

101-102. Such being the case, falsity must always depend upon the non-productibility of conceptions; and this is the contradiction urged in the Bhashya passage "*Vravīti*, &c., &c."

102-103. In "*tachchēt pratyayitāt*," ("pratyayita" means) 'one who describes things as he sees them;' and "*indriyavishayam*" means 'that which is based upon the action of the senses.'

103-104. (Some people explain the word "pratyayita" in) "*tachchēt pratyayitāt*" as (meaning) "One who sees, and speaks the truth." Because (If it meant) "One who describes things as they are seen," then we would, in their opinion, have to admit the truthfulness of the assertions of untrustworthy persons also.

104-105. But (in that case), out of the two factors, 'trustworthiness' and 'amenability to sense-action,' the absence of even one would constitute a counter-instance, which is always based upon the absence of one factor only.

pancies has been ascertained, then there is a direct contradiction of it. The chances of both these contingencies are precluded from the Veda, by proving the non-existence of discrepancies in it.

101-102 "*Vravīti*" = says, or asserts,—i.e., gives rise to a conception. "*Vitatha*" = false, i.e., that which has been proved to be identical with *not giving rise to any conception*; and thus these two terms contradict each other, hence the sentence "asserts falsely" becomes self-contradictory.

102-103 With this begins the consideration of the Bhashya passage "*yat tu laukikam vachanām tat chēt pratyayitāt purushāt indriyavishayam vā, &c.*" The word "Indriya" here includes Inference and all the other principal means of right notion; the meaning of the clause thus comes to be this: "The assertion of the person who says as he sees, having the support of one or more means of right notion, is always authentic; consequently if the instance of human speech brought forward in the objection refer to the assertion of such persons, then the instance does not apply to the Major Term of the argument, which, therefore, fails. On the other hand, the assertion of untrustworthy persons, not supported by any other means of right notion, is always unauthentic; because of its very source being faulty. And if this is to which the instance refers, then such an instance cannot shake the authenticity of the Veda; and thus too your argument falls to the ground.

104-105 This refutes the second interpretation: A counter-instance is an instance brought forward in order to prove the weakness of a definition; and as such, the counter-instance should be based on the absence of only one differentia out of the many mentioned in the definition. Otherwise, if the counter-instance consisted of the absence of all the differentias mentioned in the definition, then it would not apply to the case at all, being entirely apart from it. As for instance, the definition of "Duty" is a "purpose described in the Veda;" where we have two differentias—that of *being a purpose*, and that of *being described in the Veda*; and the counter-instance brought against this definition is the case of the "Syēna" sacrifice, which is mentioned in the Veda, but does not lead to the accomplishment of any desirable end of man. And here we see that the counter-instance is wanting in one factor only, as a rule, and not in all the points noted in the definition. In accordance with this interpretation however, "Trustworthiness" and "Amenability to sense-perception,"—each by itself, constitutes authenticity; and hence the counter-instance would consist in the absence of each of these, and thence would result the absurdity explained in note 105-106.



105-106. And in the case of the untrustworthy speaker, we would have to admit the falsity of even such assertions as are based upon the authority of the senses; and the assertion of the trustworthy speaker too would come to be false, in the case of an assertion not based directly upon the authority of the senses. And thus would result a self-contradiction in the Bhāshya.

106-107. Therefore by the first epithet ("*pratyayita*") is signified "truthfulness;" and by the second—"Indriyavishayaṃ"—is implied the fact of its having a sound basis.

107-108. The mention of the absence of *discrepancy* (want of sufficient basis) is for the purpose of the preclusion of inauthenticity (and not for the accomplishment of authenticity, which is self-evident). The theory of authenticity being due to excellences has been thoroughly refuted before; and having once been set aside, it cannot be held to supply the basis for authenticity.

109-110. In the first clause, the word "*Vā*" has a collective force; but in the latter, it has the alternative sense. It is for this reason that the counter-instances of these have been mentioned separately: *viz*: (1) even in the case of the capable, if (the speaker is) untruthful, there

105-106 This Karika lays down the deficiency of the counter-instances. In the counter-instance of "trustworthy," we have "untrustworthy," the absence of a trustworthy speaker being the only ground of inauthenticity; thus then the very sentence cited as authentic, being amenable to the sense of the hearer, and it being the assertion of an untrustworthy person,—this very sentence would become inauthentic; and as such, would come to be cited as a counter-instance of itself. And again, with regard to "amenability to the senses" we would have as its counter-instance "not amenable to the senses;" and thus the assertion of a trustworthy person, not heard by the listener, which has been accepted as authentic, would become unauthentic, and thereby would come to be a counter-instance of itself; and thus there would be self-contradiction. And further, if the expression "amenable to the senses" be used with regard to the assertion of an untrustworthy person, with regard to an object before one's eyes, then the expression "not amenable to the senses" must necessarily mean "that which is not perceived by the hearer;" and then the Bhāshya—"it is impossible to be known by the person, without an explanation"—becomes inexplicable; because that which is not heard by the hearer cannot be comprehended even after an explanation. For certainly, it is not possible to know what the hearer does not perceive. Therefore the expression "amenable to sense" must mean "based upon accepted means of right notion;" and the expression "not amenable to the sense" must mean that which has no such basis; thus does the Bhāshya passage become explained. And again, the word "*Pratyayita*" signifies "one who has a conception and declares it;" and as this conception may be either right or wrong, so a "*pratyayita*" person is not necessarily a "trustworthy" person, but only one who says what he sees. Hence the only correct interpretation is the one given in Karika 102-103.

105-107 "Truthfulness"—i.e., the fact of saying as one sees. "Basis"—i.e., the fact of its being based upon correct means of right notion.

109-110 In the first instance, the notion of falsity is due to disbelief in the speaker; and in the latter, it is due the faultiness of the very origin of the assertion.

is falsity ; as also (2) in the case of a truthful (speaker), if the fact itself be incapable (of being verified by proofs).

110-111. The passage in question does not set aside omniscience. Because in the clause "without a sentence, &c.," what is signified is only the denial of omniscience in particular cases.

111. If there really existed a person knowing all things, through the six means of knowledge, how could such a person be denied ?

112. But if a person be assumed to be knowing all things by a single means of knowledge, such a person would doubtless perceive taste and all other objects, by means of the eye alone !

113. That particular kind of the Means of knowledge which leads at the present time to the perception of a special class of objects, was of the same kind at other times also.

114. The difference of degree that we come across (in the efficiency of the various senses), does not go beyond the precincts of the objects (amenable to each sense); and hence such difference would only exist in the cases of distant and subtle cognitions; and in no case could colour (the property of the eye) be amenable to the function of the ear.

115. With regard to objects in the future (such as Dharma, &c.), we do not ever find the applicability of Sense-Perception; nor that of Inference and the rest, in a case where there is no proper Mark (to serve as the Middle Term).

116. "Inasmuch as the assumption by others (the Banddhas) of an omniscient Person, as also that of the absence of human agency in the Veda by the Mīmāṃsakas, are both of the same type (there is no difference between the validity of the two),"—those who assert this must think over the following (points of difference).

117. An omniscient person is not seen by us at the present moment; nor, is it possible to prove (by means of Inference) that such a one ever existed before, as is done in the case of the negation of such a person.

110-111 "In particular cases"—the clause serves to preclude the capability of knowledge with regard to an object that is beyond the senses, and is only amenable to words—e.g., Duty.

111 He who knows everything by means of the six means of right notion, would also know Duty, through the Veda; and this fact would not militate against our theory that "Duty is knowable by the Veda alone;" hence it is not necessary for us to disprove such omniscience.

113 And hence it cannot be urged that such omniscience, by a single sense, is not possible now-a-days, though it was possible only in days gone by.

114 And as such, Sense-Perception too, by itself, cannot bring about omniscience.

117 Neither Sense-Perception, nor Inference can prove the existence of an omniscient person. In Inference we require a middle Term, which we cannot have in the case of omniscience. On the contrary, in support of the refutation of the existence of an omniscient person, we have the following inferential argument: "The past was without an omniscient person, because it was a point of Time, like the Present;" or again, "Buddha was not omniscient, because he was a man, like ourselves."



118. Nor can the existence of the omniscient one be proved by Scriptures; for in that case there would be mutual inter-dependence. And how can one ever believe the authenticity of a Scripture composed by another man?

119. Nor can we get at any other Scripture (save the Veda) which is eternal. If the eulogies (occurring in the Veda in praise of an Omniscient Person) were eternal, then, non-eternality would belong to the Scripture itself.

120. The eternality of the Scripture (Veda) having been established, all other assumptions (of an Omniscient Author and the like) become needless. For men could prove the existence of Duty by means of the same (Scripture), whereby (you seek) to prove the existence of an omniscient person.

121. One, who, convinced of the truthfulness (of Scripture writers) with regard to their assertions in connection with the relation of the senses and their objects (*i.e.*, in the case of ordinary perception), would base their authority, even in the case of matters of faith, on the fact of these latter assertions proceeding from one whose assertion has been found to be true in the former case;—

122. Such a one would thereby prove the authenticity (of Buddha's assertions) to depend upon something else (*i.e.*, our own sense perceptions). For if the authenticity thereof (*i.e.*, of Buddha's assertions dealing with ordinary perception) were due to itself, then what need could it have of the senses, &c., of other persons?

118 "*Mutual dependence.*" The Scripture depending for its validity upon the omniscience of the Author, and the omniscience of the Author depending upon the validity of the Scriptures.

119 Omniscience cannot be proved by any Scripture which is not due to human agency. "*If the eulogies, &c.*" This is added in anticipation of the objection based upon such vedic passages as—"He is omniscient" and the like, which might be taken to prove the existence of an Omniscient person. The sense of the Karika is that such passages are only eulogistic, and not descriptive of a fact; and as such they cannot be accepted as eternal. For the Scripture, attributing omniscience to a corporeal man, would stand self-condemned as *transitory*.

120 The eternal Scripture,—that you seek to employ in proving the existence of an Omniscient Person, who would be the sole authority of Duty—may be more reasonably employed in proving the existence of Duty itself, thereby doing away with the necessity of postulating an intermediary omniscient agent.

121 Here some people argue thus: "Granted that there is no omniscient person; but Buddha and others might have been rightful knowers of Duty. We find, in ordinary life, that Buddha is truthful to a nicety in matters of ordinary perception; hence it would follow that even in matters of pure faith, such as that of Duty, we might rest upon his authority; and thereby prove the propriety of such actions as *bowing to Chaitya*, on the ground of their having been declared by him." The next Karika supplies an answer to this argument, the sense of the reply being that if such be the case, then Buddha's authority would rest upon the fact of *our* cognition of the truthfulness of his assertions with regard to the ordinary objects of sense.



123. Just as the authenticity (of such assertions) is due to (our) sense-discrimination, so would it also be in the case of matters of faith; and (its authenticity) would never be independent or self-sufficient.

124. Just as by the aforesaid cause (conformity with our perception) is proved the truthfulness (of the Scriptures); so, in the same manner is also proved the absence of their authority with regard to objects not perceived by others.

125. The "truthfulness of the trustworthy," the "falsity of the untrustworthy" and "the mere repetition (or reminiscence) of a previous conception"—you will have to accept all these (with regard to your Scripture), if you stick to the instance (you have brought forward in your argument).

126. And further, in the case of (these scriptures) referring to super-sensuous objects, we would come to recognise their falsity, on account of the fact of all Scriptures besides the Veda, originating in human agency; since in such cases the grounds of their authenticity would be self-contradictory.

127. And then too, there results the absurdity of (your Scripture proving) the authenticity of subjects other than either Duty or Non-Duty. And so long as the Sāṅkhya and the rest continue to exist, your instance too is hard to be got at.

128. Because, while being a human assertion, it refers to super-sensuous subjects;—therefore too, on account of mutual dependence, the Scripture of Buddha and others would come to be false.

129. Because the assertions of Buddha with regard to such matters as Duty are not borne out by our experience; therefore his assertions are proved to be false by the same reason which you sought to employ in proving their truthfulness.

130. If you seek to prove the authenticity of your Scriptures by reason of the assertions of its author conforming with your own experience, then, as in your own experience, you come across various cases like those mentioned in the Karikā, so, in the same manner, you will have to admit of the same discrepancies in the author of your Scriptures.

131. "Self-contradictory"—because the reason (human agency) brought forward to prove the truthfulness of the Scriptures may also be employed to prove their falsity.

132. "So long as the Sāṅkhya, &c."—The assertion of Buddha with regard to the momentary character of all external objects, has been said to conform with our own experience, which fact has been made the ground of proving his veracity. But the Sāṅkhya has established, beyond the least doubt, that all that exists is eternal, and exists for ever. Under such circumstances, so long as you have not fully refuted the arguments of the Sāṅkhyas, you cannot hope to establish the authority of your Author, on the grounds that you have urged.

133. Just as human speech, when referring to transcendental objects is almost always sure to be false, so, the speech of Buddha too could not but be false. And when his assertions with regard to transcendental objects come to be false, those with regard to perceptible objects too (such as the momentary character of all objects, &c.), become false. And as his veracity was sought by you to be proved on the ground of his latter assertions being true, it falls to the ground unsupported.



129. The antagonist who meets you for the first time would, while arguing, also have the following argument (at his disposal) against you.

130. "My assertion that 'Buddha, &c, are non-omniscient,' is true, because it is my assertion, like my assertion 'Fire is hot, and bright.'"

131. "The fact of this being my assertion is directly perceptible, and you have yet to prove that what you bring forward as Buddha's declaration was really what he asserted. And thus mine is the (correct) argument, whereas yours is doubtful and incomplete."

132. How can anyone postulate a thing, whose existence can be disproved by reason of its being contrary to Sense-Perception?

133. Nor can your omniscient Person be postulated on the ground of unbroken tradition. Because the tradition is disputed, has no basis, and is only accepted by a few people (like yourself).

134. That "He is omniscient," how could even his contemporary enquirers know, being (as they were) devoid of any conception of his cognitions and the objects thereof?

135. Thus then you will have to assume many omniscient persons (among his contemporaries and their followers, so that each of these could be cognisant of the omniscience of his predecessor). For he who is himself non-omniscient could never recognise another person to be omniscient.

136. He by whom the omniscient Person could not be recognised,—how could such a person have any idea of the authenticity of his assertions? (For these would be) to him just like the assertion of any other ordinary person.

137. When (you declare Buddha to be) devoid of attachment, &c., and free from activity,—then the injunctions (contained in your Scriptures) must have been composed by another person, specially in the absence of all definite (concrete) cognition (in the case of Buddha).

138. If you say that "By mere proximity to such a Man (as Buddha) injunctions issue forth, spontaneously, even from the walls, just as from the Chintāmani, —."

139 This is a counter-argument to the following reasoning of the Buddhists: "Buddha's assertion with regard to his omniscience is true, because it is his assertion, like the assertion 'Fire is hot' and the like."

140 In ordinary experience we find that persons take to composing works,—(1) for some gain, (2) for commanding the respect of others, (3) for the sake of fame, and (4) for winning the affection of some person; and so forth. But you deny the existence of any of these motives, in the case of Buddha; hence the scriptures attributed to him must have been composed by some other person; specially as you assert that Buddha perceives the whole universe, in the abstract, and that he has no concrete cognition thereof. How, then, could he describe things, by means of words? For, certainly, no verbal description is possible without concrete cognitions.

141 "Chintamani" is a gem which is believed to give to its possessor all that he desires.

139. Such assertions could only fit in the mouth of blind believers (like you); we can have no faith in such injunctions as proceed from walls.

140. For it is just possible that these may have been composed by Buddha himself, or they may have been uttered by certain invisible evil-minded Pisāchas (spirits) (hidden in the wall), in order to deceive (people).

141. Similarly for those that have postulated for Jiva, as independent of the sense-organs, &c., pure cognition of objects past, subtile and the like;—

142. Such an assumption could not be proved by anything except (their) Scriptures; nor again could the (authority of these) Scriptures themselves be established without the above assumption (and thus there would be a mutual dependence). Nor can such a theoriser get at any similar instance among ordinary men (that could prove the particular faculty of their Jiva).

143. The idea of an eternal Scripture too, is to be refuted in the same manner. Because with regard to that also, there is no such belief as that "This is seen by this person, or composed by him."

