CHAPTER X

NYĀYA-VAIŚEŚIKA

We now begin the study of what are commonly styled the orthodox systems. The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika, which form the subject of this chapter, were independent in their origin. Our justification for dealing with them as one here is that they are closely allied in their realistic and pessimistic outlook and that, in the course of history, they have actually been amalgamated by their exponents themselves. Thus the popular manuals of the Tarkasamgraha of Annambhaṭṭa and the Bhāṣā-pariccheda or Kārikāvalī of Viśvanātha, which belong to about the same period (A.D. 1650), treat of the two systems together. The syncretic spirit exhibited in these works is much older and may be traced as early as Vātsyāyana, whose bhāṣya is the earliest extant commentary on the Sūtra of Gautama. But a formal synthesis of the two systems does not appear till about the tenth century, when works like the Sapta-pādrarthī of Śivāditya began to appear. Besides these two stages in the history of the systems, we may also perhaps note a third when the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika as representing an independent world-view was practically ignored and it became reduced as mere logic to a position ancillary to the study of philosophy in general and of the Vedānta in particular. There are certain marked differences in the doctrine as taught in the two schools and in the several periods of its history. We shall, as we proceed, draw attention to the more important among them. The word ‘Vaiśeṣika’ is derived from viśeṣa, which means ‘difference,’ and the doctrine is so designated because, according to it, diversity and not unity is at the root of the universe. The word ‘Nyāya’ is commonly understood as meaning ‘argumentation’ (literally ‘going back’). It indicates the method followed in the system which is predominantly intellectualistic and analytical; and the fact is borne out by the other designa-

1 See Note 3 on p. 183.
2 Cf. I. i. 9.
3 Pāṇini. V. iv. 34. See ERE. vol. xii. p. 570.
tions like hetu-vidyā or 'the science of causes' which are sometimes applied to it. It is this characteristic that accounts for the special attention paid in the system to questions of formal logic, with which it is in fact ordinarily confounded. Thus the compound designation ‘Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika’ refers to the method followed in the system as also to the result finally reached, viz. pluralistic realism. Of the chronological relation of the two doctrines it is difficult to say anything definite. Speaking of the systems, as distinguished from the Sūtras in which their teaching is embodied, we may perhaps state that the Vaiṣeṣika is the older of the two.

The literature of the Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika is next in extent only to that of the Vedānta. We can mention here only a few of the outstanding works. The Vaiṣeṣika-sūtra of Kaņāda is in ten chapters, each of which is divided into two sections. Though aiming chiefly at the explanation of the various categories recognized in the system, the treatise incidentally refers to several problems of general philosophic interest. The earliest extant commentary upon it is that of Praśastapāda, known as the bhāṣya, which probably belongs to the fifth century A.D. But it does not in its exposition follow the order of the sūtras. It is a 'restatement rather than a commentary'; and in restating the position of the school, it considerably develops it. For instance the clear formulation of the doctrine of creation with God as creator is found for the first time in it in the history of the Vaiṣeṣika school. On account of such developments, the work is to be looked upon more as an independent authority on the doctrine than as a commentary. It has been expounded by several writers of whom Udayana and Śrīdhara, both contemporaries, are the most important. Of them Udayana (A.D. 984) is the more celebrated, particularly on account of his Kusumānjali, which has become a classic of Indian theism. His commentary is known as the Kiraṇāvali while Śrīdhara's bears the title of Kandalī. Both give a most lucid exposition of the Vaiṣeṣika doctrine. The Upaskāra of Saṃkara Miśra (A.D. 1650) is a commentary on the Sūtra in the common acceptation of that term, but owing to the lateness of its author it cannot always
be regarded as faithful to the original. The Nyāya-sūtra of Gautama is in five chapters each of which again is divided into two sections. Its bhāṣya is by Vātsyāyana (A.D. 400), who mentions still earlier Naiyāyikas, from whose views he dissents.\(^1\) It seems to have been unfavourably criticized by the eminent Buddhist thinker Diṇnāga and was defended against him by one described as Uddyotakara ('the illuminator') in his Vārtika. Uddyotakara probably belongs to the reign of Harṣavardhana (A.D. 608-648) and \(^\text{māv}\) have been patronized by that sovereign. This work has been explained in the Tātparya-tīkā by Vācaspati (A.D. 841), who, though a follower of the Advaita, has written works of authority on all the systems. This work in its turn has been commented upon by Udayana, already mentioned, in his Tātparya-tīkā-paraśuddhi. One more writer whom we may name is Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, of doubtful date, whose Nyāya-maṅjarī, though professing only to be a commentary on a select few of Gautama's sūtras, is a rich store-house of information on Indian philosophic thought as it was known in his time. This concludes the 'old' or prācina phase of the history of the Nyāya. Its 'new' or the navya phase\(^2\) commences about the twelfth century with the epoch-making Tattva-cintāmaṇī of Gaṅgeśa of Eastern Bengal (A.D. 1200). This great work gradually threw into the shade the earlier ones, including the two Sūtras, and it is only in recent years that they have been restored to their legitimate place in the study of the system, through the awakening of interest in India's past. In Gaṅgeśa, it has been said, the logic of the Nyāya attains its final shape. The study of the system as representing an independent philosophic doctrine thereafter declines. But what was lost in one direction was gained in another, for the new Nyāya influenced all the other schools of philosophy. It helped especially the cultivation of precision in thought as well as in expression. But discussions came to be confined more and more to matters of detail, and formal perfection

\(^1\) Cf. I. i. 32.

\(^2\) Neither of the words prācina and navya, as applied to the doctrine, always refers to the same stage in its history. What is spoken of as 'new' at one stage may be 'old' at another.
became the chief object of attainment. However acute these discussions and whatever their value as means of mental discipline, they must be pronounced as for the most part philosophically barren. They are subtle rather than profound. Several commentaries and sub-commentaries on the Tattva-cintāmaṇī have been written. It will suffice to mention here those of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma (A.D. 1500), the first of what is called the 'Nuddea school' of logicians and of Raghunātha Śiromāṇi—his pupil along with Caitanya, the renowned Bengali religious teacher. Raghunātha's commentary on Gangeśa's work, which is the best of its class, is known as the Didhiti. Gadādhara, who belonged to the same school, commented upon it; and it is his commentary in its various sections or Vādas that has since become the staple of advanced study in schools that teach Nyāya not only in Bengal, but all over the country. Gadādhara has been described as the prince of Indian schoolmen. Roughly speaking he lived in the same time as Lord Bacon whose denunciations of scholasticism, as a modern writer observes, may be 'most appositely illustrated by extracts from Gadādhara's writings.' Amongst the numerous manuals treating of the system, we have already mentioned the two most important—the Tarka-samgraha and the Kārikāvali, which have been explained by the authors themselves in the Dīpikā and the Siddhānta-muktāvali respectively.

I

The system starts with the postulate that all knowledge by its very nature points to an object beyond it and independent of it. These objects, it is added, are independent not only of knowledge, but also of one another, whence the doctrine may be described as pluralistic realism. But by this description we should not assume that the data of knowledge are all disconnected. The multifarious things of experience are divisible into certain classes of which one called dravya, or 'substance,' as it is commonly translated in English, is

Na cāviṣayā kācidupalabdhiḥ: NSB. IV. i. 32.
The dravyas are nine in number—
(1) 'earth' (prthivi), (2) 'water' (ap), (3) 'fire' (tejas), (4) 'air' (vāyu), (5) ākāśa, (6) 'time' (kāla), (7) 'space' (dik), (8) the 'self' (ātman) and (9) manas; and they, together with their various properties and relations, explain the whole universe. They are all ultimate, and as such are either infinite or infinitesimal, the system viewing things made up of parts as necessarily transient. The dravyas are not all material so that the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika is not, like the Cārvāka, materialistic. At the same time the doctrine treats all dravyas alike; and even the self, it regards, is one object among others possessing properties, exhibiting relations, and knowable like them. It will be best to begin our account by describing the nine dravyas:

(1) to (4) 'Earth,' 'Water,' 'Fire' and 'Air.'—By these four, we should not here understand the discrete things of common experience bearing those names, but their ultimate material causes which are supra-sensible—the atoms (para-māṇus) which are partless and eternal. Objects like a jar are constituted out of or derived from such atoms. They come into being and pass out of it. The exact manner in which they are produced, we shall explain presently.

(5) Ākāśa.—This and the four dravyas just mentioned are together known as 'elements' (bhūtas); but, while the latter are found in two forms—primary and secondary—ākāśa appears only in one form. It is partless and infinite and does not, therefore, produce anything as the infinitesimal atoms of the other elements do.

(6) and (7): Time and Space.—These are conceived as objective realities; and they are infinite and partless like ākāśa. Time cannot be measured except indirectly by means that possess parts, e.g. the movements of the sun. Similarly space cannot be defined except by reference to determinate objects, say, the pole star. In other words, time and space are not of atomic structure; and points and instants are conventional divisions of them. The primary dravyas are not in time and space while all secondary or derivative objects like the jar necessarily are in them. Space, it should be added, is not the same as ākāśa. The latter stands
here for what fills space—some ethereal substance of which sound is supposed to be the distinctive quality. 1 Ākāśa is, in fact, postulated solely to account for it, which as a quality requires a substance to abide in. Its affinity with the first four dravyas is shown by its being grouped along with them under elements.

