

Universal Laws of Interpretation (3)

A REformed edition of
Colonel G. A. Jacob's

Laukikanyāyāñjali



Sadyuktisādhitā sūktir dhatte nyāyapadam param.

Presented by:
Dr. Murarilal Nagar
&
Kumari Kamalee
(Katherine Marie Lee)

©1998
Veda Vedanta Mandiram
Columbia Missouri

Universal Laws of Interpretation
Series

General Editor : Sarla Devi Nagar

1. **Laukikanyāyaratnākara** by Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna.
2. **Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha** by Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna.
3. **Laukikanyāyāñjali: A Handful of Popular Maxims**
Current in Sanskrit Literature.
Comp. by Colonel G. A. Jacob.

Veda Vedanta Mandiram
The Home of the Ratnākara
Columbia, MO.
1998

Laukikanyāyāñjali. English & Sanskrit

Laukikanyāyāñjaliḥ = A handful of popular maxims
current in Sanskrit literature. Compiled by G. A. Jacob;
presented by Murarilal Nagar & Kumari Kamalee. Columbia,
MO, Veda Vedanta Mandiram, 1998.

xxxviii, 296 p.; 27.5 cm.-- (Universal laws of interpretation : 3)

Includes critical, exhaustive, editorial notes.

Sanskrit text appears in Romanized form.

ISBN 0-943913-28-4

1. Maxims, Sanskrit. I. Jacob, George Adolphus. II. Nagar,
Murarilal, 1917- . III. Series.

PN6307.S2L313 1998

891'.2802--dc21

97-51342

CIP

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	v-xxvii
2. Jacob's Bibliography	xxix-xxxviii
3. Laukikanyāyāñjali	1-300

INTRODUCTION

Some editorial comments
on the *Laukikanyāyāñjali*
comp. by Colonel G. A. Jacob
reprinted by Nirajana, 1983.

This is a REformed edition. Our readers are familiar with expressions like revised edition, critical edition, deluxe edition, ninth edition, etc., but we are not sure if they have ever seen a REformed edition. Yet this is a REformed edition. Now the word *reformed* has many denotations and connotations. Our epithet "reformed" as used here is pregnant with all its meanings, expressed as well as implied. It may also be called a *prāyaścitta prakāśana*.

Laukikanyāyāñjali, a compilation by Colonel G. A. Jacob, (our original) is a collective contribution of many scholars with whom the Colonel had been in touch personally or by correspondence. Jacob had an inquisitive mind and gathered his information from every possible source for the collection, assemblage, and interpretation of the nyāyas incorporated by him in his *Añjali*. If and when an exhaustive and systematic index is prepared of the sources used by him (we had plans to do it), we will know the nature, volume, value, and variety of the sources used. Some idea can be obtained by going through the two lists of books he had prepared and which are now consolidated and featured in one alphabetical sequence. There are one hundred and twenty four entries now in our list. And it is by no means exhaustive.

The most extensive and valuable source that Jacob used is the twin work of Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* and the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*. The colonel does not acknowledge his indebtedness to his major source, the fountain-head of his knowledge. He does not have even one word of appreciation for the great contribution Udāsīna Raghunātha Varmā has made to the field. This is very unfortunate.

Laukikanyāyāñjali originally consisted of three parts (called Handfuls), published over a period of almost quarter of a century. They were revised and reprinted several times in many editions. Its English title is--*A handful of popular maxims*. It was certainly a "popular" publication, still unique in many respects. Here is a brief chronology of its publishing:

First edition of the First Handful published in	1900.
Second	1902.
Third	1904
Second edition of the First Handful	1907.
Second	1909.
Third ?	1911.

A reprint of the three books of the *Añjali* (edition of 1911) was issued by an enterprising reprinter of Delhi in 1983. Dr. M. D. Balasubrahmanyam, Principal, Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati, is credited to have contributed a "Foreword" to the reprint. We say "credited" because there remains more unknown than what is known as explained below.

This reprinter seems to have been interested only in making money--a lot of money -- maximum profit with the minimum investment. He belongs to a group of modern-day reprinters in India who have mastered the art of manipulating mighty minting, i.e. printing machines for their own selfish gain disregarding the convenience to their readers.

The "Foreword" reflects the true nature of this reprinting enterprise. It is very short and disjointed. It has no coherence. It is thoughtless and disorganized. It is just the opposite of Nāmūlam likhyate kiñcin nānapekṣitam ucyaṭe. It could not have come from the pen of a "Principal of a Sanskrit Vidyapeetha."

This reputed scholar, who enriched this money-making enterprise by his masterpiece of a piecemeal "Foreword" does mention the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* of Raghunātha Varmā, but in a different context, which is irrelevant. There is no mention of the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*, an ocean of the nyāyas. There is no mention of the *Bhuvaneśalaukikanyāyasāhasrī*. There is no mention either of the *Mīmāṃsākośa* of Kevalānanda Sarasvatī. We don't think the great foreword-writer would have even heard the name of Kishori Lal Sarkar and his monumental magnum opus, *Mīmāṃsā Rules of Interpretation as Applied to Hindu Law*, which, by the way, contains a whole chapter on the Laukikanyāyas. Incidentally, we might add here that Sarkar brings out in a clear manner how much Jacob owes to Raghunātha Varmā.

While these oceans and great lakes find no place in the masterpiece of the above Foreword, mention is made of a tiny, little, muddy, shallow pond in the form of a compilation made by one Chabinatha Mishra. He is glorified on the title page of his book as the Head of the Department of Sanskrit of a University. Most of what is presented in this little book -let is a straight copying from the *Bhuvaneśalaukikanyāyasāhasrī*, itself a product of ugly plagiarism.

The "Foreword" says Jacob omitted a particular list of the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*. The writer does not know what he is talking about -- Sakhi me caturo bhartā svayam api likhitam svayam na vācayati. The conclusion was irresistible that the Principal just sold his name for a few chips. He gave only his name and title to the title-page; he gave neither his time nor attention to what was being written and written upon.

I began my studies of Sanskrit at a very young age under a guru of great glory and accomplishment. He was a *Dharmaśāstrin* and used to deliver religious judgments (called *dharmaśāstravyavasthā*) on controversial religious matters. These judgments were then circulated among some prominent pandits of the town (Vārānasi) for endorsement. These

pandits received a kind of dakṣiṇā. The wording of the endorsement used to be phrased as atrārhe sammatih, meaning that the signatory concurred with the view. There was one scholar -- frank and fair -- who had the courage to state the facts as they were. He used to interpret the phrase atrārhe to mean that the signatory did not care at all about the nature and content of the vyavasthā. He was concerned only with the fee received for putting the signature. This story exemplifies the nature of the association of that great scholar with this trifling "Foreword" and its contents as well as meaning, if there was any. The "Publisher's Note" and the "Foreword," viewed as a whole, did not constitute a prarocanā, but a straight pravañcanā.

This was my sad reaction when I read the "Foreword" and the "Publisher's Note" for the first time. It was at a very late stage - just a little while ago - that I chanced to see some of the "originals" of the documents that might have been used by the foreword-writer to compose his masterpiece, the one that was published by this reprinter as his "Foreword." I saw the introductory and prefatory statements made by Jacob, the scholarly review of his compilations and the report of George Buehler on the nyāyas. Apparently these were seen by the Principal.

I had been kept wondering (until I saw these documents) how such a low level of trash writing could have been produced by the Principal of a Sanskrit institute of such a high level! Tirupati has been a great center of Sanskrit learning and Principal Balasubrahmanyam is a reputed scholar of great accomplishments. But when I saw the sources that might have been used by the Principal and compared them with what was published as the "Foreword," I was able to realize that some incompetent, inefficient, worthless creature had tampered with the original writing. It was truly a monkey business. Evidently, the original writing of the Principal Balasubrahmanyam was mercilessly cut short by a thoughtless person to the extent that it turned out to be just a piece of nonsense and rubbish. It was a very sad and foolish cut-and-paste operation. The man had a pair of sharp scissors but a very dull mind. Words taken out of context turn out to be meaningless. I got confirmation of my conjecture that this dirty mean writing, which had no meaning, could not have come out from the pen of any writer having even the most elementary knowledge of English writing. Also it became evident that the reprinter was interested only in using the name of the Principal for publicity and promotion - to make a lot of easy and quick money. He seemed to have no use for the mind of such a great writer as the Principal was.

We are reproducing below in full the text of the

Foreword to Añjali reprint by Principal B.D. Balasubrahmanyam

Colonel G. A. Jacob, the well-known Indologist and Sanskritist, did yeoman's service to Sanskrit Literature by collecting *nyāyas* under the title, *A Handful of Popular Maxims Current in Sanskrit Literature (Laukika-nyāyāñjaliḥ* -- hereafter abbreviated to *LN*), drawn from Epics, Purāṇas, rhetorics, philosophy, grammar and other branches of Sanskrit Literature. At first Jacob wanted to collect only "popular" *nyāyas* but later in 1907, he has

done away with [sic] this distinction between a "popular" and one of a technical nature. In fact, the third part of *LN* represents important *adhikaraṇas* in *Mīmāṃsā* as well as *Paribhāṣās* from the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*. These were published by the *Nirnaya Sāgar Press*, Bombay during 1900-1904 and the second edition revised and enlarged by Jacob himself, appeared during 1907-1911. Tārānātha's *Vācaspatyam* (151 *nyāyas*), V. S. Apte's Dictionary (30 sayings), Satyavrata Samaśrami's monograph containing 36 popular maxims and some other sources were made use of [!] in the compilation of *LN*.¹ Buehler referred to the maxims as "inferences from familiar utterances." Raghunāthavarmā's *Laukikanyāyasaṅgrahaḥ* was also referred to, but the appended list of sayings contained in this work was omitted by Jacob.² He listed such popular maxims as have been put to actual use in Sanskrit literary texts, besides indexing [?] other important *nyāyas* from philosophical treatises. He took the trouble not only to arrange the maxims alphabetically but also to give an accurate rendering of these in English, followed by select citations of original texts from which these were drawn and adding explanatory notes to the maxims. The modestly styled *Handful of Maxims*[?] is a clear indication of the laborious care and love of accuracy for which Jacob is distinguished. One other factor which contributes to the value of the maxims which abound in Sanskrit Literature, [sic] is that some of these proverbial sayings find their parallel from [sic] English and other literatures of the world [!].

This popular and valuable compilation had regrettably found few followers in India. Yet mention could be made of Chabināth Mishra's *Nyāyoktikośa* (Delhi, 1978). It is a compilation of the aphorisms mostly found in philosophical works and their exegetical explanation. Furthermore, *nyāyas* current in popular texts have been listed. He has, of course, explained the *nyāyas* in simple Sanskrit.

It was the earnest desire of the author of *LN* that the maxims should be alphabetically arranged and brought under a single volume. This wish has now been fulfilled partly by Pravesh Chaturvedi who has taken the wise decision in printing through photo-offset process all the three parts of *LN* in one single handy volume on behalf of the *Nirajana Publishers and Booksellers* (Delhi).

I congratulate the *Nirajana Publishers* for the fine production.³ As the maxim goes, the association of many is good policy (*bahūnām amugraho nyāyyaḥ*) since any work of this type needs the cooperation of Sanskritists. It is in this sense that I heartily recommend *LN* to Indologists including the Sanskritists and the general public. Needless to say, scholars, students and lovers of Sanskrit Literature will find many a hidden treasure in *LN*. This reprinted volume must, in my opinion, find place in the libraries of the world. Lastly I wish that this useful book, the result of many years of reading will, in Colonel Jacob's words, "become the nucleus of a very much larger collection" of popular and technical maxims abounding in kaleidoscopic Sanskrit Literature.

¹ These were not "made use of" for collecting information, but for condemning them as worthless. Jacob enumerated them not for approbation, but for reprobation. See his Preface to *First Handul*, 1900.

² This is another nonsense and rubbish.

³ We are reminded of the following *nītivacana* : *Mṛdaṅgo mukhalepena karoti madhuradhvanim*.

TIRUPATI

22-8-1983

M. D. Balasubrahmanyam

Here is the "Publisher's Note" to the *Añjali* reprint:

We are happy to introduce the *Laukikanyāyāñjali* to the world of students, lovers and specialists in Sanskrit literature. The three parts of *A Handful of Popular Maxims Current in Sanskrit Literature*, compiled by Colonel G. A. Jacob and published by the Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, between 1900 to 1925 have long remained out of print. Several Sanskrit scholars have approached us and asked us to reprint all the three parts of the "Maxims" in a single volume. Accordingly we have reprinted the volume by photo-offset-process. We might have arranged the *nyāyas* contained in all the three parts alphabetically and brought out a revised edition of Jacob's useful and important collection of Sanskrit maxims. But this would [!] take a long time, and many scholars suggested that we should go in quickly for a reprinted version rather than waiting for a long time to bring out a revised edition.

