

we shall prove later on. Thus then, there is no *general* middle term which is common to both (of us).

104-105. Nor can the character of the middle term belong to the two particular cognitions (waking and dream cognitions), as they constitute respectively the Minor term and the Instance of your syllogism; and because the former is incapable of syntactical relation (with the Minor term), while the latter cannot in any way belong to (or qualify) it.

105-106. Nor can the "cognition" devoid of its object be the middle term; as it has been already explained that on account of the non-recognition of the subject, there follows the fault of having the substratum undefined.

106-107. Thus then your middle term too comes to be contradictory; and the Instance becomes devoid of the predicate of the conclusion—both of these (faults) being indicated by the alternatives that were brought forward (above) for the (avoidance of the non-recognition of the predicate).

107-109. Even in dream-cognition the external substratum is not altogether absent. In all cases there is a real substratum, though (in dreams) appearing under diverse conditions of place and time. As a

class nor the individual, but only the exclusion of all that is not cow. All this will be refuted later on.

104-105 The two particular cognitions—waking and dream cognitions—cannot be accepted as the middle term; because one of these (waking cognitions, *f.i.*) forms the Minor term of your syllogism; and if the same were made the middle term, your Minor Premiss would become absurd; as it would be—"waking cognition is waking cognition." And as for dream-cognition, it forms the corroborative instance of your syllogism, and does not belong to the Minor term; hence even in this case, no proper Minor Premiss would be possible.

105-106 The Bauddha urges that by "cognition" as their middle term, they mean "*cognition pure and simple independently of the object cognised*". The objection to this, however, is that a Minor Premiss, which is devoid of objective reality, cannot lead to any correct conclusion; specially as in such cases the middle term becomes devoid of any substratum; and as such, it becomes amenable to the same faults that we have urged against the Minor term that has its subject undefined.

106-107 "*Above*"—*Vide Kārikā: Nirālambanata Cēha Sarvatha Yadi Sādhyatē, &c., &c.,*" where it has been shown, by means of alternatives, that an absolute absence of substratum is never met with; and from the negation of such absence of substratum, we conclude that even in dream-cognition, there is no such absence. Thus then your Instance (Dream-cognition) becomes devoid of the predicate of your conclusion (which is *absence of substratum*). And waking cognitions too, being, for the same reason, not without real substratum, the middle term becomes contradictory to the conclusion; inasmuch as no "cognition" is ever found to be without a real substratum.

107-109 We dream only of such external objects as we have previously perceived. The only difference lies in the disorder of the time and place of the perception. Hence dreams too cannot be said to be totally devoid of real substratum in the external world.



matter of fact too, what is comprehended by dream-cognition is (some real external object that has been perceived) either during the present life, or in some past life, or at any other time, and which comes to be cognised in dreams, either in connection with the same time and place, or under different circumstances.

109-113. The cause of misconception in the notion of the "fire-brand-circle" is the fire-brand whirled with extreme rapidity;—in that of "imaginary cities," the particular shape of the clouds, as also some preconceived houses, &c.;—in that of the "Mirage," preconceived water, or sand heated by and reflecting the rays of the sun. And of the notion of "the hare's horns" the cause would be either the horn of other animals, or the peculiar character of the hare itself. And of the negation of the hare's horns, the cause is the baldness of its head (*i.e.*, the absence of protuberances). Of the notion of *emptiness* in the object, the cause is (the place) untouched by any other object. And in the case of improbable utterances (such as "Hundreds of elephants on the tip of one's finger") the cause lies in the objects themselves (as under the influence of extreme proximity giving rise to such misconceptions).

113-114. Even such objects as are never perceived (such as the Sāṅkhya 'Prakṛiti'), are found to be comprehended by cognitions; and the origin of these cognitions lies in (its constituent elements) the earth, &c.

114-115. It is a peculiarity of "Sense-perception" alone that it comprehends only such objects as exist at the present time, and also that it functions over objects in contact (with the senses); such restrictions do not apply to other kinds of cognition (Inference, &c.)

115-116. (If you ask) "How could an object, not existing, bring about a cognition?"—(we reply) whence do you conclude the incapacity of non-existing objects to produce cognitions?

116-117. The point at issue between us rests in the fact of (cognitions having) external substrata; and hence, even if there be no

109.113 The external cause of dreams has been explained. These Kārikās explain the external causes of the ordinary misconceptions of the senses. And it is shown that even misconceptions are not totally devoid of external realities,—to say nothing of correct Perceptions.

113.14 It is only the elements—Earth, Water, &c.,—in their subtlest forms, that are called "Prakṛiti."

114.15 The notion of "Prakṛiti" is got at by means of Inference, wherein it is not necessary that the conditions specified should apply. Hence the objection based upon the imperceptible character of Prakṛiti loses its force.

115.16 That which does not exist at the present time cannot perform any action, &c.; but this does not mean that it cannot bring about cognitions; as we have cognitions of many past and future objects.

116.17 Because the absence of proximity does not imply the absence of the external substratum of cognitions.



proximity of the object (with the Sense-organ), how could that affect our theory?

117-119. Therefore it is only that (cognition), which comprehends an object otherwise than in the form it exists in, that can be said to be "devoid of substratum;" and that Cognition which has 'negation' for its object is, in fact, one that has a real substratum; because this 'negation' too is not an independent entity by itself; for it is not so comprehended. For you, however, both of these ('absence of substratum' and 'negation as the substratum') together with their causes, can never be ascertained.

119-20. And like the discrepancies of your conclusion, the contradictory character of your middle term too would be chargeable (to your argument);—inasmuch as it leads to the subversion of the forms of the predicate, subject, &c.—taken severally as well as collectively (in the premises).

120-21. The discrepancies of the instance too become chargeable to you; inasmuch as in any single object, it is not possible to have the conception of parts of the major term and the middle term, and also that of invariable concomitance (of these two).

121-22. Some people urge against you the objection that in your argument you do not mention any instance of dissimilarity. If you urge that "it is not mentioned because there is no such instance"; then (they would reply) you have not got here the opportunity (for making such an assertion, as) such an assertion could only be made in the case of the conclusion being an affirmative one.

117-19 By "cognition without a substratum" is meant a *wrong cognition* or misconception,—and not one that cognises itself. And the notion—"this is not a jar"—has also a real substratum; inasmuch as this negative conception is nothing more than a positive cognition, having for its object, the absence of the properties of the *Jar* in the particular object. For the Baudha, on the other hand, there can be no cognition devoid of real substratum; because the cognition, according to them, cognises itself.

119-20 Your conclusion has been pointed out to be such as has its subject not known, &c., &c. In the same manner, we are going to show that your middle term is contradictory. Your middle term would prove the falsity of *all cognitions*; and as such, it would also prove the falsity of the cognitions the Subject and Predicate of your conclusion; and as such it would establish the contradictories of your conclusion.

120-21 The Instance, "Dream-Cognition," is such as is devoid of your Major term, "Absence of substratum"; it is also devoid of the middle term, "the character of cognition"; it is devoid of the combination of these two; and lastly it is also devoid of the concomitance of these. "In a single object, &c."—i.e., in cognition, taken by itself, independently of any substratum.

121-22 "Instance of Dissimilarity": *f.i.*, 'where there is no absence of substratum, there is no cognition.' "It is not mentioned, &c.": The sense of this is that when the conclusion is an affirmative one, its negation is its contradictory; and when it is a negative one, then, its negation being a non-entity, the middle term could not apply to it. Hence it is not necessary to an instance of dissimilarity, in the case



123-24. The citation (of the instance of dissimilarity) is possible, even in the case of the contradictory (of the major term) being a negative one;—e.g., “that which is not transient is not an effect, as ‘Sky-flowers,’ &c.,” an assertion which is quite reasonable.

124-25. In the case of your argument, however, we have a negative major term (or conclusion) (“*devoid of substratum*”); and hence its contradictory (*presence of substratum*) is positive; and as such it is necessary that the contradictory of your major term should have been supported by an Instance.

125-26. And if you were to mention any such, the double negation would signify only an affirmation; and no affirmation could be made if the object were non-existing.

126-27. Under the circumstances, in the case of the negation of the omniscience (of Buddha) we would have the following form of reasoning: “There is an incapability of His sense-perception, &c., (to apply to all things), like our own (sense-perception, &c.).”

of our argument. The meaning of the Author is that the Bauddhas do not make this assertion with reference to the argument in question; because for them there is no case of affirmative sense-perception; as according to them, there can be no joint cognition of the middle term accompanied by the major term (i.e., of the major premiss). It is for this reason, that they always base the applicability of their middle term upon its capacity to preclude the contradictory of the conclusion; consequently, in the absence of an Instance of Dissimilarity, there can be no preclusion of the said contradictory; therefore, in the Bauddha theory, it is always necessary to cite Instances of Dissimilarity. Their Major term—“absence of substratum”—however, is a negative one; and hence its contradictory cannot but be positive—“a real substratum”; and it is quite possible that the middle term should reside in this latter, positive entity: so in order to deny this possibility, it was necessary to cite an Instance of Dissimilarity.

123.24 Even in the case of an affirmative conclusion, as a matter of fact, the citing of an instance of dissimilarity is not necessary; but such citing is not impossible; because even when the contradictory is a negation one, such instances are always possible; hence those that are clever at inferential reasonings must always be able to cite such instances, the omission of which would be a serious mistake. An example of such an Instance is given: In the argument, “sound is transient, because it is caused,” we can cite an instance of dissimilarity, such as “that which is not transient is not caused, as *Sky-flowers*.”

125.25 If you were to cite such an instance, it could be only in the form—“That which is not devoid of substratum is not a Cognition,” and the double negation—“that which is not devoid of”—would mean “that which is endowed with;” and this affirmation could not be made, if there were no real substratum.

123.27 The Bauddha would retort that these discrepancies could be charged against all negative arguments,—even to that argument by which you seek to deny the omniscience of Buddha. In order to avoid this charge, the Author says that the form of our argument against such omniscience would be this: “Buddha’s perception cannot apply to such objects as exist in the future &c.,—because it is sense-perception,—like our ordinary sense-perception,—f.i., words”; and thus we sail clear of the above charges; as the citation of the Instance of Dissimilarity—“That which comprehends, &c.”—is quite correct.

127-28. In a case where no contradictory (of the major term) is possible, other theorists declare that this (non-citation of the instance of dissimilarity) is no fault; inasmuch as even without such citation the reasoning is conclusive.

128-29. Then again, it is only those who admit of real means (of argument) that can engage in a discussion; and the Ānyavādi is not entitled (to any discussion), because he accepts no means to be real.

129-30. (Obj.). "But all the arguments that we have brought forward are such as are accepted by you (to be real, though not by us); and as such, wherefore should you have brought forward so many objections—by means of alternatives—, in order to invalidate the argument as such?"

130-31. You who are versed in logical rules—why should you argue thus, with a view to deceive us, as it were? Have you not heard that an argument (to be effective) must be such as is accepted by both parties?

131-33. In the case of an argument which is not accepted by your opponent, and which is brought forward as recognised by yourself alone—you have a remedy at hand; but in the case of an argument which (as you say) is not recognised by yourself, what procedure can you adopt? Because if you were to establish (such an argument) you would be contradicting your own previous convictions (such as the denial of the truth of the original argument); while if you left it un-established, your opponent could not be convinced of the truth of your conclusions.

133-34. (Obj.). "That which is not recognised by the opponent can never convince him; and hence it is only reasonable that the real character of an argument should not belong to such. But that which is

127.23 Having expounded the view of "some people", the Author propounds another theory: The Instance of Dissimilarity is cited only with a view to avoid the chance of the middle term being either *too wide* or *too narrow*, and thereby making the reasoning inconclusive. In cases, however, where the contradictory of the Major term does not exist, there is no chance of such a contingency; and hence there is no necessity for citing the said Instance. But by this we do not admit your argument as conclusive; in face of the numerous objections urged above.

128.29 Only those who accept the various factors of an argument to be real, can carry on any discussion. The Ānyavādi denies the reality of all these factors; and as such, he cannot be admitted into the discussion.

129.30 The Ānyavādi says: "Though we do not accept the reality of any factor of the argument, yet we bring forward arguments, in order to convince you of the truth of our theory; and as these arguments are in due accordance with your own tenets, it is not proper for you to attempt to invalidate it; as by invalidating my argument, you will be only invalidating your own tenets, upon which my arguments are all based."

130.31 "Have you not, &c."—As taught by your own teacher Dinnāga.

131.33 If an argument is accepted by you, and not by your opponent, then what you have to do is to bring forward other arguments in support of your original argument, and thereby convince your adversary. But there is no course open to you, if you do not accept, as *real*, the argument that you yourself bring forward.



not recognised by myself—what can that matter? The fact of the necessity of the middle term being such as is recognised by both parties is not mentioned with a view to any transcendental result, (that we shall accept it upon any verbal authority). Any person would become convinced of a fact only through reasoning recognised by himself.

135-36. "If you urge—'How can you assert what you do not recognise?'—(we reply) what is even that to you? I may assert the conclusion or the argument either recognised or not recognised by me; do you not come to ascertain it (through my argument) to be true?"

137. "It is where the conclusion (a certain notion) depends solely upon a person (his utterance), that the question is raised—'whence did this man know it?' Such a question, however, does not arise in the present case (which is one of inferential argument)".

138. "For if it were so (and the conclusion depended upon my assertion) in the present case, then the mere assertion of the conclusion would lead to your conviction, solely through the non-recognition of any discrepancy (in my argument)."

139. "But because this (conclusion) stands in need of argumentative reasoning, therefore it is to this (reasoning) that authoritativeness belongs, and the use of the verbal utterance lies only in the recalling of the reasoning to the mind (of the questioner)."

140. "Therefore just as one who would be convinced of the conclusion only through a recognition of *the middle term as concomitant with the major term* (i.e., of the major premiss), does not stand in need of (knowing the character of) the speaker, so would you also be convinced of our conclusion without wanting to know what we ourselves believe."

141. "In the case of such cognitions of yours, as Sense-perception, &c.,—is there, in the case of these, any reasoning or conclusion that is recognised by us,—that you should persist upon such (being accepted by me) in the case of my present (inferential argument)?"

142. "For these reasons, it is not befitting of learned people to assert in reply that 'since the reasoning is not recognised by yourself, therefore it cannot convince me.'"

143. (Rep.). All this would have been quite true, if the only result (sought after by your reasoning) were my conviction alone; in that case the reasoning would be enough for me, even if it were not recognised by you.

144. But when the case is such that you, holding that the *idea* alone is a real entity, are asked by one—"what are your reasons?"—then it is not possible (that you should say something which you yourself do not recognise).

145. And certainly you could not have been convinced of your theory, through any reasonings, that are not accepted by you, but by me.

146. And no argument is brought forward against a questioner save that which states the grounds of the speaker's own conviction.

147-48. And again, how do you know that such and such an argument



is recognised by us? How could there be any desire on your part, for asserting (an argument), when you do not recognise the meaning (of the argument) which you knowingly bring forward for me, when I present myself only as an enquirer (and not as your opponent)? It was with a full recognisance of this fact that your teachers asserted the necessity of the reasoning being accepted by both parties.