(8) Self.—It is many, each being regarded as omnipresent and eternal. Though theoretically present everywhere the feelings, thoughts and volitions of a self are confined to the physical organism with which it is, for the time being, associated. So, for all practical purposes, the self is where it acts. A peculiar feature of the system is that it makes jñāna or knowledge an attribute of the self, and that too, not an essential, but only an adventitious one. Its adventitious character is taken to be shown by dreamless sleep where the self is supposed to endure without being characterized by knowledge. The self thus differs from matter only in that it may become conscious and not in that it is itself mental in nature. Two other attributes of it, viz. desire (icchā) and volition (yatna), are conceived more or less similarly. They, like knowledge, refer to an object (saviṣayaka) and are meaningless without such reference. The really mental or spiritual element in the doctrine accordingly is not the self, but these three attributes which are all transient. Our own self we know directly; but the selves of others can be known only indirectly through their behaviour, etc. 2 Whether it be our own self or that of another, we never know it by itself, but always as the subject of which something is predicated, e.g. ’I am pleased,’ ’He is hungry.’

(9) Manas.—This is atomic and eternal but, unlike the first four dravyas, does not give rise to any product. Each self has its own manas, which is merely an instrument of knowing and is therefore as inert as any other sense. It is consequently incorrect to translate it as ‘mind.’ The really mental element in the system, as we have just said, is different. But the co-operation of the manas is a necessary condition of all knowledge whether it refers to external objects or internal states. The fact that occasionally, 1 Cf. NV. III. i. 72.  2 SM. p. 209.
though our eyes and ears are open, we do not see or hear has been made the basis for concluding that there should be a different and common aid to all knowledge which the system terms manas. 1 Sometimes we purposely look at a watch, for example; but we do not yet see the time, for our manas has meanwhile come to be otherwise occupied. It may thus be described as exercising a double function: It helps the self in acquiring knowledge, but at the same time acts as a check upon it by narrowing its field to a single object or a single group of objects. It is through the manas that the relation of the self to the senses and the body is established; and through them the self comes to be related to the external world. Association with it is, indeed, the basic cause of bondage 2; for though the body and the senses also accompany the transmigrating self, they are, unlike the manas, completely renewed at every birth.

The dravyas do not by themselves explain the whole universe. They serve merely as its framework; and we should now refer to their various properties and the relations into which they may enter. In other words, we have now to consider the categories other than dravya. By the term 'category' (padārtha) here we have to understand, with one exception alone to which we shall soon draw attention, the several groups or classes into which objects can be divided and not mere modes of predication. They are guṇa, karma, sāmānya, viśeṣa, samavāya and abhāva; and, together with dravya, they constitute the seven categories of the Vaiśeṣika, which are also accepted in the Nyāya. 3 Originally only six of them appear to have been recognized, 4 the last, viz. abhāva, being unknown. We have already spoken about dravya; and we shall now say a few words about each of the remaining six:—

Guṇa ('Quality').—These are attributes which pertain to one or more dravyas and do not, as in Buddhism, by themselves stand for a thing. Though thus dependent upon dravya, they are conceived as altogether distinct from it; for they can by themselves be known and as such must, according to

1 NS. I. i. 16. 2 Bandha-nimittam manāḥ: NM. p. 499. 3 NSB. I. i. 9. 4 Vaiśeṣika-sūtra, I. i. 4.
the doctrine,¹ be independent realities. They are what they are in complete independence of everything, including the dravyas to which they belong; but they are not necessarily eternal.² Yet being simple and not further analysable, they are placed among the fundamental components of the universe. Another important feature is that none of these is explained as subjective, the system viewing as self-contradictory the explanation of some entities as subjective and others as objective. The guṇas have been enumerated as twenty-four, which include not only material qualities, but also the mental that are referred to a distinct centre, the self. The arbitrary number at which they have been fixed clearly shows the rather conventional nature of the category. It is not necessary to mention them all, as their significance is more scientific than philosophical. We may merely notice in passing that, while several of these qualities such as magnitude (parimāṇa) are common to two or more dravyas, a few characterize or serve as the special mark of only a single dravya. The latter are known as 'specific qualities' (veṣeṣa-guṇa). They are odour, of earth; flavour, of water; colour, of fire; touch, of air; and sound, of ākāśa.³ These, it will be seen, are the so-called secondary qualities; and the doctrine not only takes them as quite real, but also considers consistently with its pluralistic standpoint that the true nature of dravyas is revealed by the qualities in which they differ rather than by those in which they agree. Of the remaining dravyas, only one, viz. the self, has specific qualities to which we shall refer later.

Karma ('Action').—This represents various kinds of movement whose relation to the dravya in which alone they are found is exactly the same as that of the guṇas, and whose independent reality also should be understood as in their case. The significance of recognizing it as a distinct category is that the doctrine admits stability as a possible charac-

¹ Pratīti-bhedāt bhedostī: NM. p. 312.
² They are eternal when they belong to dravyas that are so. Nityagatam nityam; anitya-gatam anityam: TS. p. 16.
³ See SM. st. 90–2. Prthivi possesses also flavour, touch and colour; ap, touch and colour; and tejas, touch.
teristic of reality. In this it differs from some other doctrines, e.g. the Sānkhyā, which has no conception of static objects at all in the physical world. Infinite dravyas are always stable, for the doctrine recognizes only change of place (parispanda), but not change of form (parināma); atomic and finite dravyas may or may not be moving.

Sāmānya ('Universal').—The manifold entities, so far alluded to, are reducible to types. There is order in them which is due to objective features and is not imported into them by the perceiving mind. It is by virtue of this order that objects are divisible not only into the three classes of dravya, guṇa and karma, but also into sub-classes like cows, redness or flying. It is necessary to caution the student against taking sāmānya as the equivalent of 'genus.' It stands for merely a feature or property common to two or more things and not like genus for a class of things exhibiting such a feature. The category dravya includes jars, cloths, etc., but the sāmānya of dravyatva which characterizes every dravya does not include the lower sāmānyas of 'jar-ness' (ghaṭatva), 'cloth-ness' (paṭatva), etc. The term sāmānya may be better rendered by the word 'universal,' without, however, suggesting a complete resemblance to the Platonic 'idea.' It is in all and in each; and yet it is not different in different particulars. Thus cow-ness is one and unanalysable. It always subsists, but it can be apprehended not by itself but only through a particular cow. Though appearing together, cow and cow-ness are conceived as two distinct entities. Of these universals, sattā or Being is the highest, for it is found to characterize the largest number of entities; and the others follow it in a descending order, like dravyatva, prthivītva and ghaṭatva; guṇatva and śuklatva; and so forth, each characterizing less and less numerous things.

We find the keenest controversy raging round this conception. Some, like the Jains, admit a basis for it in the

1 For instance, the particulars are not here viewed as copies of the universal.

2 We are here taking into consideration only the more important variety of sāmānya known as jāti. There is also recognized another variety called upādhi, e.g. 'blue-potness' (nila-ghaṭatva) or 'cap-wearing.' The description given above does not apply to it.
outer world, but they do not elevate it to the rank of a universal. Cow-ness for instance stands for something objective, but it is for them only a special disposition of pudgala which disappears with the cow in which it is found.\footnote{1 See Parikṣā-mukha-sūtra, iv. 4.} The Buddhists on the other hand deny it altogether, explaining it away as merely ideal (p. 204). What is there for instance, they ask, that is common to a mountain and a mustard seed which are both classified as 'earth'? They point out that its admission in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika sense leads to all sorts of absurdities. First of all, it involves the difficulty of accounting satisfactorily for the presence of the one in the many. Again we cannot say whether the so-called universal abides everywhere (sarva-sarva-gata) or is confined only to the respective particulars (vyakti-sarva-gata). In the former case only chaos would be the result, because a cow would then be characterized not only by cow-ness, but also by horse-ness, etc., which are everywhere by supposition; in the latter, it would be difficult to account for its sudden appearance in a new particular which springs into existence at a spot where the universal in question was not found previously and where to it could not have moved from the place in which it was, being by hypothesis incapable of movement. The Buddhist admits that we do regard certain things as similar rather than others; but that, in his opinion, is due to a subjective interference and has to be explained negatively as signifying their difference from the rest without implying any actual agreement, contrast being sufficient for knowing things. When we describe an animal as a cow, we do not mean to assert cow-ness of it as a positive predicate; we rather deny of it horse-ness and such other features.\footnote{2 Cf. SDS. pp. 13-14.} The main part of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika answer to such objections is that they are based upon a spatial view of universals—that they are Located in the particular. But the particular is not the seat of the universal; it is only the means of revealing it (vyañjaka), so that we may view it as being everywhere or only where the corresponding particulars are.\footnote{3 NM. pp. 312-13.}
Visēsa ('Individuality').—This is the differentia of ultimate things which are otherwise alike. Thus two atoms of earth or two selves in their intrinsic form resemble each other in every respect and if they should still be two, there must be a distinctive feature in each. That feature is its viṣēsa. The need for it arises only in the case of such objects as cannot be distinguished otherwise; and they are ultimate entities like those we have just mentioned. Two jars may be exactly alike in size, colour, etc., but they can be distinguished from each other by means of the separateness of the material out of which they are made. So it is not necessary to assume viṣēsas in their case. Nor is it incumbent to seek their aid in distinguishing even ultimate entities like an earth-atom and a water-atom, for the difference in the qualities that characterize them is sufficient for the purpose. The question will of course now arise as to how the viṣēsas differ from one another. To this there is no more satisfactory answer forthcoming than that they differentiate not only the ultimate entities to which they belong, but also themselves (svato-vyāvartaka). This category has been given up by the later followers of the doctrine.¹

Samavāya ('Necessary Relation').—We have mentioned that relations in this system are conceived as real. They are generally included in guṇas,² but there is one relation which is elevated to the rank of an independent category. It is samavāya which may be described as an intimate relation, for the separation of the relata connected by it necessarily implies the destruction of one at least of them. Such relata are described as ayuta-siddha, which means that of them one is invariably found associated with the other. There are five types of ayuta-siddha objects, which alone admit of samavāya relation. They are (1) dravya and guṇa, (2) dravya

¹ See Prof. Keith: Indian Logic and Atomism, p. 196 n. We have not taken into account the view of the Śūtra in regard to sāmānya and viṣēsa about which there is some ambiguity.