Dr. M. D. Balasubrahmanyam (Tirupati) have [sic] blessed the Nirajana Publishers and Booksellers with his Foreword to this volume, which speaks for itself [!]. Dr. Mithilesh Chaturvedi showed an encouraging interest in this production.

We have great pleasure in placing the *Handful of Popular Maxims Current in Sanskrit Literature* at the hands of the wider-reading-public in general, and the Sanskritists in particular, so that they might make a comparative study of the proverbial sayings found in World Classics and use the Maxims in their speeches and writings.

5/13 Roop Nagar,
Delhi-110007
22-8-1983.

PRAVESH CHATURVEDI
Nirajana Publishers & Booksellers

We are giving below in brief the essential ideas of Jacob as expressed in his foreword, etc.

We begin with the

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION (of vol 1, published in 1900).

In Dr. Buehler's well-known Kashmir Report of 1877, we read the following:-- "A curious and very useful though modern treatise is the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* of Raghunāth, a Rajput [!]. This worthy has collected the *nyāyas* or "inferences from familiar instances" which occur in the *Śāstras*, especially those from the *Vedāntaśāstra*, e. g. *Daṇḍāpūpikānyāya*, *Dehalīdīpakanyāya*, etc. The collection is not complete, but contains a good deal more than that Professor Bālaśāstrī has given in his article in the *Pandit* ⁴. P. Vāmanāchārya Jhalkīkar is at present engaged on a still more extensive work on the subject, which will comprise about 900 such *nyāyas*." Page 76.

⁴ October and December 1867.

The information given in the concluding sentence raised our hopes to a high pitch, for the need of such a work was great, and Bālaśāstrī had explained only nine of those nyāyas. But alas! "there's many a slip between the cup and lip," and though we have waited for this "more extensive work" for 22 long years, there are still no signs of appearing.

*** **

In concluding this preface I must apologize to the reader for not giving him a bigger "handful" of maxims, and one of better quality. But what there is has been put together in defiance of the warnings of the skilful oculist in whose hands I have been for the last five years, and therefore at some risk to failing sight.⁵ May some younger scholar be provoked to the good work of giving us something fuller and better.

Redhill, Surrey,
July 1900.

G. A. J.

Some Opinions of the Press on the First Handful

"There are few books which give the results of so much reading in so small a compass as this little pamphlet of some fifty pages⁶. As its name indicates, it is a collection of those popular maxims, or, as Dr. Buehler calls them, "inferences from familiar instances," which one hears so frequently in conversation with Pandits.... Similar collections have been frequently put together...but we very rarely find in these any reference to the use of nyāyas in actual literature.⁷ The great value of Colonel Jacob's work is that at least one such reference is given for every maxim quoted. He has drawn principally from works on philosophy, and on rhetoric, branches of Sanskrit literature, which he has made peculiarly his own, and the modestly styled "Handful" is only one more example of the laborious care and love of accuracy for which its author is distinguished.

The book is useful to others than Sanskrit scholars....The student of Tulasī Dāsa, or of Malik Muhammad, will find many an obscure passage illuminated by this true *Dehalī-dīpaka*, throwing light, as it does, both upon the past and on the present." *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society (July 1901)*.

"Under the title "Laukikanyāyāñjali," or 'A handful of Popular Maxims', Colonel G. A. Jacob has published and explained a number of these allusions to popular and, at the same time no doubt, well-known proverbs or stories which abound in Sanskrit literature. These nyāyas find their parallels from our own language in such common sayings as 'like pot and the kettle,' 'like the hare and the tortoise,' etc. The proverbs or stories to which they allude are perfectly well-known and need no explanation. In the case of their Sanskrit counterparts, the memory of their origin has not always been preserved or has become obscured.

⁵ And yet he was able to bring out a revised edition in 1907.

⁶ An important point to note.

⁷ Another noteworthy statement.

The list now published consists of those examples which Colonel Jacob has been able either to trace to their source or to partly explain. Let us hope that this useful little work, the result of many years of reading may, in his own words, become the nucleus of a very much larger collection." Luzac's *Oriental List* (March-April 1901).

"From what we have written above, we think our readers will see what a useful little book Colonel Jacob's is, especially for those who wish to address the people of this land in forms of speech and with thoughts that are familiar to them." *Prakāśak* (Kolhapur, March 1900).

Preface to Second edition [of Handful 1, dated 1907]

The discovery of MSS. of Raghunāthavarman's works, as recorded in the preface to the "Second Handful", was of the utmost importance to me;⁸ but the student will find in my three small volumes some *nyāyas* which even he did not explain— amongst which are the *Kṛtvācintānyāya* and *Maṇimantranyāya* here incorporated for the first time. I make no distinction now between what may be really called a 'popular' maxim and one of a technical nature. Both need to be explained and illustrated, so both are freely admitted. I have thoroughly revised, and considerably enlarged the "Second Handful" also, and hope soon to see it reprinted.

I wish I could impart to some of my fellow countrymen, resident in India, something of the enthusiasm which its great literature awakened within me in the early part of my career, and which has never waned during this long intervening period. Such a hobby not only provides delightful mental exercise, but better still, it draws one into *sympathetic touch* with the people amongst whom one's lot is cast.

Redhill, Surrey
October 1907.

G. A. Jacob.

Preface to the Second Edition (of Handful 2, Sept 1909).

For the reasons given in the preface to the Third Handful I would gladly have seized this opportunity of eliminating the word 'Maxims' from the title-page; but it was not polite to change the name adopted ten years ago and repeated in each new issue. It is not probable that this will pass into a third edition during my lifetime; *but I trust that in its present form it may prove helpful to young students* (emphasis added) whose reading has not been quite so with as my own.

Redhill, Surrey,
25th Sept. 1909.

G. A. Jacob.

⁸ Note Jacob's words. It is a veiled acknowledgment. Could we call it an expression of indebtedness? But the word 'but' takes away all the juice out of it.

I have seen and used the third ed. (1925) of handfuls one and two. In spite of my best efforts I could not get a copy of the third ed. of the Third Handful in this country.

Woes of Añjali reprint

The three booklets have been reprinted as they were originally issued. They are bound in one "handy" volume. That is the only contribution this reprinter has made, if at all it could be called a contribution, because his motive was to make money and not to help the reader. There are three separate sequences of the pagination. There are no headers, no footers. There is no running title at the top of the pages. When we open the bound book, we cannot determine which particular "handful" we are looking into. The Index too is reproduced incidentally, but it indicates only the number of the "handful" as its specific location. The following note appears in the beginning of the "Alphabetical List of Nyāyas," explained in parts I, II and III.

"The nyāyas being arranged [!] in alphabetical order in each handful, it is not necessary to quote the pages."

The mighty money-making machine of the Nirajana Publishers could have used a manual-numbering machine and numbered all the pages of the three separate booklets of the *Laukikanyāyāñjali* that they reprinted. Then the same index could have shown the page no. of the reprint. It would have facilitated the location of a particular nyāya in one of the three volumes even though they existed in separate sequence and had no internal coherence.

If they did not want to buy even a manual-numbering machine, which would have cost even less than the price they charged for one copy of their marvelous publication, and for which they have received congratulations from the foreword-writer, they could have asked even their junior janitor to write the page numbers by hand on the top of each page. But the fact is they had no time for all this fancy extra work. They were rendering a great service to the world of Sanskrit learning by reprinting this book, which had remained long out of print. Was this favor not adequate enough? And enough is enough.

Woes of Añjali--More of them

J's original text has many typographical errors; There are many misprints in this Añjali reprint. At many places, no differentiation is made between prose and poetry in J's page lay-out. This looks very unpleasant.

A bhuktabhogī alone knows how painful is the bhoga. No other person in this whole wide world would have consulted all the three separate sequences of the nyāyas contained in the three separate volumes of the *Laukikanyāyāñjali* as many times as I have done to bring them to order and coherence out of the chaos wherein they were dumped. And nobody would have suffered as much as the writer of these lines on account of this tragic situation. All my labor and pain would be fully compensated if none else

beyond me would have to undergo the torture that fell to my bad luck. Thanks a million, Nirajana. I shall ever remain grateful to you.

Upakṛtam bahu tatra kim ucyate sujanatā bhavatā prathitā param.
Vidhadad idṛśam eva sadā sakhe sukhitam āsva tataḥ śaradām śatam.

Their argument for not having brought out a "revised" edition has added fuel to fire. This is how they have argued to satisfy us, the simpletons in their opinion:

"We might have arranged the nyāyas contained in all the three parts alphabetically, and brought out a revised edition of Jacob's useful and important collection of Sanskrit maxims. But this would take a long time(!), and many scholars suggested that we should go in quickly for a reprinted version rather than waiting for a long time(!) to bring out a revised edition.

We are not sure if there were any *real* scholars (in flesh and blood) to suggest such an inferior path, and even if there were some, they were not real *scholars*. This is all a fairy tale. This has hurt us more than anything else. It is an ugly aspersion on the intelligence of real scholars around the world for whom this publication was intended and printed by photo-offset process so quickly. The consoling argument does not offset our pain in the least. We regard it as kṣate kṣāram -- insult added to injury!

There is a saying in Hindi-- Kahatā bhī dīvānā aur sunatā bhī dīvānā ! An insane advising and another insane --a greater one-- listening. The question is: Didn't they have their own power of thinking? What did it dictate? Why did they not listen to their own judgment if it was better? We have condemned this Nirajana for their foolish attempt to fool us -- here, there, and everywhere-- throughout our REformed edition in our Editorial notes--so that some other reprinter in future thinks twice before indulging in this type of dirty deed. It was not necessary for them to give us any reason at all while adopting a path of their own choice. No one was going to ask them why they did not take the other path. It has been our objective to expose the dirty deed of the reprinters Nirajana and bring them out open in their naked form before the world of Sanskrit learning. We have done it. Now we would like to end this unpleasant saga of this money-making enterprise (reprint).

Añjali, what does it mean?

We may present some thoughts on the meaning of the word Añjali. It is a beautiful word pregnant with wonderful meanings. We will then discuss the nyāya in all its aspects.

The word "Añjali" may mean joined hollowed open hands (palms). Amara says: Pāñir nikubjaḥ prasṛtis tau yutāvñjaliḥ pumān. And as an example of its use we may present a śrutivākya: Añjalīnā saktūn juhoti. It may also mean the contents of the Añjali.

Some more examples of its use are: kusumāñjali, puṣpāñjali, mantra-puṣpāñjali. If it is only one "cupped" open palm, there is a Saṃskṛta word for it -- culuka. In Hindi it is called cullū. Offering is a good word for Añjali. Handbook is a better word than handful in terms of a book, though añjali can be better translated by the word handful.

The Nyāyas

Viśvanyāyavyākhyānanidarśanadarśanam

Our Discipline, the Name:

Encyclopedia of India's Proverbial Wisdom is a good generic title for all the three works we have been working on for the past five years. They are: *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* and *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* of Raghunātha Varmā and the *Laukikanyāyāñjali* compiled by Colonel G. A. Jacob. Or, we may adopt a general name worded as Universal Laws of Interpretation. Our discipline may be called Viśva-nyāya-vyākhyāna-nidarśanadarśanam-- the Science of Universal Interpretative Nyāyas. Universal Laws of Interpretation is a good translation of the name as defined here. These are only tentative (suggestive) names.

Sadyuktisādhitā sūktir dhatte nyāyapadam param is our own definition of the concept of the nyāya, derived after years of extensive as well as intensive study of the field of the nyāyas. A reliable (trustworthy) statement, based on the strong foundation of logic and reasoning-- a determinant valid saying is a nyāya. By the term yukti we mean reasoning, argument, proof, influence, induction, deduction, ground, basis, and foundation, etc. Yukti is a very significant term and carries many relevant meanings.

Nyāya-vyākhyāna-nidarśana-darśanam. In this compound nomenclature, the term nyāya-vyākhyāna may mean interpretation, exposition, explanation, or narration, etc. by means (or through the instrumentality) of the nyāyas, or the explanation, etc. of the nyāyas themselves-- what they are, how they are evolved, and why they are used, etc. Raghunātha Varmā says at the end of his magnum opus, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*: Vyākhyātam nyāyavṛndam..... Nidarśanam may mean citation or demonstration.

Kevalānanda Sarasvatī on the nyāyas

Kevalānanda Sarasvatī begins his "Prastāva" of the *Mīmāṃsākośa* with the following maṅgalācaraṇa:

Nirmathya nigamasindhūn vividhanyāyābhidhānamanthānaiḥ.
Dharmasudhām uddharate bhūyo munaye namo'stu Jaiminaye.