144. Men are, generally, speakers of falsehood; therefore just as we do not believe in the people of to-day, so too, we could have no faith in those of the past.

145. The idea of such a notion with regard to the Scripture and its meaning, may be like dream-cognition; and in that case, how could there be any authenticity in the scriptures, with regard to which such a doubt is possible?

146. What you desire to establish is the unrivalled excellence of the

141 The Buddhist having been refuted, the Ārhat theory is next taken up.

142 "Without their Scriptures."—For such an assumption is amenable neither to any ordinary means of right notion, nor to the Veda.

143 The first half seeks to set aside the eternality of the Veda; as some people say that the eternal Veda is heard by Prajapati. But the Kārikā means to say that, as the cognition of an omniscient person, so too, that of an uttered sound, is without any cause. The second half anticipates the objection that by refuting the eternality of the Veda, the author strikes at the very root of his own system. The *Nyāyarat-nākara* explains the second half thus: "This theory is to be refuted, because of the denial of the authenticity of the Veda, on the ground of its being composed by a human author."

144 Some MSS. read, in the end, "*tathā' tīlāṛthakīrtanē.*" The latter half of the Kārikā, should then be translated thus: "As we do not believe people describing the things of the present, so too, we would not believe them, when speaking of the things of the past."

145 The attributing of the Veda to Prajapati has another fault: If his knowledge and propounding of the Veda be without any cause, coming to him spontaneously, then such knowledge may only be of the nature of a dream, false and unreliable.

146 With this Kārikā begins the refutation of the theory that the Veda is Eternal, spontaneously heard and propounded in this world by Prajapati.



Author, as also the eternality of the Scripture itself; and in that case you will have to postulate the fact of His remembering the Scripture learnt in some previous birth.

147. If you postulate such ante-natal comprehensibility of the scripture (to Prajāpati), needless is your opposition to the comprehension of the objects thereof (as attributed by the Bauddhas to their Scripture-writers—viz., supernatural knowledge of Duty and its opposite). For one who is able to comprehend sounds that have not been uttered, what can be said against his comprehending the meaning of such sounds themselves (which is much easier than the comprehending of unuttered sounds)?

148. The author too, in the view of those people that postulate such comprehension of the meaning, would be independent. Whereas in the case of the mere verbal cognition of the Scripture, we would have both (Scripture and the author) depending upon one another.

149. (Whereas according to us) even in a single life the Veda is found to reside in (i.e., known by) many persons; and as such, either its remembrance or comprehension does not go against its independence.

150. For if any one person were to make any changes in the Veda, of his own accord, he would be opposed by many persons. And again, if the Veda were the outcome of the mind of a single person, then it would in no way differ from modern compositions.

151. For the same reason we do not acknowledge the agency of a single person even in the case of the traditional course of instructions (in the Veda). The very first persons (who commenced this traditional course) must have been many, dependent upon one another, just as we find to be the case at the present day.

152. Thus then, while others make many (unreasonable) assumptions for establishing their own Scriptures, Jaimini does not have recourse to any—and is this the equality (of Jaimini) with others?

153. Nothing more than what is directly visible is postulated by him (Jaimini), with regard to the authenticity (of the Veda). Whereas the other theorists have to make various assumptions with regard to the imperceptible, even in proving the inauthenticity of the Veda (to say nothing of those that they have recourse to in seeking to establish the authority of their own scriptures).

154. The Atheist in denying the authority of the Veda, lands himself on the (absurdity of) setting aside the authenticity of a directly perceptible fact. Because when a conception has once arisen (and the self-evident authority of such conceptions has already been proved), any assumption towards its denial could only be needless and far-fetched.

143 "Dependent upon one another."—The Author depending upon the Veda for a comprehension of its meaning and the Veda depending upon the author, in order to gain its right form.

155. The absence of human agency, with regard to the Veda, having been proved, it lies upon the Atheists to point out any difference between the Vedic conceptions and the perceptions due to faultless cognitions).

156. "There could be no instructions with regard to supersensuous objects, if the author had not perceived such objects"—hence is the "assumption of an object" (i.e., such is the form of the argument "Apparent Inconsistency"—Arthapatti).

157. Or the passage may be (interpreted) as an inferential reasoning: the "fact of being an instructor" is found to be invariably accompanied by that of "being preceded by the perception of the object" (of instruction). And the negation of this is laid down in the passage "Nanu, etc."

158. (The Apparent Inconsistency that you have urged) may also be explained away otherwise—as by reason of the perplexity (of the Instructor). Or your 'Linga' (the reason, the "middle term,") may be said to be anomalous, inasmuch as there are such instances as the assertions of children, etc., (who are found to speak of things they have never seen).

159. If you say that 'the Instructors (Manu, etc.), propounded their instructions after having come to know of the objects, through the Veda'—then you will only prove what has already been proved by us—this is what is meant by the passage "Vedādapi, etc."; and this refers only to Manu, etc., (who declare themselves to be the followers of Veda, which too they declare to be the only means of knowing the true nature of Duty; and not of Buddha, etc.).

160. "Because a man, though knowing one thing one way, wishes to speak of it in another way,—therefore from the assertion of a person, there can be no absolute certainty as to what is in his mind (i.e., what he really knows)."

161. "We see that one who is confused speaks something other than

155 Now begins the explanation of the Bhāshya passage—"Nanwaviduṣhām upadēṣo' nāvakaipyatē," &c., &c., (page 4). "Assumption of an object," i.e., that of the fact of Manu and Buddha knowing, by themselves, the nature of Duty.

157 "One who is an Instructor is one who has seen the object"—this is the affirmative premiss; the negative form of this is: "He who is not a seer (or knower) of the object is not an Instructor;" and this latter is what is meant by the Bhāshya passage quoted above.

158 Ref. Bhāshya "Upadēṣā hi vyāmohādāpi bhavanti" (pp. 4-5), which is said in reply to the objection moved in the passage quoted above. "The middle Term," i.e., the fact of being preceded by a perception of the object.

159 "Only prove, &c."—That is, this assertion of yours does not contradict our assertion that "Veda alone is the means of knowing Duty."

160 Ref. to Bhāshya: "Api cha pauruṣhēyādvachanādēvamāyā puruṣho vēdēti bhavati pratyayāḥ &c." (page 5). The Kārikā lays down the objections against this passage. It means that from the mere assertion of a man, we cannot come to the conclusion that 'he knows thus'; because he might be knowing it one way, and expressing it in quite another way.



what he wishes to speak; therefore the assertion does not always follow the wish (of the speaker)."

162. It is only in the case of the assertions of a trustworthy person, that his own mind, (*i.e.*, what he really knows of the object) is known (by means of his assertions); while in the case of an untrustworthy person, there is no certainty (as to what may be in his mind). Therefore it is only by means of a general rule and its exception, that the twofold powers of words, is here (in the *Bhāshya*) explained.

163. The bringing about of the comprehension of the meaning of a sentence depends upon the arrangement of Words and their Meanings; and the form of this arrangement too depends upon the wish to speak, which, in its turn, depends upon previous conceptions.

164. With regard to objects, different men are found to construct sentences differently, when actuated by different motives,—by means of additions (alterations) and subtractions (whichever seems to serve their respective ends).

165. Therefore when, by means of the assertion, the hearer has arrived at the comprehension of the object (spoken of), then verily there arises the notion with regard to the knowledge of the speaker—that "this (object) is known by him."

166. When a person questions (the veracity of) one who is following the assertion of a trustworthy person, then the latter points to the trustworthy person, saying "He *knows* it thus."

167. On account of being interrupted by the *cognition* (of the trustworthy person), the Words in this case become inoperative for the time being; but the manifestation of the authenticity thereof would be based upon the mere fact of their originating directly from the cognition of the speaker.

168. Though the Meaning may have been comprehended beforehand, yet it depends for its definiteness upon the fact of its originating directly from the speaker's cognition; hence such a fact can only be comprehended

162 This Kārikā offers the reply to the objections urged in the last two Kārikās. "General rule &c."—That based on the general rule being the power that is got at through the recognition of the source of the assertion,—the exception or negation being in the case of the assertion of untrustworthy persons.

163 This Kārikā anticipates the following question: "Does, then, all comprehension arise from inexpressive sentences?" The sense of the Karika is that the comprehension of the meaning of sentences is not verbal, but inferential; and the process of this inference is shown.

164 How do you know that the arrangement depends upon the wish to speak? The Kārikā gives the reply—"by *anvaya* (Invariable concomitance) and *vyatirēka* (constant negation)." "Addition, &c." of words, in a sentence.

167 "Interrupted"—*i.e.*, so long as one has not recognised the cognition of the speaker, though there is a recognition of the meaning of words, yet it is as good as non-existent; as its authenticity is recognised only when it is found that it rests upon a certain definite cognition of the speaker.

sible through the comprehension of the Meaning. But in the matter of authenticity, it takes the first place.

169. Thus then, in the present case (of the Scriptures of Buddha, &c.), the falsity of these is proved by the fact of their being due to human agency. This character (of falsity) could not belong to the Veda, because in its case there is no author (human agency).

170. And thus there being no interruption by any notion of the author, the meaning of the Veda is comprehended directly through the meaning (of words); and it does not stand in need of the precedence of any cognition (of a person); nor, as such, can it ever be false.

171-72. The assertions of Buddha, &c., that were brought forward (by the Atheists proper) as instances to prove the inauthenticity (of the Veda) are here shown to be non-concomitant. Because it has been shown above that the effects of these (Vedic assertions) are correct; while, as regards the meaning, they have got nothing to do with it.

173. With regard to objects outside the precincts of its applicability, there is a chance of the falsity of the Veda also. Therefore with regard to the arguments urged in the Pūrvapaksha, you would only be proving what we already accept.

174-75. Not knowing this meaning, and only bearing in mind the

171-72 The *Kācika* thus explains: "The author now explains the Bhāṣhya in another way: For the proof of the authenticity of the Veda, whatever ordinary assertions were brought forward as instances are here shown to be non-concomitant with the Major Term. The second *Kārikā* shows this non-concomitance. The meaning is this: The Bhāṣhya here takes the place of another party, and through him, replies to a third party. The Atheists bring forward the following argument: 'The Veda is false, because the objects treated of therein are not amenable to Sense-perception, like such assertions of Buddha, &c.'; and the present passage replies to this argument, with a view to the Buddhist doctrine: your instance is non-concomitant with the Major Premiss: because according to Buddha, *words* are not accepted as the means of knowing objects; for according to him, what the *words* do is simply to remind one of the object, neither adding to, nor subtracting from, it any factor..... The words only express the meaning of the speaker; therefore that which has been said to be the subject of the assertions of Buddha,—with regard to this subject, such assertions are quite true,—such effect being only what is in the mind of the speaker. And as these assertions correctly delineate what was in the mind of Buddha, they cannot but be accepted as true. As for the objects, forming the denotation of *words*, the Buddhists do not accept any applicability of the *words* to them. Therefore there is no proof against the authenticity of the Veda; and it is this that has been shown above in *Kārikā* 163."

173 "If any ordinary assertion has been urged in regard to an object other than what is within its zone of applicability (i.e., objects other than the cognition of the speaker), then you would be proving what is already proved: of the Vedas too, we accept the falsity, with regard to those objects that it does not treat of; for we accept the falsity of everything that is urged in the Pūrvapaksha."—*Kācika*.

174-75 The meaning of the Bhāṣhya is that "the mere fact of being an assertion is not a ground of falsity,"—not knowing this fact, and only bearing in mind the

declaration of artificiality and non-artificiality being the ground of correctness and incorrectness, the objector has said "*Nanu Sāmānyatō-drishtam, &c.*"

175. "Na, anyatvāt" can be no refutation; because an instance is an instance only for reason of its being another thing, and it is not based upon its identity with the Minor Term.

176-78. Therefore the meaning of the author of the Bhashya is now explained: Accepting (for the sake of argument) the function of the Sentence with regard to the Object, this is what the Bhashya means: If even in face of the interruption (by the cognition of the speaker), the ordinary false human assertion were to be the instance, with regard to the external object; even then the Reason would be "too wide," (i.e., applying to the conclusion to be proved, as well as to its contradictory proposition): as even in the true assertions of men, we find the character of a sentence; since even with regard to supersensuous objects we come across true assertions that may have been uttered at random.

179. And the clause "Na anyatvāt" denotes "something other than the declaration of the Pūrvapakshi": (the meaning being that) this (your argument) is different from, and only a false semblance of, what the Pūrvapakshi takes it to be. Or by 'anya' may be meant the "Vipaksha" (that wherein the Major Term never resides, i.e., the contradictory of the Major Term).

declaration,—that "that which is artificial—i.e., composed by a human author—is false on account of the presence of discrepancies in the author, and that which is inartificial i.e., not due to human agency—is true," the objector has put forward his objection. The *Kāṇikā* explains "*Kṛitakākritaka*" as belonging to a trustworthy person or to an untrustworthy one. But the translation follows the interpretation of the *Nyāyaratnākara*.

175 The difference of the Minor Term from the Instance is only proper. In the proof of the falsity of the Veda, an ordinary assertion has been cited as an instance; and the difference of this is no fault; as it is only proper that the instance should be something other than what is to be proved; and the "Supaksha" is that which has already been proved to be concomitant with the Minor Term.

176-78 Though there is an interruption of the speaker's cognition, and the instances are based upon the nature of external objects, yet the reason—"the fact of being an assertion"—would be too wide. The case would be the same, even if the reason were stated in the form—"the Veda is false, because being a sentence, it treats of supersensuous objects" (thus guarding against the chance of the trustfulness of human assertions, which can never be absolutely true, with regard to supersensuous objects). For instance, when one man says "There is no Indra," another may say "Indra does exist"; and one of these must be false, and the other true.

179 "Semblance, &c."—the reasoning is fallacious, because of the middle term being too wide; and hence your argument has got a mere semblance of reasoning; in reality, it is totally fallacious. "Vipaksha"—the meaning of the clause is that your argument is not valid, because your middle term—the fact of being a human assertion—resides also in "truth" which is the contradictory of your Minor Premiss.

180. Or (it may mean) that "on account of contradiction, falsity belongs to that (*i.e.*, human assertion) and not to this, (*i.e.*, Vedic assertion)." Or that, on account of the object (of human assertions) being something else (*i.e.*, not the *object* itself, but the speaker's notion with regard to it), there is non-concomitance (of your Instance) with the Major Term.

181-182. The passage "Nahi anyasya, &c." means that the falsity of one thing does not constitute the falsity of another: because the desire to speak is related to a false Object, that is no reason why the same falsity should attach to the Sentence also (for certainly, the fact of Devadatta being dark cannot prove Yajnadatta also to be dark, as in such an argument) the *fact of being a man* put in as the Middle Term is an instance of the "Width" (of the Reason).

182. Or, on account of the argument of the Pūrvapakshi being utterly fallacious, *na anyatvāt* may be taken as signifying its futility (or duplicity).

183. Or again, *the fact of being something else* may be taken as laying down an argument in favour of authenticity. And (if this argument be equal in strength to that urged by the Pūrvapakshi, then his argument comes to be) concomitant with its contradictory, *i.e.*, the conclusion arrived at by us; or (if our argument happens to be stronger than his, then his argument) is set aside by means of Inference, (*i.e.*, the Inferential argument urged below).

184. (1) The conception produced by the Veda, is authentic, because it is brought about by faultless means,—like the conceptions produced,

130 "Non-concomitance"—The object of all human assertion is the speaker's cognition with regard to certain objects; and as, in this connection, a human assertion is always true, therefore it cannot be cited as an instance of falsity.

131 The Inferential argument having "sentence" for its middle term, has, for its object, either a desire to speak, or the speaker's cognition with regard to the object in question. On the other hand, the argument based upon the "desire to speak" as the Middle Term, has for its Object, the object itself; consequently the falsity of any one of these cannot lead to the falsity of another, as their objects are totally different.