² For example, ‘priority’ (aparatva). Strictly, however, there is only one relation included in the guṇas, viz. samyoga, which is parallel to samavāya. These are the only two cases in which one of the relata can be described as being in the other.
and karma, (3) particular and universal, (4) ultimate things and višeṣa and (5) whole and parts or, as the same may otherwise be put, material cause and product. It will be observed that in one case, viz. the last, both the relata are dravyas and in another, viz. the third, neither may be a dravya, for gunas and karmas also, as conceived here, are particulars and reveal universals. The necessity for this category arises from the pluralistic postulate of the system, which takes ‘distinguishable’ as equivalent to ‘different.’ If a dravya be altogether distinct from its attributes, the particular from the universal, the material cause from the effect and they are yet found together, they must be related; and the relation itself must be unique since one at least of these in each pair does not exist apart from the other. In order to get a clear view of this relation it is necessary to contrast it with the parallel conception of samyoga (‘conjunction’) which is classed under the category of guna and is an occasional or separable connection. Samyoga obtains only between dravyas while samavāya, as we have seen, may or may not. While again samavāya is only between relata that are never found separate, samyoga is between normally separate (yuta-siddha) things. Two objects now in conjunction must once have been separate and may again be separated, the nature of the objects in either case remaining unaffected by the process. For this reason, viz. that it makes no difference to the relata, samyoga should be taken as an external relation. Even samavāya, it is necessary to add, has to be explained as an external relation, although it is usual to represent it as internal in modern works on the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. To take it so would be to go against the very spirit of the doctrine which views the relata involved in the one case quite as distinct as those in the other. One of the relata here, no doubt, is never found apart from the other. That, however, is no disproof of its distinctness. The reason why while one of them can exist without the other, the other cannot do so is that it becomes related to its correlate as it comes to be. We should not think that redness, for example, comes to characterize the rose after that colour has sprung into existence. Its origination is
simultaneous with its relation.\(^1\) In other words, unlike saṁyoga which is adventitious or contingent, samavāya is necessary, though the necessity is only one-sided. The red colour presupposes the rose (say), but the reverse does not hold good, because the rose may, according to the theory, exist out of this relation even though it be, as it is stated, but for one instant.\(^2\) Hence when we describe samavāya as an external relation, it is not in the sense that both its terms are equally independent as in saṁyoga, but only one.\(^3\)

\textit{Abhāva} ('Negation').—This is a later addition, and the addition is the result of working out in full the realistic hypothesis of the system. If all knowledge points to something outside it, so also should the knowledge of negation do and imply its existence apart from such knowledge. As in the positive sphere, here also knowledge must be different from the known.\(^4\) In other words, absence of an object is not the same as the knowledge of its absence. By abhāva, however, we should understand only the negation of something somewhere and not absolute nothing (śūnya) which the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika dismisses as unthinkable or as a pseudo-idea. We may speak of the negation of a jar or of cloth in a room or on a table, but never of negation itself. Accordingly this category, unlike others, is relative in its conception. It represents in reality what corresponds to the predicate in a negative judgment—'the lotus is not blue'—and so far is an exception to the sense in which the term 'category' is to be understood in the system. Four varieties of negation are enumerated:

In the case of a jar there is first the 'antecedent non-existence' or 'prior negation' (prāgabhāva) before the object is made and there is only the clay or, as it is usually put, the two halves (kapāla) of it. This variety of negation is

\[^1\] Jātah sambaddhaśca ityekah kālaḥ: NV. II. i. 33.

\[^2\] Cf. TSD. pp. 4 and 7: Utpannam dravyam kṣaṇam agunanam akriyākam ca tiṣṭhati.

\[^3\] For a further discussion of this topic see \textit{Proceedings of the Indian Philosophical Congress}, vol. iii. pp. 159–66.

\[^4\] Compare: '‘Socrates is not living’ must have an objective fact as its basis. This is a \textit{negative fact}. If the correspondence theory of Truth is to work, ‘negative facts’ must be admitted'—Bertrand Russell.
obviously beginningless, but comes to an end when the object in question is produced. When again the jar is destroyed leaving only the potsherd behind, there is 'subsequent non-existence' or 'posterior negation' (dhvamsā-bhāva). It has a beginning, but is endless, since the identical jar will never again come into being. It should be added that these two negations characterize the clay and the potsherd respectively, but are not identical with them. The third variety, known as 'absolute or total negation' (atyantā-bhāva), we have when there is the bare ground with no jar on it. Though really temporal it is for certain technical reasons, into which it is not necessary to enter here, regarded as eternal. The last variety is mutual negation (anyonyā-bhāva) which is only another word for distinction (bheda) between two objects each having its own identity and which finds expression in judgments like 'The jar is not cloth,' 'A is not B.' It is, of course, eternal owing to the law of identity.

We have seen that the first four dravyas have a two-fold form as atoms and as discrete objects originating from them. How are the latter derived? The answer to this is found in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika atomic theory. The first point of importance about it is that, unlike the Jaina theory (p. 162), it admits a qualitative distinction among the ultimate particles of matter, so that the atoms of any particular element can give rise only to products of that element. Commonly, no doubt, it is thought that more than one element may enter into the making of objects. But, according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, it is wrong to think so. The human body, for instance, is the product, in the strict sense of the term, of prthivi atoms only and not of the other elements also, like water, though they are found in it. It is the belief that there is difference in the manner in which dravyas may come together which is at the bottom of the conception of samavāya. When dravyas of the same kind are brought together so as to give rise to a new product, there is saṃyoga as well as samavāya; when, on the other hand, there is no such product but merely an aggregate, there is only saṃyoga—whether the dravyas coming together are
the same or are different in kind. In deciding what is new, the system is guided solely by the common-sense view (pratiti). Aggregation and production do not, as one might think, correspond to mechanical combination and organic growth, for the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika explains a piece of cloth also which is only mechanically produced as involving samāvaya, exactly like a tree that grows from a seed. When a piece of cloth is woven, we have in it the threads in conjunction; and, over and above the conjoined threads, the cloth which has come into being afresh. It is this new product that is in samāvaya relation with the threads. But in a bundle of threads there is only saṁyoga, for no fresh product, as commonly understood, results therefrom. All the material things of common experience are supposed to have been produced in this manner and are to be taken as new. This view of causation, which signifies that new things can be added to those already in existence, is known as ārambha-vāda (‘doctrine of new creation’). It is also termed asat-kārya-vāda (‘doctrine of non-existent effect’) because it maintains that the effect, once non-existent, comes into being afterwards. This does not mean that it can exist apart from the cause. The effect inheres in the material cause as a quality may be said to do in a substance. The second point to be noticed in the theory is that all such products are impermanent.¹ That is, the asat-kārya-vāda signifies not only that the non-existent comes to be, but that an existent product sooner or later also ceases to be. In contrast to Buddhism, it is maintained here that nothing can last for less than two instants²—those of origination and persistence, so that a product can disappear at the earliest only in the third instant after it is made. Lastly, all such products necessarily abide in two or more dravyas. The insistence that produced things are not only in time and space but also abide in dravyas is noteworthy. When we remember that guṇas and karmas also—whether produced or not—are so by their very nature,

¹ Utpannam nirudhyate: NSB. i. 29.
² This limitation applies also to what falls under the other categories and is produced. Jñāna, for instance, lasts only for two instants (SM. p. 425).
we see that the world as a product is in its entirety dependent upon the permanent dravyas. The doctrine does not admit of our using the term 'phenomena'; but if we might use it, we could describe the permanent dravyas as the ground of all phenomena. The universe thus consists of (1) a primary one that subsists always which was never made and will never be destroyed—the various kinds of atoms, the other dravyas like the selves, the universals and so forth; and (2) a derivative one which is dependent on it and which is the world we ordinarily know. This theory, by the way, makes an attempt at solving the well-known problem of change. The solution is that there is really no change in the sense of successive modifications within the unity of a thing. There are certain things that never change, and it is the transient things which they give rise to that explain our notion of change. The solution is thus different from the two we are so far familiar with—the Buddhistic one that change is total and perpetual (p. 211) and the Jaina one (p. 161) that it takes place in an enduring substance.

