

Inference, because it is already known. Nor can the qualified (Minor Term), or both the Major and Minor Terms, taken singly or collectively, be the object of Inference, independently of the other.

29. If any of these singly were the object of Inference, then we could not have any one member as the predicate (Linga); nor could we have any relation of this with the Major term (expressed in the Major premiss):

30. E.g., 'causedness' is not a property of 'non-eternality'; nor is there any relation between these and 'sound'; nor lastly is there any relation between these two themselves.

31-32. Nor is any relation possible between the subject and predicate, taken each independently by itself, inasmuch as the relation is neither mentioned by name nor signified by the genitive affix. Nor is any predication of the relation with the Middle term exemplified; nor can it have two forms partaking of the character of the *ascertained* (Sādhana), as well as of the *unascertained* (Sādhya).

32-33. Therefore the denotation of the possessive affix (i.e., the

29.30 If "non-eternality" (as the qualification or the predicate) were the object of Inference, then, in that case, "causedness" not being a property of it, the Middle Term ("Causedness") would cease to be a part of the Minor term ("non-eternality"); and under such circumstances, no Inference could be possible. If again, "Sound" alone were to be the object of Inference, then we could not predicate any relation between this ("Sound") and "Causedness," because there is no such proposition as that—"wherever there is *causedness*, there is also *sound*." Lastly, if the "non-eternality of Sound" (both conjointly), were the object of Inference, then we could not find any instance of the predication of any relation between the Middle Term ("Causedness") and the "non-eternality of Sound." Because, in the case of all other *caused* entities—the jar, &c.—we find a relation predicated between a *caused* entity and a *non-eternal* entity, and not between a *caused* entity and a *non-eternal sound*.

31.32 The conclusion is not in the form "*Parvatasya agnihnor*" as "*Agniparvata-sambandho'sti*." Says the *Nyāya ratnāgarā*. "The mere existence of Relation cannot be the subject of Inference; because it has already been previously ascertained. Nor does Relation possess of a two-fold character of the *Sādhana* and the *Sādhana* Object and the Means), whereby, having made "Relation" the Minor Term we could prove the fact of its being endued with *Fire*. Because a Relation, in general, can never be endued with *Fire*; and as for any particular Relation, inasmuch as none such can be arrived at, previous to the Inference itself, it cannot be the Minor Term." And the *Kācīkā*: "Is the Relation to be proved as a mere entity, or as qualified by some property? The mere existence of any object can never be the object of any Inference: and Relation has not, like the Mountain, adual form of the *ascertained* and the *non-ascertained*. Therefore Relation can never be the object of Inference."

32.33 The theory accepted is that it is the Minor Term as related to, or qualified by, the Major Term, that forms the object of Inference. And it is true that no such qualified conclusion is possible without a qualification. Therefore it is held that such a *qualification* is the object of Inference, not by itself, but only as the implied necessary accomplishment of the conclusion. And since the other members of the conclusion are already known, therefore it is only *qualification* (or the special relation)—but this only as forming part of the *qualified conclusion*—that constitutes the object of Inference pure and simple.





relation) can be the object of Inference, not independently by itself, but only as implied (in the qualified Minor term).

33. As for instance, in the case of such words as "Dandi" and the like (the man with the stick) there being a cognition of the qualified object (the man with the stick), the relation (qualification) is recognised only as its necessary concomitant.

34. Therefore these two (Subject and Predicate) are to be conceived of only as in the forms of the qualification and the qualified. The relative predominance (of these two) is by some people held to be optional :

35. According to these theorists the qualification (non-eternality) of an object (sound) is recognised by means of another qualification (causedness) ; and there is no definite specification as to which is the qualification and which the qualified.

36. In reply to this, some people assert that if the qualified object be the qualification, then it would become the secondary factor ; and as such, its relationship with the qualities of the middle term, would not be quite clear.

37-38. It is only in its primary character that the qualified object is connected, through a sentence, with the qualification. And it is only when no relationship with the qualification is possible, that it is assumed to be with the qualified subject. Or we could add the clause "of Sound" (to *Causedness*).

38. At the time of the recognition of an universal affirmative proposition, the secondary character of the qualification, which is mentioned separately, is not a fault.

39. If the Fire, as qualified by the place (mountain), were to be accepted as the qualified subject, then we could not have the definition, of Paksha (Minor Term) given below. Because such qualification of Fire could only be in the following seven forms :—

40-42. (1) 'The Fire, that has been seen in some place or other, exists' ; (2) 'the pre-experienced Fire exists in space' ; (3) 'Fire is related to this (mountain)' ; (4) 'the Fire that has been, seen is connected with this.' (5) 'This Fire is connected with space.' (6) 'This Fire is

33.57 If the conclusion were in the form—"Anityatvam Qabdagatam"—then the *Qabda* would be only a secondary element ; and as such, it could not very clearly be connected with the Middle Term, "Causedness." It is only an unnecessary complication to assert any relation with the qualified object. And again, the simple premiss—"Kṛtakatvāt"—will have to be changed into—"yatah Qabdasya Kṛtakatvam,"—an unnecessarily cumbersome process.

33 This Kārikā anticipates the following objection : "In the case of the proposition, 'whatever is caused is non-eternal,' the relation perceived would be with the primary, 'Sound,' and not with the secondary, 'non-eternality.'" The sense of the reply is that in this case, inasmuch as the word "non-eternality" is mentioned again (apart from the conclusion), we have its connection with the premiss complete ; and the secondary position that it occupies in the conclusion, is no fault.



connected with some former space'; or (7), This Fire is qualified by this place.'

42-45. Among these, in the first two, we have the fault of proving the proved (redundancy); and in the rest, self-contradiction. (3) There can be no invariable concomitance of the particular space with every Fire in existence. (4) Nor is any such concomitance possible of a formerly seen Fire with the present space; (5) Nor can the particular Fire be qualified by all space. (6) Nor can it be qualified by any former space. And (7) how can it be asserted (before the Inference has been completed) that 'this Fire is qualified by this particular place,' when apart from the particular place, there is no such specification as *this* 'Fire'?

45-46. And in the present case it is the place (mountain) which is perceived before the Fire; and since it is already perceived at the time of the perception of the Fire, it cannot be taken as the qualification.

46-47. As for the place, mountain, in as much as its form is perceived apart from, and prior to, that of the Fire, it is no fault to have another recognition of it as qualified by Fire.

47-48. For these reasons we conclude that it is the subject, as qualified by the property, that forms the object of Inference; and such, in the present case, is the *place* as accompanied by Fire. Some people however attribute (the character of the object of Inference) to the 'smoke.'

48. *Objection*: "As in the case of 'Word' so in the present case also, it may be the qualification itself that is the object of the Linga (Middle Term)."

49-50. Not so: because in the case of the Linga, there cannot be an assumption of a multitude of applications; because it cannot be the object of Inference; and the subject too is one that has been previously

42-45 (1) That the *Fire exists* does not stand in need of proofs. The same is the case with the (2). (3) Certainly, the particular space in question cannot contain all the Fire that exists in the world. (4) The Fire seen elsewhere cannot reside in the place in question. (5) The Fire seen *now* cannot occupy all the space in the world. (6) No former space can be occupied by the Fire seen at the present time. (7) Inasmuch as the Fire is not perceptible by the sense, and as such, is not capable of being designated as "this Fire," it is not possible to have as the object of Inference, "the Fire as qualified by a particular place."

48 That is to say, as in the case of a word—f.i. "cow"—though there is an idea of the class 'cow' as defined by the individual cow, yet the Mimāṃsakas accept the force of the word to lie in the class alone; so, in the same manner, in the present case also, the force of the Linga may be accepted to lie in the qualification, Fire, alone, and not in the place as qualified by Fire.

49-50 The sense of the reply is that the qualification, Fire, is perceived only at the time of the recognition of its relation with the Subject; and as such, it can serve to qualify the Subject, which is remembered at that time. Consequently it cannot be assumed that like a "Word," the "Linga" has its force in the "qualification." Nor can the Linga be said to have any such application in the Subject, either: because the Subject is such as has already been previously perceived, by some other means.





perceived. As a matter of fact the object of Inference is the *subject as qualified (by the Fire)* ; because this alone is such as has not been previously perceived.

50-51. *Objection* : " If ' smoke ' were the subject qualified, then the Middle Term would become a part of the Minor Term."

*Reply* : It is not so ; because the object of Inference is a *particular* ' smoke,' whereas the Middle Term is in the general form, the *class* ' smoke.'

51-52. If the character of the means of right knowledge be attributed to the ' smoke,' or to ' its conception,' or to the ' remembrance of its connection,' then there would be an identity of the objects with the final result, through its action (i.e., the action of the smoke, &c.), as has been described before (in the case of Sense-Perception).

52-53. " But the author of the Bhāshya holds that it is the cognition of the object that is the means of right knowledge." True ; but the uncertainty, spoken of (by the Bhāshya) as attaching to the case of Sense-Perception, applies equally to all Means of Right Notion.

53-54. One, who wishes to prove by Inference something that he has learnt by Inference, must first of all lay down the Minor Premiss, as explained above.

54-55. It is with reference to the subject (Minor Term), that the property of the predicate (Major Term) is laid down ; and by means of

50.51 This is an objection against the Naiyāyika theory of the " Smoke " being the object of Inference. " Smoke " is the Middle Term ; and if it be made the Minor Term also, this would bring about an absurd admixture. The reply to this objection is based upon the ground that the object of Inference is a *particular* " Smoke " in the mountain, while the Middle Term is the general " Dhūmatwa."

51.52 The action of smoke and the rest tends towards the recognition of the object of knowledge ; and thus there is an identification of the Object of the Means with that of the Result. In the chapter on " Sense-perception," with a view to this identity between the Means and the Result, the Bauddha has declared the " Idea " alone to be both the *Means* and the *End* (of Perception) ; and in that place it was pointed out by him that exactly the same would be the case with Inference also. Consequently the reply that was given to the Bauddha, in the previous chapter, would serve our purpose, also on the present occasion : viz : " Such identity directly contradicts the universally accepted distinction between Causes and Effects " ; and again—" Who can rightly uphold any identity of the *axe* with the *cutting* ? "

52.53 " Such being the view of the Bhāshya, how can you hold that there is an uncertainty with regard to the *smoke, its cognition, the remembrance of its connection, &c. ?* " True, but in the section on Sense-Perception, the Bhāshya expresses itself in doubtful language : " *Buddhirvā janma vā, &c.* " ; and this uncertainty applies to the case of every *Pramāna*.

53.54 An argument is that by means of which one seeks to prove something to another ; and such an argument is made up of the Conclusion, the Reason, and the Instance ; and the Conclusion consists of the *mention of the Minor Term (Mountain) f.i.) as qualified by the Major Term (Fire)* ; and it is this that ought to be laid down first.





this predication, what is implied is the preclusion of only such properties as are contrary to the said predicate, and not of those that are compatible with it.

55-56. The addition of the phrase "not in proximity" serves to set aside two things: (1) definite recognition (by some other easier means) of the object in the same form in which it is sought to be proved by the Inference; and (2) recognition (by some easier means) of a form contrary to that sought to be proved.

56-58. Because that which has already been ascertained some way or the other does not stand in need of any other Means of right Knowledge. That is to say, if an object has been definitely known beforehand in the same form (as that which is sought to be proved by Inference), then this Proof becomes useless. And if object has been known (by more trustworthy means) in a form contrary to the one sought to be proved, then there is no room for another proof. Because even before the appearance of the source (of Inference), its object will have been snatched away (by another and stronger proof).

58-59. In the case of all the six means of right knowledge—Sense-perception and the rest—if an object is ascertained by means of one of them, then it is by means of the same that the functioning of another means of Right Notion is barred; because in such cases there can be no option.

59-60. The imperceptibility of Sound, &c., is contradicted by Sense-perception; and the assertion of their being not amenable to the Sense of audition is contradicted by Inference.

60-61. Amenability to the sense of audition is not cognised by means of Sense-perception; it is cognised by means of affirmative and negative premisses, with reference to the case of the deaf, &c.

61-62. The contradiction of Verbal Testimony is three-fold—with

55-56 The Bhāṣya speaks of "*Asannikṛtsṭe'rthē buddhik*"; and by this is meant the fact that any object, which, in a definite form, is known beforehand by some easier means (Sense-Perception f. i.) in that very form it cannot be the object of a more complicated means of knowledge (f. i., Inference); and also that if an object, in a definite form, is cognised previously by a stronger means of cognition (Sense-perception) then the same object, in a form contrary to this, can never be the object of a weaker means (Inference).

56-58 "*Snatched away, &c.*"—The source of Inference consists of the perception of the Middle Term and the remembrance of Invariable concomitance, &c., &c.; and before these are accomplished, the Object of Inference will have been already proved—either in the affirmative or in the negative—by some other stronger proof, (Sense-Perception); and in that case, there will be no room for the action of Inference.

59-60 An Inference is set aside by another Inference, only when the latter happens to be simpler in its process and more direct and easier of comprehension than the former.

60-61 "*Deaf.*"—Affirmative premiss: "Wherever there is Sense of Audition, a sound is heard, as in the case of ordinary people." Negative premiss: "Where there is no Sense of Audition, there is no perception of Sound; as in the case of the deaf."





reference to (1) Present declaration, (2) Former declaration, and (3) a universally recognised fact.

62-63. (1) "I have all my life been silent" is contradicted by the mere assertion. (2) If all assertion be declared to be false, then the very mention of the subject of the proposition ("all assertion") makes it self-contradictory. (5) In the assertion "Because I was born therefore my mother is barren," there is self-contradiction in the mention of the reason ("because I was born").

64-65. (2) To the Baudddha the assertion of the eternality of 'word' is contradicted by his previous assertion (of the momentary character and non-eternality of all things.) And (3) he who denies the fact of the moon being signified by the word "Candra" is contradicted by the idea of the *moon* derived by all men from that word.

65-66. If any one were to argue, to one who is cognisant with the form of both the 'cow' and the 'gavaya,' that "there is no similarity between the 'cow' and the 'gavaya'" —he would be contradicted by "Analogy."

66-68. If anybody were to argue, with reference to Caitra who is alive and whose existence in the house is ascertained, that 'he is not outside the house', he would be contradicted by "Apparent Inconsistency" (based on Negation); so also the arguing of the non-burning power of Fire (which would contradict "Apparent Inconsistency" based on Sense-Perception); the arguing of the non-denotative power of a word (which would contradict "Apparent Inconsistency" based on Inference); the arguing of the non-existence of the Sense of Audition (which would also contradict "Apparent Inconsistency" based on Sense-perception); and lastly, the arguing of the non-eternality of word (which would contradict "Apparent Inconsistency" based upon another "Apparent Inconsistency").

68-69. There is contradiction of "Verbal Apparent Inconsistency," when *eating during the day* having been denied by a trustworthy person *eating at night* be also denied by means of arguments. And there is contradiction of "Negation" if the existence of (such non-entities as) "hare's horns" be argued to exist.

70-71. Thus has been exemplified the contradiction of the relation of the qualification (Predicate). We are now going to describe the contradiction, with regard to all the means of right knowledge, of the natural form and specific property of the Predicate, the Subject, and both of these (taken together), denoted respectively by direct assertion, and indirect implication.

62-63 The examples of the three-fold contradiction of verbal authority are : (1) one who says "I am silent" contradicts himself ; (2) If "all assertions are false," the assertion of the speaker also is false ; (3) If one is born, his mother cannot be called "barren."



71-72. If one were to argue, from the existence of certain pieces of burnt straw in ice, that the Ice contains fire, then its specific property 'heat' would be contradicted by the cold, which is directly perceptible by the Sense of Touch.

72-73. 'The prescribed (animal-slaughter) is a Sin, inasmuch as it produces a certain degree of pain to the killer'—in this argument the mention of "prescribed Sin" contradicts itself; and similarly its specific property, of bringing about pain, also stands self-contradicted.