132 "Devadatta is black, therefore Yajnadatta must also be black, because both are men." Here, the Middle Term is too wide, as all men are not black. "Futility"—literally "Vikalpasama" means *the proving of the duplicate character of the argument* (which really proves nothing definitely). It consists in the fact of showing the duplicate nature of the characteristics of the Major Term (which is to be proved), through the finding of a new characteristic of the Middle Term. This is thus explained in the *Kārikā*: "Assertions are also found to be other than human,—*f.i.*, the assertions in the Veda; and some again are human; thus then, there being this duplicity in the character of the Middle Term (the fact of being an assertion), there naturally arises a doubt as to the falsity or truth or the proposition you seek to prove."

134 The author now formulates his own arguments.

either by a correct Premiss, or by the assertion of a trustworthy person, or by direct Sense-perception.

185. (2) And again, (the conception produced by the Veda is authentic); *firstly*, because it is produced by an assertion which does not proceed from an unreliable source; and *secondly*, because it is free from all contradiction either in time or place,—like the conception produced by the assertion of a trustworthy person.

186. The applicability of these reasons (*faultlessness* and *the fact of not being composed by an untrustworthy author* as applying to the Veda) will be proved by the well-established fact of the Veda not proceeding from an author. It was with all these ideas in view, that the author of the Bhashya said "Na, anyatvāt."

187. The clause "pratyakshastu, &c.," (in the Bhāshya) may be taken to indicate either *strength* (firmness), or *precedence*, or *self-evidence*, or *inauthenticity through a foreign source*.

188. If, however, falsity be said to consist only in *non-conception*, in the absence of the other two forms (of falsity—*viz.*, *doubt* and *mistaken conception*), then (verbal conception) would be a "perception" for others (the Buddhas); though to us (Mīmāṃsakas) it is got at through Inference alone.

189. Just as your argument would prove inauthenticity, so, in the same manner would it serve to prove that inauthenticity to be due to some extraneous invalidating cause.

190. The mention in the concluding passage (of the Bhāshya) of

187 Though the conception got at through the Veda is not direct Sense-perception, yet it is similar to such perception, in that it is firm, precedes inferential knowledge, is self-evident, and owes its occasional falsity to some foreign cause; and as such, it could, by implication, be called "Perception."

188 The Buddhists hold cognition and non-cognition to be perceptible; and Doubt and Misconception have already been proved to be inapplicable to the Veda. Therefore the only ground that could be urged against the authenticity of the Veda would be "non-conception" (want of conceptions through Vedic sentences). And as this is amenable to Sense-perception, according to the Buddhists, it is not improper, in their minds, to declare Vedic conceptions to be "Perceptions"; though for the Mīmāṃsaka, it is a case of Inferential knowledge; and it is, in accordance with this, that the Bhāshya has been interpreted as above.

189 The *Kārikā* thus explains: "You seek to prove the inauthenticity of the Veda, on the ground of its similarity with ordinary human assertions. As such, what would be right for you to say is that 'the inauthenticity of the Veda must be of the same nature as that of ordinary human assertions.' And in that case, we know that ordinary human assertions are proved to be false only by certain invalidating causes; and consequently the falsity of the Veda too must be based upon similar causes. But, in the case of the Veda, we do not find any such invalidating cause; therefore it cannot but be authentic."

190 The sentence which closes the consideration of the knowledge of Duty being due to the Veda alone: "Codanālakshano'rthah Ārāyaskarah,"—where the

"*Ārēyaskara*" (*producing bliss*) with regard to Duty, is with a view to laying down the full significance of the word 'Duty.'

191. "*Bliss*" (*Ārēyah*) is man's happiness; and as this is to be accomplished by means of the Materials, Auxiliaries and Actions, as laid down in the Veda,—therefore it is to these (Materials, &c.), alone that the character of "Duty" can be rightly said to belong.

192. One who performs sacrifices comes to be called "*Dharmika*" ("Dutiful" or Pious), by people who know nought of anything else (such as *Apūrva* and the like) as resulting from such sacrifices,—which (name, "*Dharmika*") we understand as being due solely to his connection with the sacrifices.

193-94. As a matter of fact, the (acquiring of) cattle, &c., is found to result from the performance of "Duty" (Sacrifice); and these results are also said to proceed from the "*Citrā*" sacrifice, as well as from the "milking vessel, &c." (Auxiliary); therefore it is to these (latter) also that the character of 'Duty' is said to belong.

194. Because of the mention of the word "*Dharmāṇi*" (we infer that) the word "Dharma," as freed from the (marks of) Gender and Number, serves as an instance (in the Argument).

195-96. We do not find the word 'Duty' used in either of the following senses:—(1) that of a particular function of the internal organ (the Sankhya Doctrine), (2) that of a peculiar mental impression (unconsciously left thereon by good or bad actions—the Buddha doctrine), (3) that of the "Body of Virtue." ("*Punya-pudgala*"—the Jaina doctrine), (4) that of "a specific property of the person" (the Vaiśeṣika doctrine), or (5) that of "*Apūrva*" (a peculiar unseen force, in the shape of 'fate,' &c., postulated by a scion of the Mīmāṃsakas).

question arises—why should the Bhāṣya substitute the word "*Ārēyaskarah*" for "*Dharmah*"?

191 "*Ārēyaskarah*"—that which brings about '*Ārēyah*,' happiness. And happiness is seen to be got at by means of the materials laid down in the Veda; therefore these alone constitute Duty. By "materials" here is meant *sacrifice in general*.

192 "*Any other thing to be accomplished*"—in the shape of *Apūrva* and the like (postulated by others), of which ordinary people know nothing.

193-94 We know the acquiring of cattle, &c., as following from the performance of Duty; and the Veda asserts these to follow from sacrifices; e.g., the "*Citrā*" sacrifice has been laid down for one who desires cattle; and the fetching of Soma in the milking vessel is also enjoined for the same purpose. So it comes to be implied that Duty consists of Sacrifices as well as their Auxiliaries.

194 The Vedic passage—"Yajñēna yajnamayajanta dēvāstāni dharmāṇi, &c."—shows the identity of "Sacrifice" with "Duty." The difference of Gender and Number ('Yajnam' being in the Masculine Singular, and 'Dharmāṇi' in Neuter Plural) is only a Vedic anomaly.

195-96 "*Punya-pudgala*"—is the atomic body which forms the future body of the virtuous person. The compound "*apūrvajanmani*" is expounded as "*na pūrvam janma yasya*"—that which is not brought about before (an action).



196. Nor can these (aforesaid function of the internal organ, &c.), be ever recognised by means of the Veda, &c., as being the means of (the accomplishment of) the ends of man.

197. Nor can we recognise the "Apūrva,"—as anything different from 'Heaven' and 'Sacrifice,'—either in the shape of the means (like Sacrifice) or of the end (like Heaven), or in any form other than these.

198. On the other hand, we would be landed upon the absurdity of rejecting a thing mentioned in the Veda, and assuming something never heard of (therein),—if we were to assume the "Apūrva" to be identical with these (Sacrifice and Heaven). And lastly, if it were unlike both of these, it could have no form at all.

199. Therefore the "Apūrva" must be accepted as being only a peculiar form of energy (or capacity)—lying latent either in (the means) Sacrifice, &c., while they are functioning towards their ends,—or in (the ends themselves) the Cattle, &c., while these are undergoing the process of origination (or birth).

200. Inasmuch as the capabilities of objects are not denotable by names in the abstract, the "Apūrva" (which has been shown to be the capability of certain objects) cannot be said to be signified by the word "Dharma."

201. "The word 'Codana' has been known, in the first instance,

196 "Veda, &c."—including also the scriptures of the Buddhists, wherein what has been enjoined as Duty is only the bowing to the *Caitya*, which is an action, and not a mental impression.

197 By assuming the Apūrva to be either the end or the means, we would be rejecting the declaration of the Veda, wherein Heaven and Sacrifice have been distinctly laid down as the end and means respectively.

199 The Apūrva is only a peculiar form of the energy of the means or of the end, existing in the form of a sprout, to burst out in time into the full grown tree of the Result in its entirety. And so, by postulating such an Apūrva, we sail clear of the necessity of assuming anything other than the Sacrifice or Heaven, and also of the chance of being open to the objection urged against us—that the Sacrifice having been destroyed (on completion) at the present time, how could it bring about the result at a distant future time, unless we assumed an "Apūrva" apart from the Sacrifice itself. The theory here propounded is that the Apūrva is a sprout-like capability produced in one of the two,—i.e., either in the means or in the end—which may be assumed to be undergoing a process of incubation during the time that the Result has not appeared. This will be explained in detail in the "Apūrvādhikaraṇa" of the Second Adhyāya.

200 The 'Faculties' are spoken of as "Faculties," "Power," "Energy," &c., and not by the name of any particular object. And "Apūrva" having been proved to be a "faculty" of the sacrifice, it cannot be spoken of as "Dharma," which is a name of the Sacrifice itself.

201 The next nine Kārikās raise various objections against the following passage in the Bhāṣya: "*ubhayamīha codanayā lakṣhyate, &c., &c.*" "*How can, &c.,*"—as the counter-instance should be wanting in only one of the necessary differentias; in the

to apply to *positive* injunctions alone; and as a 'Slaughter' is not of that kind, how can it serve as a counter-instance" ?

202. "'Syēna' and the like are here (in the Bhāshya) spoken of as authorised by the Veda; and then, in the absence of any prohibition thereof, how can these be said to be sinful" ?

203. "Though there may be a prohibition with regard to a subject referred to by a positive injunction, yet we do not apprehend any sinfulness in connection with such subjects,—as in the case of the *shodasigrahana*."

204. "Having said that 'the *Syēna* is authorised by the Veda,' it would be a self-contradiction to assert that 'it is prohibited.' And again, while considering the injunction of the *Syēna*, &c., it is not right to introduce the consideration of 'Slaughter' in general."

205. "Because *Slaughter* is only a resultant of these (sacrifices), differing from them in its most essential feature; inasmuch as it consists entirely of the destroying of life, while the '*Çyēna*' sacrifice is something entirely different, like the sword (which also helps in the *killing*)."

206. "The assumption of *advice* too is not proper with regard to a subject which is not fit for an injunction. And again if '*Çyēna*,' &c., be not said to form the objects of injunctions, what else could" ?

207. "It is a universal rule that 'injunctions refer to two factors of a *Bhāvanā* (i.e., the *means* and the *process*),'—and this rule would be contradicted (if the character of Injunction be denied to the '*Syēna*')."

207-208. "The *Jyotishtoma* and others too that are held to be 'Dharma,' would cease to be so; because these are also accompanied by 'Slaughter' (of the sacrificial animals). Nor can an object, which is not enjoined, form part either of the result or the means of an action."

present instance of the "*Çyēna*," however, it is neither "*Codanālakshana*," nor an "*Artha*."

208 Just as we have an affirmative injunction "*Shodācinam grihnāti*,"—and then again its negation—"na *shodācinam grihnāti*,"—where the latter negation only serves to preclude the *holding* of the *Shodāci* vessels; and in no case can it imply that such *holding* would constitute a sin. Similarly, in the case in question, *slaughter* (in the "*Çyēna*") is enjoined, while *slaughter* (in general) is prohibited; where this latter would only preclude the *slaughter* from the sacrifice, and cannot imply its *sinfulness*.

208 As the sword by which the animal is killed is not "*slaughter*," so also the "*Çyēna*" (which brings about the death of the enemy) cannot, in itself, be called "*slaughter*."

208 This refers to the passage—"tasyāyamabhyupāyah iti tēshamupadēśah." "*Could not be said*"—even in the face of such direct injunctions as "*Çyēnēna yajēta*."

207 "*Would be contradicted*"—i.e., if the "*Çyēna*" (which is the means of killing an enemy) were denied to be the object of injunction, then the universal rule would be contradicted, and would give rise to the absurdity noted in the following *Kārikā*,—"Jyotishtoma," &c., also being only the *means* to the attainment of Heaven, &c.

207.208 Nor can, &c.—If "*Çyēna*," &c., were not the objects enjoined, then they could, in no case, form the necessary constituents of either their results or means.

209. "That which has been laid down as the *means* cannot be denied to be the object of the Injunction; because either in the Veda, or in ordinary experience, it is not desirable for any action to be enjoined merely as a *result*."

210. On account of these arguments, we must conclude that what is meant by the Bhāshya is only an explanation of the signification of the word "Artha," (as detailed below).

210-11. *Either in the case of activity towards, or cessation from, (a certain course of action), the conception, resulting from the hearing of the word, is "Codanā"—this general definition (of "Codanā") was in the mind of the author of the Bhāshya. The mention of the character of enjoining positive activity (in the Bhāshya) may be explained as only citing an example (of Codanā).*

212. For if ("Codana" were) restricted to the injunction of positive activity alone, then the subsequent explanations of the word 'Artha' could not be explained (as proved by the above objections). Or again, the mention of the *Injunction of positive activity* may be due to the occurrence (in the Sūtra) of the word "Artha," (which seems to restrict the definition to positive Injunctions).

213. Or the definition ("pravartakam vākyaṃ Codanā") may be explained as referring only to such "Codanā" as forms the authority for Duty.

213-214. Such being the case, the comprehension of the objects of positive injunctions as leading to merit, would be derived from Positive Injunctions; and the ascertainment of the fact of the prohibited objects being sinful, would be got at through the Prohibitory Injunctions. Thus then by the mention of "Artha" (in the Sūtra) what is meant is that the

210 By this and the few following Kārikās, the Vārtikā meets the above objections. "Thus,"—i.e., as the meaning of the Bhāshya is as explained below; and it cannot be taken literally.

212 "Occurrence of the word 'artha,'"—i.e., because in the aphorism, the word "Codanā" occurs together with the word "Artha"! and that which is an *Artha* (positive virtue) is always an object of positive injunction.

213 Positive Injunction is the sole authority of "Duty"; and as it is "Duty" alone that has been defined in the aphorism, the Bhāshya takes up the consideration of only the positive form of *Codanā* (and leaves off the negative form, as not appertaining to the definition of "Duty"); hence the Bhāshya—"Pravartakam vākyaṃ Codanā."

213, 214 Granted that *Codanā* refers both to Positive Injunctions and Prohibitions. Even then, the fact of the "Agnishtoma," &c. (which are objects of positive injunctions) leading to Merit, would be got at, through positive injunctions alone; just as the fact of "Brāhmana-slaughter" (which is an object of Prohibition) being the cause of demerit (and thereby being sinful) will be got at through the Prohibitory Injunctions. Thus then the Positive Injunctions treat of the cause of Merit (Artha), and the Prohibitory ones of the cause of demerit or sin (Anartha).

character of "Dharma" (Duty) belongs only to the object positively enjoined.

215. And the sinful character of the prohibited action is got at indirectly by implication, and is not mentioned directly in the Sūtra.

215-216. Therefore (in the passage "*Ubhayam iha Codanāya lakshyate*") the word "Ubhayam" (both) would refer to two groups of actions, represented each by the performance of sacrifices, and the killing of a Brāhmana, which form the objects of Injunction and Prohibition, respectively.

216-218. Though the "Çyēna" is also an object of positive Injunctions, and its result too (the death of the enemy) is a desirable one,—yet a sinful character is attributed to it indirectly, through (the character of) its results. This will be made clear by the clauses, "*Pratishiddhā hi sā*," "*Hinsāhi sā*" and "*Nābhicarēt*." If however the sinful character of the 'Çyēna,' belonged to its own form, then the subsequent passages (*Hinsā hi sā*, &c.), would become incompatible.

219. Because the Çyēna having been once positively enjoined, a prohibition can hardly be applicable to it directly.

219-220. If however the word "Codanā" were restricted to positive Injunctions alone, then the passage "*Ubhayam*, &c.," would have to be taken to refer to the Means and the Result.

220-221. The (causal) relation between the Means and the Result, having been established by the Positive Injunction, both of these would form the objects of Indication (i.e., by the mention of the relation between the two, the two themselves would become indicated).

221-222. There are two sorts of results following from the performance of sacrifices (and these are mentioned in the Bhāshya by the

§16.17 Though "Çyēna" and the rest are not, in themselves, sinful, for reasons shown above, yet a sinful character is attributed to them, second-hand, on account of the sinful character of their results. ("Upacara" is secondary, indirect or figurative application). As the character of the cause transfers itself to the effect, and vice versa, therefore the sinful character of the Result (killing) transfers itself to the cause (the "Çyēna" sacrifice). Because the mention of the fact of its being "prohibited" cannot directly refer to the "Çyēna," which is *not prohibited*, we must accept the Result alone as the direct object of prohibition. All the clauses quoted point to the fact that the Bhāshya only means to apply sinfulness to the Results. For that which is declared to be sinful is the "slaughter," and certainly the "Çyēna" is not "slaughter," but only a cause that brings about "slaughter" as its Result. Therefore, the assertion that "slaughter is sinful" can be made to attribute sinfulness to the "Çyēna," only indirectly—through the relation of Cause and Effect.