149. Hence, just as by means of your argument you seek to instil into me a recognition of your conclusion, so by means of objections to your argument, I shall seek to instil into you the non-acceptance or negation (thereof).

150-52. Just as you, having asserted a conclusion, and not recognising any argument in support of that conclusion, become deprived of any conviction (with regard to such a conclusion); so would also your questioner, desiring to understand such a conclusion, and then becoming conscious of the discrepancies of the reasoning (in favour of such a conclusion), fail to be convinced of the correctness of that conclusion; and if he knows the reasoning to be true, then the reality of the reasoning being firmly established, your conclusion itself becomes impossible; and so he naturally does not become convinced of its truth.

153. Therefore you should entertain no such hope as that 'even when the reasoning is asserted by me unknowingly (i.e., when not recognised by me as such), the other party would become convinced of the correctness of my conclusion by the direct acceptance of my argument.'

154. The contradiction between your reasoning (the major premiss) and the conclusion is clear, as declared by Gautama. And it was without a recognition of this fact that others (the Banddhas) declared such contradiction to be no fault.

155. (Obj.). "But it is just possible that I may have been previously convinced of the conclusion by means of reasonings recognised by ordinary people; though this (reasoning) may have no existence in reality."

156. (Rep.). That which is now known to be non-existent in reality,—how could that have been a reality before? And if it was not a reality, how could it have been accepted as sound reasoning?

157-58. If it is a correct reasoning, it could not but have a real existence. Because no reality can be proved by an unreality; for we have never known such notions as that of the "hare's horns" to lead to any correct notion; and the notion of the existence of *fire*, based upon the idea of the existence of fog (which is not smoke), cannot but be false.

159. Therefore your idea of reality, originating in an untrue reasoning, cannot but be unreal; because nothing real can be indicated by that which is itself false.

160. The different marks, &c.,—which are taken to indicate the

150-52 Since your conclusion denies the reality of the substratum of all cognitions, therefore an establishment of the reality of the object of your premisses renders your own conclusion impossible.



alphabetical letters,—these, too, in their own forms (of marks) are not devoid of reality.

161. If you urge that these (marks) are not real *as letters*,—(we reply that) such is the case with all entities: nothing is accepted to be real *in the form of something else*.

162. When the natural form of the object itself is manifest, then the form appears as such (and hence is real); when, however, such form of the object is not ascertained, then it is neither real nor unreal.

163. Your *reasoning, &c.*,—(*i.e.*, the middle term and the major term)—however are *unreal in their own forms*; therefore their agency (towards producing notions) is similar to that of the *fog* (producing an idea of *fire*), and not to that of letter-marks.

164. (Obj.). “The form of the means has, for us, only the character of a ‘Samvriti’ (falsity); and in that form they are accepted to be *real*; and thus how can they be said to be false in their natural forms?”

165. (Rep.). The character of ‘Samvriti’ exists only in word,—and as such it can never be the cause of true reality.

166. You have got no ground for distinguishing between *true* and *ordinary worldly* ‘reality’; and as such how could true *reality* belong to a thing which is amenable to worldly means (*i.e.*, that whereto you attribute the character of ‘Samvriti’)?

167-68. (Obj.). “But even in the absence of the external object, only by means of the ‘Idea’ in the mind, would (all worldly activity) be accomplished,—through the differentiations of specifications based upon ‘Impressions’ and ‘Words’. The followers of the Nyāya too have declared that ‘it is only when the predicate, &c. (of the propositions forming an argument) have become the objects of ‘Idea’, that all functioning of inference and the rest become accomplished,—and not when these (predicate, &c.) exist in the external world.’”

169. (Rep.). True, there is such an assertion of theirs; but just examine it for a moment—how could there be any differentiation of that which is a nonentity, through any representation either in Idea or in Words?

170. And again, how could there be any specification of Words or Idea, with regard to that which has no real existence? Even specification by word there can be none, because you deny (the reality of) the word itself.

171-72. And if even such specifications as do not exist, and are

167-68 Inference, Analogy, &c., could be explained as based upon the *ideas* of the subjects and predicates of the constituent propositions; and these *ideas* do not stand in need of the external reality of objects. Through differences in *Impressions* and *Words* we could have the differentiations into the false and the real factors of an argument, &c., &c. “Followers of Nyāya,” *i.e.*, Dīnāga and others.

169 “Hare’s horns” can have no differentiation, based upon any specification of either words or ideas.

171-72 If mere existence *in idea* were the sole test of the reality of a proposition,

only brought about by an *Idea* (i.e., have no existence save in *Idea*), were to bring about the action of the major, middle and minor terms;—then, even with regard to your argument, all the faults that we urge against it may be such as have real corresponding *ideas*,—and as such your argument would become subject to all these faults.

173. The mystic incantation that you have urged,—*viz.*, 'that Inference, &c., are accomplished only when the subject, &c., have appeared in idea, and that there is no need of any external object,'—would also apply to the fallaciousness, &c. (of your argument), urged by me.

174-75. For you, who base all usage upon representations in *Idea*, the objections urged by us would also have to be accepted as established; but not so the argument brought forward by you. Because we base all-usage upon external objects; and as such, for us, even when the *Idea* has appeared, we cannot in any way have any usage devoid of the external object.

176. (Obj.). "But just as we do not accept the reality of the reasoning, so we would not accept the objections (against it); and hence, in the absence of any objections, my argument remains unsalied."

177. (Rep.). Then in that case there is no need of objections,—when by the mere denial of (the truth of) your reasoning, you have accepted the non-conclusiveness of your argument, which is all that we seek to prove.

178-79. Again, there can be no specification by the *Vāsanā* (Impression or Tendency), because of the impossibility of any cause (for such specification), for you. If you urge that 'the difference of *Idea* (or Cognition) would be the cause'—then, whence the difference of this (*Idea*)? If it be urged that this latter is based upon the difference of *Vāsanā*, then you land upon 'Reciprocity.' And of the pure form of *Idea*, by itself, you can have no differentiation.

180-81. And further there is no evidence either for the existence of

then, inasmuch as we have very distinct ideas of the discrepancies in your arguments, you cannot deny the reality of these discrepancies.

175. You base usage upon mere *Idea*; hence you cannot very well deny the objections we have urged against you. We, on the other hand, hold to the necessity of a real substratum for the *Idea*; and hence your argument cannot be binding upon us, as it is devoid of a real substratum in the external world.

173-79. With this Commences the refutation of the *Bauddha* theory of "*Vāsanā*."

173-79. "And of the pure, &c."—This anticipates the theory that the *Idea* being self-differentiated, there is no Reciprocity.

180-81. This anticipates the objection that the said Reciprocity being eternal, like the relation between the seed and the sprout, cannot be faulty. The sense of the reply is that the fact of the mutual dependence of the seed and the sprout is well-known; and as such the mutual dependence in this case is considered to be faulty whereas in the case of the *Bauddha* "*Vāsanā*," there is no such testimony of general acceptance. Even if the existence of the Impressions be granted, these could only tend to recall preconceived perceptions, and would, in no case, be able to bring about the objects of perception, such as *Red, Blue, &c.* "Because, &c."—Impressions left upon the mind by past cognitions, tend to bring about a remembrance thereof.



the *Vāsanā*, or for the differentiation (thereof); (and even granting its existence) the *Vāsanā* would only bring about the differentiation of the "Apprehender" (the Idea or Cognition); and then, by what would the differentiation of the "Apprehended" (object of perception) be brought about? Because appearing in consciousness alone the *Vāsanā* could only bring about a *remembrance*.

181-82. (1) Ideas being momentary (transient), and (2) their destruction being total (*lit.* without leaving behind its least trace), and (3) there being no association of the *impressed* and the *impresser* (i.e., since the two do not in any case appear together),—there can be no *Vāsanā*.

182-83. And again, the next moment having not yet appeared, cannot be impressed by the foregoing moment; and the following moment having been destroyed (as soon as it appears), there can be no impression, thereby, of the foregoing; and even if the two moments appeared together, they could have no relation (between them); and hence there can be no 'Vāsanā or Impression.'

184-85. Both (the preceding and the following moments) being momentary, they cannot operate upon one another: how can that which is in the course of destruction be impressed by another which too is undergoing destruction? It is only the permanent entities (i.e., those that last for some moments) that can be impressed upon by other entities, which are also permanent.

185-86. (Obj.). "If the subsequent cognition, which is permanent, did not differ from the preceding one, then there could be no *Vāsanā*;

182-83. By "moment" here is meant the *cognition* appearing at the moment. The Bauddhas hold all cognition to be momentary, being destroyed as soon as produced; and hence, according to them, no two cognitions can exist at the same time; and consequently one cannot impress the other. This explains the *third* reason for the denial of *Vāsanā*.

184-85. "*Being momentary, &c.*"—This explains the *first* reason for denying *Vāsanā*. "*It is only, &c.*"—explains the *second* reason for denying *Vāsanā*; that which is totally destroyed cannot be impressed upon; nor can any impressions be produced by that which has itself been totally destroyed.

186-86. "You have urged that permanent entities are impressed upon by others. But this is wrong: because that which is permanent must be accepted as having the same form at all times, past, present and future; and hence the form of the cognition that appeared before would be identical with that which would appear subsequently; and thus on account of this identity, there could be no impression. While if cognitions are held to be undergoing momentary changes, then, the time of the subsequent cognition being different from that of the previous one, and yet there being a similarity between the two cognitions, we could have a *Vāsanā*, which would solely consist in the fact of the subsequent Idea appearing in the form of the previous Idea. Therefore it is only when the previous cognition impresses its form upon the subsequent cognition, that the former is said to *impress* the latter; and as such, there is no need of any operation, which would not be possible in the momentary cognitions. And further, the relation subsisting between the two would be that of the cause and effect; and thus all your objections against our *Vāsanā* fall to the ground."



because of the absence of any difference between the two. When however these are transient, then there can be a *Vāsanā*, based upon *similarity* and *difference* (between the two cognitions)."

187-88. (Reply). But for you, who accept the momentary character of cognitions, there can be no such similarity. And again, the preceding cognition can bring about no effect, until it has itself appeared; nor (can it bring about effects) when it has (itself) been destroyed; and in its accomplished state, it has no continuance even for one moment. Therefore (according to you) the cognition being destroyed as soon as produced, there can be no moment which would allow for its bringing about its effects.

189-90. Then again, since the cognition is destroyed *totally* (without leaving any trace behind), whence can there be any such similarity? As, in the subsequent cognition, there exists no such property as belonged to the preceding cognition; and barring the *sameness of properties*, no other 'similarity' is possible.

190-91. And if the *Vāsanā* were due solely to similarity, then in the case of an idea of the Elephant following upon that of the Cow, there could be no *Vāsanā*, because the two are entirely different. And then (there being no *Vāsanā* in keeping with the idea of the cow) after that, there would never be any idea of the cow, because of the absence of its cause (which you hold to be none other than the aforesaid *Vāsanā*). And, in fact, no other idea would proceed from another which is dissimilar to it.

192-93. And again, there being an absence of all help from any external object, and hence not being influenced by any extraneous circumstances, and having the peculiarity of *being* totally destroyed,—how could the Impressions (*Vāsanās*) bring about any effects in anything like a serial order?

187-93. Therefore your assertion,—that "the relation of cause and effect subsists between the two Ideas"—is wrong.

189-90. If the property of the previous cognition persist in the subsequent cognition, the former cannot be said to have been destroyed *totally*.

192-93. In our case, as we admit of external objects, the Impressions are held to reside in the soul, which is permanent; and hence whenever one object is found to be similar to another perceived before, this similarity serves to rouse the dormant soul-impression into activity, and it brings about its effect; and this effect we hold to be nothing else, save the *remembrance* of the object. But, in the case of the Bauddhas, as they admit of the existence of nothing but Ideas, their Impressions cannot have any aids, on which would depend their activity, or in the absence of which they could not operate. Hence their theory will be open to the absurdity of all the impressions,—all equally independent of external aids—functioning at one and the same time; and there would be no order in our cognitions; and at one stroke, we would come to have *Universal Consciousness*. But this too would disappear, the very next moment, leaving us devoid of all cognitions, which you hold to disappear so completely as not to leave any trace behind them.



193-95. It is only on the destruction of the cause—and not otherwise—that the effect is held (by you) to appear. And hence the destruction of a single *Idea* would bring about the destruction of all impressions (based thereupon). And then, the *Universal Idea*, that had been brought about by all these (Impressions), would all in a single moment, disappear.

195-96. If even on the destruction of the substratum (*Idea*), you hold its potentiality (in the shape of Impressions) to subsist, then its momentary character disappears; and there would be no bringing about of the effect consequent upon such character.

196-97. If again you hold the flow of *Impressions* to be like the flow of *Ideas* (i.e., uninterrupted and continuous),—then (both being independent) no Impressions could be produced from *Ideas*; nor would any *Ideas* be brought about by *Impressions*.

197-98. In that case each (*Idea* and *Impression*) would bring about effects similar to itself; and one could not bring about the other. Nor is there (in your doctrine) any such peculiar cause (besides these two) as would lead to the production of dissimilar effects.

198-99. Therefore this (your) "*Impression*" must have been assumed only as a "*false reality*" (*samvriti-satya*), and not as a *true reality*. But then, no effect can ever be produced by such (false) entities.

199-200. He, for whom there is a *permanent* comprehender (in the shape of the "*Soul*"), can quite reasonably have this *Soul* as the substratum of Impressions—this (the *Soul*) becoming so through repeated cognitions. Or this (*Soul*) itself may be said to be the "*Impression*" itself.

200-201. In a case where the *Lākshā* water is sprinkled on the

198.95. "*Would bring about, &c.*"—because you accept no other cause of the Impressions, besides *Ideas*.

195.95. "*There would be, &c.*"—because you hold that the effect is produced, only upon the destruction of the Cause; and in the present case, your cause, the particular *Idea*, is held to *persist*; and hence there could not appear any effects, in the shape of Impressions.

197.98. *Ideas* would produce *Ideas*, and Impressions would produce Impressions: "*Dissimilar effects*"—i.e., inasmuch as you accept no other cause besides *Ideas* and Impressions, you can assert no reason for the fact of an *Idea* producing an *Impression*, or *vice-versa*.

199.200. The Impressed *Idea* does not differ *entirely* from the original cognition; nor is it indefinite, like the original abstract perception. Hence the *Impression* cannot be said to be either different from its cause, or identical with it. And the fact of the appearance of another condition does not militate against its permanent character; specially as people recognise the two states of the same *Idea* to be contiguous. If the *condition* and the *conditioned* were held to be identical, then the *Soul* itself, as endowed with the *Impression* of the original cognition, would be the *Impression*; while if the *conditioned* be held to differ from the *condition*, then the said *Soul* would only be the substratum of the *Impression*; and the *Impression* would be located in the *Soul*.