74-75. In the assertion "all cognition is unreal", lies the contradiction of both, by its form and specific property; inasmuch as it is also the cognition of these that is proved to be unreal (by the general statement); the specific properties here contradicted are *momentariness* and *Absolute unreality*.

75-76. By the mention of "the perception of one member" (in the definition of Inference laid down in the Bhāṣhya), are set aside such cases where there is doubt, non-cognition and contrary conviction in the mind of either one or both of the disputants.

76-77. In such instances as "Fire cannot burn, because it is cool," "word is non-eternal, because it is amenable to the sense of sight, and the like,"—there is a contrary conviction in the minds of both disputants.

77-78. If the facts of "being caused," and "being a property" be brought forward by others as reasons against the Mimāṃsaka, (with a view to prove the non-eternality of Sound) then the reasons would be contrary to the firm conviction of one of the disputants (the person addressed, i.e., the Mimāṃsaka); and if such reasons be brought forward by the Mimāṃsaka himself, then they would be contrary to the conviction of the person addressing (i.e., the Mimāṃsaka himself).

78-79. If in any case, 'smoke' be doubted to be "fog" by one or both of the disputants, then it would be three-fold "Asiddha." Such are the forms of the direct contradiction (of the Middle Term).

71-72 This is the contradiction of a particular property of the Predicate.

72-73 This is the contradiction of the form and the specific property of the Subject.

"Contradicts its own form."—Because what is enjoined cannot be sinful. "Specific property, &c."—Because what has been enjoined cannot bring pain to one who does it.

74-75 Specific properties contradicted, &c."—Because by the general statement, "all cognitions are false," the cognitions of *momentariness* and *unreality* would also become false.

75-76 Uptill now, it has been proved that the mention of the word "Asannikṛṣhta," in the definition laid down in the Bhāṣhya, serves to preclude all mistaken forms of conclusion. And with this Kārikā begins the treatment of the Fallacies—"Asiddha," "Anaikāntika" and "Viruddha." And first of all it is shown that the mention of "Ēkadēṣadarṣanāt" serves to set aside, from the definition, all forms of the Fallacy of "Asiddha."

76-77 Since no disputant will admit that that *Fire is cool*, or that *Sound is amenable to the function of sight*, therefore the Middle Term is contrary to the notion of both.

78-79 "Therefore, &c.," i.e., the doubt resting in one disputant, and in both disputants.



79-80. These would be the different forms of the contradiction (of the Middle Term as based on that) of its substratum (i.e., the Minor Term, the subject of the conclusion), inasmuch as even if the Middle Term be known by itself, it does not actually serve as the Middle Term until it comes to be predicated, or related to the Minor Term.

80-81. In the case of the argument "the soul is omnipresent, because its action is found everywhere," we have a Middle Term whose substratum (the soul) is not accepted by the Bauddha; and with regard to which there are doubts even in the minds of ordinary people.

81-83. Since there can be no processes on mere verbal non-acceptance, therefore it is only the assertions of such facts as are known by both parties to be false that can be accepted as fallacies in an argument.

Any other reason will have to be accepted as valid, if the other party proves it to be so (to impartial umpires); but in case that the invalidity of the Reason be proved by the first party, it will constitute a discrepancy in the argument of the other disputant.

83-85. The two causes of a fallacious Reason, Doubt and Contradiction, are set aside by the mention of "*Jñātasambandhak*." For only three are the grounds of Doubt, or uncertainty; (1) when the Middle Term exists in the Major Term as well as in its contradictory, (2) when it does not exist in either (existing only in the Minor Term), and (3) A case where in one member (of the conclusion, either the Major or the Minor Term) exist two contradictory attributes.

85-86. In the case of such Major Terms (predicates of the conclusion) as "eternal" "not arising from an effort," "caused by effort," and "eternal,"—such Reasons, (respectively) as "knowable," non-eternal,"

79.80 It is only as related to the Middle Term, and thereby forming the Minor Premiss, that the Middle Term can be accepted as such.

81.83 This is to guard against such unreasonable disputants as would bring forward the fact of their own non-acceptance of the Reason, as an argument against all that they may find to be going against themselves. By this safeguard, the disputants can bring forward only such facts as are universally recognised as forming part of the theory that they may be upholding.

83.85 (1) is a case of "*Sādhāraṇa*" (2) that of "*Asādhāraṇa*" and (3) that of *Virūdhāvyaḥicārī*.

85.88 The first syllogism is: "Word is eternal, because it is knowable;" but *knowability* exists in *eternal* objects, like the *Soul*, &c., and also in non-eternal objects, like the *jar*, &c., and thus it is *Sādhāraṇa* (or Common, Too Wide). The second syllogism is thus: "Word is not caused by an effort, because it is non-eternal;" but here, *non-eternality* is such as is found in the *jar* as well as in the *Lightning*, the former of which is brought about by the effort of the potter, while the latter is not caused by any effort. The third syllogism is this: "Word arises from effort, because it is non-eternal;" in this too we have the same fallacy as in the last. The fourth syllogism is: "Word is eternal because it is immaterial," where too *immateriality* is such as is found in eternal things like *Space*, &c., and also in non-eternal things, like *Action*, &c.



"non-eternal," and "not endowed with a form" (Immaterial), are common to both (the Major Term and its contradictory). [ "Non-eternality" has to be taken twice in the former half].

86-87. In the case of the argument "earth is eternal, because it is endued with smell," we have an "uncommon" Middle Term; and it is a cause of uncertainty inasmuch as it is wanting in one of the grounds of certainty.

87-89. The "common" Middle Term too is a cause of doubt, inasmuch as it is found to give rise to a dual notion (those of the Major Term as well as its contradictory), and because two contradictory notions cannot belong to the same subject. So also in the case of the "uncommon," wherever (either in the Major Term or its contradictory) it does not exist, by means of the negation of that, it would point to the contradiction of the negation of both; and as such it would become a cause of doubt.

89-91. The fact of these being causes of doubt, refers only to certain particular objects, because with reference to certain other objects these are found to lead to certain definite conclusions, through negative and affirmative concomitance,—as for instance, in the case of proving "absence of action" by "immateriality," and in that of the "presence of smell" being ascertained in a certain particular form of earth; and such Reasons

86.87 Since "Odour" resides in the Earth alone. The grounds of certainty are : (1) "Existence of a substrate other the Minor Term," (2) "Non-existence in any place where the absence of the Major Term has been ascertained." In the "Common" or "Too Wide" Reason, though the former ground is present, the latter is not; while in the "Uncommon," we have the latter, and not the former.

87.89 The "Uncommon" has been called the cause of uncertainty, in accordance with the Bauddha theory; and the Vārtika has in another place, negated the fact. The "Common" is a cause of doubt, not because it leads to a false conclusion, but because such a Middle Term cannot rightly lead to any conclusion at all. The fact is that since it is seen in both, it leads to the remembrance of both its substrates; and the remembrance of two mutually contradictory subjects bars the due ascertainment of either, and as such becomes a cause of doubt. While in the case of the "uncommon," it is found in no other place save the Minor Term,—i.e., neither in the Major Term nor in its contradictory,—and so brings about the idea of neither; and as such, it cannot be said to be a cause of doubt.

89.91 In the case of the proving of "eternality," the reason of *Immateriality* is one that exists in such things as *Action*, &c., which are *non-eternal*; hence the Reason does not serve to preclude such things as "wherein the absence of the Major Term has been ascertained;" and as such, it becomes a cause of doubt; when however we proceed to prove "absence of action," the reason of *Immateriality* becomes such as is not found in anything that has any action; and as such we have the negation of the absence of the contradictory of the Major Term; and hence it leads to a definite conclusion. In the same manner, the presence of "Odour" gives rise to a doubt, when "Earth" is made the Minor Term; but when a certain particular form of "Earth" (the jar, f.i.) is the Minor Term, then, inasmuch as we have the affirmative concomitance of the presence of Odour in other particular forms of Earth, it gives rise to a definite conclusion.





serve the purpose (of proving certain conclusions with regard to another particular form of earth).

91-92. Where the non-perceptibility of air is sought to be proved by the absence of shape—we get at the idea of the perceptibility of Air from the fact of its being felt by touch; and in this case, we have the concomitance of contradictions (Perceptibility and Imperceptibility).

92-93. Some people call this “*Jātyantara*.” Others again call it “common” in parts, or “uncommon” in its totality.

93-94. When the conclusion of a certain argument is negated by the aforesaid means of right notion (Sense-perception, &c.),—then from the refutation of this argument, we have a definite conclusion (based on the arguments whereby it has been negated), because this latter itself has not been negated.

94-96. Sometimes, two Reasons though giving rise to Doubt, when taken separately, each by itself, yet on being combined, lead to a definite conclusion (as in the case of proving a certain object to be a post) we have the terms “*Vertical height*” and “*presence of crows*.” Two such reasons, as are not mutually contradictory, are able to lead to a definite conclusion, both severally as well as collectively. Therefore it is only such Reasons taken severally as are mutually contradictory that have been declared above to be causes of uncertainty.

96. The contradictory character (*Viruddhatā*) of the Middle Term has been said to be six-fold, four-fold, or one only (by different theorists).

97. When the conclusion—either the directly expressed or the one implied—is negated by the Reason, (then we have its contradictory). In the case of the proving of ‘eternality’ by ‘causedness,’ we have the contradictory character of the Reason based on the contradiction of the predicate of the conclusion (because ‘causedness’ is opposed to ‘eternality’).

98-100. We have the contradiction of a particular form of the

92-93 When one of the two contradictories exist, in parts, in the “*Sapaksha*” and the “*Vipaksha*,” it is a case of the “*Common*,” and when both of them do not exist anywhere in common, then we have the “*Uncommon*.”

94-96 Simply *Vertical Height* by itself is not able to ascertain whether a certain object is a *post* or a *man*; so also the mere fact of the *presence of the crow* is not enough for the ascertainment of the *post*. But when the facts are taken together, then they lead to the definite conclusion that it is a *post*. “Not mutually contradictory, &c.”—such as the *presence of smoke*, and that of a *smell arising from burning*—both of which lead to the conclusion as to the *presence of Fire*.

97 Contradiction of the Predicate.

98-100 “*Implied conclusion*”—because when a word has been ascertained to have its purpose of signification satisfied, with reference to its shape, then there is no further necessity of admitting any other signification. “*Cannot have its signification, &c.*”—thus the fact of the shape of the word having a meaning becomes contradicted by the reason, “*presence of affix*,” which proves the *presence of meanings other than the*



predicate (Major Term) when we have an argument such as—"the shape of a word has a meaning even before the ascertainment of its connection with its recognised meaning,—because it has an affix,—as after (the ascertainment of its recognised meaning)." In this case, the implied conclusion is that a word has its meaning restricted to its shape; while "afterwards," the word with an affix is found to have a meaning other than the shape; therefore even before the recognition of such signification, the word cannot have its signification apply to its *shape*.

100-102. In the case of such arguments as—"Samavāya (Inference) is distinct from Substance, &c.,—because with regard to it we have the notion that 'it is here,'—as for instance, 'conjunction' (*Samyoga*) in such cases as 'this jar is here'—we have the proof of the "absence of Samavāya" in the shape of "Conjunction" (*Samyoga*). Thus in this case we have a Reason directly contradicting the form of the subject ("Samavāya").

102-103. In proving the unity of "Samavāya," like "Sattā" (existence), we will have the contradiction of a particular property (unity) of the Subject; because, like "Samyoga" we have a *diversity* (of "Samavāyas").

103-104. When one is proving to the *Sautrāntika* the fact of the eternal existence of the Self, by reason of its being *impartite*, like the *Ākāṣa*,—we have the contradiction of the forms of both (Subject and Predicate).

104-105. There is contradiction of the specific characters of both (Subject and Predicate) when there is such an argument as—"The eye, &c., are for another's (Soul's) purpose because they are made up of a cogglomeration of parts, like a *bed*, &c."

105-106. In the "bed" we always have "cogglomeration" and "the being for another's purpose," where both are with regard to *material* objects; and hence by this example (of a bed) we cannot prove "the being for another's purpose" with regard to the Soul or Self (which is *immaterial*); and thus we have a contradiction.

106-107. What is sought to prove is the fact of ("eye, &c.") being for the purpose of an impartite (Soul or Self). While, what the argument proves is the material (or partite) character of the Soul. And further,

*shape* which is the contradiction of a particular property of the Predicate: *viz.*, the fact of the shape of words having meanings.

100.102 The contradiction of the form of the Subject of the conclusion (Minor Term). The reason here assigned as proving the existence of the "Samyoga" is found to prove "Samyoga" which is not Samavāya.

103.104 Because to the *Sautrāntika*, the *Ākāṣa* is nothing more than the "absence of covering;" *Ākāṣa* being a mere non-entity, there can be no chance of its eternality. Thus then, by means of the same example, the Reason (*impartiteness*) would negative the form, as well as the eternality of the Self,—in a case where the former is the Subject and the latter the Predicate of the conclusion.

106.107 "Self-consciousness."—In the *Bed*, the cogglomeration is such as is invariably concomitant with gross materiality, which is devoid of all taint of the evolution of





there would be another unwished for conclusion—*viz.*, the fact of the 'eye,' &c., not being the evolutions of "Self-consciousness."

107-108. The instances of the similarity and dissimilarity of the Predicate (Major Term) are cited with a view to describe the invariable concomitance of the Reason with the Predicate.

108-109. And it is with reference to the Reason that the Major Term is predicated. It is the "Dharma" which is the pervaded Subject, and the pervader is the other (*i.e.*, the "Dharmī").

109-110. The characteristics of the Subject are—(1) the mention beginning with "which," and (2) mention previous (to that of the Predicate); and those of the Predicate are (1) mention by "that," and (2) "eva" (definite).

110-111. As a matter of fact, a word denotes its meaning, independently of the wish of the speaker; and the fact of such meanings being the causes of the conclusion depends upon the power of invariable concomitance alone.

111-114. Hence when, not knowing this (peculiarity of Invariable concomitance), the speaker wishes to lay down mere *association* (of the Reason with the Major Term), or when by mere perversity of his attachment to a contrary conclusion, he does not lay down the invariable concomitance of the Reason, or even when desiring to make a mention of it, he does not use the proper words suited to that purpose, *e.g.*, "in the jar exist *causedness* and *destructibility*" or "the *destructible* is invariably concomitant with the *caused*,"—then in such cases the character of the Reason would belong not to what is desired to be so, but to something else which is altogether undesirable as the Reason. Therefore that which is meant to be the Reason must be mentioned, as being *invariably concomitant* (with the Major Term).

self-consciousness. Thus then, the Reason—the *presence of a cogglomeration of parts*—would come to prove, though example of the *Bed*, that the eye, &c., have nothing to do with the evolutions of Self-consciousness—a conclusion not quite palatable to the Sārikhya.

107 With this begins the consideration of the discrepancies of exemplification.

108-109 In the syllogism, "non-eternal, because caused," "causedness" is the Reason, and "non-eternality" the Major Term; and the example in its support is—"whatever is caused is non-eternal, as the jar," where "*whatever is caused*" is the Subject and "non-eternal" the Predicate.

110-111 A consideration of the Subject and the Predicate is necessary, inasmuch as it is on the expressive power of words alone that the denotation of meanings depends: and only such meanings or Objects can be used as Reasons in an argument, as are found to be invariably concomitant with the Major Term.

111-114 "*Lay down mere association, &c.*" *e.g.*, "Word is non-eternal, because it is caused, (for instance) in a jar, *destructibility*, is *causedness*. " *Contrary conclusion, &c., &c., &c., not suited, &c.*"—for example, "Destructibility is concomitant with causedness." When such is the case, then *causedness* ceases to be the Reason, the character whereof passes over to *Destructibility*. And for the purpose of precluding such false argumentations, a correct statement of an Instance is necessary.