Here the words "nyāyamanthāna," "sindhu," and "sudhā" are quite significant. They demonstrate the nature, scope, function, and power of the nyāyas.

On p. 6 he says: "Kiñca śāstrīyanyāyaval laukikā api nyāyāḥ mīmāṃsāgranth-eṣvevādhikaraṇārthanirṇayopayogitvenopanyastā bhūyāṃsaḥ..."

Incidentally we might add here that Svami Kevalananda refers to Raghunātha Varmā's *Saṅgraha* and says: Laukikanyāyasaṅgrahakāraś cāha.

Kevalānanda Sarasvatī displays his lack of information on Raghunātha Varmā when he says (p.21 of his Introd.): Raghunātha Śarmā Gulābarāyavaryātmajaḥ Laukikanyāyasaṅgrahakartā. Either his eyesight had failed him or he read the letters the way he wanted.

1. One Varmā becomes Śarmā.
2. Another Varmā becomes Varya.

We think Svāmījī believed that none but a Brāhmaṇa could compose a Vedānta-prakaraṇagrantha. Maybe, according to this Svāmījī Mithilādhipati Rājarṣi Janaka too was a Śarmā. Also it is evident that the knowledge of this Svāmījī was limited to the *Saṅgraha* as far as Raghunātha Varmā is concerned. He does not show any awareness of the *Ratnākara*, the mighty majestic ocean.

It is our observation that *Saṅgraha* became more popular as compared to the *Ratnākara*. It is relevant to recall Raghunātha's own words. In the beginning of the *Saṅgraha* he says::

Laukikanyāyaratnānām ākare yat pradarśitam.
Tasya saṅkṣepa eveha śīghrabodhāya darśyate,

And at the end of his *Ratnākara*, Raghunātha said:

Mandāḥ saṅkṣepam icchanti sudhiyo'nalasāḥ param.
Vistaram, vistr̥to'to'yam sudhiyām prītaye mayā.

There were more mandajanāḥ than sudhiyaḥ. Thus for the quick understanding of the dull and dumb, as well as the lazy people, he presented an abbreviated version.

Some new thoughts on the nyāyas

We have discussed in brief the nature, scope, and function, etc. of the nyāyas in our *Pūrvaraṅga* (Introduction) of the *Ratnākara*. It is not necessary to repeat all that here. However, we would like to present some new thoughts on the subject that we have gathered in recent months.

Vāsudeva Śāstrī on the nyāyas

The following vacanāni are taken from the Introduction to the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*, ed. by Vāsudeva Śāstrī Abhyñkara. Poona: BORI, 1972.

Nyāyaiḥ prasādhito hyartha ārohati matim drutam.

[Nyāyaśabdārthaḥ] Nīyate prāpyate tātpariyārtho yena.

Tattvaprāsādhanaṃ yuktyā nyāya ityucyate budhaiḥ.

Prakāśate svarūpeṇa nyāyo yuktyupāditaḥ.

Śabarāsvāmin on the nyāyas

V. S. Apte in his Dictionary has presented the following vacanāni from Śabarāsvāmin:

Anukte hi nyāye na pratīmo'rthāntaram.

S.B. on MS. 6.2.5.

Tasmān nāvasthito nyāyaḥ pratyuddhriyeta.

S.B. on M.S. 6.2.10.

Nanu liṅgam asādhakam, nyāya ucyatām yasyaitat
dyotakam iti. S.B. on M.S. 6.2.30.

It will be helpful to see *Vācaspatyam* and Monier-Williams too.

The Laukika Nyāyas

Atha kas tāvad ayam laukiko nyāyaḥ ? Kim etasya lakṣaṇam?

Yo hi nyāyaḥ śrutisiddho lokāprasiddhaś ca na sa nyāyo laukikaḥ. Śrutisiddhatvam lokāprasiddhatvam ca laukikatvam vyāvartayati. A nyāya must not be śrutisiddha and must be lokāprasiddha before it can be termed as a Laukikanyāya. This is the deciding factor as ordained by Raghunātha Varmā. Laukika may also mean secular or mundane as opposed to śāstrīya. cf. *Loke Vede ca*.

If a nyāya is common to many disciplines, if it is general, it can be called Laukika. On the other hand, if it is specific to a particular discipline, it will be called Śāstrīya. There is one more criterion to decide one way or the other-- whether a particular nyāya is applicable to all the situations, or it is limited to a specific situation.

Lokāprasiddhi is a primary means for deriving and evolving the laukika nyāyas. A sāmānya lokaghaṭanā, a common worldly phenomenon, is used to formulate a nyāya and then a śāstrīya siddhānta is established. Sometimes a Laukikadr̥ṣṭānta is brought forth as a means to establish a śāstrīyasiddhānta. For example, the nyāya derived from Taptāyaḥpītāmbuvat.

Simple, natural, down to earth, day to day phenomena are invoked to arrive at a śāstrīya siddhānta. For example, Na hyabaddhe kāṣṭhapūlake ekasminnākṛṣyamāṇe kāṣṭhāntarāṇi kṛṣyante. ŚB. on MS. 9.1.26, as cited by Apte with reference to the word pūla or pūlaka.

Sometimes a Lokavyavahāra is advanced as an authority to solve a śāstrīya samasyā. Ex. Nahi tripuro....Patañjali takes lokavyavahāra as an instrument to prove his point and establish his siddhānta.

Vyavahāra is a very significant word. It has many meanings, such as conduct, behavior, action, an established rule or procedure, administration of justice, etc. There is a Manuvacana reading as vyavahārān didṛkṣuḥ [sa nṛpatiḥ.]

All this shows the nature, content, and form and the efficacy, efficiency and effectiveness of the laukika nyāyas.

J's Laukika

J has titled his work as *Laukikanyāyāñjali* and has translated it as the Handful of popular maxims. He has used the word "popular" to represent the type or class of the nyāyas he has primarily collected in his compilation. Here even if we accept his epithet, the word "popular" cannot mean "liked by the people (lokapriya)" but of the people, by the people and for the people. This is our conclusion.

The use of the Nyāyas

The nyāyas are used as instruments of both offence and defence. Raghunātha does not merely cite and expound the nyāyas; he also attempts their sāmāñjasya and samanvaya-parapakṣakhaṇḍana and svapakṣamaṇḍana, i.e. Tattvasādhana. "Logical law" would be a meaningful equivalent term for the word "nyāya" in such cases.

In the discussion of the nyāyas as presented by R, many a time we find the opponent arguing that a particular example of the nyāya as presented is not suitable. Raghunātha meets the objection, presents his arguments, and establishes the fact that the example given IS appropriate and befitting.

How the nyāyas operate

The Nyāya operates as a section of the Penal Code--a sword hanging over the head. The opponent is threatened with the possibility of being subject to violating the law and then incurring the penalty. Sometimes the opponent is warned that he cannot advance a specific argument, or take a specific position (stand) because such and such nyāya would debar him from doing so (acting in a particular manner). The specific warning or threat advanced in such a case is phrased as nyāyāpātaḥ or nyāyaviṣayatām nātivartate. cf. Tailapātradharanyāya, #198. This is a warning to be cautious and careful.

Nyāyas-- some criteria

How a "saying" qualifies to be a nyāya? Nītivacana vs. Nayasiddhānta. Jacob has discussed many "nyāyas" which are only śikṣaṇanītivacanāni and not laukikanyāya-

nidarśanāni. We have to understand the difference between a didactic principle, a nīti-vacana and a logical argumentation, nayasiddhānta. One is only an upadeśa--how to conduct one's own life, private or public. The other is how to conduct vāda and secure victory over the opponent. Vāde vāde jāyate tattvabodaḥ. To put it in a different way, one is upadeśa, while another is ādeśa.

One of the most vital criteria to determine whether a particular vacana may be regarded as a nyāya or not is to ascertain if any pūrvācārya has used it as a means to prove his point-- parapakṣakhaṇḍana and svapakṣamaṇḍana--to score victory.

What services have we rendered?

Laukikanyāñjali has been composed on computer. Since we did not have adequate facilities to present the Sanskrit text in original Devanāgarī script we were forced to present it in Romanized form. The task of data input was done by an undergraduate American student. She did not have any background of India, or any of her languages, when she began the work. She learned Devanāgarī within just two months and trans-literated the entire Sanskrit text from Devanāgarī into Roman script. It was her maiden attempt in this field. That was Kamalee.

This transliterated Sanskrit text may prove to be of incidental advantage to those readers who are not very much used to read Sanskrit in Devanāgarī characters. On the other hand, readers used to read Sanskrit in Devanāgarī might feel some disadvantage. We had entertained some ambitious plans to convert Romanized Sanskrit back into Devanāgarī. But we cannot do it now. Almighty God may enable someone else to do it at a later date, but for the time being this will serve its purpose in a limited manner. There were horrors of horrible bundles of blunders in the text of the reprinted Añjali. We have corrected all of them to the best of our knowledge and ability. We have provided an ideal page-set up. Poetry and prose have been separated and properly displayed. Many editorial notes have been provided throughout this REformed edition.

Nyāyas discussed in our Editorial Notes

Throughout this publication, from the beginning to the end, here there and everywhere, in our Editorial Notes we have presented our thoughts on all aspects of the subject of the Nyāyas. We have also presented our comments on the statements, criticism, and interpretation of the nyāyas as offered by Jacob. We have also taken exception to his unjust approach wherever he has crossed the limits of decency and fairplay as required by the academic decorum and standards. We have also shown where and how Jacob has failed in his interpretation of the nyāyas. We have made an attempt also to answer the questions he raised but left unanswered. His problems too have been solved. We have gone beyond what he has done.

The work has been thoroughly edited and made useful in so many other ways. We wanted to prepare and publish many auxiliaries and aids, but we could not do so because

of the limitations of time and money, and many other debarring factors. It is hoped that someone else may follow us someday somewhere and complete what we have initiated.

Why all this attempt?

A question may arise-- Why did we undertake such an arduous task?

We have had several objectives in our mind for bringing out this REformed edition. One was to restore the glory of Raghunātha Varmā and his two valuable compositions-- the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* and the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*. Both the works have been subjected to the worst kind of editorial irresponsibility. It is a very long story and a sad one too. It is better not to narrate it. Kathā'pi khalu pāpānām alam aśreyase yataḥ. What the so-called editors have done is not a pātaka of ordinary nature. It is Ṣaṣṭham Mahāpātakam. We don't know as yet what specific prāyaścitta has been prescribed by our smṛtikāras. That is why we have named this edition as prāyaścitta prakāśana.

Colonel Jacob has drawn a good deal of "pre-prepared material" from these two works of Raghunātha Varmā to build the mansion of his glorious "Handfuls,"-- kalaśapurassara-prāsādanirmānatulyam, but he does not give Raghunātha Varmā any credit. In the words of George Buehler, Udāsīna Shrī Raghunātha Varmā was only a "Rajput." And Jacob is only a chelā of that guru. We wanted to bring out in relief this ungrateful borrowing in the clearest possible terms. In this straight statements of facts we are supported by our own śāstrakāras--

Śatror api guṇā vācyā doṣā vācyā guror api. Also

Guror apyavaliptasya kāryākāryam ajānatataḥ.
Utpathapratipannasya nyāyāyam bhavati śāsanam.

If we are successful in fulfilling these objectives, we would have received enough compensation for all the toil, trouble, and torture that we were subjected to. This reminds us of the hālāhala-ghora-bhayaṅkara-viśa-pāna by Devādhideva Mahādeva Śiva-śaṅkara and his immortal stuti in the *Mahimnastava*-- Akāṇḍabrahmāṇḍakṣayacakita No reader in future will have to suffer the way we have had to.

A pacifist who has never been hit on his face with a fierce fist by a ferocious foe might say that we are too harsh with the reprinter. The explanation may lie in the fact that he has not been a bhuktabhogin. He might change his views after he has read the whole of this publication from cover to cover and has been able to understand it. If he has a heart it will be hit hard and will be broken to pieces. Don't argue what happens if it is rocky. Have patience and read further.

Someone might argue: This is all pralāpa. And Pralāpo'narthakan vacaḥ! It is all useless. How does it help? In response we would quote Kavikulavibhūti Mahākavi Bhavabhūti, whose words possessed the power to make Api grāvā rodityapi dalati vajrasya hṛdayam! Here are his immortal words:

Pūrotpīḍe taḍāgasya parīvāhaḥ pratikriyā.
Śokasaṃvignahrdayam pralāpair eva dhāryate.

So we are not the first ones in this ageless wide world to indulge in this kind of pralāpa.