The existence of the atoms is deduced from the known divisibility of perceivable material objects—a divisibility which, it is said, must terminate at some stage; for, if all objects be alike divisible indefinitely, it would be difficult to account for the observed variations of magnitude in them. The terminal stage in this process of division gives the atoms which are the uncaused cause of all that is transient in the material universe. They are simple and partless and their size is infinitesimal so that their presence in akāśa does not interfere with its all-pervading nature. They have neither an exterior nor an interior; and their number in each of the four classes is infinite. The process of origination of objects is as follows: Two atoms of earth (say) come together and the resulting binary compound (dvyaṇuka), like the primary atoms constituting it, is infinitely small (aṇu) in size and therefore supersensuous. Three such binaries, suitably adjusted, produce a triad (tryaṇuka) which is identified with the dust mote we see dancing in the sun-beam and is

1 Kṣaṇa-bhaṅga-pariṇāmayoḥ nirāsāt: Upaskāra, VII. ii. 9.
2 There are also other views in this respect.
taken as the minimum visible entity. Its magnitude is finite and all other finite objects are made out of such triads. To the question how the finiteness of the triad arises from the infinitesimal size of the atoms, the answer given is that it is due to the number of the constituent atoms and not to their magnitude as in the case of common things. This is, however, a point which is not very clear, and has accordingly been severely criticized by the adherents of the other doctrines.\footnote{1} When material things from binary compounds onward are produced, their qualities also are produced, their nature being determined by the qualities of the respective causal substances. Thus the whiteness of a cloth is effectuated by the whiteness of the threads woven into that cloth. Not only is the whiteness of the cloth different from the cloth, it is also equally different from the whiteness of the threads, so that there are several whitenesses. They are, as already pointed out, the particular instances of white colour which all exhibit the universal ‘white-ness’ (ṣuklatva). The only other aspect of the world of things that can be produced is karma. In this case also many particulars are recognized of each variety, so that the flying of one bird (say) is not the same as that of another though both belong to the same class. The process of destruction, which is the reverse of that of creation, is somewhat differently explained by the old and the new exponents of the doctrine.\footnote{2} According to the former, a jar for example is destroyed one instant after the destruction of the halves (kapāla) out of which it is made. The only exception to this order is in the case of the very first product, viz. the binary compound. The material cause of it being indestructible, the destruction of the effect is explained as brought about by the mere disjunction of the atoms constituting it. There is in this view the difficulty of satisfactorily explaining the continuance, for however short a time it may be, of the effect after its material cause is gone. To avoid this difficulty as well as to secure uniformity of explanation, the later exponents hold the disjunction of the several parts of the material cause as throughout the cause, so that the disappearance of the material cause, where it

\footnote{1} See e.g. Śaṅkara on VS. II. ii. 11.  
\footnote{2} TSD. p. 10.
In connection with this theory we have to draw attention to the idea of God in the system. There are no references to it in the Sūtra of Kanāda, though commentators profess to find them there. Gautama makes only a casual mention of God, and some have doubted whether the Nyāya was originally theistic. But both Praśastapāda and Vātsyāyana recognize God\(^1\) and the belief later becomes a well-established part of the doctrine. Śrīdhara for instance tries to prove God's existence; and Udayana, as already noted, gives what has come to be regarded as a classical exposition of the problem and its solution. While this is the historical position, logically the teaching undoubtedly stands in need of an all-powerful Being that can initiate the process of world-production.\(^2\) It is possible that this, necessary implication of the doctrine as first conceived was developed and made explicit by Vātsyāyana and others. The God that is recognized is classed under ātman and described as paramātman to distinguish him from the jīvātman or the individual self. He, like the other ātmans, is omnipresent and eternal; but while consciousness and related attributes may or may not characterize the jīvātman always, they do so characterize God. His knowledge is not only eternal but also universal and perfect. He can desire and will, but unlike the jīva has no pain or pleasure\(^3\) and is devoid of evil desire or hate. He is regarded as responsible for the creation of the universe, by which expression we must understand here only suitable dispositions of the primary objects—atoms, etc., though according to the view of causation held in the school the dispositions themselves give rise to new things. God not only creates but also protects and in due course destroys the world, but only to create it again. The guiding factor in the whole process is the past karma of the beings that are to play their part on the stage of the world in the particular kalpa. It is difficult to say whether we have here the conception of a

\(^1\) NSB. IV. i. 21; PB. pp. 48-9. 
\(^2\) See Śaṅkara: VS. II. ii. 12. 
\(^3\) NSB. pp. 200-1. Some of the later exponents, with their Vedāntic bias, ascribe eternal bliss to God. See Dinakariya on SM. p. 467.
personal God; but the voluntary agency ascribed to him would indicate that the notion of personality is not altogether excluded. No doubt, God here cannot be described as conceived in man's image, yet he is styled ātman which does suggest some kinship of nature with man. One special point about God as understood here is that his existence is established through inference and not through revelation as in the Vedānta. The doctrine thus gives prominence to reason here as elsewhere in accordance with its generally rationalistic spirit. If we exclude those that are based upon the special postulates of the system, the arguments are of a commonplace character and their consideration need not detain us long. We shall merely note the chief of them as set forth by Udayana. They are: (1) the world is an effect and like all other effects points, among other causes, to an efficient cause or agent who is by knowledge as well as power equal to the task of creating it; (2) there is observed in the created world physical order which indicates a controller or law-giver; and (3) the moral government of the world implies a governor who dispenses justice in accordance with desert. We may also refer to one other argument which is somewhat out of the way. In trying to establish the existence of God, Udayana takes full advantage of the lack of any proof to the contrary. He devotes one whole chapter out of the five in the Kusumāṇjali to the examination of this point and shows how none of the pramāṇas can be adduced to make out that God does not exist. This is no doubt a point of only dialectical value; but it cannot be denied that it has some force, especially against those that make much of the opposite fact that the existence of God can never be proved.

It is necessary to say a few words now about the notion of 'cause' in the system. The cause should be antecedent to the effect, i.e. should exist in the just previous instant. It should also be an invariable antecedent (niyata-pūrva-vṛtti). This description, however, is too wide, for it includes in any particular case several factors which cannot be regarded as causes. Thus when a jar is being made, there is

\[\text{See for instances, Prof. Keith: op. cit., p. 268.}\]
the sound produced by the play of the staff on the clay; but, though an invariable antecedent, it can by no stretch of imagination be taken as the cause of the jar. Hence exclusions are made, which are technically termed anyathā-siddhas, to render the definition of cause accurate. Whatever answers to the description of 'invariable antecedent' after such exclusions are made is a cause of the effect in question. The exclusions are stated to be of five kinds, but the distinction between them is vague and indefinite and they can all be brought under one head and described as 'conditional factors' as J. S. Mill does. One or two instances will suffice to indicate the general nature of the five-fold scheme of anyathā-siddhas: (1) the attributes of a cause are not causes, e.g. the colour of the staff in respect of the jar is not a cause, while the staff itself is; (2) the cause of a cause also is not to be regarded as a cause. To give the standing example, the father of the potter is not a cause, though the potter is. It is clear that these are 'conditional,' since their invariable antecedence is dependent upon that of others, viz. the staff and the potter respectively. All positive effects are regarded in the other systems as having two sets of causes—one the material cause (upādāna-kāraṇa) and the other the efficient cause (nimitta-kāraṇa). But here, while the efficient cause is retained in the same form, the place of the material cause is taken by two, known as the samavāyi and the asamavāyi kāraṇas, in consonance with the view that a substance is different from its attributes. The samavāyi-kāraṇa is invariably a dravya; and the asamavāyi-kāraṇa, a guṇa or karma. Accordingly the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika speaks of three causes instead of only two for a positive effect. In the case of cloth, say, the threads—a dravya—are the samavāyi-kāraṇa, and the samyoga or conjunction between them—a guṇa—the asamavāyi-kāraṇa. In the case of the whiteness of the cloth, the cloth itself is the first kind of cause and the whiteness of the threads the second, it being believed that the whiteness is produced in it one instant after the cloth has come into being. For a negative effect neither of these is required, but only the efficient cause, as for example a stick in breaking a jar.
We may now call attention to an important difference in the general standpoint of the two systems considered separately. The Vaiśeṣika views the world from the ontological standpoint while the Nyāya does so from the epistemological. This will be clear from the nature of the categories acknowledged in the two systems. We have described the seven padārthas of the Vaiśeṣika. The Nyāya recognizes sixteen padārthas; and all the seven of the Vaiśeṣika are included in but one of them—prameya or ‘the knowable,’ the second of the sixteen. The first category is pramāṇa. These two terms—pramāṇa and prameya—are sufficient to make clear the specific viewpoint of the Nyāya. It does not concern itself with things as such, but rather with how they are known or demonstrated. This should not be taken to mean that the Nyāya felt any doubt as regards the independent existence of objects. It admitted their independent reality as readily as the sister system, but it felt that knowledge might easily mislead us, and therefore set about investigating the laws of correct thought. This standpoint becomes clearer still from the nature of the remaining fourteen categories,¹ which are all serviceable either in the discovery of truth or in safeguarding it against irrational attacks. The aim of the Nyāya thus is first to win the field of truth and then to secure it with the fence² of dialectics against the encroachment of error and sophistry. The Nyāya is not accordingly mere logic, but also a theory underlying the art of controversy. The logical part seems at first to have been even overlaid with dialectical devices, but having been relieved of much of this encumbrance it became fully prominent in course of time. Works like the Nyāya-sūtra of Bhāsarvajña, exhibit this change by adopting a new classification of their subject-matter and treating of it under the four heads of perception, inference, verbal testimony

¹ These are sarvāṣaya (doubt), prayojana (aim), drṣṭānta (example), siddhānta (conclusion), avayava (members of the syllogism), tarka (hypothesis), nirñaya (settlement), vāda (discussion), jalpa (wrangling), vitanḍā (cavilling), hetvābhāsa (fallacy), chala (fraud), jāti (wrong objection), and nigraha-sthāna (occasion for reproof).

