Tarka, argument, reasoning from hypothesis, is connected with prayojana. Uha, hypothesis, conjecture, theory, is made with reference to a purpose, an aim. 'How may this be secured,' 'how is this,' 'what is this,' 'if this be so, this other would be so,' 'if it were thus, such an inconsistency would result'—such is the form of tarka whereby a fact is determined to be 'so rather than otherwise'.

Vada, discussion, falls under pramana. It proceeds on the assumption that definite and provable facts, and knowledge of them, exist somehow and in some one; and it aims at eliciting them. It is true that there are two kinds of discussion, sat or true and asat or false. But for the purposes of knowledge they are as one; it does not matter whether a fact is 'ascertained' to be true or false. (Both are 'ascertainties' and therefore useful. Destructive criticism has its uses as well as constructive).

Jalpa corresponds with prameya. It is disputation or controversy for mere display of skill and pleasure of mental activity, with much turning and twisting about of permutations and combinations of arguments but without any real and radical opposition. In such a disputation, each person states insistently his own side, what he has seen (with an implied suggestion that that is the whole of the truth, and herein is the appearance of 'dispute'). But in reality, none necessarily contradicts the other. Always (motions, movements of mind here) exist in all-space and all-time; and all possible opinions may be true, in their proper times and places. Because this world is always in procession, always changing, it is always happening that one 'way' prevails 'now' and another 'then'. These changes are taking place every moment. On this understanding, controversy also is seen to have a use. It conduces to a fuller and clearer comprehension of the sadhanata, the final truth.

Vitanas, wrangling, altercation, aimless and systemless cavilling, belongs to 'Doubt'.

Nirnaya, determination, decision, is prayojana. It is the one motive of all enquiry. And the nirmaya of the Nature of the Self is the prayojana of all the World-process (—which is one incessant 'enquiry' into that Absolute Nature). In that final decision are determined the nature of the 'decider,' the 'decided,' the 'decision,' the 'relation' between
them, the ‘ways in which separateness appears in the Tri-Unity’.

Jāṭi, ‘genus-species,’ is the following up of the ‘specific’ separateness, the distinguishing marks of and as between atoms and atoms, things and things (species and species). The specification of denotations and connotations, the relating together of names or words with marks of and relations between things is the nature of jāṭi. It belongs to pramāṇa.

Chhalā, ‘deceit,’ excuse, occasion, pretext, casuistry, sophistry comes under prameyā. “If it be so, (and it is so) we ought to act thus, because of this necessity”—such is the nature of chhalā.

Hetu, cause, reason, belongs to samśaya. All kāraṇas, causes, are called hetu. It is the unknown, the hidden, to be searched for, to be disclosed, to be manifested.

The interpretation in the text of the principal terms and subjects dealt with by the Nyāya is more or less different, in all cases, from that given in the works now current. But it is wholly different in the case of Jāṭi and the succeeding three. It is not impossible to connect the two by means of a transition through gradual changes of shades of meaning and associations. Thus at the present day, Jāṭi is a kind of fallacy, ‘founded on false analogies’; and ‘analogies’ are based on ‘specific characteristics’ of ‘species’.

“What is the reason of all this appearance, this World-process?”—such is the nature of hetu, the point in issue.

Abhāsa pertains to prayojana. Whatever ‘appears,’ abhāṭi, is its own ‘motive,’ because all is necessary. (Every fact is its own justification; every manifestation, every appearance, is its own end, from the standpoint of the Absolute Svabhāva).

Thus does the Nyāya ‘determine’ and ‘prove’ every thing coming within the sixteen classes or categories that exhaust all the facts of life, vyaśvahāra.

Nyāya also falls into three sub-divisions corresponding to A, U and M: Tatvav-yāya, Loka-yāya, and Prakṛtiya-yāya.

In the first, corresponding to cognition, all things are examined and reduced to unity and ‘identity’; I alone is, and there is no second. In the second, referring to action, ‘the contradiction’ and manyness inherent in the This is expanded; I is one, this is another, the relation between them is a third and so on. The third, of the nature of desire-negation, shows that All-is-Not, all undergoes change, the inner content and significance of all that appears and is affirmed, is Negation.