Jacob and the nyāyas

J's coverage of R--Partial and limited.

R has discussed many nyāyas which J does not include. This is a half-way treatment, we believe, presenting a play and display of the Ardharatīyanyāya. We don't know if the omission was caused by oversight or disdain. But J condemns many nyāyas of R on the ground that they are not appropriate; yet he himself has included many of the same category.

On the other hand, J has discussed many nyāyas which are found neither in RR nor in RS. However, many nyāyas presented by Jacob are merely vācayukti and not yuktivyuktā sūktiḥ. He has made profuse references to the collection made by Boehtlingk. Now all the contents of this compilation by their very nature are subhāṣitāni, good sayings. We don't allow them to be called the nyāyas. Furthermore, many a nyāya cited and discussed by Jacob in his Añjali is only a śikṣaṇānīvacana and not an alaukika-laukika-nyāya-nidarśana.

Ālankārikas have extensively used the nyāyas to establish their theories and expound their discipline. R in his *Ratnākara* has a whole section on it. However, J lacks in this field. His emphasis has been on philosophy--Pūrva Mīmāṃsā and Uttara Mīmāṃsā. For example, Jacob has not listed the gajanimīlikānyāya. He has overlooked:

Kākasya kati vā dantā meṣayāṇḍam kiryatpalam.
Kā vārtā sindhusauvīreṣveṣā mūrkhavicāraṇā.

The above occurs in SDS Śāṅkara. Comm. p. 404. No source cited there. Introduced with the words: Tathā cābhāṇakaḥ.

J's use of varying terms to denote the nyāya.

Jacob has used varying terms to denote the nyāyas included in his compilations. For example, terms like ābhāṇaka, bhaṇitiḥ, figure, illustration, law, principle, question, rule, simile, topic, and uktiḥ, etc, are indiscriminately used to denote a nyāya. Many nyāyas are presented in translation only, without using any qualifying term to categorize it as a nyāya.

The very fact that Jacob has used so many varying terms, carrying so many different meanings, to represent the concept of the nyāya, demonstrates the fact that his collection is not homogenous; rather it is heterogenous-- a conglomerate, hodge-podge, gathering

together of all types of "sayings" which, all of them, cannot be called the nyāya in the real sense of the term as accepted by the sāmpradāyikas.

At a certain point he himself raises the question whether the nyāya in reference can be called a maxim, or only an axiom. At a later stage in his editorial enterprise, he thought of dropping altogether the word "maxims" from his books, but could not do so because of the long association and usage. Also he wrote once that his collection is no more confined to the popular ones, but both the popular as well as technical nyāyas deserve consideration.

J's Failure in interpreting the Nyāyas

There are many instances where we find Jacob running wrong in his interpretation of a nyāya. For example, Andhagolāṅgūla---. The translation of "gauḥ" as "cow" is wrong. It is a young male calf that is meant here. The word in the original is goyuvā. This is only an example presented following the principle of the sthālīpulākanyāya. We have provided such notes throughout this publication.

J's Index of the nyāyas.

J's Index of the nyāyas too is defective. It suffers from many shortcomings and incongruities. It is incomplete, inadequate. For example, Asnehadīpanyāya missed in the Index. Also one more nyāya-- Kadalīphala.... swallowed. There are many more omissions and commissions. There are disorders in the arrangement, which in reality turns out to be derangement. It is just possible that the Index was prepared by a semi-literate person. Jacob might not have even seen it. He complains about his old age and the failing eyesight.

Nyāyas--An extremely Wide Ocean

However, it is extremely difficult, almost impossible, to achieve a comprehensive coverage of the nyāyas. The field is so wide. Our study of the works on the nyāyas has demonstrated that the range and scope of the world of the nyāyas is as vast as the space.

Raghunātha Varmā says at the end of his *Ratnākara*:

Vyākhyātam nyāyavṛndam nijamatim anatikramya yāvan mayā"ptam
pāram prāptum tu śakto na hi bhavati guruḥ kaḥ punar māḍṛṣo nā.
Sarvaḥ sarvam na veti prathitam idam ato nā'sti me'trāparādhaḥ
Śiṣṭā jñeyāḥ svayam vai suvimalamatibhiḥ samygarādhitāryaiḥ.

We think R believed : Sarvam nyāyamayam jagat. He says at the end of the *Ratnākara*: Evam sarve laukikā dṛṣṭāntā laukikyo gāthās ca sarvā nyāyatvenodāhartum śakyante iti.

Jacob talks out of context

Our readers would see that many a time Jacob talks matters out of context, in an irrelevant manner. His subject of discussion was the interpretation of the nyāyas. He was not preaching his religion from a pulpit. Nobody was asking him to tell the world which specific religion was the best for mankind--their salvation. This is the reason why his views should be rejected in the most emphatic terms by impartial critics. He ought to have read a book like *Truth is one*, wherein the unity of the basic and fundamental ideas of all the religions is propounded --a kind of sarvadharmasamanvaya.

Jacob, the Pulpit Preacher

Here is the concluding part of Jacob's Preface to the First edition of the *Vedāntasāra* of Sadānanda Yati, dated September 1893, at Redhill, Surrey, England:.

"I must not conclude these prefatory remarks without a word to my Hindu friends for whom this edition is chiefly intended. No one can have a higher regard for India and its people than myself, or can be a greater admirer of its ancient language. Bharatakhanda has produced men who would have been an ornament to any society, and it has been pre-eminently a land of thinkers. It is intensely interesting to see efforts made by its great men, centuries ago. to reach the truth; yet with all their keenness of mental vision, what result did they arrive at ! The Vedānta philosophy, [emphasis added throughout] of which this is an outline, is supposed to be the finest outcome of Indian thought; yet it abolishes God, as an unreality, and substitutes an impersonal It with no consciousness, whilst its highest notion of bliss is the annihilation of personality! Yet if any man could, by searching, find out the living and true God, they would assuredly have succeeded. Is it not clear, then, that God must give us a revelation of Himself, or we shall never know Him? And I think that any really earnest and candid mind will see that the Bible is just the revelation we need; and, like the sacred books of all the other great religions of the world, it came to us from Asia. Do not look upon it, therefore, as a product of European thought,--or indeed of any merely human thought--though it has brought light and life into Europe wherever it has been allowed to circulate freely. Just one word to the annihilation of our human personality. I look upon humanity as capable, under improved conditions, of attaining to heights grand beyond all our personal conceptions; and the idea of merging our personality in another Being is as horrible as it is unsound. No, there are far greater things than that in store for that portion of the human race that is willing to unite under the headship of "the second Man"! and such will after all see the declaration" Ye shall become as gods: more than fulfilled, false as it was when uttered.

For all this vitaṇḍāvāda of the Colonel, our response would be:

Nijadoṣāvṛtamanaśām atisundaram eva bhāti viparītam.
Paśyati pittopahataḥ śaśiśubhram śāṅkham api pītam.

And

Na hyeṣa sthāṇora parādho yad enam andho na paśyati.

And

Yadā yadā muñcati vākyabāṇam tadā tadā jātikulapramāṇam.

No one ever taught him-- Satyam brūyāt priyam brūyāt.

Our readers would also see that Jacob takes away with one hand what he gives with another. While extolling Vedānta philosophy for its grandeur, he condemns it as a useless thing to be discarded. And yet he has earned a great reputation as the translator of the *Vedāntasāra*.

A cynic might argue: Well, Jacob has offered some good things too. So he should not be condemned in this manner. Our response to that critic would be: Read and try to understand the nyāya: Yato nahi pavitram syād gokṣīram śvḍṛtau dhṛtam.

Work done and yet to be done.

We have done quite a good deal. Yet what we have done so far pales into insignificance when it is weighed against what still remains to be done, or can be done, if it is desired to improve and enrich the Añjali to its full extent.

Desiderata

It is desirable to prepare an exhaustive and systematic index of all the citations along with the tracing of their original sources. This is a very long and arduous task, and will put to test all the ingenuity, skill, patience, and perseverance of the scholar who would like to embark upon this arduous enterprise. We would also like to see that a consolidated statement of all the parallel sayings, as cited by Jacob from English and other languages, is prepared-- a kind of comparative study is made. This will show the universal nature of the nyāyas-- that they are the common heritage of all the cultures and have been in use at all times and in all climes. They are not limited by time or place. Yet we have no time, no power, no facilities to do all this now.

Jacob has discussed certain nyāyas that are also found in some other European languages besides English. As far as the Indian languages are concerned, his comparison is confined to just one language, Marathi. He lived and worked in the Marathi-speaking area (Mahārāshtra). He was a member of the Bombay Staff Corps. He seems to have received academic honors as well. He was a fellow of the Bombay University. He frequently quotes Molesworth and cites Marathi proverbs and sayings. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that J's treatment of Indian languages would be extremely partial and limited. There are fourteen major regional languages in India and Marathi is only one of them. Every language has its own literary treasure. There is, for example, a large book in two big volumes, entitled *Bhāratīya kahāvata saṅgraha*, compiled by

Vishwanath Dinkar Narawane (Pune: Triveni Sangam, 1978) which contains sayings and proverbs from many languages of India.

Even if we limit ourselves to just Sanskrit and English, there are many equivalent sayings. For example, Bilavartigodhāvibhajananyāya. cf. Counting the chicken before they are hatched. This is the kind of comparative study that is badly needed.

There are many other examples. We have shown them in our Editorial Notes. For example, with regard to the sacrifice or suffering of a goat, we can give the following:

Aśvam naiva gajam naiva vyāghram naiva ca naiva ca.
Ajāputram balim dadyāt daivo durbalaghātakaḥ.

For Ekavṛntagataphaladvayanyāya. cf. Āmrās ca siktāḥ pitarās ca ṛptāḥ. See Ganganatha Jha: *Pūrvamīmāṃsā in its sources*, p 333.

It will be helpful if a section called "See Also" is prepared under which all the notes made by Jacob for this specific purpose are brought together. Also there could be a grouping of all the "Recommendations for further reading" made by Jacob. The connecting link would be the name of the specific nyāya and its serial number.

There are many other ways and means by which this Añjali could be enriched, improved and made more useful and usable. Here is one crucial area that demands immediate attention.

J's Bibliography.

The three-in-one money-making reprint has two separate bibliographies--one in vol. 1 and another in vol. 2. There is no coordination; no consolidation. It did not matter to the reprinter at all. Who cares about the convenience of serious scholars?

The books in these bibliographies are listed by titles only. There are no author entries. If the reference is made by the name of the author and the reader does not recall the exact title, he is lost. Moreover, one does not know which particular title would be found in which specific listing--first or second. Sometimes he has to scan both to get what he wants. These lists of books were prepared about a century ago. Titles might have been more important then, or, at least, Jacob thought so.

These two disjointed bibliographies leave much to be desired. A great deal of criticism can be levelled against them. A lot of work will have to be done before they meet the modern standards and can be made usable and useful. We have tried to show the way. We have integrated the two sequences into one. However, the original rendering of the names etc. had to be left as it was. Hardly any change has been made. An authentic reproduction is maintained as far as possible. There are many shortcomings.

Many publications listed by Jacob have long remained out of print.

There are many citations from a very old journal like Pandit.

Some works cited by J were still in progress when he compiled his works.

It will be an arduous task for an enterprising Indologist to trace the quotations etc. in newer editions, if older ones have been redone, or are no longer available easily. The work was done one hundred years ago. Since then the world has made gigantic progress in the field of book publishing and bibliographical rendering.

Let us try to explore the ways through which these lists can be improved if one sets about to do the job. First of all, it will be necessary to see how many books listed by Jacob have gone out of print? Have they been ever reproduced by photo-offset method? If not, any new edition might not have the same pagination. In such cases, new page numbers will have to be found and noted, because many of Jacob's references are not intrinsic; they are extrinsic, that is, they don't refer to the internal structure of the book, such as *adhyāya* or *pāda*, or *sarga* and *śloka*, etc. but the page no. only, which can apply to that particular edition only.

A separate author index will have to be prepared.

With reference to *Śālikā*. J says: "Portions of the work are missing." He consulted only the 1903 ed. Since then an exhaustive critical edition has come out from the B. H. U. I have used it. This is just an example given following the *sthālīpulākanyāya*.

Abbreviations

"J" stands for Colonel G. A. Jacob, the collector of the three *Handfuls of Popular Maxims*, named *Laukikanyāyāñjali*.

"R" refers to Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna.

"RR" refers to the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* of Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna.

"S" stands for the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* of Raghunātha Varmā, published from Banaras in 1902--a wretched edition--a disgrace to scholarship.

Acknowledgments.