§19 It is only the Result that is the direct object of prohibition, which can apply to "Çyēna" only indirectly; and then too, only on account of the sinfulness of its Results.

§19.20 The meaning of the Bhāshya being "Both—the means and the end—constitute the Codanā."

words "Artha" and "Anartha"). "Heaven" and the like (i.e., *Artha*) are got at, without trespassing on any prohibition; while "slaughter" and the like (i.e., *Anartha*) are accomplished only by trespassing upon prohibitions contained elsewhere in the scriptures.

222-223. The cognition of the Bhāvana does not serve to lay down the Result,—as we shall explain later on, and as Jaimini has also declared that "the object of desire is got at *per* Indication, and not directly from the Injunction."

223-225. Thus then, though the prohibition of "killing" (which forms part of the result),—understood to have a general application, and not set aside by the Positive Injunction,—would signify the fact of (the "Çyēna") leading to sin, yet the form proper of the "Çyēna" itself could not be sinful, the sinfulness attaching only to its result (*killing*).

225-226. The objector however, thinking the Result also to form the object of Injunction,—on account of its (the Result) being included in the Bhāvanā,—has taken exception to the fact of the sinful ("Çyēna") being enjoined as a Duty.

226-227. The clause "Naiva" however serves to set aside the idea of the Result forming an object of Injunction. "What then would be

222-223 "The result does not, &c."—This anticipates the following objection: "Slaughter is enjoined in the Injunction '*Çyēnēnābhicaran Yajēta*' and as such how can it be said to be prohibited?" The sense of the reply is that, as above explained, the operation of the Injunction does not extend to the Result; and, in the present case, 'slaughter' is only the Result of the "Çyēna" sacrifice.

"We shall explain," &c., in the Kārika—"Uddēṣacca phalatvēna, &c., &c." The same fact is also implied in the Bhāshya "*jānatyēvamasau mayā kartavyam*"—(He knows what is to be accomplished by him—i.e., the Result)—"*upāyantu na veda*" (He knows not the means whereby it is to be accomplished)—, and it is this means that is enjoined in the Injunction '*Çyēnēnābhicaran Yajēta*."

223-25 Though the positive Injunction—"Çyēnēnābhicaran Yajēta" enjoins the "Çyēna" sacrifice, yet it does not set aside the prohibition of "slaughter"—proceeding from the sacrifice. The construction of the Bhāshya would be explained in the following manner: "Both the Result and the Means are indicated by the Codanā; the Result again is of two kinds—meritorious and sinful. In the question—what is 'Artha'?—the word 'Artha' refers to the means leading to a meritorious Result—the 'Jyotistoma,' &c., being such means. In the question—what is 'Anartha'?—we must apply the word 'Anartha' to the form of the sinful Result, making '*Çyēnēdih*'—the Result of the "Çyēna" sacrifice, &c.,—viz: 'slaughter.' Thus then the means leading to a meritorious Result is *Dharma*, and the sinful ends—'slaughter' and the like—come to be *Adharma*; while the means leading to such sinful ends are neither *Dharma* nor *Adharma*.

225-26 The objector is made to say (in the Bhāshya)—"Kathampunaranarthah kartavyatayopodigyatē,"—this objection being based upon the misconception that the Result forms a constituent part of the Injunction. The fact however is that the Result is not what is enjoined; and as such, the Injunction of the "Çyēna" sacrifice cannot be taken as enjoining 'Slaughter,' which is distinctly sinful.

the object of the Injunction in question" ? The Bhāshya replies : " *Āyēna* and the other sacrifices."

227-228. In the question as well as in the reply, the affix " *tavya* " (in " *Kartavyatayā* ") is used in the sense of " Injunction," and not in the sense of the " Result;" because this latter sense would not serve any purpose in either case (question or answer).

228-229. Because the character of the Result is also held to belong to what is sinful, and (as such) not *enjoined*; and that which is *enjoined* is always accepted as being meritorious, even when it does not bear the character of the Result.

229-230. By interpreting the *Qatri*-affix (in " *Abhicaran* ") as signifying 'a distinctive mark or attribute,' and by speaking of the prescriptions of the " *Āyēna*," &c., the author of the Bhāshya clearly explains what he means; otherwise (if the explanation of the Bhāshya were rejected) there could be no ground for the injunction of such sacrifices.

230-331. The word ' *ādi* ' in (*Āyēnādayah*) would denote the fact of the *process* (of the " *Āyēna* ") also forming an object of the Injunction; therefore it must be only that form of sanctioned " *killing*," which forms part of the Result, that is prohibited.

231-232. Those people that apply prohibition also to the " *killing* " occurring in the other two factors (of the *Bhāvanā*: viz., the *means* and

228.29 The *drinking of wine* is also a *sinful result*, but as this is not *enjoined*, it cannot be the ground of the above objection. And again, since the " *Milking Vessel* " which has been *enjoined*, and as such, constitutes *Merit*, it is only the setting aside of the fact of its being *enjoined*, that one—who would seek to prove its *sinful character*—should attempt; and not the setting aside of the Result.

229.30 " How is it concluded that by *naiva* the Bhāshya means to negative the injunction of anything that is *sinful* " ? The Bhāshya explains the Present Participle Affix in ' *Abhicaran* ' as signifying " *distinctive feature*,"—the meaning of the word being, " one who is characterised by a desire to kill " ; and doubtless, this distinctive characteristic does not stand in need of a Vedic Injunction; therefore " *Slaughter* " cannot be an object of Injunction. And again, the Bhāshya says—" *tēshamupadēṣaḥ*, &c." (the prescription of these—" *Āyēna*," &c.); whereby it is shown that what is meant to be proved by the foregoing sentences is the setting aside of the idea of the Result forming the object of Injunction;—and not the negation of the fact of " *Āyēna*," &c., being *enjoined*, because the Veda cannot reasonably prescribe anything that has not been *enjoined*.

230.31 " *Vedic killing*," i.e., that form of *killing* which happens to be mentioned in the Veda.

231.32 Some people (the Sāṅkhyas, f. i.) apply the prohibition of ' *Slaughter* ' also to such *killing* as occurs in the Means and the Process of positively meritorious sacrifices, like the " *Jyotishtoma*," &c., which they thereby seek to prove to be *sinful*. This is to be set aside by the two aphorisms quoted. The meaning of the first aphorism is this: " It is laid down as a general rule that all libations are to be poured into the *Āhavaniya Fire*; and in regard to the " *Soma* " sacrifice it is laid down as a



the process),—are met by the Sutras “*Aviçēshēṇa Yacchāstram*” and “*Vacanādvā Ćirovat Ćyat*” (vi-vi-2).

232-233. Then again an action which is not directly obstructed by a prohibition, cannot be sinful. And, (such sinful character not being amenable to Sense-Perception and the other means of right notion) any assumptions to that effect, would be groundless. For we do not perceive any fault (evil) in the (sacrificial) slaughter, during the time that it is being done.

234. Even with regard to the *Slaughter* that does not form part of the sacrifice, the disgust that we feel is only based upon the prohibitive scriptural texts (which we do not find in the case of the *Sacrificial killing*).

234-235. The fact that we perceive the pain of the slaughtered animal could not lead to the inference of such pain reverting to the agent (the killer, in his future birth). Because such Inference is contradicted by facts occurring during the process of killing.

235-236. The form of such Inference would be “Slaughter produces for the slaughterer, after his death, results similar to those that happen to the animal killed;—because it (slaughter) is an action,—like *Charity* in accordance with the Scriptures.”

236-237. He who would say this, would be contradicted by such contrary instances, as, *intercourse with the preceptor's wife* or the *drinking of wine* (which are admittedly sinful).

special rule that the libations are to be poured into the Fire prepared in a place where the seventh step of the cow (which is paid as the price of the Soma used) happens to fall; and in this particular case, the former general rule is set aside by the latter special rule.” The second aphorism is thus explained: “As a general rule, the touching of the dead human body is prohibited; but in regard to a particular sacrifice—, it is enjoined that a human skull is to be kept in a particular place. Here too, the latter Injunction sets aside the former general Prohibition.” As in these two cases, so also, in the case of *killing*, though there is a general prohibition of killing, yet in regard to the “*Jyotishtoma*” sacrifice, the *killing* of the sacrificial animal is specially laid down; and hence this latter Injunction sets aside the former general Prohibition. All these arguments are refuted in the “*Tattwakāumudī*” on *Sāṅkhya-kārika* 2.

232.33 This is in anticipation of the objection that, though not directly prohibited, yet the *killing* of sacrificial animals would be sinful.

232.35 You infer that one who kills will have to suffer retributive pain in the future; but then and there, during the “slaughter” itself, there is a contradiction of this; inasmuch as we find the killer deriving pleasure from the act.

235.36 This formulates the inference referred to. Charity brings pleasure to the person receiving it; and the giver too is rewarded with similar pleasures in his next life.

236.37 Intercourse with the Preceptor's wife gives pleasure to the object of the Intercourse (the wife); and as such, in accordance with your reasoning, the perpetrator of this crime should be rewarded with happiness in his future lives.

237-238. And the premises too would be contrary to the conclusion ; because the result accruing to the *slaughterer* would, according to the reasoning, be similar to that which accrues, to the charitable person, viz : the attainment of the result implied by the injunction, and also the absence of pain.

238-39. The happiness (occurring) to the giver (in future birth,) is not declared to be the same as that of the person who receives his gifts ; thus too your instance fails in establishing what you seek to prove.

239-40. In the case of *Charity*, the object (signified by the Dative case) is the person who receives it, whereas in that of *Slaughter* it is the object *killed*, which is signified by the Accusative termination—this too is a difference (between your instance and what you seek to prove). And if you assert the "object" (similar to whose end you postulate the end of the agent) to be the object of "Sampradāna" (the receiver of a gift, signified by the Dative),—then you have a contradiction (of your Major Premiss): because you hold that (in animal sacrifice) the 'Sampradāna' object, the Deity (to whom it is sacrificed), becomes pleased (while in the case in question there is pain for the "object").

241. If in *Charity* the *object (given)* be meant to be the instance, (as in *animal slaughter* is meant the *object killed*),—then too, what sort of result (in the shape of *pleasure* or *pain*) could accrue to the object that is given away (namely, *gold, silver* and the like) ?

237.38 "In a syllogistic argument, the Middle Term has an application that is in accordance with the Instance quoted. In the present case, this instance is 'Charity'; therefore the effect resulting from 'slaughter' should be similar to that resulting from 'Charity.' With regard to 'Charity,' we have understood the Result to be the attainment of the end mentioned in its Injunction; and in accordance with your Major Premiss, this same result would also belong to the case of 'slaughter.' And through the Injunction of 'Slaughter' (in connection with Sacrifices) we come to the conclusion that its effect is *Merit*; and thereby it ceases to be sinful. Thus in seeking to prove (by means of your syllogism) that 'Slaughter is sinful,' you have proved its contrary; and further, when the Result is in keeping with the Injunction, it cannot be painful."—*Kāṇikā*.

233.39 As the result accruing to the Giver is not the same as that which belongs to the Receiver, so, the Result to the *killer* could not be the same as that belonging to the *killed*.

239.40 "Contradiction"—i.e., instead of establishing the sinfulness of "Slaughter," you would be premising the contrary. An animal sacrifice has for its "Sampradāna" (the objects to which the offering is made), the deities, Agni and Soma. And as these Deities become pleased by the offering, your argument would go to prove that the slaughterer (the sacrificer) would be reaping a harvest of happiness in retribution of the pleasure he gives by the 'slaughter,'—a conclusion which cannot be very palatable to you. Because in that case, 'slaughter' ceases to be sinful; as sin can, in no case, be said to bring about happiness to one who commits it; and this is the conclusion derived from your argument; whereby you sought to prove the sinfulness of "Animal-slaughter" !



241-42. Your argument may also be shown to be concomitant with its own contradictory, by means of such instances as *Japa*, *Homa*, &c., which are free from any source of pain to others—and by having the fact of sacrificial Slaughter *being enjoined* as the *Reason*.

242-43. For the comprehension of Dharma and Adharma, there is no other means save the fact of their being enjoined and prohibited (respectively). Hence the introduction of an inferential argument in this connection is not proper.

243-44. For those who declare 'Dharma' to be due to *helping others to happiness*, and 'Adharma' to be due to *causing pain to others*,—for these people 'Japa' and 'wine-drinking' would be neither *Dharma* nor *Adharma*.

244-45. And again one who, though with qualms of conscience, has intercourse with his preceptor's wife, would be incurring a great Dharma; because thereby he would be conferring a great benefit of happiness to the woman.

245-46. And further, how can one, who would (in the matter of Dharma and Adharma) rely solely upon Reasoning, independently of any prohibitions or otherwise (scriptural), have any qualms of conscience, when he finds that his action does not give pain to any person?

246-47. And further, he who would ascertain (the character of) Adharma independently of Scriptural prohibitions, would land himself on 'Mutual Dependency'—inasmuch as he would be attributing *sinfulness* (Adharma) to *pain*, and *pain* again to *sinfulness*.

247-48. Then the *Mlechchhas* who have got no qualms of conscience in the doing of any action, could never be said to be incurring any sin, if your theory (that the sinfulness of an action is due to the pain that it produces to either party) were true.

241-42 The form of the argument, in which *Japa* and *Homa* are instances, is this: "Animal-slaughter at a sacrifice will bring about happiness,—because it has been enjoined,—like the *Japa*, &c."

243-44 Because "*Japa*," which is acknowledged to be *Dharma*, brings pleasure to none; nor does "*wine-drinking*," which is acknowledged to be *Adharma*, bring pain to others. This *Kārikā* and the next are meant to refute the Utilitarian theory of morals.

244-45 Because, according to you, the only standard of Dharma is that it should bring happiness to others.

245-46 Reasonings based upon the utilitarian theory do not condemn *adultery*; and you accept no other standard of morality; how, then, do you explain the qualms of conscience in one who commits that deed? For, certainly he is not conscious of having given pain to any person.

246-47 If you hold 'Adultery' to be sinful, on the ground of the pain it brings, in the shape of the qualms of conscience to its perpetrator, then you land upon a mutual interdependence. Because, in that case, you would be attributing the qualms of conscience to the sinfulness of the deed, and again its sinfulness you would base upon the qualms of conscience it produces.



248-49. Therefore leaving aside pleasure and pain, and their opposites,—people, who wish to know Dharma and Adharma, ought to look out for positive injunctions and prohibitions (in the Scriptures).

249-52. "In one place (in the case of the killing of a Brāhmaṇa) *Slaughter* has been declared to have the capacity of causing sin; and this (capacity) cannot be set aside even by a positive Injunction (i.e., even if *Slaughter* be in another place, enjoined as a Duty); because the Scripture does not either add to or subtract from, the capacities of substances and actions; it simply serves to declare such faculties as already belong to them. And of a similar nature is this action (animal-slaughter in a sacrifice); and therefore it is only in accordance with the Scripture—and not by Inferential reasoning,—that we declare the sinful character of sacrificial *Slaughter*."

252-54. Those who confidently declare thus, should consider the following questions: (1) Does a Çūdra go to hell for the drinking of wine? (2) Does the "Vaiçyastoma" bring about its result when performed by a Brāhmaṇa or a Kshatriya? (3) Do proper effects result from the "Ishti" if performed on the fifth day of the month, (4) or from the "Agnihotra," if performed in the middle of the day?

254-55. As a matter of fact, the specific result of an action belongs to another, only when it is precisely of the same character, as is said in the Veda to belong to the former action, which is distinctly mentioned as bringing about that particular result.