114-116. Even when the reasoning is correctly laid down, the sentence fails to give the desired meaning rightly, on account of the absence (in the Instance) of—(1) the Major Term, (2) or the Middle Term, (3) or both the Major and the Middle Terms, or (4) invariable concomitance,—e.g., “Sound is eternal, because it is shapeless,—like (1) action, (2) atom, (3) a jar, and (4) Ākāṣa.” And to one who denies the existence of this last (Ākāṣa) (apart from a mere negation), the Minor Term (Sound) itself becomes a non-entity; and thereby too the Instance fails in its purpose.

117. Even if the positive existence of Ākāṣa be admitted, though it is mentioned as endowed with both *eternality* and *shapelessness*; yet finding, in the case of Action and the like, *shapelessness* not concomitant with *eternality*, we can have no invariable concomitance of the Reason,—hence the preclusion of the argument.

118-121. When by invariable concomitance, (affirmative instance of) similarity has been mentioned, the mention of an instance of Dissimilarity is not required. (1) When, even on the mention of the instance of similarity, the questioner, having his mind turned to mere association, does not notice the invariable concomitance; or (2) when he does not even look for instances of similarity; or (3) when the speaker himself mentions only simple association, or (4) when there is contradictory affirmation; then (in such contingencies), with a view to counteract these, our end is accomplished by (an instance of) dissimilarity, which serves to remove all preconceived notions to the contrary. And in this, the “Reason” is helped, to a certain degree, by the aforesaid “mere association.”

121-122. The relation of invariable concomitance (of the pervader and the pervaded), subsisting between the negatives of any two entities, is found to be exactly the reverse of that subsisting between the entities themselves.

122-124. For instance, the existence of “smoke” being invariably concomitant with that of “Fire” the absence of “fire” would be precluded

114-116 (1) In the argument “Sound is Eternal, because it is shapeless, like Action,” the instance—Action—is devoid of *eternality* (Major Term). (2) If Atom be the Instance, then we have an instance that is devoid of the Middle Term; as an Atom is not *shapeless*. (3) If jar be the Instance, then inasmuch as the jar is neither *shapeless* nor *Eternal* we will have an absence of the Major and the Middle Terms. (4) If Ākāṣa be instanced, then we have a total failure of invariable concomitance itself; since the *Sautrāntika* holds the Ākāṣa to be nothing more than a *negation of covering*; and so by citing Ākāṣa as the Instance, we make the Minor Term, “Sound,” a non-entity; and thence the premisses themselves fall to the ground entirely. The failure of Invariable Concomitance is farther shown in K. 117.

118-121 With this begins the consideration of Instances of Dissimilarity.

122-124 *Positive*: “Wherever there is smoke, there is fire—i.e., there can be no smoke without fire.” *Negative*: “Wherever there is no fire there is no smoke,—i.e., all cases of absence of fire are pervaded by cases of absence of smoke.” In the former “Smoke” is the concomitant of “fire”; while on the latter, “the absence of fire” is the concomitant of the “absence of smoke.”



from that ("smoke"), and would co-exist with the *absence of "smoke,"* and thus become the invariable concomitant of this latter (non-smoke). Conversely the "absence of Fire" being invariably concomitant with "absence of smoke," "smoke" would be precluded from "absence of Fire"; and thus having no room anywhere else, it would become the invariable concomitant of "Fire."

124-125. When "existence" and "absence" are both mentioned (in the instance of dissimilarity) as being the *pervader (vyāpaka)*, then we can not assert the preclusion of the "Vipaksha" *absence of Fire*, which is the ascertained substrate of the absence (of the Major Term), from the "pervaded" (smoke).

125-127. Therefore when the existence of fire is sought to be proved by the presence of smoke,—it is always proper to assert the "absence of Fire" to be the invariable concomitant of the "absence of smoke," and not otherwise. (Because) when there is (assertion of) mere association, or when there is contradiction of the premisses,—then either the matter in question is not helped, or something quite to the contrary comes to be proved by it.

127-128. (Nor is the matter in question helped) when the meaning (of the instance) is devoid of both together or one by one, *e.g.*, "That which is non-eternal has shape, as 'atom,' 'Conception,' and 'Ākāṣa.'"

128-129. For the accomplishment of the invariable concomitance (of the Middle Term) with the Major Term, we have the assertion of the

124-125 When, in the instance of Dissimilarity, the *Vyāpaka* is the negation of that which is the *Vyāpaka* in the original argument—*i.e.*, in the case of the proposition "where smoke is, fire is"—if, in the instance be asserted the proposition that "where there is absence of fire there is absence of smoke," then we cannot get at the preclusion of the "absence of fire" from "smoke,"—*i.e.*, we cannot have the proposition that "where fire is not, smoke is not."

125-27 "It is always, &c."—It is necessary to assert that "where fire is not, smoke is not."

127-28 "Both"—*i.e.*, the negation of the Reason, and the negation of the Major Term. In the case of the argument "Sound is eternal because it is shapeless," if, as an instance of dissimilarity, be cited the proposition that "that which is not eternal is also not shapeless, as an atom"—we have the instance devoid of the negation of the Major Term; inasmuch as the *atom* being eternal, it is impossible to speak of its absence. If "Conception" were cited as the instance, then we would have the instance devoid of the negation of the Reason; because Conceptions being shapeless, it is impossible to assert the absence of shapelessness with regard to it. The instance of *Ākāṣa* would be devoid of the negation of both the Reason and the Major Terms; inasmuch as the *Ākāṣa* being both eternal and shapeless, it would be impossible to assert the absence, either of eternality, or of shapelessness with regard to it.

128-29 With this begins the consideration of the Fallacy of Deficient Premisses—*Lit.* Deficiency of invariable concomitance. When such is the case, the premisses themselves become impossible, and hence there is no need of citing any instance of dissimilarity; for in the absence of the premisses themselves, no amount of instances could help us to arrive at the correct conclusion.



negative relation (of the Middle Term with the negation of the Major Term). For one who is not cognisant with this (negative relation), the Middle Term is not invariably concomitant with the Major Term (i.e., he can have no Major premiss).

129-130. Therefore even where association is perceived, we cannot have all objects of the class as the predicate (of the conclusion); because mere association is no relation; and by itself it cannot constitute invariable concomitance.

130-131. (As for example) though the "jar" is accepted as endowed with *shape* and *non-eternality*, yet it cannot be accepted as the instance, because, in the case of "Action," &c., we find that there is no invariable concomitance (between the *presence of shape* and *non-eternality*).

131-132. Though with reference to Inference a negative Instance is required in the argument,—(1) because of its being accepted by all (both parties, the Bauddha and the Mimamsaka), and (2) because of the non-perception (of a certain thing) being much easier,—yet this fact alone is not able to preclude (affirmative Instances) from forming a part of an Inferential argument, reasons for which will be detailed in the section on "Words" (in considering "Apoha").

133. There would be no chance of the comprehension of negations, because there is no invariable concomitance among them. And since there is such a thing as "Sāmānya" (*class, generality, homogeneity*) among objects, therefore we could comprehend, in this, an invariable concomitance (of the particulars).

134. Some people hold that even after a general affirmative instance has been cited, it is equally necessary to state a negative instance, for the purpose of a definite preclusion (of propositions contrary to the Premisses).

135. "When (the invariable concomitance) of the Middle Term in the Major Term has been ascertained by means of the affirmative instance, it implies the preclusion (of the Middle Term) from every other

129.50 In the case of the instance, "That which is not eternal is not shapeless as the jar, &c."—we can lay our hands upon the association of the two negations in certain cases; but even then the instance will not suffice to prove the eternality of everything (of Sound, f.i.) by reason of shapelessness; inasmuch as though some shapeless things, as Akāṣa—are eternal, yet there are shapeless things—Actions f.i.—that are not eternal.

130.31 Because Action is *shapeless* and yet *non-eternal*.

131.32 The Bauddhas hold that it is only the negative instance that has to be brought forward and not an affirmative one. In an affirmative instance, they urge, it is extremely difficult to get at any general proposition—such as "all cases of existence of smoke are accompanied by cases of presence of fire." In fact it is impossible to have any idea of "all smoke"—past, present and future. On the other hand, all negative propositions are easily comprehended.

133 That there is such a thing as "Sāmānya" will be proved in the section of "Ākṛti." And when there is such a thing, the difficulty of the comprehension of the general affirmative proposition vanishes.



thing (which is an absurdity generally); therefore (a negative instance) serves the purpose of restricting the preclusion to a definite object (the absence of the Major Term)."

136. This has not much significance because this is already implied in the mention of the Minor Term (in the conclusion) as it is only the negation of the *pervader* from which the *pervaded* is always precluded.

137. It is for this reason that when the *whiteness* of cloth is asserted, there is a preclusion only of such properties as are contrary to "whiteness," and not of others, like "length," &c. We could apply the same law to the case in question.

138. "The double form of Inference is not possible; because just as the relation of *fire* and *smoke* is known by Sense-perception, so also is that of *motion* and *approach* (so both are of the same kind).

139. "If it be urged that these (*motion* and *approach*) are not cognised by Sense-perception in the case of the sun, then (we reply that) nor (is the existence of fire and smoke) cognised (by Sense-perception) in the place before us (the Mountain). If it be urged that the concomitance of fire and smoke has been so cognised elsewhere (in the culinary hearth), then (we urge) in the case in question also, we cognise (the concomitance of *motion* and *approach*) in Dēvadatta, by means of Sense-perception.

140. "If it be urged that (in the case of the sun) there is the necessity of another substrate of the Middle Term, and in this lies its character of being the *Sāmānyatodrṣṭa* Inference,—then (we urge), the same case holds with 'Fire and Smoke.'"

140-142. Hence (in order to meet the above objections) that alone should be called a case of "Sense-perceived relation," where it so happens that in the case of two particular forms of objects—such as the 'fire'

136 The expression, "the mountain is fiery" is meant to preclude the negation of fire alone. That "fire exists" does not necessarily mean that the *fire alone exists*; but simply that the fire itself exists.

138 This Kārikā begins a series of objections to the following passage of the Bhāṣya. "Tat tu dvividham, pratyakshato-drishtasambandham sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandhanca, tatra pratyakshatodrṣṭasambandham yathā dhūmākṛtidarṣanāt agnyākṛtivyāptiṇānam, sāmānyatodrṣṭasambandham yathā Dēvadattasya gatipūrvakan deśāntaraprāptimupalukshya ādityagatīśmaranam."

139 That is to say, then too, the two inferences cited cannot but belong to the same class.

140 The meaning is that if the upholder of the Double Theory asserts that he has perceived the concomitance of *motion* and *approach* to a new place, in the case of Devadatta, and accordingly he infers (from the special case noticed before) the concomitance of *motion* in general with *approach* in general, and then refers back this general conclusion to the particular case of the Sun, which latter inference thus comes to have the character of the *Sāmānyatodrṣṭa* Inference;—the Baudha would retort that the same way he said with regard to such cases as have been cited as instances of the *Pratyakshatodrṣṭa* Inference.



produced by burning dried cowdung and the 'smoke' issuing from that particular fire—there is recognition of particulars alone; and then subsequently even when the observer has gone to another place, he happens to recognise the existence of "fire" by means of (a remembrance of) the particular 'smoke' noticed before.

142-143. On account of his former cognition (of the concomitance of 'Fire' and 'Smoke') such a person suspects the existence of 'fire' whenever he sees any 'smoke,' and finds (on inspection) that in every case, (his suspicion is justified and) 'fire' does exist. The frequent repetition (of such suspicion and its subsequent verification) gives rise to a definite general premiss (that 'the existence of smoke is always accompanied by the existence of fire'). It is the cognition of such particular relations that has been laid down by Vindhyaśin.

144. Since the relationship of the Minor and Major Terms rests in the *class*, through some specification of it, therefore the particular form is not mentioned (in the Bhāshya).

145. Though 'fire' and 'smoke' (other than the particular forms of these forming the subject of the argument) may be cited as forming an example of a "Sāmānyatodṛṣhta" Inference, yet the example of the 'sun' has been cited here, with a view to pure "Sāmānyatodṛṣhta."

146. The fact of "Sāmānya" being an object of Sense-perception, has already been proved, and hence it is that the "Sāmānya" comes to be recognised as an entity. And now we lay down reasons (inferential) in support of both these facts (*i.e.*, the fact of "Sāmānya" being a distinct entity, and its amenability to Sense-perception).

147. The inference of 'Fire' from "Smoke" has a distinct entity for its object,—because it is a means of right notion other than negation,—like auditory cognition with regard to such objects as are amenable to, and in close proximity with, the particular Sense-organ.

148 The Kārikā anticipates the objection that if the example just cited is based upon the cognition of a particular form, why does the Bhāshya mention the word "Ākṛti" (Class)? The sense of the reply is that though the instance cited is that of a particular fire, yet it has been cited with a view to the *class* ("Fire"), in which the particular fire is contained.

149 Though the example of another Fire, &c., would do well enough; yet the case of these is intermixed with the *Pratyakshatodṛṣhta*, which aspect it generally bears in ordinary parlance. While in the case of the Sun, we have an example of the pure *Sāmānyatodṛṣhta*, unmixed with any apparent tinge of the *Pratyakshatodṛṣhta*.

150 This is levelled against those who deny the "Sāmānya" as an entity. In the section on Sense-perception, the *Sāmānya* has been proved to be a distinct entity in the section on "Ākṛti."

151 For instance, any cognition of Sound, produced by the organ of audition, has got, for its object, a distinct entity, Sound. The same may be said with regard to Inference also. This argument is aimed against those Bāddhas who deny the fact of any Inference having a distinct entity for its object. "Amenable" and "in close proximity," &c., have been added, in order to preclude all chance of mistake.





148. 'Sāmānya is a distinct entity,' and is amenable to Sense-perception,—because it is a cognisable object other than negation,—like the specific character of an object.

149-153. (1) Since there can be no Inference without the Middle Term, and (2) since no one accepts as the Middle Term anything other than the 'Sāmānya,' and (3) since no uncognised Middle Term can lead to anything,—therefore for one, (the Bauddha), who admits of no 'Sāmānya' apart from the Inference, there is no other way (out of the aforesaid threefold difficulty) except having recourse to an Inference (for the purpose of having a recognition of a 'Sāmānya' to be utilised in another Inference). But this Inference too could only be brought about by a Middle Term associated with the notion of a 'Sāmānya'; and this (Middle Term, 'Sāmānya') too, being only an object of Inference, could be conceived of only by means of another Middle Term through an inferential argument, and so on. If such be the course of assumptions, then, there being an endless series of Major and Minor Terms, Middle Terms and Inferences with regard to a single object ("Sāmānya"), even thousands of æons would not suffice for the recognition of a number of objects (by means of Inference).

154. "Even if the Middle Term be a *Sāmānya* we could have its cognition from something else." If this be urged, then (we ask)—Is this 'something else' a correct means of right notion? or is it purely false? If the former, then from the same source you could also have the cognition of the Major and Minor Terms also.

155. And thus you would have the complete annihilation of Inference itself; inasmuch as the idea of 'Sāmānya' would be got at by means of other proofs (and that of particular forms is of course due to Sense-perception).

156. If (however you stick to the second alternative, then), the idea, of the Major and Minor Terms, arrived at through a Middle Term recognised by means of an incorrect means of knowledge, would always be a false one,—like the notion of 'fire' derived from the perception of 'fog.'

157. "But just as the Remembrance (of the relation between the

154 The Bauddha adds: "We have the notion of the specific character of an object by Sense-perception; and this gives rise to the specification of the particular object; and it is this specification that appears to have the character of Sense-perception, (thought in reality it is not so). And from this specification we can have the notion of a Middle Term, even if it be of the nature of your *Sāmānya*."

From the same source, &c. "The Bauddha does not admit of any proofs besides Inference and Sense-perception." If that "something else" be dependent upon the contact of the senses, it becomes Sense-perception, pure and simple; if not, then we could arrive at the notions of the *Sāmānya* of the Major and Minor Terms exactly in the same way as that of the Middle Term.

