक्तिलाभस्त्वाक्षेपादि-
ना इति केचित् । तन्न । गामानयेत्यादौ 'वृद्धव्यवहारात्सर्वतानयनादेर्व्यक्ता-
वेव संभवेन जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तावेव शक्तिकल्पनात् । शक्तिग्रहश्च वृद्धव्यव-
हारेण । व्युत्पित्सुर्बालो गामानयेत्युत्तमवृद्धवाक्यश्रवणानन्तरं मध्यमवृद्धस्य
प्रवृत्तिमुपलभ्य गवानयनं च दृष्ट्वा मध्यमवृद्धप्रवृत्तिजनकज्ञानस्यान्वयव्य-
तिरेकाभ्यां वाक्यजन्यत्वं निश्चित्याश्चमानय गां बधान इति वाक्यान्तर
आवापोद्वापाभ्यां गोपदस्य गोत्वविशिष्टे शक्तिरश्वशब्दस्याश्वत्वविशिष्टे
शक्तिरिति व्युत्पद्यते । ननु सर्वत्र कार्यपरत्वाद्यवधारस्य कार्यवाक्य एव
व्युत्पत्तिर्न सिद्धपर इति चेन्न । 'काञ्चनां त्रिभुवनतिलको भूपतिरित्यादौ

1 W omits this. Q adds शुद्धां

दण्डेन after आनय.

2 A B D and F insert इच्छा
after इश्वर unnecessarily. C
more correctly reads ईश्वरे-

च्छारूपसंकेतः.

3 N and Q here add वाक्यं
लक्षयति-वाक्येति.

4 F and Q have वृद्धव्यवहारेण.

5 A and M read काञ्चनां.

सिद्धेऽपि व्यवहारात् विकसितपद्मे मधुकर' इत्यादौ प्रसिद्धपदसमभिव्यव-
 हारात्सिद्धेऽपि मधुकरादिपदे व्युत्पत्तिदर्शनाच्च ॥ लक्षणापि शब्दवृत्ति' ।
 शक्यसंबन्धो लक्षणा । गङ्गायां घोष इत्यत्र गङ्गापदवाच्यप्रवाहसंबन्धादेव
 तीरोपस्थितौ तीरेऽपि शक्तिर्न कल्प्यते । सैन्धवादौ लवणाश्रयोः परस्पर-
 संबन्धाभावाच्चानाशक्तिकल्पनम् ॥ लक्षणा त्रिविधा । जहल्लक्षणाजहल्लक्ष-
 णा जहदजहल्लक्षणा चेति । यत्र वाच्यार्थस्यान्वयाभावस्तत्र जहती यथा
 मञ्चाः क्रोशन्तीति । यत्र वाच्यार्थस्यान्वयस्तत्राजहती यथा छत्रिणो ग-
 च्छन्तीति । यत्र वाच्यैकदेशत्यागेनैकदेशान्वयस्तत्र जहदजहती यथा
 तत्त्वमसीति' । गौण्यपि लक्षणैव लक्ष्यमाणगुणसम्बन्धरूपा । अग्निर्माणवक
 इति ॥ व्यञ्जनापि शक्तिलक्षणान्तर्भूता । अर्थशक्तिमूला चानुमानादिनान्य-
 थासिद्धा' ॥

तात्पर्यानुपपत्तिर्लक्षणाबीजम् । तत्प्रतीतीच्छयोच्चरित्वं तात्पर्यम् ।
 तात्पर्यज्ञानं च वाक्यार्थज्ञाने हेतुः । नानार्थानुरोधात्तु प्रकरणादिकं
 तात्पर्यग्राहकम् । द्वारमित्यादौ पिधेहीति शब्दाध्याहारः । नन्वर्थज्ञानार्थ-
 त्वाच्छब्दस्यार्थमविज्ञाय शब्दाध्याहारासंभवादर्थध्याहार एव युक्त इति
 चेन्न पदविशेषजन्यपदार्थोपस्थितेः शाब्दज्ञानहेतुत्वात् । अन्यथा घटः
 कर्मत्वमानयनं कृतिरित्यत्रापि शाब्दज्ञानप्रसङ्गात् ॥

पङ्कजादिपदेषु योगरूढिः । अवयवशक्तिर्योगः । समुदायशक्ती रूढिः ।
 नियतपञ्चत्वज्ञानार्थं समुदायशक्तिः । अन्यथा कुमुदेऽपि प्रयोगप्रसङ्गः ।
 इतरान्विते शक्तिरिति प्राभाकराः । अन्वयस्य वाक्यार्थतया भानसं-
 भवादन्वयांशेऽपि शक्तिर्न कल्पनीयेति गौतमीयाः ॥

1 M N F and Q add मधुनि पिबति
 after मधुकरः but wrongly; J
 supplies the ellipsis by तिष्ठति
 more correctly. A reads सिद्ध
 for प्रसिद्ध incorrectly.

2 G here adds सोऽयं देवदत्त इति च.

3 The text of T D is here un-
 doubtedly tampered with. J
 alone gives the reading adopt-
 ed, which seems to be the

correct one as it is supported
 by Nil. A L omit शक्ति before
 लक्षणान्तर्भूता. A L C P make
 अर्थशक्तिमूला च part of the pre-
 vious sentence. F N and Q
 add शब्दशक्तिमूला before and
 M पदशक्तिमूला after अर्थशक्ति-
 मूला. Q V Z make the two
 sentences one. Y Z have भूत-
 त्वात् and मूलत्वात् भूता and
 मूला respectively.

न्या. वो.—शब्दं लक्षयति—आप्तेति¹। पदज्ञानं करणम्। वृत्ति-
ज्ञानसहकृतपदज्ञानजन्यपदार्थोपस्थितिर्व्यापारः। वाक्यार्थज्ञानं शाब्द-
बोधः फलम्। वृत्तिर्नाम शक्तिलक्षणान्यतररूपा। शक्तिर्नाम²
घटादिविशेष्यकघटादिपदजन्यबोधविषयत्वप्रकारकेश्वरसंकेतः। ईश्वर-
संकेतो नामेश्वरेच्छा सैव शक्तिरित्यर्थः। शक्तिनिरूपकत्वमेव पदे
शक्तत्वम्। विषयतासंबन्धेन शक्त्याश्रयत्वमर्थे शक्यत्वम्। शक्यसंबन्धो
लक्षणा। सा द्विविधा। गौणी शुद्धा चेति। गौणी नाम सादृश्यविशिष्ट-
लक्षणा यथा सिंहो माणवक इत्यादौ सिंहपदस्य सिंहसादृश्यविशिष्टे ल-
क्षणा। शुद्धापि द्विविधा जहलक्षणाजहलक्षणा चेति³। लक्ष्यतावच्छेदक-
रूपेण लक्ष्यमात्रबोधिका जहलक्षणा यथा गङ्गायां घोष इत्यत्र गङ्गापद-
शक्यप्रवाहसम्बन्धस्य तीरे सत्त्वात् तादृशशक्यसम्बन्धरूपलक्षणाज्ञानात्
गङ्गापदात्तीरोपस्थितिः। लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकरूपेण लक्ष्यशक्योभय-
बोधप्रयोजिकाजहलक्षणा। यथा काकेभ्यो दधि रक्ष्यतामित्यत्र काक-
पदस्य दध्युपघातके लक्षणा। लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकं दध्युपघातकत्वं तेन
रूपेण दध्युपघातकानां काकविडालकुक्कुटसारमेयादीनां शक्यलक्ष्याणां
सर्वेषां बोधात्। जहदजहलक्षणा वेदान्तिनां मते⁴॥

[६०]

आकाङ्क्षा योग्यता संनिधिश्च वाक्यार्थज्ञानहेतुः। पदस्य
पदान्तरव्यतिरेकप्रयुक्तान्वयाननुभावकत्वमाकाङ्क्षा। अर्थाबाधो
योग्यता। पदानामविलम्बेनोच्चारणं संनिधिः॥

1 S T and W insert here six sentences explaining the पद-
कृत्य of the definition of शब्दः
but they are absent in older
Mss. U prints them in brac-
kets as an interpolation.

2 The reading is that of U V
and K. K omits शक्तिर्नाम, and
T and W omit घटादिविशेष्यक;
while O reads simply शक्ति-
र्नामेश्वरेच्छा। सैव शक्तिरित्यर्थः.

3 S T and W read त्रिविधा for
द्विविधा and add जहदजहलक्षणा
as a third species.

4 In the place of this short
sentence S T and W have
शक्यतावच्छेदकरूपारत्यागेन व्यक्ति-
मात्रबोधनाजहदजहलक्षणा। इयं
च लक्षणा जीवब्रह्मणोरैक्यं वदतां
वेदान्तिनां सिद्धान्तरीत्या.

त. दी.—आकाङ्क्षेति । आकाङ्क्षादिज्ञानमित्यर्थः । अन्यथाकाङ्क्षा-
दिभ्रमाच्छाब्दभ्रमो न स्यात् । आकाङ्क्षां लक्षयति—पदस्येति ॥ योग्य-
तालक्षणमाह—अर्थेति ॥ संनिधिलक्षणमाह—पदानामिति । अवि-
लम्बेन पदार्थोपस्थितिः संनिधिः । उच्चारणं तु तदुपयोगितया युक्तम् ॥

न्या. बो.—आकाङ्क्षेति । अव्यवहितोत्तरत्वादिसंबन्धेन यत्पदे यत्पद-
प्रकारज्ञानव्यतिरेकप्रयुक्तो यादृशशाब्दबोधाभावस्तादृशशाब्दबोधे तत्पदे
तत्पदवत्त्वमाकाङ्क्षा^१ । तादृशाकाङ्क्षाज्ञानं शाब्दबोधे कारणम् ॥ अर्थाबाध
इति । बाधाभावो योग्यतेत्यर्थः ॥

[६१]

आकाङ्क्षादिरहितं वाक्यमप्रमाणम् । यथा गौरश्चः पुरुषो
हस्तीति न प्रमाणमाकाङ्क्षाविरहात् । अग्निना सिञ्चेदिति न प्र-
माणं योग्यताविरहात् । ग्रहरे ग्रहरेऽसहोच्चारितानि गामानये-
त्यादिपदानि न प्रमाणं सांनिध्याभावात् ॥

त. दी.—गौरश्च इति । घटः कर्मत्वमित्यनाकाङ्क्षोदाहरणं द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

न्या. बो.—अग्निना सिञ्चेदिति । अत्र सेककरणत्वस्य जलादि-
धर्मस्य वह्नौ बाधनिश्चयसत्त्वाच्च तादृशवाक्याच्छाब्दबोधः संभवति ॥
सन्निधिं निरूपयति—असहोच्चारितानीति ॥ असहोच्चारितानि वि-
लम्बेनोच्चारितानि ॥

[६२]

वाक्यं द्विविधम् । वैदिकं लौकिकं च । वैदिकमीश्वरोक्तत्वा-
त्सर्वमेव प्रमाणम् । लौकिकं त्वामोक्तं प्रमाणम् । अन्यदप्रमाणम् ॥

त. दी.—वाक्यं विभजते—वाक्यमिति । वैदिकस्य विशेषमाह—

वैदिकमीश्वरोक्तत्वादिति । ननु वेदस्यानादित्वात्कथमीश्वरोक्तत्वमिति चेन्न । वेदः पौरुषेयो वाक्यसमूहत्वाद्भारतादिवत् । न च स्मर्यमाणकर्तृत्वमुपाधिः । गौतमादिभिः शिष्यपरंपरया वेदेऽपि कर्तृस्मरणेन^१ साधनव्यापकत्वात् । “ तस्मात्तेपानात्त्रयो वेदा अजायन्त ” इति श्रुतेश्च ॥

ननु वर्णा नित्याः ‘स एवायं गकार’ इति प्रत्यभिज्ञाबलात् । तथा च कथं वेदस्यानित्यत्वमिति चेन्न उत्पन्नो गकारो नष्टो गकार इति प्रतीत्या वर्णानामनित्यत्वात् ‘सोऽयं गकार’ इति प्रत्यभिज्ञायाः सेऽयं दीपज्वालेति-वत्साजात्यालम्बनत्वात् वर्णानां नित्यत्वेऽप्यानुपूर्वीविशिष्टवाक्यस्यानित्यत्वाच्च । तस्मादीश्वरोक्तो वेदः ॥ मन्वादिस्मृतीनामाचाराणां च वेदमूलकतया प्रामाण्यम् । स्मृतिमूलवाक्यानामिदानीमनध्ययनात्तन्मूलभूता काचिच्छाखोच्छिन्नेति कल्प्यते । ननु पठ्यमानवेदवाक्योत्सादस्य कल्पयितुमशक्यतया विप्रकीर्णवादस्यायुक्तत्वान्नित्यानुमेयो वेदो मूलमिति चेन्न । तथापि वर्णानुपूर्वीज्ञानाभावेन बोधकत्वासंभवात् ॥

न्या. वो.—वैदिकं लौकिकं चेति ॥ वैदिकं वेदवाक्यमित्यर्थः । इदमुपलक्षणम् । वेदमूलकस्मृत्यादीन्यपि ग्राह्याणि । लौकिकमिति । वेदवाक्यभिन्नमित्यर्थः^२ । आसत्त्वं प्रयोगहेतुभूते यथार्थज्ञानवत्त्वम् ॥ इति शब्दपरिच्छेदः ॥

[६३]

वाक्यार्थज्ञानं शाब्दज्ञानम् । तत्करणं शब्दः ॥

त. दी.—नन्वेतानि पदानि स्वस्मारितार्थसंसर्गवन्ति आकाङ्क्षादिमत्पदकदम्बकत्वात् ‘सद्वाक्यवदित्यनुमानादेव संसर्गज्ञानसंभवाच्छब्दो न प्रमाणान्तरमिति चेन्न । अनुमित्यपेक्षया शाब्दज्ञानस्य विलक्षणस्य शब्दात्पत्येमीत्यनुव्यवसायसाक्षिकस्य सर्वसंमतत्वात् ॥

1 N F and Q here add इत्यनुमानेन पौरुषेयत्वासिद्धेः; Z adds इत्यनुमानात्.

2 A reads कर्तुः स्मर्यमाणत्वेन; N F and Q have सकर्तृकत्वस्मरणेन.

3 Q inserts तपः before तेपानात्.

4 This is the reading of L and M; C J N P Y Z have the same without सा before जात्या;

A reads सोऽयं दीप इति प्रत्यभिज्ञानवज्जात्यालम्बनत्वात्.

5 A and F have तथा सति for तथापि.

6 K R and V omit this sentence, while S and W omit the next.

7 F and Q insert here गामानय दण्डेन इति मद्वाक्य°.

SECT. 68.] तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिण्या च सहितः

नन्वर्थापत्तिरपि प्रमाणान्तरमस्ति 'पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते' इति दृष्टे श्रुते वा पीनत्वान्यथानुपपत्त्या रात्रिभोजनमर्थापत्त्या कल्प्यत इति चेन्न । देवदत्तो रात्रौ भुङ्क्ते दिवाऽभुञ्जानत्वे सति पीनत्वादि-त्यनुमानेनैव रात्रिभोजनस्य सिद्धत्वात् । शते पञ्चाशदिति संभवोऽप्यनुमानमेव । इह वटे यक्षस्तिष्ठतीत्यैतिह्यमज्ञातमूलवक्तृकः शब्द एव । चेष्टापि शब्दानुमानद्वारा व्यवहारहेतुरिति न मानान्तरम् । तस्मात्प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानशब्दाश्चत्वार्येव प्रमाणानि ॥

सर्वेषां ज्ञानानां तद्वति तत्प्रकारकत्वं स्वतो ग्राह्यं परतो वेति विचार्यते । तत्र विप्रतिपत्तिः । ज्ञानप्रामाण्यं तदप्रामाण्याग्राहकयावज्ज्ञानग्राहक-सामग्रीग्राह्यं न वा । अत्र विधिकोटिः स्वतस्त्वम् । निषेधकोटिः परतस्त्वम् ॥ अनुमानग्राह्यत्वेन सिद्धसाधनतावारणाय यावदिति । 'इदं ज्ञानमप्रमेति' ज्ञानेन प्रामाण्यग्रहाद्वाधवारणायाप्रामाण्याग्राहकेति । इदं ज्ञानमप्रमेत्यनुव्यवसायनिष्ठप्रामाण्यग्राहकस्याप्रामाण्याग्राहकत्वाभावात्स्वतस्त्वं न स्यादतस्तदिति । तस्मिन्प्रामाण्याश्रयेऽप्रामाण्यग्राहक इत्यर्थः । उदाहृतस्थले व्यवसायेऽप्रामाण्यग्राहकस्याप्यनुव्यवसाये तदग्राहकत्वात्स्वतस्त्वसिद्धिः ॥ ननु स्वत एव प्रामाण्यं गृह्यते घटमहं जानामीत्यनुव्यवसायेन घटघटत्वयोरिव तत्संबन्धस्यापि विषयीकरणात् व्यवसायरूपप्रत्यासत्तेस्तुल्यत्वात् पुरोवर्तिनि प्रकारसंबन्धस्यैव प्रमात्वपदार्थत्वादिति चेन्न । स्वतःप्रामाण्यग्रहे जलज्ञानं प्रमा न वेत्यनभ्यासदशायां प्रमात्वसंशयो न स्यात् । अनुव्यवसायेन प्रामाण्यस्य निश्चितत्वात् । तस्मात्स्वतो ग्राह्यत्वाभावात्परतो ग्राह्यत्वम् । तथा हि । प्रथमं जलज्ञानानन्तरं प्रवृत्तौ सत्यां जललाभे सति पूर्वोत्पन्नं जलज्ञानं प्रमा समर्थप्रवृत्तिजनकत्वात् यन्नैवं तन्नैवम् यथाप्रमा इति व्यतिरेकिणा प्रमात्वं निश्चीयते ।

1 A here adds अनुपलब्धिर्न मान-
म् । परिशेषोपि अनुमात्यैव, but
the words seem to be spurious
as no other copy contains
them. They are also super-

fluous, as अनुपलब्धि has already
once been referred to, while
it is doubtful whether परिशेष
is recognized as an independent
proof.

द्वितीयादिज्ञानेषु पूर्वज्ञानदृष्टान्तेन तत्सजातीयत्वलिङ्गेनान्वयव्यतिरेकि-
णापि गृह्यते ॥

प्रमाया गुणजन्यत्वमुत्पत्तौ परतस्त्वम् । प्रमाऽसाधारणकारणं गुणः ।
अप्रमाऽसाधारणकारणं दोषः । तत्र प्रत्यक्षे विशेषणवद्विशेष्यसंनिकर्षो
गुणः अनुमितौ व्यापकवति व्याप्यज्ञानं उपमितौ यथार्थसादृश्यज्ञानं
शाब्दज्ञाने यथार्थयोग्यताज्ञानम् इत्याद्यहनीयम् । पुरोवर्तिनि प्रकारा-
भावस्य व्यवसायेनानुपस्थितत्वादप्रमात्वं परत एव गृह्यते पित्तादि-
दोषजन्यत्वादुत्पत्तौ परतस्त्वम् ॥

ननु सर्वज्ञानानां यथार्थत्वादयथार्थज्ञानमेव नास्ति । न च 'शुक्ता-
विदं रजतमिति' ज्ञानात्प्रवृत्तिदर्शनादन्यथाख्यातिसिद्धिरिति वाच्यम् ।
रजतस्मृतिपुरोवर्तिज्ञानाभ्यामेव प्रवृत्तिसंभवात् उपस्थितेष्टभेदाग्रहस्यैव
सर्वत्र प्रवर्तकत्वेन नेदं रजतमित्यादावतिप्रसङ्गाभावादिति चेन्न । सत्य-
रजतस्थले पुरोवर्तिविशेष्यकरजतत्वप्रकारकज्ञानस्य लाघवेन प्रवृत्ति-
जनकतया शुक्तावपि रजतार्थिप्रवृत्तिजनकत्वेन विशिष्टज्ञानस्यैव
कल्पनात् ॥

[६४]

अयथार्थानुभवस्त्रिविधः संशयविपर्ययतर्कभेदात् । एकस्मि-
न्धर्मीणि 'विरुद्धनानाधर्मवैशिष्ट्यावगाहि ज्ञानं संशयः । यथा
स्थाणुर्वा पुरुषो वेति । मिथ्याज्ञानं विपर्ययः । यथा शुक्ताविदं
रजतमिति । व्याप्यारोपेण व्यापकारोपस्तर्कः यथा यदि वहि-
र्न स्यात्तर्हि धूमोऽपि न स्यादिति ॥

त. दी.—अयथार्थानुभवं विभजते—अयथार्थेति । स्वप्नस्य मानसविपर्य-
यरूपत्वान्न त्रैविध्यविरोधः ॥ संशयलक्षणमाह—एकस्मिन्निति । 'घट-
पटा'विति समूहालम्बनेऽतिव्यासिवारणाय एकेति । 'घटो द्रव्य'मित्यादाव-

1 The passage is variously worded in different copies. The reading in the text is that of A B D F U and S. C. O G H Q and W have 'वैशिष्ट्य-

ज्ञानम्, while B J read 'विशिष्ट-
ज्ञानम्. E differs from all in giving 'विरुद्धनानाकोटिकं ज्ञानम्.
2 X has यथार्थ-निर्वाहः स्यात्तर्हि निर्भूतोपि स्यात्.

§ 66.] तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिण्या च सहितः

विव्यासिवारणाय विरुद्धेति । ' पटत्वविरुद्धघटत्ववानि ' त्यत्रातिव्यासि-
वारणाय नानेति ॥ विपर्ययलक्षणमाह—मिथ्येति । तदभाववति तत्प्र-
कारकनिश्चय इत्यर्थः ॥ तर्कं लक्षयति—व्याप्येति । यद्यपि तर्को
विपर्ययेऽन्तर्भवति तथापि प्रमाणानुग्राहकत्वाद्भेदेन कीर्तनम् ॥

न्या. बो.—यथार्थानुभवं निरूप्यायथार्थानुभवं विभजते—
संशयेत्यादिना । एकेति । एकधर्मावच्छिन्नविशेष्यतानिरूपितभावा-
भावप्रकारकं ज्ञानं संशय इत्यर्थः । भावद्वयकोटिकसंशयप्रसिद्धेः स्थाणुर्वे-
त्यत्र स्थाणुत्वस्थाणुत्वाभावपुरुषत्वपुरुषत्वाभावकोटिकः संशय इत्यर्थः ।
विपर्ययो नाम भ्रम इत्यर्थः ॥ व्याप्यारोपेणेति । तर्के व्याप्यस्य व्या-
पकस्य च व्यतिरेकनिश्चयः कारणम् । अन्यथाबाधनिश्चयाभाव इष्टा-
पत्तिदोषे तर्कानुत्पत्तेः ॥

[६५]

स्मृतिरपि द्विविधा^१ । यथार्थायथार्था च । प्रमाजन्या यथार्था ।
अप्रमाजन्यायथार्था ॥

त. दी.—स्मृतिं विभजते—स्मृतिरिति ॥

[६६]

सर्वेषामनुकूलतया वेदनीयं सुखम्^४ ॥

1 C K V omit this sentence, but as besides S T it is found in R also in a slightly different form, it is retained. The sentence as it stands in both S and R is corrupt and is therefore amended as above. S reads स्थाणुर्वेत्यादेः which is not intelligible, while R inserts एक before last कोटिक quite superfluously.

2 U and W read बाध for व्यतिरेक.

3 E H J K omit द्विविधा and join the two sentences. K adds इति after च.

4 It is impossible to ascertain the true reading of this and the next passage. A B C H J U and Q together with S. C. and V. V. agree in reading अनु-
कूलवेदनीयं and प्रतिकूलवेदनीयं respectively; while the other variants अनुकूलतया and प्रति-
कूलतया वेदनीयं are found in D E G K, as well as Nil. I have adopted the latter as being grammatically more correct, and being supported by the high authority of Nil.

त. दी.—सुखं लक्षयति—सर्वेषामिति । सुख्यहमित्याद्यनुव्यव-
सायगम्यं सुखत्वादिकमेव लक्षणम् । यथाश्रुतं तु स्वरूपकथनमिति
द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

न्या. बो.—सुखं निरूपयति—सर्वेषामिति । इतरेच्छाऽनधीनेच्छा-
विषयत्वमिति निष्कर्षः । यथाश्रुतेऽनुकूलत्वप्रकारकवेदनाविशेष्यत्वस्य
घटोऽनुकूल इत्याकारकज्ञानदशायामनुकूलत्वप्रकारकज्ञानविशेष्यत्वस्य घ-
टादावपि सत्त्वाद्धटादावतिव्याप्तिरिति निष्कृष्टलक्षणमुक्तम् । भोजना-
दावतिव्याप्तिवारणायेतरेच्छानधीनेच्छाविशेषणम् । सुखेच्छायाः सुख-
त्वप्रकारकज्ञानमालज्जन्यत्वात् ॥

[६७]

सर्वेषां प्रतिकूलतया वेदनीयं दुःखम् ॥

न्या. बो.—दुःखं निरूपयति—प्रतिकूलेति । अत्रापीतरद्वेषान-
धीनेद्वेषविषयत्वमिति निष्कृष्टलक्षणम् । द्वेषविषयत्वमालोक्तौ सर्पादावपि
द्वेषविषयत्वसत्त्वात्तत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणायेतरेद्वेषानधीनेति द्वेषविशेषणम् ।
सर्पजन्यदुःखादौ द्वेषात्सर्पद्वेष इति सर्पद्वेषस्य सर्पजन्यदुःखद्वेषजन्यत्वा-
दन्यद्वेषानधीनेद्वेषविषयत्वरूपलक्षणस्य सर्पादावसत्त्वान्नातिव्याप्तिः ।
फलेच्छोपायेच्छां प्रति कारणं । अतः फलेच्छावशादुपायेच्छा भवति । एवं
फलद्वेषादुपायद्वेषः ॥

[६८]

इच्छा कामः ॥

[६९]

क्रोधो द्वेषः ॥

[७०]

कृतिः प्रयत्नः ॥

[७१]

विहितकर्मजन्यो 'धर्मः' ॥

[७२]

निषिद्धकर्मजन्यस्त्वधर्मः ॥

न्या. बो.—धर्माधर्मौ निरूपयति—विहितेति । वेदविहितेत्यर्थः ।
 निषिद्धेति । वेदनिषिद्धेत्यर्थः ॥

[७३]

बुद्ध्यादयोऽष्टावात्ममात्रविशेषगुणाः^१ ॥

[७४]

बुद्धीच्छाप्रयत्ना^२ द्विविधाः । नित्या अनित्याश्च । नित्या ईश्व-
 रस्य । अनित्या जीवस्य ॥

[७५]

संस्कारस्त्रिविधः । वेगो भावना^३ स्थितिस्थापकश्चेति । वेगः
 पृथिव्यादिचतुष्टयमनोवृत्तिः^४ । अनुभवजन्या स्मृतिहेतुर्भावेनात्म-
 मात्रवृत्तिः । अन्यथा कृतस्य पुनस्तदवस्थापादकः^५ स्थितिस्थापकः
 कटादिपृथिवीवृत्तिः ॥

त. दी.—संस्कारं विभजते—संस्कार इति । संस्कारत्वजातिमा-
 न्संस्कारः । वेगस्याश्रयमाह—वेग इति । वेगत्वजातिमान्वेगः । भावनां
 लक्षयति—अनुभवेति । आत्मादावतिव्याप्तिवारणायानुभवेति । अ-
 नुभवध्वंसेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय स्मृतीति । स्मृतेरपि संस्कारजनकत्वं नवी-
 नैरुक्तम् ॥ स्थितिस्थापकं लक्षयति—अन्यथेति ॥ संख्यादयोऽष्टौ नैमि-
 त्तिकद्रवत्ववेगस्थितिस्थापकाः सामान्यगुणाः । अन्ये रूपादयो विशेष-

1 C and X read आत्मनो विशेष°,
 and K आत्मानि विशेष°; D omits
 विशेष.

2 G J Q U W X omit द्विविधाः
 and join the two sentences.

3 C K read स्थितस्थापकः.

4 E J X have वेगाख्यः; D G X
 insert मात्र after मनः;

5 D H J read तादवस्थापादकः; C
 and S. O. have तद्वस्थापकः

गुणाः । द्रव्यविभजकोपाधिद्रव्यसमानाधिकरणावृत्ति-द्रव्यकर्मावृत्ति'-जा-
तिमत्त्वं विशेषगुणत्वम् ॥

न्या. बो.—संस्कारं विभजते—संस्कार इति । भावनां लक्षयति ।
अनुभवेति । अनुभवजन्यत्वे सति स्मृतिहेतुत्वं भावनाया लक्षणम् ।
अत्रानुभवजन्यत्वे सतीति विशेषणानुपादाने आत्ममनःसंयोगेऽतिव्याप्ति-
रात्ममनःसंयोगस्य ज्ञानमात्रं प्रत्यक्षमवाधिकारणत्वेन स्मृतिं प्रत्यपि
कारणत्वादतस्तदुपादानम् । आत्ममनःसंयोगस्यानुभवजन्यत्वाभावाच्चा-
तिव्याप्तिः । तावन्मात्रे कृतेऽनुभवध्वंसेऽतिव्याप्तिः ध्वंसं प्रति प्रतियोगिनः
कारणत्वेनानुभवध्वंसस्याप्यनुभवजन्यत्वात् । अतः स्मृतिहेतुत्वोपादानम् ।
अनुभवध्वंसे स्मृतिहेतुत्वाभावान्नातिव्याप्तिः ॥

(७६)

चलनात्मकं कर्म^१ । ऊर्ध्वदेशसंयोगहेतुरुत्क्षेपणम् । अधोदेश-
संयोगहेतुरपक्षेपणम् । शरीरसंनिकृष्टसंयोगहेतुराकुञ्चनम् । विप्र-
कृष्टसंयोगहेतुः प्रसारणम् । अन्यत्सर्वं गमनम् । पृथिव्यादिचतु-
ष्टयमनोमात्रवृत्ति^२ ॥

त. दी.—कर्मणो लक्षणमाह—चलनेति । उत्क्षेपणादीनां कार्य-
भेदमाह—ऊर्ध्वेति । शरीरेति । वक्रत्वसंपादकमाकुञ्चनम् । ऋजुता-
संपादकं प्रसारणमित्यर्थः ॥

(७७)

नित्यमेकमनेकानुगतं सामान्यम् । द्रव्यगुणकर्मवृत्ति । तद्विधं
परापरभेदात् । परं सत्ता । अपरं द्रव्यत्वादिः^३ ॥

1 Instead of द्रव्यकर्मावृत्ति N has
गुणवृत्ति, Z adds गुण after जाति-
मत्. Other copies omit the
word altogether, but wrongly.

