

THE
SARVA-DARŚANA-SAMGRAHA

OR

*REVIEW OF THE DIFFERENT SYSTEMS
OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.*

BY

MĀDHAVA ĀCHĀRYA.

TRANSLATED BY

E. B. COWELL, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT AND FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,
AND HONORARY LL.D. OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

AND

A. E. GOUGH, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE PRESIDENCY COLLEGE, AND
PRINCIPAL OF THE MADRASA, CALCUTTA.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.
1882.

[*All rights reserved.*]

CHAPTER XI.

THE AKSHAPÁDA (OR NYÁYA) DARŚANA.

THE principle that final bliss, *i.e.*, the absolute abolition of pain, arises from the knowledge of the truth [though in a certain sense universally accepted], is established in a special sense as a particular tenet¹ of the Nyáya school, as is declared by the author of the aphorisms in the words "proof, that which is to be proved, &c.,—from knowledge of the truth as to these things there is the attainment of final bliss." This is the first aphorism of the Nyáya Śástra. Now the Nyáya Śástra consists of five books, and each book contains two "daily portions." In the first daily portion of the first book the venerable Gotama discusses the definitions of nine categories, beginning with "proof," and in the second those of the remaining seven, beginning with "discussion" (*váda*). In the first daily portion of the second book he examines "doubt," discusses the four kinds of "proof," and refutes the suggested objections to their being instruments of right knowledge; and in the second he shows that "presumption," &c., are really included in the four kinds of "proof" already given [and therefore need not be added by the Mímámsakas as separate ones]. In the first daily portion of the third book he examines the soul, the body, the senses, and their objects; in the second, "understanding" (*buddhi*), and "mind" (*manas*). In the first daily portion of the fourth book he examines "volition" (*pravṛitti*), the "faults,"

¹ Cf. Nyáya Sūtras, i. 29.

“transmigration,” “fruit” [of actions], “pain,” and “final liberation;” in the second he investigates the truth¹ as to the causes of the “faults,” and also “wholes” and “parts.” In the first daily portion of the fifth book he discusses the various kinds of futility (*jāti*), and in the second the various kinds of “occasion for rebuke” (*nigrahassthāna*, or “unfitness to be argued with”).

In accordance with the principle that “to know the thing to be measured you must first know the measure,” “proof” (*pramāṇa*) is first enunciated, and as this must be done by defining it, we have first a definition of “proof.” “Proof” is that which is always accompanied by right knowledge, and is at the same time not disjoined from the proper instruments [as the eye, &c.], and from the site of knowledge [*i.e.*, the soul];² and this definition thus includes the peculiar tenet of the Nyāya School that God is a source of right knowledge,³ as the author of the aphorisms has expressly declared (ii. 68), “and the fact of the Veda’s being a cause of right knowledge, like spells and the medical science, follows from the fact that the fit one who gave the Veda was a source of right knowledge.” And thus too hath the universally renowned teacher Udayana, who saw to the farthest shore of the ocean of logic, declared in the fourth chapter of the Kusumāñjali:

“Right knowledge is accurate comprehension, and right knowing is the possession thereof; authoritativeness is, according to Gotama’s school, the being separated from all absence thereof.

“He in whose intuitive unerring perception, inseparably united to Him and dependent on no foreign inlets, the succession of all the various existing objects is contained,—all the chaff of our suspicion being swept away

¹ In p. 112, line 16, of the Calcutta edition, I read *doshanimittatattva* for *doshanimittakatva* (compare Nyāya Sū. iv. 68).

² Without this last clause the definition might include the objects

(*viśaya*), as these are, of course, connected with right knowledge.

³ *Īśvara* is a cause of right knowledge (*pramāṇa*) according to the definition, because he is *pramāṇyāśrayaḥ*.

by the removal of all possible faults as caused by the slightest want of observation in Him,—He, Śiva, is my authority; what have I to do with others, darkened as their authority must ever be with rising doubts?"