157 That is to say, just as a Remembrance, which is not a proof, brings about true cognition of Major and Minor Terms; so also the notion of the Middle Term, though



various terms), though in itself not a correct means of knowledge, becomes the means of arriving at the correct notion of the Major and Minor Terms; so would also the notion of the Middle Term (be a means of arriving at a correct inference)."

158. There (in the case of Remembrance), to the previous cognition (which is the origin of the Remembrance) belongs the character of a correct means of knowledge; and the purpose of Remembrance lies in the mere recalling of that previous cognition.

159. For the comprehension of the Middle Term, no means (of knowledge) is possible; and in the absence thereof, Remembrance can in no way apply in this case.

160. If anyone urges that the comprehension of the specification of an object has the character of 'Remembrance,' inasmuch it is not different (from the comprehension of the specific character of an object, which, in the opinion of the Bauddha, is a matter of Sense-perception);—then verily, such a person will also have the power of having a Remembrance of the son of a barren woman!

161. Nor can the specific character of an object be the cause of the cognition of its "Sāmānya"; because we have never perceived any invariable concomitance of the former with the latter.

162. And, further, the comprehension of the relation (of concomitance) of the specific character would make this character a 'Sāmānya,' like "causedness"; specially as no unique (specific, *asādhāraṇa*) object exists, or has ever existed before.

163. Nor can the character of a Middle Term belong to one which (like the specific character of an object) is devoid of specification and (hence) unnameable,—without previous recognition.

164. Even such particular properties as are specified cannot become

itself not true (as having its origin in a false means of knowledge) could bring about a correct Inference.

158 The true character of the proof of Remembrance is denied, only because it refers only to such objects as have already been recognised. Though it is unable to have an independent object of its own, yet it owes its origin to a correct recognition of a real object, at some previous time; and when it succeeds in recalling that object correctly, it becomes a correct means of knowledge. Hence the similarity cited in the last Kārikā does not hold good; and the position of the Bauddha remains as weak as ever.

161 The cognition of the specific character of an object is not always accompanied by that of the "Sāmānya" or class to which it belongs. Therefore the truth of the former cannot belong to the latter.

162 The specific character of an object could produce a notion of the *Sāmānya*, only if it could be the Middle Term; but this it cannot be; because of the specific character of an object, no relation can be asserted. If any relationship be asserted, then it would become a "Sāmānya," like "*Kṛtakatwa*."

164 When specified properties cannot form the Middle Term, without being related, how can unspecified entities be so? If neither the specific object nor the *Sāmānya* be the Middle Term, then the Ideas cannot be so; because of their being unrelated.





the Middle Term, unless they are related (to something else). And for the same reason even the *idea* of these (unrelated) entities cannot be the Middle Term.

165. And if the Middle Term be accepted to be of the form of a 'Sāmānya,' then you have the same endless series (K. 149-153). If any relation perceived in connection with something else (be admitted as giving rise to the Inference of a 'Sāmānya,' other than the one with reference to which the relation has been cognised) then any and everything will give rise to the cognition of anything (there being no restricting agency).

166. The recognition of the relationship of the Major and Minor Terms ought surely to be looked for (in all cases of Inference). But, prior to the action of Inference, the Bauddha can have no idea of it.

167. Nor is a knowledge of the Middle Term possible, through mere impression (Vāsanā); for (in that case) the cognition of the Major and Minor Terms too would be arrived at in the same manner, and not through the three-membered argument (in the form of an inferential syllogism).

168. Where the Middle Term is a negative one, it cannot be an object of Inference, since it is amenable to other means of knowledge (Sense-perception); hence the aforesaid discrepancy does not apply to it.

169. One, to whom cognition of the Major and Minor Terms arises from a Middle Term, which is cognised by Sense-perception,—for such a one, there is nothing more to be desired.

170. Even in a case where the cognition of the Major and Minor Terms is due to an inferred Middle Term,—the first Middle Term must be one that has been cognised by Sense-perception.

171. In (such Middle Terms as) "causedness" and the like, the character of the Middle Term belongs either to the action (of being caused) or to the agent (the 'potter' f.i.); and both of these being amenable to Sense-perception we have not to look for them (for the accomplishment of the cognition of the Middle Term).

172. Similarly Verbal Testimony and Analogy, &c., being based on "Sāmānya," any discrepancy in the cognition of it ("Sāmānya") causes discrepancy in all of them.

173. Thus then, for all the means of right knowledge, it is necessary

166 There can be no recognition of any relationship between unrecognised *Sāmānyas* of the Middle Term and the Major and Minor Terms; and these *Sāmānyas* cannot, in your opinion, be cognised without Inference. Therefore there is the same endless series of Inferences as pointed out in *Kārikās* 149-153.

168 If negation were not amenable to Sense-perception, and if it were an object of Inference, then the cognition of one negation would depend upon that of another and so on, *ad infinitum*; so the aforesaid fault of endlessness would apply here also.

170 That is to say, the Inference of the Middle Term (of the argument in question) must have a Middle Term that has been cognised by Sense-perception.





to be preceded by Sense-perception. And "Sāmānya" must be amenable to Sense-perception; since there would be no other means of cognising it.

174. Or else, how could even a particular object, (cow, f.i.), be said to be amenable to Sense-perception, when in comparison to other objects (*i.e.*, its own constituent parts), it is also said to be a "Sāmānya."

175-176. For instance, colour, &c., are all "Sāmānya" in comparison with "Blue, Red, &c."; these latter again have the character of 'Sāmānya' in comparison with particular forms of themselves (different forms of Blue, &c.); these particular forms again would be "Sāmānya;" so on and on, till we come to atoms; for the colour of even a binary compound is common to the two atoms composing it.

177. There is no process (of reasoning) based upon the final atom as a specific entity; nor does amenability to Sense-perception belong to it, either singly, or in masses.

178. Those that are not cognised separately, cannot be comprehended as a whole either; nor is it possible for distinct (atoms) to be the object of the cognition of non-difference.

179. And again, for the Bauddha there is no such thing as a concrete whole; and it is not possible always for all people to have their cognitions brought about by an object which is non-existing.

180. Then too, there can be no concrete whole without many individuals belonging to the same class. Therefore even when these (atoms) form a concrete whole, their atomic character remains unaltered.

181. And thus it is proved that even in an invisible object (atom) you have a "Sāmānya" (the class "atom"). Because it is only in what we call a "Sāmānya" that there is an idea extending over a number of homogenous objects, even if we do not hold them to form one concrete whole.

182. Just as we have the sensual comprehension of a "Sāmānya"

178 Inference of the rest are all based upon Sense-perception.

177 Then, says the Bauddha, we will have the final atom as a pure particular entity, which could be amenable to Perception; and this would form the basis of all subsequent Inferences, thus sailing clear of the rock of endlessness urged in K. 149 153. The Kārikā meets this assertion of the Bauddha.

178 The objection is that that though atoms are not visible singly, Masses of them will be clearly visible, like masses of Sand. The Sense of the reply is that the grains of sand are such as are distinctly seen individually, which cannot be said of atoms.

"Nor is it, &c." Those that are distinct cannot be comprehended as identical.

179 The Bauddha holds to the existence of parts and denies the existence of a whole constituted by these parts. Hence a collection of atoms, considered as one concrete whole, is not admitted by him; and hence he cannot reasonably base all conceptions upon this non-entity.

182 This anticipates the following: "We may have sensuous perception of such as *avayavi* (concrete whole); but how can there be any such conception of the class *cow* as inhering in an individual cow?" The sense of the reply is that the nature of perception is identical in both these cases; and so there can be no difference.





that extends over certain homogenous objects (as forming a concrete whole), so we would also have a similar perception of a "Sāmānya" that inheres in each individual.

183. The Mimāṃsakas, again, do not necessarily admit the existence of atoms; and so upon that ground you cannot postulate the falsity of a perceived entity.

184. One, who would deny the visible concrete whole, by means of invisible atoms, would also assert the absence of the hare, through its horns!

185. It is only when the existence of a concrete whole is established as a fact, that the existence of atoms is postulated, and that simply as a means for the accomplishment of the idea of the whole.

186. Therefore an object is to be accepted, just as it is always perceived,—be it either as a "Sāmānya" or otherwise (specific entity).

187. In comparison with the genus (Sāmānya) "Being," the class 'cow,' comes to be accepted as a specific entity. Therefore one who holds the specific entity to be amenable to Sense-perception, need not deny the existence of the 'Sāmānya' (Genus).

188. If it be urged that "it is not as a genus ('Sāmānya') that a 'Sāmānya' is perceived by the Sense,"—then (we reply) *Is there any such idea of any object perceived being a specific entity?* (The fact is that) whatever a person comprehends can be spoken of in both ways (i.e., as a *class* and as a *specific entity*).

*Thus ends the chapter on Inference.*

#### (SECTION 6.)

#### ON WORDS.

#### (VERBAL AUTHORITY.)

1. *Obj.* "While treating of Sense-perception, &c., what should be laid down is the definition of *Verbal Authority* in general; how is it, then, that the definition of Scripture has been put forward (in the Bhāṣhya)

183 If the perception of atoms militate against the theory of concrete wholes, formed of these atoms, then we can safely say that the postulating of atoms is by no means a necessary element in our theory. We admit of the atom, merely as a hypothesis to explain the existence and formation of concrete wholes.

188 Just as we do not *always* have a recognition of the *cow* as a *class*; so too we do not always have the recognition of the unspecified specific entity. Hence, if the mere non-recognition of the *Sāmānya* as such be sufficient ground for denying its Sense-perceptibility, then, on the same ground we could also deny the Sense-perceptibility of the unspecified specific entity (accepted by the Baudāha). For these reasons, we conclude the fact to be that all that we perceive is perceived in a two-fold character—i.e., (1) an unspecified abstract idea of *thing*, and (2) the thing as belonging to a particular class, and endowed with certain properties.

<sup>1</sup> Bhāṣhya : "Āstram gādvijñānāt asannikṛtē'rthē vijñānam."





so hurriedly—(i.e., without Verbal Authority in general having been defined) ?

2. "To leave off the definition of the generic term and then to mention the definition of the specific term is a most absurd process; for this reason too the definition of Scripture should not have been given (now).

3. "The cognition of an object produced by the knowledge of words, mentioned without any specification, cannot be the definition of a particular form of Verbal Authority (*Scripture*).

4. "'Scripture' is the name given only to such 'words'—either caused or eternal—as lead, either to the activity or to cessation from activity of certain human agents.

5. "If there be a description of the form of any (action), that too becomes 'Scripture,' inasmuch as it forms an integral part of the 'word,' as leading to the activity or otherwise of the person addressed.

6. "Since it is only when the *Bhāvanā* is praised (or decried) that there is activity or cessation from activity; therefore it is to that alone that the name 'Scripture' can correctly belong, and not to mere words."

7. *Rep.* The author of the *Bhāshya* has got to explain the fact that the Means of Knowledge need not be examined; and it is only in the course of this that he lays down the definitions of these; and so he does not chatter away about things that are not directly essential to his own Scripture (*Veda*).

8. If he were to lay down the definition of 'word' as occurring in ordinary human parlance, it would not have served any purpose of one wishing to explain the *Veda*.

9. The definition of "Sense-perception" has been given, because it is of use in the deciphering of letters, &c., at the time of learning the meaning of the Scripture.

10. Since it would have served no purpose to define such words as occur in ordinary parlance, as "bring the cow," &c., therefore the definition has been stated in a form suitable only to the 'words' constituting the Scripture.

11. Since there can be no specific term without its corresponding generic term, therefore after having exemplified the specific, it is always easy to get at the definition of the generic term.

12. Even the generic form (the cognitions of objects by means of words) is here restricted to the specific form (Scripture); because of the peculiar context. It has already been laid down that "*Codanā*" (urging) and "*Upadēṣa*" (Exhortation) are both (synonymous with) "*Çāstra*" (Scripture).

<sup>6</sup> e.g., "Arthavada passages."

<sup>7</sup> The definition of Word in general would not serve any purpose of the *Mimāṃsaka*.

<sup>12</sup> "Context."—Since the definition is given in the course of a consideration of *Codanā*, which is synonymous with Scripture.





13. Just as the word "Codanā" refers to the "Vedic codanā" alone, so the words "*the meaning of words*" and "*cognition of objects*" (occurring in the definition given in the Bhāṣya) refer to those occurring in the "Scripture" only.

14. "Sense-perception and the rest" have been declared to be no proper subjects of enquiry; and since "Scripture" is included therein the fact of its being no subject for enquiry is implied in the same declaration.

15. The Bauddhas and the Vaiçēshikas declare this ("Verbal Authority") to be included in "Inference." The Sankhyas hold the two to be distinct, but do not lay down any adequate grounds of difference.

16-17. They declare that the ground of Inference is that the *specification of sentences and final letters (of words) endowed with impressions of foregoing ones*—and the *desire to utter*, are not found in the case of (the terms of an Inference) "Smoke, &c." But here they are encountered by a double fallacy: (1) "Vaidharmyasamā" (the similarity of dissimilarity), and (2) "Vikalpasamā." (The similarity of doubt). Even among Inferences of such objects as "smoke," "non-eternality," "Horned-ness," &c., there is a difference; but that does not make any difference in their common character of "Inference."

18. So long as any discrepancy in the tripartite character (of Inference) is not shown, one who would speak only of very slight points of difference, would become open to refutation.

19. (They urge that) "in the case of words we have cognitions in accordance with optional usage, which is not the case with smoke, &c.;"

<sup>18</sup> As the generic term "Codanā" is restricted to the specific term *Vedic* "Codanā," so the generic term in the given definition would refer to the specific term "Scripture."

<sup>16-17</sup> "*Similarity of dissimilarity*": The Bauddha argues: "Verbal Authority is nothing but a case of Inference; because it is brought about by affirmative and negative premises; just like the idea of *fire* obtained from a sight of the *smoke*. The Sāṅkhya meets this by a counter-argument: "*Smoke, &c.*, are devoid of any verbal specification which is present in Verbal Authority; and on account of this vital difference between them, the two processes can never be identical." This, however only serves as a counter-argument, and does not quite refute the Bauddha reasoning. "*Similarity of doubt*": Even the production of cognition by means of affirmative and negative premises is, in part, devoid of verbal expression; e.g., the cognition of fire from smoke; while in certain cases it is accompanied by such expression; as in the case of Verbal Authority. Thus one part becomes Inference, while the other does not. (For *Vaidharmyasama* and *Vikalpasama*, See Gantama's *Nyaya-Sutras*). "*That does not, &c.*"—The mere fact of the presence of a point of difference does not necessarily make them different in class.

<sup>19</sup> Signs and gestures are understood to express something; and surely there is no articulate utterance in this case, the meaning being comprehended by means of pre-concerted signs.





but here also, we have Self-contradiction with reference to signs made by the different parts of the body.

20. As a matter of fact, gestures of hands, &c., are capable of expressing correct meanings, when their meanings have been previously settled; consequently these meanings come to serve as the middle terms (helping to arrive at a correct conclusion by means of Inference).

21. In the case of "dependence upon man" (as a ground of difference) too, we have the same Self-contradiction; for in that case, there would be no truth in *words* and *Vedic sentences* (none of which depend upon human option).

22-23. "The recognition of relation" (between words and their meanings, urged as a ground of difference) is also found to be peculiar to the case of the different forms of Inference: in the case of Verbal Authority the relationship depends upon *human agency* (the utterances of a trustworthy person are true); that of 'smoke' and 'fire' rests upon (sameness of) *place*; and another case (that of the rise of the ocean-tide on a fullmoon night) rests upon (the peculiarity of) *time*. In fact the fact of depending upon human agency is made, by the Baudddhas, a ground for asserting the non-difference of "Verbal testimony" from Inference—basing their assertion upon the invariable concomitance between "trustworthy assertions" and "correct assertion."