1 Not recognised by current Nyāya.
2 This statement indicates that if the writer of the Prapāṭha-Vāda had to use modern technical language,
The unity running through these three Nyāyas is that they all represent distinct standpoints which all exist. From the point of view of cognition, the One I is the root and support of all the many. From that of action, there is a Multiplicity: ‘Do this, and this, and this other; this is important, this is unimportant and so on’; the ‘practical’ conclusion belonging to this standpoint is: ‘I exist only for the carrying on of the World-process’. From that of paraśāma, the end, the denouement (desired or to be expected and sure to follow), change, transformation, the conclusion of both I and This is Not, of the Interplay of Self and Not-Self in any given world-system is dissolution and praṇāya.

From Nyāya we come to learn, thus, how at one epoch, the idea, the law or the consciousness of the Not-This prevails in the World-process; at another, that of the Not-Self; again, of the I only; still again, of the This only; at one time, of the ‘I-This’; at another ‘This-Not’; at yet another, ‘I-This-Not’; and so forth. In truth, The Self is proved by Self and not by proofs. It is not matter for proof or doubt.

he would speak of the Laws of Thought as Identity, Contradiction, and Inclusivity (rather than Exclusivity) Middle. More on this will be found in the note at the end of this chapter.

Or varied concept, premiss, syllogism, Deductive and inductive inference, Hypothesis, contention, argument, It feels no fact or motive but Itself, The One Assurance through all fallacies. One Unity, One only is the Self, Yet also It is second, third, fourth, All. All contradiction is within It hidden. By Nyāya and Vedānta it is known, And all Mimamsā is its dwelling-place, The Root of Being, Bliss and Consciousness, Itself enrooted in Transcendent AUM.

Note: The intelligence, outward-turned, distinguishing rather than synthesising, endeavoring to master the details of its own world, the world of intelligence, and looking at all facts in their aspect of ‘objects of investigation,’ groups these outer and inner facts for its special purposes, under sixteen heads, those mentioned in the text. Other systems, from other ‘points of view,’ dharma-bheda, ‘leading off’ from other ‘points of departure,’ prasthāna-bhedā, behold and grasp the facts of life in other ways and aspects. Thus the Vaiśeṣika treats them not as ‘objects of study and logical discussion,’ but as in themselves, and so classifies them under six or, according to some, seven groups. The Vedānta, as objects of enquiries subservient to the one enquiry after the Supreme. The Mimamsā, as objects of and related to action. The Yoga, as means to the evolution of the Jīva, and indirect
(iv) Vaiśeṣika.—The significance of the name.—The subject-matter of the system.—Its relation to Nyāya.—Its practical purpose.—The seven categories under which it groups all the phenomena and facts of the World-process.—Their significance.—Their origin in and correspondence with the primal triplet instruments of its Release. The Sāṅkhāya (of the Praṇava-Vāda), as embodying the Infinite and the Eternal, always, everywhere.

The sixteen heads of Nyāya, given here, differ from those of the current system, so far as the names go, in one small respect: he ṭu and aḥāśa are treated as one by the current system and to make up the sixteen, another head nigrāha-sthāna, is added. There are differences of interpretation also, especially as regards the latter heads. For a fair account of the main doctrines of the six systems as now current, the reader may refer to Max Müller’s Six Systems. With reference to the principles of Logic proper, which is studied mostly by itself in modern days, but forms only a part of the philosophical system of Nyāya, a few observations may be made. The Indian syllogism has five steps instead of three. It combines, in a certain sense, both induction and deduction. Its method of induction, vyāpti-graha, is the same as the most approved modern one, etc., of concomitant variations, unya-vyāti-reka. Its proposition or judgment or syllogistic premiss is not equational, but associative. It does not say A is B, and B is C, therefore B is C. It will say A goes and summation.—Special consideration regarding aḥāśa or non-existence.—The three kinds or sub-divisions of the system in correspondence with the Trinity.—The Absolute.