² NS. IV. ii. 50. It is interesting to note that the same figure was used by the Stoics also.
and upamāṇa—all coming under pramāṇa, the first of Gautama’s categories. The transformation is complete in Gaṅgeśa’s Tattva-cintāmanī where the Nyāya becomes pre-eminently a pramāṇa-śāstra, casting off for the most part its features as a vāda-vidyā. The epistemological standpoint adopted from the beginning in the Nyāya thus comes to be emphasized and the dialectical character of Gautama’s scheme, so far as it remains, is subordinated to it.

II

We have seen that in India psychology never succeeded in getting itself separated from philosophy. Accordingly each system has its own psychology which is coloured by its metaphysics. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika believes in a permanent self and makes consciousness, which it describes as the basis of all life’s activity,¹ one of its possible attributes. In addition to this, five other specific attributes which the self may have, have a bearing upon psychology. They are, ‘love’ (rāga), ‘aversion’ (dveṣa), ‘pleasure’ (sukha), ‘pain’ (duḥkha) and ‘volition’ (yatna). Of these six attributes, jñāna and yatna correspond to cognition and conation; and the remaining four may be viewed as roughly representing what would now be described as the affective side of the mind. Love and hatred are the result of pleasure and pain respectively. We like things that have given us pleasure and dislike those we associate with pain. But while in modern psychology these three phases are not regarded as in reality separate and the mind is looked upon as a unity, in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika the distinction between them is taken to be fundamental. The three attributes of cognition, feeling and volition are in any specific case supposed to manifest themselves in the self in a particular order: first, knowledge; then, desire; and last, volition.² We have to know a thing before we can feel the want of it; and it is to satisfy that want that we will to act. Feeling thus mediates between cognition and conation. There is not much that is psychologically important which we find stated in the system about feeling and volition. It

¹ TS. p. 21.
² Jānāti icchatī yatate.
contents itself with viewing them from the ethical standpoint, and we shall refer later to its view of them in that respect. The psychology of cognition, on the other hand, is very fully treated. Before describing it, it is necessary to call attention to the distinction between presentative cognition (anubhava) and representative cognition (smṛti). The former generally leaves behind a trace or impression called bhāvanā or saṃskāra which abides in the self and, when revived, leads to recollection of what was previously cognized. That is smṛti or memory. Such bhāvanā is a seventh specific quality of the self.

Presentative cognition may be broadly divided into two, viz. mediate and immediate, the manas being a necessary aid to both. The latter is termed pratyakṣa which may roughly be taken as equivalent to sensation and perception; and the former, such as inferential knowledge, is known as parokṣa which is based upon pratyakṣa and needs no further reference in this section. On the primary character of pratyakṣa is based its definition as knowledge which does not presuppose other knowledge. When we infer that there is fire on the hill, we should previously have observed smoke there, not to mention our acquaintance with the inductive relation between smoke and fire. But to cognize blueness, say, no such preliminary knowledge is necessary. That is, our first ideas are furnished by the senses. There is another definition which is more useful in understanding the psychology of perception. It states that it is knowledge which arises by contact of a sense-organ (indriya) with an object. Such contact is not the sole condition of perception, but it is its distinctive feature. The actual process is usually described as follows: The self comes into contact with the manas; the manas with the senses; and the senses with the object, when, if certain external conditions like the presence of sufficient light are satisfied, perception takes place. It is obvious that the description applies only to cases involving voluntary attention; and the process is reversed when, for instance, a man waking from sleep perceives the things about him casually.

1 The word indriya here denotes not only the five organs of

1 NSB. I. i. 4.  
2 NS. II. i. 26.
sense as elsewhere in Indian philosophy, but also the manas. The last is the means of experiencing pain, pleasure, hunger, etc. Thus the manas is not only an aid in the acquisition of knowledge through the other senses; it is also a direct means of securing for the self the knowledge of certain internal states. The senses, excepting the manas which is both simple and ultimate, are explained here as derived from single elements (bhautika)—the sense of sight, from fire-atoms; the sense of taste, from water-atoms; the sense of touch, from air-atoms; and the sense of smell, from earth-atoms. The sense of hearing is ākāśa itself, but as delimited by the corresponding physical organ, the ear (karna-śaṅkulī).

The principle underlying the explanation is that like only can affect like—since without kinship between a sense and its object its distinctive capacity cannot be satisfactorily accounted for. The organ of sight alone for example apprehends colour, for it alone is made of tejas-atoms whose characteristic quality is colour. This, by the way, is how the doctrine maintains the objective character of the secondary qualities—a point to which we have already alluded.

What are the kinds of objects that can be known through pratyakṣa? That some qualities and actions out of the seven categories are apprehended directly needs no special mention. But does pratyakṣa apprehend any of the objects falling under the remaining categories? Here the system holds certain peculiar views which we must now consider:

(i) Realists commonly believe that the existence of substances is inferred or indirectly known after their attributes are perceived. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika considers that substances also are directly cognized. But not all the senses are capable of doing this. In regard to external substances, it is only the organs of sight and touch that can do so; and in regard to the internal, viz. the self, it is the manas. In other words, while all the indriyas can sense, some can perceive also. This position is not merely assumed; attempts are made to substantiate it by a reference to experiences like the following: ‘I am now touching what I saw.’ Here what the two senses are able to apprehend are clearly different, but yet an identity is experienced which is explained
as referring to the underlying substance perceived alike in the two moments. (2) We have seen in the previous section that the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika views universals as distinct ontological entities. The means of apprehending them is identical with the means of apprehending the corresponding particulars so that when the latter are perceivable the former also are so. That is, some universals are directly apprehended. We perceive that a rose is red through the eye; and the same organ of sense is also able to show the universal red-ness (raktatva) characterizing the red colour. Again let us suppose that with the aid of touch we cognize that a certain animal is a cow; the same sense of touch gives us the idea of the universal cow-ness (gotva) also. (3) We are able to know directly not only dravyas and sāmānyas in addition to some guṇas and karmas, but also abhāva or negation provided it is of perceivable objects, the aid to it being the same sense-organ as is necessary for apprehending those objects. A jar is visible to the eye and its absence also is perceivable by the same sense-organ. But atoms for example being supersensuous, their absence cannot be perceived but has to be inferred or known otherwise. The reason adduced in support of this view is that the apprehension of the absence of such objects is invariably preceded by the functioning of the respective organs of sense. Nobody for instance can say that there is no chair in a room without using his eye or some other appropriate sense-organ. We shall recur to this point when dealing with the Mīmāṃsā system which postulates a distinct pramāṇa for the knowledge of negation.

All these kinds of pratyakṣa are described as laukika or ordinary. The system recognizes a different variety of it also which it designates alaukika-pratyakṣa or transcendental perception. This is of three kinds: (1) We have stated that when a cow, say, is seen cow-ness also is seen in exactly the same manner. The range of pratyakṣa extends farther still, and with the aid of this knowledge of the universal cow-ness we are able to apprehend directly, it is

1 NSB. I. i. 30.
2 Yenendriyena yā vyaktih grhyate tenaivendriyena tajjatīḥ tadabhāvopi grhyate.
said, but in a transcendental manner all the particular cows that exist now or ever existed or are going to exist, though only as belonging to that class. This knowledge of all the particulars falling under a universal when that universal itself becomes the object of perception is regarded as a case of alaukika-pratyakṣa. (2) Again when we see a rose at a distance we apprehend its redness, form, etc., directly; and we may also become conscious then of its fragrance by virtue of the impression left on our mind by a past experience of that quality in the rose. But the flower being by supposition too far from us we cannot ascribe it to ordinary perception. This is regarded as another case of alaukika-pratyakṣa. The psychological truth involved here is the familiar one that all percepts are partly presentative and partly representative. (3) The last variety is termed yogic perception. It brings man face to face with supersensuous objects like atoms, dharma, etc.; and its acquisition means the development of mystical power through a long course of discipline which is as much moral as mental. It is described as perception, though the senses do not co-operate in it, on account of the complete vividness of view which it is supposed to yield.

We have yet to draw attention to the distinction between savikalpaka and nirvikalpaka pratyakṣa. All perceptual knowledge, according to the doctrine, is expressible in the form of a judgment. Even what appears as an isolated percept really stands for a judgment—something predicated of something else. ‘A horse’ for example is equivalent to ‘an object possessing the characteristic of horse-ness.’ In other words, perception as familiarly known to us is complex in its character, and it is therefore described as determinate (savikalpaka). Now, according to the atomistic standpoint of the system, all complex things are explained as the result of a putting together of the simples constituting them. The complex of savikalpaka also is brought under this rule, and it is assumed that it presupposes necessarily simple or nirvikalpaka pratyakṣa, which presents the isolated object altogether uncharacterized.¹ Thus if at any time we cognize

¹ SM. p. 255.
that a cow is white, we must, it is assumed, necessarily have perceived previously a cow by itself, the whiteness by itself, and the relation of samavāya between them also by itself. So the savikalpaka becomes a process of compounding units separately given and not one of ‘discrimination within a mass.’ The fact of this preliminary cognition, however, it is admitted, is not a matter of which we become directly aware; it is only the result of logical deduction from a fundamental postulate of the system. The savikalpaka, on the other hand, is a matter of observation and is given in introspection. We become aware of it not as it arises, but later in a second knowledge termed anuvyavasāya (‘after knowledge’). We first know the object; and then, if we choose, we may become conscious of this fact, i.e. of the self as characterized by the jñāna in question. That is inner perception or self-consciousness.