"Proof" is fourfold, as being divided into perception, inference, analogy, and testimony. The "thing to be proved" [or the "object of right notion"] is of twelve kinds, viz., soul, body, the senses, their objects, understanding, mind, volition, faults, transmigrations, fruit, pain, and final liberation. "Doubt" is a knowledge whose nature is uncertainty; and this is threefold, as being caused by the object's possessing only qualities which are common to other things also, and therefore not distinctive, —or by its possessing only irrelevant qualities of its own, which do not help us in determining the particular point in question,¹—or by conflicting testimony. The thing which one proposes to one's self before proceeding to act, is "a motive" (*prayojana*); this is twofold, i.e., visible and invisible. "An example" is a fact brought forward as a ground for establishing a general principle, and it may be either affirmative or negative.² A "tenet" (*siddhānta*) is something which is accepted as being authoritatively settled as true; it is of four kinds, as being "common to all the schools," "peculiar to one school," "a pregnant assumption" [leading, if conceded, to a further conclusion], and "an implied dogma" (i. 26–31). The "member" (of a demonstration) is a part of the sentence containing an inference for the sake of another; and these are five, the proposition, the reason, the example, the application, and the conclusion (i. 32–38). "Confutation" (*tarka*, i. 39) is the showing that the admission of a false minor necessitates the admission of a false major³ (cf. Sūt. i. 39, and

¹ On this compare *Siddhānta-Muktāvali*, p. 115.

² On these compare my note to *Colebrooke's Essays*, vol. i. p. 315.

³ "Our coming to the conclusion that there can be no smoke in the hill if there be no fire, while we see

the smoke, is the confutation of there being no fire in the hill" (*Ballantyne*). Or, in other words, "the mountain must have the absence-of-smoke (*vyāpaka*) if it has the absence-of-fire (the false *vyāpya*").

iv. 3) ; and this is of eleven kinds, as *vyágháta*, *átmáśraya*, *itaretaráśraya*, &c.

“Ascertainment” (*nirṇaya*, i. 40) is right knowledge or a perception of the real state of the case. It is of four kinds as produced by perception, inference, analogy, or testimony. “Discussion” (*váda*) is a particular kind of conversation, having as its end the ascertainment of truth (i. 41). “Wrangling” (*jalpa*) is the talk of a man only wishing for victory, who is ready to employ arguments for either side of the question (i. 42). “Cavilling” (*vitandá*) is the talk of a man who does not attempt to establish his own side of the question (i. 43). “Dialogue” (*kathá*) is the taking of two opposite sides by two disputants. A “fallacy” is an inconclusive reason which is supposed to prove something, and this may be of five kinds, the “erratic,” the “contradictory,” the “uncertain,” the “unproved,” and the “precluded” or “mistimed” (Sút. i. 44-49). “Unfairness” (*chhala*) is the bringing forward a contrary argument by using a term wilfully in an ambiguous sense; this is of three kinds, as there may be fraud in respect of a term, the meaning, or a metaphorical phrase (i. 50-54). “Futility” (*játi*) is a self-destructive argument (i. 58). This is of twenty-four kinds (as described in the fifth book of the Nyáya aphorisms (1-38). “Occasion for rebuke” is where the disputant loses his cause [by stupidity], and this is of twenty-two kinds (as described in the fifth book of the aphorisms, 44-67). We do not insert here all the minute sub-divisions through fear of being too prolix,—they are fully explained in the aphorisms.