2 K adds तत्पञ्चविधम्.

3 A B D have शरीरस्य; E H J X
insert शरीर before विप्रकृष्ट also
in the next sentence.

4 K omits मात्र; G J add कर्म
after वृत्ति, perhaps better; Q

U and W omit the whole
sentence.

5 C E G J Q U X and W omit
तद्विधं परापरभेदात्. X has
instead परमाधिकवृत्ति । अपरं
न्यूनवृत्ति । H has परमपरं चेति
for परापरभेदात्, before द्रव्यगुण-
कर्मवृत्ति. A B D F insert जातिः
before द्रव्यत्वादिः.

त. दी.—सामान्यं लक्षयति—नित्यमिति । संयोगादावतिव्या-
प्तिवारणाय नित्यमिति^१ । परमाणुपरिमाणादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय—अने-
केति । अनुगतत्वं समवेतत्वं । तेन नाभावादावतिव्याप्तिः ॥

न्या. बो.—सामान्यं निरूपयति—नित्यमेकमिति । नित्यत्वे
सत्यनेकसमवेतत्वं सामान्यलक्षणमित्यर्थः । नित्यत्वविशेषणानुपादाने
संयोगादावतिव्याप्तिस्तत्राप्यनेकद्रव्यसमवेतत्वस्य सत्त्वात् तद्वारणाय नि-
त्यत्वापादानम् । अनेकसमवेतत्वानुपादान आकाशादावतिव्याप्तिस्तद्वार-
णायानेकसमवेतत्वविशेषणम् । अनेकत्वानुपादान आकाशगतैकत्वपरि-
माणादौ जलपरमाणुरूपादौ चातिव्याप्तिर्जलादिपरमाणुगतरूपादेराका-
शगतैकत्वपरिमाणादेर्नित्यत्वात्समवेतत्वाच्च । अतोऽनेक इति समवेत-
विशेषणम्^२ ॥

[७८]

नित्यद्रव्यवृत्तयो व्यावर्तका विशेषाः^३ ॥

त. दी.—विशेषं लक्षयति—नित्येति ॥

न्या. बो.—नित्यद्रव्यवृत्तय इति । नित्यद्रव्येषु परमाण्वादिषु
वर्तमानाः । अत एव व्यावर्तका इतरभेदानुमितिहेतवः । नित्यद्रव्य-
वृत्तित्वरूपपक्षधर्मताप्रयोज्येतरभेदानुमापकशालिन इत्यर्थः^४ ॥

[७९]

नित्यसंबन्धः समवायः । अयुतसिद्धवृत्तिः । ययोर्द्वयोर्मध्य एकम-
^५विनश्यदपराश्रितमेवावतिष्ठते तावयुतसिद्धौ । यथावयवावयविनौ
गुणगुणिनौ क्रियाक्रियावन्तौ जातिव्यक्ती विशेषनित्यद्रव्ये चेति^६ ॥

1 N places this sentence after the next, omitting आदि. Other copies except A J Y omit the sentence altogether. Y omits the next sentence. Q and F insert घटात्यन्ताभावो घटायनु-गतोप्यसमवेतः before तेन नाभावा^१.

2 The passage is variously read by K R V S U and W. Mss. C and V end here.

3 E G H K add अनन्ता एव after विशेषाः; X adds पृथिव्यादिवृत्त-

वृत्तस्य परमाणवः आकाशादिपक्षकं नित्यद्रव्याणि ।

4 This is a portion of a long abstruse passage in W not found in other Mss.

5 A B E J omit अभिनश्यत् which is however necessary.

6 E G J only insert यथा; but their reading has been adopted as making the sentence more grammatical.

त. दी.—समवायं लक्षयति—नित्येति । संयोगेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणाय नित्येति । आकाशादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय संबन्ध इति । अयुतसिद्धलक्षणमाह—ययोरिति । नीलो घट इति विशिष्टप्रतीतिविशेषणविशेष्यसंबन्धविषया विशिष्टप्रत्ययत्वाद्घण्टीति प्रत्ययवदिति समवायसिद्धिः । अवयवावयविनाविति । द्रव्यसमवायिकारणमवयवः । तज्जन्यद्रव्यमवयवि ॥

न्या. बो.—समवायं निरूपयति—नित्येति । संबन्धत्वं विशिष्टप्रतीतिनियामकत्वम् । तावन्मात्रोक्तौ संयोगेऽतिव्याप्तिरतो नित्येति विशेषणम् ॥ ययोर्मध्य इति । यन्निष्ठकालनिरूपिताधेयतासामान्यं यदवच्छिन्नं तदुभयान्यतरत्वमयुतसिद्धत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

(८०)

अनादिः सान्तः प्रागभावः । उत्पत्तेः पूर्वं कार्यस्य । सादिरनन्तः प्रध्वंसः । उत्पत्त्यनन्तरं कार्यस्य । त्रैकालिकसंसर्गावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकोऽत्यन्ताभावः । यथा भूतले घटो नास्तीति । तादात्म्यसंबन्धावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकोन्योन्याभावः यथा घटः पटो न भवतीति^१ ॥

त. दी.—प्रागभावं लक्षयति—अनादिरिति । आकाशादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय सान्त इति । घटादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय—अनादिरिति । प्रतियोगिसमवायिकारणवृत्तिः प्रतियोगिजनको भविष्यतीति व्यवहारहेतुः प्रागभावः ॥ प्रध्वंसं लक्षयति—सादिरिति । घटादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय—अनन्त इति । आकाशादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय—सादिरिति ॥ प्रतियोगिजन्यः प्रतियोगिसमवायिकारणवृत्तिर्ध्वस्तव्यवहारहेतुर्ध्वंसः ॥ अत्यन्ताभावं लक्षयति—त्रैकालिकेति ॥ अन्योन्याभावेतिव्याप्तिवारणाय संसर्गावच्छिन्नेति । ध्वंसप्रागभावयोरतिव्याप्तिवारणाय त्रैकालिकेति ॥ अन्योन्याभावं लक्षयति—तादात्म्येति । प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकारोप्य-

1 S T and W omit this sentence | 2 Q and U omit भवति,
and K. R. omit the next.

NOT: 80.] तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिण्या च सहितः

संसर्गभेदादेकप्रतियोगिकयोरप्यत्यन्ताभावान्योन्याभावयोर्वहुत्वम्^१। केवल-
देवदत्ताभावो दण्ड्यभाव इति प्रतीत्या विशिष्टाभावः^२। एकसत्त्वे
द्वौ न स्त इति प्रतीत्या द्वित्वावच्छिन्नोऽभावः। संयोगसंबन्धेन घटवति
समवायसंबन्धेन घटाभावः। तत्तद्धटाभावाद्धटत्वावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिक-
सामान्याभावश्चातिरिक्तः॥ एवमन्योन्याभावोऽपि। घटत्वावच्छिन्नः
पटो नास्तीति व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाभावो^३ नाङ्गीक्रि-
यते। पटे घटत्वं नास्तीति तस्यार्थः। अतिरिक्तत्वे स केवलान्वयी।

सामयिकाभावोऽत्यन्ताभाव एव समयविशेषे प्रतीयमानः। घटाभाव-
वति घटानयनेऽत्यन्ताभावस्यान्यत्र गमनाभावेऽप्यप्रतीतेर्घटापसरणे सति
प्रतीतेः। भूतले घटसंयोगप्रागभावप्रध्वंसयोरत्यन्ताभावप्रतीतिनियामक-
त्वं कल्प्यते। घटवति तत्संयोगप्रागभावप्रध्वंसयोरसत्त्वादत्यन्ताभावस्या-
प्रतीतिः। घटापसरणे च संयोगध्वंससत्त्वात्प्रतीतिरिति। केवलाधि-
करणादेव नास्तीति व्यवहारोपपत्तावभावो न पदार्थान्तरमिति गुरवः।
तत्र। अभावानङ्गीकारे कैवल्यस्य निर्वक्तुमशक्यत्वात्। अभावाभावो
भाव एव नातिरिक्तः अनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात्। ध्वंसप्रागभावः प्रागभावध्वंसश्च
प्रतियोग्येव^४। अभावाभावोतिरिक्त एव तृतीयाभावस्य प्रथमाभावरूप-
त्वान्नानवस्थेति नवीनाः॥

न्या. बो.—प्रागभावं निरूपयति—अनादिरिति। ध्वंसं निरूपयति

1 A's reading is corrupt and makes no sense. The reading of J has been adopted as the most intelligible; although even with it the passage is vague. N F Y Q and Z agree with J but omit अपि; W has भिन्नत्वं for बहुत्वं.

2 The passage seems to have been tampered with. The reading of A J is retained in the text, as being most probably the original. After: दण्ड्यभावः

P adds केवलदेवदत्तसद्भावेऽपि दण्डाभावे दण्ड्यभावः; all other copies read देवदत्ताभावात्, and some of them omit the following words up to प्रतीत्या.

3 C L M N Y Z omit the word प्रतियोगिताक, which however makes no difference of sense as both expressions are common.

4 N F and Q add इति प्राग्; after एव, but the words seem to be interpolated.

सादिरिति । अत्यन्ताभावं निरूपयति—त्रैकालिकेति¹ ॥ अन्योन्या-
भावं निरूपयति—तादात्म्येति¹ ॥

[८१]

सर्वेषां पदार्थानां यथायथमुक्तेष्वन्तर्भावात्सप्तैव पदार्था इति
सिद्धम्² ॥

त. दी.—ननु प्रमाण—प्रमेय—संशय—प्रयोजन—दृष्टान्त—सिद्धान्ता-
वयव—तर्क—निर्णय—वाद—जल्प—वितण्डा—हेत्वाभास—च्छल—जाति—निग्रहस्था-
नानां तत्त्वज्ञानाभिधेयसाधिगम इति न्यायशास्त्रे षोडशपदार्थानामुक्त-
त्वात्कथं सप्तैवेत्यत आह—सर्वेषामिति । सर्वेषां सप्तस्वेवान्तर्भाव
इत्यर्थः । ‘ आत्मशरीरेन्द्रियार्थमनोबुद्धिप्रवृत्तिदोषप्रेत्यभावफलदुःखाप-
वर्गास्तु प्रमेयमिति ’ द्वादशविधं प्रमेयम् । प्रवृत्तिर्धर्माधर्मौ । रागद्वेषमोहा
दोषाः । राग इच्छा । द्वेषो मन्युः । मोहः शरीरादावात्मभ्रमः ।
प्रेत्यभावो मरणम् । फलं भोगः । अपवर्गो मोक्षः । स च स्वसमाना-
धिकरणदुःखप्रागभावासमानकालीनदुःखध्वंसः । प्रयोजनं सुखं दुःख-
हानिश्च³ । दृष्टान्तो महानसादिः । प्रामाणिकत्वेनाभ्युपगतोऽर्थः सि-
द्धान्तः । निर्णयो निश्चयः । स च प्रमाणफलम् । तत्त्वबुभुत्सोः कथा वादः ।
उभयसाधनवती विजिगीषुकथा जल्पः । स्वपक्षस्थापनहीना वितण्डा ।
कथा नाम नानावक्तृकः पूर्वोत्तरपक्षप्रतिपादकवाक्यसंदर्भः । अभिप्रा-
यान्तरेण प्रयुक्तस्यार्थान्तरं प्रकल्प्य दूषणं छलम् । असदुत्तरं जातिः । सा-
धर्म्यवैधर्म्योत्कर्षापकर्षवर्ण्यवर्ण्यविकल्पसाध्यप्राप्त्यप्राप्तिप्रसङ्गप्रतिदृष्टान्ता-
नुत्पत्तिसंशयप्रकरणहेत्वर्थपत्त्यविशेषोपपत्त्युपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिनित्यानित्य—
कार्याकार्यसमा जातयः । वादिनोऽपजयहेतुर्निग्रहस्थानम् । प्रतिज्ञा-
हानिः प्रतिज्ञान्तरं प्रतिज्ञाविरोधः प्रतिज्ञासंन्यासो हेत्वन्तरम् अर्था-

1 S T U and W omit this, ex-
cept त्रैकालिकेति, and instead
of it give a long passage
which is not found in other
copies.

2 J K Q and W insert अपि, and

E एव, after सर्वेषां; they also
insert एव after उक्तेषु.

3 This is the reading of O G J
L P Y Z. A has सुखं दुःखं
हानिश्च which makes no sense.
N reads प्राप्तिः after सुख.

81.] तर्कदीपिकया न्यायबोधिण्या च सहितः

न्तरं निरर्थकं अविज्ञातार्थकं अपार्थक्यं अप्राप्तकालं न्यूनं अधिकं पुनरुक्तं
 अननुभाषणं अज्ञानं अप्रतिभाविक्षेपः मतानुज्ञा पर्यनुयोज्योपेक्षणं
 निरनुयोज्यानुयोगः अपसिद्धान्तः हेत्वाभासश्च निग्रहस्थानानि । शेषं
 सुगमम् ॥

ननु करतलानलसंयोगे सत्यपि प्रतिबन्धके सति दाहानुत्पत्तेः शक्तिः
 पदार्थान्तरमिति चेन्न । प्रतिबन्धकाभावस्य कार्यमात्रे कारणत्वेन शक्ते-
 रनुपयोगात् कारणस्यैव शक्तिपदार्थत्वात् । ननु भस्मादिना कांस्यादौ
 शुद्धिदर्शनादाधेयशक्तिरङ्गीकार्येति चेन्न । भस्मादिसंयोगसमानकाली-
 नास्पृश्यस्पर्शप्रतियोगिकयावदभावसहितभस्मादिसंयोगध्वंसस्य शुद्धि-
 पदार्थत्वात् ।

स्वत्वमपि न पदार्थान्तरम् । यथेष्टविनियोगयोग्यत्वस्य स्वत्वरूप-
 त्वात् । तदवच्छेदकं च प्रतिग्रहादिलब्धत्वमेवेति ॥

अथ विधिर्निरूप्यते । प्रयत्नजनकचिकीर्षाजनकज्ञानविषयो विधिः ।
 तत्प्रतिपादको लिङादिर्वा । कृत्यसाध्ये प्रवृत्त्यदर्शनात् कृतिसाध्यता-
 ज्ञानं प्रवर्तकम् । न च विषमक्षणादौ प्रवृत्तिप्रसङ्गः । इष्टसाधनतालि-
 ङ्गककृतिसाध्यताज्ञानस्य काम्यस्थले नित्यनैमित्तिकस्थले च विहित-
 कालजीवित्वनिमित्तकज्ञानजन्यस्यैव प्रवर्तकत्वात् । न चाननुगमः स्व-
 विशेषणवत्ताप्रतिसंधानजन्यत्वस्यानुगतत्वादिति गुरवः । तन्न । लाघवेन
 कृतिसाध्येष्टसाधनताज्ञानस्यैव चिकीर्षाद्वारा प्रयत्नजनकत्वात् । न च
 नित्ये इष्टसाधनत्वाभावादप्रवृत्तिप्रसङ्गस्तत्रापि प्रत्यवायपरिहारस्य पाप-
 क्षयस्य च फलत्वकल्पनात् । तस्मात्कृतिसाध्येष्टसाधनत्वमेव लिङाद्यर्थः ।
 ननु “ ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेत ” इत्यत्र लिङा स्वर्गसाधनकार्यं

1 G reads शुद्धिदर्शनात् शुद्धिः प-
 दार्थान्तरमिति चेन्न.

2 A P read प्रत्यवाय for प्रयत्न,
 which is wrong; M has प्रति-
 वृत्त, which is probably a mis-
 take for प्रवृत्ति.

3 N and Q add कृतिसाध्ये प्रवृत्ति-
 दर्शनात् after प्रवृत्त्यदर्शनात्, but

it is superfluous. A P wrongly
 separate ज्ञान from साध्यता
 and join it to प्रवर्तकम्, which
 makes no sense.

4 C L M N Q Y Z put this be-
 fore नित्यनैमित्तिक°. A and Q
 have ज्ञानजन्यत्वस्य; J is
 doubtful

प्रतीयते । यागस्याशुविनाशिनः कालान्तरमाविस्वर्गसाधनत्वायोगात्त-
द्योग्यं स्थायिकार्यपूर्वमेव लिङाद्यर्थः¹ ॥ कार्यं कृतिसाध्यम् । कृतेः
सविषयत्वात् । विषयाकाङ्क्षायां यागो विषयत्वेनान्वेति । कस्य कार्य-
मिति² नियोज्याकाङ्क्षायां स्वर्गकामपदं नियोज्यपरतयान्वेति । कार्य-
बोद्धा नियोज्यः । तेन 'ज्योतिष्टोमनामकयागविषयकं स्वर्गकामस्य
कार्य'मिति वाक्यार्थः संपद्यते । वैदिकलिङ्त्वात्³ " यावज्जीवमग्निहोत्रं
जुहुयात् " इति नित्यवाक्येऽप्यपूर्वमेव वाच्यं कल्प्यते । " आरोग्य-
कामो भैषजपानं कुर्यात् " इत्यादौ लौकिकलिङः क्रियाकार्ये लक्षणेति
चेन्न । यागस्याप्ययोग्यतानिश्चयाभावेन साधनतया प्रतीत्यनन्तरं तन्निर्वा-
हार्थमवान्तरव्यापारतया अपूर्वकल्पनात् । कीर्तनादिनानाश्रुतेर्न⁴
यागध्वंसो व्यापारः । लोकव्युत्पत्तिबलात्क्रियायामेव कृतिसाध्येष्टसाध-
नत्वं लिङा बोध्यत इति लिङ्त्वेन रूपेण विध्यर्थत्वम् । आख्यातत्वेन
प्रयत्नार्थकत्वम् । पचति पाकं करोतीति विवरणदर्शनात् किं करोतीति
प्रश्ने पचतीत्युत्तराच्चाख्यातस्य प्रयत्नार्थकत्वनिश्चयात् । रथो गच्छती-
त्यादावनुकूलव्यापारे लक्षणा " देवदत्तः पचति तण्डुलान्देवदत्तेन पच्यते
तण्डुलः " इत्यत्र कर्तृकर्मणोर्नाख्यातार्थत्वं किंतु तद्रूपैकत्वादीनामेव ।
तयोराक्षेपादेव लाभः । प्रजयतीत्यादौ धातोरेव प्रकर्षे शक्तिः । उप-
सर्गाणां द्योतकत्वमेव । न तत्र शक्तिरस्ति ॥

पदार्थज्ञानस्य परमं प्रयोजनं मोक्षः । तथा हि । "आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः
श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः" इति श्रुत्या श्रवणादीनामात्म-
साक्षात्कारहेतुत्वबोधनात् । श्रुत्या देहादिविलक्षणात्मज्ञाने सत्यप्यसं-
भावनाऽनिवृत्तेर्युक्त्यनुसन्धानरूपमननसाध्यत्वात् मननोपयोगिपदार्थ-

1 A J Z omit आद.

2 A reads wrongly अन्वितस्य
कार्यमिति for अन्वति कस्य कार्य-
मिति.

3 This is the reading of J N.
A P have वैदिकालिङ्त्वात्. L
वैदिकालिङ्त्वात्, M वैदिकालिङ्ग-

त्वात्, Z वैदिकालिङ्गत्वात्, all of
which appear to be wrong.

4 This is the reading of Q; J
N Y and Z read नाऽनाशं,
while A reads कीर्तनादिना न
श्रुतेस्तेन, both of which make no
sense; L M P are also corrupt.



NOTES.

SECT. I.

मङ्गलम्.

*“ Having enshrined the Lord of the universe in my heart,
and having made a salutation to the preceptor, I compose this Compendium of all
knowable things for the easy comprehension
of beginners.”*

Opening prayer.

1. Following the usual orthodox practice, the author begins his work with a prayer to the deity and a salutation to the preceptor. This मङ्गल, say the commentators, is necessary for the completion of a work, and for two reasons; first because it is enjoined by the *Śruti*, and secondly because its necessity is proved by inference. Of course there is no express Vedic text enjoining the मङ्गल, but the existence of such a text can be assumed on the authority of good usage (शिष्टाचार), by the well-known rule laid down by *Jaimini* असति ह्यनुमानम् 'a *Śruti* text is to be inferred when an express one is not to be found.' The argument for inferring 'a *Śruti* text on the authority of शिष्टाचार is thus stated by T. D.—A मङ्गल is an act enjoined by the Vedas, because it has always been the object (विषय) of uncommon (अलौकिक) and unprohibited (अविगीत) practice of wise men, like दर्श and other rites. It is obvious that this inference is only available for the assumption of a text, when the शिष्टाचार happens to be अलौकिक (uncommon or sacred) and अविगीत (unprohibited). An अलौकिकशिष्टाचार is that which is not रागादिप्राप्त, i. e. caused by our own inclinations, such as the ordinary human acts of eating and drinking, but which is practised as a duty rather than as a pleasure; while it is अविगीत when it is not expressly prohibited by *Śruti* like the performance of a *Śrāddha* ceremony at night.

शास्त्रः i. e. one who has mastered grammar, poetry and vocabulary, but does not know Logic. सुखबोधाय explains the purpose (प्रयोजन) why a new work like this is undertaken, when there were already many ably written treatises on the subject. The name तर्कसंग्रह at once explains the subject matter (विषय), namely तर्क, as well as its connection with the method of treatment adopted in the book (संगति). तर्क is defined as तर्क्यन्ते प्रतिपाद्यन्त इति तर्कः द्रव्यादिसत्तवादार्थः. The word तर्क is employed in *Nyāya* writings in several different senses, but the one intended here is quite unusual. It is rarely met with anywhere except in the titles of a few manuals similar to the present work, such as तर्ककौमुदी, तर्कभाषा, तर्कवल्ली and तर्कामृत. संग्रह primarily means a collection but here it signifies a compendium or brief exposition. T. D. and T. C. define it simply संक्षेपेण स्वस्वरूपयनम्. V. V. and S. C. give a more elaborate definition, making a संग्रह comprise three parts, namely, उद्देश (simple enumeration), लक्षण (definition) and परीक्षा (examination or exposition). The present book contains all these three. पदार्थोद्देश from Sec. 2 to Sec. 9 and their लक्षण and परीक्षा together from Sec. 10 to the end.

4. Either the passage मङ्गले कृतसि etc. is corrupt or the author has committed a strange solecism.

A disputed reading I have retained the reading of A, because, while it is found in most of the copies, it is not much worse than the others given by F, Q or N. If *Kiraṇāvali* and *Kādambārī* are the well-known works of that name, they are quite inappropriate as *opposite* instances of the efficacy of मङ्गल. *Kiraṇāvali*, if it be the commentary on *Prasastapāda*'s scholium on the aphorisms of *Kaṇāda*, by the famous logician *Udayanācārya*, is supposed to be an unfinished work, said to extend only as far as the section on बुद्धि; but the eight Mss. collected by Pandit Vindhyaśwari Prasād Dube for his edition in Benares Sanskrit Series contain only the chapters on द्रव्य and गुण. It however begins with a मङ्गल to the Sun and Creator, and may therefore be a fit instance of non-completion in spite of मङ्गल. But *Kādambārī* too, if it is the same as the well-known work of *Baṇabhaṭṭa*, remained unfinished, although it opens with no less than 20 verses of मङ्गल. *Kādambārī* therefore cannot

serve as a counter-instance of a work completed without a मङ्गल unless of course we resort to the two-fold supposition, that its completion by the author's son is to be considered as समाप्ति proper, and that the opening मङ्गल does not form part of the book. The latter supposition is apparently supported by T. D's subsequent words कादम्बर्यादौ ग्रन्थाद्वहिरेव मङ्गले कृतं which are interpreted by some to mean that the मङ्गल verses are outside the book. But the interpretation is not approved by *Nilakaṇṭha* who takes the word बहिः to mean जन्मान्तरादौ. Either therefore the author committed a mistake or he meant some other *Kādambarī* which is not known at present. The difficulty is no doubt removed in M. which reads बौद्धग्रन्थादौ for कादम्बर्यादौ, but the reading is not supported by any other copy and is probably an emendation of some one who perceived the mistake. The commentator T. C. also omits *Kādambarī*, and mentions in its stead a प्रमत्ता-लुहितग्रन्थ. The other readings given in F, Q and N, and apparently supported by *Nilakaṇṭha* and S. C., are equally faulty, since although the solecism as regards *Kādambarī* is removed, a similar one is committed about *Kiraṇūvali* which is neither completed nor is devoid of मङ्गल. T. C. and S. C. avoid the difficulty about *Kiraṇūvali* by substituting नास्तिक-ग्रन्थादौ for it. Of course there is the possibility that *Kiraṇūvali* may have been finished by its author and a portion of it is now lost; but the supposition is improbable, and does not lessen a whit the difficulty as regards the actual presence of मङ्गल. Some have supposed that the *Kiraṇūvali* mentioned here is a नास्तिकग्रन्थ, and not the commentary of *Udayana*, but no such work is known. In short whatever reading we accept, the difficulty created by the mention of *Kiraṇūvali* and *Kādambarī* as opposite instances is insuperable, since both of them, being incomplete in spite of a long or short मङ्गल, are works exactly of the same nature.