The Vaiśeṣika is the fourth Upāṇga. That which is ‘left behind’ after the marking off of with B, this is B, therefore A will be found accompanying this. The so-called Laws of Thought, it does not formulate in their modern form. It would probably regard them as very barren and prohibitive of all really useful or even logical operations. If A is A only and never Not-A, how can any one ever say that A is B and B is C and therefore A is C? A can be only A and never B or C, which are obviously different from A? If it were questioned as to the laws of thought it would probably refer for the answer to its sister Vedānta, who would again very likely say that the so-called laws of thought apply only to the transcendental or metaphysical thought of or about Brahmān: The Self is Self alone and never Not-Self; that they are, all three, summed up in the one phrase I Not-I Not. In the region of empirical thought, on the other hand, we find everything becoming something else, moment by moment; whatever of continuity anything has, and which continuity makes any induction possible at all, is only a shadow, a reflection, of the continuity and Unity of Brahmān. And the mention of the induction, and of the reason for it, in every syllogism, is intended as a standing reminder of
all others, that by which a thing is separated, distinguished, specialised from others is vi-she-
sha. That which proceeds from or is concerned with vi-she-sha is Vaishešhika. The enumera-
tion of the objects of the World-process with specification of their distinctive features or
this fact, and as an incentive to correction of any
error there might be in the induction or generalisa-
tion. The semblance of absolute completeness
which appears in the major or minor premise of
modern syllogisms, and which is against fact, —
since no generalisation regarding concrete partic-
ulars, by an individual human being of limited
 capacities, can ever be absolutely universal—is
also avoided thereby. No multiplication of the finite
will yield the infinite. No amount of ‘repeti-
tion’ of an experience can give a universal law.
The reasoning is not, ‘Because many times therefore
always,’ but ‘Because once therefore always’.
Universalty of generalisation lies in the Unity of
each instance, not in manyness. Repetitions only
help us to eliminate accidental factors.

It has been claimed that Aristotle improved
upon the ancient system when he reduced its
five steps of a syllogism to three. This is a
hallucination. He has, indeed, increased its
five steps to six, for the five, as said above,
include the inductive as well as the deductive
syllogism.

attributes is the work of the Vaishešhika
system.

It has been repeatedly observed before that
all (things and thoughts) are based ultimately
on the quartet of cognition, desire, action and
summation. But the preliminary groupings and
combinations of these primarily give rise to
seven. The sixteen categories of the Nyāya
are universal or general. The Vaishešhika deals
with the special differentia or propria.1 Without
the ‘general’ knowledge conveyed by the for-
mer, the ‘special’ knowledge offered by the latter
is not possible to grasp. After mastering the
knowledge of those sixteen, the ‘special methods’
of samsāra should be studied. In this par-
icular brahmāṇda of ours, only seven pa
dārtihasa are necessary (to deal with).
For the knowledge of universals, Nyāya should
be studied; for that of particulars, Vaishešhika.
This is all the difference between them; otherwise,
as is well-known, they are but one. Distinctions
exist only as between the parts of a whole.
Because of this we have the statement: Having
studied the whole of samsāra according to

1 The distinction is not quite clear. Perhaps what
is meant is that the Nyāya categories are ‘subjective,’
and each and every thing may appear under all of
them in succession, in various situations; while the
categories of the Vaishešhika are ‘objective,’ and
what belongs to one head cannot belong to another.
the Nyāya and then the Viśeṣṭhīkā, create a brahmāṇḍa.

The Viśeṣṭhīkā is thus the means of creating a brahmāṇḍa. Seven things are dealt with here: dravya or substance, guṇa or attribute, kārma or motion, sāmānyya or genus, vīṣeṣṭa or specifying and particularising (to the extent of singularising) characteristic (of species and individual), sāmāvāya or relation and abhāva or non-existence. Of these, the first three are the chief and respectively correspond to desire (Negation), the Self and the Not-Self.

Substance is the root and locus of all relations (which are brought about by desire). There is an apparent inversion of the usual order here. This is due to the reversal (which is unavoidable in the ‘reflection’ of the attributes of Self and Not-Self in or on each other). Without substance, nothing can appear or manifest. Hence it is placed first in order. Hence too the statement that the whole of the World-process is supported and upheld by desire, which is māyā. Hence all substance is of the nature of, or is compact of, Energy, Shaktī. All energy, desire, necessity, resides in and about substance.