But here an objector may say, “If these sixteen topics, proof, &c., are all thus fully discussed, how is it that it has received the name of the Nyáya Śástra, [as reasoning, *i. e.*, *Nyáya*, or logic, properly forms only a small part of the topics which it treats of ?” We allow the force of the objection; still as names are proverbially said to be given for some special reason, we maintain that the name Nyáya was

rightly applied to Gotama's system, since "reasoning," or inference for the sake of another, is justly held to be a predominant feature from its usefulness in all kinds of knowledge, and from its being a necessary means for every kind of pursuit. So it has been said by Sarvajña, "This is the pre-eminent science of Nyáya from its establishing our doctrines against opponents, and from its producing action;"¹ and by Pakshila Swámin, "This is the science of reasoning (*anvikshiki*) divided into the different categories, 'proof,' &c.; the lamp of all sciences, the means for aiding all actions, the ultimate appeal of all religious duties, well proved in the declarations of science."²

But here an objector may say, "When you declare that final liberation arises from the knowledge of the truth, do you mean that liberation ensues immediately upon this knowledge being attained?" We reply, "No," for it is said in the second Nyáya aphorism, "Pain, birth, activity, faults, false notions,—on the successive annihilation of these in turn, there is the annihilation of the one next before it," by means of this knowledge of the truth. Now false notions are the thinking the body, &c., which are not the soul, to be the soul; "faults" are a desire for those things which seem agreeable to the soul, and a dislike to those things which seem disagreeable to it,³ though in reality nothing is either agreeable or disagreeable to the soul. And through the mutual reaction of these different "faults" the stupid man desires and the desiring man is stupid; the stupid man is angry, and the angry man is stupid. Moreover the man, impelled by these faults, does those things which are forbidden: thus by the body he does injury, theft, &c.; by the voice, falsehood, &c.; by the mind, malevolence, &c.; and this same sinful "activity" produces demerit. Or, again, he may do laudable actions by

¹ Action (*pravṛtti*) follows after the ascertainment of the truth by *nyāya*.

² Cp. Vātsyāyana's Comment., p. 6. The Calcutta edition reads *prakīrtitā* for *parīkshitā*.

³ The printed text omits the third fault, "a stupid indifference, *moha*," which is however referred to presently.

his body, as alms, saving others, &c., truthful speaking, upright counsel, &c., by his voice, and guilelessness, &c., by his mind; and this same right activity produces merit. But both are forms of activity, and each leads to a similar laudable or blamable birth or bodily manifestation; and while this birth lasts there arises the impression of "pain," which we are conscious of as of something that jars against us. Now this series, beginning with "false notions" and ending with "pain," is continually going on, and is what we mean by the words "mundane existence," which rolls on ceaselessly, like a waterwheel. And whenever some pre-eminent man, by the force of his previous good deeds, obtains through the teaching of a great teacher the knowledge that all this present life is only a scene of pain and bound up with pain, he recognises that it is all to be avoided, and desires to abolish the ignorance, &c., which are the causes that produced it.¹ Then he learns that the one means to abolish it is the knowledge of the truth; and as he meditates on the objects of right knowledge divided into the four sciences,² there arises in his mind the knowledge of the truth, or, in other words, a right view of things as they are; and from this knowledge of the truth false notions disappear. When false notions disappear, the "faults" pass away; with them ceases "activity;" and with it ceases "birth;" and with the cessation of "birth" comes the entire abolition of "pain," and this absolute abolition is final bliss. Its absoluteness consists in this, that nothing similar to that which is thus abolished can ever revive, as is expressly said in the second aphorism of the Nyáya Sútras: "Pain, birth, activity, faults, false notions,—since, on the successive annihilation of these in turn, there is the annihilation of

¹ In p. 116, line 3, I would read *tannirvartakam* for *tannivartakam*.

² This refers to the couplet so often quoted in Hindu authors, "Logic, the three Vedas, trade and agriculture, and the eternal doctrine of polity,—these four sciences are

the causes of the stability of the world" (cf. Manu, vii. 43). It occurs in Kámandaki's *Nítidra*, ii. 2, and seems to be referred to in Vátsyáyana's Com. p. 3, from which Mádharma is here borrowing.

the one next before it, there is [on the annihilation of the last of them] final beatitude."