III

One of the distinguishing features of the doctrine is the belief that whatever is, is knowable. It not only asserts a reality outside knowledge, but also admits that it can be known. In fact, to say that anything is unknowable is equivalent in the system to denying it. According to this view, even knowledge can be known so that jñāna is not only about objects but also about itself. But it is primarily directed to the object which is therefore known before either the subject or knowledge is. The two latter are revealed together and later in self-consciousness or reflection upon experience (anuvyavasāya). Though thus the reality of the external world stands on its own footing, knowledge is necessarily the means of reaching to it: and that is how the problems of logic come to be considered in the system.

1 The nirvikalpaka is not here restricted to the sva-lakṣaṇa as it is according to Buddhism. See p. 204 ante.

2 In current expositions of the doctrine the preliminary knowledge, it is stated, need only refer to the viśeṣaṇa or attributive element: Viśiṣṭa-jñānam viśeṣaṇa-jñāna-janyam (TSD. p. 30. Cf. SM. p. 253). But a knowledge of the other constituents also seems once to have been thought necessary. See NM. pp. 93 and 95.
The Nyāya differs from the Vaiśeṣika in admitting two pramanās—verbal testimony (śabda) and comparison (upamāna)—in addition to perception and inference which alone the Vaiśeṣika, like Buddhism, allows. We shall now consider these pramanās in order:

(i) Perception (pratyakṣa).—The psychological aspect of this variety of knowledge has been treated of already and we have here only to look at it from the logical side. The main point to realize about it is that the scope of the postulate that knowledge invariably points to a real object beyond itself is restricted to the nirvikalpaka. Its data can never be false, for we are then in direct contact with reality and get an immediate knowledge of it. An erroneous nirvikalpaka is a contradiction in terms. Error may, however, creep in when we relate two or more objects thus given in it, for though all the things we are thinking of may be severally there, the content of our knowledge as a complex may be false. In other words, it is the judgment with its synthetic character or the savikalpaka that is the subject of logic. If the complex content of our knowledge has a complex corresponding to it in the objective world, we have truth; otherwise error. Thus when one sees the conch to be yellow (pīta-śaṅkha) owing to one’s jaundiced eye, the conch, the yellow colour, and the relation of samavāya are all facts of the objective world and are given at the nirvikalpaka level; but while the yellowness is not related to the conch by samavāya there, it appears so in knowledge. It is therefore an error. In the case of a red rose when it is cognized as such, the two schemes—the mental and the actual—agree; and we have therefore truth. While the three elements involved in judgment do not constitute in error a single complex whole in the objective world, they are thus perceived by us. In truth, on the other hand, they are not only thus perceived but are actually so. This explanation of error will have to be altered in a matter of detail when we take other examples.

In the case of the yellow conch or the white crystal appearing red when placed in the vicinity of a red flower, the several elements constituting them are presented to the mind in the ordinary or laukika sense; but there are cases of error
in which it is not so, as in the stock example of shell-silver (śukti-rajata). Here also the doctrine maintains that not only the subject but also the predicative element is 'presented,' but the presentation is of the alaukika kind—the second variety of it, where the impression of a former experience serves as the means of re-presenting a thing to our mind. The silver is not here, but elsewhere. It is āpāna-stha ('in the shop'), as it is stated. Thus in such cases also, error is due to a wrong synthesis of presented objects only. The argument may appear specious, but all that is meant is that even the content of error has a complete objective basis, and what does not exist at all (asat) can never be known. What serves as the subject of an erroneous judgment ('this') is actually given; the predicate also is, though elsewhere and not here. This theory, which is directly opposed to the Mādhyaṁika view that the non-existent is perceived (asat-khyāti), is known as anyathā-khyāti, a term which indicates that the discrepancy found in error is in regard to the predicative element.¹

It may be asked how the correspondence with reality, which is said to constitute truth, can be known. There can obviously be no direct testing of correspondence, for we cannot get outside of our knowledge. Hence the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika proposes an objective or indirect test—through putting the knowledge in question to practice. If we doubt whether a thing we cognize as water is really water or not, we have to see whether it will quench our thirst. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. This is what is known as saṁvādi-pravṛtti or 'fruitful activity.' The verification is pragmatic; but the definition of truth, it should be remembered, is not so. Truth is not what 'works'; it is what conforms to reality. Knowledge is for its own sake, and it need not necessarily have a practical end in view.² Unlike the Buddhists (p. 209), the followers of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika lay stress on the cognitive significance of knowledge. The practical activity to which it leads is only a further result. It

² NM. p. 171.
implies a motive operating subsequent to cognition, viz. to attain what is liked or to avoid what is disliked. In its absence, knowledge may remain without a practical consequence, but its logical validity cannot on that account be questioned.

(2) Inference (Anumāna).—The conception of vyāpti here is much widened when compared with that in Buddhism. Thus we can reason not only from smoke to fire, but also from the cloven hoof to the horns—features which, so far as we know, are not necessarily related1 (p. 201). An attempt seems to have been made by the Buddhists2 to bring cases of the latter kind also under causation. It is quite possible that the association between the 'cloven hoof' and 'horns' is a necessary one, though how it is so is not known to us. Yet the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika on principle postulates invariable concomitance as the criterion of vyāpti, adducing as the reason therefor that even supposing that the features in question are causally related, a person that connects them inductively is not conscious of that relation when he does so. To the Cārvāka contention that neither the universals nor the particulars can be thus related (p. 189), the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika reply is that the relation is between the particulars but as belonging to a class. The justification for this view is found in the recognition of universals as a separate objective category and in the belief that through the apprehension of a universal all the corresponding particulars are in some sense apprehended (alaukika-pratyakṣa).

Gautama refers to a triple classification of inference. The terms denoting the three classes—pūrvavat, śeṣavat and sāmānyatodrṣṭa—are ambiguous and they have been so from the time of Vātsyāyana. The classification in itself is not very important; but we shall refer to one of the explanations given by Vātsyāyana, for it brings out very well a characteristic feature of inference as understood in the system. According to it, pūrvavat stands for reasoning based

1 Hence the more comprehensive terms of līṇa ('sign') and līṅgin ('the signified') are generally used here for the middle and major terms in preference to hetu and sādhyā, which are applicable strictly to cases based on causation.

2 PP. p. 67.
upon resemblance to what has been observed in the past (pūrva) as in the case of seeing smoke on a hill and concluding to fire therefrom on the strength of former experience. This is the common form of reasoning. Śeṣavat is reasoning, by the method of elimination. It is indirect proof such as is sometimes met with in Euclid’s *Elements*. The third variety of sāmānyatodṛśta is that in which, with the support of what is found in the sphere of sensuous objects, we reason about parallel cases in the sphere of the supersensuous. For example we know that an instrument like an axe needs a sentient agent to wield it before it can function. Assuming that manas is such an instrument (karaṇa), we may conclude that there should be behind it an agent—the self, to explain its activity though neither the self nor the manas is perceivable. This, it will be seen, is merely analogical reasoning, and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika arguments for the existence of God are of this type. It was such an extension of the scope of inference that was questioned, as we mentioned before (p. 188), by the Carvāka. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika here undoubtedly claims too much for inference, for it mistakes analogy for evidence. It in fact gives this variety of inference, as we shall presently see, a place in its scheme of pramāṇas resembling that of revelation in the Mīmāṁsā.

Inference is two-fold—that which resolves a doubt in one’s own mind (svārtha) and that which does so in another’s (parārtha). The latter is necessarily couched in language, but the verbal form in itself constitutes no part of the inference. It only helps to direct the mind of the listener to think in the required manner, and thereby gives rise to the same process of thought in his mind as the one in that of the speaker. So if the syllogistic form is described as anumāna, it is only by courtesy. That is, the verbal view of logic which is common in the West is rejected here. It was never forgotten in India that the subject-matter of logic is thought and not, in any sense, the linguistic forms in which it may find expression. This anti-verbalist character of Indian Logic is referred to as follows by the Italian philosopher Croce: ‘Indian Logic studies the naturalistic
syllogism in *itself* as internal thought, distinguishing it from the syllogism *for others*, that is to say, from the more or less usual, but always extrinsic and accidental forms of communication and dispute. It has not even a suspicion of the extravagant idea (which still vitiates our treatises) of a truth which is merely syllogistic and formalist, and which may be false in fact. It takes no account of the judgment, or rather it considers what is called judgment, and what is really the proposition, as a verbal clothing of knowledge; it does not make the verbal distinctions of subject, copula and predicate; it does not admit classes of categorical and hypothetical, of affirmative and of negative judgments. All these are extraneous to Logic, whose object is the constant: knowledge considered in itself.'

The following is a typical Indian syllogism:

1. Yonder mountain has fire.
2. For it has smoke.
3. Whatever has smoke has fire, e.g. an oven.
4. Yonder mountain has smoke such as is invariably accompanied by fire.
5. Therefore yonder mountain has fire.