So, guṇa, quality, is cognition (or cognisable; as substance is the object of desire, so quality is the object of cognition); and cognition is Āṭma; hence guṇa is, i.e., corresponds to Āṭma.

Finally, what is done (created) is kārma; and doing is action which is, i.e., corresponds to Not-Self. Thus do the three padarths correspond to M, A and U.

Then follow sāmānyya, sameness, equality, similarity, the common element, genus, type; and vīṣeṣṭa, speciality, diversity, particularity, individuality, singularity. Sāmānyya is of the nature of the sāmāhāra or summation and resides in the triad of substance, attribute and motion. Because Desire, the Self and the Not-Self are all of them universal and necessary and yet one, therefore do we find that all is sāmānyya, i.e., is possessed of a unity in diversity which is, and is the origin of, the fact of genus. Hence people speak of a common spirit, a common desire, a common work, and, again, of so-and-so being a common or universal rule or law.

Vīṣeṣṭa, the singular or particular, arises in and by the sāmānyya, the universal or general, and is therefore said to be included in the latter. Vīṣeṣṭa is a part of sāmānyya, as sāmānyya is the whole of vīṣeṣṭa.

The relation with each other, connexion or nexus between, general and special, substance and attribute, motion and motion, or motion and
any of the others, is *samavāya*, 'going together,' juxtaposition, interconnection, immanence, interdependence.

The unity of all inter-related facts, their reduction to oneness, the abolition of all differences and distinctions, is *abhāva*, non-existence, non-becoming, non-being. Ordinarily, it is true, a totality, an agglomerate of inter-related facts implies the continued separate existence of those facts. But when the totality or unity is that of the Universal Substrate, Being, the reduction to unity will amount to non-separate-existence, i.e., non-existence, *abhāva* (wherein all the opposing differences, the pairs of opposites, the contrasts, which and which alone, the manifested world consists, abolish themselves mutually and leave behind only Pure Being, which may equally well be called Pure Nothing.) The *abhāva* which is the unity or summation of the Three is 'Not-anything'. All this multiplicity of this, that, the other, which, who, someone, somewhere, you, I, he, etc., is possible only during *bhāva*, the existence of an inter-relation of separates. Where all is one there is neither speaker, nor speech, nor spoken to or about. *Abhāva* is generally described as 'is not'. Four kinds of this are usually distinguished, with reference to 'whole' and 'part'. They are: (i) Previous, preceding or 'past non-existence' i.e., the non-existence of a thing in the past, before that thing came into existence; (ii) the subsequent, succeeding or future 'non-existence of or by destruction,' the non-existence of a thing after it has been destroyed; (iii) utter, or absolute or 'extreme non-existence'; and (iv) 'mutual non-existence.' A little consideration shows how all these are but variations of non-existence, the absence of separateness, absence of distinct manifestation, latency in the One Unmanifest. Thus 'previous non-existence' implies a consciousness, a memory, of a still earlier existence of the particular thing under reference, from which earlier existence it had passed into latency and has now reappeared. 'Non-existence by destruction' implies also that the thing has passed into the non-manifest condition out of which it will some day emerge anew into patency, for no-thing can be annihilated and everything must continue 'to be' in Universal Being in some way or other, and what 'becomes' or 'comes forth,' surely disappears, and what disappears as surely 'comes forth' again. 'Utter non-existence' also means only that the thing is non-existent, non-manifest to

---

1 The Sanskrit names are, are *prāg-abhāva*, *prājñavams-abhāva*, *ātman-abhāva*, and *anyony-abhāva*. See in this connexion the last paragraphs of Section II. in Vol. I.
the senses; as a pādārtha, a ‘meaning of a term,’ a concept, a notion, an idea, it always is. Finally, ‘mutual non-existence’ means that the destruction or disappearance of one thing causes or goes together with the destruction or disappearance of another; or that the birth of one causes the death of another—as we see all about us.