"But is not your definition of the *summum bonum*, liberation, *i.e.*, 'the absolute abolition of pain,' after all as much beyond our reach as treacle on the elbow is to the tongue;¹ why then is this continually put forth as if it were established beyond all dispute?" We reply that as all those who maintain liberation in any form do include therein the absolute abolition of pain, our definition, as being thus a tenet accepted in all the schools, may well be called the royal highway² of philosophy. No one, in fact, maintains that pain is possible without the individual's activity. Thus even the Mádhyamika's opinion that "liberation consists in the abolition of soul," does not controvert our point, so far at any rate as that it is the abolition of pain. But if you proceed to argue that the soul, as being the cause of pain, is to be abolished just like the body, &c., we reply that this does not hold, since it fails under either alternative. For do you mean by "the soul," (*a.*) the continued succession of cognitions, or (*b.*) something different therefrom? (*a.*) If the former, we make no objection, [since we Naiyáyikas allow that cognition is evanescent,³ and we do desire to abolish cognition as a cause of *pravṛitti* or action⁴], for who would oppose a view which makes for his own side? (*b.*) But if the latter, then, since it must be eternal,⁵ its abolition is impossible; and, again, a second objection would be that no one would try to gain your supposed "*summum bonum*;" for surely no sensible person would strive to annihilate the soul, which is always the dearest of all, on the prin-

¹ Compare the English proverb, "As soon as the cat can lick her ear."

² Literally the "bell-road," *i.e.*, "the chief road through a village, or that by which elephants, &c., decorated with tinkling ornaments, proceed."—*Wilson's Dict.*

³ The cognition is produced in the

first moment, remains during the second, and ceases in the third.

⁴ See Nyáya Sút. i. 2.

⁵ As otherwise why should we require liberation at all? Or rather the author probably assumes that other Naiyáyikas have sufficiently established this point against its opponents, cf. p. 167, line 11.

ciple that "everything else is dear for the soul's pleasure;" and, again, everybody uses such a phrase as "liberated," [and this very term refutes the idea of annihilation or abolition].

"But why not say with those Bauddhas who hold the doctrine of pure intelligence [*i.e.*, the Yogácháras and the Sautrántikas¹], that 'the *summum bonum*' is the rising of pure intelligence consequent on the cessation of the conscious subject?" To this view we object that there is an absence of means; and also it cannot be established that the locus [or subject] of the two states is the same. For the former, if it is replied that the well-known fourfold set of Bauddha contemplations² are to be accepted as the cause, we answer that, as [according to the Bauddha tenet of the momentary existence of all things] there cannot be one abiding subject of these contemplations, they will necessarily exercise a languid power like studies pursued at irregular intervals, and be thus ineffectual to produce any distinct recognition of the real nature of things.

And for the latter, since the continued series of cognitions when accompanied by the natural obstacles³ is said to be "bound," and when freed from those obstacles is said to be "liberated," you cannot establish an identity of the subject in the two states so as to be able to say that the very same being which *was* bound *is* now liberated.

Nor do we find the path of the Jainas, viz., that "Liberation is the releasing from all 'obstructions,'" a path entirely free from bars to impede the wayfarer. Pray, will our Jaina friend kindly inform us what he means by "obstruction"?⁴ If he answers "merit, demerit, and error," we readily grant what he says. But if he maintains that "the body is the true obstruction, and hence Liberation is the continual upspringing of the soul consequent on the

¹ See *supra*, pp. 24-32.

² All is momentary, all is pain, all is *sui generis*, all is unreal.

³ In the form of the various *kletas* or "afflictions."