SECT. II. पदार्थाः

"There are seven Categories:--Substance, Quality, Action, Generality, Particularity, Co-inherence or Intimate relation and Negation."

1. The *Dīpikā* following the etymological sense of the word (पदस्य अर्थः) defines a पदार्थ as 'a thing having a name' (अभिधेयत्वं पदार्थसामान्यलक्षणम्). अर्थ is a thing to which the senses travel (क्वच्छन्तीन्द्रियाणि यं सः), i. e. any external object which is comprehended by the senses. पदार्थ, therefore, means any object that is namable. Other definitions of पदार्थ convey the same sense. S. C. defines पदार्थत्वम् as ज्ञेयत्वम्, while T. C. and S. P. as प्रमितिविषयत्वम्, i. e. any thing which is an object of knowledge. A thing however which is knowable must also have a name; and so knowability (ज्ञेयत्व) and namability (अभिधेयत्व) regarded as definitions of पदार्थ are interchangeable. The word is invariably used by the *Vaiśeṣikas* in this composite sense.

2. The rendering of the word पदार्थ by 'category,' though not quite accurate, is convenient Aristotle's categories, and useful for all practical purposes. Ballantyne used the word 'category,'

while Colebrook translated पदार्थ by 'predicament'; but both renderings are inaccurate, inasmuch as they imply something which can be predicated of another, while पदार्थ implies not only a thing which is predicable of another, but also a thing which is capable of having something predicated of it. Categories, especially in the Aristotelian sense, are a classification of predicates only, and not an enumeration of all namable things (including both subjects and predicates as the *Padārthas* of the *Vaiśeṣikas* are. In this respect, the classification of the *Vaiśeṣikas* is superior to that of Aristotle. The latter enumerated ten categories, 1 Substance, 2 Quantity, 3 Quality, 4 Relation, 5 Place, 6 Time, 7 Posture, 8 Appurtenance or Property, 9 Activity and 10 Passivity. Of these the last nine only can be properly said to be predicable of something else, i. e. substance, but sub-

stance itself, being assumed to be an *Ens* (Being) independent of all attributes, cannot be predicated of anything. It cannot be predicated even of itself, because in that case it will be an attribute and not substance. Thus in including substance among the categories Aristotle confounded the notion of a predicable with that of a namable thing; but *Kaṇāda* is not open to the charge inasmuch as his *Dravya* is a namable thing, and therefore a *Padārtha*. Notwithstanding this distinction, however, the word category has been employed in so many senses by subsequent European philosophers that one is almost justified in using it as an equivalent of पदार्थ also. In the history of philosophy, the categories have been successively a classification of universal things, or of words, or of forms of thought; and consequently they have now come to mean simply the highest classes to which all the objects of knowledge can be reduced and in which they can be arranged in subordination and system. In this general sense, *Kaṇāda's Padārthas* are as much categories as those of Aristotle or of Kant or of Mill; only that their number and arrangement would vary according to the fundamental principle on which the classification is based, and the purpose for which it is intended. The classification of Aristotle is mainly logical, that of *Kaṇāda* metaphysical. One is concerned with notions and propositions, the other with external objects which give rise to those notions. The seven *Padārthas* of the *Vaiśeṣikas* can therefore be easily apportioned among the categories of Aristotle. *Dravya* and *Guṇa* correspond to Substance and Quality, respectively. Aristotle's Quantity is classed among the *Guṇas* by *Kaṇāda*. Relation is of two kinds: *Sāmyoga* and *Samarāya*, the first of which is a *Guṇa* and the second a distinct *Padārtha*. The remaining categories really fall under relation in its widest sense, but some of them are separately recognized by the *Vaiśeṣikas*. Thus Time and Place are *Dravyas*. Activity is *Karma* while Passivity is simply negation of it. Property may be *Sāmānya*, *Viśeṣa* or any common attribute called by later *Naiyāyikas* an *Upādhi*. Lastly Posture is संस्थानविशेष and is at best a *Guṇa*. Aristotle does not mention *Abhāva* or negation as he deals only with *Ens* or Being.

3. The various classifications of *Padārthas*, given by Indian systematists, can be likewise reduced to the seven *Padārthas* and *vice versa*, if one clearly understands beforehand the particular standpoint of each. *Nyāya* writings do not explain the process by which the seven-fold division of *Padārthas* was first obtained, but if we may make a guess, the process must have been something

Classifications of Padārthas. like this. A notion is either positive or negative, and so the external object of a

notion might be भाव or अभाव. भाव things, again are of two kinds, properties and a *common* substratum in which they reside. The latter is द्रव्य. Of the properties, again, some reside in many objects conjointly, others in individual things singly. The first is सामान्य, while the latter class is again divisible into properties that are stationary and those that are evanescent *i. e.* गुण and कर्म. The remaining two *Padārthas*, समवाय and विशेष, are assumed to explain the special theories of *Vaiśeṣikas*. Other Indian philosophical schools also have their own classification of things, suited to their particular doctrine or theory. Every system of science or philosophy in ancient times thought it necessary to begin by arranging the Universe into a few elementary classes. Thus *Gotama* enumerates sixteen *Padārthas*, necessary for the functions of logic; the *Vedāntins* have two, *Cit* and *Acit*; the *Rāmānujas*, one more, *Īśvara*; the *Sāṅkh-yas*, twenty-five; the *Mīmāṃsakas* eight; and so on. All schools do not use the word पदार्थ exactly in the same sense. It is used even more loosely than the word *category* in Europe, and often-times implies nothing more than topics to be treated in a book.

4. The *Tarka-Dīpikā* says that the word सप्त is used to exclude a larger number. T. D. and other commentaries here give a curious disquisition as to whether an eighth *Padār*

tha can be logically proved. An eighth *Padārtha* is either known or unknown. If it is known, it exists and the restriction to seven is wrong; if however it is unknown it cannot be negated, because there can be no negation of an unknown quantity. This dilemma is cleared by defining

पदार्थत्व to be द्रव्यादिसत्तान्यतमत्वव्याप्य, i. e. the genus पदार्थ is covered by any one of the seven species, *Dravya* etc. The passage, however, beginning with ननु is of doubtful authenticity, as it is questioned by *Nilakaṇṭha*, who remarks, “एवं च बहुषु पुस्तकेषु सत्तान्यतमत्वाप्रसिद्धिशङ्कानात्समाधानपरस्य ‘ननु सत्तान्यतमत्वमि’ त्यादिग्रन्थस्यासत्त्वंऽपि न क्षतिरिति ध्येयम्.”

5. It is probable that the word ‘seven’ is used merely to emphasize the seven-fold enumeration of the modern *Vaiśeṣikas* as distinguished from the six *Padārthas* of *Kaṇāda* and the sixteen of *Gotama*. The original aphorisms of *Kaṇāda* mention only six categories, and the seventh, अभाव, is added by commentators on the ground that the six up to समवाय being all भाव things, i. e. entities, necessarily imply their contradictory the non-entity. Consequently many first divide things into भाव and अभाव, the former being then subdivided into six. The sixteen categories of *Gotama*, and several others assumed by other *Naiyāyikas*, are reconciled with the sevenfold enumeration by T. D. in its concluding passage.¹

SECT. III. द्रव्याणि.

“Of these seven categories (तत्र=सप्तपदार्थमध्ये S. C.) the class *Dravya* comprises nine, and nine Substances. only:—Earth, Water, Light, Air, Ether, Time, Space, Soul and mind.

1. Out of the seven categories enumerated in the preceding section, the author now mentions the nine subdivisions of the first, *Substance*. T. D., T. K., T. C. and S. C. give two definitions of द्रव्य, viz. द्रव्यत्वजातिमत्त्वम् and गुणवत्त्वम् to which may be added क्रियावत्त्वम् and समवायिकारणत्वम्; but all these, except perhaps the last, are defective. The first appears like a purely verbal definition, or a truism which teaches us nothing new about the thing defined. S. C. however tries to justify it by arguing that द्रव्यत्वजाति is independently proved, either by direct perception or by inference. The inference is put thus, द्रव्यवृत्तिर्या समवायिकारणता सा किञ्चि-

इमं वच्छिन्ना, कारणतात्वाद्दण्डवृत्तिकारणतावत्, i. e. the intimate causality residing in a *Dravya* is distinguished by some attribute (which is the genus *Dravya* or substantiality) because every causality such as that of a stick has a distinguishing attribute. The argument of course makes two assumptions which are not yet proved, viz. that only a *Dravya* can be an intimate cause, and that such a cause must have some attribute to distinguish it. The second definition is superior though still defective. If we say that a substance is anything in which qualities reside, we exclude an important class of substances, namely all created things just at the moment of their production, when according to the theory of the *Naiyāgikas* they are without any attribute. अद्यै क्षणे निर्युणं द्रव्यं तिष्ठति is an axiom of *Nyāya*, for if the qualities are supposed to rise simultaneously with the substances and not a moment later, all distinction between qualities and substances will virtually disappear. The definition गुणवत् will not therefore apply to *Dravyas* at the first moment of their creation and is therefore अव्याप्त. The defect is remedied by amplifying it thus, गुणसमानाधिकरण-सत्ताभिन्न-जाति-मत्त्वं द्रव्यत्वम्. Although products in the first moment are without attributes, they possess even then a जाति (i. e. द्रव्यत्व in this case) which co-exists with qualities in the same substratum. But such a definition again would be too wide because सत्ता (existence) is also a जाति that is co-existent with qualities; hence the word सत्ताभिन्न is inserted in the definition to qualify जाति. This amplification however makes the latter definition almost as verbal as the first द्रव्यत्वजातिमत्त्वम्, only the word द्रव्यत्व is avoided. Though thus theoretically faulty, the definition is good for all practical purposes. The definition समवायिकारणत्वम् is technically correct for only a *Dravya* can be the समवायिकारण of a product, but it is पारिभाषिक as being based on a peculiar doctrine of *Vaiśeṣikas* and is not therefore easily intelligible to ordinary people.

2. The difficulty of defining a substance accurately arises from its very nature. A definition which is not to be merely verbal must be an exhaustive enumeration of all essential attributes; but a substance *ex hypothesi* is something

that, while underlying all attributes, is quite distinct from them. Now if the qualities which are enumerated as the definition of substance are essentially and invariably connected with it, they are part and parcel of substance itself, and not attributes distinct from it; while if they are not so connected they do not constitute a definition. This dilemma has perplexed philosophers of all ages and countries, and consequently many of them, like Berkeley in England and the *Bauddhas* in India, have denied any independent entity such as a *substance* altogether. This is not a satisfactory solution, however, as the necessity of having some *substratum* for the qualities still remains. To obviate this, others like the *Vedāntins* acknowledge the reality of *substance* but call its manifestation अनिर्वचनीय, indefinable, or साया.

2. The propriety of नवैव is the same as that of सप्त in the last section, the words being used to limit the number of substances to nine only. T. D. here controverts the position of the *Bhāṭṭa* school of *Mīmāṃsikas* that darkness is a *dravya*. Darkness, says the objector, is a substance because it is blue and moves, and therefore the definition of

Dravya, गुणक्रियावत्, strictly applies to it.
What is darkness. But darkness cannot be classed under any of the nine *dravyas* above enumerated.

As darkness has colour it cannot fall under any of the last five, ether, time, space, soul and mind, which are colourless. It is not air because it has neither touch nor constant motion which are the attributes of air. It is not light, as it has neither bright colour, nor hot touch. It is not water because it has neither cool touch nor white colour, the colour of water. Lastly it is not earth, because it has neither scent nor touch. Darkness therefore, not falling under any of the nine *dravyas*, must be regarded as a tenth one, and so the restriction to nine is wrong. Having thus stated the objector's argument in full, T. D. answers it by declaring that darkness is, according to the *Naiyāyikas*, merely the negation of light. A tenth *dravya* can be either with or without colour; but darkness cannot be the latter as it is blue. Nor can it be a substance having colour, because

every such substance requires light for being perceived with the eyes, while darkness is perceived only when there is no light. Darkness is therefore defined as प्रौढप्रकाशकतेजःसामान्याभावः, i. e. absence of large and illuminating light in general. The S. C. explains the propriety of each word in the definition thus : The word सामान्य implies that darkness is total absence of any light whatever, and not the absence of a particular light such as that of the sun or the moon or a lamp. The word प्रकाशक is necessary because otherwise there will be no darkness wherever there is gold which is classed by *Naiyāyikas* under *Tejas*. Finally प्रौढ excludes the possibility of darkness being negatived even by minute particles of light. How is then the perception of blue colour and motion in darkness to be accounted for? T. D. declares it to be a misapprehension. Besides the above two views with respect to the nature of darkness, *Mādhvācārya* the author of *Sarvadarśana-Saṁgraha*¹ mentions two more, namely those of *Śrīdhara*, the reputed author of *Nyāya-Kāṇḍalī* and of a section of the *Prābhākara* school of *Mīmāṃsakas*. The first mentions that darkness is nothing more than the blue colour imposed on something else, thus making darkness a quality only ; while the latter call it absence of knowledge of light, and not that of light itself. A fifth doctrine would say that instead of regarding darkness as the absence of light we should deem it *dravya* and regard light itself as the absence of darkness. But these views are not warranted by experience, and the one propounded above as to darkness being the absence of light is the most satisfactory. The controversy, however, well illustrates the aptitude of Indian mind for hair-splitting.

3. Incidentally T. D. gives under this section the three characteristic marks of a perfect definition.

Definition.

T. D. defines a लक्षण as दूषणत्रय-रहितो धर्मः i. e. an attribute free from the

three faults. A more scientific definition of लक्षण, however, is that given by *Vātsyāyana* उद्दिष्टस्यातत्त्वविवेचकधर्मो लक्षणम्, a

1. *Sarv. D. S. Calc. ed.*, p. 108.

definition is an attribute which differentiates the *definitum* from all things different from itself.¹ In other words लक्षण is what English logicians call a 'differentia.' Another definition of लक्षण is व्यावर्तकम् which with the qualifications mentioned by T. D. means the same thing as the preceding. A fourth definition and one of a somewhat different kind is असाधारणधर्मः, and असाधारणत्वम् is defined as लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकसमानियतंत्वम् a characteristic mark which exactly covers all (*i. e.* not more nor less) things denoted by the *definitum*. From this it will be seen that the idea of a definition entertained by Indian logicians was somewhat narrow. It was not an exclusive enumeration of all the essential *characteristics* of a thing, but only a *differentia*, or "laying down the boundary" (as the word definition etymologically means) which separated the thing defined from everything else. The function of a definition was more negative than positive; that is, a definition was more often intended merely to exclude all things other than the *definitum* than to give us any accurate notion of the *definitum* itself. Accordingly any characteristic that was peculiar to the *definitum* was made to serve the purpose. The consequence was that the definitions of the *Naiyāyikas* often became merely verbal or nominal, which satisfied the ear as it were but conveyed no idea of the thing defined. इव्यत्वजातिमत्त्वम् and पृथग्व्यवहारकारणम्, which are given by *Annamābhatta* as definitions of इव्य and पृथक्त्व respectively, may be mentioned as instances of this kind of inconsequential definitions. Another device employed to escape difficulties was first to give a wide description of the *definitum* and then to narrow it down by the express exclusion of superfluous objects by using words like इतर or भिन्न, as for instance, the definition of इन्द्रिय, शब्देतरोद्भूत etc. For practical purposes, however, the definitions of *Naiyāyikas* are generally useful and often ingenious; and a student bearing the above limitations in mind will escape the misconceptions and prejudices that are likely to arise owing to the peculiar form of many definitions he will meet with in the course of his study.

4. The three faults mentioned in the definition of लक्षण given by T. D. are अव्याप्ति, अतिव्याप्ति, and असंभव. अव्याप्ति is लक्ष्यैकदेशावृत्तित्वम् i. e. non-pervasion by the characteristic of a portion of (the class denoted by) the *definitum*. For instance, if we define a cow as a tawny animal, we exclude all black, red or white cows. अतिव्याप्ति is extension of the attribute to things not denoted by the *definitum*, as when we define a cow as a horned animal, and thereby include buffaloes that have horns but are not cows. असंभव is the total absence of the characteristic from the *definitum* itself, as when we define a cow to be an animal with uncloven hoofs. Of these असंभव is only a kind of अव्याप्ति *in excelsis*. In short, a proper definition ought to be neither too narrow, nor too wide, nor totally false. If, for instance, we define a cow to be an animal having a dew-lap, we avoid all the three faults, since all cows have dew-laps and none but cows have them. It is not possible always to have such a perfect definition. Annambhatta often employs simple enumeration instead of a regular definition; and when even this is not possible he contents himself with an approximate description. For examples of the first see Sects. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9, while for the latter see Sects. 8, 11, 12, 20, 25-32. Such enumerations or descriptions, besides, are better suited to the untrained understandings of the beginners for whom this treatise is mainly written. The author has wisely relegated all abstruse definitions and discussions to the commentary.

SECT. IV. गुणाः

“ There are twenty-four qualities, viz. colour, taste, odour, touch, number, dimension or magnitude, severally, conjunction or contact, disjunction, priority or propinquity, posteriority or remoteness, weight, fluidity, viscosity, sound, intellect or understanding, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, effort or volition, merit, demerit and faculty. ”

The T. D. defines a *Guṇa* as गुणत्वजातिमान्, possessing the genus *Guṇas*, or द्रव्यकर्मभिन्नत्वे सति सामान्यवान् Quality defined. “possessing generality and being at the same time different from *substances* and *motions*.” The first is only a verbal definition, but the latter needs explanation. According to the theory of the *Naiyāyikas*,¹ जाति or सामान्य resides in three *Padārthas* only, viz. *Dravya*, *Guṇa* and *Karma*. The definition सामान्यवान् would therefore cover all the three, and hence it is restricted to *Guṇa* by expressly excluding *Dravya* and *Karma*. The same is expressed in another way as द्रव्यावृत्ति-नित्यवृत्ति-जातिमान् i. e. possessing a जाति which permanently inheres in a receptacle other than a *Dravya*. Here the word नित्य excludes कर्मत्वजाति which, like individual motions, is transitory; while the epithet द्रव्यावृत्ति excludes both द्रव्यत्व and सत्ता. The definition of *Guṇa* given in B. P. is fuller, अथ द्रव्याश्रिता ज्ञेया निर्गुण निष्क्रिया गुणाः² i. e. *Guṇas* reside in *dravyas* and are themselves devoid of attributes and motions. This slightly varies from the original definition of *Kaṇāda*, which is द्रव्याश्रयगुणवाम् संयोगविभागेष्वकारणमनपेक्ष इति गुणलक्षणम्.³ The expression संयोगविभागेष्वकारणम् is added in the *Sūtra* to exclude *Karma* which is the cause of conjunction and disjunction.

2. Comparing the several definitions of *Guṇa*, we find that it is clearly distinguished from *Dravya* as an attribute dependent on something else i. e. *dravya*, which is self-supported, while it is distinguishable from *Karma*, as an attribute which is fixed or permanent, and not evanescent or transitory. Both *Guṇa* and *Karma*, quality and motion, are accidents attaching to *Substance*, the *Ens*, which underlies and supports them ; but *Guṇa* is permanent while *Karma* is evanescent. They are as it were two different phases of the same *phenomena*. *Guṇa* in the process of change is action, while *karma* when made fixed and permanent becomes a *guṇa*. For instance, the motion of a carriage is action because it may cease at any moment, but

1 See *Infra* Notes to Sect. VI and LVII.

2 B. P. 85.

3 V. S. I, 1, 16.

the motions of the earth and the planets are *guṇas* because they are permanent and belong as it were to their very nature; similarly heat which is *Guṇa* is produced by motion of molecules, while गुरुत्व or weight produces the action of falling. This distinction is succinctly put in one of the definitions of *Guṇa* given above, द्रव्यावृत्ति-नित्यवृत्ति-जातिमान, and will be made still more clear by the following extract—“We understand by a *quality* that which truly constitutes the nature of a thing—what it is—what belongs to it permanently, as an individual, or in common with others like it—not that which passes, which vanishes and answers to no lasting judgment. A body falls: it is a fact, an accident; it is heavy: that is a *quality*. Every fact, every accident, every phenomenon supposes a *quality* by which it is produced, or by which it is undergone; and reciprocally every quality of things which we know by experience manifests itself by certain modes or certain phenomena; for it is precisely in this way that things discover themselves to us.”¹

It is doubtful whether the *Naiyāyikas* of India had obtained a correct notion of *qualities*, while as to *actions* they do not seem to have gone very deep into the matter. The list of 24 *guṇas* is by no means based on a common *fundamentum divisionis*, while subsequently there is no attempt to probe into the real nature of each.

3. The *Tarka-Saṃgraha* like all modern works on *Nyāya* enumerates twenty-four *Guṇas*, but the original aphorism of Kaṇāda mentioned only seventeen. The *Sūtra* runs:—रूपरस-गन्धस्पर्शाः सङ्ख्याः परिमाणानि पृथक्त्वं संयोगविभागी परत्वापरत्वे बुद्ध्यः सुखदुःखे इच्छाद्वेषौ प्रयत्नाश्च गुणाः.¹ To this list commentators add seven more, गुरुत्व, द्रवत्व, स्नेह, संस्कार, धर्म, अधर्म and शब्द, under the shelter of च. S'āṅkara Miśra, the author of *Upaskāra*

¹ *Dict. des Sciences Philosoph.* quoted in Fleming's *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, p. 398.

explains the omission by saying that these seven are not expressly mentioned in the *Sūtra* because they are too well-known. The addition is expressly made by *Praśastapāda*.¹ It cannot at present be ascertained who had the ingenuity of first discovering this hidden meaning of च ; but the fact at any rate shows that there was a time when the system was sufficiently elastic to admit material improvements. The modern school of *Naiyāyikas* reduce the number of *guṇas* to 21, excluding परत्व, अपरत्व and पृथक्त्व as being not *guṇas* proper. परत्व and अपरत्व, they say, are accounted for by विप्रकृष्टत्व and संनिकृष्टत्व or ज्येष्ठत्व and कनिष्ठत्व, while पृथक्त्व does not differ from अन्योन्याभाव.

4. Others have tried to increase the number of *guṇas* by further additions. T. D. instances 3 *guṇas* which are not expressly mentioned in the list, viz. लघुत्व, मृदुत्व and कठिनत्व, while S. C. adds a fourth, आलस्य. These, however, it is argued, need not be considered as separate *guṇas*, as all of them are negations or contradictories of some one of the 24 *guṇas*. Thus लघुत्व is nothing but the negation of गुरुत्व, while मृदुत्व and कठिनत्व are simply different degrees of संयोग. आलस्य is the opposite of प्रयत्न. In this way any quality not mentioned in the list can be shown to fall under one of those already mentioned. On the other hand, if it be asked why both धर्म and अधर्म are mentioned since the latter can only be the opposite of the former, it is answered that the *Naiyāyika* idea of अधर्म is that of something positive, and not simply the negation of धर्म. अधर्म is actual demerit and not the mere absence of merit. The same remark applies to three other pairs of contrary qualities, संयोग विभाग, परत्व अपरत्व, and सुख दुःख. Logically speaking these are the contraries and not the contradictories of each other. Some include both धर्म and अधर्म under one head, अदृष्ट.²

1 P. B. Ben. ed. p. 10.

2 B. P. 161.

5. The explanations are no doubt ingenious but there appears to be a good deal of confusion of ideas. In saying that लघुत्व (lightness) is the opposite of गुरुत्व, Annambhatta seems to confound the two senses of the word गुरुत्व viz., 'heaviness' and 'weight.' लघुत्व is opposed to गुरुत्व in the first sense alone, while in the latter and the wider sense, namely weight, it is only a lesser degree of गुरुत्व, both lightness and heaviness marking different degrees of weight. Similarly सूक्ष्मत्व and कठिनत्व or either of them are also entitled to be classed independent qualities like द्रवत्व, for all the three are different degrees of संयोग of particles. आलस्य, being identical with स्थितिस्थापकत्व or inertia, is a positive quality and not merely a negation of effort. The nine qualities from बुद्धि onwards are peculiar attributes or functions of Soul and ought to have been classed separately. The enumeration of *guṇas* in fact is rather rough and unscientific.

6. The twenty-four *guṇas* have been distributed in various ways according to the different principles of division adopted. The *guṇas* are either नित्य or अनित्य, सामान्य or विशेष, एकेन्द्रियग्राह्य, द्वीन्द्रियग्राह्य, or अतीन्द्रिय, and so on. Some of these distributions are given below, as likely to be useful to students :—

I. First, the twenty-four *guṇas* are distributed among the nine substances in the following manner :—

स्पर्शादयोऽष्टौ वेगाख्यसंस्कारो मरुतो गुणाः ।
अष्टौ स्पर्शादयो रूपं द्रवो वेगश्च तेजसि ॥
स्पर्शादयोऽष्टौ वेगश्च गुरुत्वं च द्रवत्वकम् ।
रूपं रसस्तथा स्नेहो वारिण्येते चतुर्दश ॥
स्नेहहीना गन्धयुताः क्षितावेते चतुर्दश ।
बुद्ध्यादिषट्कं संख्यादिपञ्चकं भावना तथा ॥
धर्माधर्मौ गुणा एते आत्मनः स्युश्चतुर्दश ।
संख्यादिपञ्चकं कालदिशोः शब्दश्च ते च खे ॥

संख्यादयाः पञ्च बुद्धिरिच्छा यत्नोऽपि चेश्वरे ।

परापरत्वसंख्याद्याः पञ्च वेगश्च मानसे¹ ॥

“The qualities of air are touch, number, quantity (dimension), individuality (severalty), conjunction, disjunction, priority, posteriority, velocity, and faculty. The same first eight qualities together with colour, fluidity and velocity, are assigned to light.

“Water is the site of 14 qualities, viz., of the eight before mentioned (*i. e.* स्पर्शादि), and further, of velocity, gravity, fluidity, colour, taste and viscosity.

“Earth has the same qualities, with the exception of viscosity, and the addition of smell.

“The 14 qualities of the soul are intellect, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, volition (effort), number, quantity (dimension), severalty, conjunction and disjunction, faculty, merit and demerit.

“The qualities of time and place are number, quantity (dimension), severalty, conjunction, and disjunction. The same qualities together with sound belong to ether.