200.201. "*Lākshā*" is a kind of red dye produced out of a certain species of cochineal. If this dye is sprinkled over a lemon-blossom, the fruit becomes red.

lemon-blossom, it is only the colour (of the Lākshā) that is transferred to the fruit. For these reasons (detailed above) there can be no such thing as Vāsanā.

202. As a matter of fact, this denial of (the reality of external) objects,—following upon the assumption of such an "Impression-theory," which is incorrect and devoid of reason,—was declared by the Buddha, with the sole object of alienating the affections (of men from such worldly objects); and somehow or other, some people (the so-called followers of Banddha) fell into a mistake (and accepted it to its utmost extent, as the denial of all external substratum of cognitions).

Thus ends the Nirālambanavāda.

[The Refutation of Buddhist Idealism.]

THE ĀNYAVĀDA.

1. The discrepancies of the inferential argument having been pointed out, on the strength of the (nature of) cognitions,—another (scion of the Bauddha) comes forward with an argument based upon the incapability of the effect of cognitions (to give rise to any notions of external objects).

2. "You stick to Sense-perception, and the contradiction thereof you urge as an objection against our argument; now just consider the following points."

3. "Is it a fact that a cognition is able to function, only when such objects, as the *post* and the like, have an existence in the external world? Or is it that the cognition rests only in itself as the object cognised, and not in any extraneous object?"

4. "If it is only the external object that is perceived by the cognition, then the objections urged by you are right enough; but if it is the cognition itself which is cognised, then each and everyone of them falls to the ground."

5. "Here then, it must be admitted that all living creatures are cognisant of the well-established fact that cognisability belongs to *objects* in the shape of *blue, yellow, long, short, &c., &c.*"

6. "And we do not perceive any difference in the shape of the *cognition* and the *cognised*; nor do we have any clear idea of such and such properties as belong either to the one or to the other."

7. "Only that which is cognised can be said to have an existence; there can be no existence for that which is not cognised; inasmuch as such a thing cannot but be unreliable." Therefore it must be admitted that

203. Buddha himself never meant to entirely deny external objects. By such denial he only meant to impress upon the minds of his disciples that worldly objects were not worth striving after;—thus only echoing the Vedāntic denial of the external world.



there does exist an object with a shape, inasmuch as it is found to have the character of cognisability."

8. "Therefore to those who are thus investigating the matter, if the Cognition itself appear as having a shape; then the trustworthiness (of the existence of the form) would rest solely in the Cognition; and there would be no ground for postulating an extraneous object."

9. "If however, the shape belonged to the external object, then such an object would have to be accepted as existing, on the sole ground of its being cognised; and for the accomplishment of (this perception) we would also have to accept the existence of the cognition."

10. "Now then, which (of the two alternatives) is correct? It must be the cognition itself which has the form (as perceived). Why? Because we have found that it is one and the same object which has the shape, and is cognised as such."

11. "And hence if, what has the form were held to be some extraneous object, then its cognisability not being otherwise possible, we would have to postulate something else as the *cogniser*."

12. "And in this, over and above the well-defined and ascertained cognisable object having a form, we would be postulating a groundless *cogniser*, which would be formless and something altogether foreign to the cognisable object."

13. "And if, in order to avoid the postulating of such a groundless entity, you were to attribute the character of the *cogniser* to the object itself,—then the difference between us would be one of names only, as both of us would be holding the existence of only *one* entity."

14. "In any case, all that we do is to assert the identity of the *cogniser* (Cognition) and the *cognised* (object of cognition); the assumption of either externality or internality we hold to be utterly groundless."

15-17. "In my theory, though the real character of Cognition is naturally *pure*, yet in this beginningless world, there is an agglomeration of diverse dispositions (or impressions) born of foregoing cognitions; and through these, the cognition comes to appear in the various shapes of *blue*, &c., tinged with the character of the *cognised* and the *cogniser*, which latter, however, appear as if they were something quite apart (from the Cognition itself); and as such, the cognition does not stand in need of any extraneous object. The reciprocal causality of the Cognition and its faculty (in the shape of dispositions) is without a beginning (and as such, not faulty)."

18. "The assumption of one is certainly better than the assumption

18. You would be holding the *external object* to be both the *cogniser* and the *cognised*; while we hold *Cognition* itself to be both.

16.17. *Not faulty*—"Just as the reciprocal causality of the *seed* and the *tree* is not considered faulty.

18. We accept only one entity, the Cognition alone; and you accept two, the Cognition and the Object. Though we also postulate a faculty of cognition, in the shape

of many; and then again, the assumption of a diversity in the faculty (of an object) is more acceptable than that of a diversity in the objects themselves."

19-20. "For these reasons, inasmuch as it is accepted by both of us, it is far more reasonable to postulate the form to belong to the Cognition itself; for you however, such postulating would be possible only after you have postulated an (extraneous) object; because so long as this object has not been established, the Cognition can have no function (itself being without a substratum); and hence there would be a certain degree of remoteness (between the Cognition and the forms, *blue* and the rest). Whereas in my case, the Cognised would be such as is in close proximity and connection (with the *Cognition*)."

21. "For the following reason too, it is the Cognition which must be held to have the form; because being self-luminous, it is accepted, even by you, to be the means of illuminating the external object, which in itself is devoid of any luminosity."

22. "And so long as the factor of Cognition has not been comprehended, there can be no definite idea of the object apprehended thereby; because such apprehension depends upon the Cognition, like the jar under the light of a lamp."

23. "Even when the objects have appeared, there is no cognition of these, either because there is no illumination (of Consciousness), or because there is some impediment (to their cognition)."

24. "For the Cognition however, when it has once appeared, there can be no impediment; nor is it ever non-luminous; hence it cannot but be comprehended."

25. "Even prior to the comprehension of the object, you accept the appearance of the Cognition; as such, we would have the comprehension of the Cognition (even prior to that of the object). And if (even in the absence of any impediments) such comprehension were denied, then we could as reasonably deny its comprehension at all times (*i.e.*, even after the comprehension of the object)."

26. "Because, what is that which would accrue to the Cognition, subsequently (*i.e.*, after the comprehension of the object),—which did not belong to it before,—and accompanied by which it has never been really comprehended, but only comes to be known subsequently as 'comprehended'?"

27. "The luminosity (*i.e.*, the appearance of Cognition) too does not stand in need of the appearance of another Cognition; for if it were so then the comprehension of one cognition would require that of another, and so on *ad infinitum*; and there would be no resting ground for any Cognition."

of Impressions, yet the postulating of properties is simpler than that of the objects themselves.

28-29. "We find that, even in the absence of external objects, we have a reminiscence of the forms of such objects, following upon mere ideas thereof; and how could these reminiscences be possible, if, as you assert, the Cognition were not to appear as embracing the form of the object, and if, even in the past, the object were not comprehended only as preceded by such Cognition?"

30. "Even with regard to the cognitions of objects existing at the present time, we find people asserting—'this object is blue, because with regard to it I have such a notion.'"

31. "Therefore it is only when cognitions have been previously comprehended, that there is a comprehension of objects. Nor is any comprehension possible when the Cognitions are devoid of any definite forms."

32. "Because there is an absence of any discrimination (between the objective form and the Cognition), and because it is only such objects as have forms that are capable of being comprehended,—therefore it is Cognition alone (and not any extraneous object), that can ever be comprehended as having that form."

33. "No such assumption is possible as that—'in the beginning it is only a formless idea that is comprehended, and then latterly is comprehended the object endowed with a form;'"

34. "Because such an assertion could be made only after the difference between pure Cognition and the Cognition as endowed with a form has been only recognised. And prior to the comprehension of the Cognition, there can be no comprehension of the object,—as we have already proved."

35. "Nor can the form of the object be comprehended as superimposed upon the Cognition; because such a form cannot enter into the *inner* (cognition); nor is it able to suppress the object (as it would have to do, if the form were to be imposed upon the Cognition)."

36. "Nor could any evidence be brought forward in favour of such character (of the form of the object). For this very reason, we do not accept the position that the form is reflected upon the Cognition (as held by the *Sautrāntikas*)."

37. "It is only the man who has seen the surface of water, during the day, as without any reflection of the Moon,—that, seeing at night, the moon in the sky, can recognise its reflection in the water."

38. "Whereas in the case of Cognition, it has never before been seen without a form; nor has there been any idea (in the absence of Cognition) of the external object being endowed with a form; and hence in this case, there can be no such notion of reflection."

39. "And again, what sort of reflection could there be, in the case of (incorporeal objects like) sound, odour, taste, &c. ? And how could there be any notion of the form belonging to the object, when it is distinctly comprehended as belonging to the Cognition?"

40. "Being, as they are, located (separately) in the external world, and inside (the man),—there can be no mutual contact between the object and the Cognition; and hence no amount of stupidity could give rise to any notion of the identity (of the form of the object and the Cognition)."

41. "Since we do not find any person who is not so deceived, there can be no such assumption of stupidity (as held by you). And even if such deception could be assumed, it would apply equally to both (Cognition and Object)."

42. "And for this reason, it is not proper to assert that the 'form' is a property of the contact (of the Cognition with the Object): there can be no such contact, because of the difference of their positions, and because of the Cognition being immaterial (and incorporeal) and the Object being material (and corporeal)."

43. "Such contact cannot be said to consist of *contemporinity* or (coequality); because that would apply to the whole Universe. Nor is there any such position of the object as is face to face with the Cognition."

44. "If such contact be held to be universal, then *taste*, &c., would come to be perceived even by means of the eye; and of all entities, the atomic forms therein encased would also come to be perceived."

45. "Nor can it be held that the mere existence of the object, as an object of cognition, constitutes the said *contact*; because of what sort would the character of the object be, prior to the comprehension of its forms?"

46. "Because no entity can be said to be an object of cognition, unless it has been recognised. Then, the fact of its having such and such a form would depend upon its character of being the object of cognition; and the fact of its being such an object would depend upon the fact of its having such a form (and thus there would be the fault of 'mutual inter-dependence')."

47. "The assertion of the existence of the two (Cognition and the Object) as free from all form, and also that of their contact, and the like, would be possible only when the (Cognition and the Object) have been rightly discriminated in their real forms."

48-49. "But in the present case the existence of the object is not

40 The Object exists in the external world, while the Cognition is within the man's mind; therefore no one could mistake the one for the other. This is aimed at the theory that the form really belongs to the object, while, through close proximity, it is mistaken to belong to the Cognition.

43 Because Cognitions have no face.

44 If the cognition of the jar were held to be in contact with the jar, in all its forms, then the *taste* of the jar, as well as its atomic molecules would be perceived, on the presentation of the jar to the eye,—which is an absurdity.

48-49 "Or after"—because according to the Baudhdha, the Cognition is no sooner produced than destroyed. For this reason, unless the two are perceived together, and



comprehended either prior to or after (the comprehension of the Cognition). And it has already been asserted that the cognisable object does not exist apart from the form. Therefore your theory of the contact of Cognition with the Object is without any foundation."

49-50. "Nor can the assumption of the object be said to be for the sake of the diversity of Cognitions. Because where have we found such diversity to be due to objects, that we will have such an assumption?"

50-51. "And again, how can there be any production, of Diversity and Form by means of something (*i.e.*, contact) that is itself formless? Nor is it possible that the form of the Cognition should originate in an object which is itself formless. Thus then your position becomes very precarious."

51-52. "It is only by means of Memory and Dream-Cognition that you could support (your theory of) formlessness; for in these, there is no contact with an object; mere 'Impressions' being held to be the cause (of the forms of such Cognitions); therefore it is (the agency of) these Impressions alone that could apply to waking Cognition also."

53-54. "Thus then, both by affirmative and negative inference, we get at the fact of the form belonging to the Idea. Nor is there any instance to show the existence of an external object, independently of the Idea,—as we have of the Idea, independently of the external object. Therefore your 'Contact-theory' could be tenable, only with reference to Impressions, even if the Idea were accepted to be formless."

55. "Nor is there any reason to suppose that 'both (Idea and Object) have one and the same form'; (1) because of the difference in their positions, (2) because of the absence of any contact, and (3) because of the absence of any definite notions of the two as distinct."

56. "Thus, for the same reason, (inasmuch as the two are not recognised as such) it cannot be held that 'the non-discrimination of the one from the other is due to the extreme likeness of the two,; because it is only when the difference has been recognised, that there can be any notion of likeness,—which could not be possible if such difference were not already recognised; for in that case, it would be as unreal as 'sky flowers.'"

57. "Similarly in the case of such misconceptions as the 'duplicate moon' and the like, the real state of objects is other than what is perceived;

their respective forms have been rightly discriminated, there can be no such notions as those referred to in the Kārikā.

59-61. You hold that before the contact, the Cognition and the object are both formless. Under the circumstances, how could mere Contact, which is itself formless, give rise to the form of Cognition and its diversity? Nor is it possible for the object, which you hold to be formless, to impart a form to the Cognition. Your theory thus becomes untenable.

61-62. The forms of Dream-cognition, &c., could not be explained, except through Impressions. Therefore we could also attribute the forms of present (waking) Cognitions to the same agency of Impressions, which are without beginning, without end,

and hence the form that the Idea would take in such cases, could not be said to depend upon any extraneous object."

58-59. "In the case of the use of such words as 'Nakshatra' (Neuter) 'Tārakā' (Feminine), and 'Tishya' (Masculine), and 'Dārāh' (Masculine Plural)—it is not possible for contradictory genders, &c., to apply to one and the same object. And similarly (with regard to the single object, a fair woman, f.i.) there could not be such diverse notions as that of a *corpse*, &c., belonging respectively to an ascetic, a licentious person and a dog."

59-60. "With regard to one and the same object we have the notions of its being *long* and *short*, in comparison with different objects; and with regard to the same object, *jar*, f.i. we have the notions of its *being a jar*, *being earthy*, *being a substance*, and *being predicable*;—all these notions simultaneously appear in the observer; and this could never be the case, if there really existed any such single object (as the *jar*)."

61. "For in one and the same object, the application of contradictory forms is not possible. As for *Ideas*, they are different in each case, and as such adjustable to the (diversity in the) force (of Impressions)."

62. "That form which the Idea takes, independently (of any extraneous entities),—in that form, you might postulate the object; but in no case, is any Idea brought about, in keeping with (or in accordance with) any external object."

63. "Thus then, in as much as the form of the object depends upon the Idea, how can any one assume (the existence of the external) object? And as for the Idea, so long as no form has been imposed upon it, it could certainly rest in itself."

(Thus ends the expounding of the Ānyavāda):

(NOW BEGINS THE REFUTATION OF THE ĀNYAVĀDA).

64. It is not so. Because you hold one and the same thing (Idea) to be both the *cogniser* and the *cognised*; whereas you cannot have any instance to show that such duplicate character belongs to any single object.

65. Because Fire, &c., that are known to be *illuminators* (of the

58-59 The words, "Nakshatra," "Tārā," "Tishya," all signify *stars*; and so if the object *star* had any real existence in the external world, then names of such contradictory genders could not be applied to it. In the same manner, the word "Dārā" is always used in the Masculine Plural, which could not be the case, if any such thing as the *woman* (signified by the word), really existed in the external world. And again, in the case of a fair woman, the ascetic looks upon her as disgusting corpse, the licentious man looks upon her as an object of enjoyment, while the dog looks upon it as an article of food, which diversity would not be possible if the woman had a real existence.