⁴ *Ávaraṇa*, cf. pp. 55, 58.

body's annihilation, as of a parrot released from its cage," then we must inquire whether this said soul possesses form or not. . If it possesses form, then has it parts or not? If it has no parts, then, since the well-known definition of an atom will apply here as "that which has form without parts," it will follow that the attributes of the soul are, like those of an atom, imperceptible to the senses.¹ If you say that it has parts, then the general maxim that "whatever has parts is non-eternal," would necessitate that the soul is non-eternal; and if this were conceded, then two grand difficulties [against the Providential course of the world] would burst in unopposed, viz., that what the soul has done would, at its cessation, perish with it [and thus fail of producing the proper fruit], while it would have reaped during life the effects of what it had not done [as the good and evil which happened to it would not be the consequences of its actions in a former birth]. If, on the other hand, the Jaina maintains that the soul does not possess form at all, then how can he talk of the soul's "upspringing," since all such actions as motion necessarily involve an agent possessing form?²

Again, if we take the Chárváka's view "that the only bondage is dependence on another, and therefore independence is the true liberation,"—if by "independence" he means the cessation of pain, we have no need to controvert it. But if he means autocratic power, then no sensible man can concede it, as the very idea of earthly power involves the idea of a capability of being increased and of being equalled.³

Again, the Sánkhyā opinion, which first lays down that nature and soul are utterly distinct, and then holds that

¹ But the Nyáya holds that the attributes of the soul, as happiness, desire, aversion, &c., are perceived by the internal sense, mind (Bhāshā P. § 83).

² The reading *mūrtapratibandhāt*

is difficult, but I believe that *prati-bandha* means here *vyāpti*, as it does in Sánkhyā Sūtras, i. 100.

³ The true *summum bonum* must be *niratīśaya*,—incapable of being added to.

“liberation is the soul’s remaining as it is in itself after nature [on being known] has withdrawn,”—even this opinion accepts our tenet of the abolition of pain; but there is left a difficulty as to whether this cognition of the distinction between nature and soul resides in the soul or in nature. It is not consistent to say that it resides in the soul, since the soul is held to be unchangeable, and this would seem to involve that previously it had been hampered by ignorance; nor can we say that it resides in nature, since nature is always held to be unintelligent. Moreover, is nature spontaneously active or inactive? If the former, then it follows that there can be no liberation at all, since the spontaneous actions of things cannot be set aside; and if the latter, the course of mundane existence would at once cease to go on.

Again, we have the same recognition of our “abolition of pain” in the doctrine of Bhaṭṭa Sarvajña and his followers, that “Liberation is the manifestation of an eternal happiness incapable of being increased;” but here we have the difficulty that an eternal happiness does not come within the range of definite proof. If you allege Śruti as the proof, we reply that Śruti has no place when the thing itself is precluded by a valid non-perception;¹ or if you allow its authority, then you will have to concede the existence of such things as floating stones.²

“But if you give up the view that ‘liberation is the manifestation of happiness,’ and then accept such a view as that which holds it to be only the cessation of pain, does not your conduct resemble that of the dyspeptic patient who refused sweet milk and preferred sour rice-gruel?” Your satire, however, falls powerless, as fitter for some speech in a play [rather than for a grave philosophical argument]. The truth is that all happiness must

¹ *Yogyānupalabdhi* is when an object is not seen, and yet all the usual concurrent causes of vision are present, as the eye, light, &c.

² Alluding to the Vedic phrase,

“*grdvānaḥ plavanti*,” see Uttara Naishadha, xvii. 37. The phrase *atmānaḥ plavanti* occurs in Śhaḍv. Br. 5, 12.

be included under the category of pain, since, like honey mixed with poison, it is always accompanied by pain, either as admitting of increase,¹ or as being an object of perception, or as being exposed to many hostile influences, or as involving an irksome necessity of seeking all kinds of instruments for its production. Nor may you retort on us that we have fulfilled the proverb of "seeking one thing and dropping another in the search," since we have abolished happiness as being ever tainted by some incidental pain, and, at the same time, our own favourite alternative is one which no one can consider desirable. For the truth is that any attempt to establish happiness as the *summum bonum*, since it is inevitably accompanied by various causes of pain, is only like the man who would try to grasp a red-hot ball of iron under the delusion that it was gold. In the case of objects of enjoyment got together by rightful means, we may find many firefly-like pleasures; but then how many are the rainy days to drown them? And in the case of those got together by wrong means, the mind cannot even conceive the future issue which will be brought about. Let our intelligent readers consider all this, and not attempt to disguise their own conscious experience. Therefore it is that we hold it as indisputable that for him, pre-eminent among his fellows, who, through the favour of the Supreme Being, has, by the regular method of listening to the revealed Śruti, &c., attained unto the knowledge of the real nature of the soul, for him the absolute abolition of pain is the true Liberation.