“Those five qualities (संख्या, परिमाण, पृथक्त्व, संयोग, and विभाग) together with intellect, desire, and volition (effort), abide in God; the same five qualities with posteriority and velocity, in the mind”.²

II. *Guṇas* are also divided into सामान्य and विशेष. A विशेष गुण is defined द्रव्यविभाजकरोपाधिद्रव्यसमानाधिकरणावृत्ति-गुणवृत्ति-जातिमात्र³ which in simple English means a quality that resides in one substance only at one time, and not in two or more substances conjointly. सामान्य *guṇas* are those which reside in two or more substances jointly. The विशेष and सामान्य *guṇas* are enumerated as follow :—

बुद्ध्यादिषट्कं स्पर्शान्ताः स्नेहः सांसिद्धिको द्रवः ।

अदृष्टभावनाशब्दा अमी विशेषिका गुणाः ॥

1 B. P. 23-33.

2 Roer's translation of B. P. *Bibl. Ind.* p. 13.

3 T. D. p. 60 *Supra*.

संख्यादिरपरत्वान्तो द्रवः सांसिद्धिकस्तथा ।

गुरुत्ववेगो सामान्यगुणा एते प्रकीर्तिताः¹ ॥

“Special qualities are : intellect, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, effort, touch, viscosity, natural fluidity, fate, memory and sound. General qualities are : number, quantity (dimension), severalty, conjunction and disjunction, priority and posteriority, derived fluidity, gravity, and velocity.”²

III. *Guṇas* are also divided into those which are apprehended by one external sense only (एकेन्द्रियग्राह्य), viz., colour, taste, odour, and touch; those which are apprehended by two senses, eye and touch (द्वीन्द्रियग्राह्य), viz., number, dimension, severalty, conjunction, disjunction, priority, posteriority, fluidity and viscosity; and those again which are not perceived by an external sense (अतीन्द्रिय), viz., gravity, merit, demerit and faculty.

For other classifications see M. M. Bhimacharya's *Nyāya-Kośa* (second edition) pp. 232-4, and *Bhāṣā-Pari-ścheda*, 85-97.

SECT. V. कर्माणि

Motion or Action is of five kinds only, viz., Tossing or throwing upwards, Dropping or throwing downwards, Contraction, Expansion and Going or Motion in general.

1. The division of Karma is in strict conformity with the aphorism of *Kaṇāda*.³ The T. D. as in the case of *Guṇa*., offers two definitions of *Karma* also, of which the first संयोगभिन्नत्वे सति संयोगासमवायिकारणम् is a real one. Motion is the non-intimate cause of conjunction, but is not itself conjunction. The meaning of असमवायिकारण will be explained later on; it is sufficient to note here that only

¹ B. P. 89-91.

² Roer's Translation of B. P. Bib. Ind. p. 53

³ V. S. 1, 1, 7.

karma and some *guṇas* can ever be the non-intimate causes of *dravyas* or *guṇas*. *Karma* is supposed to be the non-intimate cause of conjunction, as when a hand touches a book the motion of the hand is such a cause of the conjunction of the hand with the book. But sometimes one conjunction is the non-intimate cause of another conjunction, as for instance, the conjunction of the hand with the book is the non-intimate cause of the connection of the whole body with the book. This connection therefore is expressly excluded by the words संयोगभिन्नत्वे सति.

2. The definition of *Karma* given in *Kaṇāda's sūtra*

is more elaborate though essentially the same. एकद्रव्यमणुं संयोगविभागेऽनपेक्षकारणमिति कर्मलक्षणम्¹ means that action inheres

Other definitions. in one substance, but is not a quality, and is the direct and immediate cause of conjunction and disjunction. The first two epithets exclude अवयवि द्रव्य and some qualities like संयोग, while the last is practically identical with संयोगिसमवायिकारण of T. D. *Saṃkara Miśra* mentions several other definitions of *Karma* in his Commentary on V. S. I, 1, 17 (Calcutta ed. p. 35). The only one which is worth nothing is नित्यावृत्ति-सत्तासाक्षाद्व्याप्य-जातिमत्त्वम्, which means that कर्मत्वजाति resides in a thing (कर्म) which is never permanent. The wider genus सत्ता resides in द्रव्य, गुण and कर्म of which the former two are sometimes नित्य; but कर्म is never नित्य, as it is always transitory. *Karma* is said to last only for five moments² and so कर्मत्वजाति is said to be नित्यावृत्ति.

3. The division of *Karma* into five kinds does not appear to be very logical. If all miscellaneous motions such as gyration (घ्रमण), evacuation (रेचन), flow (स्यन्दन), flaming up (ऊर्ध्वउत्थलन) and slanting motion (तिर्यग्गमन) are to be classed under simple going (गमन), why cannot, it may be

¹ V. S. I, 1, 17,

² Roer's Transl. B. P. Bibl. Ind p. 4. note.

asked, उत्क्षेपण and the other three also be similarly included under it ? *Nilakaṇṭha* justifies this arbitrary division on the quaint but easily comprehensible ground that it would be sacrilegious on our part to question what is laid down by a free-willed sage like *Kaṇāda* (न चोत्क्षेपणादीनां गमनेऽन्तर्भावोऽस्तिवति शङ्कनीयम् । स्वतंत्रेच्छस्य नियोगपर्यन्तयोगानर्हस्य ऋषेः संमतत्वादिति भावः). A closer inspection, however, might reveal some sort of principle even in this arbitrary division. Motion is primarily divided into three kinds according to its direction, namely, vertical, horizontal and slanting or miscellaneous. The vertical motion may be from below upwards (उत्क्षेपण), or from above downwards (अपक्षेपण). Horizontal motion also may be twofold, motion nearer to oneself (आकुञ्चन) or motion further from oneself (प्रसारण). All other motions are relegated to the comprehensive class of गमन. It is not of course meant that the above groups exactly correspond to the ordinary conceptions of उत्क्षेपण etc.; but that some such principle was in the mind of the *Sūtrakāra* when he made the division seems to be highly probable.

SECT. VI. सामान्यम्.

Genus or Generality is of two kinds, wider or extensive and narrower or limited.

1. In Section LXXVII *Annambhaṭṭa* defines सामान्य as नित्यमेकमनेकानुगतम्, and adds that this सामान्य resides in *Dravya*, *Guṇa* and *Karma*.

Generality.

There are three characteristics of *generality*:

that 1 it is eternal, 2 it is one, and 3 it resides in many. Conjunction and some other qualities such as द्वित्वादिसंख्या reside in many, but they are not eternal, and therefore the word नित्य in the definition of सामान्य excludes them. The dimension of an atom is both eternal (for atom is eternal) and resides in many ; but it is not one residing in many (एकमनेकानुगतं) and hence the word एकम्. अत्यन्ताभाव however

is eternal, one and residing in many. Therefore the word अनुगतम् is interpreted as समवेतम् or समवायसंबन्धेन वर्तमानम्, thereby excluding negation which does not reside in things by intimate union, while सामान्य does. The word Genus is a convenient rendering of सामान्य as Ballantyne and others have adopted it, although it is not quite accurate. Genus may perhaps be a more appropriate rendering of जाति. Genus in English not only means the common characteristic residing in several individuals, but comprehends the individuals also, while सामान्य or जाति denotes only the common characteristic. Genus is a class, सामान्य or जाति is the common attribute which distinguishes that class. Other definitions of सामान्य are, नित्यत्वे सत्यनेकसमवेतत्वम् and नित्यत्वे सति स्वाश्रयान्योन्याभावसमानाधिकरणम् which are however not as good as that given by T. D. But they all imply that सामान्य was conceived by later Naiyāyikas to be some attribute having a real external existence in the individual objects comprised in it. The original aphorism of Kaṇāda is ambiguous and conveys a somewhat different notion. सामान्यं विशेष इति बुद्ध्यपेक्षम्¹ conveys the sense that the notion of generality depends on the operation of our own intellect. A quality becomes a सामान्य only if we conceive it as residing in many; while the same is विशेष when we regard it as a differentia. A property for instance exists in a certain number of objects, which are so far of one kind; if we use the property for grouping those objects into one class, it is सामान्य, if for distinguishing them from all other objects in the world, it is विशेष. Thus an attribute, though inhering in the object, cannot become a सामान्य until our intellect has recognised it to be so. As long, for example, as I have seen only one elephant and do not know that there are others of the same kind, the genus elephant does not exist, at least so far as I am concerned. Similarly the same attribute, e. g. घटत्व, is सामान्य if regarded as residing in all pots, and is a विशेष if regarded as distinguishing pots from other things. Such seems to have been the original conception, but subsequently सामान्य appears to

have come to be regarded as an attribute having an absolute and not merely a relative existence externally.

2. In later times सामान्य came to be used synonymously with जाति, and was given an independent and eternal existence apart from the individual objects. This will be clearly seen from the various divisions of सामान्य. *Annambhaṭṭa*, following the commentators on *Kaṇāda's* aphorisms divides सामान्य into पर and अपर, higher or extensive and lower or non-extensive. The instances are सत्ता (existence) and द्रव्यत्व (substantiality) respectively. Of course the terms पर and अपर are relative only, the same attribute द्रव्यत्व for instance being अपर with respect to सत्ता and पर with respect to घटत्व. Some other writers make a threefold division of सामान्य. The T. A. for example divides सामान्य into व्यापक (widest) e. g. सत्ता, व्याप्य (narrowest,) e. g. घटत्व and व्याप्य-व्यापक (middle) e. g. द्रव्यत्व. This division obviously regards the common characteristic as existing in itself and absolutely, while the former two-fold division only sought to fix its relative extent as compared with higher or lower generalities. द्रव्यत्व can be sometimes पर and sometimes अपर, but सत्ता must always be व्यापक, and द्रव्यत्व only व्याप्यव्यापक. The terms in the former division were relative; in the latter they are absolute. This is not the place to discuss which division is more consonant with reason, but it may be noted that the latter though apparently simple is beset with difficulties from which the former is free. *Annambhaṭṭa* therefore was justified in disapproving of the threefold division, if we may accept the interpretation of the word इति after परमपरं च as given by V. V., which remarks अत्रेतिशब्दस्य स्वसमभिव्याहृत-पदार्थ-तावच्छेदक-परत्वापरत्वरूप-द्विप्रकारवत्सामान्यमिति वाक्यार्थः.

3. सामान्य is again divided into two sorts, अखण्ड and खण्ड.

Jāti and Upādhi.

The first is otherwise called जाति and is defined as साक्षात्सम्बद्धं सामान्यम्, that which is directly connected with the thing such as द्रव्यत्व, कर्मत्व etc. The second is called उपाधि and is defined as

परंपरया सम्बद्धम्, indirectly or mediately connected with the object such as प्रमेयत्व, दण्डित्व etc. Every common characteristic does not constitute a *jāti*. A number of persons might be blind or lame or black, but blindness, lameness or blackness does not constitute an independent class. The circumstances which prevent a common characteristic from becoming a *jāti* are summed up in the following verse of Udayanācārya :--

व्यक्तेरभेदस्तुल्यत्वं सङ्कुतोऽथानवस्थितिः ।

रूपहानिरसम्बन्धो जातिबाधकसंग्रहः ॥

The circumstances that prevent *generality* from becoming a class are six : (1) Unity of the object, *e. g.* the sky being one all-pervading thing, there is no *jāti* as आकाशत्व; (2) Identity of things though the names be different, *e. g.* घटत्व and कलशत्व are not different *jātis* as both words denote the same thing; (3) Cross-division, *e. g.* भूतत्व and मूर्तत्व *a. e.* not *jātis* as they constitute cross-divisions, आकाश being भूत and not मूर्त, and मनस् being मूर्त but not भूत, while the remaining four, पृथ्वी, अप, तेजस् and वायु, being both भूत and मूर्त; (4) Want of finality, *e. g.* *jāti* itself cannot have *jāti* on it, for in that case, there being *jāti* over *jāti ad infinitum*, there will be no finality; (5) Violation of essence, *e. g.* the *Viśeṣas* (particularities), though innumerable, cannot have a *jāti* विशेषत्व on them, because by hypothesis they are essentially opposed to the conception of *jāti*; (6) Lastly, want of proper connection prevents *jāti*, *e. g.* समवायत्व cannot be a *jāti* because, as every *jāti* rests on its आश्रय by समवायसंबन्ध, there cannot be a समवाय on समवाय, and समवायत्व, if accepted as a *jāti*, cannot have any connection with its आश्रय. All these therefore are mere *Upādhis*. The student will now be able to understand Annambhaṭṭa's remark that सामान्य, or more properly its one variety the *jāti*, can rest on *Dravya, Guṇa* and *Karma* only, and cannot rest on the last four *Padārthas*. Even amongst the first three there are many things that cannot have जाति, such as ether, time and space. It will be seen from the above that उपाधि is any characteristic which belongs to several individuals, while जाति is only a particular kind of them, fulfilling certain conditions necessary to consti-

tute a proper class. These conditions are implied by their opposites in *Udayana's* verse quoted above. If you take a hundred persons you can arrange them in various groups, as for instance by their nationality, or the language they speak, or the complexion of their body, or by their education. But each of these groups cannot constitute a class, for in that case there will be the absurdity of one person belonging to several classes, and all notions of genus and species will be confounded. Human being is a class because we can at once recognize certain well-marked characteristics which clearly distinguish human beings from all other animals; but blackness cannot be a class, for if it be so we shall have to group black men in the same class as black sheep or black stones. This distinction between *जाति* and *उपाधि* is very important and is one of the subtlest discovered by Indian logicians.

SECT. VII. विशेषः.

The Individualities or Particularities residing in eternal things are innumerable.

1. The idea of विशेष, particularity, (called अन्यविशेष by *Kaṇāda*) is a counterpart of that of सामान्य Particularity. (generality), as the one necessarily implies the other. In Sect. LXXVIII, *Annam-bhaṭṭa* defines विशेष as residing in eternal substances and serving the purpose of distinguishing them from each other, while this section further tells us that those particularities are innumerable, one being assigned to each eternal substance. A more accurate definition of विशेष is स्वतो व्यावर्तकत्वम्, that which distinguishes self from itself. The peculiarity of a *Viśeṣa* is that it performs the double function of differentiating one eternal substance from all others, and also that of differentiating itself from other *Viśeṣas* and everything else. The latter assumption is necessary, because otherwise we shall have to suppose a second *Viśeṣa* over the first to differentiate it from others and so on *ad infinitum*.

2. The eternal substances in which *Viśeṣas* inhere are the atoms of the first four substances, earth, water, light and air, together with the remaining five substances, ether, time, space, soul, and mind.

3. Other definitions of *Viśeṣa* are जातिरहितत्वे सति नित्यद्रव्यमात्रवृत्तिः, एकमात्रसमवेतत्वे सति सामान्यशून्यः and अत्यन्तव्यावृत्तिहेतुः, all of which amount to the same thing, namely, that *Viśeṣa* is a *padārtha* assumed to account for the difference of atoms and other eternal substances from one another. The necessity of this assumption is established by S. C. thus:—“घटादीनां कपालसमवेतत्वादिकं पटादिभेदकमस्ति परमाणूनां तु परस्परभेदकं न किञ्चिदस्त्यतोऽनायत्या विशेष आश्रयितव्यः”. A jar is distinguished from a piece of cloth because the component parts of the first are distinct from those of the latter (अवयवभेदादवयवविभेदः), and so on we may argue until we arrive at the ultimate constituents of matter, namely the atoms. But as an atom has no parts, we cannot account for the distinction of one atom from another by the same process of reasoning. Similarly we cannot account for the mutual distinction of the imperishable substances such as ether, time and space. There is therefore no help (अनायत्या of S. C.) but to assume a separate individuality in each of the substances to account for its distinctive character. This individuality is called the विशेष of that substance, and they are as innumerable as the atoms and other eternal substances. It is not right to translate this विशेष by ‘difference’ or ‘differentia,’ because the latter words denote the special characteristics of a species as distinguished from genus, while विशेष concerns the individual only.¹

4. This doctrine of विशेष is supposed to be a peculiar tenet invented by the *Vaiśeṣikas*, and one from which they derive their appellation; but it is singular that the original aphorisms of *Kaṇāda* do not give much prominence to it. It is referred to

Why *Viśeṣa* is recognized.

1. See Bain's *Deductive Logic* p. 73.

only incidentally as it were, in the *Sūtra* अन्यत्रान्येभ्यो विशेषेभ्यः¹ which, while treating of सामान्य, distinguishes its occasional विशेषत्व² from the well-known ultimate *Viśeṣas*, that are called final, because they reside in the final atoms of matter. On this bare reference the commentator *Prāśastapāda* founds the theory of विशेष which is however wholly repudiated by many of the modern *Naiyāyikas* who are otherwise followers of the *Vaiśeṣika* school. They argue that, granting that *Viśeṣas* are necessary to distinguish individual atoms, there must be something else to distinguish the *Viśeṣas* themselves from one another. If however it is said that the latter function is done by the *Viśeṣas* themselves by some peculiar inherent faculty, why not then attribute this inherent faculty to the atoms themselves. If you have to bring in the inherent faculty somewhere, why not suppose it in the individual atom itself and discard the superfluous *Viśeṣa* altogether, rather than first attribute a *Viśeṣa* to the atom and then attribute the inherent faculty of self-distinction to the *Viśeṣa*? The argument is irresistible but not a new one. *Prāśastapāda* the oldest known commentator on *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* already anticipates and answers it thus:—“अथान्यविशेषेष्विव परमाणुषु कस्मान्न स्वतः प्रत्ययव्यावृत्तिः प्रत्यभिज्ञानं वा कल्प्यत इति चेन्न तादात्म्यात् । इह तादात्म्यनिमित्तप्रत्ययो भवति यथा घटादिषु प्रदीपात् । न तु प्रदीपे प्रदीपात् । यथा च श्वमांसादीनां स्वत एवाशुचिर्त्वं तद्योगादन्येषां तथेहापि तादात्म्यादन्यविशेषेषु स्वत एव प्रत्ययव्यावृत्तिस्तद्योगात्परमाण्वादि-
 प्विति.³ The answer however is hardly satisfactory. It is of course scarcely needful to say that the doctrine of *Viśeṣa* is not accepted by other Indian schools of philosophy such as the modern *Naiyāyikas*, the two sections of the *Mīmāṃsakas* namely, the *Bhāṭṭas* and the *Prābhākaras*, and the *Vedāntins*.

1 V. S. 1, 2, 6.

2 See V. S. 1, 2, 3, and our Note under Sect. VI. on p. 90 *Supra*.

3 P. B. Ben. ed. p. 323.

SECT. VIII. समवायः

Intimate Union is one only.

1. समवाय etymologically means the act of coming together closely, and is therefore used to denote a kind of 'intimate union' between two things which are thereby rendered inseparable so that they cannot be separated without themselves being destroyed. It is therefore more appropriate to translate समवाय by 'intimate union' rather than by co-inherence as Ballantyne has done. Annambhatta defines समवाय in Sect. 79 as 'a permanent connection existing between two things that are always found inseparable'. The समवाय is called नित्य-संबन्ध in contradistinction to संयोग which is a *guṇa* and is always अनित्य. The expression अयुतसिद्ध denotes things one of which is always dependent on the other, as the jar on its components or the quality on the substance. अयुतसिद्ध is the opposite of युतसिद्ध which may be taken to mean either "proved to be joined" or 'proved to be separated,' according as we take the verb यु in the sense of 'to join' or 'to separate'. In either case the meaning of युतसिद्ध is the same. In the first sense युतसिद्ध means things which are proved to have been actually joined and therefore which must have once existed in a state of separation, while in the latter sense युतसिद्ध simply denotes things which are proved to have once been separated. Those things therefore which are not thus proved, that is, which have never existed in a separate condition, are अयुतसिद्ध. The two halves of a jar were separate before they were joined together; their connection therefore is संयोग which can be destroyed at any moment by separating them again. But the jar never existed and can never exist separately from the two halves; the connection of the jar with the halves is therefore समवाय. These अयुतसिद्ध things are limited in number. In fact there are only five pairs of things between which समवाय is supposed to exist, viz., 1 the product and its parts (अवयवावयविनौ), 2 the quality and the qualified (गुणगुणिनौ), 3 the motion and the moving (क्रियाक्रियावन्तौ), 4 the indivi-

dual and the common characteristic (जातिव्यक्ती), and lastly 5 particularity and the eternal substance in which it inheres (विशेषानित्यद्रव्ये). The definition in the *Sūtra* is simpler and less comprehensive इहेदमिति यतः कार्यकारणयोः स समवायः,¹ from which it may be inferred that the notion of समवाय was crude at first, and must have been gradually developed by later writers.

2. In Sect. VIII *Annambhaṭṭa* emphatically says that समवाय is one and one only, in order to repudiate the position of the *Prābhākara Mīmāṃsakas* and a modern school of *Naiyāyikas*. These latter deny even नित्यत्व to समवाय. The नित्यत्व of समवाय is proved by the argument that as all positive products (भावकार्य) are generated in their material cause by समवाय relation, a समवाय if produced will require another समवाय and so on *ad infinitum*. समवाय therefore must be regarded unproducible *i. e.* नित्य. Of course this नित्यत्व is only relative* and not absolute such as that of an atom. समवाय is नित्य in the sense that it can neither be produced nor destroyed without producing or destroying the product. Now comes the question why this separate entity of समवाय is recognised at all. Here there is a difference of opinion between the *Naiyāyikas* and the *Vaiśeṣikas*, or the old and the modern schools, as S. C. calls them. The former hold that समवाय is observed by perception, and therefore no other proof is required to prove its existence. The *Vaiśeṣikas* however, of whom *Annambhaṭṭa* is one, deny preceptibility to समवाय, on the ground that a connection is perceptible only when the two connected things are perceptible, while समवाय often exists between things one of which (*e. g.* आकाश the समवायकारण of शब्द) may be imperceptible. In their opinion समवाय is proved by inference only, and the argument is often put as *Annambhaṭṭa* has put it in his commentary on Sect. 79.

3. The doctrine of समवाय is very important and may in

*The doctrine of
Samavāya.*

one sense be said to be the corner-stone of Nyāya philosophy. It is the समवाय that explains the phenomenon of causality as conceived by the Naiyāyikas; and it is this theory that makes them so intensely realistic, in marked opposition to idealistic schools like the Vedānta. The conception of समवाय is in fact a key to the whole theory of causation as viewed from the Nyāya standpoint, and consequently the doctrine has been strongly animadverted by writers of the Sāṃkhya and Vedāntic schools who hold different views. The Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas also agree with the latter in repudiating समवाय. The theory of atoms for which the Naiyāyikas have been so famous is but a necessary result of the doctrine of समवाय. Śaṅkarācārya, in his commentary on *Brahma-Sūtra* II. 2. 13, lays his finger accurately on the weakest point in the समवाय theory, namely, the inconsistency of calling समवाय a connection between two distinct things, and at the same time regarding it as of a totally different kind from संयोग. If संयोग exists on the संयोगि *dravyas* by समवाय, समवाय also requires another समवाय to exist on the समवायि; and so there is the absurdity of an *ad infinitum*. To avoid this difficulty समवाय is regarded as a distinct *padārtha* and not a *guṇa* and the Naiyāyikas add that the first समवाय does not rest upon the समवायि by another समवाय but is identical with it. Why then, rejoins the Vedāntin, do you not take संयोग to be identical with the संयोगि. As to संयोग being a *guṇa* and समवाय an independent *padārtha*, says the Vedāntin, that is a technicality of your own invention, and we do not accept it. It cannot also be said that समवाय being नित्य is of a different kind from संयोग, and must be treated differently, for संयोग also is sometimes eternal, as for example the संयोग of काल or आकाश with परमाणु, while समवाय itself is not truly eternal, it being liable to destruction by the destruction of the product. But the chief

objection against समवाय is that, if समवाय is to be regarded as identical with its कार्य and कारण, would it not be better and simpler (लाघव) to regard the कार्य itself as identical with the कारण? Hence the *Vedāntins* and *Sāṃkhyas* hold the cause and its product to be connected with each other not by समवाय, but by the relation of identity (तादात्म्य). The doctrine of अयुतसिद्ध on which that of समवाय depends is also ruthlessly criticized by *Śaṅkarācārya*.¹ The gist of his criticism is that the notion of cause and effect being अयुतसिद्ध, that is, being connected together in an inseparable union, is directly opposed to the hypothesis that the cause is always anterior to the effect. As a matter of fact the cause and effect are one and the same thing, and not two different things joined together inseparably by a fictitious union called समवाय. The whole realistic theory of the *Naiyāyikas* is therefore based on a fiction which has no basis in actual experience. This is not the place to go deeper into this controversy which has been vigorously carried on between the rival disputants from the earliest to the latest times; but what has been said will be sufficient to give the student an idea as to how the doctrine of समवाय and the theory of causation built upon it lie at the very root of the whole *Nyāya* system of philosophy.

SECT. IX अभावाः.

Negation is of four kinds :—Antecedent, Consequent, Absolute, and Reciprocal.

1. The ninth section only enumerates the four kinds of negations, reserving the definitions of each for a future occasion. They are *antecedent negation* or non-production, *consequent negation* or destruction, *absolute negation*, and *reciprocal negation*. The word *negation* used by Ballantyne conveys the idea of *Abhāva* better than *non-existence*, which is hardly applica-

¹ *Brah. Sūtra* II, 2, 17.

ble in the case of अन्योन्याभाव. *Antecedent negation* is that which exists before a thing is produced, and the *consequent* results after its destruction. *Absolute negation* exists always and in all places except where the thing itself is. *Reciprocal negation* is the denial of one thing being any other, such as that a jar is not a piece of cloth.

2. Other writers divide अभाव first into two kinds, अन्योन्याभाव and संसर्गाभाव, and then split the latter into the remaining three. Thus *Viśvanātha* says in *Bhāṣā-Pariccheda* :

अभावस्तु द्विधा संसर्गान्योन्याभावभेदतः ।
प्रागभावस्तथा ध्वंसोऽप्यत्यन्ताभाव एव च ॥
एवं त्रैविध्यमापन्नः संसर्गाभाव इष्यते ।¹

Mutual or reciprocal negation may be defined as the negation of identity. All other kinds of negation are grouped under संसर्गाभाव which, literally translated, means negation by contact, the contact being between the thing negated and the thing on which its negation is affirmed. Thus when we say इह भूतले घटो नास्ति we affirm the negation of घट on a particular spot. Similarly the antecedent and the emergent negations also are affirmed with reference to some external अधिकरण, with which they are said to be connected, while अन्योन्याभाव simply denotes the mutual non-identity of two things. In short, in both kinds of अभाव, *viz.* संसर्ग and अन्योन्य, there are always two things referred to ; but in the first, one is negated of the other, while in the other, both are negated of each other. Thus an अन्योन्याभाव may be resolved into two संसर्गाभावाः. For instance घटः पटो नास्ति is a proposition affirming the mutual negation of घट and पट ; and it may be split up into two propositions घटे पटत्वं नास्ति and पटे घटत्वं नास्ति, both of which are examples of संसर्गाभाव. In अन्योन्याभाव the words expressive of the two things are always in the same case, *i. e.* the nominative ; while in the other case one word is usually in the locative as denoting the अधिकरण on which the negation rests. संसर्गाभाव is divided into प्रागभाव, प्रध्वंसाभाव, and अत्यन्ताभाव, of which the first two are nothing but the non-produce-

tion and the destruction, respectively, of a thing. अत्यन्ताभाव is absolute negation, and comprises all varieties other than those mentioned. A discussion as to its exact nature will be found under Sect. 80.