255-56. The idea of sinfulness due to a prohibition, refers only to that sort of 'killing' which is other than the two factors (of the Bhāvanā :

249-52 Some people base their theory of the sinfulness of all kinds of *killing* on the scriptural prohibition "kill not a Brāhmaṇa"; and it is this theory, that is expounded in the Kārikā. "Killing" is one only; and hence if it be prohibited in one case, by that fact alone, it comes to acquire a sinful character, which becomes permanent and cannot be set aside by any number of passages positively enjoining it.

252-54 If what is once declared in the Veda be held to be permanent and unmodifiable, then (1) the "drinking of wine," which has been prohibited for the Brāhmaṇa, would come to be prohibited for the lower castes also; (2) The "Vaiçyastoma" sacrifice has been laid down for the Vaiçya caste, bringing about certain specific results; and, in accordance with your premiss, this sacrifice would bring about the same results, when performed by men of the other castes also; (3) the "Ishti" has been laid down, as to be performed on the last day of the month, when alone it can bring about its proper result; and according to your argument, the same results would also come about, even when the "Ishti" happens to be performed on other days of the month. (4) Similarly with the "Agnihotra" which has been enjoined as to be performed in the morning.

254-55 If a certain action with certain qualifications, be declared in the Veda, as leading to certain definite results,—then such results could belong to those actions alone, as qualified in the Veda. And hence, your argument loses its ground. Because the Veda has declared only the *killing of a Brāhmaṇa* to be sinful, and from this you infer the sinfulness of all kinds of *killing*.

Means and Process); elsewhere (*i.e.*, in the case of *Slaughter* enjoined as the means or as forming part of the process) such (idea of sinfulness) is set aside by the positive Injunction (which enjoins Slaughter either as the means to the accomplishment of a certain action, or as forming part of the procedure of a certain sacrifice).

256-57. What is got at from the Scripture is a comprehension of the faculties (of substances and actions), and not any additions or subtractions (of faculties). These latter are regulated according to the differences among the actions themselves.

257-58. We find a certain difference in the character of the same thing, even in the case of actions with visible results—*e.g.*, the (effects produced by the same) action of *eating*, on the healthy and the unhealthy.

258. Though the form of 'Slaughter' is the same, in all cases, yet there is a difference among the different kinds of *Slaughter* due to the fact of its being or not being subsidiary to a sacrifice positively enjoined.

259. If (even in the face of such arguments) you declare that the result is one and the same (in the case of all *killing*), then from the fact of every action being an *action*, we would have a Universal Confusion (Commixture); and on account of the similarity of having the character of a *sacrifice*, all the sacrifices "Citrâ," "Jyotishtoma, &c., would come to have the same result.

260. If in these latter cases, you make restrictions through the differences among the sacrifices, we would have the same resource in the case in question also (there being a difference between the *Slaughter* enjoined as subsidiary to a Sacrifice, and one not so enjoined, but only forming part of a certain Result).

260-61. Of all injunctions, the result is such as is desirable for men, either directly or indirectly; therefore they cannot be taken to imply anything that is not so desirable.

256-57 Additions or subtractions of faculties are brought about according to the nature of the actions in question; and they cannot be said to belong equally to all cases.

257-58 We know that *eating* produces pleasure; but we find that an unhealthy person, who has no appetite and relish for his food, does not derive any pleasure from *eating*. Thus we find that the same action brings about different results in different cases.

258 The "Slaughter" which is subsidiary to another act is not sinful; and that which is not a subsidiary, but an independent act in itself, is sinful.

259 Every action has the general character of "Action"; and if a single point of similarity between any two actions be the ground for an identity in their results, then all actions would have the same result, because they are all similar, in having the general character of "action."

260-61 And as the aim of the person cannot but be happiness to himself, anything sinful cannot be the object of an Injunction.

261-62. We do not find any sinfulness mentioned in connection with such *Slaughter* as is enjoined as subsidiary to certain sacrifices; nor is such (sinful character) to be assumed (in the case of such *Slaughter*) through other prohibitions. Nor can the result of these subsidiary slaughters be said to be the end of man; because of their occurring in a particular context,—whereby what we can postulate as the result of these, is only the help, either perceptible (direct) or otherwise, that they would give to the primary Action itself.

263. In such cases, we have no occasion for making assumptions of sinfulness; because we do not stand in need of any such assumption.

263-64. The help too, that the purification of the animal gives to the sacrifice, is not an indirect one; because we find that the sacrifice requires the accomplishment of the various parts (of the animal's body, as offerings). Even in the "Çyēna," sinfulness does not attach to that *Slaughtering* which forms part of the sacrifice itself.

265. Therefore we declare *sinfulness* to belong to only that *Slaughter* which does not form part of a sacrifice. In the case of the "Çyēna," it is mentioned as the Result; and hence, in this case, it cannot be said to be the object of an Injunction.

266. Because though the Injunction belongs to the complete Bhāvanā (consisting of the three factors, Means, Procedure and Result), yet it ceases to apply to the factor of Result. Consequently "Çyēna" and the rest, by themselves can be neither "Dharma" nor "Adharma."

267. It is through the sinful character of their Result, that the character of Adharma is attributed to them. The "Çyēna" having all its requirements fulfilled by only one Result, it cannot have two.

261-62 If the subsidiary slaughter were to have any effect upon human wishes, then there might be some doubts as to its being sinful. But as a matter of fact, it is not so; as such slaughters are mentioned in an altogether different context. This is explained later on. The direct help is such as when certain offerings have to be made out of the limbs of the animal killed.

263 What we require in that particular context is something that would help the sacrifice; and as such, the "Slaughter" is at once interpreted as affording such help. So there is no occasion for postulating its sinfulness.

265 The Injunction takes in only the *Means* and the *Procedure*; and as in the case of the "Çyēna" sacrifice, "Slaughter" is declared to be the *Result*, it cannot form an object of the Injunction.

267 "The Çyēna, &c."—This is said in anticipation of the following objection: "we could make *sin* also the direct result of the Çyēna sacrifice, just like the *death of the enemy*, thus getting rid of the indirect attribution of *sinfulness* through the Result." The sense of the reply is that all the factors of the "Bhāvanā" (signified by the sentence enjoining the "Çyēna") being fulfilled by the *death of the enemy* as its Result, it does not stand in need of any other Result; and hence it is absolutely useless to postulate another Result, in the shape of *sin*, when all our needs are satisfied by the former Result alone. And one "Bhāvanā" can have only one Result.



268. Therefore the *sinfulness* (of the "Çyēna") is said to be due to "Slaughter" which is an action other than the "Çyēna" itself.

268-69. That action alone is called "Dharma," which, even through its result, does not become tainted with sin; because such an action cannot but bring about happiness to the agent.

269. (Obj.). "But the character of 'Dharma' would also belong to the "Çyēna," &c., on account of these being the means of attaining a desirable end."

270. (Rep.). But even then the Result of these would not cease to be sinful. And we must also consider the following points, in this connection:

270-71. If 'Dharma' be explained as *that by means of which something desirable would be accomplished, without the least taint of anything undesirable*, then the "Çyēna" and the rest would become excluded (from the category of "Dharma").

271-72. If *anything that is laid down in the Veda as bringing pleasure to the agent* were held to be "Dharma," independently of the property or otherwise of the performance thereof,—then alone could the "Çyēna" come under the category of "Dharma."

272-73. But if by 'Adharma' we understand *anything that causes pain either directly or indirectly*, and which may have been laid down in the Veda,—then the "Çyēna" would be included in the category of "Adharma."

273-74. He, who would attribute *sinfulness* even to the enjoined (killing—as subsidiary to a sacrifice), on the ground of its being a 'Slaughter,' like any ordinary slaughter (outside a sacrifice),—would be courting a contradiction of the Scriptures.

274-75. And if one were to argue, without any regard to the Scriptures,—he would also prove the incapability of accomplishing "Heaven" with regard to Sacrifices; because (they may urge that) these (sacrifices) are actions, like 'eating' and the like (which do not lead to Heaven).

268.69 Therefore the "Çyēna" sacrifice can never be "Dharma," inasmuch as it is tainted with sin, through its Result; and it has already been proved in Kārikās 267-68, that it is not "Adharma."

270 The Result of "Çyēna" has been proved to be sinful, and now we must consider the character of the sacrifice itself.

270.71 This Kārikā and the next consider what ordinary people understand by "Dharma" and "Adharma."

271.72 That is, explaining *propriety of performance as capability of causing happiness*.

272.73 Thus, in reality, the "Çyēna" is neither "Dharma" nor "Adharma."

274.75 Because sacrifices are accepted as the means of leading to Heaven, on the sole ground of the Veda. And if one were to disregard this, no such capability in the sacrifice could be proved. In fact we would have an irrefutable argument to the contrary, viz., "Sacrifices cannot lead to Heaven, because they are actions, like Eating."

275-76. The *sinfulness* (of sacrificial slaughter), postulated on the strength of passages from the Gītā, Mantras, and other Eulogistic passages,—contradicts the direct assertions of the Vēda (which distinctly enjoins sacrificial slaughter); and hence these (passages) must be taken to have some other meaning.

276-77. (Obj.). "The Sūtra and the Vedic sentences being of equal importance to the student, and the incapability (of signifying something) also applying equally to both (in the mind of the student),—the clause 'not in the Sūtras' is no reply (to the objection raised in the Bhāshya)."

277-78. (Rep.). This clause ('*na sūtreṣu*') serves only to reply to the aforesaid "exclusive specification": Because in the case of the interpretation of the Sūtras, this method ('splitting of the sentence' and other indirect methods of interpretation) is applicable (when the sense thus indirectly got at is supported by other evidences).

278. Or the Sūtra itself may be repeated; or as a last resource, we may have recourse to "Tantra" (a conventional subserviency) in accordance

276.77 The Bhāshya (pp. 5-6) having raised the objection: "But the aphorism is incapable of giving the two meanings" [namely, (1) that the Veda is the authority for Duty, and (2) that Duty is that which brings about happiness],—replies by adding that the syntactical split that the objector has urged against such double signification, does not affect the case of the aphorism. In the Kārikā, the objector says that the Veda and the Sūtras are both equal, in the eyes of the student.

277.78 Though both the Veda and the Sūtra are equal to the student, yet commentators have been found to explain the Sūtras by double interpretations. It was with this view, that, in explaining the opening sentence of the Bhāshya, we have taken it to signify "exclusive specification,"—the sense of the clause "*sati sambhavē*" having been explained as that "it is only when the ordinary significations of the words of the aphorism can reasonably be accepted, without contradicting the Veda, that such significations are to be accepted; otherwise, if such signification be found to militate against the Veda, then, in interpreting the aphorism, we must have recourse to indirect methods of signification."

278 That is, in order to signify both the facts, the aphorism may be read over twice. The second part of the Kārikā is not easily intelligible; hence the explanation of the *Nyāyaratnākara* is reproduced: "The word 'Dharma,' for instance, may be taken to be uttered as a 'Tantra,'—i.e., it may be conventionally accepted as the subordinate word in the sentence; and for this reason, it would be constructed with each of the other two words, simultaneously: when taken with the first word '*Codanālakṣaṇah*,' it would give the meaning that 'Duty has Veda for its authority;' and when taken with the second word 'Arthah' it would signify that 'Duty is the means of happiness.' And as both these constructions are accepted simultaneously; there is no syntactical split, in reality. In this case, the word '*Codanālakṣaṇah*' would be the subject and 'Dharmah' the Predicate, of the first proposition; while of the second proposition, 'Dharmah' would be the subject and 'Arthah' the "Predicate." The two propositions may be thus stated: (1) 'That which has Veda for its authority is Dharma,' and (2) 'Dharma is the cause of happiness.' The meaning that the Sūtra would give, when the other two words are made subservient to the word 'Dharmah,' is explained in Notes 281-82.



with the difference in the signifying power (of the three words constituting the Sūtra).

279. Or we may make two Sūtras out of the one, in accordance with the theory that the Sūtra only gives certain portions (of two sentences),

279-80. These two (sentences constituting the Sūtra) are assumed to depend upon one another, on account of proximity. And the assumption of a portion (of the second sentence) is not meant simply to complete the sentence.

280-81. Though the sentence "Atha vā, &c." (in the Bhāṣhya) explains each of the constituents to refer to 'Dharma,' as qualified (by the definition afforded by another), yet the syntactical split remains just the same.

281-82. Therefore the real answer (to the objection raised in the Bhāṣhya) would be one of the following: either (1) that the 'name' ("Dharma") is subservient (to the other two factors); or (2) that the 'name' and the word "Lakṣhaṇa" may be construed with "Artha"; or (3) that the word 'Lakṣhaṇa' may be taken to be subservient to the words "Dharma" and "Artha."

282-83. "Dharma in general, being previously known, as soon as its

279 This is what the Bhāṣhya has done. The sense is this: Sūtras, being extremely brief, are not expected to give every sentence in its entire form. The present Sūtra is really made up of two Sūtras—(1) "Artho dharmah" (Dharma is the cause of happiness), and (2) "Codanālakṣhaṇah"—this latter being only a part of the complete sentence: "Codanālakṣhaṇo dharmah" (that which is based upon the Veda is Dharma).

279-80 If both these constituent Sūtras were taken independently, then, the Sūtra, "Codanālakṣhaṇo Dharmah" would make the "Āyēna" also a Dharma; and, on the other hand, the Sūtra "Artho Dharmah" would make any source of happiness a Dharma. In order to guard against these anomalies, the Kārikā adds that the word "Dharma," in each of these sentences, is taken in the light of its definition afforded in the other; the Sūtras are to be interpreted as interblended together, and forming only one Sūtra.

281-82 If we accept the first alternative, then the construction of the Sūtra would be this: "Codanālakṣhaṇo Dharmah-Dharmo'rthah." In accordance with the second alternative, the construction would be—"Artho Dharmah-arthaḥcodanālakṣhaṇah." In the third case, the construction would be "Arthaḥcodanālakṣhaṇah Codanālakṣhaṇo Dharmah." The meaning, in the second case, would be "Dharma is the cause of happiness,—and the cause of happiness too only such as is laid down in the Veda." In the third case, the meaning would be—"The cause of happiness is as declared in the Veda,—and that which is authorised by the Veda is Dharma." The meaning obtainable in the first case, has already been explained in note 278.

282-83 The objection is that the word "arthah" in the Sūtra is superfluous; because when we know what Dharma is, we know it only as *bringing about happiness*; and hence, as soon as its authority has been declared, it at once comes to be recognised as the *means of happiness* ("Artha"); and as such, there is no use of having this word in the Sūtra.

authority is declared, it at once becomes a means of happiness ; and as such, why should the word ' Artha ' (' means of happiness ') be mentioned in the *Sūtra* ? "

283-84. (Rep.): The fact of *having the Veda for its authority* comes to be predicated of " Dharma," only by the addition of the word " Artha "; otherwise there would be a doubt as to its real character.

284-85. For in that case, those that are declared (in the Veda), by means of prohibitions, to be the causes of *sin*, would also become included in " Dharma "; inasmuch as these also are *mentioned in the Veda*.

285-86. Therefore that form of the sentence, whereby we could have the restriction of the definition to the single object (" Dharma,") —which is possible only if we admit the word " Artha,"—is to be got at only by repeating the word " Artha."

286-87. The author of the Bhāshya has also declared the result *the exclusion of slaughter, &c.*, to be due to the signification of the word " Artha," without taking it as qualifying (Dharma).

Thus ends the *Vārtika* on Aphorism II.

283-84 If we had only "*Codanālakṣaṇo Dharmah*," then even those Acts, which are authorised by the Veda in one phase, and prohibited in another phase of it, would become included in the category of " Dharma "; and the preclusion of such acts would not be possible, unless we added the word " Arthah," which restricts the definition to only such as are *causes of happiness*, and thereby excludes all that is sinful.