But it may be objected, "Is there any proof at all for the existence of a Supreme Being, *i.e.*, perception, inference, or Śruti? Certainly perception cannot apply here, since the Deity, as devoid of form, &c., must be beyond the senses. Nor can inference hold, since there is no universal proposition or true middle term which can apply.² Nor can Śruti, since neither of the resulting

¹ Or perhaps "capable of being surpassed."

² Since the Supreme Being is a single instance.

alternatives can be sustained; for is it supposed to reveal, as being itself eternal, or as non-eternal? Under the former view an established tenet of our school would be contradicted [viz., that the Veda is non-eternal]; under the latter, we should be only arguing in a circle.¹ As for comparison and any other proof which might be adduced [as that sometimes called presumption, &c.], they need not be thought of for a moment, as their object matter is definitely limited, and cannot apply to the present case.² Therefore the Supreme Being seems to be as unreal as a hare's horn." But all this elaborate disputation need excite no flurry in the breast of the intelligent, as it can be at once met by the old argument, "The mountain, seas, &c., must have had a maker from their possessing the nature of effects just like a jar." (a.) Nor can our middle term [possessing the nature of effects] be rejected as unproved (*asiddha*), since it can be established beyond a doubt by the fact of the subject's possessing parts. "But what are we to understand by this 'possessing parts'? Is it 'existing in contact with parts,' or 'in intimate relation with parts'? It cannot be the first, since this would equally apply to such eternal things as ether,³ &c.; nor can it be the second, since this would prove too much, as applying to such cases as the [eternal] species, thread, which abides in intimate relation with the individual threads. It therefore fails as a middle term for your argument." We reply, that it holds if we explain the "possessing parts" as "belonging to the class of those substances which exist in intimate relation."⁴ Or we may adopt another view and

¹ Since the Veda, if non-eternal, must [to be authoritative] have been created by God, and yet it is brought forward to reveal the existence of God.

² The Nyāya holds presumption to be included under inference, and comparison is declared to be the ascertaining the relation of a name to the thing named.

³ Since ether is connected by con-

tact with the parts of everything, as e.g., a jar.

⁴ The whole (as the jar) resides by intimate relation in its parts (as the jar's two halves). But the eternal substances, ether, time, the soul, mind, and the atoms of earth, water, fire, and air, do not thus reside in anything, although, of course, the category *viśeṣa* does reside in them by intimate relation. The word "sub-

maintain that it is easy to infer the "possessing the nature of effects" from the consideration of their possessing intermediate magnitude.¹

• (b.) Nor can our middle term be rejected as "contradictory" (*viruddha*),² since there is no such acknowledged universal proposition connected with it as would establish the opposite major term to that in our syllogism [*i.e.*, that they must have had no maker]. (c.) Nor is our middle term too general (*anaikānta*), since it is never found in opposite instances [such as the lake, which is the *vipaksha* in the argument, "The mountain has fire because it has smoke"]. (d.) Nor again is it precluded (*bādhitā* or *kālātyayopadiṣṭā*), for there is no superior evidence to exercise such a precluding power. (e.) Nor is it counter-balanced (*sat-pratipakṣhitā*), for there does not appear to be any such equally valid antagonist.

If you bring forward as an antagonistic syllogism, "The mountains, &c., cannot have had a maker, from the fact that they were not produced by a body, just as is the case with the eternal ether,"—this pretended inference will no more stand examination than the young fawn can stand the attack of the full-grown lion; for the additional words "by a body" are useless, since "from the fact that they were not produced" would be a sufficient middle term by itself [and the argument thus involves the fallacy called *vyāpyatvāsiddhi*].³ Nor can you retort, "Well, let this then be our middle term;" for you cannot establish it as a real fact. Nor again is it possible to raise the

stances" excludes *tantutva*, and "existing in intimate relation" excludes ether, &c.