24. The difference of only a few such words as "apūrva," and the like (words whose relations are not perceived by any means save that of Verbal Authority, and which therefore cannot in any way form subjects of Inference) is not enough for asserting the difference of all ('Verbal testimony'); nor are these few words distinguished from such words as "Horse, &c.," because both have the common character of being *words*.

25. A word, whose relation (with objects and meaning) has not been recognised, cannot express anything. Therefore the absence of any relation (with regard to these few words) cannot serve to differentiate them from Inference.

26. Nor can a difference (between Verbal testimony and Inference) be asserted on the ground that in the former there is identity of form among "word," "its meaning," and the "idea of these"; because this (identity) has been fully refuted (in the Chapter on Sense-perception).

22.23 The mere difference of the ground of expressiveness is no sure sign of difference; as even in various cases of avowed Inference, the basis of each Inference is peculiar to itself. "*Basing their assertion, &c.*" The argument being: "Trustworthy assertion is true, because it is in keeping with the real state of things."

25 Even such words as "Apūrva" and the like stand in need of the cognition of certain relations, without which they cannot give any meaning. Thus then, if they have no relations, they cannot express any meaning; and if they have relations, they become included in Inference.





27. With a view to the case of reflections (in the mirror), the argument (based upon identity of form) becomes doubtful. A person understands his own face to be exactly like the reflection that he sees in the mirror; but that does not preclude this cognition from being a case of Inference.

28. Even if the cognition of the similarity of the face with its reflection be accepted to be a case of direct Sense-perception, we will find the argument contradicted by other instances; *e.g.*, when from foot-prints in the sand, we infer the identity of the prints with the feet of persons that may have passed by that way.

29. By a single sentence uttered but once, there cannot be an indication of many meanings (simultaneously); therefore the mere fact of a word expressing contradictory and non-contradictory meanings, cannot serve as a ground for asserting its difference (from Inference);

30. because (in the case of Inference too) we find the same thing with regard to the Middle Term, both when it is a true Reason, and when it is not. If it be urged that "since there is contradiction, there can be no Inference,"—then, for the same reason, you too could have no Scripture (on account of the contradictory significations of words).

31. In whichever sentence we have only one meaning, there we cannot but admit of an identity with Inference; and certainly if a sentence is uttered only once, the meaning desired to be conveyed cannot but be one only.

32. The fact of the appearance of many ideas, as forming the denotations of words whose meanings have not been ascertained, is present also in the case of such Middle Terms as are not very explicit (in their applications); therefore that cannot form a ground of difference.

33. The non-mention of an Instance (in the case of "Verbal Testimony," as a ground of its difference from Inference) is found to be too wide, inasmuch as it is found to be the case in (Inferences from) 'smoke,' &c., where the Middle Term being too well known, the Instance is not cited.

27 The experience of common people is that they cannot see their own face directly, it is only its reflection that they perceive in the mirror; and in the case of the hand, &c., they find that the reflection in the mirror tallies exactly with what they see with the eye; and from this fact they infer that the face too must be exactly like the reflection in the mirror.

30 The perception of "smoke," proves—(1) the existence of fire, (2) its heat, (3) its capacity to burn, and (4) origin from fuel—all at one and the same time. This is the case when the Reason is valid. In the case of an invalid reason, also—*e.g.*, 'Sound is eternal, because it is caused'—we find that the argument as stated proves the eternality of Sound, while the same reason, through well-ascertained invariable concomitance also proves its non-eternal character. Therefore the mere fact of expressing diverse and contradictory meanings cannot serve as a ground for asserting any absolute difference between Verbal Testimony and Inference.

32 *e.g.*, when the presence of Smoke has not been quite ascertained.

33 "Not cited"—as also in the case of Inferences employed for one's own conviction.



34. In the case of a word not often used, people stand in need of the remembrance of some object related to it (in order to comprehend it rightly); and with regard to which word, one comes to remember that "this word had been used in such and such a sense."

35-37. Here, the arguments, that the opponent brings in support of identity (of Verbal Authority with Inference), have not been refuted (by the Sāṅkhya in giving proofs of the difference of Verbal Authority from Inference). (These arguments are): "Verbal Authority is identical with Inference, (1) because of the existence of affirmative and negative premises; (2) because in the case of Verbal Authority (as also in that of Inference) cognition is preceded by the recognition of a certain relation, due to the previous sensuous perception of one of the members; (3) because, not touching objects of Sense-perception, it is a means of knowledge other than Sense-perception; (4) because its object is a *Sāmānya*; and (5) because it refers to all the three points of time (past, present and future),—exactly like the Inference of Fire from smoke."

38. Certain Mimāṃsakas seek to prove the difference (of Verbal Authority from Inference) on the ground of the difference in the object (of Verbal Authority); since, they argue, Scripture has its application in such cases as are not touched by the former two (means of knowledge: Inference and Sense-perception).

39. But, in that case, no Verbal Authority could belong to human utterances. "Be it so." Then by what means will you have the cognition of the meaning? "From the idea present in the speaker's mind (inferred from his utterance)." But from where do you get at this 'speaker's idea'?

40. This idea cannot be the characteristic mark (and hence the Reason, Middle Term) of the meaning of a Word: nor can this (meaning) in any way be the characteristic mark of the speaker's idea. By means of these is brought about the cognition of particular objects; and hence the character of Inference (which always has a 'Samānya' for its object) must belong to it.

34 "The word had been used, &c.,"—and only then is the meaning of the word duly comprehended. And this is a case of pure Inference: "This word has such and such a meaning, because (I remember that) knowing people had used it in that sense—exactly like the word 'cow.'"

35-37 The instance in each of the five syllogisms is the same: "the Inference of the existence of fire from the perception of smoke." In the case of (2)—in Inference we have a *sensuous perception* of the Smoke, which leads to the *remembrance* of the invariable concomitance between Smoke and Fire, as perceived in the culinary hearth. In the case of Words also, we have a *sensuous perception* (auditory) of the word, and then follows the *remembrance* of the concomitance of this word with a certain sensation.

39 "From where, &c.,"—without understanding the constant relationship between the Word and its Meaning, how could you get at any notion of the idea present in the mind of the speaker?





41. Therefore when the meaning of the speaker is not amenable to Sense-perception, &c., then (in that case) even a human utterance becomes a Verbal Authority for the listener.

42. (Says the Baudha) "Even then, you (the Mimāṃsaka of K. 38) fail to prove that the meaning of the Scripture is not an object of Inference. For there too we have the Word as the characteristic (Middle Term), just as 'smoke' is of the 'fire.'"

43. "The mere fact of its not being an object of Inference, does not prove it to be the object of no other means of knowledge; for certainly, the mere fact of 'colour' not being an object of the sense of Hearing, does not prove it to be imperceptible by the organs of Sense."

44-45. Under the circumstances, some people of our own party, not caring to trouble themselves with the subtleties of argumentation, admit that "Verbal Authority" is a particular form of Inference, and as such, the means of obtaining a notion of Duty; for in the case of Duty (which is yet to come) what has been denied (by the Bhāṣhya) to be the characteristic Middle Term is only one in the form of an object (and not in that of a word).

45-46. (To these people we reply): Well, we do not object to your desire to call "Verbal Authority" by the name of "Anumāna." If, however, there be an identity of form and character between Verbal Authority and Inference, then the knowledge due to the Veda ceases to have any validity, because this latter has not got the character of Inference.

47-48. In human utterances, it happens to be endowed with validity, on account of its similarity to Inference, inasmuch as (in that case) you have the concomitance of "trustworthy assertion" and "correspondence to the real state of things," as the basis of the inferential argument. In the case of the Veda, on the other hand, since there is no trustworthy personality attached to it, and as such there being no concomitance

41 Therefore it is only when the idea of the speaker has not been duly recognised by Sense-perception that his utterance can have any verbal authority; and not that the recognition of the speaker's idea produces the recognition of the meaning of his utterance.

44-45 *In the case of Duty, &c.*—The Bhāṣhya has laid down the fact that, in the case of Duty, which is yet in the future, and not amenable to Sense-perception, there can be no Inference. Hence if Verbal Authority were made only a special form of Inference, then the Veda would cease to be an authority for Duty. With this objection in view, these "some people of our own party" seek refuge in the assertion that "it is only a Middle Term of an objective form that has been denied with regard to Duty; and as we can hold the Word to be a Middle Term applicable to the case of Duty, there can be no contradiction."

45-46 If you give up all the necessary ingredients of Inference, then Verbal Authority comes to be called "Anumāna" only in name; and as the word "Anumāna" only means a "cognition, following upon certain other cognition," we do not object to this name being applied to Verbal Authority.





(recognised), the character of Inference cannot apply to it, and it ceases to be valid.

49. "Even the accepted truth (as perceived by other means of knowledge) of even one part of the Veda, would give it the character of Inference: F.i. 'The passages treating of Agnihotra, &c., are true, because they are Veda, like the passage declaring 'deftness' of the God of Wind (which is found to be true in ordinary experience)'"?

50. It will not be so, because the argument fails in the case of the passage which declares the sun to be a post; or again, the Agnihotra passages too would come to have a subsidiary character, like the passage "The sun is the post." And further (if Verbal Authority be accepted to be a form of Inference) then there would be no end to the counter-arguments (proving the invalidity of the Veda), as described before (under *Sutra 2*).

51. For these reasons it is only when Verbal Authority, in the Veda as well as in human utterances, has its validity apart from the character of Inference (which is sought to be thrust upon it), that the validity of the Veda can be established.

52. For the same reason too we cannot have the *fact of being the exhortation of a trustworthy person*, as a definition of "Scripture"; because in the Veda, there is no possibility of any trustworthy speaker; and in the case of ordinary human utterance too, Validity cannot rest solely upon that fact.

53. This has been explained before (under *Sutra 2*). Therefore the idea that is produced by Verbal testimony must have its validity in itself,—provided that its contradiction is not perceived (by other and simpler means of right knowledge).

54. The only similarity that this (Verbal testimony) has with Inference, is that both are valid. The opponent has however tried hard

50 "*Subsidiary character, &c.*" In the case of the *deftness* of Air (as declared in the Ṛuti passage "*Vāyurvā Kṣhāpishthā dēvata*"), we find it to be true, because it tallies with other means of cognition. Therefore in the case of the Agnihotra passage also, we would have to admit its truth, on the ground of the results tallying with the results obtained by other means of knowledge. And thus these passages would come to be only secondary passages, laying down the excellences of objects cognised by other means of cognition. Just as the passage "The Sun is the post" is accepted as laying down a peculiar excellence of the Sun. "*Counter arguments*":—these are described in full under Aphorism 2,—and these have been refuted on the sole ground of the Veda being self-evident, and as such depending, for its validity, upon nothing else save its own inherent strength. If, however, it is admitted to be only a form of Inference, then all the arguments, urged by the Baudha against the authority of the Veda, would rebound with doubled vigour, utterly damaging the cause of the Mimāṃsā philosophy.

53 The definition given in the Bhāṣya is the only correct one.

54 Verbal Testimony is twofold: in the form of Word, and Sentence. The Word has been precluded by the qualification "*asannikṛishṭa*," in the definition given by the Bhāṣya; inasmuch as the Word being before us, perceived by the Ear, cannot be said





to prove the two to be identical; hence it is that we also consider this question (of the validity of Words) here.

55-56. Of the characteristic Middle Term (of an Inference) and of the Word, we find the objects to be entirely different: it will be shown hereafter that the Word has a 'Sāmānya' for its object; and it has been already proved that the Minor Term is an object endowed with a particular qualification. Therefore, so long as it has not got such a *qualified object* for its object, Verbal Authority cannot be (called) Inference.

57. In the case of Verbal authority, anything other than the "Sāmānya" belongs only to the sentence; even when no second word is uttered it is always inferred through the force (of the uttered word).

58-59. If it be urged that "even in a single word, we have the denotation of a certain object, as *characterised by a certain Number, &c.*"—(we reply) such is not the case with "Avyayas" (Indeclinables). Even where these (Number, &c.,) are denoted, they only qualify the particular *individual* (and not the whole *class*); because the *action*, signified by a different word (the verb), belongs to the Individual (and it is with reference to the verb that the Number of the nominative is determined).

59-60. Even in the case of sentences where, such (qualified) words as "Gomān" ('one who has cows') are used,—though the word is qualified, yet it cannot serve as the Minor Term of an inferential argument, because it is already a definitely established entity. Specially as (in the case of such words) the denotation is only so much as has been previously ascertained (and hence there can be no ground for the interference of Inference).

to be "asannikrishta." Consequently it is not necessary for us to prove the difference of Word-cognition from Inferential cognition. Still, since the Bauddha has laboured hard over the identification of Word-cognition with Inference, we cannot but spare a little space for its consideration.

55-56 "Hereafter"—i.e., in the Chapter on "Akriti."

57 This anticipates the following objection: "A word is also found to denote a qualified object; as for instance, when one asks—'who is going?'—the reply is: 'The King'; the meaning of the reply being—"The King is going." The sense of the Kārikā is that the instance cited is one of the use of a *Sentence*, and not of a *Word*, the reply being really in the form of a complete sentence: "The King is going." The wanting words are inferred from the force of the Nominative ending in "Rājā," which stands in need of a verb, to complete its nominative signification.

58-59 The *class* is always one; the difference of Number belongs to the *individual*, which, according to our theory, is not directly denoted by the Word, which denotes only the Class.

59-60 "Cannot be the Minor Term."—It is only a known object, sought to be proved as having a property not yet known, that can be the Minor Term in an inferential argument. In the case in question, however, prior to the utterance of the Word, nothing is known; and when the Word has been uttered, the qualified object is at once recognised; and there is nothing left to be proved, which could form the Major Term of any Syllogism.



61-62. Even in this case however, there is a difference (from the qualification of the terms of a syllogism), inasmuch as there is a difference between the meaning of the noun ("Go," cow) and that of the (possessive) affix ("Matup"). Nor is there (in the case of the word) a cognition of the qualification and that of the qualified object, independently, each by itself. And again, in the case of Inference, the cognition of the object with a qualification is preceded by that of the object itself; whereas in the case of the Word, the case is quite the reverse.

62. (*Objection*): "But wherefore is not the "Word" made the Minor Term (object of Inference), as with regard to its *having a definite meaning* (as the Major Term)?"

63. In that case the Reason (Middle Term, "Çabdatwa") would be a part of the conclusion. It is only when a particular 'smoke' (the one seen issuing from the mountain) is the Minor Term, that the class 'smoke' in general, is made the Reason (Middle Term).

64-65. We cannot (in the same manner) have "Çabdatwa" (the class 'word' in general) as the Reason; and that there can be no such class as "Goçabdatwa" will be shown later on. It is only the one particular individual (word) (and not a class) that can serve as the Reason. If it be urged that "it can be so through the difference in the manifesting cause of the same word (as forming the *Hētu*, and as forming the Minor Term)"; (we reply) we are cognisant of no idea (of any such difference based upon difference of the manifesting agency).

65-66. And again, what sort of specification can you have in the case in question? It cannot be one either of time or of space. If it be

61.62 And hence the whole need not be taken as one word. "Nor is there, &c." :— in the case of an inferential argument, the *smoke*, for instance, is perceived by itself; and so also is the *Fire*, and so again the *Mountain*. Whereas in the case of the Word "*Gomān*" the word cannot bring about any separate cognition of the signification of the possessive affix by itself. And again, &c." The *Mountain* is recognised before its qualification (the existence of *Fire*); while in the case of the word "*Gomān*" we have the cognition of the *Cow* before that of the person possessing the cow.

62 The syllogism being: "Çabdo'rthavān (the Word has meaning) Çabdatwāt (because it is a Word), Çhatapatādivat (like the words *ghata*, *patu*), &c."

64.65 What we have got to prove here is the presence of a definite meaning; and certainly the class "Çabdatwa" cannot, in any way, help to prove such presence. "It is only, &c."—It is only the particular word in question that can be asserted as the *hētus* and inasmuch as this is also the Minor Term, the objection, viz, the anomaly of the Middle Term (or the Minor Premiss) being a part of the conclusion—remains untouched "It can be so, &c."—the difference in the manifesting agency of the Word in the two places will suffice for all the difference that is necessary for the argument.