286-287 This anticipates the following objection : " If the construction of the sentence be as you have explained it to be, then, how is it that, in the Bhāshya, the word ' Arthah ' has been explained as qualifying ' Dharma ? ' (*Vide Bhāshya: ' anartha dharma ukto mā bhūḍiti arthagrahaṇam '.*) " The sense of the reply as embodied in the *Kārikā* is that the Bhāshya does not mean " Arthah " to be a purely qualifying term ; because even without such qualification, the Bhāshya explains the exclusion of " slaughter " and other sinful deeds as being due to the direct signification of the word " arthah " itself. The *Nyāyaratnākara* and the *Kārikā* interpret this *Kārikā* differently. They take it as embodying a reply to the objection urged, against the last sentence of the Bhāshya on this *Sūtra*, in *Kārikā* 280. The meaning of the *Kārikā*, in this case, would be this : " we do not mean to say that the *Sūtra* mentions ' dharmah ' as qualified by ' arthah ; ' all that the Bhāshya means is that, even without such specification, the word ' arthah,' by itself, would directly lead to the exclusion of ' slaughter ' &c., by means of a particular construction put upon the *Sūtra* ; and the Bhāshya—' *athavā, &c.*'—only gives the form of the construction that is to be put upon the *Sūtra*, in order to get at the exclusion of ' slaughter, &c.'—the literal meaning of the Bhāshya being ' That which is an *Artha* (cause of happiness) has the character of *Dharma*, only when it is authorised by (distinctly enjoined in) the Veda.' "

APHORISM III.

"The examination of its cause (follows)." (I-1-3).

1.2. Though, besides simple declaration, the author of the Bhāṣhya has also added the argument in favour of his own theory, to be explained later on; yet the statement that "the foregoing is a mere declaration (statement of a proposition)" refers to what has been stated by Jaimini (in the aphorism). Or it may be that the Commentator has only pointed out the possible arguments—through the mention of the expression "the past, future, &c."

Thus end the *Vartika* on the third Sūtra.

1.2 This refers to the following passage of the Bhāṣhya: "*uktamasmābhih codanānī-
mittam dharmasya jñānam iti pratijñamātrēṇoktam.*" The sense of the objection is clear. The reply means that the Bhāṣhya passage may be taken as referring to the Sūtra alone, which only lays down a simple proposition. The second alternative suggested is that the passage may be taken as referring to the Bhāṣhya itself,—the sense, in that case, being that what appears as the argument is not brought forward as an argument, but only as a simple declaration of the probable features of the object of declaration. The latter sentence has been translated in accordance with the interpretation of the *Nyāyaratnākara* and the *Kācīkā*. It may also be translated thus: "Or it may be that the author of the Vritti has declared the argument beginning with 'past, &c.' over and above what was necessary" (and the Bhāṣhya has only repeated the declaration of the Vritti).

APHORISM IV.

“Sense-perception, which is the cognition of the person, brought about by the correct functioning of the sense-organs, is not the means (of knowing Duty); because Perception only consists in the apprehension of what already exists.” I-i-4.

1. He,—who breaking up the aphorism into two, explains (the first half) as the definition of Sense-perception,—has to explain the connection of the aphorism (thus interpreted) with the former declaration;

2. and also in what part of the declaration, the mere statement of the definition can help; and also the reason for the definitions of Inference and the rest, being not stated.

3. It is not that these (Inference, &c.), are not means of right notion; nor can it be held that they are included in “Sense-perception”; nor lastly (can it be urged that) they have the same definition (as that of Sense-perception).

4. Nor again can these be (said to have their definitions) indirectly implied in the definition of “Sense-perception.” Because, it is yet to be proved that all Means of Right Notion are preceded by “Sense-perception.”

5. Nor can it be urged that “a statement of the definition of Sense-perception is not possible without a concomitant implication of the definition of Inference, &c.”; and consequently no indirect implication of these can be possible.

6. For the definition of Sense-Perception cannot give any idea as to

2 There are two factors in the declaration: (1) that the Veda is the only means of knowing Duty; and (2) that the Veda is always authoritative; and doubtless none of these two propositions is helped by the definition of “Sense-perception.”

4 “Indirectly.”—Since all other means of knowledge are preceded by Sense-perception, the definition of this latter may be said to include those of others also.

5 A definition can be said to imply only that, in the absence of which the definition itself remains incomplete. But the definition of Sense-perception is not incomplete without that of Inference, &c.

6 When the definition of Sense-perception gives no idea, either of its precedence or non-precedence of Inference and the rest, it is as reasonable to accept the one as the other.

its precedence or non-precedence (to other means of Right Notion); and under such circumstances, why should not the definition of Sense-perception be taken to imply the fact of Inference, &c., not being preceded by Sense-perception?

7-8. Nor can the definition of Sense-perception in any way, give an idea either of the specific definition, or of the form, or of the extent (or limits), of these (Inference, &c.). And (if it be urged) that "these are not defined, only because they are well-known"; then that would apply to the case of Sense-perception also.

8-9. Thus then, the aphorism would either denote the exclusion (of all other Means of Right Notion); or it might be explained as uttered by some silly person: for an intelligent person could never define only one among many such Means. And further, when the aphorism can reasonably be construed as a single sentence, it is not proper to split it up into two.

10-11. Nor is even Sense-Perception clearly defined by the aphorism; because the definition applies equally to the false semblances thereof (i.e., mistaken Sense-perception); for the definition only serves to set aside "Dream-perception," which occurs without the contact of the senses with their objects. If (perception be defined only as the cognition) following from the contact (of the Senses) with an object, then even false impressions would become included in the definition.

12. The definition does not specify the contact to be either with something perceptible, or with something else,—whereby there could be any such specification as is to be mentioned hereafter.

13. It was only when the author of the Vritti found the Aphorism (as it stood) unable to signify all that he wished, that he changed the reading of the aphorism into "*Tatsamprayogē*."

14. Therefore (the contact not being specified), the character of Sense-perception (as defined in accordance with the former interpretation of Bhavadāsa) would belong to such cognitions of objects as arise from the contact of the Eye, &c., with some other object—(Sound, f. i.).

7-8. Granted that Inference, &c., are invariably preceded by Sense-perception; even then the definition of Sense-perception can give us no idea of the specific definitions of the other Means of Knowledge—Inference and the rest.

10-11. If the only differentia were the fact of being produced by the contact of the sense-organs with an object, then only dream-cognition would be excluded, and all sorts of mistaken perceptions, &c., would become included in the definition.

12. The "Specification" referred to is the changing of the order of words in the aphorism, as assumed by Bhavadāsa. The definition lays down mere "contact of the Sense-organs."

13. The change in the reading makes the Sūtra imply that the contact is with *that* whereof one has the perception.

14. The eye sees an object, and this Perception recalls the impressions of other objects; then, these latter too,—being, though indirectly, due to the contact of the eye, though with a different object,—would come to be included in "Sense-perception."

15. If it be urged that "in that case the word '*Satsamprayoga*' ('contact') would become redundant,"—(we reply) just so, that is what the opponent (of the "Definition-theory") urges,—as also the deficiency of the definition itself (which has been proved just to be too Wide).

16. The use of the expression *Satsamprayogē* would lie in excluding "dream-perception, &c." Therefore (in this aphorism) to the unstated definition, cannot belong the character either of "direct declaration," or of "supplementary explanation."

17-18. Therefore the construction (of the aphorism) cannot be this: "To the cognition, that is comprehended on the contract of the senses, belongs the character of Sense-perception; and that which is ordinarily known as such 'Sense-perception' can be the cause of the apprehension of only that which exists; and as such it cannot be the means of knowing duty."

19. The clause "*Evanlakṣaṇakam hi tat*" in the Bhāṣhya is not meant to signify the form (or definition) (of Perception); what the author of the Bhāṣhya means to imply is the special form of Sense-perception, (by which it cannot be the Means of knowing Duty).

20. (The meaning of the said clause being that), because the character of consisting in the apprehension of already existing objects belongs to Sense-perception, therefore from this well-known character, we must infer the fact of its not being the Means (of knowing Duty).

21. The "fact of being a Perception" is the reason for proving the

¹⁶ This shows that even when we do not accept the "definition" theory, the expression "*Satsamprayogē*" does not become redundant.

"Therefore, &c."—Since the definition is not mentioned by name, in the Sūtra, therefore it cannot be said to be either directly mentioned, or supplementarily implied. The form of the direct declaration of the definition would be—"That which is Sense-perception has this character"; and the form of the Definition, as a "supplementary explanation," would be, "That which has such a character is Sense-perception"; and so long as "Definition" has not been mentioned by name, it cannot be either the one or the other.

¹⁷⁻¹⁸ The construction here denied is that which has been put on the Sūtra by Bhavadāsa, who breaks it up into two parts; one part ending with "Pratyakṣam," which he takes to be the definition of Sense-perception, and the rest of the Sūtra forming the second part, which he takes as precluding the fact of such Perception being the means of knowing Duty. As this construction necessitates a syntactical split, and as there are other objections to it also (as noted above), the Vārtika denies such an interpretation of the Sūtra.

²¹ These arguments are thus explained in the *Nyāya-ratnakara*. "Sense-perception is not the means, because it consists of the apprehension of already existing objects; (1). It consists of the apprehension of existing objects, because it is brought about by direct contact in the present; (2). It is brought about by direct contact in the present, because it is Sense-perception; (3). The *Sat* in "*Satsamprayoga*" signifies present (contact); and the contact too is co-substrate with the Perception. Bhavadāsa, on the other hand, has explained "*Sat-samprayoga*" as 'contact with something existing.' The



rest of the arguments; and as this is too well known (to need any explanation) in the case of our Sense-perception, it is explained only with a view to the Perception of the Yogi.

22. The connection (of the Sūtra thus interpreted) with the principal subject (or proposition) is established through the signification of the unauthoritative character of all other Means of Right Notion, (with regard to Duty), the non-authoritativeness of the rest (besides Perception) being proved by the absence of premises (which could only be derived from Sense-perception).

23. The unauthoritative character of others (besides Sense-perception) is easily comprehensible (as implied by such character of Sense-perception itself); and hence it is not stated (directly) in the Sūtra.

23-24. Nor can the objection of the unnecessary character of the definition, apply (in our case); nor is the discrepancy in the definition of being either too narrow or too wide—applicable to our case.

24-25. What we refer to is such character of Sense-perception, as is well known; and then too, the character of Sense-perception does not belong to miragic (false) perceptions and the like. And as for the chance of these latter not being the means (of knowing Duty), we do not deny it.

26-28. "Even objects in the past and in the future, and those that are

second half of the Kārikā is added in order to guard against the absence of corroborating instances. By making "Yogic Perception" the major term, we get ordinary "Perception" to serve as a corroborating Instance in the syllogism.

28 The Sūtra, as interpreted by Bhavadāsa, has been shown to have no connection with the Principal Proposition: "The Veda alone is the means of knowing Duty"; and the present Kārikā explains that this want of connection does not apply in our case; because we take the whole Sūtra to mean only that Sense-perception is not the means of knowing Duty; and this implies that none other out of the various means of Right Notion—Inference and the rest—can be the means of knowing Duty; because all these latter are based upon premises derived from Sense-perception, which being precluded from producing any knowledge of Duty, precludes the applicability of all the rest; and thereby serves to strengthen the original proposition that "Veda alone is the means of knowing Duty."

28.24. Because we do not interpret the aphorism as embodying a definition of "Sense-perception."

22.25. What we mean is that Sense-perception, which is known to have such a character, cannot be the means of knowing Duty. "Then"—i.e., by referring to the well-known character of Sense-perception.

23.28. "The Perception of the Yogis, brought about by contemplation, touches all kinds of objects, even those of the past and the like; and as such, it would also comprehend Duty, &c., as held by the Buddhists. And then again, the naturally omniscient souls of men would also come to comprehend all such objects, when freed from the shackles of the Body; and thus then these souls would also come to perceive Duty, &c., as held by the Arhats." In reply to these, the aphorism has brought forward the following two arguments, aimed against the amenability of Duty, &c., to Sense-perception:—(1) Duty is not amenable to Sense-perception,—because Sense-perception consists in the comprehension of objects in the present time. (2) Duty is not amenable



extremely subtle in character, and also those at a distance,—some people hold to be amenable to the Sense-perception of Yogis, and to that of the liberated souls; and therefore (1) the premissing of the fact of 'Sense-perception consisting of the comprehension of objects existing in the present time,' becomes inapplicable, in reference to such Yogis, &c., or (2) the reasoning based upon the future character (of Duty) would be contradicted by the fact of future objects being perceptible to the Yogis." In order to avoid these two contingencies, Jaimini has added "Sat" (*present*), which indicates something that is well known.

28-29. The Sense-perception of the Yogis too, cannot be any other than what is ordinarily known as such. And the very fact of these being 'Sense-perception' would prove the fact of their consisting of the comprehension of objects existing at the present time, as also the fact of their being brought about by present contact;—like our own ordinary Sense-perception.

30-31. The notions that the Yogis have with regard to objects not present, cannot, for that very reason, be called "Sense perception;"—just like Desire or Remembrance; also because such notions of Yogis (with regard to remote objects), are not ordinarily known as "Sense-perception,"—these being more like "Fancy" than anything else. And it is the absence of both that is signified by "Sat" (*present*).

32. Just as ordinary Fancy, independently of Sense-perception and

to Sense-perception,—because it is as yet only in the future. The fact of the Yogis being able to perceive objects of the past, future, &c., however, goes directly against the first of these arguments; because such Sense-perception is actually found *not* to consist in the comprehension of present objects alone. The second argument is also contradicted by the fact that the Yogis do actually perceive future objects; and hence the mere future character of Duty is not enough to render it unamenable to Sense-perception. The addition of "*sat*" (*present*), however, guards against both these contradictions: because this addition restricts "Sense-perception" to such cases alone, in which the contact of the senses is *direct* and *at the present time*; and doubtless, such Perception can only be of objects that exist in the present.

28-29 The Perception of Yogis cannot be different from what is ordinarily known as "Perception"; because the very fact of its being Sense-perception would prove it to have the two characteristics, mentioned in the last note;—The form of the arguments being—"The Perception of Yogis consists in the comprehension of objects existing at the present time, and is produced by present contact; because it is Sense-perception, like any ordinary Sense-perception.

30-31 "For that very reason"—i.e., on account of such objects not existing in the present. "Absence of both"—i.e., of the character of "Perception," and of that "Means of Right Notion." That is to say, the "*sat*" in "*Satsamprayogē*" serves to imply that the Perception of the Yogi mentioned above is *not true Sense-perception*, and also that there is no ground for accepting such Perception to be authoritative.

32 The Vaiśeṣikas assert that the means of the transcendental vision of the Yogi is not the ordinary channel of Perception, but a peculiar faculty developed in him, to which is given the name of "Pratibhā" (Intuition or Fancy). Against this theory, it is urged that we come across such intuitive Perception in the case of ordinary



the other (Means of Right Notion), is not able to give rise to any definite idea, so also would be the Imagination (or Intuition) of the Yogi.

33. If there ever was a sensuous cognition, produced by contact with objects not existing at the present time,—then alone could it apply to Duty, which is yet to come. And it was for these reasons that Jaimini added "Sat."

34. Specially, because, Duty is not perceptible, prior to its performance; and even when it has been performed, it is not perceptible, in the character of *the means of accomplishing particular results*.

35. And again, like our Sense-perception, the Sense-perception of the Yogis too,—as consisting of the comprehension of objects existing at the present time, and as having the character of "Sense-perception,"—cannot be accepted as applying to Duty.

36. If the word "Sat" were removed, how could we get at the denial of the character of (Sense-perception) in the case of Yogic-perception, on the mere ground of the latter being brought about by a contact not at the present time?

37. Though the signification of "Sat" could be got at through the

persons also; but this does not lead us believe in all that the person may be saying; and the same disbelief may also affect the assertion of the Yogi.

³³ In Kārikās 26-28, the addition of 'sat' has been said to be for the purpose of avoiding the two contingencies therein noted; and Kārikā 32 concludes the explanation of the avoidance of the first of those contingencies. With Kārikā 33 begins the consideration of the assertion that the addition of 'sat' serves to set aside the contradiction due to the amenability of future objects to Yogic-perception. The meaning of the Kārikā is that the word 'sat' serves to set aside all possibility of a perception without direct contact with an object in the present.

³⁴ The sacrifice has been said to constitute "Duty," only in the character of being the means to certain desirable ends, and not merely as appearing in the ritual; hence even when though the sacrifice may have been performed, yet it does not yet manifest its aforesaid character, which comes to be manifested at some remote period of time; and as such it can never be amenable to Sense-perception; this amenability to Sense-perception being set aside by the addition of "sat," which restricts "Sense-perception" only to such cognitions as arise from the direct contact of the organs of Sense with objects existing at the present time. Such contact is not possible in the case of Duty; because Duty does not manifest itself in its true character, until the performer is dead, and there are no Sense-organs left, with which there could be any contact.