¹ Intermediate between infinite and infinitesimal, all eternal substances being the one or the other.

² The *viruddha-hetu* is that which is never found where the major term is.

³ This and much more of the whole discussion is taken from the *Kusumāñjali*, v. 2, and I extract my note on the passage there. "The

older Naiyāyikas maintained that the argument 'the mountain has fire because it has blue smoke,' involved the fallacy of *vyāpyatvāsiddhi*, because the alleged middle term was unnecessarily restricted (see *Siddhānta Muktv.* p. 77). The moderns, however, more wisely consider it as a harmless error, and they would rather meet the objection by asserting that there is no proof to establish the validity of the assumed middle term."

smallest shadow of a fear lest our middle term should be liable to limitation by any suggested condition (*upādhi*),¹ [such as “the being produced by a corporeal agent,” to limit our old reason “from having the nature of effects”]. because we have on our side a valid line of argument to establish our view, viz., “If the mountains, &c., had no maker, then they would not be effects” [but all do acknowledge that they have the nature of effects], for in this world that is not an effect which can attain its proper nature independently of any series of concurrent causes. And this series inevitably involves the idea of some sort of maker; and I mean by “being a maker” the being possessed of that combination of volition, desire to act, and knowledge of the proper means, which sets in motion all other causes, but is itself set in motion by none. And hence we hold that if the necessity of a maker were overthrown, the necessity of the action of all the other causes would be simultaneously overthrown, since these are dependent thereon; and this would lead to the monstrous doctrine that effects could be produced without any cause at all. There is a rule laid down by Śaṅkara-kīṅkara which applies directly to the present case—

“When a middle term is accompanied by a sound argument to establish its validity,

“Then you cannot attempt to supply a limiting condition on account of the [supposed] non-invariable concomitance of the major term.”

If you maintain that there are many sound counter-arguments, such as “If the Supreme Being were a maker, He would be possessed of a body,” &c., we reply, that all such reasoning is equally inconsistent, whether we allow that Supreme Being’s existence to be established or not.²

¹ For the *upādhi* cf. pp. 7, 8.

² As in the former case it would be clear that it is a subject for separate discussion; and in the latter you would be liable to the fault of *āstray-dśiddhi*, a “baseless inference,” since your subject (or minor term), being

itself non-existent, cannot be the locus or subject of a negation (cf. Kusumāñjali, iii. 2). “Just as that subject from which a given attribute is excluded cannot be unreal, so neither can an unreal thing be the subject of a negation.”

As has been said by Udayana Āchārya [in the Kusumāñjali, iii. 5]—

“If Śruti, &c., have any authority, your negative argument fails from being precluded; if they are fallacious, our old objection of a ‘baseless inference’ returns stronger than ever.”

Nor need we fear the possibility of any other contradiction to our argument, since it would be overthrown by either alternative of God’s being known or unknown.¹

“Well, let all this be granted; but the activity of God in creating the world, what end did it have in view? His own advantage or some other being’s? If it was for the former end, was it in order to attain something desired, or to avoid something not desired? It could not be the first, because this would be quite incongruous in a being who possesses every possible desire gratified; and for the same reason too it could not be the second. If it was for the latter end [the advantage of another] it would be equally incongruous; for who would call that being “wise” who busied himself in acting for another? If you replied that His activity was justified by compassion, any one would at once retort that this feeling of compassion should have rather induced Him to create all living beings happy, and not checkered with misery, since this militates against His compassion; for we define compassion as the disinterested wish to avoid causing another pain. Hence we conclude that it is not befitting for God to create the world. This has been said by Bhaṭṭāchārya—

“Not even a fool acts without some object in view;