3. The simplest definition of अभाव is भावभिन्न, what is distinct from existing things, but other definitions are more elaborate. S. C. defines अभावत्व as प्रतियोगिज्ञानाधीनविषयत्वम्, i. e. a *padārtha* the knowledge of which is dependent on the knowledge of its contradictory. S. M. defines it as द्वयादिषट्कान्या-न्याभावत्वम् a *padārtha* in which rest the mutual negations of all the other six *padārthas*, i. e. which is distinct from the six categories, substance etc. While really meaning the same as भावभिन्नत्व, this definition begs the question by inserting अन्योन्याभाव, a sub-variety of अभाव, into the definition of अभाव. It is therefore faulty. A third definition, given in *Sarva-Darśana-Saṁgraha*, is असमवायत्वे सत्यसमवायित्वम्, i. e. अभाव not being itself समवाय is not connected with anything else by समवाय.¹ *Naiyāyikas* hold that अभाव is an object of direct perception and is connected with its अधिकरण by the relation called विशेषणता; that is, when we say घटाभाववद्भूतलम् we regard घटाभाव as an attribute of भूतल, just as we call दण्ड the attribute of दण्डी. This peculiar conception of negation discloses the habit of *Naiyāyikas* to invent any number of fictitious conventionalities, if they are convenient for practical purposes. Really speaking, to class अभाव as a *padārtha* along with the other six is an absurdity. There is not the least resemblance between the two groups, as one is the direct opposite of the other. अभाव can be a *padārtha* only in the most literal sense of the word, namely, the connotation of a word (अभाव), but really speaking it cannot be said to have any external existence. It is *non-existence* pure and simple, and all varieties of it such as the non-existence of this thing and that thing are mere conventionalities of speech. In what respect, for instance, does a घटाभाव differ from a पटाभाव? Really in nothing essentially, for both agree in their simple

¹ *Sarv. D. S. Calc.* ed. p. 109.

character of negation. But one might say that we find षटाभाव even where there is a पद, and *vice versa*; and therefore the two negations must be different. But this means that we only attribute the difference of the things (प्रतियोगी) to their negations. In other words, the भेदबुद्धि on the अभाव is simply आरोपित, while as a matter of fact all negation is pure and characterless. It follows that अभाव cannot really be the विशेषण of भूतल, for a विशेषण, in order to be apprehended, must exist, while the essence of अभाव is non-existence. *Vedāntins* and others therefore who refuse to recognize अभाव as a *padārtha* regard it simply as कैवल्यरूप, that is, as भूतल itself and nothing more.

4. It seems that the *Vaiśeṣikas* had not originally conceived of अभाव as a separate *padārtha*. *Kaṇāda's* aphorism¹ enumerates only six *padārthas*, omitting अभाव altogether. But the ingenuity of commentators has added a seventh category अभाव as being intended though not expressed by the *Sūtrakāra*, the intention being gathered from the occurrence of the word अभाव in some other *Sūtras*, such as “कारणाभावात् कार्याभावः² and असतः क्रियागुणव्यपदेशाभावादर्थान्तरम्.³ To recognize a separate entity because a word expressive of it occurs somewhere in a work is not indeed a very strong argument. Similarly *Udyanācārya* in his *Kiraṇāvalī* remarks “एते च पदार्थाः (the six mentioned in V. S. I, 1, 3) प्रधानतयोद्दिष्टा अभावस्तु स्वरूपवानपि नोद्दिष्टः प्रतियोगिनिरूपणाधीननिरूपणत्वात् न तु तुच्छत्वात्. This is more like an apology for the non-mention of अभाव in the original *Sūtras* than an argument for recognizing it as a separate *padārtha*. Whatever be the case, the recognition of अभाव as an independent entity has been a distinct gain to Indian logic, inasmuch as it has greatly facilitated the processes of analysis and reasoning. Even those who deny it the status of a *padārtha* cannot often help clothing their propositions in its terms. The wonderful accuracy of the Indian syllogism is in a great measure due to the use of such fictitious but well-understood expressions as अभाव, प्रतियोगी and अनुयोगी.

1 V. S. I, 1, 4.

2 V. S. I, 2, 1.

3 V. S. IX, 1, 3.

5. Here ends the first chapter of *Tarka-Saṃgraha*, which S. C. names पदार्थोद्देशविभागनिरूपणम्. According to the well-known dictum of the scholiast, the *Vaiśeṣika* system consists of three parts, the enumeration, the division and the definitions of *padārthas*. The author of *Tarka-Saṃgraha* first enumerates the *Padārthas* in the second section, and then proceeds to state their divisions and subdivisions in Secs. 3 to 9. From the tenth section onwards he enters upon their definitions or स्वरूपकथन severally, and defines them in the order in which they have been enumerated.

SECT. X. पृथिवी.

Earth is that which has odour. It is of two sorts, eternal and non-eternal. Eternal is atomic, non-eternal is product. It is also threefold, body, organ and object. Body is that like ours; organ is the olfactory sense at the tip of the nose; object comprises the earthy stones and the like.

1. The author defines earth as गन्धवती 'having odour,' which means गन्धसमवायिकारणम्, the intimate cause of odour.¹ The relation expressed by the termination वत् here is समवाय

Earth.

only, for otherwise the definition will overlap on *time* and *space*, with which गन्ध is connected by कालिक and देशिक relations respectively. Besides the apparent अतिव्याप्ति on *time* and *space*, the T. D. notices three other objections against the definition : 1st, it will not apply to a product which, being composed of parts having both good and bad smells, is rendered odourless owing to the two kinds of smell being mutually destroyed ; nor can it be said that in that case perception of odour is rendered impossible. You will have therefore, says the opponent, either to recognize a चित्रगन्ध 'variegated odour,' which you do not, or your definition will be inapplicable to such a case. The author denies both alternatives, saying that in such cases we can distinctly apprehend the different odours of component parts, and so there is no need of recognizing one variegated odour of the whole. The second objection is the same as in the case of उज्ज्वल as

a definition of *Dravya*, viz. that it will not apply to a product in the first moment of creation, when it is supposed to be without attribute. The answer to the present objection is also the same, viz. amplification of the definition (p. 77). The third objection is drawn from our experience that even water and other substances besides earth possess smell. The answer is that the smell belongs not to the water but to earthy particles mixed with it. There is a fourth objection which the author does not notice. We see many earthy things such as stones which are odourless, and the definition may not apply to them; but the answer would be that the smell in them is अनुद्भूत, that is, though existing, it is not perceived owing to unfavourable circumstances.

2. Although odour is mentioned as the differentiating attribute of earth it is not its only attribute.

Its attributes. Kaṇāda's aphorism रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शवती पृथिवी^r describes earth as possessing four qualities,

colour, savour, odour and touch, which Śaṅkara Miśra construes as giving four alternative definitions of earth. Besides these four material qualities, earth is credited with ten others, making in all 14 qualities residing in earth, for which see quotation *Supra*. p. 85.

3. Four copies A B D and K add तत्र before गन्धवती, but the *pratikas* in all the copies of *Dīpikā* except A, as well as that in S. C. show that the sentence began with गन्धवती, and that the तत्र got into the text by error, probably from the opening sentence of the *Dīpikā*. The तत्र in the *Dīpikā* is explained by *Nilakaṇṭha* as पृथिव्यादिषु (नवद्रव्येषु) मध्य इत्यर्थः.

4. Earth is first divided into eternal and non-eternal: the first being atomic, and the second a product.

Earth eternal and non-eternal.

T.D. defines नित्यत्व as ध्वंसाप्रतियोगित्वम्, its contrary ध्वंसप्रतियोगित्वम् being अनित्यत्व.

That which is not liable to destruction is eternal, and its opposite is the non-eternal. These definitions of T. D. are however incomplete. *Vākya-Vṛtti* defines नित्यत्व and अनित्यत्व more correctly, as नित्यत्वं प्रागभावाप्रतियोगित्वे सति ध्वंसाप्रतियोगित्वम् and

अनित्यत्वं प्रागभावप्रतियोगित्वध्वंसप्रतियोगित्वान्यतरवत्त्वं बोध्यम्. The T. D. does not take into account past as well as future eternity, and consequently its definition of नित्यत्व overlaps on प्रध्वंसाभाव which, being indestructible, is ध्वंसाप्रतियोगी, but which is not नित्य as it has प्रागभाव. There are some however who regard ध्वंस as eternal; and according to them T. D.'s definitions will be correct. नित्यत्व is also defined in another and a simpler way as त्रैकालिक-संसर्गावच्छिन्नत्व, "being distinguished by a connection with the three times, past, present and future", i. e. existing in all times. Whichever definition we take, products are always अनित्य as they do not exist prior to their production. The eternal portion of earth is the atoms which are the ultimate material causes of all earthy products. The atomic theory of the *Vaiśeṣikas* will be explained later on. (See note Sect. XIII).

5. Earth is again divided into three kinds, body, organ
Another division. of sense and mass. The body is that which belongs to human beings like ourselves; the organ is that of smell which apprehends odour and is situated at the root of the nose; while mass comprehends all other earthy things, such as stones etc. This threefold division of earth is very ancient, being derived from the aphorism of *Kaṇāda*.¹ But there is a difference of opinion as to whether this threefold division is of पृथिवी in general or of कार्यरूपा पृथिवी only; and the controversy, so far as we are concerned, turns partially, if not mainly, on the correct reading of the passage in *Tarka-Saṅgraha*. A reads सा पुनस्त्रिविधा, but as all other copies of the text as well as the commentaries agree in omitting सा before पुनः there was no alternative but to omit it here also. The reading सा can be defended on the ground that by unmistakably applying the threefold division to कार्यरूपा पृथिवी it makes the meaning of the passage clear, and thus brings the text into harmony, not only with other works like P. B., S. P., S. M., and others, but also with *Kaṇāda's* aphorism तत्पुनः पृथिव्यादि कार्यद्वयं त्रिविधं शरीरेन्द्रियविषयसंज्ञकम्.² The word सा however is not absolutely necessary, since S. C. extracts the same sense out of the word पुनः. The chief objection against सा, as also

against the interpretation put on the passage by S. C. to make it conform with the works mentioned above, is that the interpretation does not agree with T. D.'s note on the passage प्रकारान्तरेण विभजते. The remark apparently shows that the three-fold division is not a sub-division of one of the two kinds of पृथिवी first mentioned, namely कार्यरूपा, but an altogether independent division of पृथिवी itself. Having divided earth into eternal and non-eternal, the author mentions another division of the same according to its forms and functions. But here comes the question, does *Annambhaṭṭa* say something which is in direct opposition to *Kaṇāda's Sūtra*? The *Sūtra* distinctly ascribes the three-fold division to product earth only: and the scholiast *Prāśastapāda* also clearly states his opinion by remarking त्रिविधं चास्याः कार्यं । शरीरेन्द्रियविषयसंज्ञकम् ।¹ *Annambhaṭṭa*, by taking in the whole earth (eternal and non-eternal), would be plainly contradicting the *Sūtra* and the scholiast, which is highly improbable as the present work is distinctly based on *Prāśastapāda's* scholium. As a matter of fact, whichever interpretation we take, the ultimate result, as observed by *Nilakaṇṭha*, is the same, namely, that laid down in the *Sūtra*. *Nilakaṇṭha* noticing these two ways of interpretation remarks अत्र नित्यपृथिव्या-शरीरेन्द्रियभिन्नत्वरूपविषयलक्षणाक्रांतत्वेन विषयांतर्गतत्वमिति पृथिव्यास्त्रिविधत्वमत एव मूले पुनस्त्रिविधत्युक्तिः संगच्छत इति ध्येयम्. Even if the three-fold division be ascribed to पृथिवी in general, it does not apply to नित्या पृथिवी, that is, atoms, as all the atoms obviously fall into the third of the latter three divisions i. e. विषय. In other words, नित्या पृथिवी instead of being the genus of the latter three kinds becomes a variety of one of them. In this way the passage in T. D. can be made to agree with the *Sūtra*, and both views reconciled.

6. शरीर is defined as आत्मनो भोगायतनम्, but a more accurate definition is अन्त्यावयवित्वे सति चेष्टाश्रयम्, that is, a final product which possesses voluntary action. अन्त्यावयवित्व is defined as अवयवज-

The three varieties of the earth

निरूपणद्वारा शास्त्रस्यापि मोक्षोपयोगः । तदनन्तरं श्रुत्युपदिष्टयोगवि-
धिना निदिध्यासने कृते तदनन्तरं देहादिविलक्षणात्मसाक्षात्कारे सति
देहादावहमभिमानरूपमिथ्याज्ञाननाशे सति दोषाभावात्प्रवृत्त्यभावे ध-
र्माधर्मयोरभावाज्जन्माभावे पूर्वधर्माधर्मयोरनुभवेन नाशे चरमदुःखध्वंस-
लक्षणो मोक्षो जायते । ज्ञानमेव मोक्षसाधनं मिथ्याज्ञाननिवृत्तेर्ज्ञानमाल-
साध्यत्वात् “ तमेव विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय ”
इति साधनान्तरनिषेधाच्च । ननु “ तत्प्राप्तिहेतुर्विज्ञानं कर्म चोक्तं महा-
मुने ” इति कर्मणोऽपि मोक्षसाधनत्वस्मरणज्ज्ञानकर्मणोः समुच्चय इति
चेन्न । “ नित्यनैमित्तिकैरेव कुर्वाणो दुरितक्षयम् । ज्ञानं च विमलीकुर्वन्न-
भ्यासेन च पाचयेत् । अभ्यासात्पक्वविज्ञानं कैवल्यं लभते नरः ” इत्या-
दिना कर्मणो ज्ञानसाधनत्वप्रतिपादनात् । ज्ञानद्वारैव कर्म मोक्षसाधनं न
साक्षात् । तस्मात्पदार्थज्ञानस्य मोक्षः परमं प्रयोजनमिति सर्वं रमणीयम् ॥
इति श्रीमदद्वैतविद्याचार्य-श्रीमद्राघवसोमयाजिकुलावतंस-श्रीमत्तिरु-
मलाचार्यवर्यस्य सूनुनाऽन्नभट्टेन कृता स्वकृततर्कसंग्रहस्य दीपिका
संपूर्णा^१ ॥

न्या. बो.—सर्वेषामिति । प्रमाणप्रमेयसंशयप्रयोजनदृष्टान्तसि-
द्धान्तावयवतर्कनिर्णयवादजल्पवितण्डाहेत्वाभासच्छलजातिनिग्रहस्थानानां
तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगम इति न्यायस्यादिमे सूत्र उक्तानां प्रमाण-
प्रमेयादीनामित्यर्थः । विस्तरस्त्वन्यत्रानुसंधेयः^३ ॥

1 After साक्षात् G V add तदुक्त-
माचार्यैस्तस्मादुपकारकं कर्मेति.

2 This colophon is found in J
alone, and is inserted here be-
cause it is important. It also
occurs in two other works of
our author.

3 This is the reading of R and

U. B omits प्रमाणप्रमेया—र्थः,
and joins उक्तानां to next
sentence. S and W read the
passage differently. Different
Mss. give various colophons,
while S and W add a verse,
which are omitted here.



६८

तर्कसंग्रहः

CSL

[SECT. 81.

काणादन्यायमतयोर्बालव्युत्पत्तिसिद्धये ।

अन्नंभट्टेन विदुषा रचितस्तर्कसंग्रहः ॥

इति श्रीमहामहोपाध्यायान्नंभट्टविरचितः स्वकृतदीपिकया श्रीगोव-
र्धनकृतन्यायबोधिण्या च समेतस्तर्कसंग्रहः समाप्तः ॥

स्यत्वे सत्यवयव्यजनकत्वम्, a thing which is produced from parts but does not itself become a producer of another product, such as a jar. Our body is such a final product, because it does not

Body.

constitute a part of any other larger product; and it possesses the additional character of being the seat of voluntary actions. चेष्टा

is defined as हिताहितप्राप्तिपरिहारार्थक्रिया an act which conduces to the acquisition of the desirable and prevention of the undesirable. A hand or a foot is also the seat of such चेष्टा, but it is not a final product as it forms a part of a larger body. Body is divided into योनिज embryonic, and अयोनिज non-embryonic. The first is शुक्रशोणितमेलनजन्य and belongs to human beings, quadrupeds, birds etc. The second kind is possessed by insects born of perspiration, plants and semi-divine personages, like the sage *Manu*, who were self-born owing to the influence of अदृष्ट. This classification comprehends the whole Biology of the *Naiyāyikas*.

7. The second division of earth is organ of sense, which is also limited to animate nature. इन्द्रिय is defined as शब्देतरोद्भूतविशेषगुणानाश्रयत्वे सति ज्ञान-

Organ.

कारणमनः संयोगाश्रयम्. "An organ of sense is

the seat of that contact of mind which produces knowledge, but is not the seat of any manifested special qualities except sound." The *Naiyāyika* theory of perception is given by S. C. thus:—आत्मा मनसा संयुज्यते मन इन्द्रियेणेन्द्रियमर्थेन ततः प्रत्यक्षम्. "The organ is united with the external object on the one hand and is on the other connected with the mind which acts as a link with the soul." So the contact of the mind is with two things at once, viz. the soul and the organ, and both are the causes of knowledge. The first part of the definition ending with सति is therefore inserted to exclude the soul, which is the seat of 14 special qualities,¹ while the organ of sense possesses none. But then one might object that as the organs of sense such as smell and sight partake of the nature of their respective constituents, viz., earth and light, they must possess odour and colour, the special qualities of

1. See quotation p. 85-86 *Supra*.

earth and light. The answer is that they do possess them, but the qualities are not manifested in them, and hence the word उद्भूत is inserted to qualify विशेषण. In this form however the definition becomes too narrow, because it does not apply to श्रोत्र, the organ of hearing, which being by hypothesis आकाशस्वरूप possesses one उद्भूतविशेषण viz. शब्द. This defect is removed by excluding शब्द (शब्देतर) from the special qualities that are not manifested in an organ of sense. In this way the definition is made to denote an organ alone. Other and perhaps simpler definitions of इन्द्रिय are शरीरसंयुक्तं ज्ञानकारण-मतीन्द्रियम्¹ and स्मृत्यजनक-ज्ञानजनक-मनःसंयोगाश्रयत्वम्.² In the first of these अतीन्द्रिय excludes the Soul and external objects, while शरीरसंयुक्तम् excludes निर्विकल्पज्ञान which being अतीन्द्रिय is the proximate cause of सविकल्पज्ञान. In the second definition the words स्मृत्यजनक exclude the Soul. इन्द्रिय is of two kinds, the internal (अन्तरिन्द्रिय) which is mind, and the external (बहिरिन्द्रिय) which are five, viz. the organs of sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch, corresponding to the five elements. Of these the organs of smell, taste and hearing apprehend qualities only, while the rest apprehend substances as well as qualities.

8. The third division of earth is विषय object, which comprehends the whole mass of inorganic substances. The term विषय is used here somewhat loosely. It signifies everything that

at any time becomes the object of our knowledge. Organs of sense not being objects of direct preception may perhaps be excluded from the class विषय, but organic bodies, at least of all the living beings beside ourselves, do become the objects of perception and ought therefore to fall under विषय. One's own body being subjective (आध्यात्मिक) may be ranked apart, but the bodies of other persons are as much objects of knowledge as houses or stones. Why then should they not be included under विषय ? The reason is that the word विषय is used here in a restricted sense. It

1 T. K. p. 3.

2 Tattva-Cintāmaṇi.

means those things only which are always the objects and never the subjects of knowledge. The bodies of living beings though objects of other men's knowledge are subjective so far as each individual is concerned, while inanimate things like stones not having any knowledge of their own must always remain objects and objects only. This point does not seem to have been clearly understood by commentators, although the difficulty was perceived by them. S. C. for instance remarks "यद्येतल्लक्षणं शरीरादावतिव्याप्तामिति विभाव्यते तदा शरीरेन्द्रियभित्त-त्वमेव तदनुसरम् । वस्तुतस्तु शरीरादिकमपि विषय एव । भेदेन कीर्तनं तु बालधी-वैश्याय," that is, although the three-fold division is a cross-division in as much as the usual definition of विषय (भोगोपयोगी विषयः) would also apply to bodies and organs, the latter are classed separately for the clear understanding of beginners. This explanation of S. C. is of course copied from a similar one in *Muktāvalī* : शरीरेन्द्रिययोर्विषयत्वेऽपि प्रकारान्तरापन्यासः शिष्य-बुद्धिवैश्यायार्थः.¹ It is difficult to guess how such a cross-division tends to the easy comprehension of beginners, but probably these commentators, while noting that body and organ are expressly excluded from विषय, did not quite realize why the meaning of the word विषय was thus restricted. It is also significant that *Annambhaṭṭa* defines विषय simply as शरीरेन्द्रिय-भित्तः, and thus carefully abstains from any reference to भोग or उपभोग.

9. There are two other questions with regard to the extent of the class विषय which cannot be so easily answered. The first is whether atoms are included in विषय. The definition भोगोपयोगी would of course exclude them, for atoms being अतीन्द्रिय can never be the objects of enjoyment. Besides other works expressly exclude them. *Bhāṣā-Pariccheda* for instance has:—

विषयो द्रव्यणुकादिश्च ब्रह्माण्डान्त उदाहृतः ।²

On the other hand, as observed in a previous note (*Supra* p. 106) *Annambhaṭṭa* would seem to include atoms under विषय, and the fact that he gives a definition of विषय which

1 S. M. Cal. ed. p. 27.

2 B. P. 37.

applies to atoms as well as products supports the conjecture. The second question is whether plants are to be classed with शरीर or with विषय. The question seems to have very much exercised later writers, and there is a difference of opinion. *Praśastapāda* includes trees under विषय,¹ while *Viśvanātha*, the author of *Siddhānta-Muktāvalī*, declares in favour of the opposite view.² *Śaṅkara Miśra* discusses the arguments on both sides and arrives at the only reasonable conclusion, तथापि चेष्टावस्त्वमिन्द्रियवस्त्वं च नोद्दिष्टं स्फुटतरमतो न शरीरव्यवहारः.³ *Annam-bhaṭṭa* also would seem to take the same view.

SECT. XI. आपः.

Water is a thing having cold touch. It is of two sorts, eternal and non-eternal. Eternal is atom, non-eternal is the product. It is again three-fold, body, organ, and object. Body is in the region of Varuṇa, organ is the sense of taste perceiving savour and residing on the tip of the tongue ; masses are rivers, seas etc.

1. Water is defined as having cool touch. Like earth, *Water.* water is divided, first into eternal and non-eternal, and then into body, organ and mass. The watery body is possessed by beings in the regions of *Varuṇa*, the organ is the organ of taste located at the tip of the tongue, and the mass comprehends rivers, oceans etc. This and the following paragraph on light closely resemble the last one treating of earth, and appear to have been inserted with an eye to symmetry. They are good examples of how a passion for analogies and symmetry in everything often leads to unwarranted and absurd conclusions. Because we see earthy bodies and earthy atoms, we are also asked to believe in watery and luminary bodies as well as atoms in the *Varuṇa* and *Āditya* regions respectively. *Kaṇāda* defines water as रूपरसस्पर्शवत्य आपो द्रवाः स्निग्धाः,⁴ and al-

1. P. B. Ben. ed. p. 23.

2. S. M. Cal. ed. p. 26.

3. V. S. Up. Cal. ed. p. 214.

4. V. S. II, I, 2.

so affirms the coldness of the touch of water,¹ but it is singular that no trace of the subsequent classification is found in his *Sūtras*. These details in the case of water as well as of light have been supplied by commentators, whose dialectical ingenuity never fails to supply arguments for defending the grossest absurdities. The objection, for instance, that a watery body having no solidity, would be like a bubble of water, incapable of enjoyment, is met by the reply that though such a body would be mainly composed of watery particles, there would be enough of earthy atoms in it to add consistency and cohesion. This watery body is held to be only अयोनिज. Another objection that if coldness is the special attribute of water how is it felt in slabs of stone, is answered by attributing the coldness to the presence of water in the stone. The remarks made in the three preceding notes on the last section as to the propriety of the division and cross-division, apply *mutatis mutandis* to this and the following sections also. For the qualities residing in water see quotation at p. 85 *Supra*.

SECT. XII तेजस्.

Light has hot touch. It is of two sorts, eternal and non-eternal; eternal is atomic, non-eternal is product. It is again threefold, body, organ and mass; body is well-known in the Solar region, organ is the sight which perceives colour and resides in the forepart of the black pupil of the eye; mass is fourfold, earthy, heavenly, gastric and mineral. Earthy (mass) is fire and the like; heavenly is lightning etc. produced from watery fuel; gastric causes digestion of things eaten; mineral is gold and the like.

1. The only variation in this section over the last two is the sub-division of विषय into four kinds of light; 1 earthy, in the shape of common fire and the light of the glowworm; 2 celestial, in the shape of lightning which is fed by the fuel of water (आप इन्धनं यस्य तत्), as well as sun-light, moon-light and submarine fire; 3 gastric, which is instrumental in digesting the food eaten; and 4 mineral, such as gold and other metals. The first two kinds are undoubtedly real fires; but it will re-

1. V. S. II, 2, 5.

quire a very strong metaphor to class the latter two among the luminary substances. The gastric juice is called fire because it consumes food like fire, and produces heat in the body. The last case of luminous metals will be discussed further on.

2. The threefold division of light and the four-fold subdivision of its third variety are taken from

Varieties of lustre. *Prāśastapāda's* scholium, while the original *Sūtras* themselves contain no trace of them. *Śaṅkara Miśra*, the author of *Upas-*

kāra gives another four-fold division of light, viz, 1 having colour and touch manifested, as sun-light; 2 having colour manifested but touch unmanifested, as moon-light; 3 having both colour and touch slightly unmanifested, as the lustre of the eye; 4 having colour slightly unmanifested, but touch fully manifested, as a red-hot postsherd.¹ This division is of course not compatible with the first, and proves that the symmetrical classification adopted by *Annambhatta* was regarded by *Śaṅkara Miśra* as an innovation of the Scholiast not reconcilable with the original *Sūtra*. It may be remarked in passing that the organ of sight is located by *Naiyāyikas* at the top of the black ball, but modern science places it still further back on the retina, the black eye-balls being simply windows to let in external light. Another now exploded doctrine of the *Naiyāyikas* was that before an object could be perceived, the organ of sight went out of the eye, reached the object and then returned back to its place carrying with it the impression of the object; while it is now proved that the organ does not go out at all but the rays of the sun falling on the object carry its impression to the retina of the eye.