Thus, then, in essence, the absence or disappearance and destruction of separateness is the real signification of non-existence.

But, in this sense, strictly speaking, abhava is not to be counted amongst the pādārthas; and the manifest World-process contains and consists of only six, dravya, etc., in which is included the whole of this ever-moving or manifest brahmāṇa, devoted to kriya or karma.

1It is said elsewhere that the two principal subdivisions of karma (as mere movement, not as the ethicological deeds which are the cause of pleasure or pain) are ākāśīchāna or contraction and prasāraṇa or expansion. On this point, compare the following: “Response, in whatever manner expressed, resolves itself into two simple and well-defined factors, namely, contraction and expansion.” Knowledge, October 1906, p. 567.—Review by G. Mason of Dr. J. C. Bose’s book entitled Plant Response as a means of Physiological Investigation. See also The Science of the Functions.

These six are divided into triplets in the usual way. (The first three with the fourth or sāmanya as summation have been already mentioned. Of the second three, sāmanya may be regarded as corresponding to A, viśeṣha to U and sāmavaya to M, the seventh or abhava becoming the summation.) The actual concrete kinds or instances of karma and all the other pādārthas are to be seen and understood only in the concrete or ‘real’ transactions and events of the World-process.

The Vaiśeṣika system is also threefold like the others, Ātma-Vaiśeṣika, Kriyā-Vaiśeṣika, and Āpara-Vaiśeṣika. The object of the second, to unify all karma residing in ‘the separate’ karma which is the basis of and is in turn based on separateness. The third deals with the completion or fulfillment, satisfaction or extinction, of all desire (dravya) in the one primal and eternal endeavor of Self-realisation (by means of the counterfoils of particularised substance, matter, Not-Self). These


1Current Sanskrit philosophical literature does not know of these.
three correspond respectively to the A, U and M.

The \textit{Vaitheśhika} should be studied as a means to the realisation of the unity of Substance, Attribute and Movement, in the All-Self, and, thereafter, the mastery of the special methods of creation under the guiding principle of AUM. But in reality,

No worlds and no World-process is this Self, Nor universal all-embracingness, Nor special and particular is It, But ever, every way, pure Consciousness; No substance and no attribute is It, Nor motion is It, nor the opposite, But all equality, summation, One, Awareness pure, ever and every way; Nor is nor is not, but the sum of both, Nor part, the positive, nor whole, the naught, Its substance, plenitude of partlessness, Its attribute, wareness of blessed Being, Its movement, the eternity of rest, Its common genus, Universal Self, Its utmost, atomic selves, singular Its all-embracing nexus, Unity, And Non-Existence, Its Abode of Peace.

\textit{\textbf{(v)}} \textit{Yoga.—The significance of the name.}—The purpose of the science.—Its subject-matters.—Its technicalities and their interpretation.—The three kinds of \textit{yoga.}—The Absolute.

All things ‘conjoin,’ ‘fit together,’ into each other and into One in succession—such is the significance of \textit{yoga.} And how the whole World-process, in all its parts, appropriately fits together and is inter-related—the exposition of this synthesis, this unity, this co-ordination, is to be found here. ‘This enters into or exists in or comes after this, and for such and such a reason’—such is the nature of the synthesis. The projection, the fitting in, of one’s own self into the Universal Self, the inspiration and motivation of the former by the latter—is the object of the science of \textit{Yoga}. This I that seem separate, am really seated and established in and identical with the Universal I—this is the form and nature, substance and essence, of \textit{yoga}; and the practice and securing of \textit{yoga} is recommended only for the realisation of this fact. The duties, functions, operations (of all beings and forces of nature), ordained and pointed out separately (elsewhere), are all summed up and unified here; and the One is seen in all and all in One; this is the sole fruit of \textit{yoga}. The methods of these various functions and operations, and of their unification, are all described here.

The technical words of \textit{Yoga}, \textit{praśayāma}, etc., should be interpreted in accordance with these principles. This ‘control of breath,’ metaphysically and superphysically, means, essentially
the realisation of all the pseudo-infinite vital currents underlying the activities of all objects, vastest and minutest, as (being the same in nature as the operation of the life-breaths) in one's Self.