³⁵ The Perception of Yogis, consisting of the comprehension of objects existing at the present time, cannot be the means of knowing Duty; and it cannot be such means, also because even the Perception of Yogis is only "Sense-perception" after all; and as such, cannot apply to such transcendental objects, as Duty and the like.

³⁷ The Causative Locative would imply that the "contact" must be the one at the present time; as no causativeness can belong to either the past or the future. Though such is the fact, yet some people assume that the perceptions of Yogis belong to the past and the future also; and it is with a view to remove this misconception that "Sat" has been added.

(causative) Locative (in "Samprayogē"), yet the assumptions of others have to be negated; and hence the addition by Jaimini.

38-39. The word "Sam" is used in the sense of "proper (or right)"; and it serves to preclude all faulty 'prayoga.' And by "prayoga" is here meant the "functioning" of the senses with reference to their objects. In the case of the perception of silver in mother-o-pearl, the functioning of the Sense-organ is faulty; and hence such perceptions become precluded (by the prefix 'Sam').

39. In this way, the Sūtra may be taken as a mere statement of the definition (of Sense-perception).

40-41. The Bauddhas have urged that "The eye and the ear naturally functioning without direct contact with the object, the 'contact,' that you have put into your definition, as the common factor in all Sense-perception, cannot be accepted to be so; and even if we grant the functioning of these by contact, there could (in the case of the Eye and the Ear) be no intercepted perception; nor could an object larger than the Sense-organ, be perceived,—as we find to be the case with the skin, &c."

42-43. But all this does not militate against our theory, because we have explained "prayoga" as mere 'function;' or we may explain "Samprayoga" as 'confrontation;' or again "Samprayoga" may be taken only as a peculiar capability, indicated by the effect. But it is only after you have subdued the Sāṅkhyas, &c., that you can seek to subvert the "Contact Theory."

44. These two (the Eye and the Ear) function through contact,—because they are organs of Sense, like those of touch and the rest. On

39 When the words are explained in the above manner, the Sūtra may be taken to mean the denial of the causality of Sense-perception towards a Knowledge of Duty, after having pointed out its definition; and in that case, none of the objections brought against Bhavadāsa's interpretation would have any force. Because Bhavadāsa has explained "Satsamprayoga" as "contact with any existing thing," which makes the definition too wide, &c., &c.

40-41 "Intercepted or remote Perception"—i.e., The cognition in such cases as—"We hear this sound at a distance," "I see that object at a distance," and the like.

42-43 We do not explain "prayoga" as *contact*; hence the objections urged by the Buddhist do not affect us.

"Confrontation"—i.e., the object directly facing the Sense-organ. If either of these interpretations be accepted, the Buddhist objections cease to have any force.

44 This sets forth the arguments in support of the "contact theory." "On the other hand, &c." To the syllogism there is an objection, that the eye, which is in the body, cannot possibly have any contact with the objects, that are at a distance from the body. It is for this reason that the Sāṅkhyas hold the senses to be only modifications of Self-consciousness, the cause of Sense-perception being the fact that the function or Action of the Sense-organ proceeds out of the eye, and touches the object, which comes thereby to be perceived; and certainly there can be no objection against this invisible function or energy going forth from the body.



the other hand, some people, declare that the functioning of these is exterior to the body.

45. And the medication too that is done to the substratum (in the body—the eye f.i.),—is only such embellishment (of the substrate) as goes to purify that which is supported (i.e., the faculty or function of vision).

46-47. And the embellishment, even when belonging to a part of the body, pervades the whole of it; as we find that aids to the foot are found to help the eye. For these reasons, the mere fact of embellishment cannot always establish the location of the Sense-organ therein.

47-48. The external functioning of these two (the Eye and the Ear) are said to be gradually expanding outwards without interruption; and it is for this reason that objects even larger than the organ itself are perceived, in accordance with the magnitude of the functioning, in its various parts. And in the same manner, there would be a perception of remote objects also.

49. Just as the light of the lamp is extinguished on the destruction of the lamp, so to the faculty (of the Sense), even when outside, is destroyed on the destruction of the substratum (the Eye).

50. On the closing of the substratum (the organ), though the faculty exists, yet being disjoined from any effort of the soul, it does not apprehend objects, which thus cease to be perceived by the Soul.

51. The notion of "interception" too, is with reference to the body. With regard to Sound however, the notions of "excess" and "interception" are mistaken ones; because of the impossibility of these (in the case of Sound).

46.47 The function of the eye operates without abandoning its position in the eye—just like the light of a lamp. Hence medication to the eye aids the faculty of vision, though the former is external to it; just as we find that the rubbing of oil to the soles of the foot improve the vision.

47.48 Like a ray of light, the stretch of vision goes on gradually expanding; and the range of vision depends upon the extent of this stretch, which terminates at the object, beyond which the vision does not proceed.

49 This anticipates the following objection: "If the faculty of vision function outside the eye, how is it that vision ceases when the physical organ is destroyed?"

50 Though on the closing of the eye, the faculty of vision continues all the same, yet it is only when it is aided by an effort of the person that it succeeds in apprehending objects; hence though it exists, even when the eye is closed, yet it does not lead to any perception.

51 Because in reality, there can be no interception of an omnipresent function—such as we hold the functions of the Senses to be. "With regard to sound, f.c." This is said in accordance with the Mimāṃsā theory. The Sāṅkhya theory is that the function of the ear goes out to where the perceptible Sound exists; and thus, in this case also, as in that of the eye, the notion of interception must be explained in the Section of Sound. The Sāṅkhya doctrine has been stated at length, only with a view to establish the "contact theory," in opposition to the Buddhist; and not as an exposition of the author's own view.

52. The words "Person" and "Sense-organs" (in the Sūtra) have been construed by means of transposition (in the Bhāshya).

52-53. The "Person" (here meant) may be either the one ordinarily known as such, or the one whose existence is to be proved in this treatise. Such modification of (the person) as consists of consciousness, does not militate against his eternal character.

53-54. By "cognition-production" is meant that "cognition becomes authoritative as soon as it is produced." In the case of all causes, we find that their operation is something apart from their birth (or manifestation). In order to preclude such character from the Means of Right Notion (Cognition), the word "production" has been added.

55. Not even for a moment does the cognition continue to exist; nor is it ever produced as doubtful (or incorrect); and as such, it can never subsequently operate towards the apprehension of objects, like the Senses, &c.

56. Therefore the only operation of Cognition, with regard to the objects, consists in its *being produced*; that alone is Right Notion (Pramā);

52 The Bhāshya passage here referred to is this: "*Indriyārthasambandhē hi yā puruṣasya buddhirjāyate*"—which transposes the order of words in the Sūtra.

52.53 "One ordinarily known as such"—i.e., the Body. The Kārikā anticipates the following objection: "If the Person be the Body, then he can have no perception, since this latter is insentient; on the other hand, if by 'Person' be meant the Soul, then this, having a modification in the shape of the Perception, would come to be modifiable, and hence non-eternal." The first half of the Kārikā means that we do not mean to discuss this question here, as it is not germane to the present aphorism. As a matter of fact, however, by "Person" we understand the Soul, and this cannot be said to be non-eternal, on account of the Perception; because it is not such modifications that constitute transitoriness.

53.54 The meaning is that Perception is no sooner produced, than it directly becomes the means of right notion; and it depends upon no other operation than its own appearance.

55 It is only something that has continued existence even for some time, that can have any other function besides its birth. Sense-perception however is no sooner produced than past and gone; and as no trace is left of it, that could carry on farther operations, as soon as it is born, it becomes absolutely certain and beyond doubt. Therefore the apprehension of the object being thus accomplished by the mere appearance of Perception, this latter cannot, for this very reason, have any subsequent functions, as its sole purpose lies in the apprehension of objects; and this having been accomplished by its mere appearance, it stands in need of no further operations. "That it will, &c."—i.e., as it is not produced as doubtful, it cannot have any subsequent operation to go through, for the apprehension of objects, as the Senses have got to do.

56 This anticipates the following objection: "How can the cognition—which, as you say, is devoid of action—be either a means in general, or the means of a right notion in particular?" The sense of the reply is that we do postulate an action for the cognition, viz: the action of being produced; and its effect—right notion—too is the manifestation of the object; and through the fact of its giving rise to such a result, in the shape of right notion with regard to the particular object, the cognition itself comes to be the Means of Right Notion (Pramāna).

and the cognition itself as accompanied by this Right Notion is the Means (of Right Notion : Pramāna).

57. This "being produced" too has been explained by the author of the Bhāṣhya, as identical (with the cognition itself). And it has also been made the qualification of cognition (sensuous), in order to differentiate it from all past and future (cognitions).

58. Even if "production" were only a permanent relation (that of inherence), as held by the Vaiśeṣikas;—the manifestation of this relation would depend upon the senses; and it is for this reason that it is called "sensuous" (belonging to the senses).

59. The character of the Means (of Right Notion) or that of the Result (Right Notion), may be attributed to any factor, as one may please; but in any case, Sense-perception cannot be the means (of knowing Duty), because of its consisting of the comprehension of something existing at the present time.

60. The Means of Right Notion may be (1) either the sense, or (2) the contact of the sense with the object, or (3) the contact of the mind with the senses, or (4) the connection of the mind with the Soul, or (5) all these, collectively.

61. In all cases, cognition alone would be the Result; and the character of the Means would belong to the foregoing, on account of their operating (towards cognition); for when there is no operation of these, then the Result, in the shape of cognition is not brought about.

62. The contact of the sense with the object is not with the whole of it; and hence there is no chance of the perception of all objects by means of a single Sense-organ, for those that hold the character of Pramāna to belong to the senses;

63. Because they do not hold the relation of the sense to consist

67 The Bhāṣhya passage here referred may be either—"Eva buddhirjāyatā tat pratyakṣam"—or the subsequent passage—"Buddhirivā janma vā, &c." If only "cognition" were stated, then "Sense-perception" would become applicable to cognitions of past and future objects; the addition of "janma" however serves to exclude these,—the meaning being "the cognition as produced."

58 Even if we accept the Vaiśeṣika theory that production consists of *inherence* in the cause,—the production thus being something different from the cause,—even then, this relation of *Inherence* could not be manifested, except through the agency of the Sense-organs; and as such, this *production* is rightly called "sensuous."

61 "When there is no operation"—as during sleep.

62 To the theory of "the contact of the sense with the object being the Means of Right Notion," some people object that, in that case, the sense of touch would give rise to the cognition of colour; as the sole cause of cognition, according to the aforesaid theory, is *contact with the object cognised*; and it cannot be denied that the sense of touch has contact with the colour of a material object.

63 This Kārikā is thus explained in the Kāṇikā:—The objection urged in 62 would apply to this theory, if the relation of the Sense-organ with the object were held to be mere 'contact,' as being the Means of Right Notion. But such is not the case; since

in mere contact; and they deny such a relation simply with a view to avoid the absurdity of the sense of *Touch*, which is a means (of a particular class of perception), giving rise to the cognition of *colour*.

64. Just as in the accomplishment of the *Pramāṇa*, the only cause is the fixed relation of the Sense and the Object, through their inborn amenability (to one another), so would it also be in the case of the Result.

65. Though the contact resides equally in both (the Sense and the object), yet, it is only proper that it should be mentioned as residing only in one of the two. Or the Sense may be taken as the only uncommon substratum of the relation.

66. "If (the cognition were due) to the contact of the mind with the Soul, then there would be no co-objectivity between the Means of Right

it is held that such means is the 'contact' as qualified by capability or applicability; and this "capability" is to be inferred, in accordance with the effect produced. Therefore to that alone, which comprehends an object on its contact with the Sense-organ, belongs the "capability" or applicability of the "contact."

"In order to avoid, &c."—"The meaning is this: He, who holds the cognition itself to be the means, and thus declares 'contact' to be the means of this means,—thereby denying the character of *Pramāṇa* to the 'contact'—, even to such a theorist, the 'contact' remains unspecified; and as such, it belongs to all the Sense-organs; and thus there would be, in this case also, the absurdity of the perceptibility of forms and colours by means of the Sense of Touch. Therefore in order to avoid this absurdity, which is common to the two theories, both of them must deny the fact of the relation of the Sense-organ and the object consisting in mere 'contact,'"—*Kārikā*.

64 In the latter theory, noted in the foregoing note, the upholders declare the cognition itself to be the *Pramāṇa* or the Means of Right Notion, and as a cause of this, they lay down the aforesaid applicability, through propriety of the contact of the Sense-organ with the object perceived,—the absurdity urged above, being avoided, on account of the inapplicability of one sense to the objects of other senses. The *Kārikā* means that the same means of getting clear of the absurdity would also apply to the theory in which the contact is held to be the means of cognition, which latter is held to be the Result, and not the Means.

65 The objection is that the contact resides as much in the Sense as in the object; and under the circumstances, why should it be attributed solely to the Sense? The sense of the reply is that such specification is not always wrong—as for instance, the Father of Rāma and Lakshmana is rightly called "the Father of Rāma." "Or the sense, &c."—this supplies another explanation of the specification: The word "Sense-perception," as here used, means "concrete (definite) cognition;" and what is specially related to this cognition alone is the sense only; while the object, is also related to Inference, and the other Means of Right Notion.

66 The Sense of the objection is that in the theory of the contact of the Sense and the Object being the means of cognition, we have a co-objectivity of the Means (the contact) with the Result (cognition), both of which belong to the object of cognition. In the theory of the contact of the mind and Soul being the cause of cognition, there can be no such co-objectivity, as the Means (the contact) belongs either to the Soul or to Mind, while the Result (cognition) belongs to the object. The meaning of the reply is that since both the contact and the cognition operate upon the object of cognition itself, there can be no want of co-objectivity.



Notion, and its Result." It is not so; because both operate upon the same object (of cognition).

67. And if (by "co-objectivity") you mean 'co-substrateness' (i.e., the sameness) of the substratum, which is something other than the object of cognition,—then the cognition residing in the Soul becomes naturally co-substrate (with its means, viz., the contact of the mind and the Soul).

68. Being the best means, on account of close proximity (co-substrateness), this (the contact of the mind and Soul) is the only Means of Right Perception; and hence the true character of the Means of Right Notion, can belong to no other agency.

69. If such character of the Means of Right Notion be attributed to all the agencies (noted in Kārikā 60) taken collectively, there can be no objection to it. And for one, to whom the Sense is the Means of Right Notion, the sameness of the object is clear.

70. When to the cognitions of the qualification and the qualified, are attributed, respectively, the characters of the Means (of Right Notion) and the Result, then too the objection of the diversity of objects, would be set aside in the aforesaid manner.

71-72. When the object of cognition is the qualification itself, then the abstract (or undefined) perception subsequently gives rise to a definite cognition; and in this case the character of Pramāṇa belongs to the *undefined* Perception, and that of the Result, to the subsequent *definite* (or concrete) cognition.

72. When, however, there is no definite cognition, then the character of Pramāṇa could not belong (to the foregoing undefined perception); because of its not bringing about any definite idea with regard to any object.

73. If the character of Pramāṇa were attributed to the cognition of the qualified object, then the character of the Result would belong to the determination of *shunning*, &c. And if it be urged that these two

68 In this theory, the cognition and its means (the contact) are found to inhere in the same base—viz., the Soul; and therefore such contact is the best means of cognition.

69 "All these taken collectively"—The contact of the Soul with the mind is preceded by the contact of the mind with the Sense-organ, which latter is preceded by the contact of the Sense-organ with the object perceived.

70 In the theory of cognition being the means, the concrete cognition of an object is preceded by the cognition of its qualifications: and in this theory, the latter is held to be the Result, and the former, the Means; and the cognition of the qualification having its purpose in the cognition of the qualified object, we have the co-objectivity of these, on account of the co-substrateness of their operations.

72 "Shunning, &c.," i.e., shunning, accepting, and disregarding. If the objector insists upon the character of the Result being attributed to that which follows *immediately* after the Means, then, in that case, we would accept the *rememberance* to be the Result.