65.66 What sort of specification is asserted with regard to "Word" as the Minor Term? "What remains," &c.—all that is sought to be proved is that such and such a word has got such and such a meaning; and so, when, before the conclusion of the Inference has been arrived at, the Word is recognised as having a definite meaning, there is nothing more left to be cognised, for the sake of which we should have recourse to Inference.





urged that "it is taken as specified by the cognition of its meaning," then (we ask) what then is left behind that would form the subject of Inference?

66-68. Nor is any such power, as that which causes the meaning to be cognised (inferred) as belong to any *particular* (word). No such power can belong to a part of the particular object, as it does to (a part of) the class 'Fire.' Because power can belong to the *class* alone; and for the Minor Term and the Middle Term too, you cannot but have the *Class*; hence Inference cannot apply to the case of words as endowed with a certain meaning.

68-72. And again, how do you define the fact of "Word" being the property of the Minor Term? As a matter of fact, there is no relation-ship except that of *action and agent*. The King being the *supporter* of the man, we have the expression "the *King's man*"; the *tree* exists in the *branches* or the *branches* in the *tree*; hence "the *tree's branches*"; in a place occupied by *Fire*, we have the *agency* of *smoke*, with regard to the *action* of *existence*. In all such relations as the causal and the like, there is always a certain *action*. And until the form of the relation has been recognised, there can be no such assertion as that "the relation exists"; nor, in the absence of a relation, is the "Genitive-Tatpurusha" possible; therefore the fact that the Word is "*pakshadharma*" (property of the Minor Term) can never be rightly ascertained.

73-74. When (in the above manner) all other relations have been precluded (from the compound '*pakshadharma*'), if some people were to assert the fact of Word being the *pakshadharma* (property of the Minor

66.68 If that which is inferred be not the meaning, but a power to make the meaning comprehended, then—we ask—to what factor does this power belong? If it belong to the word "Cow" then we become open to all the objections urged in K. 63 *et seq.* In the case of "Fire," the *class* has been found to extend over all individual *Fires*; hence the remembrance of the Fire and the Smoke in the culinary hearth leads to the inference of the existence of fire in the mountain. There can, however, be no such pervasion in the case of an individual, which therefore can never be the object of Inference. "You have the same, &c." Since a *Sāmānya* (class)—"Word"—alone is your Minor Term; and the Middle Term—"Çabdatwa" is—also a *Sāmānya*; so also is the Major Term. In such a case, then no Inference is possible.

68.72 In an Inference, there are three factors; with regard to the Middle Term: (1) the fact of its having a relation with the Minor Term, and thus constituting the Minor Premiss; (2) its existence, in common with the Major Term, in a certain substratum, and thus constituting the Major Premiss and the Instance; and (3) Non-existence in a place, where the Major Term never exists, and thus helping the formation of the Major Premiss. Kārikās 68-84 prove that in the case of "Word" as the Middle Term, the first factor is not applicable; Kārikās 85-95 set aside the application of the second factor, and Kārikās 95-98 that of the third. "*Genitive Tatpurusha*": the compound word "*Pakshadharma*," we can analyse as "*pakshasya dharmah*."

73.74 "Like negation"—*i.e.*, just as *absence* is held to be the object of negation.





Term, *Meaning*) in consideration of the relationship, that the word bears to the meaning, *viz.*, that the *meaning forms its object*—as in the case of 'negation,'—then those people too will have to explain in what manner the Word has the Meaning for its object. There is no coexistence in place or time, &c., between the two; nor is there any proximity (of the one to the other).

75. For these reasons the fact of the Word having the Meaning for its object can be explained only by the fact that the Word brings about an idea of which the particular thing (denoted by the word) is the object; and in this "bringing about" alone lies the action (that would justify any relationship between the two).

76. Thus then the expressiveness of the Word (with regard to the particular meaning) having been previously established, such a 'pakshadharmā' cannot be the means of the cognition (of the meaning); and hence for this reason too, there can be no Inference.

77. (Because) the fact of the Word being a property (of Paksha) would rest upon its expressiveness (of the meaning); and its expressiveness would depend upon the fact of its being the property (of the Paksha in order to fulfil the conditions of Inference),—and thus there is a mutual interdependence; and hence this assumption, too, will not hold water.

78-79. Such people as are not cognisant of the relationship (that the Word bears to the Meaning), do not know the Word apart from its form (as heard); and hence there is nothing else on which the notion of the Word being a 'pakshadharmā' could be based; for certainly it is not on the mere *shape* of 'smoke,' &c., that their character of "pakshadharmā," is based.

79-80. Nor can the character of "pakshadharmā" depend upon any previous relation. For even if this relation (of Smoke and Fire) has not been previously recognised, one has the notion that this mountain has "smoke in it," which asserts the fact of *smoke* (Middle Term) being the 'property' of the *mountain* (Paksha). And it is in this point alone that lies the difference (of *pakshadharmā*) from the second factor (*sapakshasattva*).

79-80 "The relation of the Word with the meaning has been recognised by some other people beforehand; and this might serve as the bases of *Pakshadharmatā*." This cannot be: because, even if the relation of the Smoke and Fire, &c., &c., &c. *It is in this point, &c.*" Since the *Pakshadharmatā* (*i.e.*, the relation predicated in the Minor Premiss) does not depend upon any previous recognition of the relations of the Middle Term; therefore it is upon this ground alone that it differs from the *Supakshasattva* (*i.e.*, the relation predicated in the Major Premiss), which does not depend upon the recognition of any relation at the present time,—being as it is, only a general statement of relations between the Middle and Major Terms, perceived beforehand; whereas the Minor Premiss is the statement of the particular relation that the Middle Term bears to the Minor Term.





81. In this case (of Inference with regard to Word), since the Minor Premiss (pakshadharmatā) is nothing more than the previously recognised relation (i.e., the Major Premiss); and since there is no relation previous to the recognition of the Meaning, therefore, such a Minor Premiss can never be any means (of getting at the Meaning of a Word).

82-83. Nor (in the case of Word) is the Minor Term previously cognised; therefore there can be no Minor Premiss based upon it; (in the case of the inference of fire from smoke) however the place 'Mountain,' is such as has been known, prior to the recognition of its property (smoke). And that (meaning) which is here assumed to be the Minor Term, is also the one which is sought to be cognised by means of Inference.

83-84. And so long as that (Minor Term) has not been cognised, the predicate cannot be ascertained; and if it be such as has been already cognised before even the Minor Premiss has been ascertained, what else remains, that would be learnt by means of the Inference got at by means of the subsequently cognised Minor Premiss.

85-86. Nor can you ascertain any affirmative concomitance of the Word with the Object (Meaning) sought to be proved by Inference. For it is by means of a certain action that we arrive at the notion of the concomitance of anything e.g., where smoke is, there the presence of Fire, as an invariable concomitant, is clear; but we have no such certain idea that 'whenever word is, meaning is sure to exist.'

87. For the meaning is not recognised as being concomitant with the word, either in time or place. If it be urged that "Word being eternal and all-prevading, we can always have an idea of such concomitance" then (on that ground) we would have (the notion of concomitance with word) of everything (and not only of the one definite meaning).

88. In this way, the Word being omnipresent, and (for the same reason) there being no negation with regard to it, every word in existence would bring about the notion of all things in the world.

89-90. Thus then, there being no affirmative concomitance, either in time or place, if some one were to assert the cognition of the (form of the) Word as concomitant with the cognition of the Meaning;—then (we reply) even this (concomitance) does not exist; because we find that, even without any idea of the Meaning, there is a cognition of the Word,—in the case of illiterate people.

81 The Minor Premiss is not any advance upon the Major Premiss, towards particularisation.

82-83 "That which, &c."—If the object sought to be cognised by means of the Inference be already previously cognised, what is the use of the Inference?

83-84 "Cannot be ascertained"—i.e., we can have no Minor Term.

90 Illiterate persons quite rightly comprehend the form of the word only by the Ear, but they may not understand its meaning.





91. (If it be urged that) "we may assume such concomitance, when the Word is repeated (to the person not comprehending its meaning the first at utterance)";—(we reply) in some instances we find that even if the Word is repeated a hundred times, its Meaning is not comprehended.

92. (*Objection*). "But we have a clear case of concomitance, in a place where the words are such as have their relations (with meanings) definitely ascertained." (*Reply*). Well, if the relation be ascertained prior to the comprehension of the concomitance, then such concomitance cannot be held to be the means of getting at the idea of the meaning.

93-94. It is an acknowledged fact that Inference owes its origin to invariable concomitance. But when the concomitance proceeds after the expressiveness of the Word (with regard to its Meaning) has been recognised, how can such concomitance be said to be the cause of the cognition of such expressiveness?

95. Therefore it must be admitted that the expressiveness of a Word is recognised independently of any such concomitance. Whereas (in the case of Inference) prior to the cognition of the concomitance of smoke (with fire), we do not get at the notion of the presence of this (smoke) bringing about the cognition of the presence of fire.

96. If there be the recognition of a negative relation between the idea of the Word and the Meaning not yet known; even this, occurring afterwards, cannot be the means of bringing about the recognition of the meaning.

97. The relation, that we will lay down as being the means of the ascertainment of expressiveness, will have both affirmative and negative bearings; but these (affirmative and negative relations) cannot belong to the recognition of the Meaning (of Words).

98. Thus, as to Sense-perception, so to "Verbal testimony" too, the character of Inference cannot belong; (1) because it is devoid of the three

91 "*Hundred times*."—The present day readers of the Veda repeat the whole of it like a parrot, and this too, very often; but they do not comprehend its meaning.

96 The negation cannot be in the form—"where there is no object, there is no word denoting it"; because though Rāma himself does not now exist, the word continues all the same. If the negative premiss be in the form—"Where there is no idea of the meaning there is no idea of Word,"—then this becomes untrue, with regard to illiterate persons. If it be asserted that the premiss holds with those who know of the relation between the Word and its Meaning,—then, in that case, there being no other relation save that of *expressiveness*, the negative premiss based upon this appears only after its purpose (i.e., the recognition of the expressiveness of the Word) has been fulfilled; and as such, it becomes useless, as a factor in the bringing about of the recognition of the meaning of the Word.

98 The three factors of Inference having been proved to be inapplicable to the case of Verbal authority.





factors, and (2) because an object like that of Inference is precluded (from being the object of "Verbal testimony").

99. It is only when the "Word" is accepted as a means of knowledge that, we can discuss (as above) its difference or non-difference (from Inference). But, as a matter of fact, the *meaning of a word* is not recognised by means of the cognition of the 'word.'

100. Because a word when used, is used with reference to four kinds of objects : (1) object directly perceptible by the senses, (2) object not in contact with the Sense-organs, (3) object that is previously known, and (4) object that is not previously known.

101. The word, that is used with reference to (3) *the object that is already known* (&c.), that which is perceived directly by the senses, is used only with regard to objects that are already cognised (by other means); and thus, there being nothing more denoted by the Word, all that it does is to describe (what is already known, and hence is not, by itself, a means of knowledge).

102. With regard to (4) *an object not known before*, there is either no knowledge (produced by the Word), or there is a cognition of mere relationship (between Word and Meaning). This 'Relation' is not the meaning of the word; and that which is the meaning (of the word) is got at by other means of knowledge.

103-104. In the case of (2) *an object which is not in contact with the senses, and which is not known*, there can be no idea of the meaning expressed (by the Word). And in the case of an object which is behind the Senses, but known, we can have only a remembrance. And since it is only to objects already cognised (by other means of knowledge) that Remembrance applies, it cannot have the character of an independent means of knowledge. Because such character (of the means of knowledge) depends upon the means leading to the specification (or determination, of something not so determined by any other means).

105. "Inasmuch as it brings about an independent determination at the time (of remembrance), wherefore should not we assert the character of an independent means of knowledge to belong to Remembrance, as we do Recognition (Pratyabhijñā)?"

106. By means of Remembrance we cognise only so much as has

<sup>99</sup> In our opinion, it is the Sentence, and not the Word, that is, the means of cognition. In that case, there can be no occasion for the above discussions.

<sup>102</sup> "By other means, &c."—The object denoted by the Word is cognised by means of Sense-perception, and not by that of the Word.

<sup>106</sup> At the time that the object is *remembered*, it is not perceived by any other means of knowledge.

<sup>105</sup> "Recognition" proves the existence of the object at the particular time; and as such it is held to be a "Pramāṇa"; whereas at the time that we *remember* an object, we do not know whether at that time, the object exists or not.



been previously determined ; but in accordance therewith we have no idea of the existence of the particular object (remembered), *at the time of remembrance.*

107. The Word too does not differ from the means of remembrance, inasmuch in the case of that too, that which is expressed is nothing more (than what has been previously determined by other means of knowledge). If there be anything more that happens to be cognised, it cannot be expressed by the Word.

108. Even though cognition by means of the *word* be an object of Inference, yet inasmuch as Verbal authority is attributed (by us) to the meaning of a sentence, it does not touch the position of those who assert "Verbal testimony" to be a distinct means of knowledge (apart from Inference). (i.e., We, the Mimāṃsakas).

109. Since in the case of the meaning of a Sentence, the cognition is produced by means of the meanings of words (making up the Sentence), without the recognition of the relation (of invariable concomitance) necessary in Inference,—therefore it (recognition of the meaning of a Sentence) must be held to be distinct (from Inference), like Sense-perception.

110. This Reason (the fact of the meaning of a sentence being arrived at by means of the meaning of words contained therein, without the recognition of invariable concomitance) will be established in the Chapter on "Sentence" (Sutra, Adhyaya II). And none of the arguments urged by others (in support of the identity of Verbal Testimony with Inference), can apply to the case of a cognition brought about by a Sentence.

111. It was only on account of not having perceived any Sentences with definite meanings, that finding cognition to be brought about by the mere cognition of the meanings of words, the Bauddhas and Vaiṣeṣikas, —being afraid of the difference from Inference being established (if cognition by means of a Sentence were accepted),—have laboured hard to prove the identity of the "Cognition by Word" with "Inference."

*Thus ends the Chapter on Words.*

### (SECTION 7.)

### ON ANALOGY.

1-2. "Being asked by the town-people" 'like what is a *gavaya*'?

III If cognition by means of a Sentence be admitted, then there can be no question of the identity of Verbal Authority with Inference. It is for this reason that the Bauddhas purposely evade this fact, and only seek to establish the identity of "Word" with "Inference,"—hoping thereby to prove such identity of "Verbal Authority" also, which would, therefore, have to be rejected as a distinct means of right notion.

<sup>1</sup> Says the Bhāṣhya: "Upanānamapi sādrśyam asannikṣhite'rthē buddhimut-pādayati yathā gavayadarśanam gosmaranasya." (Analogy also is similarity and brings





if the forester says that a '*gavaya* is just like the cow'—then we have what is commonly known as "Analogy." According to the view of Çabara however, this is nothing apart from "Verbal testimony"; and hence 'Analogy' is explained in a different manner.

3. Because in the above instance the object (of Analogy) is got at by means of the personal recognition of a man, and is also recognised as explained by him, hence it is 'Verbal testimony' pure and simple.

4-5. How can any validity belong to the recognition of an object by means of (the perception of) another object similar to it,—such recognition being exactly similar to remembrance brought about by constant pondering, &c.? In other cases (e.g., that of *Pratyabhijnā*, Recognition) the object is specified by different time, place, &c.; it is not so in the case of the instance cited, because here the cow is remembered only *as being in the town*.

6-7. According to some people,—the name 'Analogy' belongs to the cognition of the *gavaya* in the forest, when belonging to such people as have heard the assertion of the similarity of the cow to the *gavaya*,—such cognition being tinged by an idea of similarity with the cow. In this case too, in the case of the *gavaya* we have Sense-perception, and in that of 'Similarity' we have mere remembrance.