Sir Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765-1837) was one of the greatest British Orientalists. His works have been published in many volumes. His son has presented a biography of his father. We believe it was Colebrooke who donated the MS. of the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* to the Library of the East India Company, the predecessor of the India Office Library and the Commonwealth Relations Office. The MS photocopy that I have

secured bears this fact out. It is just possible that he was the divine instrument of bringing both the works of Raghunātha Varmā in manuscript form to London and thus making them available to us. A thorough study of his life and contribution would be a rewarding engagement for an Orientalist. We are highly thankful to the service rendered by such devoted scholars. We have already stated, time and again, that but for the one lone london MS of the Ratnākara still preserved there, this unique work was totally lost to the world of Sanskrit learning for ever. We are greatly obliged to God Al-mighty that He made us an instrument in the recovery and dissemination of India's cultural heritage through the publication of this unique work.

In this edition, all editorial contributions (comments and "ED. NOTES", etc.) are provided by the chief editor Dr. Murarilal Nagar. Credit for textual composition goes to our research associate Kamalee. One is the internal form, the meaning, the artha. Another is the external form, the structure of the body, the śabda. The publication is a product of modern desk-top publishing. A great deal of editorial responsibility had to be shared by my life-partner, Sarla Devi, who gets the credit for offering the pūrṇāhuti. Pūrṇāhutyā sarvāṅ kāmān avāpnoti. The final finishing touch had to be given by her magic touch. We have brought out more than a score of volumes during the last ten years. This one could not become an exception. She too had to make her own contribution and make it better from every point of view.

Apologia

During the last five years I have worked along with my life-partner on three compositions on the subject of the Laukikanyāyas, viz. *Laukikanyāyaratākara* and *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* of Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna and the *Laukikanyāyāñjali* compiled by Colonel G. A. Jacob. For us it was a kind of Holy Treveni Saṅgama-- a confluence of Gaṅgā, Yamunā, and Sarasvatī.

It is possible to have a dip in the Triveṇī Saṅgama once only and acquire the virtue of taking a bath in all the three rivers simultaneously, but I could not work on all the three compositions at the same time. One thing at a time was the supreme commander-in-chief dictating the performance. My state can be compared with a father of three sons. He has to take care of all the three, maybe, turn by turn. Each one of the three sons has to be provided with equal share in terms of clothing, shelter, and food. The father cannot neglect anyone. The father cannot give preference or priority to any one of them. Each one has a right to receive equal provision. If I had given time and attention to only one by exercising any kind of priority or preference it would have been injustice with others. Time was a vital factor. I wanted to do as much work as possible with all the three works as soon as possible. Śarīre kā vārtā kairkalabhakarṇāntacapale. Something is better than nothing. The internal and external condition of each of the three offsprings is much better today than when I began working with them. That is the greatest satisfaction of my life. If someone follows me, he will have a much smoother going. We are reminded of an immortal vacana of Kavikularavi Mahākavi Bhāravi:

Viśamo'pi vigāhyate nayaḥ kṛtatīrthaḥ payasām ivāśayaḥ.

Sa tu tatra viśeṣadurlabhaḥ sadupanyasyati kṛtyavartma yah.

So I have given life, living , and its continuation concurrently to all the three. Naturally, all three are not fully developed. They did not get maximum possible nurturing and nourishment. There is scope for each one of them for further development. If they have their own intrinsic qualities they are bound to survive and flourish. It is truly and correctly stated by a Nītikāra--Jīvan nara bhadrāśatāni paśyati. If the life is continued one is likely to experience hundreds of pleasures.

I did not want my work on any of the publications to be recycled. There was hardly any hope of their being published in this manner beyond this life of the writer of these lines. The wretched Banaras ed. of the *Sangraha* was published almost one hundred years ago. No publisher found it worthy to be reprinted. Durbhāgakṛtir durbhagākṛtiḥ is a disgrace to Sanskrit scholarship. But for a lone London manuscript, the Ratnākara as a whole was lost to Sanskrit scholarly world for ever, let it be repeated. Just a photocopy alone has cost us (in terms of the present exchange rate) at least 28,000 rupees. Our actual expenditure has exceeded fifty thousand dollars. In terms of the virtual cost, this project represents an investment of at least half a million dollars. In terms of time and effort, my wife and I have worked on it seven days a week for long hours, and three hundred and sixty five days of the year for full five years. These figures might sound very high, but, the reality is known only to Him Who knows everything. Yaḥ sarvajñaḥ sarvavit.

And as far as the Añjali is concerned, the third and last edition was published as early as 1925. It was virtually a buried treasure. A reprinter came after about sixty years and made a lot of money. He did not add anything. So that too was a lost treasure. We are happy that it is now in a much better shape in every way and will prove more attractive and useful as well as usable.

Before we take our readers through the beautiful world of the nyāyas as presented in the Añjali, we would likd to offer our prayer in the words of our own author Śrī Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna:

Stutir na syān me cen nahi bhavati me hānir iyatā
na tasyai me yasmād bhavati kṛtir asmin prakaraṇe.
Kathañcit kintvasmād bhavatu sujane kā'pyupakṛtiḥ
Purāreś ca prītir bhavatu śiśuvākyād iva pituḥ.

Veda Vedānta Mandiram
The Home of the Ratnākara
1405 St. Christopher Street
Columbia Missouri 65203
United States of America.

Murarilal Nagar
Dīpāvalī 2053 V.
October 30, 1997.

J's Bibliography

There is no consistency, no uniformity in the original listing. For example, "Appai Dikṣita" has also been listed as one compound word--Appaidikṣita! It is not surprising at all. The two parts were prepared at two different times. They were never put together until now. Here is another example: the Pandit and The Pandit. Such incongruities mar the value of such work. It seems the work was done by a beginner, or a junior janitor of the Military barracks of Colonel Jacob. This cannot be a work of an experienced scholar-bibliographer!

We have integrated two sequences into one. The original rendering of the names etc. is left as it was. Hardly any change has been made. An authentic reproduction is maintained as far as possible.

Advaitabrahmasiddhi of Sadānanda Yati; Bib. Ind., 1890.

Āgamaprāmānya of Yāmunacārya Swāmin (Rāmānuja's Paramaguru = guru's guru); Medical Hall Press, Benares 1900.

Alaṅkārasarvasva of Rājānaka Ruyyaka; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, Bombay, 1893.

Āpastamba-Grhyasūtra, with the Com. of Sudarśanārya; edited by Dr. Winternitz, Vienna, 1887.

Ātmabodha of Śaṅkarācārya, edited, with Commentary, by Fitzedward Hall; Mirzapur, 1852.

Ātmatattvaviveka of Udayana, edited by Pandit Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara; Calcutta, 1873.

Ātmatattvaviveka of Udayana, with four Commentaries; Bib. Ind., Part i, 1907.

Bhāmatī of Vācaspatimiśra; Bib. Ind., 1880.

Bhartṛhari's Śatakātraya, with Com.; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, Bombay, Śaka 1813.

Bhāṣāpariccheda, with Com.; edited by L. N. Vasāka, Calcutta, 1871.

Bhedādhikāra of Nṛsiṃhāśrama Muni; Benāres Sanskrit Series, 1904.

Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva, with the Com. of Prajñākaramati, edited by Prof. L. de la Vallee Poussin; Bib. Ind., 1901-1907.

Incomplete.

Brahmasūtrabhāṣya of Śankarācārya, with Ānandagiri's Com.; Ānandāśrama Press, 2 vols., 1890-1. Translation by Dr. G. Thibaut in Sacred Books of the East Series, 2 vols., 1890-6. A fine edition of the Bhāṣya, with the *Bhāmatī* and two other Commentaries, was issued from the Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, in one volume, in 1904.

Brahmasūtratātparyavivaraṇa, published in *The Paṇḍit* for 1882.

Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtika of Sureśvarācārya, with Ānandagiri's ṭīkā, and full index to verses; Ānandāśrama Press, 2 vols, 1892-4. This is sometimes quoted as large Vārtika.

Citsukhī of Citsukhamuni, with his own vṛtti; published in *The Paṇḍit* for 1882-3.

Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, with Abhinavagupta's ṭīkā; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1891.

Gaṇaratnamahodadhi of Vardhamāna; edited by Prof. Eggeling, 1879-81. Index much needed.

Gauḍapāda's kārikās on *Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad*; Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1890.

Haṭhayogapradīpikā of Svātmārām, with Brahmānanda's ṭīkā; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, Śaka 1811.

History of Indian Literature, by Prof. Dr. Weber; Truebner's Oriental Series, 1878.

History of Sanskrit Literature, by Prof. A. A. Macdonell, London, 1900.

Indian Thought, a quarterly Magazine edited by Dr. G. Thibaut and Prof. Gangānātha Jhā; Allahabad, 1907.

Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, with Śabara's Bhāṣya; 2 vols. Bib. Ind., 1873-89.

Jīvanmuktiviveka of Vidyāraṇya; Ānandāśrama Series, Śaka 1811.

Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1891.

Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadevabhaṭṭa; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1887.

- Translation by Prof. C. H. Tawney. 2 vols. Bib. Ind., 1880-4.
- Kāvyaḍarśa* of Daṇḍin; Bib. Ind., 1863.
- Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* of Rudraṭa, with Namisādhū's ṭīkā; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1886.
- Kāvyaḷradīpa* of Govinda, with Vaidyanātha's ṭīkā; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1891.
- Kāvyaḷprakāśa* of Mammaṭa and Allāṭa; edited by Maheśacandra Nyāyaratna, Calcutta, 1866.
- Khaṇḍanaḷkhaṇḍakhādyā* of Śriharṣa, with Śaṅkaramiśra's ṭīkā; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1888. A new edition of this work with the Com. entitled *Vidyāsāgarī*, is now appearing in the Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, edited by Prof. Gangānātha Jhā who is also issuing a translation in the new Magazine *Indian thought*.
- Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, a criticism of the above, by Vācaspati (not the celebrated philosopher, but a modern writer of about three centuries ago--so the learned Paṇḍit Govind Dās of Benares tells me); Medical Hall Press, Benares. Incomplete.
- Kiraṇāvali* of Udayana, on Prasastapāda's *Bhāṣya*; Benāres Sanskrit Series, 1885 and 1897. A mere fragment.
- Kīrtikaumudī* of Someśvaradeva, edited by Ābāḷī Viṣṇu Kāthavṭe; Bombay, 1883.
- Kusumāṅjali* of Udayana, with his own vṛtti, and two ṭīkāś, 2 vols., Bib. Ind. 1890-95. The Kārikās of the same, with Haridāsa's ṭīkā, edited and translated by Prof. Cowell; Calcutta, 1864.
- Kuvalayānanda* of Appaidikṣita, with Vaidyanātha's ṭīkā, edited by Paṇḍit J. Vidyāsāgara; Calcutta, Śaka 1796. A very faulty edition. But an excellent one of the same two works, was published at the Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, in 1903.
- Laukikanyāyaratnākara* of Raghunāthavarman; India Office MS. 582.
- Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* of Raghunāthavarman; India Office MS. 700. An inaccurate edition was published at the Medical Hall Press, Benares, in 1902.
- Madhyamakavṛtti* of Candrakīrti on Nāgārjuna's kārikās, edited by

Prof. L. de la vallee Poussin; Bibliotheca Buddhica, St. Petersburg, 1903-1907. Incomplete.

Māgha's *Śiśupālavadhā* with Mallinātha's comment, edited by Tārānātha Tarkavācaspatī; Calcutta, Śaka 1769.

MahāBhārata, 4 vols., Calcutta 1834-39. Also an oblong edition with Nīlkaṇṭha Govind's ṭīkā; Ganpat Kṛṣṇāji's Press, Bombay, Śaka 1799.

Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali, edited by Dr. Kielhorn; 3 vols., Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1880-85. A new edition is now in course of publication; and let us hope that the learned editor will add a *complete index*.

Mahābhāṣya with the *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa, and Nāgeśa's *Uddyota*; edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍit Śivadatta D. Kudāla; vol. 1 (Navāhnika); Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1908. A fine edition.

Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, in course of publication in Bib. Ind., Calcutta; Vols. i and ii; and part of iii, already issued.

Manual of Hindu Pantheism, by Colonel Jacob; Truebner's Oriental Series, 3rd edition, 1891. This edition was reprinted by the publishers, about two years ago, without the author's knowledge, and therefore without the revision necessary to bring it up to date.

Manusmṛti with 7 commentaries; edited by Rāo Sāhib V. N. Maṇḍlik, Bombay, 1886.

Medinī, a dictionary of homonymous words, edited by Somanāth Mukhopādhyāya; Calcutta, 1869.

Molesworth's *Marāṭhi-English Dictionary*; 2nd edition, Bombay, 1857.