The syllogism stands for what was described above as 'reasoning for another,' i.e. reasoning for convincing another. This explains for instance the statement of the conclusion at the outset known as the pratijñā or proposition. It is intended to draw attention to the point under consideration and keep the discussion within limits. In a purely logical syllogism—unmixed with rhetorical appurtenances—it is admitted that the first two or the last two of the five members (avayava) may be dropped. Dropping the first two and taking the last three, we shall contrast the Indian syllogism with the well-known Aristotelian one:

(i) The first is the major premise. It does not stand by itself but is supported by an example. This step in inference seems to have consisted originally of only the example. It is even now designated udāharana or 'illustration.' The general statement was introduced later. That is, according to early

---

1 See *Logic*, pp. 584–5.
Indian logicians, reasoning even when restricted to the sphere of the sensuous was taken to be from particulars to particulars. In its present form the statement implies that it was realized in course of time that reasoning proceeds from particulars to particulars through the universal. This innovation is now commonly ascribed to the Buddhist logician Diinnāga.¹

(ii) The Indian logician is not content to leave the universal proposition by itself. He illustrates it by an example. This is, no doubt, due to an historical circumstance, viz. a change in the view taken of the character of the inferential process. But by retaining the example in the major premise even in its changed form, he desires to point out that it is a generalization derived from observation of particular instances. In other words the reasoning process, as represented by the above syllogism, is not purely deductive but inductive-deductive.

(iii) In the next step we have a synthesis of the major and minor premises. In the Aristotelian syllogism, the two stand apart although there is the middle term to link them together. The Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika syllogism makes this connection quite explicit by bringing all the three terms together in the same proposition. The formulation of the conclusion then becomes very simple indeed. The doctrine lays special stress on this synthesis, but other doctrines like the Vedānta do not agree with it,² and refuse to accept the synthesis as necessary.

(3) Verbal Testimony (Śabda).—We have already drawn attention (p. 178) to the distinction between śabda as a pramāṇa and as a prameya and pointed out the value of the former as a means of communicating information to others or of enriching our own experience. We have also stated that some Indian logicians like the Buddhists (p. 209) hold that it cannot be a separate pramāṇa. They bring it under inference because the ascertainment of the meaning of a verbal statement, they say, in no way differs from the inferential process. When we hear uttered significant words

² VP. p. 191.
bearing certain syntactical relations to one another, we infer on the basis of our past experience that they must stand for a connected meaning. Or to express the same in another way, we take the words uttered as the characteristic mark (liṅga) of an idea in the mind of the speaker; and since we can always go back from the sign to that of which it is the sign, we conclude that there must be a corresponding idea in the mind of the speaker, the exact nature of that idea being determined by the sense of the words in question. This argument is commonly met by an appeal to our introspection which shows, it is contended, that the two processes of inference and interpretation are not identical.\textsuperscript{1}

The Nyāya, unlike the Vaiśeṣika, admits śabda as an independent pramāṇa and defines it as the testimony of a trustworthy person (āpta)—one that knows the truth and communicates it correctly.\textsuperscript{2} We find out that a person is trustworthy by the truth of his statements and by his unselfishness.\textsuperscript{3} That is, the doctrine makes the value of śabda as testimony depend upon the virtue of its source—the honesty and competence of the speaker. On this principle, it regards what is taught in the Veda as valid because its author, God, is all-knowing.\textsuperscript{4} It does not in this involve itself in a circle since it bases its belief in the existence of God not on revelation as the Vedānta does, but on reason. According to the Mīmāṁsā, on the other hand, the Veda, as we shall see, is self-existent and authority is inherent in it. But it must be added that in proving the existence of God, the Nyāya utilizes a form of inference—sāmānyatodṛṣṭa—whose validity can easily be questioned. If we do not reckon it as inference from which it materially differs, we have in the system an additional pramāṇa whose bearing is extra-empirical quite as much as that of revelation in the Mīmāṁsā. Thus there seems eventually to be little difference

\textsuperscript{1} TSD. p. 54; SM. st. 140-1.  
\textsuperscript{2} TS. p. 50.  
\textsuperscript{3} That the process so far is inferential is admitted even in the Nyāya. See NM. p. 155. What is contested is the view that the psychological process involved in passing from the sounds heard to an idea as existing in the mind of the speaker is also inferential.  
\textsuperscript{4} NS. II. i. 68.
from the logical standpoint between the two systems in regard to their attitude towards the Veda.\footnote{It is instructive to note in this connection that in all probability the belief neither in God nor in the Veda was originally a part of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika teaching.}

(4) \textit{Comparison (Upamāna).—}This is commonly rendered as ‘analogy’ in English, but the student should be careful not to confound it with reasoning by analogy. We shall best explain what the Nyāya means by it by taking an example. Suppose we are familiar with an object X and there is another object Y resembling it. Suppose also that while we do not know Y, we have been informed of its resemblance to X by one who knows both. Now if the object Y is casually presented to us, we notice the resemblance in question, and recollecting what we have been told we at once come to know that that is the object which bears the name Y. It is this connection between a name and the thing it signifies that forms the sole sphere of upamāna here; and it is so called because it arises through the previous knowledge of resemblance between two things. The immediate cause (karaṇa) of the knowledge that Y is the object bearing a certain name is the perception of Y after one has learnt that it resembles X. The scope of the pramāṇa is quite narrow. Yet in practice it is very useful, as for instance in teaching where explanations accompanied by apt illustrations help us in extending our acquaintance with language.

In treating of perception, we referred to the nature of truth as understood in the system. It is such knowledge as represents reality faithfully.\footnote{Tadvati tat-prakārakam jñānam pramā: TS. p. 23; Kārikāvalī. st. 135.} There are two other points of an allied character, usually considered in Indian philosophy, to which we have hitherto alluded only incidentally (p. 210). As it is judgments that are true, we may view truth to be a property of the savikalpaka form of knowledge; but it does not appear to be essential to it. Hence a question arises as to how knowledge \textit{comes to be true}. We know the manner in which knowledge arises according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, though it is hard to understand how when the aids to its
genesis—the self, manas, senses and object—are wholly inert (jaḍa), it can be knowledge at all.¹ The point to determine now is what conditions determine the added feature of truth when it is found in it (utpattau prāmāṇya). This is the first of the points to be considered now. Some maintain that knowledge does not become true as we have assumed, but is by its very nature so; and that where it is otherwise, its erroneous character is the result of some extraneous interference. Knowledge as such is valid, but it may deflect from its nature owing to some disturbing factor. That is, it is not truth that needs explanation, but only error—a view which stands opposed to the Buddhistic one according to which all knowledge is suspect until it is proved to be true. To this theory of the self-validity or svataḥ-prāmāṇya, as it is termed, of knowledge we shall recur later in speaking about the Mīmāṃsā and shall confine our attention at present to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view. According to it, neither truth nor falsity is a normal feature of knowledge. Whether any particular knowledge is the one or the other depends entirely upon circumstances other than those that account for the rise of knowledge itself. To state the view in general terms: If a, b and c are the causes of knowledge, its truth or falsity is caused by another circumstance, say m or n. This additional circumstance, however, does not stand for anything altogether distinct from the causes of knowledge, but means only their excellence or deficiency respectively.² And since the doctrine holds that the causes must necessarily have either of these features, all knowledge as it arises will be either true or false and there can never be what may be called neutral knowledge.³ A similar discussion is carried on in reference to the criterion of truth—that by which we discover what knowledge is true (jñaptau prāmāṇya). This is the second of the two points mentioned above. The question here is not how knowledge comes to be true or false, but how we become aware of its truth or falsity. Here also

¹ The position is scarcely distinguishable from that of the Cārvāka.
² TSD. pp. 55–6; Kārikāvali, st. 131.
³ Cf. NM, p. 171: Nirdoṣam nirguṇam vāpi na samastyeva kāraṇam. See also Id., p. 161.
two answers are given by Indian logicians, but we shall refer only to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika one at present. According to it, the validity or invalidity of knowledge is not revealed in anuvyavasāya, which apprehends it. That gives us only knowledge. To know whether the knowledge so given is true or not, we require an additional means, viz. fruitful activity (saṃvādi-pravṛtti), as pointed out already. That is, when we know knowledge, we do not know its logical worth. It is known only subsequently—as the result of an appeal to facts, which is what fruitful activity means. And there may be knowledge known of which the truth or falsity is not yet seen. That is ‘doubt.’ The view that the validity of knowledge depends, in respect of its origin (utpattau) or of its ascertainment (jñāpaptau), upon the fulfilment of an extra condition is known as parataḥ-prāmāṇya-vāda or ‘the theory of validity from outside.’