3. *Naiyāyikas* have spent much argument to prove why gold and other metals are classed under

Gold is light.

light. The argument by which the luminosity (तेजस्व) of gold is established is explained at length in T. D. Gold is light because it

can neither be earth, nor water, nor wind. Its being any of the last five *dravyas* is of course out of the question. Gold is not earth because the fluidity of melted

gold is not destroyed even by application of extreme heat, while the fluidity of earthy things such as clarified butter is generally found to vanish at certain temperature when there is no counteracting force. The fluidity of gold remains intact even in the absence of any counteracting force. Gold cannot therefore be of earthy nature. It cannot be water because its fluidity is occasional and not inherent; nor can it be wind as it has colour. Gold therefore is light, the heat and brilliancy natural to light being concealed by the obstruction of earthy colour and touch. The argument may be put in the following syllogism:—

सुवर्णं तेजसम् । असाति प्रतिबन्धकेऽत्यन्तानलसंयोगे च सत्यप्यनुच्छिद्य-
 मानद्रवत्वत्वात् । यन्नैवं तन्नैवं, यथा घृतम् ।

The fallacy or rather a number of fallacies in this reasoning can be easily detected. In the first place, the proposition that the fluidity of every earthy substance must be destroyed by extreme heat is an arbitrary assumption based on insufficient data. Modern science proves that the solidity and fluidity are not definite qualities belonging to particular kind of substances as the *Naiyāyikas* hold; but they are simply states of matter dependent on temperature. Thirdly the device of accounting for the non-appearance of any quality by the supposition of a counteracting force is often, as here, carried rather too far. If obstructing causes can explain the disappearance of heat and brilliancy of light, why can they not explain the non-destruction of the fluidity of gold? To remove this objection the words असाति प्रतिबन्धके are introduced in the हेतुवाक्य, for we often see that when there is an obstructing cause, even earthy substances, such as ghee placed in water, do not lose their fluidity. But how is it to be proved that there is no obstructing cause in the case of gold also? The difficulty of converting metals to gaseous state by the application of strongest possible heat seems to have struck the Indian thinkers early, but owing to the infancy of experimental sciences they did not wait to verify their conceptions of solidity and fluidity. They rather preferred the easier way of solving the difficulty by relegating these apparent exceptions to a different category altoget-



ther. The *Nāiyāyikas* included the metals under तेजस् to which their peculiar lustre gave them affinity. The *Mīmāṃsakas* went further and reckoned the metals as a distinct *dravya*.

SECT. XIII. वायुः.

Air has touch without colour. It is of two sorts eternal and non-eternal; eternal is atomic, non-eternal is product. It is again threefold, body, organ and mass; body is in the aerial world, organ is the sense of touch, apprehending touch and spread over the whole body, mass is the cause of the shaking of trees etc.

Air circulating within the body is Prāṇa. Though one, it acquires different names such as Prāṇa, Apāna, etc. owing to (different) situations.

1. This section also is modelled on the three last preceding. Air is defined as colourless and possessing touch. It is of two kinds eternal and non-eternal, and again of three kinds, body in the regions of wind, organ of sense in the shape of the airy cuticle extending over the whole surface of our body, and object or mass in the form of the wind that blows and shakes trees.

2. Another variety of air is however mentioned, called *Breath*. vital air or breath, which is nothing but wind moving inside our body. There is a difference of opinion as to how breath is to be classed under wind. *Prāśastapāda* and the ancient school mention breath as a fourth kind of air and distinct from the body, organ, and mass; while later works on *Nyāya* generally include it under mass. It is doubtful what view *Annambhaṭṭa* takes, but from the unconnected manner in which he has tacked the definition of प्राण to the section on वायु, he seems to be undecided. While he divides वायु into three kinds only, and not into four as *Prāśastapāda* has done, he does not expressly class प्राण under विषय. In the *Dīpikā* also he carefully avoids the point, although the अवतरण "ननु प्राणस्य कुत्रान्तर्भावः" would seem to show that he

had to say something on the point. He gives however a decided opinion as to the identity of the five breaths. Although प्राण is mentioned as one of the five breaths, it can also be used as a generic name for all of them, as the remaining four are nothing more than the same प्राण called by different names, according to the different parts of body it travels over and the different functions it performs. There are not really five breaths but only one passing through five places and performing five functions, each at its proper place. *Prasastapāda* simply says क्रियाभेदादिभिरपानादिसंज्ञां लभते, the first word आदि including स्थान. *Annambhatta* has improved upon him by employing the word उपाधि which signifies both क्रिया and स्थान. The exact meaning of उपाधि will be discussed further on. The five breaths are differentiated by their places in an old verse :—

हृदि प्राणो गुदेऽपानः समानो नाभिसंस्थितः ।

उदानः कण्ठदेशस्थो व्यानः सर्वशरीरगः ॥

Prāṇa is situated in the breast, *Apāna* in the rectum, *Samāna* in the navel, *Udāna* in the throat and *Vyāna* over the whole body.

The functions and names of the five are explained thus:—
सुखनासिकाभ्यां निष्क्रमणप्रवेशनात्प्राणः । मलादीनामधोनयनादपानः । आहारेषु पाकार्थं वह्नेः समुन्नयनात्समानः । उर्ध्वं नयनादुदानः । नाडीमुखेषु वितननाद्व्यानः । These five breaths also bear mythological names:—

उद्गारे नाग आख्यातः कूर्म उन्मीलने स्मृतः ।

रुकरः क्षुत्करो ज्ञेयो देवदत्तो विजृम्भणे ।

न जहाति मृतं चापि सर्वव्यापी धनंजयः ॥

As the whole of this peculiarly *Pauranic* physiology has been imported into modern *Nyāya* works it cannot be totally ignored, but it is not necessary to dwell on it here any further. It may be noted, however, as a good example how Indian systematists often imported foreign material into their systems, and reconciled it as far as possible with their fundamental doctrines.

3. Air has been defined as devoid of colour, and possessing touch; the first epithet distinguishes it from the first three and the second epithet from the last five *dravyas*. The touch in the air is again neither hot nor cool, and therefore different from the touch in light or water. Air thus occupies a somewhat middle and ambiguous position between the visible and the invisible *dravyas*; and consequently a hot discussion has been carried on between the ancient and the modern schools of *Naiyāyikas* as to whether air is perceptible or not. The ancients held that air cannot be perceived but can only be known by inference ; and *Annambhaṭṭa* inclines to the same view. The argument, says T. D., that air is perceptible like a jar, as it possesses perceptible touch, is wrong, because manifested colour is a necessary condition precedent to perceptibility. A condition (उपाधि) is defined as साध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापकः, that which is greater in extent than साध्य (the thing to be proved) but is not more extensive than the साधन or हेतु (reason). In a good syllogism the साध्य must always be greater than, or at least equal in extent to, the हेतु, e. g. the साध्य fire should always exist wherever there is smoke, the हेतु. When however the हेतु is greater in extent than the साध्य, there are necessarily found cases where the हेतु exists but the साध्य does not; and consequently an argument based on that हेतु becomes fallacious. These cases are due to an उपाधि. Now let us put the above argument in a syllogism, and the उपाधि will at once appear :—

वायुः प्रत्यक्षः

प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयत्वात्

या यो द्रव्यत्वे सति प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयः स स प्रत्यक्षः यथा घटः ।

तथा वायुम् ।

तस्मात्तथा ।

Here हेतु is सोपाधिक because there is an उपाधि intervening between the हेतु and the साध्य. The उपाधि is उद्भूतरूपवत्त्व (the state of having manifested colour) and is of course greater in extent than the साध्य and less than the साधन. The उपाधि is greater than the साध्य because we can say यत्र द्रव्यत्वे सति बहिरिन्द्रियजन्य-

प्रत्यक्षत्वं तत्रोद्भूतरूपवत्त्वं, all substances visible to external senses have manifested colour. The words द्रव्य and बहिरिन्द्रिय are used in order to make it clear that we are talking of sensuous perception of substances only, and thus to exclude आत्मा and perceptible qualities like रूप. We cannot however assert यत्र यत्र प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयत्वं तत्रोद्भूतरूपवत्त्वं, wherever there is tangibility there is manifested colour, because we know as a fact that air though प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रय does not possess उद्भूतरूप. The उपाधि is therefore साधनात्पापक. On account of its existence the व्याप्ति or major premise becomes too extensive, and the whole argument is a fallacy. Separated from its technicalities, the above reasoning amounts to this. According to the hypothesis of the ancient *Naiyāyikas* the term प्रत्यक्षत्व has a narrower meaning and is exclusively applied to the cases of ocular perception. Hence substances and qualities that are apprehended by other senses but are not seen by the eye do not become objects of perception. In this restricted sense of प्रत्यक्ष, namely ocular perception, it is evident that उद्भूतरूपवत्त्व must be a necessary condition and that air which has no रूप cannot be perceptible.

The modern *Naiyāyikas*, who affirm the perceptibility of air, deny this *in toto*, because they deny the very hypothesis that बहिरिन्द्रियप्रत्यक्षत्व is confined to ocular perception only. Their view is explained by S. C. as being बहिरिन्द्रियप्रत्यक्षं प्रति महत्त्वविशिष्ट-विभुव्यावृत्त-विशेषणः महत्त्वविशिष्टोद्भूतरूपोद्भूतस्पर्शाश्रयतद्वा कारणम्, that is everything is perceptible that possesses some special quality having महत्त्व but not विभुत्व, as for instance manifested colour or manifested touch, combined with magnitude. On this hypothesis modern *Naiyāyikas* regard air as perceptible, as it is the object of स्पर्शान, as opposed to चाक्षुष, प्रत्यक्ष, but atoms are not, because they have no magnitude. *Annambhaṭṭa* holds the ancient view and regards air as inferable only.

4. The inference to prove the existence of वायु is stated at length in T. D. The not-hot-not-cold touch which we feel on the blowing of the wind must reside in some substance as it is a quality, because the व्याप्ति, यो यो गुणः स स किञ्चिद्द्रव्याश्रयः is universally true. Now the touch cannot reside in earth, because all earthy matter having manifested touch has also manifested colour which is not found here. The touch cannot also reside in water or light, because it is neither cold nor hot. It cannot reside in the four all-pervading substances, ether, time, space and soul, for if it did, it ought to be found everywhere. Finally it cannot rest in mind, because mind being atomic, any quality residing in it cannot be felt. So there must be a ninth substance, different from these, where this touch may reside, and that substance we call air.

It is not necessary to criticise the above reasoning, because it is too evidently founded on a total ignorance of the nature of atmosphere as determined by modern physical science. The idea that our atmosphere is a mixture of different gases and not one uniform वायु, and that it has several distinguishing properties besides touch and other 'special qualities,' never occurred to these Indian physicists. Roughly speaking, पृथिवी, जल and वायु of the *Naiyāyikas* may be identified with the three states of matter, solid, fluid and gaseous, while तेजस् is a sort of material embodiment of the energy of heat. The Hindu physicist most probably did not know that heat and luminosity are the results of the same kind of chemical action. Luminosity or भास्वरशुद्धरूप was classed as a variety of colour, while औष्ण्य was a kind of touch.

5. As air is the last of the four tangible *dravyas* which are divided into eternal and non-eternal, the T. D. takes occasion to state the *Nyāya* theory of creation and destruction of material things. Motion is first produced in the atoms as a result of God's will. This motion produces conjunction of two monads giving birth to a diad. Three diads or binary atoms make one tertiary. From this last is produced the quadrate, and so on, until the great masses of earth, and water, and light, and atmosphere are formed.

6. The destruction of things takes place in the same order, that is, when God wills to destroy effects, motion is produced dividing the monads, and thereby destroying the binary. Thence follows the destruction of the tertiary, and so on, until the mass of earth becomes extinct. This is the process of creation and destruction which is unanimously accepted by all *Naiyāyikas*; but there is a difference of opinion between the ancient and the modern schools as to the precise cause which immediately brings about the destruction of things. The old traditionists (संप्रदाय) held that with one exception the destruction of effects is immediately brought about by the destruction of their causes, the exception being the binaries which are destroyed, not by the destruction of their causes, i. e. the monads which are indestructible, but by the destruction of the *union* of the monads or primary atoms. In other words, the binaries are destroyed by the dissolution, and the subsequent products by the destruction, of the parts composing them. The dissolution of parts no doubt occurs in the latter cases also, but there it is itself the result of the destruction of parts. The moderns object to this multiplicity of causes on the ground that it is simpler (साधव) to assume only one uniform cause in all cases, namely, the dissolution of the union binding the parts, than to suppose one cause for the binaries and another for other effects. In their opinion, therefore, there is only one cause for the destruction of all effects, namely the dissolution of the union which is the असमवायि कारण or non-intimate cause of the product.

7. The difference between the two views is much more radical than appears at first. According to the former view, the process of destruction always proceeds from cause to effect i. e. the destruction of parts always precedes the destruction of effect. When the monads are separated, the binaries are necessarily destroyed, and the destruction of the latter as necessarily involves the destruction of the tertiaries. In this manner the final product is destroyed the last, just as it is the

last to be produced. Now this is diametrically opposed to the view held by other schools of Indian philosophers, especially the *Vedāntins*. *Bādarāyaṇa* in *Brahma-Sūtra* II, 3, 14 expressly says that the process of destruction is just the opposite of that of creation; that is, the final product is destroyed first, then its parts, then their parts respectively, until we arrive at the ultimate causes. In other words, destruction is accomplished by the successive resolution of things into their components. This is in accordance with the rule warranted by our experience that analysis or division proceeds in a contrary way to synthesis or composition, whilst the *Naiyāyika* theory lays down that the building and the pulling down processes are accomplished exactly in the same way. This means that as we build a house from the foundation to the top, we should pull it down in the same order. This is certainly an impossibility; for, as *Śaṅkarācārya* in his commentary on the above mentioned *Brahma-sūtra* justly points out, if the destruction of effect follows that of parts, there must be an interval when the parts have vanished but the effect remains. Where could the effect reside in this interval? Not on the intermediate parts which are already extinct, nor on the ultimate atoms between which and the final effect there is no direct connection. The existence of the effect in the absence of the parts is as absurd as it would be impossible to take away the foundation of a house without bringing down the roof. The theory of destruction laid down by the ancient *Naiyāyikas* is therefore opposed to reason as well as experience. But the view of the moderns is not so inconsistent with the natural order of things. Their theory that destruction of effects is produced by the dissolution of the union of parts is equally reconcilable with the old *Naiyāyika* doctrine and the Vedantic doctrine, according as we conceive the process of destruction to begin from the non-intimate cause of *क्षणिक* and end with that of the final product, or *vice versa*. The old *Naiyāyika* theory is positively opposed to the order of nature, while the modern is reconcilable with it.

8. The *Naiyāyikas* accept the old mythological idea of two cosmic dissolutions, an अवंतरमलय (intermediate dissolution) when all tangible products only are destroyed, and a महाप्रलय (universal dissolution) when all things, material and immaterial, are merged in the *primum mobile*, that is, the atoms. These periodical creations and destructions, says T. D., are proved on the authority of the *Śruti* text वाता यथा-पूर्वमकल्पयत्, 'the Creator made the creation as before,' the word 'before' implying that there was a previous creation of which the present one is a copy.

9. This is a convenient place for an explanation of the *Naiyāyika* परमाणुवाद or Indian atomic theory, as it is essentially connected with the evolution and ultimate form of the first four substances. The *Nyāya* theory of creation and destruction as explained above presupposes the existence of atoms, while the division of earth, water, light and air, into eternal and non-eternal is founded on the same fact. T. D. therefore properly asks and answers here the question what is the proof for the existence of these atoms on which so large a part of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* doctrines seems to be based. The argument briefly put by T. D. may be explained thus: Every visible thing is composed of parts, for a thing in order to be visible must have three dimensions, length, breadth and thickness; and these dimensions necessarily presuppose smaller parts. A line has length because it is a succession of many points, while a surface has length and breadth because it is a series of lines placed side-ways. A mathematical point on the other hand having no dimension can never be perceived and is really speaking nothing but a notion. Having established this universal and self-evident proposition that every visible thing has parts (यत्र यत्र चाक्षुषद्रव्यत्वं तत्र सावयवत्वं यथा पटे), we get the further axiom, also proved by experience, that every object having parts is divisible into any number of smaller parts. From these two axioms we

come to the conclusion that by gradually dividing and subdividing a thing howsoever large we can arrive at particles as minute as we please. But the same experience which gives us the above two self-evident axioms puts a limit to our power of division, and we find that beyond a certain limit we cannot go on dividing a particle *ad infinitum*. In modern times Chemistry has increased this power of division largely but still it is not indefinite, and science is forced to assume a limit on which it bases all its calculations. This limit is the परमाणु of *Nyāya* and the atom of European scientists, the smallest of the small, and the ultimate constituent of all matter in the universe. Human mind cannot think without having some purely simple notions which it combines into complex ideas, and these simple notions must have their counterparts, such as the atoms, in the external world. This is the genesis of the atomic theory, and the *Naiyāyika* argument to prove the existence of परमाणु is essentially the same, although clothed in the phraseology of their peculiar dogmas. The smallest visible particle is the mote in the sunbeam which is called व्यणुक, त्रसरणु, or त्रुदि, that is, a tertiary atom. This mote being visible must have parts. Each of these parts again, called द्व्यणुक, is divisible into smaller parts because it produces the large magnitude in the त्रसरणु, just as the thread of a large piece of cloth is itself divisible. To explain this it must be noted here that in *Nyāya* theory the महत्त्व, magnitude, is a distinct species of dimension from अणुत्व, and cannot therefore be produced from it. If द्व्यणुक had no parts and were itself the ultimate particle, its अणुत्व would have been incapable of producing the महत्त्व of व्यणुक; while by assuming a further subdivision of द्व्यणुक into two atoms, we can account for the magnitude of व्यणुक by saying that it is the number of atoms composing the binaries forming a व्यणुक, and not their अणुत्व, that gives rise to the latter's magnitude. It is for this reason that while two atoms make one binary molecule three binaries are thought necessary to make up a tertiary. The number two only intensifies in the product the परिमाण of

each part; and thus the compound of two binaries, which are अणु, would be अणुतर *i. e.* still more minute, and not महत् as the त्र्यणुक really is. Therefore the number of binaries composing the त्र्यणुक is fixed at three to account for its magnitude, while, no such reason existing in the case of द्व्यणुक, the number of its parts *i. e.* the atoms, need not be more than two. Hence the mnemonical couplet जालसूर्यमरीचिचर्यं यत्सूक्ष्मं दृश्यते रजः । तस्य षष्ठतमो भागः परमाणुः स उच्यते ॥ The atom is the sixth part of the little mote which we see in the sun-beam coming through the window.

10. The question then arises -In what respect does the अणुत्व of a binary differ from the अणुत्व of an atom? That the two are different cannot be disputed, because atoms being parts of binaries must be smaller, and also because their परिमाण has a distinct name परिमाण्डल्य which is never applied to binaries. Now, according to the law that like produces like, the अणुत्व of a द्व्यणुक must be greater *in degree* than the परिमाण्डल्य of a परमाणु, that is, a binary must be more minute than the atom, which is absurd. To obviate this difficulty as well as that about the महत्त्व in त्र्यणुक, the *Naiyāyikas* make an exception of atoms and binaries to the usual rule that the magnitude of the product is nothing but the magnitudes of parts intensified so many times. They assert that the magnitude of the product is produced by any one of the three causes, *viz.* the magnitude, the number, or the particular arrangement of parts. *Kaṇāda*, in the aphorism कारणबहुत्वाच्च,¹ by the च in which according to commentators we are to understand the two other causes कारणमहत्त्व and प्रचयविशेष, lays down this multiplicity of causes, and expressly distinguishes अणुत्व from महत्त्व in the next aphorism. While the महत्त्व of products from त्र्यणुक upwards is caused by कारणमहत्त्व as well as प्रचय, अणुत्व is caused by बहुत्व or number of parts only. But here comes the question why we should stop at the sixth part of त्रसरणु. There seems to have been a difference of opinion as to why we must go even so far. Some are for stopping at द्व्यणुक and others at त्रुति or त्र्यणुक.

even,¹ but no one appears to go beyond the परमाणु, except of course the *Vedāntins* and the *Sāṃkhyas* who deny the परमाणुवाद altogether. The necessity of stopping at this limit is of course founded on the usual argument of *regressus ad infinitum*. If we have to stop somewhere it is better that we should stop at the earliest limit available; for, as T. D. puts it, if this परमाणु also is a product of still smaller parts, there will be अनवस्था. The same argument is often put in another way. Why is this jar distinct from or larger or smaller than the piece of cloth or that jar? The answer is that the constituent parts of this jar are different or more or less numerous than those in the other. The parts of each are again larger or smaller according as they contain more or less sub-divisions. Reasoning in this way we find that a mountain is far bigger than a mustard seed, because the number of ultimate parts, that is the atoms, is much larger in the first than in the second. These ultimate particles must be all indivisible and of equal magnitude, because so long as there are degrees of size amongst them, there will be a possibility of reducing the larger to the size of the smaller, that is, there will be further division. The indivisibility of atoms necessarily implies that they are all of equal size. It is nothing but their greater or smaller number therefore that can make one thing, like the mountain *Meru*, big, and another thing, like a mustard seed, small. To calculate these numbers we must have a common unit like परमाणु. If we however do not recognize परमाणु and go on dividing *ad infinitum*, the number of parts in both things will be equal but the parts will vary in magnitude, and the question why one is larger than the other will ever remain unsolved. Thus the parts in both the *Meru* and the mustard seed being always the same in number, namely infinite, there is no reason why the one thing should differ in size from the other, and perfect equality ought to exist between the two (मेरुसर्वपयोस्तुल्यत्वप्रसङ्गः). If however, we fix upon a

unit like परमाणु, we can easily account for their different magnitudes by the varying number of atoms in each. It can be easily guessed from this that the statement made above that the magnitude of a thing depends on the number (बहुत्व) or the size (महत्त्व) or the peculiar arrangement (प्रत्ययविशेष) of its parts was only provisional, the real cause in all cases being the number of ultimate parts, while the latter two causes were simply the variations of the first. This may perhaps account for their omission in the original aphorism of Kaṇāda.²

11. A third but not a very convincing argument for proving the necessity of atoms may be stated in Dr. Roer's words—
"To say that the point where the end is obtained is not eternal would be to admit the production of an effect from a thing which is not in the connection of intimate relation. Therefore this point is eternal. As the continual progress from one great thing to another still greater finds its end in the assumption of the sky and other infinite substances, so there must also be ultimately a cessation of the progress from small to a smaller thing. Thus the necessity of atoms is proved." ²

12. Such is the परमाणुवाद which originally distinguished Vaiśeṣika philosophy from others, and which was afterwards imported into various other systems. It closely resembles the doctrine of atoms which found acceptance with several Greek philosophers. Leucippus considered the basis of all bodies to consist of extremely fine particles, differing in form and nature, which he supposed to be dispersed throughout space and to which the followers of Epicurus first gave the name of atoms. To these atoms he attributed a rectilinear motion, in consequence of which such as are homogeneous were united, whilst the lighter ones were dispersed throughout space. The universe was made of matter consisting of ultimate indivisible atoms which are indestructible and

Atomic theory in
India and Greece,

¹ V. S. VII, 1. 9.

² Roer's Trans. of B. P. Bib. Ind. p. 16 Note.

eternal. Empedocles and Anaxagoras did not exclude mind and spirit from this atom-born universe, thus partially agreeing with *Kaṇāda* who excludes spirit but includes mind and intellect in matter. Leucippus and Democritus excluded both. Epicurus added nothing to the doctrine. The परमाणु-वाद of *Kaṇāda* also materially agrees with the modern atomic theory of Dalton on which the whole science of chemistry may be said to be founded. The conception of atoms, simple as it seems when once comprehended, is one of the most subtle and shows a considerable advance of philosophical thought. The doctrine has been sharply criticized by *Śaṅkarācārya* and other Vedantic writers, and their criticisms have greatly tended to diminish its popularity ; but the credit of originality is none the less due to the philosopher who first discovered it.

SECT. XIV. आकाशम्.

Ākāśa or ether is that which has sound for its (special) quality. It is one, all-pervading and eternal.

This definition of ether differs from the preceding four in that the word गुण is inserted in it, when *Ākāśa* or ether, the author might have as well said शब्दवत् or शब्दसमवायि आकाशम्. What is then the propriety of the word गुण ? V. V. and S. C. explain it as intended to controvert the doctrine of *Bhūttā Mīmāṃsakas* that sound is a substance and not a quality ; but the explanation is rather far-fetched. That of N. B. and *Nilakantha* is better, namely that the word गुण is used for विशेषगुण and implies that sound is the special quality of ether and ether alone, as distinguished from all other substances. Colour and other qualities are found in several substances, and even odour, the special quality of earth, is often associated with water and air ; but sound is always confined to ether. Hence the author defined earth as simply गन्धवती while he defines ether as शब्दगुणम्. As to the *Mīmāṃsā* doctrine that sound is substance, it is already denied.

by the mention of शब्द among the *gunas*. *Ākāśa* is also defined as संयोगाजन्यविशेषगुणसमानाधिकरणविशेषाधिकरणम्¹ i. e. ether is the seat of that particularity (विशेष) which coexists with a special quality (sound) that is created but not produced from conjunction. Ether, being eternal and all-pervading, has a विशेष of its own, but this विशेष is distinguished from that of soul, as it is accompanied by a *created* special quality i. e. sound, and hence the qualification जन्यविशेषगुण etc. But then the *particularities* in atoms are also accompanied by *created* qualities and hence they have to be excluded by the further epithet संयोगाजन्य, the special qualities in atoms such as पाकजरूप being often अग्निसंयोगजन्य. This elaborate definition therefore ultimately amounts to the same as शब्दगुण. *Ether* is the best available though not quite accurate English equivalent for *Ākāśa* because it resembles the latter in being an all-pervading and imponderable substance. Ether however carries light and heat only, and not sound, which function is assigned by modern science to the atmosphere. Ether therefore resembles *Ākāśa* in all respects, except its special quality of producing sound. Both ether and *Ākāśa* are substances proved by inference, that is, their existence is presumed in order to account for certain natural phenomena, such as the diffusion of light and sound which are otherwise inexplicable.

2 *Kaṇāda*² concludes sound to be the sign (लिङ्ग) of *Ākāśa*

Why sound is the attribute of *Ākāśa*'s.

by process of exhaustion, because no other substance is capable of having sound as its quality. The question in what respects

Ākāśa differs from *Dik* will be discussed under *Dik*. The fact seems to be that the names of the five elements including *Ākāśa* came down to the *Nāyāyikas* from a very ancient source and that they had no choice but to recognize them if they wanted to preserve their orthodoxy. They only assigned to each such place and functions as harmonized with their own physical theory of the universe. Our author mentions three characteristics of *Ākāśa*, that it is one, all-pervading, and eternal. The

¹ Sarv. D. S. Calc. ed. p. 104.

² V. S. II, 1, 27.



CSL

epithet *one* implies that the mention of numerous *Akāśas* such as घटाकाश and मटाकाश in common parlance is due to उपाधि and cannot be real. Being one and emitting sound everywhere, ether is necessarily all-pervading; and being all-pervading it must be eternal also. Being विभु *Akāśa* is अतीन्द्रिय, imperceptible, and therefore known only by inference. The syllogism may be put thus : शब्दः पृथिव्याद्यष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तद्रव्याश्रितः । अष्टद्रव्यानाश्रितत्वे सति समवायिकारणवत्त्वात् । यन्नैवं तन्नैवं यथा रूपम्.