(the determination to shun, &c., and the cognition of the qualified, object) are intercepted by the remembrance of the desirable character or otherwise (of the object cognised),—then we would declare this (remembrance) itself to be the Result.

74. He (i.e., the Bauddha),—who, desiring co-objectivity (between the Means and the Result), asserts the Result (cognition) itself to be the Pramāna,—would be contradicting the well-known distinction between the Cause and the Effect:—

75. As, when the axe is applied to the *khadira* wood, the cutting does not belong to a log of the *Palāsa*,—so (we see that) in ordinary experience, there is no identity between the axe (the means) and the cut (the result).

76. If co-objectivity happens to please you, by doing away with the distinction (between the Means and the Result),—through the rejection of such identity, the said distinction would be equally pleasing to others (the Naiyāyikas).

77. If you assume that the attribution of the character of the Means to the Result, is indirect (or Secondary),—then would not others be able, somehow or other (indirectly), to assume the desired co-objectivity also?

78. The result being the specification of the object, the character of Pramāna belongs, according to us, to that which immediately precedes it; and so, if the cognition be said to be the Pramāna, then the Result must be held to be something else.

79. It is not proper to attribute the character of the result to "Self-recognition,"—as this will be refuted later on; nor is it proper to

76 The mere fact of any one theory pleasing your fancy cannot serve as an argument in its support; for such grounds could be urged in support of the most absurd theories.

77 "Would not, &c."—As we have shown above, the co-objectivity, through operation.

78 "If the Result be the specification of the object of cognition, then the Pramāna would be the contact of the mind and the soul, &c., as the factors immediately preceding the said Result. But if the cognition be held to be the Pramāna, then such character of Pramāna would also belong to abstract cognitions, the subsequent concrete cognition (in the shape of the cognition of the specific properties, &c.), being its Result."—*Kāṣikā*.

79 The "Sautrāntika" theory is that "Cognition in the shape of the object cognised—i.e., the forms of red, yellow, &c., imprinted upon cognition—is what is held to be Pramāna; because on this is based all differentiation into Red, yellow, &c., and the Result of this Pramāna is Self-cognition,—i.e., the comprehension of the cognition by itself; and the external objects are the objects cognised." This theory of "Self-recognition" is refuted in the "Vijñāyāda" section of the Vārtika, where it is shown that the cognition is only able to apprehend the external forms of objects, and also the change that these produce in the cognition itself; because any such "Self-recognition" as held above would imply contradictory actions in itself.

state the "form of the object" to be the *Pramāṇa*, because of the diversity of objects.

80. The 'form of itself' (*i.e.*, of the cognition itself) is not found to be anything, other than 'Self-recognition,'—which could be said to be the *Pramāṇa* with regard to 'Self-recognition' as the Result.

81. Nor can the 'form of the cognition itself' be defined, (or specified) without another 'form'; and so again of this latter, and so forth, there would be no end of 'forms.'

82. The 'form of the cognition' too can have no existence, unless it is defined (or specified). In the case of the form of the object being the object of apprehension, however, we find no other apprehender (and as such there could be no specification).

83. The mind being a Sense-organ, the idea of pleasure, &c., is also 'Sense-perception,' because it is only when in contact with the mind, that the soul experiences them.

84. It is only an object existing at the present time, that, being in contact with the eye, &c., can be apprehended; and the object thus

"Diversity of objects"—you hold the *Pramāṇa* to be in the shape of the object; and this *Pramāṇa* has got the object of cognition for its object; and the objects of cognition too are *Red*, *Blue*, &c. Thus then the *form of the object* comes to have the *object itself* for its object; while "Self-recognition" has cognition for its object,—thus there being a diversity of objects between the *Pramāṇa* and its Result.

80 This *Kārikā* attacks the "Yogācāra" position. The *Yogācāras* hold that cognition is naturally pure, and as such comprehends itself in the form of *Red*, *Blue*, &c., which has been imprinted upon it by external impressions, thus doing away with the necessity of external objects; and as such, the "form of the cognition" itself is held to be the *Pramāṇa*, the form of the object being the object cognised, and "Self-recognition" being the Result. The sense of the refutation of this theory is that the "form of cognition" is the same as the "Recognition by the cognition of itself;" and this being the Result, cannot, at the same time, be the *Pramāṇa*.

81 "Is the 'form of itself' definite or indefinite? If indefinite, no such *form* exists. If definite, then as any one form cannot be defined by itself, we would have to assume another form; and so on, *ad infinitum*."—*Kārikā*.

82 "It has been urged that the *form of the object as identified with the cognition* is held to the object of apprehension; but this cannot be; because such an object cannot be apprehended by the cognition, because of the absurdity of any operation in itself; and we cannot find any other agent that would apprehend such an object, of which, we would thus come to have a negation"—*Kārikā*.

83 It is urged by the opponent—"you too will have to postulate the *Self-recognition* of Cognition, in the case of the feelings of pleasure and pain, which are not directly perceptible by any of the Sense-organs." The reply to this is that we sail clear of such a contingency, by postulating *mind* as a distinct Sense-organ, whereby pleasure and pain are directly perceived.

84 "The *Saṅgatas* hold that Sense-perception apprehends only *specific* objects; while the *Vedantists* hold that it apprehends only the *generic* character (the *class* to which the object belongs). Hence the definition given in the *Sūtra* is different from both; inasmuch as it does not make any definite assertion with regard to the

apprehended may be either generic or specific,—and hence it is not particularly declared to be either the one or the other.

85. Whatever definitions are given, no Sense-perception, of the ordinary character (*i.e.*, not of Yogis, &c.), can be the Means (of knowing Duty),—because it consists of the comprehension of objects existing at the present time.

86. If Sense-perception be said to consist in abstract (or undefined) cognition, then as a matter of course, it cannot be the Means (of knowing Duty); because the relation of Cause and Effect, is not apprehended without specification (*i.e.*, without the comprehension of qualifications, which is wanting in all undefined cognitions).

87. “How can Inference, &c., be said to be preceded by Sense-perception, when Sense-perception itself is declared to be undefined,—on account of its incapability of remembrance?”

88. “Nor is there any comprehension, without specification, of either the Linga (the middle term of the syllogism), or the Lingi (the Major term), or the relation of these two (the premisses). In ‘Analogy’ too, the comprehension of *similarity* being due to memory (it cannot be said to be preceded by Sense-perception).”

89. “Apparent Inconsistency also does not apply to an object which has not been perceived by some one else; and the object, a cognition whereof gives rise to this (Arthāpatti), is always concrete.”

object of apprehension.” The sense of the reply is that we hold the object of perception to be only such an object as is *capable of being perceived*, as existing at the present time, and as connected with the organs of sense; and such an object may be either *generic* or *specific*, according to circumstances. Consequently no such specification of the character of the object is called for, in the Sūtra.

85 “Sense-perception” only apprehends present objects; hence whatever its definition, it can never be the means of knowing Duty. The cognition brought about by meditation is only a case of *memory*; and as such, it is not even authoritative—to say nothing of its being “Sense-perception.”

85 Duty is the means of accomplishing a desirable end; and hence there can be no comprehension of Duty, except in the form—“This is the means to such and such a desirable end”—which would not be possible in the absence of a well-defined idea of the cause as well as of the effect.

87 Kārikās 87 to 94 bring forward objections against the passage in the Bhāṣya, wherein it is declared that “Inference,” “Analogy” and the rest being necessarily preceded by “Sense-perception,” cannot be the means of knowing Duty. “When Sense-perception, &c.,”—“Sense-perception” is a perception brought about by the function of the Sense-organs. But these organs themselves have not the capacity to remember things; and a well-defined cognition is brought about by the adjustment of the *Genus*, &c., remembered at the time; therefore “Sense-perception” can, at best, be only indefinite. Under such circumstances, how can “Inference” be said to be preceded by “Sense-perception,” which is always indefinite?

89 And as such it cannot be said to be invariably preceded by Sense-perception, as described above.



90. "In a case of Inference, where the *Linga* (the middle term) in the shape of the *movement of the sun*, is also such as is got at by means of Inference,—as also is the '*Lingi*' (major term),—how can we assert the precedence of Sense-perception?"

91. "In the case of an object apprehended by Sense-perception, how can these (Inference &c.) have any authority? For when an object is only comprehended by means of these (Inference &c.), then it is not amenable to the organs of Sense."

92. "If it is be urged that 'the precedence of Sense-perception may be said to be due to the cognition of some object, (not necessarily the same as the object of the subsequent Inference, &c.),'—then the *futurity* of the object (*Duty*) would not be a cause of its said non-cognisability."

93. "Because, if such be the case, then any one object existing at the present time having been cognised by means of Sense-perception,—with this as the *Linga* (minor term of the syllogism), the sensuous perception would lead to the cognition of *Duty*, even if it does not exist at the time."

94. "And again, even the object treated of in the *Veda*, is known, only after the letters have been recognised by means of Sense-perception; and for this reason, the *Veda* too, being preceded by Sense-perception, could not be the means of knowing *Duty*."

95. (In reply to the above) some people hold that the precedence of Sense-perception is not the cause (of Inference, &c., not applying to the

90 In a case, wherefrom the fact of the sun being found in different positions, one infers that the *sun is moving*; and from this conclusion we deduce the cause of the sun's motion. This latter Inference cannot be said to be preceded by "Sense-perception."

91 If Inference &c. be said to be invariably preceded by "Sense-perception," then they would be devoid of any authority. Because in that case, they would be only leading to a useless comprehension of such objects as have been already cognised by means of Sense-perception. If it be urged that both may have their uses at different times, then we reply that, if at the time of Inference, there be no Sense-perception, then the object of Inference would be only such as is not amenable to the action of the Senses; and hence Inference could not be said to be invariably preceded by Sense-perception. For if the object were amenable to the Senses, then it could not be possible to have an Inference without Sense-perception; and it has been already explained that, at the time of Sense-perception, there is no use for Inference, which, in that case, can have no authority.

92 The meaning of this *Kārikā* is this: if the other party say that they do not hold that the object of Inference is always perceived by the Senses and such is the precedence of Sense-perception; and that what they mean by *precedence of Sense-perception* is that one of the three factors of Inference must be such as has been previously recognised by Sense-perception;—then we meet this position by urging that if such be the case, then the assertion that—"Duty is not amenable to Sense-perception on account its being in the future"—becomes false; the reason for this is explained in the next *Kārikā*.

case of Duty); all that is meant is that the authority which is due to the precedence of Sense-perception, does not apply (to the case of Duty).

96. As a matter of fact, however, Inference and the rest can operate only after one out of the three factors, 'Linga' (minor term), &c., has been cognised by means of Sense-perception; and certainly there is no such thing in the case of Duty.

97. Nor is here in this case, any possibility of Inference *per* Inference;—because of the impossibility of any pre-ascertainment of the premises and the terms (of the Syllogism).

98. By means of Inference we do not arrive at the idea of the mere *existence* of anything. If it be urged that "by 'Duty' we would qualify some other object,"—then (we reply) that in that case, the 'Paksha' (major term) would be devoid of any definite properties.

99. Therefore, because of its never before having been found to be

⁹⁶ The way of meeting the above objections, as shown in the last Kārikā would make the Bhāshya passage in question altogether redundant. Therefore the Author offers another reply, more in keeping with his own views: we shall prove later on that we do not confine Sense-perception to undefined cognition alone; but we also hold the term to include well-defined concrete cognitions. Thus then, we can have no Inference without Sense-perception; because all processes of Inference depend upon the premises, which are got at solely by means of Sense-perception; and certainly, there can be no Inference without the premises. For instance, it is only when "smoke" is actually *seen* to be accompanied by *Fire*, and thus to be its *mark*,—and only when the *gavaya* is *seen* to be *like the cow*,—that there can be a cognition of the existence of Fire (through Inference), and of the similarity of the *gavaya* to the cow (by Analogy). In the same manner, it is established that it is the cognition of the principal object of Inference that stands in need of Sense-perception; and in the case of Duty, we cannot perceive by the senses, either any of its *marks* or anything *similar* to it. Hence Inference, Analogy, and the rest cannot apply to the case of Duty.

⁹⁷ This hints at Kārikā 90, where it has been asserted that an Inference *per* Inference is not preceded by Sense-perception. This is not correct; because even in the instance there cited, until we have, through Sense-perception, arrived at the relation subsisting between the *motion* and its *cause*, we can have no Inference of any sort.

⁹⁸ In every case of Inference, the object of Inference is a certain object, *endowed with certain definite properties*, and not as a mere entity; while in the case of Duty, the only conclusion that is possible is—"Duty exists," which, in reality, can never be amenable to Inference; but it would become so, if *mere existence* were the subject of Inference. If it be urged that—"For Inference as applied to the case of Duty, we could have an object, such as some *person endowed with Duty* (i.e., one who has performed the duties prescribed in the scriptures); and this would not be an Inference of *mere existence*,"—then we reply that even such an Inference cannot be correct; inasmuch as we have not yet arrived at any well-defined properties of *Duty*—which is to be the major term of the syllogism; and until the properties of the major term be known, there can be no Inference. That is to say, Duty has not yet been proved, to be an entity; and so long as this has not been proved, there can be no Inference in which "Duty" could be the major term.

⁹⁹ This Kārikā and the next bring forward two syllogisms in the proper style, to prove the inapplicability of Inference and Analogy to the case of Duty. By "uncommon object" is meant the "*Swalakshana*" (the individual characteristic) of the Buddhist, which, according to them, is undefined, and as such, not amenable to Inference, &c.

concomitant with any object, Duty cannot be amenable to Inference,—like the specific (undefined) characteristics of objects (or ‘uncommon objects’).

100. Because of its being similar to the unseen (invisible), and because of its own imperceptibility, Duty cannot be amenable to Analogy,—like the said characteristics of objects.

101-102. “But then, ‘Apparent Inconsistency’ would become such (means of recognising Duty),—based upon the perception of diversity in the world: the distinction of ‘happy’ and ‘miserable’ is not possible without some unseen cause; because all visible causes are found to be incapable of explaining this diversity; and because (conversely) we find such distinctions even in the absence of any seen cause; as we find that even when service and study are exactly similar, the result, in the capacity of the students, is not the same.”

103. Such could be the case, only if it were possible to refute the action of natural idiosyncracies; or if there were any other cause of the diversity of the powers of Karma.

104. Just as with regard to the diversity of their results, there is the natural capacity of Actions,—in the same manner could the diversity in the world be due to the peculiarities of nature.

105. Then too, so long as, with regard to the action, the forms of Duty

101-102 These Kārikās embody an objection, the sense of which is thus explained in the Kārikā: “Granted that Inference and Analogy are not the means of knowing Duty; but we have always found Apparent Inconsistency to apply to objects beyond the action of the Senses; and on the *seen* diversity in the world, we could base an Apparent Inconsistency: This diversity in the world cannot be explained, unless we postulate some such unseen agency as that of ‘Duty.’ We find in the world that though all worldly circumstances and advantages are equal in the case of any two persons, yet they are not seen to be equally happy; and like the *fatness of Devadatta who does not eat during the day*, such diversity cannot be explained by any seen causes; and, as in the case of Devadatta, the Apparent Inconsistency of *fatness with fasting in the day* is explained by postulating the fact of his *eating at night*, which is not seen by the people; so too, in the case in question, the Apparent Inconsistency of the *equality of all worldly advantages with the inequality in the degree of happiness* can be explained, only by postulating an unseen agency, to which is given the name of ‘Duty.’” “*Service or study*,”—i.e., two persons serving the king equally well, are found to be rewarded differently; and similarly two men studying the same subject under exactly similar circumstances, are found to differ in their acquirements. And these discrepancies can be explained only by the agency of Dharma and Adharma,—the former causing superiority, and the latter inferiority.

103 Even in the case of such actions as the “Aśvamēdha” sacrifice and “Animal-slaughter,” we attribute their diverse results to the peculiar character of the actions themselves, and not to any extraneous cause. In the same manner, we could also attribute the diversity in the conditions of two men equally circumstanced to the peculiarities of their own nature, and not to any unseen extraneous cause, as you would seek to prove, by means of Apparent Inconsistency.

105 The last Kārikās embody one kind of reply to the above objections. But the Author finds this reply inadequate; because if all diversity were due to nature, one