Mṛcchakaṭīkanāṭaka, edited by N. B. Goḍbole; Bombay, 1896. Translation by Dr. Ryder; Harvard Oriental Series, 1905.

Mudrārākṣasanāṭaka with Dhunḍhirāja's ṭīkā, edited by K. T. Telang, Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1884.

Naiṣkarmyasiddhi of Someśvara, with the comment of Jñānottama; edited by Colonel Jacob, 2nd edition, Bombay, 1906.

Nītisāra of Kāmandaki, with ṭīkā; Bib. Ind., 1884.

Nītiśataka of Bhartṛhari; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, Bombay, Saṃvat 1947.

Nyāyadīpāvali of Ānandabodhācārya, published together with *Nyāyamaakaranda* in Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1907.

Nyāyakandalī of Śrīdhara, with the text of Praśastapāda's *Vaiśeṣika-bhāṣya*; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1895. It is a lamentable thing that this fine series has come to a premature end. A translation of both works is now appearing in *The Paṇḍit*.

Nyāyakaṇikā, a commentary by Vācaspatimiśra pm Maṇḍanamiśra's *Vidhiviveka*, with which it is now being published in the Paṇḍit.

Nyāyamakaranda of Ānandabodha, with comment by Citsukha Muni; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares. Incomplete.

Nyāyamālāvistara of Mādhavācārya; Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 1892.

Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1895.

Nyāyamañjarīsāra, a commentary on *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī*; *The Paṇḍit*, 1907.

Nyāyasiddhāñjana of Venkaṇṭanātha (of Rāmānuja's School); Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1901.

Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa of Śeṣadharācārya, with comment of Śeṣānanta; in course of publication in *The Paṇḍit*.

Nyāyavārtika of Uddyotakāra; Bib. Ind., 1907. The first fasciculus was issued in 1887; the title page, this year!

Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭikā of Vācaspatimiśra; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1895. Often quoted as *Tātparyaṭikā*. When are we going to have an edition of Udayana's *Pariśuddhi*?

Padamañjarī, a Commentary on *Kāśikāvṛtti*; Published in *The Paṇḍit*, 2 vols.

Pañcadaśī of Vidyāraṇya, with Rāmakṛṣṇa's comment; edited by Paṇḍit J. Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1882.

Pañcapādikā of Padmapāda; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1891. Said to be the oldest comment on Śankara's bhāṣya (sūtras 1-4 only).

A translation of the first 14 pages of this work, by Mr. Arthur Venis, was published in *The Paṇḍit*, but then, alas! it ceased.

Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa of Prakāśātma Yati; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, Saṃvat, 1948.

Pañcatantra, edited by Professors Buehler and Kielhorn; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1385.

Paramārthasāra of Śeṣa; Lucknow, 1876.

Paribhāṣenduśekhara, Text and translation; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1868-74.

Pariśiṣṭaparvan of Hemacandra, edited by Prof. H. Jacobi; Bib. Ind., 1891.

Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅga; Bombay, 1888. Translation by Mr. C. H. Tawney; Bib. Ind., 1901.

Practical Sanskrit Dictionary by V. S. Āpṭe; Poona, 1890.

Pramāṇamālā of Ānandabodhācārya, published with *Nyāyadīpāvali* as above.

Prasannarāghava Nāṭaka of Jayadeva; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1893.

Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa, edited by Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892-96.

Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 2 vols., 1888.

Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannāth Paṇḍit, with Nageśa Bhaṭṭa's ṭīkā; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1888.

Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems, by N. Śāstrī Gore, translated from the Hindi by Dr. Fitzedward Hall; Calcutta, 1862.

Ṣaddarśanacintanikā of Mahādeo Moreśwar Kunte, in Sanskrit, Marāṭhi and English; Poona, 1877-82. Incomplete.

Ṣaddarśanasamuccaya of Haribhadrasūri, with the comment of Maṇibhadra; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1905. About half of the chapter on Jainism is found, word for word, in the *Syādvādamañjari*! Which was the plagiarist, this man or Malliseṇa?

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha Kavirāja, edited by Dr. Roer; Bib. Ind., 1851. Translation by Dr. Ballantyne and Mr. Pramadādāsa Mītra; Bib. Ind. 1875.

Śālikā, or Prakaraṇapañcikā, a treatise on Mīmāṃsā according to the school of Prabhākara, by Śālikanātha; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, 1903. Originally published in *The Paṇḍit*, 1866-7. Portions of the work are missing.

Sambandhavārtika of Sureśvarācārya, translated by S. Venkaṭaramaṇa Aiyar, B. A.; Medical Hall Press, 1905.

Śāṅkaravijaya of Ānandagiri; Bib. Ind., 1868.

Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti of Aniruddha, with Extracts from Vedantin Mahādeva's Commentary, edited and translated by Dr. R. Garbe; Bib. Ind., 1888 and 1892.

Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī of Vācaspatimiśra, edited by Paṇḍit Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati; Calcutta, 1871.

Sāṅkṣepaśārīraka of Sarvajñātma Muni; *The Paṇḍit*, vols., IV-X. New Series.

Saptapadārthī of Śivāditya, with comment by Mādhava Sarasvatī; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1893.

Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha of Mādhava; Bib. Ind., 1858. An edition by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1871. Translation by Professors Cowell and Gough, in Truebner's Oriental Series, 1882. This, too, was reprinted by the publishers, without the much-needed revision. An edition of the Text, with an additional chapter on Śankara's system, and the text of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's *Prasthānabheda*, was published at the Ānandāśrama Press in 1906.

Sarvārthasiddhi, Venkaṭanātha's vṛtti on his own work *Tattva-muktākalāpa*.

Śāstradīpikā of Pārthasārathi Miśra; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1891.

Satyavrata Sāmaśrami's *Nyāyāvalī*; Calcutta, 1875.

Siddhāntaleśa of Appaidīkṣita; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1890.

A translation by Mr. Arthur Venis is being published in *The Paṇḍit*. So far, it extends to page 47 only of the text. I hope my learned friend will carry this on to completion; for his renderings and critical notes are always of the highest value.

Ślokavārtika of Kumārila, with Pārthasārathi's ṭīkā; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1898. Translation by Prof. Gangānātha Jhā; Bib. Ind., 1907.

Śribhāṣya of Rāmānuja, with Sudarśanācārya's ṭīkā, reprinted from *The Paṇḍit*, 3 vols. 1889-91. An edition of the text only, edited by Rev. J. J. Johnson of Benares, is now nearing completion in *The Paṇḍit*. Translation by Dr. G. Thibaut in the Sacred Books of the East Series, 1904.

Syādvādamañjarī, a Commentary by Malliṣeṇa on Hemacandra's verses entitled *Vītarāgastuti*; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1900. This work is wrongly described by Rājendralāl Mitra, in his *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.* vol. iv, page 87, as "A Commentary *in verse*," and ascribed to Gaganadinamañī. See the remarks, above, on *ṣaḍ-darśanasamuccaya*.

Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtika of Sureśvarācārya, with Ānanda jñāna's ṭīkā; Ānandāśrama Press, Śaka 1811.

Tantravārtika of Kumārila; Benāres Sanskrit Series, 1903. Prof. Gangānātha Jhā is bringing out a translation of this important work in the Bib. Ind. Series. He has already, through the same channel, published a complete translation of the first volume of Kumārila's work, *The Ślokavārtika*.

Tarkabhāṣā of Keśava Miśra with the ṭīkā entitled *Nyāyapradīpa* of Viśvakarman; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1901.

Tārkkarakṣā of Varadarāja, with the Commentary (in part) of Mallinātha; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1903.

Tattvabindu, a treatise on Mīmāṃsā, by Vācaspati Miśra; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1892.

Tattvadīpana of Akhaṇḍānanda Muni, a commentary on *Pancapādikā-vivaraṇa*; Benāres Sanskrit Series, 1902.

Tattvamuktākalāpa of Venkaṭanātha, with his own comment; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1900. In the *Sarvadarśanasan̄graha* it is

quoted as *Tattvamuktāvali*.

Udānam, a Buddhist work, published by Pāli Text Society, 1885.

Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā of Siddharṣi, edited by Profs. Peterson and Jacobi; Bib. Ind. 1899-1907. Incomplete.

Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkarācārya, with Rāmatīrtha's ṭīkā; edited by Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī Navare, Bombay, 1886.

Vācaspatyam, a Sanskrit Lexicon, of 5442 pages, by Paṇḍit Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati, Calcutta. It is very full up to the end of "Pa" (page 4550), whilst the rest of the alphabet is squeezed into 900 pages! It is said that the Bengal Govt. which largely subsidized the undertaking, ordered it to be curtailed. If that is so, it did a very unwise thing ! We ought to store up the knowledge of these old Paṇḍits who are fast dying out!

Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā on the Vedāntasūtras; Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1891.

Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, kāṇḍas i and ii, Benāres Sanskrit Series, 1887. An edition of kāṇḍa iii, otherwise styled *Prakīrṇaka*, has been commenced in the same Series.

Vedāntakalpataru of Amalānanda, a commentary on the *Bhāmati*; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1895-7.

Vedāntakalpataruparimala of Appaidikṣita; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1895-8. Sometimes quoted as *Parimala*.

Vedāntaparibhāṣā, with the *Śikhāmaṇi* and the ṭīkā of Amaradāsa; Venkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay, 1901. Translation of the *Paribhāṣā* by Mr. A. Venis in *The Paṇḍit*, 1882-85.

Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda, with the commentaries of Nṛsimhasarasvatī and Rāmatīrtha; edited by Colonel Jacob, and published at Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1894. For the translation of the same, see *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*.

Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvali of Prakāśānanda, edited and translated by Prof. Arthur Venis; Benares, 1890.

Vidhīrasāyaṇa, a work on Mimāṃsā, by Appai Dikṣita; Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series, 1901.

Vidvanmaṇḍana of Viṭṭhala Upāddhyāya, edited by Ratnagopāla; Victoria Press, Benares, 1904. In Hall's *Index* this is described as "Strictures on the expositions of several expositors of the Vedānta doctrine." It ascribes to the same author a work entitled *Bhakti-hetunirṇaya*.

Viṣṇu Purāṇa, with Śrīratnagarbha Bhaṭṭa's *Candrikā* entitled Vaiṣṇavākūta; Kṛṣṇa Śāstri Gurjara's Press, Bombay.

Vivaraṇaprameyasaṅgraha of Vidyāraṇya; Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, 1893. A translation by Dr. Thibaut is now appearing in the new Review, *Indian Thought*.

Yaśastilaka of Somadeva, with Śrīśrutasāgara's ṭīkā; Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 2 vols. 1901-3.

Yogasūtra with Vyāsa's bhāṣya and Vācaspatimiśra's ṭīkā, edited by Rājārām Śāstri Boḍas; Bombay Sanskrit Series, 1892.

Yogavārtika of Vijñāna Bhikṣu; Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1884.

Yogavāsiṣṭha with the Commentary of Ānandabodhendra Saraswati; Gaṇapat Kṛṣṇāji's press, Bombay. This ought to be printed in modern style. The huge oblong tomes are most difficult to handle.¹

¹ This note is outdated. Several new eds. have come out since Jacob wrote the comment.

Laukikanyāyāñjali

001

Akāle kṛtam akṛtam syāt.

A thing done at a wrong time [might as well be left undone, for it] would be regarded as not done. It occurs in the following passage of Mādhava's *Nyāyamālāvistara* 10. 1. 1:

"Kiṃ caturdhākaraṇād ūrdhvam āvāhyate, kiṃvā prayājebhyaḥ purā. Nādyah. Akāle kṛtam akṛtam syād iti nyāyenāvāhanasya nirarthakatvāt."

Again, in Śabara on Jaimini 6. 2. 25, with reference to the times prescribed for the Agnihotra, and New and Full Moon sacrifices, we read, "Tasmād anyeṣu kāleṣu avihitatvāt kṛtam apyakṛtam syāt."

Compare the following which is quoted on page 284 of *Nyāyakandalī*:

"Svakāle yad akurvams tat karotyanyad acetanaḥ.
Pratyavāyo'sya tenaiva nābhāvena sa janyate."

And somewhat similarly we have Patañjali 1. 2. 64 (vārt. 43):

"Aśāstroke kriyamāṇe viguṇaṃ karma bhavati, viguṇe ca karmaṇi phalānavāptiḥ."

ED. NOTE: Shall we read: Aśāstroke kāle kriyamāṇe ? Cf. Hindi: Kā barkhā puni kṛṣī sukhāne. This is the first nyāya of the Third Handful. It had to wait so long to get into the hands of the readers!

002

Akṣipātranyāyah.