59-60 One finger appears long in comparison with one, while shorter in comparison with another finger.

62 The form of the *Idea* may be taken to formulate the form of the object; not vice versa.



jar, &c.), cannot be said to be themselves *illuminable*, because they do not stand in need of any other illuminator.

66-67. And whenever they come to be cognised, it is only a Sense-organ that could be their cogniser; while in the cognising of the Sense-organ, the character of the *cogniser* would belong to the Idea. And when this Idea itself comes to be cognised, we shall have another Idea for its cogniser; and in no case can the same object be both (*cogniser* and the *cognised*).

67. "But even you hold the 'Self' (*Ātmā*) to have the character of both, cogniser and cognised."

68-69. (Though the Self is really one, yet) being somehow or other, taken as diverse, in the shape of its diverse properties,—we attribute the character of the *cogniser* to (the Self in the character of) the Idea, and the character of the *cognised* to (the Self in the character of) substance and the rest. If it be urged that 'then, (even in your own theory) there is no absolute difference (between the cogniser and the cognised),—(we reply) where have you found me accepting (or holding) such *absolute* difference? The fact of the word 'I' applying only to the *Pratyagātman* is based upon the extreme proximity (of the cognising 'I' with the cognised 'object').

70. As matter of fact, the notion, intermixed with the use of the word 'I', is applicable to the nominative (*kartā*) of the cognition;—though in reality it is really restricted to the agency of the Self only.

71. Nor is there any comprehension of the forms of the Means of Cognition, (*i.e.*, the Sense), the Cognition itself and the Cogniser (Self); and consequently no cognisability can belong to the Idea, as before (in the case of the Self),—even though it is really non-different (from the other factors).

72. If the cognition of one form were to be accepted to have another form for its object,—then, why could not the cognition of an object be held to have the form of the Idea?

73. And when it is held that the cognising and cognisable entities are identical, then the comprehension of any one of these would bring about a comprehension of both.

74. At the time when such cognisable forms as the *blue*, &c., are

68.69 'The fact of the word, &c.'—This anticipates the following objection: "Even in your theory, if there be a difference between the *cogniser* and the *cognised*, how could the *Bhāṣya* assert that the word 'I' applies only to the *Pratyagātman*, the Human Soul?" The sense of the reply is that the idea by itself is not the *cogniser*; the character whereof belongs only to the Human Soul as endowed with this idea; and again, it is this very Human Soul which, in the shape of substance, &c., comes to be the object of cognition, while substance &c., by themselves, can never be the object cognised, therefore though in the two cases there is a difference among the accessories, yet the substratum of these accessories—*viz.*, the Human Soul—being only one, it is only right to hold the word 'I' to be applicable to the Human Soul.

comprehended, we do not come across any Idea which has the form of the cognising (cognition).

75. And if there were a non-difference, we would have an idea of this (cognising entity) also; or else there might be no cognition of the cognised object either, just as there is none of the cognising factor.

76. In the same manner, the comprehension of the cognising factor would always lead to that of the cognised object as well; the more so, as the Bauddhas hold the Cognising factor (*i.e.*, Cognition or Idea) to be pure and formless.

77. But no such (pure) Idea would be possible, if it were to be non-different from the cognised Object (which has a form); or else (*i.e.*, if the cognised Object were not to be comprehended), the Cognising factor too would not be comprehended, just as the cognised Object is not comprehended (because the two are held to be non-different).

78. And again, as the comprehension of the cognisable Object would not lead to that of the cognising Idea,—and as the comprehension of the cognising Idea would not lead to that of the cognisable Object,—there would be non-comprehension of both of these (because they are held to be non-different).

79. The clause (in the Bhashya), “it (cognition) is connected with the external world,” serves to point out the fact that there is a comprehension of the cognisable Object, even without any idea of the Cognising Idea.

80. But inasmuch as the fact has to be proved to an opponent, we cannot have the fact of its relation to the external world, as a sound argument for proving the form of external objects, (because the opponent does not admit of the reality of an external world).

81. Therefore the sense of the Bhashya is that the word “external” denotes the *cognisable objects*, blue, yellow, &c., as apart from the Cognising Ideas (or means of cognition), Sense-perception and the rest.

82. This will be explained in the passage (of the Bhashya) “Cognition is not comprehended beforehand.” In some places again, it is only the comprehension of the Cognising (‘Idea’) that is indicated:

83. (*e.g.*), ‘I do not remember if any object had been comprehended by me at that time,’—in such cases, people remember the appearance of the Cognising Idea, independently of the form of the cognised Object.

84. Thus then, if there were no difference (between the *cogniser* and the *cognised*), the remembrance of the one would have brought about the remembrance of the other; whereas as a matter of fact, we find that there is, in the instance cited, a remembrance only of the Cognising Idea; hence it must be concluded that it is the Cognising Idea alone that is comprehended (in the case referred to).

82 The Bhashya passage here referred to is this: “It is true that the idea is originated beforehand; but it is not so comprehended; inasmuch as sometimes we come across cases where an object that has been known is spoken of as unknown.”

85. And the same conclusion also follows from the absolute invariable concomitance of the Cognising Idea with the cognised Object; and the reminiscence of the two does not appear in one and the same form. Therefore from both affirmative and negative concomitance we find that the two are entirely different.

86. (*obj.*) "Inasmuch as it is a part of the cognised Object that is comprehended by means of a part of the Cognising Idea, it cannot be rightly urged that 'the Cognising Idea would also be comprehended', because there is no other cogniser (that would comprehend the former Idea)."

87. "And it is not possible that the Idea should be comprehended by means of the cognised Object;—because this latter has not the faculty (for such comprehension). And if the Object were to be the cogniser, then the duplicate form of the Idea would entirely disappear."

88. "And further, if the *cogniser* were also made the *cognised*, then we would have only the *cognised*, all in all. And hence the absence of the form of any one of the two would lead to the negation of both."

89-91. "And again it is only by appearance (predominance) and disappearance (suppression) that we get at the comprehension of cognisability and non-cognisability (respectively): *e.g.*, of the lamp-light, &c., we perceive (at night) only the form (and not the heat, &c.); while during the day, those that are close to the fire, comprehend only the touch (warmth); and when there is proximity of an odoriferous substance, there is perception of the odour alone. And just as in all these cases the absence of the perception of other qualities is due to suppression,—so in the case of the Cognising Idea and the cognised Object, there would be no comprehension of any other form (save the one that is not suppressed)."

92. "It may be that certain things, though they are non-different

87 If the object were made the cogniser of the idea, then both the idea and the object would possess the character of the cogniser; whereas the Mīmāṃsaka holds that an idea has two forms that of the object cognised and that of the cognising idea.

88 You would have no *cogniser proper*, every thing becoming the *cognised*. "Hence the absence, &c." If the cognising idea and the cognised object be held to be identical, then, according to you, the two being dependent upon each other, if the one ceased to exist the other would also do the same; and hence the cognising Idea would become devoid of any form; this would be equal to a total denial of the existence of the cognising Idea.

89-91 At night the brightness of the lamp predominates over its other properties; while during the day it is the heat of the fire that predominates over its other characteristics, and so forth; whence we find that comprehension is due to predominance. For this reason too, in the case of the Idea and the Object we have the comprehension of the form of the one or the other according as one or the other happens to be the predominating element. That is to say, we have a comprehension of the form of the idea, when the idea predominates over the object; while the reverse is the case when the object predominates over the Idea.

92 This anticipates the following objection: "Colour, &c., being comprehended as different from one another, it is possible that one may predominate over the other

from the cognised Object, may not be cognised (when the Object is cognised); just as, even when sound is perceived, such properties as its *permanence or transitoriness &c.*, may not be comprehended at all."

93. "Or if you urge this objection, on the ground of non-difference (of the Cognising Idea and the cognised Object),—then (we ask)—when one portion of it has been comprehended, how is it that the other portion is not comprehended also.?"

94. "For these reasons, we conclude the fact to be that there is a comprehension of that alone which is capable of being comprehended at the time; and as for both—as urged by you,—they cannot be so comprehended, simply because they are not capable of being so."

95. (Reply.) When the object is held to be absolutely single, whence should there be any possibility of its capability or incapability? And again, how could you assume the appearance or suppression of the *single object* itself?

96. And further, the suppression of one part of your object would also lead to the suppression of its other part; and thus the whole object being suppressed,—its comprehensibility would be impossible.

97. In the same manner, the *incapability* of an object too could only be based upon an assumption. As for the instances that have been cited (by the objector), in as much as there is a diversity of form, &c amongst them, such "appearance" and "suppression," &c., could be brought forward to support our view also.

but how can this be possible in the case of the *cogniser* and the *cognised*, which are both identical?" The Sense of the reply is that we do not comprehend any cognising Idea, to be non-different from the cognised object; and hence it is quite possible that even when there is a comprehension of the one, there may be no idea of the other, Though the properties of *permanence*, &c., are such as are not comprehended apart from the objects themselves, yet that is not the case with such properties as *Colour* and the rest, which are perceived even apart from the objects to which they belong.

98. "Objection"—noted in note 92. If there be non-difference between the two, the comprehension of one must lead to the comprehension of the other; and hence there can be no such non-comprehension as has been urged against us.

99. "Capable:"—That which has appeared as predominating over others is "capable." It has been urged above, (K. 85 *et seq.*) by the Mimāṃsaka, that if the Çūnyavāda theory were accepted, then, out of the two—the cognising Idea and the cognised object—, if one were comprehended, both would be comprehended; and if one were not comprehended, none would be comprehended. The present Kārikā objects to this view, and says that both of them cannot be comprehended at the same time, for the simple reason that at one and the same time, both of them could not have the aforesaid "capability;" specially as the form of the one is bound to predominate over and suppress that of the other.

100. [With this Kārikā begins the refutation of the arguments brought forward by the Çūnyavāda, in Kārikās 86 to 94]. Because two contradictory properties belonging to the same object would split the object into two parts.

101. As before, so now, if *incapability* belonged to one part, the other part would also become incapable, on account of the said identity; and thence there would be no comprehensibility. "Instances"—of the Lamp, &c; as shown in K. 89-90.



98. Even if among Form and the rest, there were no absolute difference, there would be various diverse developments of the form of the substance itself.

99-100. You have asserted (in K. 92) that "though there is non-difference yet it is not comprehensible;" and (on this we ask)—when there is a difference between the notions of such properties as *non-eternality* and the like (apart from those of the objects possessing such properties), how can there be such a non-difference? For, without doubt, excepting the distinctness of the idea, there is no other ground for differentiating a comprehensible object (from others).

100. Nor is the difference restricted to (difference in) time and form only.

101. It is the relation of the causes with the effects that is called 'non-eternality' (the fact of being *caused*); while in certain cases, it is the disjunction of the constituent parts that is known as "non-eternality."

102. In the case of such immaterial entities, as the Intellect and the like, destructibility (or non-eternality) consists in their existence in the pure form of the Self. By "Eternality" is only meant everlasting existence (permanence); and it is this (existence) that is called "Entity."

103. Relation with the Means of Right Notion and Knowledge are called Predicability and Knowability (respectively). In all these cases, there is a difference in some form or other.

104. Therefore, just as in the case of Colour &c., even in the absence of any difference of time, &c., there is a diversity, based upon a difference of ideas (or notions), so, in the same manner, you should accept in the present case also.

98 Though Substance being one, its properties of Colour &c., as identical therewith, would also be one, and as such the difference among them would not be absolute,—yet there is always an intrinsic difference among them, as regards their *form*, &c., and Substance too, though in itself only one, becomes diverse, in accordance with the diversity of the various forms of its properties.

99-100 It has been urged in K. 92, that, the properties of *eternality*, &c., are non-different from the object "Sound," yet we do not comprehend such properties. This Kārikā refutes that assertion.

100 There being many other grounds of difference, chiefly the distinctness of the notion.

101 This Kārikā shows that we have a notion of non-eternality apart from none eternal substances, whence the assertion in R. 92 becomes false.

102 When the Self attains the state of purity, all its accessories, in the shape of the intellect and the rest, cease to exist; and in this lies the non-permanent character of these latter. "This"—that is, existence without the permanence is what is called 'entity.'

103 "Difference"—of such properties as eternality and its contrary, from such objects as Sound and the like.

104 You should not restrict all difference to time and place only.

105. Absolute difference, we do not accept in the case of any object; because Objects, in the form of "entities," do not differ from one another.

106. All (such properties as) 'non-eternality' and the like are comprehended in reference to action, cause, &c.; and when there is no cognition of these action, &c., then they (non eternality, &c.), are not cognised, notwithstanding their (supposed) non-difference (from the objects possessing such properties).

107. In a Cognition, however, there is no such difference; nor does it stand in need of anything else. If it be urged that there is a mutual need (between the *cognition* and the *cognised*),—(we reply that) the two are always close to each other (and as such there can be no such need).

108. (Obj.). "In the case of the cognition of *blue*, &c., there is no such idea as that 'this is the cognition' and 'that the cognised'; and as such, how can you assert mutual need?"

109. There may not be such a need; but even then, the conception would have a duplicate form. For if there were no such conception, how could the duplicacy of form belong to the Cognition?

110. The conception of the form of the cognising Cognition, that is assumed through the peculiarities of cognitions one after the other, is only inferred from remembrance.

111-112. If the Cognition in the first be assumed to have only one form, then all other conceptions in connection therewith cannot but be of

105 Since all objects, as objects or entities, are identical, therefore we cannot accept any absolute difference among them.

101 Though the Mīmāṃsaka does not admit of any such mutual requirements, as asserted in the first half,—yet even if it be necessary to accept such requirement, when one is in close proximity to the other there can be no requirement that is not already supplied.

109 "Duplicate form"—that is as *cognition* and the *cognised* object. Though cognition is in reality one only, yet it consists of the character of both the cognition and the cognised; and as such, even when it is perceived in its single form, there is a conception of its duplicate character; inasmuch as it includes the characteristics of both.

[110-114 These Kārikās embody the view of the opponent in the mouth of the Mīmāṃsaka].

110 "Assumed, &c."—A cognition when produced has the form of the cognised object; and subsequently it appears in the form of the cognising cognition. Thus then, owing to the peculiarities of one cognition after the other, there is a remembrance that what now appears as *cogniser* is the same that had appeared as the *cognised* object; and hence it is inferred that the cognition appears in a duplicate form.

111-112 If the first cognition of the Jar were in the form of the Jar alone, then the second cognition in connection therewith—namely, the notion that 'I know the Jar'—would also be of the same form; and as such we could not assert any difference among the series of cognitions in connection with any particular object. If however the first cognition were of the form of the *cogniser* and the *cognised*, then alone, there being an accumulation of different forms, there would be a difference among the cognitions themselves.

the same form. And it is for this reason that the difference between the *cognition of the jar* and the *cognition of that (cognition)* is not fully established. It is only in the conception of the form of the cognising cognition that there can be any accumulation of forms.