7-8. "But in the recognition of the object *as tinged with similarity*, there can be neither remembrance, nor any application of the organs of Sense." Well, if the perception of the *gavaya* does not produce any ideas over and above that which is due to the previous assertion of the forester, then such recognition would be nothing more than remembrance; and as such being mere repetition (of a former cognition), it could have no validity.

9. If there is anything in excess (of the former assertion), it is only such as is amenable to Sense-perception; because it has already been proved that so long as there is contact of the Sense-organ with the object, the cognition that we have is Sense-perception.

10-11. Invalidity attaches to the factor of remembrance, as different about the cognition of an object not in contact with the senses; e.g., the sight of the *gavaya* reminds one of the cow).

4.5 The definition given in the Bhāshya means that when one object, on being produced, produces the recognition of another object similar to it, then we have what is called Analogy. Against this it is urged that this would only be a case of remembrance. *Pratyabhijnā* (Recognition) is considered valid only because, over and above the mere recognition of the object, it cognises the object as being the same object that was perceived before, but occupying another place and time in the present. There is, however, no such fresh specification in the case of the *gavaya* and the cow.

4.7 In order to avoid the objection urged above, these people add "*tinged, &c.*," as a fresh specification, on which they rest the validity of Analogy.

9 "It has been proved"—under "Sense-perception."

10.11 Even in the case of Remembrance, invalidity does not attach to every part of



tiated from the factor of Sensuous perception. Even the fact of a knowledge of the assertion of similarity is not of much help, inasmuch as this (recognition of similarity) happens also in the case of such people as have never heard of the assertion of similarity, but having known the cow, happen to see the *gavaya* in the forest.

12. If it be urged that "in the case of such people there is no idea of the name '*gavaya*'"—(we add) the name is not the *object*; and this (the object *gavaya*) is completely recognised by them (as resembling the cow).

13. Nor then can the relation, between the word ('*gavaya*') and its meaning (the object, animal), be said to be the object of recognition; because when the object, (animal, *gavaya*), has been ascertained to resemble the cow, the relation of the animal with the word ('*gavaya*') is recognised by the help of the previous assertion of the forester.

14. Nor can it be urged that in the forest, there is a recognition (*Pratyabhijñā*) of this fact (of "*gavaya*" being the name of the particular animal); because the denotations of words being beyond the Senses, the present instance cannot be anything more than mere Remembrance.

15. The factor of Sense-perception has been proved to enter also into the case of such cognitions as are intermixed with Verbal expressions.

it; the factor of Sense-perception that enters into it, in the shape of a perception of the object before the eye, cannot but be valid. But the invalidity attaches to the factor of remembering something that has gone before. The specification—"the remembrance of such people as have heard the assertion of similarity,"—too, does not add any validity to the remembrance, because we have notions of similarity, even in the case of such people as have no idea of the said assertion, and yet recognise a similarity of the well-known cow with the *gavaya*, whenever this latter happens to be seen in the forest.

13 The Nyāya theory—that the object of Analogy is the recognition of the denotation of the name "*gavaya*"—is here controverted. No sooner has the man seen the *gavaya*, and found it to resemble the cow, then he remembers the previous assertion of the forester, and from that he directly concludes that the object that he has seen resembling the cow, must be the "*gavaya*" that the forester had described. Thus then, we find that the recognition of the name "*gavaya*" is due to pure Verbal Authority, the assertion of the forester, and the element of Analogy does not enter into it. "Then"—i.e., in cases where the person knows of the previous description by the forester.

14 In *Pratyabhijñā*, there is a present factor of Sense-perception, upon which its validity rests. The opponent seeks refuge in this fact, and says that the man has known the name "*gavaya*" to belong to something that resembles the cow, and hence as soon as he sees such an object in the forest, the name flashes upon him, the factor of the perception of the animal lending validity to the remembrance of the name. To this it is replied, that the denotation of the name can never be amenable to Sense-perception, and hence the idea of the name must be a pure case of Remembrance, and as such, it could not have any validity.

15 *Objection*. "One who is not cognisant with the previous assertion of the forester has an idea of the *gavaya* resembling the cow, unmixed with any notion of words;





Therefore you must mention some peculiar transcendental object, endowed with resemblance, to be the subject (of Analogy).

16. And further, when you accept the fact of Sense-perception having the character of a positive function, how is it that Resemblance cannot be cognised by means of that, just as "class, &c.," are.

17. For those also who hold the theory of unspecified abstract perception, this cognition of resemblance is a *semblance of Sense-perception*. But they attach no validity to it, inasmuch as according to them, there exists no such thing (as Resemblance).

18. The fact of "Similarity" (or Resemblance) being a positive entity, however, cannot be denied; inasmuch as it consists of the presence, in one class of objects, of such an arrangement (or cogglomeration) of constituent parts as is common to another class of objects.

19. The similarity of constituent parts, between the lotus-leaf and the eye, would rest upon the fact of the presence, in one object, of parts of the same class as those in the other.

20. Thus then Similarity comes to be of different kinds, inasmuch as it can rest upon one, two or three of the following points—*birth, property, substance, action, power and specific character*.

21. These properties themselves do not constitute Similarity; nor again is it the multiplicity (or repetition) based upon these (properties). It is only the "class," or "genus," &c., as qualified by multiplicity (or repetition), that is cognised as similar.

and such an idea may be amenable to Sense-perception. In the case of one who knows of the previous assertion, the factor of verbal expression cannot be so amenable; and it is for the sake of this that we have recourse to Analogy." The sense of the reply as given in the Kārikā is, that we have just shown how the factor of Sense-perception enters into the latter case also. Therefore in order to establish Analogy, as an independent means of knowledge, the Naiyāyika, will have to assert the existence of a peculiar object, which resembles an object that has been seen, and which cannot be perceived by the senses. But such an object does not exist; therefore the Nyāya theory falls to the ground.

16 The Bauddha holds Sense-perception to belong to a specific abstract entity ("Swadharma") alone, devoid of all concrete specifications. So he can very well deny resemblance to be an object of Sense-perception. The Naiyāyika however holds the Class to be amenable to Sense-perception; so he cannot very well deny the fact of Resemblance being amenable to it.

17 "*Semblance, &c.*"—because it is qualified and concrete.

19 That is to say, where the Similarity lies, not in the fact of the objects themselves resembling each other in the arrangement of their constituent parts, but in that of the parts, severally, of each of the two objects.

20 "Of birth," e.g., Agni and Fire both have their origin in Prajapati's mouth. "Property"—as, in the case of two pictures. "Substance"—as in the case of two men wearing similar jewels. "Action"—as between the kite, bird—and the Īyēna sacrifice. "Power"—as between the Lion and Dēvadatta. "Specific character"—as between the Panchāvattanarāṇsa sacrifice and the second Prayāja.

21 Similarity is an inherent relation, and as such, it rests in the Class, and not in mere Property.





22-23. If it be asked—"how then do you explain the similarity of twins?"—(we reply) we accept it because we actually see it so;—how strange, that you should ask such a silly question! For Similarity belongs sometimes to many, and sometimes only to a few; and this peculiarity does not in any way affect the fact of similarity being a positive entity.

23-25. These *classes* have their end, in the end (or destruction) of their substrates. Then the fact is that, inasmuch it inheres in innumerable (many) substrates, the destruction of any one of its substrates does not lead to its utter annihilation. But this fact does not necessitate the hypothesis that all *classes* are eternal; nor do we accept the utter annihilation of any *class*, inasmuch as every *class* has got its substrate somewhere (even when many of its substrates have disappeared).

26. And Similarity differs from the (*classes*) in that it rests upon a cogglomeration of classes; whereas the classes appear also severally among objects of Sense-perception.

27. In such cases too as where we recognise the similarity of parts, we have the Similarity resting upon the fact of the homogeneity between the parts of each of these parts.

28. Thus then, we shall have a Class devoid of Similarity, at a point (in an atom) where there can be recognition of identity with anything else.

29. In a case where we have the recognition of a single *class* as belonging to the principal objects themselves (and not to the parts), there we have a notion (of identity) such as "this is that very thing"; and where there is difference, there we have the notion of Similarity only.

30. "What would be the *class*, in a case where we recognise similarity in pictures"? There too we have the resemblance of the various earthly colours, &c.

31. From among *colour*, *taste* and *odour*, we have the resemblance of one or other, in different places. It is not necessary that the notion of Similarity should rest upon absolute resemblance in all the parts.

22.23 "If similarity lies in the Class, how can you explain the similarity of twins"? The reply is given jocularly. "*This peculiarity*"—of belonging, at times to many, and at times to a few only.

23.25 "Substrates"—i.e., the individuals constituting the Class.

29 That which gives rise to a notion of similarity constitutes *sādṛśya*. In a case where we recognise a *class*—"cow" f.i.—pervading over principal wholes, we have the notion of identity. It is only when the principal classes "cow" and "gavaya" differ from one another, that we have a notion of Similarity.

30 Because in the picture, we have not got the members of the human body; "*colours, &c.*"—we have, in the picture, a resemblance of posture, colour, &c.

31 This anticipates the objection that, in the picture, there is no *odour* or any other such property. The sense of the reply is that Similarity can rest even upon the resemblance of a single property; and in the picture we have many resemblances, such as those of colour and the like.





32. In the earth, &c., all these (colour, odour, &c.), naturally exist (always); but one or other of these is perceived according as they become manifested in the various manifestations of it.

33. Nothing, that is a non-entity even in potency, can ever be brought into existence. Properties are not different from their substrates; nor are they identical with them; they occupy a middle position.

34. Thus then, Similarity having been proved to be a positive entity, whenever it happens to be in contact with the Sense of sight,—be it perceived in one or both of the members (between whom Similarity is cognised)—, the fact of its being an object of Sense-perception is not disputed.

35. Like a Class, Similarity too exists wholly in each of the two members; therefore even when the corresponding member is not seen at the time, a notion of Similarity is possible.

36. Hence though (in accordance with the Naiyāyika explanation) in the case in question, the recognition of Similarity follows upon the remembrance of the cow,—yet since Sense-contact at the time lies in the 'gavaya' (seen at the time), therefore the Similarity must be an object of Sense-perception.

37. For this reason, it is the member remembered, recognised as qualified by similarity, that forms the object of Analogy; or it may be the Similarity as qualified by that member.

38. Though Similarity is recognised by Sense-perception, and the 'cow' is remembered, yet the 'cow as qualified by similarity,' not being recognised by any other means, Analogy comes to be recognised as a distinct means of right knowledge.

39. E.g., the place (mountain) is seen by the eye, and the 'fire' is remembered (as being concomitant with smoke); and yet since the object to be cognised is a qualified one (the mountain as containing the fire), therefore the character of a distinct means of right knowledge is not denied to Inference.

40. In a case where a notion of similarity is brought about by means of objects that are not really similar, we have only a (false) semblance of similarity.

<sup>32</sup> As a matter of fact, odour, &c., also exist in the picture, but are not manifested.

<sup>33</sup> That is, that which does not exist in the cause, can never be brought about. c.f. Sāṅkhya Kārikā 9. "Properties."—This is in reply to the question,—“Is similarity different from, or identical with, its substrates”?

<sup>36</sup> Whether the cow and the gavaya be both seen at the same time, or only one of them be seen at the time of the cognition of similarity.

<sup>38</sup> The Nyāya theory having been set aside, it must be admitted that the definition given in the Bhāṣya is the only true one. It is not the similarity of the gavaya that is the object of Analogy, which pertains to the cow, as remembered at the time, and recognised as similar to the gavaya that is directly perceived by the eye.



41-42. This is said to be a false semblance of similarity, because it is subsequently set aside by an idea to the contrary, *e.g.*, the similarity of an elephant in a stack of hay; in which case when one is sufficiently near the stack, he realises that there is no real similarity between the stack and the elephant. That notion of similarity, which is not set aside even on close proximity to the object, is a case of real Similarity.

43-44. This (Analogy) is not Inference; because in it we have no assertion of any relation of the Middle Term (*i.e.*, we have no premises): Prior to there cognition of Similarity (by means of Analogy), the similarity is not known as a property (and as such cannot be asserted to qualify any terms); since that which is perceived in the '*gavaya*' cannot bring about an Inference (of its existence) in the cow.

44-45. That (similarity) which resides in the cow, cannot be the Middle Term; because it (the similarity of the cow) forms part of what is to be proved. The '*gavaya*' too (as qualified by similarity) cannot be the Middle Term, because it is not in any way related (to the Minor Term, the '*cow*,'—and so there can be no minor premiss). Even the similarity (of the *gavaya* in the cow) has not been perceived by all men, as being invariably concomitant with it (the cow).

46. In a case wherever only one object (cow) has been seen (by the person), whenever the other (the '*gavaya*') happens to be seen in the forest, the cognition of this latter is produced simultaneously with that of similarity (between that object and the one seen before).

47. If the '*cow*' be asserted to have the character of the Middle Term, because of the concomitance of the class '*horn, &c.*' (in the '*gavaya*' which is seen);—even that we deny; because the action of recognition of the class '*horn, &c.*' ends with the mere recognition of the '*gavaya*' (as similar to the cow).

48. Even if there were any idea (of the cow) produced by these

44-45 It is the similarity, in the cow, of the *gavaya*, that is the true object of Analogy; whereas that which is perceived by the eye is the similarity as located in the *gavaya*; and the latter could not give rise to any Inference that would bring about any idea of the similarity in the cow.

45-46 "*Even similarity, &c.*"—This anticipates the objection that there is a relation between the cow and the *gavaya*, namely, that of similarity, and the assertion of this relation would constitute the Minor Premiss of the inferential argument. The sense of the reply is that the cow has not been recognised by all men to be invariably concomitant with the *gavaya*. Hence though there is a relation, there can be no such concomitance as is necessary for an Inference.

47 Analogy cannot be said to be a form of Inference, because it is found to function even in a case where none of the two members have been perceived by the eye. Even one, who has never seen the *gavaya* before, when he sees it for the first time, he at once recognises its similarity with the cow, even though this latter is not before him at that time.

48 "*Mere recognition, &c.*"—The presence of horns leads to the recognition of the fact of the *gavaya* being similar to the cow; and there it ends. So it can have no





(horns, &c.), it would be devoid of any notion of similarity; because the 'cow' is similar, not to horns, &c., but to the *gavaya*.

49. Having got at the notion of similarity (of the cow in the *gavaya*), following upon the recognition of horns, &c.,—the idea of the 'cow' (as being similar to the *gavaya*) is brought about by that of the *gavaya*.

50. If the fact of the similarity of the parts (horns of the cow with those of the *gavaya*) be brought forward,—then (we say that) we would have an Analogy of these *parts*; and certainly the existence of the cow is not inferred in all cases where horn, &c., are seen to exist.

51. For, one who would infer thus, would only be landing upon mistaken notions; and the idea of the cow as existing in the village is nothing more than remembrance.

52. Analogy being thus proved to be distinct from Inference,—there being no concomitance (of the factors of procedure, *fire*, &c.), with the passages enjoining the "Saurya," &c.,—how could mere similarity bring about the association of *fire*, &c., (with the "Saurya")?—In this lies the use of Analogy.

53. In the case of the corn "Vrihi," kept for the sacrifice, being spoilt (or stolen), we have the use of the "Nivāra," &c., which latter are the recognised substitutes of Vrihi, *simply because they are similar to it*. This too forms an instance where Analogy has its use.

53-54. In a case where a substitute is denoted by the subsidiaries, if by means of others (not subsidiaries) we get at something which is

influence in the recognition of the similarity of the *gavaya*, in the cow, which is the real object of Analogy.

49 The horns might recall the cow, but they cannot in any way bring about the idea that the cow is similar to the *gavaya*, which is only possible when the similarity of the cow has been perceived in the *gavaya*.