_ Jāpa_, repetition, recitation, of the AUM etc., is prescribed for the same purpose. It means reflexion on, realisation of, the meaning of that which is thus uttered repeatedly. The strenuous thinking out of the universal principles included in and signified by the AUM is its _jāpa_. There is an order, a law, in the World-process; and the discovery of that universal law and order of all manifestation constitutes the real import and importance of the ‘repetition’. And the highest end and aim of the science and art, theory and practice of Yoga, is the unification of all the parts in the Whole, the parts which all fall under and are also all interrelated to Unity within and by means of the AUM. The Whole and the parts are both obviously necessary. And hence are both of them but one, even though appearing as separately distinguishable during processes of description and manifestation, in language and in existence—for things which are necessary to each other are part of each other’s being.

The aphorism quoted here in the text, and explained, is the same as 1.28 of the current Yoga-Sūtras; the explanation is slightly different.

The three kinds of _yoga_ are _rāja_. _hatha_, and _lakṣhaya_. The first refers to cognition, knowledge, and is the source of all ‘enlightenment’. The second consists in the ‘persistent practice’ of various processes and methods, as means. The third is the realisation of the ‘aim’ of the unity of all things. These respectively correspond to A, U and M. In truth, however,

Not _Yoga_ and not _Yogin_ is the Self,
Not union nor disunion knoweth It,
‘Not’ is the I the means of any ties,
Nothing to be conjoined or to conjure,
But e’or the Self abideth in the Not.
This Self pursueth naught, renounceeth naught,
Is not perfected by oft-uttered sounds,
Or image contemplated in the mind,
Or vows and vigils, fasts, observances,
Or restful seat, or ceasing of the breath
And movement of the ever-restless mind,
Or surge of lordliness and powers divine,
Or rapt intentness, trance or ecstacy—
’Tis but the One Summation of them all.

(vi) The Sākhya.—The etymological significance of the name.—The teaching of the system.—The Absolute.

Lastly, we come to the sixth _Upānga_, the _Sākhya_. The numberlessness, the infinity, of all and everything is explained by it. The word
sānkhyā means absence or transcendence of sānkhyā or number; "Not-this," "not-another," "not-all"—such is the universal sānkhyā, the abolition of all to which number applies. The contradiction, the opposition, the traversal and refutation of all enumeration and calculation, of all beginning and end and limitation—this is Self-knowledge according to the Sāṅkhya.

Before me, behind me, within me, above, below, beyond—Infinity stretches everywhere.

Thus does the Sāṅkhya teach the transcendence of the Paramātma, the Self, beyond all the states of Mahāviṣṇu, etc. Endlessness is the very essence of this dārshana, this 'view' of the World-process—without count or end in number, as also in object, aim, motive. (Nothing has in reality anything else for end and aim; all are ends to each other; for everything is its own end, its own motive, because everything is

1 The current explanation is different: That which carefully recognises, explains, 'enumerates,' sannayaṅkaḥ yāti, the principles, tattvas, of the universe, is Sāṅkhya. A thing is known, is understood finally when it is 'numbered out,' interpreted in terms of mathematics; therefore sāṅkhyā comes to mean 'number,' though primarily meaning 'good knowledge'.

2 Thus, the sensor and motor organs are means to the nutritive apparatus, and that in turn to these; and both to the organism as a whole and that to
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within and is the outcome of the One Absolute, Svabhāva, Self-realising Self.) Succession is ignored by this science; and, consequently, Ishvaraṇas and Mahāviṣṇus and the endless grades beyond are all passed by, and only the Self-based, all-free Brahman as the Self embodied in the AUM is recognised.

Infinite all around, before, behind,
Above, below, within, without, beyond,
The Soul, the Self, of all the moods of Being,
Devoid even of voidness, the One Self,
One Computation in minute or vast,
An endless sigh and surge of Countlessness,
A Consciousness unconscious of all bounds.

these; and all together to the ensoiling consciousness which the organism subserves as instrument of experience; and the consciousness, in turn, to the organism, for without it, the latter breaks up—and so on.