113-114. Where the first conception appears in a duplicate form, and this is followed by a third conception (such as "I have that conception"),—in that case, this third conception as well as the former two are both manifested; and thus, there being an augmentation of forms, the following ones would differ from the preceding ones. And again, since there is a subsequent remembrance of the conception in the form of the comprehended object, the comprehending conception must have been cognised before, as such.

115. But as a matter of fact, we do not come across any such accumulations of forms; nor can the conception be defined, without mentioning the object (of cognition).

116. Therefore Cognition by itself being only one, it is established that the difference in the conceptions is due to a diversity among the objects of cognition; and as such what business have we to postulate another form (for the cognition itself)?

117. Just as between corporeal objects there is a natural difference, so too, in the present case, though two conceptions may have the similarity of being incorporeal, yet, could not these too have a natural difference between themselves?

118. It is a false assertion that after remembrance, (the Conception is inferred to be duplicate). Because its cognition is at that time brought about by "Apparent Inconsistency" only.

119. You have asserted that "since both the conception and the comprehended object are identical in form, therefore when one is comprehended, the other is also comprehended;" but it is not so; and certainly, you have not been questioned by me simply to afford you occasion for making any wild assertions you like.

120. No one recognises the character of both the Comprehender

115 With this commences the refutation of the arguments urged in K. 110-114. The meaning of the Kārikā is that the cognition or conception is by itself pure; and its object is an external one, which however does not assume the form of the cognition. The reason, why the object is named in expressing a cognition, is that without the mention of the object the cognition could not be defined.

116 "Another form"—that is, the duplicate form, partaking of the character of the cogniser and the cognised.

118 In fact there is no remembrance in the case of introspection—"The Jar has been known by me." The fact is that when we remember a Jar, finding the remembrance to be apparently inexplicable, we assert it to be due to Conception. And it is only with reference to this conception that we use such language as "I know the Jar."

120 The Bauddha holds all cognitions to be resolved into perception; hence he can

and the Comprehended, with regard to one single object. Nor can such duplicate character be got at by means of Inference; specially when all conceptions are held to be only forms of Sense-Perception.

121. It is only one form that is comprehended; and yet you assume a second; why then cannot you assume a thousand such forms, to be included in that single conception?

122. "But there is a natural difference between the Comprehender and the Comprehended." That will only strengthen our theory. "But not so; because they are still identical in their common character of 'conception.'"

123. But, then, how is it that of one and the same object, you assume both difference and non-difference? In so doing you accept the doctrine of the Sāṅkhya, having renounced the teachings of Buddha himself.

124. For if the Comprehender and the Comprehended be one (as held by Buddha), whence this assertion of difference (between the two)? And if they are different, how could you assert them to be one?

125. The Comprehender and the Comprehended being both identical, and consisting in one and the same conception,—there could be a conception of only one form,—be it either in that of the Comprehender (alone), or in that of the Comprehended (alone).

126. And then again, if one of the two (Comprehender or the Comprehended) were suppressed, the other would also be suppressed (since both are identical); and thus then there would be an absence of both the constituent parts of a conception, which would thereby lose its character altogether; thence there would be an absolute negation of it.

127. Or again, on account of its non-difference from two mutually different entities (the Comprehender and the Comprehended), the character of *conception* too would come to be different,—like its own self. And thus would be established a double entity (the Comprehended object apart

never have recourse to inference, &c.; while by perception alone, no one can ever recognise the said duplicate character.

122 The *Sautrantikas* and the *Vaibhasikas* hold that the two are different in themselves, while both are non-different from Conception; and in this much, the two may be said to be identical.

124 "Assert them to be one"—as you must do, in accordance with Buddha's teachings.

125 The *Kārikā* thus expresses the reasoning in the syllogistic form: "The Comprehended and the Comprehender, have only one character, because both are identical with Conception, which is uniform; and thus both being of only one form, the Conception too would be in the form of the Comprehended alone, or in that of the Comprehender only."

127 "Like its own self"—i.e., just as it has the character of the Comprehended, it must be different from the Comprehender.



from the Conception comprehending it, which you sought to disprove, and which is all that we seek to establish).

128. If, however, it be only as a matter of convention that you name these entities "Jñāna"; then that may be so. Or the word 'Jñāna,' when applied to the object, may be explained as "that which is known" [the affix having an objective force]; and when applied to Cognition, the affix may be explained as either the Nominal or the Instrumental (in the former case, the meaning being 'knowledge,' in the latter, 'that by which anything is cognised').

129. In any case, the duality of existence (in the shape of *Comprehension* and the *Comprehended*) has been established; and such being the case, you may make use of whatever words you like; and we have got nothing to say against the word.

130. If it is urged that—"though there is a difference (between the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*) yet the *Comprehended* may only be in the form of another conception (and not any external object as you take it),"—then, we ask, what is the ground for holding the *Comprehended* Cognition to be a *Cognition* at all? If for such grounds you urge only those that have been explained above (in K. 128), then we also accept them.

131. There is however no such character as "Jñāna" (Conception or Cognition) that extends over both (the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*); and as for any such distinct class as "Jñāna," you do not accept any (class apart from the individuals).

132. And even if there were any such class as "Jñāna" distinct from both (the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*),—then (in that case) to these two, the character of Jñāna could never belong. And thus there being a total absence of the form (or character) thereof (of Jñāna), there would result an absolute negation of Jñāna.

133. Then again, (in the case of Jñāna being something distinct from the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*), it could be related to each of these, either one by one, or as pervading over each in its entirety; in any case, it would be open to the fault of being made up of constituent parts—a fault that is urged against the *Vaiçāshikas*.

134. The objections that have been urged by the *Bauddhas* against the Class-theory, would also apply to the theory that the *Class* "Conception" bears a definite relation to two mutually different conceptions (one following after the other).

135. If again the class "Conception" be said to be identical with

128 If you accept any of these explanations we have nothing to say against you.

129 If the class 'Jñāna' were distinct from both the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*, then these two could not have the character of Jñāna; hence the application of this name to them would only be a misnomer.

130 Is the class related to the whole of each individual, or does the one class

these two, then the aforesaid (Karika 127) difference would apply to your case. And as for the theories of "Similarity" (between the Individual and the Class) and "Apōha" (negation of the contradictory), these will be met and refuted later on.

136. But as there is no other substance (than conception), even an "Apōha" can not be possible for you. Because for the Idealist, there is no such thing as "non-Idea" (or non-Conception) that could be said to be negated (by the "Apōha").

137. Then again, the negation of a negative factor is in no way possible. (Granted that it is so, even then) this negative factor would be a substance other (than the Idea); as the character of a substance would doubtless belong to it on account of its being an object of negation.

138. Thus then, if an Idea (or Conception) were held to be the negation of non-Idea, you would have a new substance other (than the Idea). If you urge that "the negation would be only an assumed one (and so no new substance would have to be accepted)," we deny this, because there can be no assumption of that which can never exist.

139. Your assumed "non-Idea" too would only be an "Idea" partaking of the character of "non-Cognition," and hence it would be "Idea" alone that would be held to be the object of negation.

140. And certainly, in any theory of "Class," there can be no negation of the object (or class) by itself. For never can there be a negation of a *tree* by the *tree* itself.

141. If the Idea itself were to be negated, then you could not establish your own "Idea." For the character of a *tree* cannot belong to other objects, such as the *jar* and the like, which are negated by the "tree."

142. Thus then, it would be a "non-Idea" (or non-Conception) alone that would be a real entity; and thence would there be an Identity (of the *Comprehended* with the *Comprehender*). And what substratum would this notion of "non-Conception" have?

143. For you cannot admit of any such object of comprehension as "non-Conception," free from all touch of "Conception" (or Idea) itself. *Objection* : "But, since it is only a substance (other than the Idea) that we

permeate through all the individuals? If the first, then there is a difference between the individuals and the class; while in the second case, it would be necessary for the class to have parts, in absence whereof it could not permeate through all individuals.

144 If Ideas are negated by Ideas, the character of "Idea" could not belong to the Idea,—an absurdity.

145 You do not admit of any entity save that of "Idea"; and certainly, this could not be the substratum of *non-Conception*.

146 In the second half, the Buddhist urges that he does not deny Negation, but only all *substances* other than the Idea.



deny, why could not we comprehend the negation of the substance denied?"

144. (We reply). One who does not comprehend positive entities (like the *hill*, &c.), what can be said of him with regard to (the Comprehension of) negations? And as for the fact of having an end in itself, it is equally common to both (the Conception of a positive and that of a negative entity).

145. Therefore (in any Idea) the object of comprehension could be either another "Idea," or the self of the same Idea; and how could we ever recognise a contradictory entity (such as *non-Conception*) to be the object of the *comprehension* (of a Conception)?

146. Just as in the case of "heat," there *can* be no conception of "non-heat," so too there can be no conception of "non-Conception" with regard to a "Conception." For these reasons, if there were no other substance than the Idea, there could be no object of negation.

147. For these reasons, then, we conclude that the character of the "Idea" cannot belong equally to the *Comprehended* and the *Comprehender*; and hence it must be held to belong to one of them only.

148-49. Then too, we hold this character (of Idea) to belong to the *Comprehender* only; since this is admitted by both of us. And when the duality of objects has been proved, names may be given to them in accordance with one's choice: Both may be called "Idea," or both may be called "Object," or even the Object may be called the "Comprehender."

149-50. Since Ideas do not appear simultaneously, therefore two Ideas cannot have between themselves the relation of the "*Conceived*" (object) and the "*means of Conception*" (as held by the Idealist)—this is what has been asserted (by the Bhāṣhya) in the passage referred to: "It (Idea) is momentary, &c." Therefore the object (of Cognition) must be something other (than the Idea itself.)

150-51. Even when the two Ideas appear simultaneously, in as much as they are independent of each other, there is an absence of any such relation (between the two Ideas) as that between the "*Conceived*" (object) and the "*means of Conception*;" because both (Ideas) are equally devoid of action and instrumentality.

144 The Bauddha denies positive entities, such as the Mountain, the River, and the like, which, however, are comprehensible by all men. Under the circumstances, how can he comprehend a Negation? If the Bauddha urges that his Conception has an end in itself, and as such, there is nothing impossible in the comprehension of a Negation,—we reply, that this is equally applicable to the comprehension of positive entities; why then, should you deny these latter?

145-49 "Admitted by both of us": the Bauddha attributes the character of "Idea" to the *Comprehended* as well as to the *Comprehender*; and it is to the former alone that such character is attributed by the Mimāṃsaka. Thus then in the matter of the *Comprehended*, there is an agreement.



151-52. It is the Conjunction (or relation) of the Object and the Idea with regard to a Conception—that is known as the “relation of cause and effect”; and we do not come across such (causal relation) anywhere else.

152-53. And again, in the case of the right and left horns of an animal (two objects appearing simultaneously), there can be no such fixed rule as that ‘this is the effect, and that the cause’; nor can both be both, because that would lead to the fault of “reciprocity.”

153-54. And people knowing the real character of the causal relation, do not define it as mere concomitance, independently of all notion of Sequence.

154-55. (Conversely also) we find that though, at times, the cow would follow the horse, this mere Sequence could not constitute causal relation. Just as in the case of two moments (of Cognition), when appearing in different series of Cognitions, though occurring simultaneously,—and also in the case of the different properties of the jar (though occurring simultaneously),—(there can be no causal relation.)

155-56. For these reasons, an entity can be said to be the effect of another, only when the former is such that it can come about *only* when the latter has already existed.

156-57. You have brought forward the case of the *lamp and the light* emitted by it, as the instance of the simultaneity of the cause and the effect. But in this case also, there is a minute point of time (intervening between the appearance of the lamp and that of the light); though this is imperceptible; just as is the case with the piercing (with a needle) of the hundred petals of the lotus.

158. The same refutation would also apply, even if you assert the simultaneity of the two parts (of Cognition, i.e., the *Comprehended* and the *Comprehender*.)

158-59. Nor can it be urged that “by means of a transference of potentialities, the substratification would be gradual”; because in that case, the object of Comprehension would have passed away, and it would be unreasonable to assert (its) identity (with the present notion).

155-56 That is, when there is a necessary and invariable sequence between the two.

153 The reasons that have been urged, in the refutation of the definition of mere *simultaneity* constituting the causal relation.

158-59 The sense of the objection is this: “Granted that there is no simultaneity between the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*; it may be that they may appear, one after the other; and thus the one that goes before may be the *Comprehended* object of that which follows; and though by the time that the latter appears, the former will have passed away, yet it will surely have left traces of its potentialities upon the latter. The latter Conception is brought about by means of the impressions left by the former Conception, which thus comes to be *Comprehended* by it.” The sense of the reply is that that which has passed away can never be *Comprehended* as “present;” and hence, no Comprehension of a foregone Conception is possible.



159-61. What is comprehended by Memory, too, is only the Comprehended Object, as intermixed with its past character; and the same could be said in the present case also (if things were to be as you assert them to be). In a dream however, it can never be so; because dream-consciousness is always false; as in a dream that which is not present is cognised as present; and this must be a mistaken notion, because it is always set aside by a contradictory Cognition (in the waking state). But there is no such mistake in the present case (of ordinary Conception).

161-62. Therefore, of all ideas of Sense-perception, the past cannot be said to be the object; simply because it is *past*; exactly like the operations of these (Ideas) in past lives. Or the fact of these 'not being Cognised as such (as past)' may be laid down as the Reason; the instance (in this case) being "future entities."

163. Even if it be the *past*, what proof have you got for the assertion that 'it is not an *Object* but a *Conception*'?

163-64. The *past* Conception that you have assumed to be the object of Comprehension (by the present Conception),—is it of the form of the *Comprehender*, or of that of the *Comprehended*, or of *both*? If it be of the form of the *Comprehended* alone, then it comes to be a pure *Object* for you, only in a different name.

165-66. And in as much as it is not cognised at any time except its own (in the *past*), there could not be any transference of energy (or potentiality). Just as there can be no such transference from a Conception that has not yet appeared, or from one occurring in another series, so in the same manner, there can be no transference from a Conception which is not strongly realised, and which disappears as soon as it is produced.

166-67. If (secondly), the past Cognition were in the form of the *Comprehender* alone, then it could never have the character of the *Comprehended*; and then in comparison with (and with reference to) what would it be the *Comprehender*?

167-68. As for the duplicate form of Conception, it has already been refuted (K. 64 et. seq.) And (if a Conception were to have such

159-61. The objector urges that in a dream, past events are Cognised as present; and is met by the argument that Dream-Cognition is always mistaken; and as such, cannot be admitted as an instance of Right Notion.

161-62 The reasoning is put into the syllogistic form. "*Past lives*": just as past lives are not objects of Cognition in the present birth. The second syllogistic argument is this: "Ideas of Sense-perception do not comprehend past objects; because these are not cognised as such; like future objects."