“Suppose that God did not create the world, what end would be left undone by Him?”—

We reply, O thou crest-jewel of the atheistic school, be

¹ If God is known, then His existence must be granted; if He is not known, how can we argue about Him? I read lines 15, 16, in p. 120 of the Calcutta edition, *vikalpaparāhataḥ syāt tad etat*, and then begin the next clause with *syād etat*. The printed text, *vikalpaparāhataḥ syāt tad etat*, seems unintelligible.

pleased for a moment to close thy envy-dimmed eyes, and to consider the following suggestions. His action in creation is indeed solely caused by compassion; but the idea of a creation which shall consist only of happiness is inconsistent with the nature of things, since there cannot but arise eventual differences from the different results which will ripen from the good or evil actions of the beings who are to be created. Nor need you object that this would interfere with God's own independence [as He would thus seem to depend on others' actions], since there is the well-known saying, "One's own body does not hinder one;" nay rather it helps to carry out one's aims;¹ and for this there is authority in such passages of the Veda as that (in the Śvetáśvatara Upanishad, iii. 2), "There is one Rudra only; he admits² not of a second," &c. "But then how will you remedy your deadly sickness of reasoning in a circle? [for you have to prove the Veda by the authority of God, and then again you have to prove God's existence by the Veda"]. We reply, that we defy you to point out any reasoning in a circle in our argument. Do you suspect this "reciprocal dependence of each," which you call "reasoning in a circle," in regard to their being produced or in regard to their being known?³ It cannot be the former, for though the production of the Veda is dependent on God, still as God Himself is eternal, there is no possibility of *His* being produced; nor can it be in regard to their being known, for even if our knowledge of God were dependent on the Veda, the Veda might be learned from some other source; nor, again, can it be in regard to the knowledge of the non-eternity of the Veda, for the non-eternity of the Veda is easily perceived by

¹ The aggregate of the various subtle bodies constitutes Hiranya-garbha, or the supreme soul viewed in His relation to the world as creator, while the aggregate of the gross bodies similarly constitutes his gross body (viráj).

² The usual reading is *tasthur* for *tasthe*.

³ For these divisions of the *anyonyáśraya* fallacy, see *Nyāyasūtra vṛitti*, i. 39 (p. 33).

any *yogin* endowed with the transcendent faculties (*tivra*,¹ &c.)

Therefore, when God has been rendered propitious by the performance of duties which produce His favour, the desired end, Liberation, is obtained; thus everything is clear.

E. B. C.

NOTE ON PAGES 172, 173.

We have here an exemplification of the five fallacies or *hetvābhāsas* of the modern Hindu logic (cf. *Siddhāntamukt.*, § 71, *Tarkasaṃgr.*, 55-67), viz., *anaikānta*, *viruddha*, *asiddha*, *kālītyayopadiṣṭa* or *bādhita*, and *pratipakṣhita* or *sat-pratipakṣha*. The four first of these generally correspond to the *savyabhichāra* or "erratic," *viruddha* or "contradictory," *sādhyasama* or "unproved," and *atītakāla* or "mis-timed," i.e., "precluded," as given in the list of fallacies of the older logic in p. 164; but *pratipakṣhita* corresponds imperfectly to *prakaraṇasama*. The *prakaraṇasama* or "uncertain" reason is properly that reason which is equally available for both sides, as, e.g., the argument, "Sound is eternal because it is audible," which could be met by the equally plausible argument, "Sound is non-eternal because it is audible;" or, according to other authorities, it is that reason which itself raises the same difficulties as the original question, as, e.g., "sound is non-eternal because eternal qualities are not perceived in it;" here this alleged reason is as much the subject of dispute as the old question, "Is sound eternal?" But the *pratipakṣhita* reason is one which is counterbalanced by an equally valid reason, as "Sound is eternal because it is audible," and "Sound is non-eternal because it is a product."

¹ For *tivra* cf. *Yoga sūtras*, i. 21, 22.