The simile of *the eyeball*. An illustration of *extreme sensitiveness* in persons or things. The following from *Yogabhāṣya* ii. 15 (page 78) is an example of its application to a person:

"Evam idam anādiduḥkhasroto viprasṛtaṃ yoginam eva pratikūlātmakatvād udveja-yati. Kasmāt. Akṣipātrakalpo hi vidvān iti. Yathorṇātantur akṣipātre nyastaḥ sparśena duḥkhayati na cānyeṣu gātrāvayaveṣvevam etāni duḥkhānyakṣipātrakalpaṃ yoginam eva kliśnanti netaraṃ pratipattāram."

This is very well put, also, in the *Maṇīprabhā* on the same sūtra. See, too, *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 442, line 8. It looks as if this nyāya, like many others found in orthodox works, came from a Buddhist source. Prof. L. de la Vallee Poussin has kindly pointed out the following verses on page 476 of the *Madhyamakavṛtti*:

"Ūṇāpakṣma yathaiva hi
karatalasaṃsthaṃ na vedyate puṃbhiḥ.
Akṣigataṃ tu tadeva hi
janayatyaratim ca pīḍāṃ ca.

Karatalasadṛśo bālo
na veti saṃsāraduḥkhatāpakṣma.
Akṣisadṛśas tu vidvān
tenaivodvejate gāḍham."

The word *akṣipātra* is not in any of our dictionaries. In the *Yogavārtika* it is defined thus: "Akṣṇaḥ pātreṇādhāreṇa golakena tulyo vidvān iti."

ED. NOTE: Jacob says: The word *akṣipātra* not yet in any dictionary. *An encyclopaedic dictionary of Sanskrit on historical principles* (1976-), prepared and published by the Deccan College, Poona has a great deal of information on this word. It does have: *Yathorṇātantur akṣipātre nyastaḥ sparśena duḥkhatayati.*

The reprint reads *vidyate* for *vedyate* and *saṃskāra* for *saṃsāra*. Very sad. An easy way to make a lot of money! Minimum investment, maximum profit, is the motto of such reprinters. And yet they are still flourishing!

They could have given an "errata." But they were not interested in helping the readers or improving the work. They were just interested in profit-making in an unjust manner. They did not want to wait long. They had to release the reprint instantaneously.

003

Agnihotranyāyaḥ.

The rule as to *the Agnihotra sacrifice* [consisting of morning and evening libations]. It forms the subject of *Jaimini* 6. 2. 23-26, where the injunction, "yāvajjīvam agnihotraṃ juhōti," is discussed. The interpretation put upon these words by the *pūrvapakṣin* is that the householder is to do nothing else but offer the *Agnihotra* during his whole life! *Kunte* thus summarizes his argument: "From the time of the establishment of a sacred fire to the time of death, the *Agnihotra* is to be performed continuously, without the remission of a moment. This is the duty of an *Ārya*. He cannot rest for a moment. The *Agnihotra* is not a constituent part of any other sacrifice. It is an independent sacrifice by itself. It therefore accomplishes the purpose of a person; and must therefore be unremittingly

adhered to; and it does not matter if, in performing a principal act, minor acts are neglected. It is therefore reasonable to perform the Agnihotra-sacrifice alone continuously for life." The reply to all this is that the meaning of the *vidhi* is simply that it is to be offered every morning at daybreak, and every evening, according to the injunction, "pradoṣam agnihotraṃ hotavyaṃ vyuṣṭāyāṃ prātaḥ." For a description of the Agnihotra, see *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, Kāṇḍa 2, Adhyāyas 3 and 4; also a very useful excursus of Kunte's on pages 410-420 of his *Ṣaḍdarśanacintanikā. Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 4. 32 shows how Vedantists apply the injunction relating to the Agnihotra.

ED. NOTE: Jacob has condemned many nyāyas discussed by Raghunāthta Varmā, alleging that they have no practical value. We would like to know what "practical value" the Colonel attached to this very specialized, technical nyāya.

004

Aṅgulidīpikayā dhvāntadhvaṃsavidhiḥ.

Attempting to dispel the darkness with a lamp no bigger than your finger! Endeavouring to bring about a great result by the use of manifestly inadequate means. It occurs in the following passage of *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 52:

"Na cāsmākam iva tavāpyatra mūkataiva śaraṇaṃ. Sarvathā vacanavirodhe hyudāsīnasya sā śobhate. Na cātra vidhau virodhaḥ kaścit. Na ca tvam udāsīnaḥ, prajoyane pravṛttatvāt. Tasmād alam aṅgulidīpikayā dhvāntadhvaṃsavidhim anuṣṭhāya."

I am indebted to Mr. Arthur Venis for an explanation of this nyāya.

ED. NOTE: A noteworthy statement. All such statements should be collected and brought together. Jacob is indebted to many scholars for the collection and interpretation of the nyāyas.

Aṅgulidīpikā needs a better explanation.

005

Aṅgulyagraṃ na tenaivāṅgulyagreṇa sprśyate.

The tip of a finger cannot be touched by itself. Akin to the sayings, "A man cannot mount on his own shoulder," and "The edge of a sword cannot cut itself." It occurs in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭikā* page 466, line 10 from bottom:

"Yathāṅgulyagraṃ na tenaivāṅgulyagreṇa sprśyata, evaṃ jñānaṃ na tenaiva jñānena grahītuṃ śakyate."

Then in *Madhyamakavritti*, page 62, we have the double simile:

"Yathāpi nāma tayaivāsīdhārayā saivāsīdhārā na śakyate chettum, na tenai-
vāṅgulyagreṇa tad evāṅgulyagraṃ śakyate spraṣṭum, evaṃ eva na tenaiva tad eva
cittam śakyam draṣṭum."

We meet with it again in Pārthasārathi's comment on the Śūnyavāda section of the
Ślokavārtika (page 288):

"Na hi pākaḥ pacyate, chidā vā chidyate. Nāpi karaṇakarmatvaṃ kartṛkarmatvaṃ
vā ekasya sambhavati. Na hyaṅgulyagreṇaivāṅgulyagraṃ spr̥śyate, nāpyaṅgulyagram
ātmānaṃ spr̥śati. Tenāsāṃ vidhānāṃ dṛṣṭānte kvacid apyadarśanājñāne'pi nāsti sam-
bhavaḥ."

I do not understand the double statement here about the finger-tip. Pārthasārathi could
not mean that the tip of one finger cannot be touched by the tip of another finger! The
second part of the statement looks like a marginal gloss which has gotten into the text.

The following verse is found in *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, page 63, and in *Nyāyakaṇikā*, page
268:

"Aṅgulyagraṃ yathātmānaṃ nātmanā spraṣṭum arhati.
Svāmśena jñānam apyevaṃ nātmānaṃ jñātum arhati."

See also *Nyāyamakaranda*, pages 131, 183; *Śrībhāṣya*, page 169; and *Sarvārtha-
siddhi*, page 391.

ED. NOTE: This is a "See Also" statement. Jacob reads *tasyaivāsīdhārayā*. We have
changed it to *tayaivāsīdhārayā*.

Simple day-to-day phenomena of this phenominal world are used to propound funda-
mental philosophical systems.

006

Aṅgulyagre hastiyūthaśatam āste.

There are a hundred herds of elephants on the tip of my finger! This illustration of an
absurdity occurs frequently. In *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 232 g, we read:

"Atra kecic codayanti. Vyartho'yaṃ vyutpattinirūpaṇaprayāsaḥ. Śabdasyāsthā-
samsparsītvāt. Na hyaṅgulyagre hastiyūthaśatam āsta ityādisabdaiḥ kaścid arthaḥ
pramīyate. Yatrāptavākye pramīyate tatrāpi mānāntaranibandhanā sā pramītir, na
śabdanibandhanā iti."

Then, in *Citsukhī* ii. 32:

"Āptodīritavākyeṣu Mālatīmādhavādiṣu.
Vyabhicārān na tad yuktam āptatvasyāniruktitaḥ.

"Svakapolakalpitamālatīmādhavādivākyeṣu prāmāṇyābhāvād ativyāptiḥ. Na hi purāpta eva san nātakanāṭikādiprabandhaviracanamātreṇānāpto bhavati Bhavabhūtiḥ. Uktam caitad Umbakena--'Yadāpto'pi kasmaicid upadiśati -- na tvayānanubhūtārtha- viṣayaṃ vākyam prayoktavyam, yathāṅgulyagre hastiyūthaśatamāsta iti,' tatrārtha- vyabhicāraḥ sphuṭaḥ."

Compare Śālikā page 13, verse 4.

In the commentary on *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 104, the saying is modified to "Āṅgulyagre kariśataṃ viharati," and another of a like kind is added, namely "Mama kaṇakuharam praviśya siṃhaḥ kṛḍati;" and in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 65, Udayana gives us "Mama kaṇe praviśya gajo garjati bheṣajam ucyatām." The Umbaka quoted above is perhaps the Umbeka* referred to by Hall (on page 166 of his *Index*) as an authority on Mīmāṃsā. In the *Catalogus Catalogorum*, the latter is identified with Maṇḍanamiśra, which is one of the names by which Sureśvarācārya is known.

*Hall found this name (together with those of Prabhākara, Vāmana and Revaṇa) in a verse of the *vṛtti* by Chāritra Sinha Gaṇi on the *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*. What is manifestly the same verse is found also in the *vṛtti* ascribed to Maṇibhadra, but there the name Utpala is substituted for Umbeka. The verse is as follows:

"Utpalaḥ kārikāṃ vetti tantraṃ vetti Prabhākaraḥ.
Vāmanas tūbhayaṃ vetti na kiñcid api Revaṇaḥ."

From the fact that all the other authors and works mentioned in Gaṇi's *vṛtti* are found in the latter also, I am inclined to think that the two are identical.

007

Ajākṛpāṇīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the she-goat and the sword*. It is founded on some story of a goat's being suddenly killed by accidental contact with a sword, and is used to illustrate any surprising event happening altogether by chance. It, therefore, belongs to the same class as *kāka-tālīya*, *khalvāṭabilvīya* and others of a similar kind. An excellent illustration of its use is found on page 229 of Śrīharsha's *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*:

"Pāṇau pañca varātakān pidhāya kaścit pṛcchati kati varātakā iti. Pṛṣṭaś cājā-kṛpāṇīyanyāyena bravīti pañceti."

In a footnote, the maxim is thus explained:

"Kaṇḍūyanārthaṃ stambhādau śīthilabandhakhadḡe chāgī grīvāṃ prasārayati yadṛcchayā ca grīvā chidyate tathābhūto'jākṛpāṇīyanyāyaḥ kākatālīyanyāyasamaḥ."

Vardhamāna puts it differently in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196:

"Yathā'jayā bhūmiṃ khaṇantya'tmavadhāya kṛpāṇo darśitas tattulyaṃ vṛttaṃ kenacid ātmavināśāya kṛtam ajākṛpāṇīyam."

For another variety, see *Padamañjarī* on *Kāśikā* 5. 3. 106.

The nyāya with the same illustration is found also in the *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, page 52; and the illustration, *without* the nyāya, in *Siddhāntaleśa*, page 95. Then on page 96, it is again referred to in the expression,

"Kākatālīyasamvādivarātakasamkhyāviśeṣāhāryajñānavat."

It is interesting to note that the Marāṭhī-speaking folk of western India have adopted the maxim, but with a changed meaning. Molesworth defines it as, "The maxim of the sword upon the neck of the goat. Expressive of meekness and absolute helplessness."

008

Ajātaputranāmotkīrtananyāyaḥ.

Proclaiming the name of a son before he is born. That is, counting your chickens before they are hatched. The nyāya, in negative form, is found in the *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 345:

"Yaścāsau vyāpāraḥ kṛiyate cābhidhīyate ca sa kiṃ pūrvam abhidhīyate tataḥ kṛiyate, pūrvam vā kṛiyate paścād abhidhīyate, yugapad eva vāsya karaṇābhidhāne iti. Na tāvat pūrvam abhidhīyate'nutpannasyābhidhānānupapatteḥ. Na hyajāte putre nāmadheyakaraṇam."

009

Aṇurapi viśeṣo'dhyavasāyakaraḥ.

Even a slight difference [between two or more things or expressions] *establishes the fact* [that they do differ and enables us to discriminate between them]. After explaining the Puṣṭalaguḍanyāya and nine others of similar purport, Raghunātha says:

"Puṣṭalaguḍanyāyād ārabhyaitatparyantānām nyāyānām sām̐ye'pi, yatkiñcidviśeṣam ādāyānurapi viśeṣo'dhyavasāyakara iti nyāyena bhedasiddhir bhinnodāharaṇatvasiddhiśca keṣāñcid iti bodhyam."