50 (1) First of all, we have the perception of the horn; then (2) follows the recognition of the similarity of the cow, in the *gavaya*; and then (3) lastly, appears the notion of the similarity of *gavaya* (seen now) in the cow, that had been seen before. Thus then, there being an interval between (1) and (3), the former cannot be said to be the direct cause of the latter. "Cases"—of the perception of the *gavaya*, for instance.

51 That would give rise to a notion of the similarity of the horns, &c., and not to that of the cow.

52 If the horn alone is perceived, and the similarity of the *gavaya* to the cow is not recognised, then alone could the former be the Middle Term for the Minor Premiss of your Inference. But in that case, there being no recognition of the similarity of the *gavaya* to the cow, we could have no notion of the similarity of the *gavaya*, in the cow. All that we could have would be a notion of the cow as we knew it in the village; and this would be a case of remembrance only. Thus then, the notion of the similarity of the *gavaya*, in the cow remains untouched by your Inference. And as it is this similarity that we hold to be the object of Analogy, this cannot but be accepted as a distinct means of right cognition.

53 No such concomitance being recognised, we could have no Inference. No other means of cognition is applicable in the case. Between the "Āgnēya" and the





more like the original (than the one denoted by the subsidiaries),—then the former, which has only a slight similarity becomes false, on the ground of its greater dissimilarity. And further, we have a quicker recognition of the second (*i.e.*, that which has greater similarity), even in the absence of any idea of the former (*i.e.*, that which has only a slight similarity); and it is for this reason also that it is set aside (in favour of the one which has greater similarity).

*Thus ends the Chapter on Analogy.*

(Section 8.)

ON APPARENT INCONSISTENCY.

1. A case,—where, in order to avoid the contradiction (or irrelevancy) of any object ascertained by means of any of the six means of right notion, an *unseen* object (or fact) is assumed,—is known to be one of “*Arthāpatti*” (Apparent Inconsistency).

2. “Unseen” means ‘not cognised by any of the *five* means of right notion’; because that produced by “Verbal Authority” has been declared to be apart from the “seen” (perceived); inasmuch as this latter (Verbal Authority) comprehends also the means of cognition (*Ābda*) [whereas the other five comprehend only the object of cognition], and in this lies its difference from the other five.

3. (1) The assumption, of the burning power of fire, based upon the facts of its burning a certain object ascertained by means of *Sense-perception* (constitutes an example of the first kind of “Apparent Inconsistency”); and (2) the assumption of the mobility of the sun, based upon the fact of his movement from place to place, which is ascertained by means of Inference (is an instance of the second kind of Apparent Inconsistency based upon Inference).

4. (3) Apparent Inconsistency based upon “Verbal Authority” will be explained hereafter. (4) The assumption of the fact of the comprehensibility of the ‘cow’ (as similar to the *gavaya*), based upon the fact of the ‘cow’ having been perceived by ‘Analogy’ to be similar to the *gavaya* (is an instance of Apparent Inconsistency based upon Analogy).

5. The assumption (5) of the eternity of words is based upon the fact of the expressive power of words, which is ascertained by means of “Apparent Inconsistency” (resorted to) for the purpose of the definition of the denotation of words.

“*Saurya*” there is the similarity of having a common Deity. Therefore the properties and appurtenances of the “*Āgnēya*” can be said to apply themselves to the “*Saurya*” only through Analogy.

2 “Five”—leaving out Verbal Authority.

5 This is *Arthāpatti* based upon another *Arthāpatti*; it is explained in the following *Kārikā*.





6-7. That is to say, inasmuch as the denotation of a word cannot be otherwise defined, we assume (by Apparent Inconsistency) a expressive power (in words); and as the latter is not otherwise possible, therefore we arrive, by means of another "Apparent Inconsistency, at the notion of the eternality of words. All this will be explained under the aphorism "*Darṣanasya parārthatwāt*" [I-i-18].

8-9. The absence of Caitra from the house having been cognised by means of "Negation," we arrive at the notion of his presence outside the house; and this latter has been cited (by the Bhāshya) as an instance of another (sixth) kind of "Apparent Inconsistency" based upon "Negation." The instances of other forms of "Apparent Inconsistency" have been detailed under the treatment of the discrepancies of the Minor Term (*chap. on Inference, K. 66 et seq.*).

10. From the perception (by means of 'negation') of the absence of Caitra (in the house) we get at the notion of his presence outside the house,—and this is different from the process of Inference, inasmuch as in this case we have none of the appurtenances of Inference,—such as the assertion of the premises, &c., &c.

11. Because, whether the object to be cognised be (1) the object (Caitra) as qualified by existence outside, or (2) an *outside* as qualified by the existence of Caitra,—any way, how can 'non-existence in the house' (which is brought forward as the Middle Term) be a property of the Minor Term?

12-13. "The house, as qualified by Caitra's absence" cannot be the property of any (of the two alternatives pointed out in the last Kārikā); because at the time the object (*Caitra* or *outside*) is not recognised as qualified by absence in the house; for it is only the 'house' that is recognised, and not Caitra.

13-15. Nor can *non-visibility* (of Caitra in the house) be a Middle Term, as will be explained in the chapter on "Negation." Therefore "*because he is not found in the house*" cannot be accepted as the Inferential Reason. The non-visibility having led to the ascertainment of the negation of the object of cognition (Caitra), there follows the notion

6.7 No Denotation is possible without expressiveness; and this latter could not be possible, if the words were not eternal.

11 "*Object to be cognised*"—which will be the Minor Term of your syllogism. Those who assert Apparent Inconsistency to be a form of Inference, put forth the following syllogism: "The living Caitra exists outside the house,—because he is living and is not found within the house,—like myself": where "living Caitra" is the Minor Term, "exists outside" the Major Term, and "non-existence in the house," the Middle Term.

12-13 "*At the time*"—i.e., when we go to his house and find that Caitra is not there.

13-15 Because "non-visibility" is one step further removed, being intervened by the notion of the absence of Caitra from his house.



of his *existence outside the house*; and hence this notion cannot be said to be caused by 'non-visibility.' And (even if) the character of the Middle Term belong to the *absence of Caitra*, this resides in the *house* (and not in the Minor Term, *Caitra*; and as such no premiss would be possible).

16. Nor can such an object, (Minor Term) as has not been perceived before, can ever be the object of cognition (by Inference); and in the present case, neither '*outside*,' nor '*Caitra*' has been perceived before (as concomitant with the Middle Term; hence no premiss is possible).

17. *Obj.* "In a case, where from rise in the river-surface you infer that there has been rain in the higher regions, how do you recognise the relation of the Middle Term (*rise in the river*) with the unseen *higher regions* (Minor Term)?"

18. In this case we cognise the fact of the *falling of rain over the higher regions* with reference to *the region where the river has risen*. Or this too may be explained as only an instance of "Apparent Inconsistency."

19. In the former case in question the "*absence in the house of one who is living*" is made the Middle Term; but the cognition of this is not possible until "*his existence outside*" has been ascertained.

20. (In the case of the Inference of fire) the *existence of smoke* is cognised independently of the *existence of fire*; because at the time of the perception of the existence of smoke, there is nothing that depends upon fire (for its existence).

21. "*Absence in the house*," pure and simple,—apart from devoid of any idea of the person *being alive*,—is also found to apply to dead persons; and as such it cannot be the means of getting at the notion of his *existence outside*.

22. Whenever the notion of *his absence in the house* is accompanied by *the notion of his being alive*, *Caitra*, being precluded from the house, is conceived to exist outside (without having any recourse to process of Inference).

23. The notion of a general "*absence in the house*," by itself (without any reference to any particular individual), cannot bring about any notion of *Caitra's* existence outside.

17 This case is admitted, by the Mīmāṃsaka also, to be one of Inference. Hence the objector brings it forward as equally open to the arguments urged by the *Kārikā* against the theory of Apparent Inconsistency being only a special case of Inferential reasoning.

18 The syllogism being—"The region where the river has risen (Minor Term) is such as had rainfall over its higher regions (Major Term), because of the rise in the river (Middle Term)." Finding this explanation not suitable he relegates this instance to Apparent Inconsistency.

19 "Absence in the house, of one who is living" cannot be accepted as true, so long as we have not become cognisant of his *existence outside*; till then, the former proposition has all the appearance of absurdity. Therefore the Middle Term becomes dependent upon the conclusion, which vitiates the validity of the Inference.





24 It is only when the fact of his being alive has been established, that the notion of *his absence in the house* can point to his existence being outside, having precluded it from within the house.

25. Thus then we find that *absence in the house*, independently of *any idea of his being alive*, is (also common to dead persons, and as such) contrary (to the conclusion); and it is only the character of being not contradicted that is held to belong to the conclusion of your Inference.

26. Therefore the *house* being cognised by "Sense-perception," and the *absence in the house* by means of "Negation,"—the *idea of his existence (being alive)* [which is all that is left of the Middle Term, after the first two factors, have been cognised by means of "Sense-perception" and "Negation"] is the same that is recognised as being outside.

27-28. It is only for the accomplishment of the Minor Premiss, that "existence outside" has been introduced; in as much as it is only as qualified by this that the person can be the object of Inference, by means of the concomitance of the Middle Term and the Minor Term, &c. Thus then, if the cognition of the Minor Premiss, &c., be produced by the cognition of "outside existence," and that of "outside existence," by the Minor (and Major) premisses,—then we have an unavoidable mutual inter-dependence.

29. In the case of "Apparent Inconsistency" on the other hand, this fact of being contained in the object to be proved does not constitute a fallacy, because it is actually meant to be recognised as such.

24 In that case, your conclusion becomes only an implication of the premisses, and not an independent proposition.

25 In your inferential argument, if mere *absence in the house* be made the Middle Term, then it applies to dead persons also, and as such, contradicts your own conclusion. It is only when the idea of absence in the house is qualified by that of the person being alive, that you can have the conclusion of his being outside. This has been shown in K. 22, to be only an implication of the premisses, and not an independent proposition. Thus then you must admit that in fact your conclusion is nothing but the premisses themselves stated differently.

26 The conclusion—existence outside—becomes only a part of the Minor Premiss. The Middle Term consists of three factors: (1) *non-existence* (perceived by means of Negation) (2) *in the House* (seen by the eye) (3) *of one who is alive*. The first two are cognised by other means of cognition, and the third implies his existence outside, and as such the conclusion is no advance upon the Premisses.

27-28 "Thus then, &c."—The fact of his being alive cannot be recognised, until his existence elsewhere (other than the House, from where he is found to be absent) has been ascertained; and as this is a necessary factor in the Middle Term (and hence in the Minor Premiss), therefore it seems that the premiss itself depends upon (the recognition of) *outside existence*; and as this is what is sought to be proved by means of the premisses, there is an absurd mutual inter-dependence.

29 In the case of Apparent Inconsistency, the inclusion of the object to be cognised in the notion of "absence from the house," accompanied by that of his being alive, does not affect its validity adversely; because it is a peculiarity of this particular means of cognition that it leads to the assumption of something else, in order to avoid the





30-31. Invariable concomitance too, in the case, could be recognised only when his existence outside has been ascertained. And inasmuch as it has not been recognised before, it cannot be the means of the cognition (of outside existence), even though it exist (subsequently); because "absence in the house" and "existence outside" have never been perceived to be invariably concomitant.

31-32. In the matter of such concomitance, there is no other means of knowledge, save "Apparent Inconsistency," by means of which the notion of one (absence in the house of one who is alive) brings about that of another (existence outside). If there be no such assumption (of the one by means of another), then we cannot get at their concomitance.

33. Therefore at the time of the cognition of this relation, one of the two members related must be held to be recognised by means of "Apparent Inconsistency"; and after this the Inference might follow.

34-35. If one, sitting at the door of the house, were to assume Caitra's existence outside,—(thinking that) 'when he exists in one place (*i.e.*, the garden where he is seen) he does not exist in another place, the house';—even then, the fact of his non-existence everywhere cannot be recognised (by means of Inference); because there could be no invariable concomitance between the Middle Term and 'non-existence in one definite place.'

36. (*Obj.*). "Well, non-existence in a place before us is cognised by

apparent irrelevancy of two well-recognised facts,—in the present case, *absence from the house*, and *being alive*, the inconsistency whereof could be avoided only by the assuming of the fact of his being outside.

80 The existence of the Minor Premiss has been refuted in the above Kārikās. Now begins the refutation of Invariable concomitance (embodied in the Major Premiss), as applied to cases of Apparent Inconsistency.

1.32 'Their'—*i.e.*, of "existence outside," and "absence from the house."

83 "Inference, &c."—but by that time Apparent Inconsistency will have done its special work, and thus justified its distinct existence.

34-35 Some people might urge that one who is sitting at the door is cognisant of the concomitance of Caitra's *absence from the house* with his *existence outside* somewhere in the garden (where he is seen by the man at the door); and hence this man seeing him thus could conclude that inasmuch as he is in one place (in the garden) he cannot be elsewhere (in the house); and thus he could recognise the concomitance of absence from the house with existence outside. In reply to this, it is urged that though this may be possible, yet the fact of one who exists in one place not existing elsewhere, cannot form the subject of Inference; because even the man at the gate cannot be cognisant of any concomitance with regard to such universal absence. The Objector urges: "We recognise the fact that one who is present in one place is not present in another place (both places being before our eyes): and upon this fact we can base the Inference of his absence from every other place in the world except the one in which he is seen." The reply to this also is the same as before. The concomitance that is cognised is with reference to the absence from one definite place; and this cannot form the basis of any Inference with regard to absence from all other places.

86 In Inference, you urge the inapplication of invariable concomitance, &c., but Negation does not stand in need of such accessories. Therefore just as we recognise





means of Negation; and, in the same manner, this means of knowledge (Negation) requiring no special effort (on the part of the cogniser), we would get at the notion of absence, from everywhere else, of one who if found to exist in one place."

37. But Negation too cannot lead us to any correct idea of "non-existence everywhere else"; because such negation would also apply to the case of objects that are positive entities, but are at a distance,—so long as we have not gone to that particular place.

38. It is only when we have visited different places, and found certain objects not existing there, that, in the absence of any other means of knowledge (of the objects), we conclude that they do not exist (in those places).

39. "(If such be the fact) then we could have no concomitance between the *absence of fire*, and the *absence of smoke*, because we have not visited every place (where there is negation of fire)."

40. He, for whom the object of Inference is "*absence in another substrate*" (i.e., of the Middle Term in a substrate where the absence of the Major Term is ascertained, i.e., the "*Vipaksha*"), will be liable to the above objection. As for ourselves, the mere fact of our not seeing (the smoke, in two or three cases of the absence of fire) is enough to bring about an idea of the absence of its concomitant (fire).

41. "Well, in the same manner, in the case in question also, the relation (of concomitance) between the absence of Caitra (in the house), and his existence (outside),—being recognised by means of Negation,—becomes quite possible."

the non-existence of something in a place near us, so could we also do with regard to its absence from all other places. And the concomitance of absence from the house with existence outside being thus arrived at by the man at the door, the course of Inference would be clear; and there would be no need of any distinct means of knowledge in the shape of Apparent Inconsistency.

37 Mere Negation we have also got with regard to such real existing objects as are at a distance—due to the mere fact of our not having gone to that place. So mere Negation cannot be held to be a sufficient proof of non-existence.

38 The Objector urges: "You have a Negative premiss in the case of your stock example of Inference 'where fire is not, smoke is not.' Now, this would become impossible; because so long as you have not visited every place where fire is not, you cannot assert any concomitance between the absence of fire and the absence of smoke."

40 We do not stand in need of any idea of the absence of smoke, in *all* cases of the absence of fire,—only two or three instances are sufficient for our purpose, just as we do not stand in need of ascertaining the existence of fire in *every* case of the existence of smoke.

41 When affirmative concomitance has been ascertained (between the Fire and the Smoke), if only a few instances of the concomitance of their contraries be necessary, as you urge, for a successful issue of the Inference,—then the existence of Caitra in one place (the garden) being found to be concomitant with his absence from another place (the house),—and thus even in one place the concomitance of absence from the