3. T. D. defines विभुत्व, all-pervasion, as सर्वमूर्तद्रव्यसंयोगित्वम्, contact with all corporeal objects. Corporeality (मूर्तत्व) again is defined as परिच्छिन्नपरिमाणत्वं, the quality of having definite dimensions. मूर्तत्व is defined by N. B. as क्रियावद्द्रव्यत्वम्. Corporeal substances are thus either those that have definite dimensions or that have motion. The second definition practically amounts to the same as the first, because action or motion implies movement of either the parts or the whole from one place to another, and that is not possible unless the substance is limited in space. The corporeal substances are five : earth, water, light, air, and mind. They and their common properties are enumerated as follows :—

क्षितिर्जलं तथा तेजः पवनो मन एव च ।

परापरत्वमूर्तत्वक्रियावेगाश्रया अमी ॥²

These however do not constitute a separate class as they come under *Udayana's* exception, cross-division.² The class of five मूर्त *dravyas* crosses with that of five भूत *dravyas*, the first four being common to both, but मनस् of the one class being replaced by आकाश in the other. The distinction between मूर्त and भूत is simple. मूर्त *dravyas* are corporeal substances that are limited in space and have definite dimensions ; while the भूत *dravyas* are not necessarily so. They are simply elemental substances which singly or by combination among themselves become the material causes of all the products in the world.

1 B. P. 24.

2 Vide note supra, p. 92.

मनस् though atomic does not produce anything else and is not therefore भूत, while आकाश though all-pervading produces sound. The other four substances are of course both भूत and मूर्त. मूर्तत्व is opposed to विभुत्व (all-pervasion,) भूतत्व to कार्यरहितत्व or अविकारित्व (invariability). Soul is only a substratum of knowledge and not being its material cause cannot be either भूत or मूर्त.

SECT. XV. कालः.

Time is the (special and instrumental) cause of the use of (words) past etc. It is one and all-pervading.

1. Annambhatta's definition of time is very simple and is

Time.

best for all practical purposes, although it labours under the fault of being merely a verbal one. This and the succeeding de-

initions based on व्यवहार are convenient descriptions of the things and are sufficient for their identification, but they do not convey the full connotation of the terms. व्यवहार is defined by V. V. as वाक्यप्रयोगरूपः i. e. statements such as past time and future time. The word हेतु here, as well as in the following definitions where it is applied to व्यवहार, is to be understood in the restricted sense of असाधारणनिमित्तकारण, special and instrumental cause. Time is the instrumental cause of व्यवहार, as distinguished from Akāśa which is its material cause. व्यवहार, of course, is nothing more than words or sound. Similarly, time is the special cause of व्यवहार alone, as distinguished on the one hand from all other effects of which time is only the general cause (साधारणकारण), and on the other, from space and other things which are enumerated as साधारणकारणानि along with time, and which are therefore the general causes of all effects including व्यवहार. Thus the word हेतु, when taken in the above restricted sense, frees the definition of time from three faults, viz. an अतिव्याप्ति on ether, a second अतिव्याप्ति on space and other general causes, and an unnecessary restriction (अव्याप्ति) in calling time the cause of one thing only when it is really the cause of all effects. The definition in the text, being based on common usage of certain words, teaches us nothing new about the thing itself. The utmost

that it tells us is that time is some unknown entity which is necessary to explain why we speak of certain occurrences as past, others as present and others as future. The fact of there being a common usage of those terms is proved by our daily experience, and the *Naiyāyika*, finding no better way of explaining it, assumes an independent substance, which is its source but about the real character of which he is as much in the dark as those who deny the substance altogether.

2. Another and apparently more accurate definition of time is that given by *Viśvanātha*:—

जन्यानां जनकः कालो जगतामाश्रयो मतः ।

परापरत्वधीहेतुः क्षणादिः स्यादुपाधितः ॥¹

This is compressed into परापरव्यतिकर-यौगपद्यायौगपद्य-चिरक्षिप्र-प्रत्ययकारणं द्रव्यं कालः । that is, time is the substance which is the (instrumental) cause of our cognitions of priority or posteriority, simultaneity or otherwise, slowness or quickness.¹ The only material difference between this and *Annambhaṭṭa*'s definition is that the latter's व्यवहार (common usage) is substituted by प्रत्यय (cognition). According to *Annambhaṭṭa* time is the cause of व्यवहार, that is a certain kind of speech or language; while according to *Viśvanātha* and others it is the cause of a certain kind of cognitions or mental notions. Now as language and thought are identical, or rather as language is but the outward expression of thoughts, both definitions practically amount to the same thing. There can be no outward expression unless there are mental notions previously, while according to many no thinking is possible without the aid of language. Anything therefore which is an essential element of the one must be so of the other also. *Annambhaṭṭa* stops short at language and is therefore safe; *Viśvanātha* in going a step further to thought, treads on debatable ground; for one may, while accepting the instrumentality of time to व्यवहार as a broad and indubitable fact, deny that an independent entity like time is

¹ B. P. 44 5.

² Śaṅkara Mīśra on V, S. VII, 1, 25.

the cause of our particular cognitions. For aught we know, the cognitions may be due to other causes, and when produced they constitute a separate class the common property of which we denote by the word time. It is therefore obvious that *Annambhatta* was wise in purposely making his definition simple and somewhat vague.

3. The question what is time essentially, apart from its being the cause of any व्यवहार or धी remains to be answered ; and it has remained unanswered till now in spite of the various speculations of Indian and European philosophers. Among the Indians, *Sāmkhyas* denied the existence of an independent entity like time, including it under *ākāśa*, while some modern *Naiyāyikas* identify time and space with God. Time being an incorporeal and imperceptible substance is only inferrible. The argument may be stated thus : परत्वापरत्वे सासमवायिकारणके । भावकार्यत्वाद्भवत् । It must be remembered that time being संयोगरूप is the असमवायिकारण of the qualities परत्व and अपरत्व, which have the substances in which they reside for their material causes. The संयोग with which time is here identified is the contact of रविक्रिया or तपनपरिस्पन्द (motions of the sun) with material objects like घट. These motions of the sun constitute the *Upādhis* that mark the divisions of time such as moments, days and months.

4. Time is regarded as one, all-pervading and eternal entity like *Ākāśa*, its particular divisions like those of *Ākāśa*, being due to *Upādhi* and therefore unreal. Here *Annambhatta* probably means to deny the doctrine of a section of *Naiyāyikas* who assign reality to moments only, and regard time in general as merely a collection of such moments. It is clear from the above that the *Naiyāyikas* did not apply the test of a searching analysis to the conception of time, just as Kant for instance has done in modern times. In his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant arrives at the conclusion that the conception of time as well as those of space and causality are ultimate facts lying at the basis of all experience and

Time is eternal and all-pervading.

are derived from intuition only. We cannot account for it by any theory founded on experience, because experience itself is possible only when we have first the idea of time. It seems the *Naiyāyikas* had a faint notion of this fact, which they roughly expressed by saying that time is the cause of speech (व्यवहार) or thought (धी).

SECT. XVI. दिक्.

Space is the (special and instrumental) cause of the employment of words East, etc. It is one, all-pervading and eternal.

1. The definition of space in the text is modelled on that of time. *Viśvanātha* gives a more comprehensive and accurate definition, दूरान्तिकादिधीहेतुः the cause of (our) notions of far and near.¹ Another definition of space given in *Sarv. D. S.* is more technical, अकालत्वे सत्यविशेषगुणा महती,² 'space is that which not being time is extensive and is devoid of any special quality'. Space, like time, is one, all-pervading and eternal, while its varieties which are counted four or ten or any larger number, are due to *Upādhi*. The conception of space very nearly corresponds to that of time, although the two things can be sufficiently distinguished to make them separate entities. The remarks as to time in the preceding notes apply *mutatis mutandis* to space also. The difference between time and space is slight but clear. Time is the cause of कालिकपरत्व, space of देशिकपरत्व. The उपाधि which diversifies time is production, or in fact, any kind of action, while the उपाधि in the case of space is contact with corporeal objects, जन्यमात्रं क्रियामात्रं वा कालोपाधिः । मूर्तमात्रं दिद्युपाधिः (S. C.). This means that the divisions of time are determined by production and destruction of things, while those of space by the greater or smaller number of visible objects that intervene between two spots.

2. Another distinction between time and space is :--

नियतोपाधुन्नायकः कालः । अनियतोपाधुन्नायिका दिक्.³

1 B. P. 46.

2 *Sarv. D. S.* Calc. ed. p. 104.

3 *V. S. Up. Ca'c.* ed. p. 115.

The relations of time are constant, for when a moment of time is said to be present or future with reference to any object or event, it is always so ; while the relations of space are often varying, that is, the spot of ground, which may be eastward of one thing at one time, might be westward of the same thing at another or of a different thing at the same time. This means that the divisions of time are fixed and settled, while those of space are relative only. This is not however quite correct, for the relations of time are in fact as varying as those of space. The same object or event which is past in reference to one moment may be future or present with reference to another. The only positive assertion that we can make about the two conceptions is that they are complementary to each other and cannot vary at the same moment ; that is, we can speak of different times only with reference to a particular spot, and of different spaces with reference to a specific moment of time. Like time, space is inferrible only, the inference being expressed in the form : देशिकपरत्वापरत्वे सासम्बाधिकारणके । भावकार्यत्वाद्भवत्.

3. It may be asked in what respect *Dik* differs from

Ākāśa and why the two are separately recognized. Of course as treated in the *Nyāya* system the difference between the

two is too patent. *Ākāśa* is a भूतद्रव्य, *Dik* not; *Ākāśa* is the material cause of sound and has a special quality ; *Dik* does not produce sound and has no special quality; *Dik* resembles time in being the general cause of all effects, while *Ākāśa*, like earth and other material substances, produces one kind of effect only, namely, sound. *Ākāśa* belongs to the region of matter, *Dik* to the province of mind; *Ākāśa* has an objective existence, *Dik* is known by subjective experience only. In this way the two can be easily differentiated, but the question goes deeper. The objector will admit that ether and space, as conceived by the *Naiyāyikas* may be different entities, but he may still ask, why they are conceived so different at all. In what respect do they differ essentially ; and if one is dropped, cannot its functions

be assigned to the other ? It is not easy to answer the question in this form, because the conceptions of ether and space are extremely vague and general. It appears however that the *Naiyāyikas* recognized the two entities, because they could not reconcile the notion of a material cause of sound with that of a general cause of all effects. A thing which produces a positive material quality like sound must be material ; but then it cannot be the instrumental cause of mere relations like परत्व and अपरत्व, which constantly vary and have, so to say, only a mental existence. Besides it is possible that *Ākāśa* had already taken its place in the popular mind as one of the five elements before the time of *Naiyāyikas*, and they had therefore no choice but to incorporate it into their system, while they invented a new substance called *Dik* to account for ideas and notions, that could not be attributed to *Ākāśa* as it was then conceived. Whatever may be the case, the distinction between the two as defined in the *Nyāya* system is perfectly clear.

SECT. XVII. आत्मा.

The Soul is the substratum of Knowledge. He is two-fold, Human and Supreme. Of these the Supreme Soul is the All-powerful, Omniscient God, devoid of pleasure and pain. The Human Soul is different in each body and is all-pervading and eternal.

1. The eighth substance is Soul, which is defined as ' the substratum of knowledge. ' The word अवि-
 Soul. करण here implies that the knowledge resides in the soul by intimate relation (समवाय); otherwise the definition might overlap time and space, which are the receptacles of all things (सर्वाधार) by कालिक and देशिक relations respectively. This soul is of two kinds, Supreme and Human, of whom (तत्र) the Supreme Soul, namely God, is One and Omniscient, while the human Soul is all-pervading, eternal, and different in each body. The soul being अमूर्त is inferrible only, the argument being that the existence of organs of sense and their appropriate objects implies a distinct knower who can use them. करणव्यापारः सकर्तृकः । करणव्यापारत्वात् । तद्विक्रियायां वास्यादिव्यापार-
 वत् । The activity of organs must have an agent to account for it, for every instrument requires an agent to handle

it, as for instance, an axe in cutting. *Kanāda's* aphorism likewise runs इन्द्रियार्थप्रसिद्धिरिन्द्रियार्थेभ्योऽर्थान्तरस्य हेतुः.¹ The followers of *Gotama* however confine this inference to the Supreme Soul only, holding the human soul to be capable of being perceived. Another argument to prove the existence of soul is बुद्ध्यादयः पृथिव्यायष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तद्रव्याश्रिताः। पृथिव्यायष्टद्रव्यानाश्रितत्वे सति गुणत्वात्। यन्नैवं तन्नैवं, यथा रूपादि। The soul has to be inferred because a substratum is wanted for the qualities बुद्धि सुख दुःख इच्छा द्वेष प्रयत्न धर्म and अधर्म, which cannot reside in any one of the eight inanimate substances, earth etc.

2. As souls are innumerable it may be said that they constitute a class and have a common property आत्मत्व, residing in all of them. आत्मा therefore may be defined as आत्मत्वसामान्यवान्² or अमूर्तसमवेतद्रव्यत्वापरजातिः.³ According to the latter definition, soul is a species of substance having as common property that is intimately connected with an incorporeal thing. As there are four incorporeal substances, ether, time, space and soul, of which the first three being single do not form a class, आत्मत्व will be the only sub-class of द्रव्यत्व that is intimately connected with an incorporeal thing. To this definition however some might object on the ground that as Supreme and human souls are dissimilar in every respect, they cannot be huddled together in one class, and there cannot therefore be any common जाति as आत्मत्व; at least such a जाति will not reside in ईश्वर. The answer to this objection is that possession of knowledge is a property common to both kinds of souls, whatever be their other differences, and it is sufficient to make आत्मत्व a जाति covering both the Supreme and the human souls. This is implied in such general Vedic texts as आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः.⁴ The argument is characteristic and very important too. It is characteristic because it shows how a single common property often suffices the *Naiyāyikas* to form a class notwithstanding that the individuals might disagree in all other respects. The argument also explains the

1 V. S. III, 1, 2.

2 T. K, p. 3.

3 Sarv. D. S. Calc. ed. p. 104.

4 S. M. Calc. ed. p. 37.

anomaly of including two such quite distinct and dissimilar things as Supreme and human souls under one category. No two conceptions can be more opposed to each other than those of God and the human soul. One is Omniscient and One, the other is ignorant and numerous. One is the Creator and Master of the universe, the other is the slave and the plaything of fate. One is entirely free from pleasure and pain, the other is subject to all transient passions. Almost every attribute, that can be predicated of one is necessarily denied of the other. And yet the *Naiyāyikas* have grouped both of them together, because they have the single common characteristic of possession of knowledge. This knowledge again is different in both, being eternal in the Supreme, and evanescent in the human souls, but that does not necessarily make the two souls totally dissimilar. This seems to be the reason why *Annambhaṭṭa* has given ज्ञानाधिकरणत्व as a general definition of आत्मा in preference to others that are debatable. The word चैतन्य (life) also seems to be purposely avoided in defining आत्मा, because in the wider sense of the term even plants have चैतन्य, but they fall under विषय as they have no आत्मा according to a section of the *Naiyāyikas*. चैतन्य can be identified with आत्मा in its narrower sense only, namely, conscious life.

3. The method of grouping God and man together as subdivisions of one category as well as the argument with which it is defended appear somewhat arbitrary and have led some writers to suspect that the आत्मा in the original aphorisms of *Kaṇāda* meant जीवात्मा only, and the inclusion of God or परमात्मा under the same category was due to commentatorial ingenuity. It is said that all the descriptions and arguments to prove the existence of soul evidently apply to जीवात्मा, while there is no clear and specific mention of God in the aphorisms of either *Kaṇāda* or *Gotama*. Some have argued from this circumstance that both the *Nyāya* and the *Vaiśeṣika* systems were at first atheistic.

Are the Vaiśeṣikas atheists.

Without however going so far we might assume that the guess is not very wide of the mark and *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* might have at first purposely excluded God from their systems, not as being totally non-existent, but as being beyond and above the phenomenal world with which their systems were chiefly concerned. Possibly the aphorists confined themselves to a classification and discussion of sublunary things only without minding the supernatural agency, while commentators considering this as a defect, supplied the omission by inserting God under the only category where it was possible to do so. Thus for instance while *Prasastapāda* says nothing about God, his commentator *Śrīdhara* classes God along with the human soul, although the former has six and the latter fourteen qualities.¹ Whatever be the truth, the *Naiyāyikas* do not attach much importance to the inclusion of God under आत्मन् and always speak of Him as an independent entity whenever occasion requires. When they speak of soul, they generally mean जीवात्मा only. This is another illustration how a love of symmetry and completeness which characterises Indian systematists often overrides their philosophical accuracy. The student should also note the fact that soul is here mentioned as one of the substances, along with earth, water etc. Nothing can show better the materialistic tendency of *Nyāya* philosophy than this inclusion of spirit under the same category as dead matter.

4. The T. D. supplies a deficiency in the text as it were by stating in full the celebrated *Naiyāyika* Existence of God. argument to prove the existence of God.

The argument is a reply to an atheist-like *Cārvāka* or *Bauddha*, who absolutely denies the existence of God because there is no positive proof of it. God, say the atheists, cannot be perceived, because, being a colourless substance, He is not the object of external senses; nor can He be perceived mentally, as He is far removed from pain and pleasure felt by the soul. God cannot also be inferred as no similar instance can be given to

support the inference. As to आगम or testimony it is useless, first because it is not universally accepted as a valid proof, and secondly because the *Vedas* themselves depend for their authority on God and cannot therefore prove His existence. Our author denies this and declares the existence of God provable by inference based on the universally accepted principle of causality. The argument is

क्षित्यङ्कुरादिकं कर्तृजन्यं । कार्यत्वात् : यद्यत्कार्यं तत्कर्तृजन्यं यथा घटः ।

Every effect must have an agent ;

The universe is an effect ;

∴ It must have an agent.

This agent is called God. It should be noted that this argument is founded on several assumptions; viz. 1 that the relation of causality is universal, i. e. every effect must have a cause ; 2 that every product must have a sentient and intelligent producer; 3 that this world is such a product and 4 that its producer must be such an extraordinary Being as God. The first, says the *Nāyāyika*, is a self-evident axiom, known to us intuitively as it were, and corroborated by experience. The second is proved by daily observation, because we see that a jar is made by a potter and a piece of cloth is woven by a weaver, without whom they could not have been produced. Creation results from some kind of motion in the atoms, and motion requires previous effort or volition. This last being the quality of sentient soul only, it follows that no creation is possible unless there is a sentient being pre-existing to set the particles of matter in motion. The third assumption, that this world is a product is also based on observation. Plants and animals are products because we see their birth, growth and death. These occurrences cannot be spontaneous, and there must be some hidden agency to prompt them. Besides they happen with such a remarkable regularity that one is forced to think that the agency directing them must be an intelligent one, and not simply *Adṛṣṭa*, fate or

destiny, which is assumed to be a universal cause of all creation. The last premise necessarily follows from the preceding ones, because a Creator of this multifarious universe must be Omniscient and Omnipotent, and in fact must possess all attributes usually ascribed to God; otherwise he will be either incapable of creating or be himself liable to creation and destruction. This reasoning is of course powerless against an opponent who denies any one of the above premises or the validity of the common experience on which they are founded.

5. T. D. defines कर्तृत्व as उपादानगोचरापरोक्षज्ञानाविकीर्णकृतिमत्त्वम् i. e. the agent is one who possesses (three things), an intimate cognizance of the material cause, a will to act, and an effort. The three attributes ज्ञान, इच्छा and कृति are closely related to one another as cause and effect. There cannot be an effort (कृति) unless there is a will, and a will to produce can only arise when there is previously direct cognition of the material cause on which the will is to operate. अपरोक्षज्ञान is required because mere knowledge of an absent (परोक्ष) material cause such as earth in a pit or cotton on the tree, will not suffice. The material must be at hand and under the agent's control at the time of creation. It is suggested by some and with great plausibility, that the definition of कर्तृत्व may be confined to कृतिमत्त्वम् simply, as कृति being the final stage necessarily presupposes the other two, ज्ञान and इच्छा. It follows that the Creator of the universe must have direct knowledge of the atoms of all substances, must have a will to create, and also power to bring about such a creation. He must therefore be Omniscient and Omnipotent.

6. The weakness of the argument to prove a Creator lies in the third and the fourth of the aforesaid four assumptions which are not accepted by many. How do we know for instance that this universe is a product? Individual things in the world may be products in our common acceptance of the term, but that does not necessarily prove that the whole is a product too. The whole does not always share the nature of the parts, as for instance in a windmill although each particle moves, the whole is stationary. Secondly, our human experience being limited

we cannot positively say that everything in this world is a product and that there is nothing which is not produced. Thirdly, *Naiyāyikas* themselves accept several eternal things such as atoms, ether, time, space, souls and minds. If these are eternal, they cannot be products and can have no Creator. If they are excepted, the Creator of the remainder cannot be omniscient and omnipotent. Anyhow the *Naiyāyikas'* theory of God is inconsistent with their other doctrines. Fourthly, since every intelligent agent must have a will, God also must have desire and the consequent feelings of pleasure and pain. He cannot therefore be much better than frail mortals. Lastly, to call this world a product or effect is begging the whole question; for cause and effect being merely correlative terms, a thing cannot be called effect unless and until its cause is proved. The universe therefore cannot be called a product unless you first independently prove the existence of its Creator. Such are some of the objections advanced by the *Vedāntins* and other monistic philosophers against the teleological argument of the *Naiyāyikas*. The controversy as to an independent Creator of the Universe ultimately resolves itself into the distinction between dualism and monism.

7. The student will do well to master the full armoury of *Nyāya* arguments by which the existence of a personal God outside the universe is proved. These arguments or proofs are summed up by *Udayanācārya* in the following verse :—

कार्ययोजनधृत्यादेः पदात् प्रत्ययतः श्रुतेः ।

वाक्यात् सङ्ख्याविशेषाच्च साध्यो विश्वविद्वयः ॥ ¹

“ From effects, combination, support etc., from traditional arts, from authoritativeness, from Śruti, from sentences thereof, and from particular numbers—an everlasting Omniscient Being is to be established. ” ²

The first of these eight or nine arguments to prove the existence of God is the same as the one discussed above, viz. that a Creator is necessary to account for this phenomenal world. The second *आयोजन* or ‘combination’ is explained as the action which produced the union of two atoms forming the binary compound at the beginning of creation,

1 *Kus.* V, 1.

2 *Ibid.* Cowell's Trans, *Bib In p.* 64.

and which being action, required an intelligent actor. The third proof, 'support' means that the world depends upon some Being who prevents it from falling. The etc. (आदि) includes destruction of the world and presupposes a destroyer. *Pada* here means पटादिसम्प्रदायव्यवहार, that is, traditional arts of weaving cloth etc. which could have been invented at first only by some intelligent being. 'Authoritativeness' is a certain virtue inherent in the *Vedas* whereby they produce right knowledge in us, and therefore implying a Being who imparted that virtue. The proof of *Śruti* establishes a Being who made the *Vedas* what they are. Again the *Vedas* consisting of sentences must have been produced by some author just as *Mahābhārata* and other books. The last proof, 'number,' requires a little explanation. It is held that the magnitude of a binary is produced not from the infinitesimality (परिमाण्डल्य) of atoms but from the number (two) of the atoms composing the binary;¹ and it is also a *Nyāya* doctrine that the conceptions of duality and subsequent numbers are produced in things by an effort of the mind. The duality therefore which produced binaries at the beginning of creation must have been first conceived by some intelligent being existing before creation. Number is thus a proof of the existence of God. *Udayanācārya* also establishes God's existence in another way, namely, first by proving *Adṛṣṭa* or destiny, and then arguing that the inanimate destiny must have some intelligent Being to regulate it.² Many of these arguments of *Nyāya* writers are identical with those given by Aristotle and widely used in modern times by Paley and the Christian divines. The idea of God or a Supreme and Omniscient Creator of the world which was at first rather faint in the *Sūtras*, came to occupy an important place in the *Nyāya* system as developed in later times.

8. *Nyāya* writers, while unanimous on the point of God's existence, do not agree as to his attributes. God's attributes. Some hold that God can make creation although He has no body owing to absence of any *Adṛṣṭa* in his case; others say that God may be

¹ See note p. 123 *Supra*; and P. B. Ben. ed. p. 131.

² *Kus* 1. 4.

sometimes endowed with a body (as in the various incarnations) by our *Adiṣṭa* just as a woman gets a body according to the *Adiṣṭa* of her husband. A third school calls the atoms the body of God ; and a fourth assigns that honour to ether. A fifth section conceives God to be formed of two bodies, the Creator and the thing to be created, at the beginning of creation ; while a sixth one reaches the climax by giving a body to God in the same way as a devil gets one for itself by possessing some human medium. All these speculations are due to attempts to overcome the difficulty how a Creator could create without having a physical body as well as organs of sense and action. The *Nyāya* enumerates eight special qualities of God, namely, number, (the greatest) dimension, severalty, disjunction, intellect, desire and effort. The Supreme Soul differs from the human in not having pain, merit and demerit; but there is a controversy as to whether He has pleasure. The modern *Naiyāyikas* hold on the authority of texts such as नित्यं विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म, that God enjoys eternal happiness just as He has eternal knowledge, while the ancients interpret the word आनन्द as meaning simply दुःखाभाव, and deny any positive pleasure or pain to God. *Annambhaṭṭa* as usual appears to prefer the ancient view; and hence probably the epithet सुखदुःखादिरहित which is found interpolated in some Mss. of T. S.

9. Having proved the existence of God, T. D. defines the

Human Soul.

human soul as सुखायाश्रयः, thereby excluding God who is devoid of pleasure or pain.

जीव is also described variously as इन्द्रियाद्यधिष्ठाता, or बन्धमोक्षयोग्य or जन्यज्ञानवान्, all which epithets are merely contradictories of the attributes of God. The human soul can be easily proved to be distinct from body or organs, and also to be numerous, eternal and all-pervading. The *Cārvākas* say that our body itself is the soul, because our self-consciousness ' I am a man ' ' I am a Brahman, ' relates to the body; but it is not so, because the self remains the same although the body changes as it grows from infancy to old age. Besides we have the opposite consciousness 'my

body, ' my head ' etc. and we feel no diminution of self even if parts of body such as arms or legs be cut off. Others maintain that the soul is identical with organs of sense as is proved by our consciousness ' I am blind ' I am deaf ' ; but this is also not true, for the deprivation of any one or all the organs does not injure the soul. Again if the organs were soul, there would be as many different souls in a body as there are organs of sense, and besides, says T. D. , we should not have, as we have now, the identity of consciousness that the same person. *i. e.* I, who saw the jar at a former time, touch it now. Nor is mind the soul, as mind being atomic would be incapable of simultaneously apprehending many objects. The soul is therefore something different from all these. The human souls are conceived to be numerous, and not one as the *Vedāntins* hold, in order to account for the variety of experiences of pleasure, pain etc. in different bodies. The same soul however passes through several bodies; otherwise we cannot form certain impressions and habits (such as the sucking of a new-born child) that seem to come to us intuitively as it were, and are really derived from our experience in previous births. Plurality of souls is thus reconciled with the doctrine of transmigration. It follows from this that the human soul is eternal, for otherwise he could not pass through several births without losing his identity. He must also be all-pervading, for he can neither be atomic nor of any intermediate magnitude. If atomic he could occupy only a minute spot in the body and thus could not simultaneously feel pleasure or pain at distant parts of the body. If the soul had an intermediate magnitude he would be liable to destruction by the enlargement or diminution of that magnitude. Again, how is this middling magnitude to be determined ? It would be either the same size as the body, as the *Jainas* hold, or it would be different, being larger or smaller. In the latter case the soul would be too large or too small to exactly occupy the body as he should. In the former case the difficulty arises as to how a soul which was small in the small body of a child could increase when the child grows to manhood; and similarly how the same soul which in one birth was of the size of an

elephant could in another birth be accommodated in the body of an ant. If it is said that the size varies, then it is not the same soul, and there would be different souls not only in different births but even at different stages of life. Hence the soul must necessarily be regarded as all-pervading. To this last supposition an objection may be made that each all-pervading soul would occupy all bodies and thus the experiences of all beings would be cognized by every individual. The answer to this objection is that the soul though all-pervading cognises things, not by himself, but by contact with a mind which is separate and confined to each body.