165-66 There is another discrepancy in this alternative: An Impression is only such as has comprehended its object; and the former Conception is solely in the form of an object of Comprehension. Consequently, prior to the appearance of the latter Conception, (of which alone the former could be the object), the former could, in no way, be Cognised. And as such, it could not transfer its potentialities, in the shape of impressions; and in the absence of this transference, we could not have the latter conception comprehending the former.



a duplicate character) it would also be ordinarily recognised as such (which is not the case); and even if such were the case, the latter Conception would not stand in need of another (foregoing Conception as the *Comprehended* object), for its full cognisance.

168-69. If you hold that a Conception has the duplicate form (of the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*), then all right notions would end in the Conception itself (as you declare that the Conception cognises itself); and hence, the past could never be an object of the Conception. If (the latter Conception were) of the same form as the former (Conception which you assert to be the) object of Comprehension, then (of the latter Conception) the very character of the *Comprehender* would disappear.

170. And if it were solely in the form of the *Comprehender*, then there would be no object (of Comprehension); because there is no similarity between the two. And as for the transference of potentialities (urged by you), we never come across any such transference.

171. And the absence of any such transference of potentialities, in accordance with your theory (of Momentary Ideas), has been proved (by us, in the Section on "Nirālambana-Vāda.")

171-72. In the case of Ideas occurring in the same series, we must deny the relation (between them) of *Cause* and *Effect*, as also the relation of the *Impressor* and the *Impressed*,—because they are Ideas,—just like Ideas occurring in different series (of Cognitions).

172-74. Therefore that which is the *Comprehender* (of colour *f.i.*) must be different from its object, (colour),—because the conception of one is not always accompanied by that of the other;—as *f.i.* the *Comprehenders* of taste, &c. Similarly the *Comprehended* object is different from the *Comprehending* (Idea);—because one who conceives of the one does not necessarily conceive of the other;—*f.i.* the *Comprehenders* of taste &c.

174-75. Thus then, the two factors (the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*) must be concluded to be different,—like *taste*, &c.;—because they are never conceived as identical;—as, *f.i.*, the conceptions occurring in another series.

175-76. Again, an Idea can not comprehend any portion of itself;—because of its originating in an Idea;—like its own potentiality (i.e., *Vāsanā*); (and for the same reason) there is a denial of the comprehensibility of an

170. If the latter conception were solely in the form of the *Comprehender*, then the former could not be its object; because the two would be dissimilar—one being the *Comprehender*, and the other being the *Comprehended*; and all *Objectivity* is based upon *Similarity*. "Process"—since no such process is possible for an Idea or Conception, which the Bauddha holds to be a *non-entity*.

171.72. Now follows a series of syllogisms.

175.76. The Bauddha holds that an Idea originates from an immediately preceding Idea; and it is an admitted fact that that which originates in an Idea cannot Comprehend itself; as for instance, the Impressions produced by an Idea, which are never capable of being Comprehended by themselves.



Idea (by itself); because Impressions are not equipped with a duplicate character (that of the *Comprehender* and the *Comprehended*).

176-77. Caitra's conception cannot be the means of the cognition of the comprehensible part of the conception occurring in the same series;—because it is a conception;—just as a conception occurring in another body (of another man), cannot be the *Comprehender* thereof, (i.e., of Caitra's conception).

177-79. In the same manner is to be explained the refutation of the duplicate capability of conceptions. We admit of a multiplicity of faculties elsewhere (e.g., in *Ātmā*), because such is proved by other means of right notion. Whereas in the present case (of conception) there is no ground for asserting such multiplicity of capabilities. And for these reasons we do not accept, as valid, the fact of your theory being simpler and acceptable to both us (which you have urged in support of the theory of the form belonging to the Idea, and not to any external object).

179-80. There is another reason too—that since conception is the means of comprehending the object, therefore it (conception) must be itself comprehended before the comprehension of the object; but this reasoning is unsound, because the case of the sense-organs—the eye, &c.—affords an instance to the contrary.

180-81. Then again, it has been urged that since the conception is not repressed, it must be comprehended as soon as it is produced. But, on this, we urge that the Conception could not be comprehended by itself (for reasons urged above); and none other (that would comprehend it), has till then been produced; hence, in the absence of any means of Comprehension, it could not be comprehended (as urged).

182. If there were no 'Idea,' then we could not, in any other way, explain the existence of objects; hence it is that after (the object has been perceived), we form an idea (of the Idea) as the means of a right notion (of the perceived object).

183. The mere fact of *non-repression* by something else cannot lead to the Comprehension of anything. As a matter of fact, in the absence

177.79 "In the same manner,"—i.e., "A conception cannot have a double faculty, because it originates in a conception,—like Impressions." "*Simplicity*";—we part company from you when you sacrifice evidence to simplicity; and certainly "*Gaurava*" is no fault, when supported by proofs: "*Pramāṇavāntyadrishtāni kalpyāni subahūnyapi.*"

The eye is the means of cognising colour; and certainly, the Eye, as an organ, is not necessarily Comprehended, always, before the Comprehension of colour. Therefore the mere fact of the Idea being a means of Comprehension cannot afford sufficient ground for holding its own prior Comprehension.

182 The Author explains how the Comprehension of the "Idea" is got at. He means to say that, if there were no Idea, we could not explain objects as we see them. Consequently, it is through "Apparent Inconsistency," that we assume the existence of Ideas.



of a fully efficient cause, even a (solid) object is not perceived (or comprehended).

184. While functioning towards the Comprehension of the Object the Idea does not approach itself (i.e., does not render itself comprehensible). Hence, though the Idea is the illuminator (or the means of the Comprehension of other things), yet for its own Comprehension, it stands in need of something else.

185. Or, the illuminative character (of the Idea) may be said to consist only of the Comprehension of the object; and there is no Comprehension (by itself) of (the Idea) itself; hence it cannot be its own illuminator (or manifestor).

186-87. As in the case of the *Eye*, &c., we find that, though endowed with an illuminative character, they have their illuminativeness restricted to (their specific objects) colour, form, &c.,—so, we would have the same restriction in the present case also: viz.: the illuminativeness (of the Idea) would affect the external object, and not (the Idea) itself; for the simple reason that it is incapable of doing so (i.e., of manifesting itself or leading to its own Comprehension.)

187-88. "If one (Idea) were to be comprehended by another (Idea), then there would be no end of (such Ideas—one comprehending the other). Finding that there is remembrance of such and such (Cognitions), we must admit that all such Cognitions in a series are definitely comprehended. If however all these were comprehended by a single Cognition, then, the comprehension of all would be explicable by that alone (and it would not be necessary to assume an endless series of Cognitions)."

189. Your assertion that "there is a remembrance of each of the Cognitions in a Series" is opposed to ordinary experience. For no ordinary person ever remembers any such Series of Cognitions.

190-91. (The ordinary experience is that) when such objects as the jar and the like, have been Comprehended, soon after this, there follows, through Apparent Inconsistency, the frequent recognition of certain conceptions; and this recognition goes on until one becomes tired of it; and hence subsequently, it would be only so many Cognitions, that would be remembered (and not an endless series of them). And as for any remembrance, prior to such recognition, of Cognitions, it would be like the remembrance of the child of a childless woman (i.e., an impossibility).

192. The notion of remembrance that enters into the element of the subsequent Cognitions, is a mistaken one; because it is (really) only a remembrance of the object (and not of the Cognition). And it is

184 Being engaged in manifesting the object, it cannot, at the same time, manifest itself. Since two independent functions can never operate simultaneously.

192 It is the object that is remembered; and as this could never be explicable without a former cognition, therefore the latter has to be assumed, through "Apparent Inconsistency."



this (remembrance of the object) that leads to the cognisance of a previous Cognition.

193. The recognition of the Series of Cognitions would continue only so long as one is not tired of it, even if the preparations for its continuance be on a grand scale. And there is sure to be a break, either through fatigue, or predilection, or contact with something else;—just as there is in the case of objects.

194. As for “the remembrance of such and such” that has been mentioned (in K. 188);—if this refers to the first cognition, then there would be a Comprehension of that one alone; and as such there would be no “endlessness.”

195. If however the remembrance belonged to every one of the Cognitions (in a Series), then we would have to accept an equal number of Comprehensions as well,—and as such who could get aside the series (even though *endless*) when they would be in due accord with reason?

196. If it be assumed that “they (i.e., the endless remembrances) have all got the *first Cognition* for their object,” then the differences, among the Cognitions (of the series) coming one after the other, would not be possible.

197. For one, who holds that all conceptions have *Cognitions* for their objects, the distinction between the *Conception of the jar* and the *Cognition of this conception*, is scarcely possible.

198. And just as such a theorist, when remembering a conception, remembers it as devoid of any form,—so, when remembering a pre-cognised object, he would remember this also as devoid of any form.

199. When the remembrance follows on the wake of a *conception*, it is because the conception (or Idea) is the means of (ascertaining) the existence of the object, and *not* because the conception is comprehended.

193 In the case of an object, perceived by the eye, for instance, we find that there is a cognition of the object, only so long as the Eye is not tired, or the person himself does not desire to withdraw to other objects, or until no other object appears on the scene. The same is the case with the Comprehension of cognitions; and hence there never could be an endless series of cognitions.

194 The expression could apply either to the complete Series, or to the first unit alone. The former alternative has been refuted in K. 190-91, *et. seq.*

195 The series is made up of the first Cognition of the *jar*, the Cognition of this Cognition, and so on *ad infi.* And certainly there is a certain difference among these. No such difference could be possible, if every one of the endless Cognitions, had the same Cognition for its object.

196 The Baudḍha ascribes a form to the Conception; and yet he says that when remembering it, he remembers it as devoid of form. So in the case of the Cognition of objects also, the remembrance would be devoid of all form,—which is an absurdity.

197 It has been urged by the Baudḍha that, because Remembrance is found to follow on Conception, therefore it is the Conception that is comprehended. The Kārikā refutes this view by declaring that we have Remembrances following upon Conceptions because it is only through such Conceptions that we can have any idea of objects.



200. "Proximity" and "Relativity" (that have been urged by the Bauddha as reasons for the Comprehensibility of the Conception based upon its identity with the form of the object) are precluded (from the Conception) because of the impossibility of the Comprehensibility (of Conceptions.) Or the two factors (of Proximity and Relativity) could be said to be based on the relationship of the object and subject (subsisting between the Object and the Conception); and as such what good would result from their non-disjunction of place (*i.e.*, identity)?

201. It has been urged (by the Bauddha) that no form of an object could be possible in the case of a mistaken Cognition; but we have already proved (in the Section on *Nirālambanavāda*) that in some cases (of mistaken Cognition) we have only instances of the perversion of time and place.

202. Even Cognitions other than those of Sense-perception are brought about by means of past and future objects,—both during the existence and non-existence of Impressions.

203. In the case of the object that has never been, or never will be, comprehended,—there being no impressions, how could the Bauddha too, have any Cognition?

204. If, even in the absence of Impressions, Cognitions were to appear; then that would contradict the causal efficiency of Impressions, which is accepted by you.

205 The Bauddha argues thus: "The object *Blue* is not different from its cognition; because there can be no Cognition of anything that is not identical with the Cognition itself. And again, if there be no relation, there can be no Comprehensibility. According to us, however, the form of the object is close to, and identical with, cognitions; and it is on account of this that it is comprehensible." To this the Kārikā offers the reply that both the Proximity and the Relativity (of the form of the object with the Cognition) become precluded from the Cognition, simply because this latter cannot be the object of comprehension. Therefore you must accept the comprehension of a form of the object, which is neither related to, nor in close proximity with, Cognition. Or again, even in the absence of any such identity, (between the Cognition and the form of the object), we could assert the proximity and relativity of these two, to be based upon the relation of the object and subject, which subsists between them. "Non-distinction of place" is identity; and "objectivity" is the character of bearing the result of Cognitions; and this latter is the definition of "Comprehensibility," of which no other definition is possible.

206 A wrong Cognition is only one of an object, in a place and at a time other than the correct ones; and it can never be possible for any Cognitions, right or wrong, to affect such objects, and such regions of time and place, as are not known to the agent.

207 Remembrances and Dreams occur only when there are impressions; but Inferential Knowledge is attainable, through premises, even in the absence of impressions.

208 Because the Bauddha asserts the forms of Cognitions to be due to the impressions left by previous Cognitions.

209 You hold that cognitions are always due to Impressions; and this theory would be contradicted.



205. And if there be any impressions in that case also, then, these must have been preceded by a cognition (if not in this life, at least in some former life); and such being the case, the object (to which the impressions belong) must have been cognised before at some place or other (so that this Cognition, at some distant date, must have given birth to the impressions in question).

206. Thus then, it is not proper ever to assert the absolute non-existence of an object (with reference to a Cognition). And on account of the inexplicability (of strange dreams and impressions, without external objects), it becomes established that the object (dreamt of) had existed (and had been cognised) (at least) in some previous birth.

207. Sometimes it happens that Cognitions appear in an incorrect form; but this is due to certain discrepancies in the cognitions themselves. In the case of the earth &c., however, their forms would be cognised only through themselves (and not as based on Cognitions).

208. Barring these (objects like the Earth, &c.), we cannot ascribe any form to the objects of cognition. For "Cognition" too cannot attain to its character, unless it is possessed by an external object.

209. And again if this (form dreamt of), and other forms, were to be ascribed to Cognitions alone,—then what would be the distinguishing feature in *dreams*, which marks them as absolutely *non est* (or unreal)?

210. For these reasons, it must be concluded that, this (dream) is a pure misconception, which, while comprehending an object for us, comprehends it in a way other than in which it exists; and it can never be said to exercise any independent function by itself.

211. It is for this reason that the Cognition to the contrary (of any misconceived Cognition) gives rise to such a reasoning as that—"though the object really exists in another form, yet this (false) form is imposed upon it by the mind (or Cognition) (under the influence of a certain delusion)."

212-13. The same is the case with such misconceptions as that of the

205 "In some previous birth." This has been added, in order to guard against the instances of such Dreams, &c., as are altogether new to the Agent, and as such, unlike all his experiences in this life.

207 *Objection*; "One can have no impressions of his own head being cut off; and then how can you explain a dream to that effect?" *Reply*: a man sees another person's head being cut off, and by certain misconceptions, common in Dreams, the impression left by that event is transferred to one's own head.

210 By Dreams also, we only comprehend certain objects, the only difference being that during a Dream, the object is perceived to be in a form other than the right one. As a matter of fact, Dreams could never have an end in themselves, as laid down by the Banddha, with regard to Cognition, in general.

211 This is all that a contradictory Cognition does; it does not absolutely negative the existence of an external object.

212-13 Refer to the objections urged in Kārikās 57-58. The first explanation means that the difference in the Gender and such application of names to the same object is



"double moon"; and in the same manner, in the case of such synonyms as "tārakā" (Fem.) ("Nakshatra" Neut.), &c., the feminine character, &c., (1) would be such as has been perceived elsewhere (and attributed here by mistake); or (2) they might be somehow explained as being merely verbal; or (3) lastly they might be explained as being due to such perceived agencies as the excess or otherwise of the various attributes of *Sattwa*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*, as has been suggested by some,—notably, by Patanjali (in his *Vyākharana-Bhāshya*).