IV

Before describing the practical teaching of the doctrine, it is necessary to refer to the notions of dharma and adharma which in one form or another all systems alike associate with the self, indicating thereby that man’s life has not only a mental but also a moral or spiritual side to it. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika speaks of dharma and adharma as two specific qualities (viśeṣa-guṇa) that belong to the self in addition to the seven already mentioned. They thus directly characterize it. But then the words do not stand for right and wrong deeds; they signify rather the merit (puṇya) and demerit (pāpa) resulting respectively from the performance of the one and indulgence in the other.¹ The Mīmāṃsā and the Vedānta systems accept an external standard for distinguishing a right deed from a wrong one, viz. the revealed authority of the Veda; here in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, the law that constrains us in the field of conduct, is in the last resort internal. It believes that dharma as well as adharma is directly perceived. It is not, however, every one that can discern the difference between them, but only he that has purified

¹ TS. pp. 58–9.
his nature by continuous self-discipline and has succeeded in developing yogic power. Hence their perception is stated to be of the alaukika kind—the third of the varieties mentioned above. When we say that morality as conceived here is obedience to an inner law, we mean the intuitive judgments of such ‘seers’ who alone can speak with the voice of the true self. To the average man, who is still under the sway of particular desires and passions, the standard remains external inasmuch as his knowledge of dharma, to confine ourselves to only one of the two notions we are considering, is acquired through another and is second-hand. Strangely enough the doctrine in its present form accepts the authority of the Veda also in this respect as shown by its adoption of the whole of the karma discipline as taught in it, and the need for two pramāṇas is justified on the supposition that dharma can be intuited only after it is known from the Veda. But if we remember that when once dharma is known, the most important thing to do is to strive not for acquiring an immediate or direct knowledge of it, but for realizing it in action, it becomes clear that one of the two pramāṇas is superfluous. And it is the Veda that is so, if we may judge from the general tenor of the doctrine and the repudiation of verbal testimony as an independent pramāṇa in the Vaiśeṣika part of it.

So far as the preliminary discipline is concerned, we can trace the influence of the Gītā teaching as early as Praśastapāda, but the training really appropriate to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and originally recommended in it is akin to what we have noted in connection with the heretical schools in an earlier chapter (p. 113). Its object, however, is the same as that of karma-yoga, viz. sattva-śuddhi or ‘cleansing of the heart,’ as is clear from Gautama’s reference to it as ātma-sāṁskāra or ‘self-purification,’ and is to be achieved by eliminating narrow love (rāga) and hate (dveṣa). Only the course of conduct laid down here is not disinterested activity in the Gītā sense but the practice of yama and niyama. There is some uncertainty regarding the original connotation

1 PB. pp. 7 and 272-3.
* NM. p. 108.
4 NS. IV. ii. 46.
of these terms as understood in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. But in the later works treating of the doctrine, they come to be identified with the same as defined in the Sāṅkhya-Yoga.1 We shall, therefore, defer the explanation of these terms to the next chapter, merely remarking now that they respectively represent the negative and positive sides of ethical training. Love and hate are found to a greater or less extent in all men; and together with their causes—pleasure and pain—they are reckoned as specific qualities of the self in its empirical condition. All voluntary activity is traced to these sources so that the view which the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika takes of conduct may be described as hedonistic. Only we must not forget that it regards the desire to avoid pain to be as strong a motive in prompting the will as the desire to obtain pleasure.2 The selfish activity (pravṛtti) to which narrow love and hate give rise leads in its turn to pain and pleasure, and they again to likes and dislikes. Thus life, as it is commonly led, moves in a vicious circle in which no point can be regarded as the beginning. By restraining man from indulging in certain activities and by encouraging him to cultivate certain positive virtues, the training implied in yama and niyama helps him to break away from this circle and pursue undistracted the path by which he may reach the ultimate goal of life.

The nature of the goal is determined by the pessimistic attitude of the doctrine towards life as a whole. The doctrine does not deny the reality of pleasure as a positive experience;3 but pain is equally real, and the two, in its view, are so inextricably connected with each other that avoiding pain necessitates avoiding pleasure as well. Further, it believes that pleasure in life is so uncertain and pain so much predominates over it that it is not worth one's while to strive to secure it. All pleasure again being transient—lasting only for two instants, like jñāna—continuous pleasure means perpetual effort. Hence the ideal of life is represented as apavarga or 'escape.' It is negative and consists not in the

1 See NSB. IV. ii. 46; Vācaspati: Tātparya-ṭikā, IV. ii. 46; Nyāya-kandali, p. 278.
2 Kārikāvalī, st. 146 ff.
3 NS. I. i. 9; IV. i. 56.
attainment of happiness, but in the removal of pain. The removal, being a dhvamsa or ‘posterior negation,’ will endure ever afterwards and no lapse from that condition will take place. Such an ideal is quite operative, for, according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, conative activity is prompted as much by a desire to shun pain as by a desire to obtain happiness, and the prospect of rising above all pain once for all is strong enough to impel a person convinced of the misery of empirical existence to do his utmost for reaching that end. But the aim of life should not only be desirable; it should also be possible of attainment and the doctrine holds, as we know, that evil though real can be avoided. For pain like pleasure is only an adventitious feature of the self and its removal means no loss to its intrinsic character. For instance in deep sleep, the self remains without either, which may be taken to indicate the possibility of mokṣa being a similar but permanent condition. It is not only pain and pleasure that are adventitious, but also knowledge, desire, volition, etc., so that the state of mokṣa is one in which the self is able to cast off all its nine specific qualities. Accordingly, the self then not merely transcends empirical life, but also ceases to be the subject of experience in all its forms.

It is interesting to compare this ideal with that of Buddhism. Buddha taught that avoiding pleasure and pain or eliminating selfishness is not possible until we cease to believe in the self as a persisting entity. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika differs in admitting an enduring self; but it insists that the ideal of life is not reached until we feel convinced that the self in reality is beyond all experience. Thus the source of evil in this system lies not in our belief that there is a permanent self, but in the belief that it must needs have pain or pleasure while in its intrinsic nature it is devoid of both. Such a wrong view of the self gives rise to love and hate; and the rest of life’s selfish activities follow from them. This theory which is implicit in the Vaiśeṣika analysis of the springs of action into desire for pleasure (rāga) and aversion from pain (dveṣa), the Nyāya makes explicit by resolving them into something more ultimate, viz. NS. I. i. 20-1; NM. p. 501. NS. IV. i. 63.
delusion (moha). Our aim should be to free ourselves from the tyranny of this wrong conviction by realizing the true nature of the self. This initial folly of moha or mithyā-jñāna is not a mere lack of right knowledge but positive error or wrong knowledge. It may be represented as two-fold: (i) mistaking things that are not really of the self as belonging to it, viz. manas, body and so forth; and (ii) mistaking the non-essential or accidental features of the self such as knowledge, pain and pleasure arising through association with its empirical vesture, for its essential features. Neither separation from the former nor the elimination of the latter can affect the integrity of the self; but man commonly loses sight of this fact and feels that with their deficiency is bound up that of himself. In one word, there is nothing which the self can or has to obtain for itself; and it is the knowledge of this truth that is the immediate means of release. But if it is successfully to dispel the delusion, it should be ripened into direct intuition through constant meditation. Mere reasoned conviction is of no avail. Thus the acquisition of right knowledge and the practice of yoga constitute the chief features of the discipline directly leading to release. The way of securing the saving knowledge is as follows: (1) Formal study of philosophy which is to be carried on under a competent teacher who can properly instruct us; and (2) reflection upon what has been thus learnt with a view to get conviction for oneself about it. These two stages secure mediate knowledge or 'knowledge by description' as we might say. Then follows (3) meditation upon the true nature of the self. It leads to direct experience of the truth which will banish ignorance at once. A person who has such experience, it is supposed, will reach the final goal of life (apavarga) as soon as he is dissociated from the physical body at death.

In thus conceiving of the goal of life, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika

1 NS. IV. i. 3-8; NM. pp. 500-1.
2 Na tattva-jñānasya anutpatti-mātram: NSB. IV. ii. i.
3 NS. I. i. i.
4 NSB. IV. ii. 38 and 47-9. These correspond to śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana of the Upaniṣads and are so termed in the Nyāya-kāndali, p. 282.
is tacitly denying that there is any difference between soul and matter. The self that has reached it is divested of all experience and it is not even conscious of itself then. Such an ideal is surely repugnant to the common mind, whatever justification it may or may not have in theory. It may successfully avoid evil, but it is a success which is worse than defeat. The straightforward attempt of the Buddhist to secure annihilation is far better than this formal admission of a self in unconscious mokṣa. But it is mokṣa only in the eschatological sense. The complete elimination from the self of all its specific qualities in the case of an enlightened person is supposed to take place only after death. So far as the present life is concerned, such elimination is not only not aimed at but is impossible. If we then, according to our plan (p. 184), try to determine the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika ideal of life from the positivistic side, much of what is undesirable disappears from it. Jivan-mukti, no doubt, is not formally recognized here as in some other systems; but a stage corresponding to it, when a person has succeeded in obtaining enlightenment though he has not yet become 'free' in the technical sense, is admitted (p. 19) both by Vātsyāyana and Uddyotakara. Such a person will not be divorced from his physical or mental adjuncts; but narrow love and hate will have disappeared from him together with the selfish activity that proceeds from them. Nor will his life be one of passivity, if we may judge from Gautama's statement1 that activity taints only when it is prompted by selfishness. The best support for putting this forward as the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika ideal of life is to be found in its conception of God, 'the highest soul' (paramātmā) as he is termed, who is not bereft of knowledge or desire or will, but only has no pain or pleasure, no likes or dislikes and therefore, though ever active, never engages himself in any selfish activity. From this view-point, then, man's effort here should be directed towards acquiring enlightenment, refining desire and will by purging them of all selfishness, learning to endure pain and wholly abolish hate—an ideal which, whatever it may lead to ultimately, is not without an excellence of its own.

1 NS. IV. i. 64.