6. There is one point with respect to जीव which being controversial seems to have been purpose-ly omitted by T. D., namely whether जीव is perceived or is only to be inferred like ether and other incorporeal substances. The followers of *Gotama* hold that जीव is perceptible by the mind because it is the object of such mental cognitions as 'I am happy' or 'I am unhappy.' The *Vaiśeṣikas* maintain that जीव is not perceptible even mentally, because the cognition 'I am happy' refers not to the pure Ego, but to the quality of pleasure or pain which thus becomes the sign of the existence of जीव. A still greater objection to the perceptibility of soul is that he being the perceiver of everything cannot perceive himself, the knower and the known being always different. जीव is therefore only inferrible, the inference being सुखादिसंज्ञात्कारो द्रव्याश्रितः : शुणत्वादप्यवत्. जीव may also be inferred from the existence of organs of sense, or of qualities such as बुद्धि which can reside in soul alone. Several of these so-called 'signs' of soul are enumerated in *Kaṇāda's* aphorism—प्राणायान-निमेषोन्मेष-जीवन-मनोगतीन्द्रियान्तरविकाराः सुखदुःस्वेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नाश्चात्मनो लिङ्गानि. ¹ *Annambhātṭa* seems to favour the *Vaiśeṣika* view of the inferrible character of soul. though he does not explicitly say so. The human soul has 14 special properties, for which see quotation, p. p. 85-6 *Supra*.

SECT. XVIII. मनः.

Mind is the organ which is the instrument of the cognition of pleasure etc. Being assigned to each soul, it is countless, atomic and eternal.

Mind

1. Etymologically mind is not simply the instrument of thought, (मन्यतेऽनेन), but in reality its functions are much more extensive, because it is not only the direct cause of internal experience, such as that of pleasure and pain, but is also an aid in the perceptions of external senses. The *Naiyāyikas*, strangely enough, give much prominence to the latter two functions of the mind, and entirely subordinate, if not actually deny, its character as the instrument of thinking. Even taking these two functions assigned to mind, it has a double character. It is both an organ of sense itself, and an accessory to other organs. *Annambhaṭṭa*'s definition, being founded on the former of these two functions, distinguishes mind from other organs which give knowledge of external objects only, while mind brings about internal cognition of such things as lie beyond the province of the other organs. Hence the word उपलब्धि is purposely used here in the restricted sense of direct internal cognition; while साधन means an instrumental cause. By सुखादि, V. V. remarks, are to be understood all qualities that reside in the soul by intimate relation, and which could therefore be perceived by mind alone. The word इन्द्रिय is purposely inserted in the definition to exclude soul as well as the conjunction of mind with soul, both of which are instrumental in bringing about the cognition. If we however take the word साधन in the strict sense of a करण, the word इन्द्रिय seems to be unnecessary and may be dispensed with; for आत्मा will be excluded as being the agent and not the करण proper of a cognition, while आत्ममनःसंयोग being व्यापार is distinct from the करण. Perhaps the word इन्द्रिय is introduced to contradict those theorists who refuse to call mind an organ; but of this later on.

T, D. gives another definition, स्पर्शरहितत्वे सति क्रियावत्त्वम् which, though technically correct enough, does not give us much insight into the nature of the thing defined. Of the

five intangible substances, ether, time, space, soul and mind, the last alone, having a limited dimension, can act, while the first four being all-pervading can never have any motion. Mind being thus intangible and corporeal is only inferrible, the inference being, as usual in such cases, drawn from the functions assigned to it. The mode of reasoning is to assume a certain cause to account for such effects or phenomena as are known to be undoubted facts and cannot be explained in any other way. The argument for mind is सुखादिसाक्षात्कारः करणसाध्यः । जन्यसाक्षात्कारत्वाच्चाक्षुषसाक्षात्कारवत्. ¹ *Kaṇāda* and *Gotama* give two different proofs of mind which are if possible even more convincing than the above. *Kaṇāda's* aphorism आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षे, ज्ञानस्य भावेऽभावश्च मनसो लिङ्गम् ² gives as a proof for mind the fact that knowledge is produced or not according as there exists or not the conjunction of mind with soul, organs and objects. *Gotama* lays stress on the fact that our cognitions are always successive and never simultaneous युगपज्ज्ञानानुत्पत्तिर्न मनसो लिङ्गम्. ³ There can be only one conjunction at a time, and therefore a succession of cognitions such as we daily experience can be possible only with an intermediate link like the atomic mind.

2. The minds are as innumerable as there are human souls, one being assigned to each of the latter. The word नियत is interpreted by V. V. so as to include both the principal and the accessory functions of the mind—अत्र समवेतकारणत्वे सत्यं समवेतभोगकारणत्वं नियतत्वशब्दार्थः ⁴ i. e. the word नियत implies the instrumentality of mind both to the cognition of those things that are intimately united with soul, as well as of those that are not so united. More probably it implies that the same mind is always associated with the same soul and accompanies him through his successive births; otherwise we cannot account for survival of impressions acquired in previous births. It may also be mentioned here that some assume मनस्व as a जात residing in all individual minds, while others deny it.

1 S. C. loc. cit.

2 V. S. III, 2. 1.

3 G. S. I, 1, 16.

4 V. V. loc. cit.

3. The most important property of mind is its infinitesimality (अणुत्व), because it is necessary to explain its chief function, that of acting as a connecting link between the soul and the external organs. The *Mīmāṃsaka*s hold mind to be all-pervading, and their argument is मनो विशु । स्पर्शान्वन्ताभावपत्वादाकाशवत्, or मनो विशु । विशेषगुणशून्यद्रव्यत्वात् कालवत्, or मनो विशु । ज्ञानासमवायिकारणसंयोगाधारत्वादात्मवत्.¹ This inference by analogy however is contradicted by our experience, for if mind were all-pervading it would be in contact with all organs of sense at once, and there would be a variety of perceptions simultaneously. Not only so, but as this contact of mind with the senses would continue always, there would be no sleep or cessation of knowledge. The contact of mind with the organs must therefore be occasional and voluntary, and the mind therefore must have a limited magnitude so that it can be attached to and severed from the organs at pleasure. The argument employed by T. D. is a little different and is not quite correct. If mind were all-pervading, there would be no contact of mind with the all-pervading soul, for it is a *Nyāya* doctrine that two all-pervading substances can never be mutually in contact. To this the *Mīmāṃsaka* has an obvious reply that he does not accept the *Nyāya* doctrine, and therefore there is no impossibility of आत्ममनःसंयोग in his theory. T. D. thereupon urges that if such a contact between two all-pervading things were admitted it would be eternal and continuous, and there would be no sleep. The *Naiyāyika* can account for sleep by supposing that it is induced when the atomic mind enters a particular vein in the body, called पुरित्; but the *Mīmāṃsaka* cannot do so, for even assuming that आत्ममनःसंयोग ceases as soon as mind enters the पुरित्, there will be still some portion of it outside as, being all-pervading, the whole of it could never be contained in पुरित्, and the contact of this out-lying portion with soul would never cease. The weakness of this argument of T. D. lies in the assumption that the contact of mind with soul

ceases as soon as the former enters पुरितत्; but no reason is given for this assumption. Even granting that the mind is atomic, the continuity of its contact with soul cannot be prevented, for the soul being all-pervading must be present wherever the mind may be situated. The difficulty in fact will be greater, for in this case the *Naiyāyika* cannot take shelter behind his doctrine of non-contact of all-pervading things. This difficulty is sought to be removed by the arbitrary assumption that the contact of mind with soul ends at the mouth of पुरितत्. As a matter of fact if the soul is all-pervading it should be present in, as well as out of, the पुरितत्, and the contact of mind with it should never cease. An alternative assumption to account for the same phenomenon of sleep is that there is no त्वग्निन्द्रिय in पुरितत्, and that contact of mind with त्वक् is a necessary condition for all knowledge, त्वङ्मनः संयोगो ज्ञानसामान्ये कारणमित्यर्थः; but this is as arbitrary as the above. The argument based on आत्ममनःसंयोग is not therefore as satisfactory as the other one based on इन्द्रियमनःसंयोग. The phenomena of sleep and knowledge can be sufficiently accounted for by conjunction and severance of mind with organs of sense, even if the आत्ममनःसंयोग is continuous.

4. The *Naiyāyika* theory of sleep already hinted above is peculiar. पुरितत् is an intestine somewhere
Theory of sleep. near the heart and conceived as a sort of a fleshy bag in which the mind remains during sleep. The process is thus described by *Dinakara-bhaṭṭa* :—

“प्रथमं सुषुप्त्यनुकूलमनः क्रियया मनसाऽत्मनो विभागः, ततः आत्ममनः-संयोगनाशः, ततः पुरितदात्मकीत्तरदेशेन मनसः संयोग उत्पद्यते; सैव सुषुप्तिः^१. The पुरितत् as well as the theory of sleep based upon it are not however pure inventions of the *Naiyāyikas*. Both are more or less fully described in ancient writings, and the originality of the *Naiyāyikas* consists simply in the way they adapted them to their own psychological system. Texts like

1 S. M. Calc. ed. p. 48.

2 Dip. Bomb. ed. p. 115.

“अथ यदा सुषुप्तो भवति यदा न तस्य च वेद हिता नाम नाड्यो दासततिसह-
 स्राणि हृदयात् पुरीततमभिप्रतिष्ठन्ते ताभिः प्रत्यवसृष्य पुरीतति शेते” had
 already formulated a physical theory of sleep which all
 orthodox schools were bound to accept, modifications being
 permitted only where the *Śruti* was silent. The above text
 of *Brhadāranyakopaniṣad*, for instance, vaguely says that
 he or it entered from the heart to the पुरीतत् by way of seventy-
 two thousands of arteries; and hence the *Vedāntins* take that
 he to be जीव, while the *Naiyāyikas* take it to be मनस्. This
 पुरीतत्, which is said to be joined to the heart by 72000 feeder
 arteries, is also called सुषुम्ना नाडी by *Yogins* and *Vedāntins*,
 who describe it as opening at the top of the head called ब्रह्म-
 रन्ध्र and as being the path by which the soul of a ज्ञानी passes
 out of the body to the solar region.² The *Naiyāyikas* of course
 with their usual shrewdness adopted only so much of this
 anatomy as suited their purpose and substituted mind for the
 पुरुष of the original. The notion of this entrance of the think-
 ing element into some narrow vein near the heart was
 probably derived from the observed slackening of the blood
 circulation in the arteries, and the consequent slower palpita-
 tions of the heart during sleep. Anyhow modern anatomy
 and physiology do not support the theory.

5. Whether the word इन्द्रिय is inserted in the definition of
 mind to exclude आत्ममनःसंयोग or to re-
 pudiate the doctrine of an opponent, it is
 certain that both the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika*
 schools agree in calling mind an इन्द्रिय; or rather the *Nyāya*
 expressly says so and the dogma is imported into the *Vaiśe-
 śika* system as one that is not explicitly repudiated by
Kaṇāda, according to the maxim अप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतं भवति.³ Mind
 must be called an organ, because it is the instrument of in-
 ternal perception. Other doctrinaires, and especially the *Vedān-
 tins*, deny इन्द्रियत्व to mind. As the point has considerable
 bearing on the *Nyāya* definitions of perception and inference

1. Brh. Up. IV. 1, 19.

2. Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya on *Brahm. Sūt.* III, 2, 7.

3. Vāt. on G. S. I, 1, 1.

as well as on some other kindred topics, it will be worth while here to explain it once for all. प्रत्यक्ष will be presently defined as इन्द्रियार्थसंनिकर्षजन्यं ज्ञानम्. If the mind is not इन्द्रिय, the definition will not cover perception of pleasure and pain, while, if mind is इन्द्रिय, it will overlap on अनुमिति which also results from contact of mind with external objects such as the mountain and smoke. It will be seen further on how *Naiyāyikas* get out of this dilemma, but the fact that it arises has sufficed the *Vedāntin* to deny इन्द्रियत्व to mind. The chief consideration however which weighs with the *Vedāntin* is authoritative texts of *Śruti* like “इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः”¹, in which mind is not only mentioned separately but placed on a higher level than the organs, thereby implying that mind is not इन्द्रिय. As to the other horn of the dilemma, namely that mental perception will not come under the given definition of प्रत्यक्ष, *Vedāntins* escape it by repudiating the *Nyāya* definition of perception itself as incorrect.² It must also be remembered that though the later *Naiyāyikas* stoutly maintain the इन्द्रियत्व of mind, the doctrine is not expressly stated in either of the *Sūtras*. While *Kaṇāda* is admittedly silent upon it, *Gotama* does not include mind in the list of organs,³ but mentions it separately among his *Prameyas*.⁴ After all the controversy seems to be nothing more than a battle of words. So long as all are agreed in distinguishing mind from the five external organs, and treating it as an entity by itself, it does not matter whether you call it इन्द्रिय or अंतःकरणवृत्ति or anything else. If mind is an organ, it is an internal organ (अन्तरिन्द्रिय) quite distinct from the external organs, while if it is not an organ it is so much akin to one that it shares many of its properties and functions.

1. Kaṭh. U. p. III, 10.

2. *Vedānta-Paribhāṣā* Calc. ed. p. 3.

3. G. S. I, 1, 12.

4. G. S. I, 1, 9.

SECT. XIX. रूपम्.

.. Colour is the (special) quality which is cognised by eye alone. It is of seven kinds, and resides in earth, water, and light. All the seven are found in earth, pale white in water, and brilliant white in light.

1. The definitions of colour, savour, odour and touch are taken from *Prāsaṣṭapāda's* scholium with the exception of the words मात्र and गुण. The latter words seem to have been

suggested by Śrīdhara's comment.¹ The word मात्र excludes number which is cognised by eye as well as touch; while गुण excludes on one side प्रभा which is *dravya*, and on the other रूपत्वजाति, it being a rule that the जाति and अभाव of a thing are perceived by the same sense as the thing itself. But the प्रभाभित्तिसंयोग, being a *guṇa*, will still come in; and to exclude it therefore the word गुण is interpreted as विशेषगुण, special quality, although T. D. seems to take the word in its general sense. Why then, one might ask, insert मात्र when सङ्ख्या too like संयोग might be excluded by taking गुण in the sense of विशेषगुण? The answer is that मात्र is also necessary to exclude सांख्यिकद्रव्यत्व. This is obviously a refinement of a later commentator (S. C.), for T. D. does not notice it. V. V. is not satisfied with the definition in the text, hedged as it is with so many qualifications, because परमाणुरूप which is imperceptible to the eye is not included in it. V. V. therefore proposes as a better definition त्वगग्राह्य-चक्षुर्ग्राह्य-गुणविभाजकधर्मवत्त्वम्. The prefix त्वगग्राह्य serves the purpose of मात्र; while by saying गुणविभाजकधर्मवत्त्वम्, which is the same as गुणत्वावान्तरजातिमत्त्वम्, instead of mere गुणत्वम्, we include परमाणुरूप which has a गुणत्वावान्तरजाति, namely रूपत्वजाति, although it is not चक्षुर्ग्राह्य itself. The purpose can equally be served by adopting the enlarged definition suggested by T. D. to exclude संयोग. It is needless to remark that ग्रहण or cognition means here our ordinary cognition, and not the supernatural perception of Yogins who can perceive anything by any organ of sense they please. Śīṅkara Miśra² gives four

1. F. B. Ben. ed. p. 104. et. seq.

2. V. S. Up. Calc. ed. p. 201.

necessary conditions for the perception of colour, viz. 1. large magnitude (महत्परिमाण), 2 visibility (उद्भूतत्व), 3 not being overpowered (अनभिधूतत्व), and 4 the property रूपत्व. The colour of atoms is not perceived because atoms have not a large magnitude: the whiteness of the eye is not perceived because it is अनुद्भूत; the whiteness in common fire and the lustre of rubies are unperceived owing to their being overpowered by earthy matter; while savour and touch are unperceived because they have no रूपत्वजाति. The modern theory first propounded by Newton is that colour belongs to light only and that a ray of white light contains all the primary colours which can be separated by a prism of glass. An object appears to have the colour which it reflects. The colours of earth and water are therefore not their own, but are derived from the particular rays reflected from them.

2. Colour is of seven kinds, white, blue, yellow, red, green, tawny and variegated. This enumeration of seven colours is not known either to *Praśastapāda* or *Śrīdhara*, and

*Varieties of
Colour.*

is probably borrowed from some later writer. The last variety being a mixture of the preceding six, it is naturally asked why चित्ररूप is recognized separately. Instead of supposing a new colour why cannot, says the objector, चित्ररूप be called simply a mixture of several colours, and a variegated piece of cloth be simply designated as having so many colours? To this T. D. replies that, colour being a व्याप्यवृत्तिधर्म, there cannot be several colours in one and the same object.

A व्याप्यवृत्तिधर्म is defined as स्वसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावाप्रतियोगी धर्मः, i. e. a quality which never co-exists with its own अत्यन्ताभाव (absolute negation) in one and the same object. The opposite of this is an अव्याप्यवृत्तिधर्म which is a quality that resides in a portion of the object only, and is therefore co-existent with its own absolute negation residing in another portion of the same object. Thus when a monkey sits on the top of a tree, the monkey touches the top only and not the root of the tree. The कपिसंयोग is therefore said to be अग्रावच्छिन्न, residing in the top, while its अत्यन्ताभाव is मूलावच्छिन्न, residing in the root of the same tree. This संयोग is therefore an अव्याप्यवृत्तिधर्म.

व्याप्यवृत्तिधर्म is a quality which covers the entire thing and not a part of it only, like the whiteness or blueness of a jar which resides in all its parts.

If चित्ररूप be only a collection of several colours, each individual colour will be अव्याप्यवृत्ति, i. e. partial, while there will be no one colour covering the whole. What of it if there be not, rejoins the objector; can we not still perceive the piece of cloth by means of the colours of its parts? You cannot, says the author, for there is no colour in the piece of cloth as a whole, and without a colour you cannot perceive an object. But are there not so many instead of one colour in the piece? They are useless, replies the author, to make it visible, because individually they reside in parts only while collectively they do not form one quality of the whole, it being a peculiar doctrine of the *Naiyāyikas* that a collection (समुदाय) is not a thing by itself apart from its components.

A समुदाय, if it exists apart from its parts, would be a product different from its parts; but where would it then reside? Not in each part, nor in all put together, since it is distinct from all of them. समुदाय is therefore not distinct from the parts and is, like द्वित्वादिसंख्या, only a पर्याप्तधर्म i. e. a conjoint attribute. Such being the case, a collection of several colours cannot by itself constitute a quality which would make the piece of cloth visible. But here a question arises, why is a colour at all necessary for the perception of a thing? Let the condition precedent for perceptibility be not रूपवत्त्व, possession of colour, but रूपवत्समवेतत्व, the state of being intimately united with things having colour. So although the piece of cloth may not have a colour of its own, it is in intimate union with parts that have colour, and will be therefore perceptible. The objection to this view is that such a condition precedent (रूपवत्समवेतत्व) for perceptibility is unnecessarily elaborate and therefore not preferable to the usual one रूपवत्त्व. The result of this discussion is that we must recognize an independent चित्ररूप to account for the perceptibility of a variegated piece of cloth.

3. The definition and divisions of रूप must have already shown to a critical student that the *Naiyāyika* conception of रूप is somewhat restricted. It is clear that what we, ordi-



narily call the form or shape of a thing (आकारविशेष), such as its roundness or squareness, is not comprehended under रूप. It neither falls under any one of the seven colours, nor does the definition चक्षुर्मन्त्रिद्राह्युणत्वं apply to it, for form can be apprehended by the eye as well as by touch. Hence रूप is translated here by 'colour', although in popular parlance it signifies form as well. Under what head then would this form go? *Naiyāyikas* call it simply an अवयवसंस्थानविशेष particular arrangement of parts, and as such would probably include it under संयोग. Other scholastics such as the *Vedāntins* do not regard form as in any way distinct from the thing or its parts; for, they say, we recognize the same identical person in a देवदत्त standing and a देवदत्त sitting although the arrangements of his limbs (अवयवसंस्थान) are different in the two cases. The point is noticed here simply to clear a possible doubt.

4. Colour of all sorts resides in earth, while water and light have only one kind, namely white.

Distribution of colours.

The whiteness of light, however, being brilliant, differs from that of water, which is not so. The meaning of the passage is clear; but curiously the reading in the majority of the copies of the text is unsatisfactory if not actually corrupt, rendering the passage almost unintelligible. Only two Mss. in fact give the correct reading which is adopted in the text, others mostly reading अभास्वरं शुक्लं and भास्वरं शुक्लं, and thus apparently making अभास्वरं and भास्वरं independent attributes of रूप and not qualifications of whiteness as they really are. There are no separate colours like भास्वर and अभास्वर, but the words are introduced to distinguish between the particular sort of whiteness that resides in water and that which resides in light. Even with the reading भास्वरं शुक्लं we can no doubt get the right meaning by taking भास्वरं to be an adverb modifying the adjective शुक्लं; but then the construction becomes extremely awkward. In any case there ought to be no doubt as to the real meaning of the passage.

SECT. XX, XXI, XXII. रसः, गन्धः, स्पर्शः.

Savour is the quality apprehended by tongue; it is of six kinds : sweet, sour, saline, pungent, astringent and bitter ; it resides in earth and water ; earth contains all the six varieties ; water only the sweet.

Odour is the quality apprehended by the nose ; it is fragrant and non-fragrant, residing in earth only.

Touch is the quality apprehended by skin only ; it is of three kinds : cool, hot, and tepid, residing in earth, water, light and air ; of these cool touch is (found) in water, hot in light and tepid in earth.

1. The three qualities of savour, odour and touch are here grouped together as they are treated symmetrically. कटु and तिक्त mean pungent and bitter respectively, and not *vice versa*,

as Ballantyne translates them wrongly. Earth has all varieties of savour, while water has only one, viz. sweet. Other tastes, such as sourness and salt, which are sometimes apprehended in water, are due to the dissolution of earthy matter in it.

2. Odour is apprehended by the nose and is of two kinds, fragrant and non-fragrant, residing in earth only. चित्ररस is not recognized because we never experience it, the several

savours when mixed in one substance being in reality apprehended separately and one after another. चित्रगन्ध and चित्रस्पर्श are impossible because their varieties are mutually repellent, and cannot therefore reside in one substance at one time. The word मात्र is omitted in the definitions of रस and गन्ध as unnecessary because the two organs apprehend their respective qualities only and nothing else. It is however necessary in the definition of स्पर्श, for the sense of touch apprehends other qualities besides touch, such as number and conjunction, which are also perceived by the eye. The word गुण is retained in the three definitions to exclude the जाति respectively residing in the three qualities, viz. रसत्व, गन्धत्व and स्पर्शत्व. It is needless to remark that the three definitions are to be understood as जातिविशिष्ट (e. g. रसनग्राह्य-जातिमात्र) in order to include the qualities in atoms.

3. Annambhatta following old authors divides स्पर्श into three kinds, hot, cold, and temperate ; but some others are for recognizing चित्रस्पर्श also, the reason given being

Touch.

the analogy with colour (चित्रस्पर्शस्तु रूपस्थलीययुक्त्या स्वीकरणीय एव¹). चित्रस्पर्श however is not so possible in the three-fold division as in the theory of those who divide स्पर्श into numerous kinds such as :—

रूक्षः शीतस्तथैवोष्णः स्निग्धश्च विशदः खरः ।

कठिनश्चिक्कणः शुष्कः पिच्छलो दारुणो मृदुः ॥

एव द्वादशविस्तारो वायव्यो गुण एव च² ।

The idea seems to be that the eye and the organs of touch being the chief organs through which most of our perceptive knowledge is derived, चित्ररूप and चित्रस्पर्श have to be recognized to account for the perception of a whole having variegated parts. No such necessity however exists in the case of objects having different odours or savours, as even if they are never perceived at all, they can be inferred from their qualities. The same is the case with स्पर्श according to those who deny स्पर्शनप्रत्यक्ष to objects having touch. Hence Śaṅkara Miśra remarks: न च हरीतक्यां रसोऽपि चित्र इति वाच्यम् । हरीतक्या नीरसत्वे दोषाभावात्. ¹³

SECT. XXIII. पाकजापाकजत्वे.

The four qualities, colour etc., are products of heat and non-eternal in earth; elsewhere they are natural and either eternal or non-eternal. Those inhering in eternal things are eternal; those in non-eternal things are non-eternal.

1. The four qualities colour, savour, odour, and touch are both eternal and non-eternal; they are sometimes produced by heat, and sometimes they are natural. In earth they are said to be produced by heat, and are consequently non-eternal, while in the remaining three substances they are natural and are both eternal and non-eternal, the eternal being confined to the eternal atoms, and the non-eternal belong-

Production of qualities.

1 V. S., Up. Calc. ed. p. 292.

2 Mahā-Bhārata.

3 V. S., Up. Calc. Ed. p. 286.

ing to products which are non-eternal. The author is silent as to whether natural and eternal odour resides in the atoms of earth. If it does, the words पाकजमनित्यं च ought to be supplemented by the further addition अपाकजं नित्यं. The distinction between पाकज and अपाकज appears to be that earth can change its qualities by the application of heat, while water, light and air do not change them. Not that water and air do not become hot by the contact of heat, but the change of touch in their case does not affect the material but belongs to the light that is mixed with them.

2. T. D. here states briefly the rival theories about पाकजोत्पत्ति, that sharply divide the

*The controversy
of Pīlupāka and
Pītharapāka.*

Vaiśeṣikas from the *Naiyāyikas*. The former are called पीलुपाकवादिनः because they explain the change of colour in

an unbaked jar by the separate baking of individual atoms, while the *Naiyāyikas* are called पिठरपाकवादिनः because they supposed the change of colour to be accomplished in the jar itself. पाक is defined as रूपादिपरावृत्तिफलक-विजातीयतेजः-संयोगः, application of external heat which effects a change of colour and other qualities. It is of various kinds according to the effects, one changing only colour as in a baked jar, another changing colour, odour and savour as in an artificially ripened mango-fruit, and so on. The word विजातीय excludes a change by heat in metals, which, being तेजस्, are सजातीय. When a jar is baked, the old black jar is, according to *Vaiśeṣikas*, destroyed, and its several compounds, of binaries etc. are also destroyed. The action of the fire produces the red colour in separate atoms, which are then joined by the same action of fire into new compounds, and eventually produce a new red jar. This complicated process of dissolution and reconstruction of the jar is necessary to allow all the atoms in the jar to be baked, for if the jar remained intact, the fire cannot penetrate it and bake the atoms in the interior. The reason why we cannot perceive this process of dissolution and reconstruction is its great rapidity. The time occupied by this process has been variously computed, some holding it to be nine moments, others ten, others eleven, and a fourth school, five only. The order of nine moments, which is generally