214. Thus then, we find that the application of the three genders to the same object, is not un-reasonable. And since the diversity is based upon comparative difference (from other objects in the excess or deficiency of one or other of the attributes), therefore there is no contradiction (if different genders be attributed to the same object).

215. The same is the case with the ideas of a "dead body," &c., (with reference to a handsome woman), where the same object (the woman) being found to be possessed of all the three characters, the disposition of the cognising person leads to the recognition of one or the other definite character.

216. In the case of objects with many forms, the impression left after its particular Cognition (at a particular moment) would be the cause

a mistake. But inasmuch as we have no Cognitions whereby such use would be contradicted, and (hence) set aside, we offer the *second* explanation. The differences may be only verbal, and not real. But inasmuch as this also is a gratuitous assumption, we have a *third* explanation. Patanjali holds that the Gender of objects, and hence of Words is based upon the excess or deficiency of the several *Guṇas*: That which abounds in *Sattwa* is *masculine*; that which abounds is *Rajas* is *feminine*, and that abounding in *Tamas* is *Neuter*; this excess or otherwise of the *Guṇas* however is purely comparative; one and the same object may have an excess of *Sattwa*, in comparison with one object (thus being *masculine*); while the same object may have a deficiency of *Sattwa* and an excess of *Rajas*, in comparison with a third object (and as such it would be called *Feminine*). Thus then, there is nothing unreasonable in the use of different Genders with regard to the same object. In the case in question, the brightest stars may be said to be *Masculine*, the lesser ones *Feminine*, and the smallest ones *Neuter*—called, respectively, "Tishya," "Tārakā" and "Nakshatra."

215 This refers to the objection urged in *Kārikā* 59. The Woman is possessed of the three properties of a *dead body*, a *handsome person*, and a *mass of flesh*. The Renunciate recognises her a dead carcase (not fit for touching); because having continually thought of the body without the Self as dead matter, he recognises only a dead body in the Woman. A licentious man, accustomed to the company of women, recognises, in the handsome woman, an object of enjoyment. And the Dog, accustomed to flesh-eating, recognises in her only a lump of flesh. The determining cause of each of these recognitions is the impression that is engraved upon the mind of each of the three Agents. By continuous practice, certain impressions are produced upon individual minds; and these impressions predispose the mind to one or the other form of ideas.

216 The specific form being that to which, more than to others, the Agent has been accustomed, and of which the impressions are stronger and more permanent.



of determining any one specific form, and setting aside, for the time being all, other forms.

217. Similarly in the case of the notions of "length" ("shortness," with regard to a single object) and of "Ghatatwa" ("Parthivatwa," with regard to the single object "jar"), these will cease to be contradictory,—the diversity of forms being due to differences based upon comparison (of the object with various other objects).

218. And on the mere ground of the Cognition being of multifarious forms, it is not right to assert that there can be no form at all; because the diversity of forms may only be due to the diversity of comprehension (in different Individuals).

219. And on the ground of the comprehension (by different persons being diverse), it is quite possible for contradictory forms to belong (to one and the same object). There is no such hard and fast rule laid down by God, that "one object must have one, and only one, form."

220. We must accept everything just as it is perceived; and even the singularity (or one-ness) of an object cannot be held to be absolute.

221. Therefore the forms of objects, consisting of appearance and disappearance, would be separately comprehended by means of Cognitions, brought about by the peculiarities of place (time), &c.

222. Among people who simultaneously comprehend (an object, as ('jar' 'earthy' &c.))—he who happens to remember a word denoting a certain form, comprehends the object in that form only.

223. Though the properties of colour, odour &c., reside separately in

217 This refers to the objection urged in Kārikās 59-60. The same object may be long in comparison with one object, and short in comparison with another.

218 It has been urged in K. 61 that since different persons have different ideas with regard to the same object, therefore any one form cannot be said to specifically belong to any object. The present Kārikā meets this by urging that the diversity in the form is due to the difference in the comprehensions of different persons, based upon individual idiosyncracies.

219 Because different persons have different comprehensions—this is enough reason to lead to the conclusion that it is possible for a single object to be impressed with diverse, and even contradictory, forms.

220 We must accept an object to be of one or of multifarious forms, according as we perceive them; there can be no other criterion. There is no proof of the object being one only. Therefore there is nothing contradictory in one and the same object being endowed with various forms,—when such are in accord with the cognitions of individual persons.

221 "Appearance and disappearance"—one form appearing in the cognition of one person, and disappearing in that of another. Thus then the object will have one form or the other, according as it happens to be cognised by this or that person. Such appearance or disappearance may be based upon the differences of time, place &c., f.i. a well-armed man in the jungle is recognised as a huntsman, while in the midst of a town, he is only known as a policeman.

223 This refers to K. 30. Even these people do not become cognisant of the form of the Conception, prior to that of the form of the object.

a jar, yet—their Cognition is restricted in accordance with the respective functioning of the Eye, the Nose, &c.

224. In the same manner, though the characters of 'Ghatawa,' *Pārthiatwa* &c.—have their existence equally for all persons, yet their recognition is controlled by the remembrance (by different Individuals) of words expressing the various forms (of the jar).

225. Therefore the character of the object, though existing outside, is assumed to be the object of Cognition, according as it is approached or not approached, by the various organs of sense, the Eye and the rest.

226. Though ordinary people assert that "the external existence of the object is in accordance with the Conception we have of it,"—yet even these people do not attribute a form to the object by means of (and subsequently to) the recognition of the forms of the Idea.

227. It is only as a means of Cognition that a Conception presents to us the Object—as that "such is the object"; because it (Conception) is only the means (of recognising the form of the Object).

228. Thus then those who hold the existence of external objects do not admit their non-existence, which you seek to prove by means of Inferences; and passing over the Cognition of the Idea, they become cognisant of the form of the external object itself.

229. It is necessary for students of Philosophy to explain things exactly according to Cognitions met with in ordinary experience. And (in ordinary experience) the external object is never cognised to be of the same form as the internal (Idea).

230. "If at the time of the Cognition of the Object, the Conception too were to be cognised as what has already appeared,—what would this fact accomplish for the Pūrvapakshin? And again, how could he speak of another object?"

231. (The meaning of the objection as urged in the Bhāṣhya is that) the objector asks the upholder of external objects—'Do you not hold that

228 The cognition of external objects is got at by means of Sense-perception; and you seek to prove the negation of these by means of Inference. But before your Inference has had time to function, the existence of the external object will have been recognised by the prior functioning of Sense-perception.

229 The object is recognised as "blue," and not as "I" (which is the real internal form).

230 The Bhāṣhya says: "*utpadyamānāvāsām Jñāyatē Jñāpayati cārthāntaram pradīpavadīti yadyucyēta*" (an objection urged from the standpoint of the Bauddha); and the present Kārikā objects to this as coming from the Bauddha. The fact urged by the objector does not in any way help his position; in fact it only goes to weaken it, inasmuch as he is made to assert "another object" (*Arthāntaram*)—which is opposed to the purely Idealistic theory.

231 This Kārikā supports the objection as urged in the Bhāṣhya. If there is no suppression, the object is bound to be comprehended; and as such, if you deny its suppression, how can you deny its Comprehension?



there is no suppression of Conception while it comprehends another object ?'

232. The reply to this question is that we do not admit of such Comprehension, because there is no direct (sensuous) means of comprehending (such another object) ; and also because there is no mark (Reason or middle term by which such Comprehension could be inferred).

232-33. Or, the objection may be taken as applying to other theories. In these other theories, the Idea is said to be cognised at the time of the Cognition of the Object ; and in that case, the existence of the Object would be struck at its root ; and it is for this reason that we bring the objection home to them.

234. "The passage beginning with 'Nanu' is irrelevant (as coming from the Bauddha) ; because it urges what is desirable for his opponent ; and secondly, the mention of sequence contradicts what has been asserted before."

235. "And if it be urged that 'both (Idea and Object) being momentary, the Cognition urged in the objection is quite proper, and that the fact of the object *being cognised subsequently* is mentioned only as a past event (by means of the past participle affix in *Jnyātaḥ*),—there would be a useless repetition of what has already been said before."

232 This Kārikā explains the passage of the Bhāṣhya, embodying the reply to the objection raised by the Bauddha in the passage referred to above. Though there is no suppression there may be no means of comprehending the object ; nor is there any such characteristic of it as would lead to the acceptance of its Comprehension.

232-33 This Kārikā interprets the objection urged in the Bhāṣhya, in a different way, as directed against the Vaiśeṣika doctrine that the Idea is comprehended simultaneously with the Object. In that case, no external object could be proved to have a real existence ; because the Comprehension of the Idea is not possible without that of the form ; and when the form has once been cognised in connection with the Idea, there would be no room left for the interception of the external object itself.

234 The Bhāṣhya lays down another Bauddha argument : "*Utpannāyāmēva buddhaḥ artho jñāyatē, &c., &c.*"—a passage which ends with the assertion that "at first there is an appearance of the Idea, and then follows the cognition of the object." The Kārikā says that this is not opposed to the Mīmāṃsā theory, which also holds that the Object is cognised only on the manifestation of the Idea ; and, to the contrary, the mention of the *Cognition of the Object* is directly against the Ānyanāda tenets ; and lastly, it has been urged above that the cognition of the Idea is *simultaneous* with that of the Object ; and this is contradicted by the present assertion, that the cognition of the Idea is *followed* by that of the Object.

235 The contradiction urged above is met by the assertion that in the second objection also, we have only the aforesaid *simultaneity* in view. With regard to the Idea it has been said that it is *being manifested* (in the present tense), while the object has been said to *have been cognised* (in the Past). And for the Bauddha, there cannot be any other alternative save that of *simultaneity* ; because all things being momentary, any object that has once appeared and given rise to an Idea, could not wait for another moment, to be cognised *by itself* separately.

[It may however be noted that if this explanation is accepted, the second objection becomes the same as the first.]

236. Here too, the Bauddha does not speak from his own standpoint the fact being that through the assertion of his opponent he is mistaken as to the theory of his antagonist and (while under this misapprehension) he has put the question (urged in objection 2).

237-40. "The simultaneity of the manifestation and Comprehension of the Idea being absolutely established,—we ask if these come before the Comprehension of the Object, or after it, or simultaneously with it? This theorist (the Mīmāṃsaka) asserts the Comprehension of the Idea to follow after that of the Object; and then (in accordance with this theory) the Idea would be produced also after (the Object). But this is not possible; hence we declare the production (or manifestation of the Idea) to precede the cognition of the Object; and thus at the same time we would also have the Comprehension of the Idea (and hence the Comprehension of the Idea would also precede that of the Object). And the prior Comprehension of the Idea being thus established, there can be no proper discrimination between the external (Object) and the internal (Idea) [and as such by priority we infer the form to belong to the Idea and not to any external Object]." And it is in view of these reasonings that the objector has brought forward the aforesaid objections.

241. Even if the Comprehensions of the Object and the Idea were simultaneous (as mentioned in Obj. 1),—we could not recognise any form as belonging to the Object (because the form will have been cognised as being confined to the Idea). And it is for this reason that the Mīmāṃsaka first seeks to prove that the *Comprehension of the Object precedes that of the Idea* (even though the Idea may have been produced before).

236 This Kārikā supports the objection as quite proper, as coming from the Bauddha. The Mīmāṃsaka has asserted that the Idea of an object is cognised before the Object itself; but, at the same time, he has also said that when the Object has been cognised, the cognition of the Idea follows by Apparent Inconsistency. And from this the Bauddha has concluded the Mīmāṃsaka to hold that there is no cognition of the Ideas before that of the Object; and from this he has also concluded him to deny even the manifestation of the Idea before the Object. And thus having misunderstood the theory of his opponent, the Bauddha asks:—"But it is only when the Idea has appeared," &c., &c. (*Vide Bhāṣya, quoted above*).

237-40 These Kārikās set out the process of reasoning employed by the Bauddha as based upon the aforesaid misconception of the Mīmāṃsaka's standpoint. The process shows that the aim of both objections is the same—viz., the denial of the external Object, and the establishing of the fact of the Idea being the sole entity.

241 The first half of the Kārikā shows how the aim of the former objection too consists only of the denial of the reality of the external Object; and the sense of the second half is that if we accept the comprehension of the Idea to be cognised, either prior to, or simultaneously with that of the Object, then we would be forced to ascribe a form to the Idea, and deny the existence of the Object altogether. For this reason, the first business of the Mīmāṃsaka is to prove that the comprehension of the Object precedes that of the Idea—which latter is got at subsequently by means of Apparent Inconsistency.



242. The portion of the Bhāṣhya that follows after this has already been explained above.

242-43. "Because the character of the Object comprehended is not remembered (at some future time), just like an unknown object,—that is no direct reason for asserting the previous non-Comprehension of the Idea. Therefore with what, and on what way, is the previous non-Comprehension of the Idea connected or relevant to the present discussion?"

244. For these reasons the present passage must be explained as being a refutation of the theory that "the form belongs to the Idea, because of its prior cognition"—because the notion of the form belonging to the Idea is the result of the argument based on its prior Comprehension.

245. The passage "*Kāmam buddhēh*" denotes the fact of the Idea being dependent on the Object.

246-47. As a matter of fact apart from the form of the Object, there is no recognition of Ideas. And the Idea being recognisable by another's form, it cannot be the object of cognition, because it is like a Mirage. Thus then, for you, the cognisability of Ideas would be in accordance with a comprehensible object, which you hold to be *non-est*. And since the form of the Ideas themselves is a *tabula rasa*, their cognisability could only be assumed to have been caused by the disturbance of *Vāsanā* (predispositions or tendencies). And as such the Idea itself could not be cognisable, in reality.

248. "The fixity of cause" is equally applicable to both the theories because the upholders of 'Idea' as well as the upholders of "external objects" equally take their stand upon the peculiar faculties of their substances.

249. "How is it, that for you too the objects in the shape of *threads*

242 "The portion of the Bhāṣhya," &c—"saṁyam pūrvam buddhirutpadyatē na tu jñāyatē"—explained above in Karikās 82-83.

242-43 This Kārikā takes exception to the Bhāṣhya passage in reply to the above objections: The passage referred to is: "*Bhavati hi khalu kadācidetat yajnatō'pyarthak sannājnātavaducyātē.*" It is often found that Of two objects cognised at one-time, only one may be remembered in the future; consequently it is not right to assert that—"because the Idea is remembered when the object is not, therefore there could have been no cognition of the Idea together with the Object."

244 This is in defence of the Bhāṣhya: Though the direct denial of the prior conception of the Idea is not quite relevant, yet what we mean by such denial is only to strike at the root of the resultant theory: namely that the form belongs to the Idea, and not to the Object.

245 Bhāṣhya: "*Kāmamēkarūpatvē buddhirēva bhavati*"—i. e. Even if the Idea and the object were identical, it would be more correct to attribute the form to the Object than to the Idea.

246-47 Ideas, being naturally plain (according to the Bauddha), could not have any forms of their own.

248 Kārikās 249-52 take exception to the Bhāṣhya: "*Api ca niyatanimitta, &c., &c.*"

bring about only such effects as the *cloth*? Wherefore could not these (threads) bring about a *jar*? Or how is it that the cloth is not brought about by lumps of clay?"

250. If you object to the *Ideas* of 'thread' and 'lump of clay' (as having the power to bring about *ideas* of the 'cloth' and the 'jar' respectively), then in the same manner, you would have an objection to the *objects* ('thread' and 'lumps of clay' as having the properties whereby to bring about the *objects* 'cloth' and 'jar')."

251. "If the fixity of the creation (or causation) of objects were said to depend on the restrictions of faculties (or capabilities—such as the faculty of causing a cloth is restricted to the thread alone and so forth), then who could deny the same capabilities in the restriction of the causation of *Ideas* (i.e., we would also have the *Idea* of threads such as having restricted within itself the power of bringing about the *Idea* of cloth)?"

252. "Therefore when the objection is common to both theories and when the means of meeting the objection too is similar to both,—such an objection should not be brought forward by one against the other, during a discussion over a subject."

253. But for the upholder of the "Object" theory, we have such means (of meeting the objections) as the specialities of *time*, *place* and the like, which serve to control the capabilities of the causes, in (the manifestation of) their particular effects; (which resource is not open to the Idealist who denies space, time, &c., in fact everything besides *Ideas*).

254. The capabilities of objects too are such as are postulated through the "Apparent Inconsistency" of the effects;—and as such these are known to be real, having their application restricted to their respective effects.

255. For you, on the other hand, any such capability, either different or non-different from the *Idea*, is not recognised as real,—apart from its assumed (unreal) existence.

256-58. It is *VĀSANĀ* (Disposition) alone that you describe by the

254 When we find that a certain characteristic in the effect cannot be otherwise explained, we postulate a corresponding potentiality in the cause, to which source we relegate the said characteristic.

255 To assume that the potentiality has an unreal existence is only a tacit denial of the potentiality; and hence a restriction of the causal efficiency.

256-58 You hold that the operation of the cause is restricted by *Vāsanā*. That any such controlling agency, as that of the *Vāsanā*, is not possible, we have shown under the section of *Nirālambana-Vāda*. "Not dependent, &c.": For us, the *Vāsanā* resides in the *Soul*, which being, for us, permanent, it may be possible for the operation of the underlying *Vāsanā* towards the restriction of the Causal efficiency to be delayed to a certain extent. But the *Buddha* holds the *Vāsanā* to reside in the *Idea*, which is held to be *momentary*. Under the circumstances, how could *Vāsanā* (which



word "Çakti" (capability). And the restriction of causality, that you base upon the *Vāsanās*, becomes impossible, *firstly*, because such *Vāsanās* cannot exist, and *secondly*, because they cannot be said to serve the purpose of any other object. Nor do you accept any such controlling agencies, as those of Time, Place, &c. It is with all this in view, that the author of the *Bhāshya* has urged, against his opponent, the argument beginning with "*api ca*", &c.

258-59. Therefore it does not meet our objection to your theory, merely to assert that "just as for you, cloth proceeds from threads, so for us too, the Idea of cloth would proceed from the idea of threads."

259-61. Thus then (we conclude that) the negation of the external object is not proved by the first two means of Right Notion (Sense-perception and Inference); Of Verbal Authority there is no application in this case (denial of external object),—in fact it is applicable to the contrary; Analogy is not applicable, because you admit of nothing else that would be similar to Idea; neither does Apparent Inconsistency serve your purpose; because it proves quite the contrary. Hence we conclude that such denial of the external object can only be amenable to "Negation" (*i.e.*, the denial is only capable of being denied).

261. Some people, finding that external objects being aggregates of atoms are incomprehensible, have asserted the Negation (*Ānyatā*)—thus proved to be unamenable to any means of Right Notion—to reside in the predicable object itself;

262. but on account of the impossibility of any comprehensibility belonging to an internal (Idea) as shown above,—even these people will have to admit of the comprehensibility of something else. As for atoms, neither do we accept them to be comprehensible; and as such, we must describe the aggregates of these (atoms) to be real (and as such, objects of comprehension).

too cannot but be momentary) exert any controlling influence over the operation of Causes? In fact the *Bauddha's* *Vāsanā* becomes devoid of any substantial substratum. Nor does the *Bauddha* admit of any other controlling agency; hence all his Causal operations would become erratic in the extremest degree.

259.61 "*Verbal authority*"—such as Injunctions—laying down sacrifices, &c., and as such bearing testimony to the reality of external objects. "*Apparent Inconsistency*. Various forms perceived in the world having been found to be inexplicable, we infer, from Apparent Inconsistency, the reality of the existence of the various objects in the external world. And this goes directly against the *Ānyavāda*. Thus then all these Means of Right Notion being found to contradict the denial of external objects, the only remaining Means of Right Notion is Negation. And a theory that is amenable to Negation alone cannot but be denied in its totality.

261 Finding that *Ānyatā* is not established by any *Pramāṇa*, some people seek to rest it in the *Pramāṇya*,—their reasoning being this: Atoms are invisible; therefore the aggregate of atoms must be invisible; therefore all objects are invisible and incomprehensible: and therefore they do not exist."

262 "*We must describe, &c.*"—as we shall prove later on.

263. Thus then (the reality of) the external object having been established, there can be no unreality of the Idea (either); and for those who know the true character of both (the Object and the Idea), this (the Couple, Object and Idea) is really a fit object for being made the axle of the wheel of "Investigation into Duty."

Thus ends the Cūnyavāda.

(SECTION 5.)

INFERENCE.

1. Since "Sense-perception" has been proved to be not a mistaken process, therefore, for the same reason, there can be no question as to the validity of Inference and the rest, as defined below.

2. The epithet "known—relation" either belongs to the cognising agent; or it refers to a substrate of the middle term; or the compound may be explained as a *Karmadhāraya*—the words "one-substrate" referring to each of the two members of the relation (postulated in the Premiss).

3. Or the epithet may refer mutually to both members of the relation itself,—the words 'one substrate (or part)' in that case, signifying (severally) the two members themselves.

4. The "relation" meant here is that of *invariable concomitance* of

263 Just as a pair of horses is fit for pulling a car, so these two—the Object and the Idea—are fit for supporting and carrying through an Investigation into Duty, for those who know the real character of the Object and the Idea (i.e., the Mīmāṃsakas).

1 Because Inference and the rest are all based upon Sense-perception.

2 The Bhāṣya passage here referred to is this: "*Anumānam Jñātasambandhasya, &c., &c.*" If the compound "Jñātasambandha" be explained as an Accusative Bahuvrihi—"He by whom the relation is cognised"—then the meaning of the definition would be that "Inference is the cognition of *that person* who has previously recognised the relation, &c. &c." If however, the compound be explained as a Genitive Bahuvrihi—"That whereof the relation has been cognised"—then, the definition would mean that "Inference is the cognition, in another substrate (Fire), brought about by the perception (in the mountain, of smoke) which is a part of the relation of concomitance with Fire, perceived in such substrates as the culinary hearth, *the relation whereof with the smoke* has been previously recognised." Thirdly, the compound may be explained as a *Karmadhāraya*—"known relation;" in that case the definition would mean that "Inference is the cognition, in another member of the relation, brought about by the perception of the smoke, which is another member of the *known relation*."

3 Taking the compound to be a Bahuvrihi, there can be yet another explanation: That whereof the relation is known belongs to both members of the Minor Premiss taken together; and "one-part" of this may be each of these taken severally.

4 In the stock example, "There is fire, because there is smoke," smoke is the means of the cognition of fire; and certainly it occupies less space, and is seen less often, than the fire.



the character of the Middle term with the Major term. To the 'Pervaded' (Middle term) belongs the function of bringing about the conception (of the Major term), and the 'Pervader' (the Major term) is held to be the subject of the conception (arrived at through the Inference).

5. Because the 'Pervaded' is that which, in space and time, is either the equal or less in comparison with another; and that which is equal or more is the 'Pervader';

6. therefore it is only after the 'Pervaded' has been recognised, that its 'Pervader' can be cognised; otherwise there would be no such relation between them as that of the 'Pervader and the Pervaded' (i.e., that of Invariable Concomitance).

7. Though it is a fact that the 'Pervaded' is (sometimes) cognised as the 'Pervader; yet even if its greater extension (in time and space) may not be contradictory, it could not (in that particular form) bring about the conception of the 'Pervaded.'

8. This is found to be the case in the instance of the 'cow' (pervaded) and the 'horned animal' (Pervader); where the 'cow' being the 'Pervaded' gives rise to the conception of the 'Pervader' 'horned animal.'

9. Therefore even in such cases, where both members may in certain cases be accepted as the 'Pervader' and the 'Pervaded,' it is the character of the 'Pervaded' alone, and never that of the 'Pervader,' that forms part (as the cause) of cognition.

10-11. Thus then that form of the 'Pervaded' which brings about the conception of the 'Pervader' is precisely that alone which has at some previous time been perceived, at a definite time and place, as located in one substrate, and which is subsequently perceived, exactly in the same form, in another substrate.

12-13. The Invariable Concomitance of two general objects is recognised through a repeated cognizance (of their concomitance), and through the removal of all doubt as to their difference (non-concomitance). At times (there is an invariable concomitance) of particular objects also; as for instance, the perception of the appearance of the constellation of "Krittikā" gives rise to the notion of the proximity of (its neighbour) "Rohiṇi."

7 As in the case of the argument—"non-eternal, because, caused"—a case where both are equally co-extensive, and both may be the "pervader" or the "Pervaded;" Even if we admit the greater extensiveness of any one of these, though this will not be contradictory, yet any such member of greater extensiveness could not always give rise to the conception of another of lesser extensiveness; because the former can exist even in the absence of the latter.

10-11 The smoke has previously been perceived to co-exist with Fire, in the culinary hearth; and subsequently, it is perceived in the mountain,—and instantly gives rise to the idea of the Fire existing in the mountain.

13-15. In the cognition of an Invariable Concomitance the cause is a certain property, with regard to which there is such a notion as that '*it is only when this exists that such and such a thing can exist*'; (properties) other than this only tend to add support to concomitances brought about by other means. And we do not admit of any ascertainment of concomitance on the perception of only such properties as these latter.

15-16. Those that employ such (secondary properties) for the accomplishment of their conclusions are frequently led away by the discrepancies of counter-arguments, that crop up quite easily in their way.

16-17. These persons are also open to the faults of 'contradiction of the scriptures,' 'and contradiction of their own ends' '(self-contradiction),' 'unheard of argumentations;' and such illogical argumentations should be avoided by all reasonable men.

17-18. Animal-slaughter is sinful, simply because it is prohibited. In the absence of such prohibition, the mere fact of its being 'animal slaughter' could not prove it to be sinful.

18-19. The falsity of all ideas is based on two causes (the discrepancy in the means of arriving at the idea, and the subsequent cognition of some idea setting aside the former); and the arguments asserting the facts of an Idea being an idea, and of having an origin, are of no use (in proving the falsity of any Idea).

19-20. The capacity of leading to Heaven belongs to sacrifice, &c., when performed by the first three castes; and hence it cannot be ascribed to those that are performed by the Ṣūdras, on the sole ground of these latter being performed by human beings, just like the former ones.

13.15 The objection, that the Kārikā is meant to meet is that "if the pervaded be admitted to lead to the inference of the pervader, then the mere fact of its being a slaughter would lead to the inference that the slaughter of animals in the sacrifices is sinful; because there is a concomitance between *Sinfulness* and *Slaughter*, in the case of Brāhmana—slaughter and the like." The sense of the reply is that such concomitance is not admissible; because we have no such general proposition, as that "whenever there is *sin*, there is *slaughter*." The property that must be admitted as the basis of concomitance, in the case in question, must be the *character of being prohibited*; because no one can deny the truth of the assertion that "whenever there is *sin*, there is also something that is *prohibited* in the scriptures." The basis of concomitance, in all cases, must be such as is capable by itself of being directly connected with the Major Term. Such however is not the case with *Slaughter*, because even in its absence, we come across *sinfulness*—e.g., in wine-drinking, &c.

16.17 "Contradiction of scripture"—e.g., in the case of the alleged *sinfulness* of animal sacrifice in the "Agnishtoma."

17.13 This cites an example of the "contradiction of scriptures."

13.19 This gives an example of "Self-contradiction."

19.20 Some people might urge the argument that "sacrifices performed by Ṣūdras lead them to Heaven, because they are performed by human agents, like the sacrifices performed by the higher castes." Besides being fallacious in itself, such an argument would be directly contradictory to facts laid down in the scriptures.



20-21. Destructibility is based on the facts of having a beginning in time, and on that of being made up of certain constituent parts; and it can never be based upon such facts as that of being cognised after a certain effort on the part of the agent.

21-22. In the same manner the facts of *belonging to a class*, and being *sensual* (belonging to a certain organ of Sense) are common to all existing things (eternal as well as non-eternal); and hence, who else, except the Naiyāyika, could bring forward these, as arguments for proving the non-eternality of Sound (or Word)?

22-23. Therefore that, which by its very capability has been found to be the means of proving the existence of another, can be said to be the means of bringing about its conception,—and not that which comes to be related to it by mere chance.

23. By means of the double mention of the words 'one member' is mentioned the Minor term which forms one of the members of the relation.

24. If 'smoke,' &c., were not related to others (the Major and Minor terms) they could, by themselves, be 'a member' (of the relation) and it is the 'Paksha' (Minor term) alone that contains both members (of the relation) partaking of the character of both the conceived (the Pervader) and the means of (another) being conceived (i.e., the Pervaded).

25. With regard to the unascertained factor (Fire, f.i.) the Minor term (Mountain) forms the object to be conceived; while in relation to the ascertained ('smoke') it is the means of the conception (of another); and it may be mentioned either separately or identically, according to the wish of the speaker:

26. As an instance of the mention of the Minor term in a form co-extensive with its correlatives, we have "non-eternal, because it is originated" and "the smoky is fiery"; and as an instance of the Minor term mentioned in a form separate from them, we have "there is fire in the mountain, which is smoky."

27. It is the Minor term as qualified by the Major term that forms the object of Inference. Independently of it (the Major term), the Minor term can never be the object of Inference.

28. The qualifying (Major term) by itself cannot form the object of

20.21 The fact of being cognised is urged as a proof of the destructibility of "Words"; and the Kārikā meets this argument.

22.23 That is to say, that alone could be regarded as such means, with regard to which we have such a notion as that—"when this exists, that must exist"—e.g., in the case of "being prohibited," and "sinfulness," where we have a definite general proposition: "Whatever is prohibited is sinful."

24 Consisting of both, it must partake of the nature of both.

25 "Fire" (in the mountain) is not known by any other means save that of Inference; while the 'smoke' is seen by the eye. "separately" i.e., apart from the two members. "Identically"—i.e., in a form co-extensive with them.

28 All the members of the syllogism are already known; and it is only the definite relation between the Major and Minor terms that forms the object of Inference.