The nyāya occurs in Mathurānātha's commentary on the opening paragraph of *Ātmattvaviveka* (page 19), where, after stating that according to the Buddhists, mokṣa is brought about by the knowing of the non-existence of soul, he says:

"Taduktam --

Nairātmyadṛṣṭim mokṣasya hetum kecana manvate.
Ātmatattvadhiyam tvanye nyāyatattvānusāriṇaḥ. Iti.

"Na ca tatra nairātmyadṛṣṭipadam śarīrātmabhinnatattvajñānaparam iti vācyam. Nirāḥ saṃsargābhāvabodhakatayā tādṛśajñānasya tadarthatvāsambhavāt. Nyāyamate ca mokṣāśrayamukhyaviśeṣyakatayā anurapi viśeṣo'dhyavasāyakara iti nyāyenātmaviśeṣyakaśarīrādibhinnatvajñānasyaiva mokṣahetutvād iti dhyeyam."

010

Atyantaparājayād varam saṃśayo'pi.

Better even a doubtful condition of things than a crushing defeat. This occurs in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā* 5. 1. 43. (page 491):

"Yadi tvasya kadācit samyaksādhanavādinō'pi pratibhākṣayāt samādhānam na sphurati tato'tyantaparājayād varam saṃśayo'pīti nyāyena samādhānābhāsenāpi pratyavastheyam evetyāśayavān āha teṣām sādhasādhutāyām iti."

On page 473 of the same, and in *Nyāyamañjarī* page 620, it appears as ekāntaparājayād varam sandehaḥ. It is not in any of the lists of nyāyas to which I have had access, but Raghunāthavarman has two of the same purport, namely "māraṇāya grhīto'ngacchedam svīkaroti" (shown in its proper place) and "maraṇād varam vyādhiḥ"; and in *Nyāyamālāvīstara* 6. 2. 7., Mādhava gives us "pradhānalopād varam aṅgalopaḥ." All of these seem akin to our "Half a loaf is better than no bread."

ED. NOTE: A comparison showing the universal nature and common basis of these nyāyas-of the people, by the people and for the people. .

011

Atyantabalavanto'pi pauraajānapadā janāḥ.
Durablair api bādhyante puruṣaiḥ pārthivāśritaiḥ.

Even very powerful men from town and country are held in check by weaker men who have the king's support. This verse from the *Tantravārtika* (page 863), found also as a quotation in *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa* page 35, is thus applied by Raghunātha:

"Yatra nirbalenāpi prabalahāyena prabalo bādhyate tatra

'Atyantabalavanto'pi pauraajānapadā janāḥ.
Durbalairapi bādhyante puruṣaiḥ pārvivāśritaiḥ.'

iti nyāyo'vatarati. Spāṣṭārtho'yam. Udāharaṇam tu śrutyapekṣayā durbalāyā api smṛter ācamanarūpaprabalapadārthāśritatvena prābalyam. Ataḥ śrautakramatyāgena vedakaraṇānantaram kṣute ācamanam eva kāryam iti dik."

We may compare with this the following from Sureśvara's large vārtika, page 753:

"Āśaṃsate balīyāṃsam abalīyān api svayam.
Dharmaṃ balaṃ samāśritya jetuṃ loke tathā yathā.

Rājñā balenālpabalo balīyāṃsam kuṭumbinam.
Jetuṃ āśaṃsate tasmād dharmāḥ syād balavattamaḥ."

012

Aditsor vaṇijaḥ pratidinam patralikhitaśvasthanadinabhaṇananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the merchant who was unwilling to give, and who wrote every day saying that he would give on the morrow!* It occurs in the following passage of Malliṣeṇa's *Syādvādamañjarī* (page 128):

"Saugatāḥ kilettham pramāṇayanti -- sarvaṃ sat kṣaṇikaṃ yataḥ sarvaṃ tāvad ghatādikaṃ vastu mudgarasannidhau nāśaṃ gacchad dṛśyate. Tatra yena svarupe-
nāntyāvasthāyāṃ ghatādikaṃ vinaśyati taccaitatsvarūpam utpannamātrasya vidyate.
Tadānīm utpādānantaram eva tena naṣṭavyam iti vyaktam asya kṣaṇikatvam. Athe-
dṛśa eva svabhāvas tasya hetuto jāto yat kiyantam api kālaṃ sthitvā vinaśyati. Evaṃ
tarhi mudgarādisannidhānēpi eṣa eva tasya svabhāva iti punarapyanena tāvantam eva
kālaṃ sthātavyam iti naivaṃ vinaśyed iti so'yamaditsorvaṇijaḥ pratidinam patra-
likhitaśvasthanadinabhaṇananyāyaḥ."

Those who, in an Indian cantonment, have ever undertaken the thankless task of the collection of *promised* subscriptions to a fund are very familiar with the "*kal āo*" or "*parsoñ ke din āo*" with which their messenger is often greeted, with perhaps stronger language superadded! Human nature is much the same everywhere. Compare *Proverbs* iii. 28.

ED. NOTE: Note the translation of bhaṇana into "wrote." Bhaṇana does not mean writing as the Colonel would want us to believe. He (the aditsu vaṇik) cites every day the "following day" as recorded in the deed (letter of promised giving). That is the idea. Here also is a comparative study. This is an example of what contribution we have made.

013

Adhikaraṇasiddhāntanyāya.

A truth or conclusion which implies another truth or conclusion.

This is the third of four kinds of siddhānta defined in *Nyāyasūtras 1.1.28-31*, the others being (1) Sarvatantrasiddhānta, (2) Pratitantrasiddhānta, and (4) Abhyupagama-siddhānta. Ballantyne's rendering of the four is (1) a dogma of all the schools, (2) a dogma peculiar to some school, (3) a hypothetical dogma and (4) a dogmatic corollary. In *Tārkikarakṣā 1. 29* (page 126) we have the following description of *manas*:

"Yugapajjñānānutpattir manaso liṅgam iti. Evam cānutayaiva manasaḥ siddhiḥ. Anyathā yugapad anekendriyādhiṣṭhānād yugapaj jñānodayaprasaṅgāt." On this, Mallinātha comments thus: "Evam ceti. Jagatkartuḥ sarvajñatvādivan manaso-ṅutvam adhikaraṇasiddhāntanyāyād dharmigrāhakād eva siddham ityārthaḥ."

There is another example in *Ātmatattvaviviveka*, page 83, line 9; and a third in Yāmunā-cārya's *Āgamaprāmānya*, page 17, line 1.

For an example of three other kinds of siddhānta, see *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, p. 36, lines 16-27.

ED. NOTE: Several examples are presented here.

014

Adhikāraṇyāyaḥ.

The rule regarding *the qualifications* [required of a sacrificer]. Jaimini 6. 1. 1-3 deals with part of this. The decision is that he must be desirous of heaven, according to the Vidhis "Darśapūrṇamāsābhyāṃ svargakāmo yajeta," "Jyotiṣṭomena svargakāmo yajeta." The principal thing here is the desire for heaven, whilst the sacrificial act is subordinate. The remainder of the pāda deals with the physical and social fitness demanded. See under *Ākhyātānām arthaṃ bruvatām &c.* For a full description of the four kinds of injunction, of which *adhikāraṇyāyā* is the third, see Laugākṣibhāskara's *Arthasaṅgraha*, page 4, with Dr. Thibaut's translation, page 7 &c.

ED. NOTE: Here is a recommendation for further study.

015

Adhyāropāpavādanyāyaḥ.

The method of *illusory attribution followed by its withdrawal*. This nyāya belongs entirely to the Vedāntists, but I follow Raghunātha in admitting it here. The two terms are explained as follows in the *Vedāntasāra*: "Illusory attribution is the attributing to the real of that which is unreal; as a snake is imagined in a rope which is not a snake." "The withdrawal is the assertion that the whole of the unreal, beginning with Ignorance, which is an illusory effect of the Real, is nothing but the Real; just as a snake, which is the illusory effect of a rope, is nothing whatsoever but the rope." This rendering is from my *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*, page 44 and 83. On page 42, there is the following note which includes a quotation from page 209 of that valuable book, *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems*:

"12. *Illusory attribution &c.* (adhyāropāpavāda). In order to describe the pure abstraction Brahma, the teacher attributes to him, or superimposes on him, certain qualities which in reality do not belong to him, and then afterwards withdrawing them, teaches that the residuum is the undifferenced Absolute. When the Vedāntins speak of the origin of the world, they do not believe its origin to be true. This mode of expression they call false imputation (adhyāropa). It consists in holding for true that which is false, in accommodation to the intelligence of the uninitiated. At a further stage of instruction, when the time has arrived for propounding the esoteric view, the false imputation is gain-said, and this gain-saying is termed rescission (apavāda)."

See also a long note on page 172 of the text of the *Vedāntasāra*. The verse in the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, there referred to, should be 140 instead of 170.

ED. NOTE: Jacob has great regard, respect and reverence for *A rational refutation of Hindu philosophical systems*. Is this because it is a REFUTATION of what he does not like?

016

Anadhīte mahābhāṣye vyarthā syāt Padamañjarī.

Adhīte'pi mahābhāṣye vyarthā sā Padamañjarī.

The Padamañjarī would be of no use to one who had not read the Mahābhāṣya, and would be equally useless [because unnecessary] if the latter had been read! This saying is used by Raghunātha to illustrate the position of the Gāṇapatās, who regard the worship of Gaṇapati as essential and all-inclusive. A portion of the argument is as follows:

"Ataḥ śreyahkāmaiḥ sarvair api sa evārādhyah. Tatpūjāṃ vinā'nyapūjāyā vaiyarthyasmarāṇena, phalajanakatvāyogāt. Avaśyāpekṣitānapekṣitayor apekṣitam smaraṇīyam iti nyāyena kṛtākṛtaprasaṅgī yo vidhiḥ sa nitya iti nyāyena ca tadā-rādhanasyāvaśyakatvāt. Kṛte ca tasmin

Vidyārthī labhate vidyāṃ dhanārthī labhate dhanam.
Putrārthī labhate putrān mokṣārthī paramaṃ padam.

ityādivacanebhyaḥ sarveṣṭalābhasaṃbhavena

Anadhīte Mahābhāṣye vyarthā syāt Padamañjarī.
Adhīte'pi Mahābhāṣye vyarthā sā Padamañjarī.

iti nyāyenānyārādhanē prayojanābhāvāt."

The second nyāya quoted here is a slight modification of Nāgojī's *Paribhāṣā* xlii, "Kṛtākṛtaprasaṅgī nityaṃ, tadviparītam anityaṃ." In the Preface to vol. 2 of his edition of the *Mahābhāṣya*, Dr. Kielhorn, referring to the above dictum of the Paṇḍits, says, "Whatever truth there be in this remark, I can say for myself that I have been much assisted by Haradatta's learned work, even though it is based to a great extent on the *Mahābhāṣya* itself and on Kaiyaṭa's commentary"; and he points out that, though the *Padamañjarī* is primarily a commentary on the *Kāśikā*, its author discusses often, at great length, most of the arguments advanced in the *Mahābhāṣya*. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa has several verses of the same type as that regarding the *Padamañjarī*. They will be found on pages 29, 39, 55, 61, 182, 447 and 448 of his *Nyāyamañjarī*. I quote that on page 182 as a sample:

"Kāryaṃ ced avagamyeta kiṃ kāraṇaparīkṣayā.
Kāryaṃ cen nāvagamyeta kiṃ kāraṇaparīkṣayā."

ED. NOTE: Smaraṇīyam is better.

Even Añjali has helped in the correction of the *Durbhagākṛtir durbhagākṛtiḥ*. Here Jacob's text reads sā in the second line. Our R text even today (January 1997) reads syāt also in the second line. This is pitiable. This is a contribution of the defective edition of Darbhāṅga. That has been our greatest cause of suffering in this total operation of the work on the *Ratnākara*.

017

Anantarasya vidhir vā bhavati pratiṣedho vā.

[A rule containing] *an injunction or a prohibition* [enjoins or forbids only] *that which is nearest* [to it in some other rule]. Here is one of Raghunātha's grammatical nyāyas,

included in both of his works. My translation is based on that of Dr. Kielhorn in his well-known edition and translation of the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, where it appears as Paribhāṣā LXI. Nāgojī-Bhaṭṭa took it, of course, from the *Mahābhāṣya*, and I have noted the following ten instances of its occurrence: 1. 1. 43 (vārt. 3); 1. 2. 48 (vārt. 7); 1. 3. 12 (vārt. 7); 1. 3. 14 (vārt. 3); 1. 3. 58 (vārt. 3); 1. 4. 17; 3. 1. 67 (vārt. 5); 7. 1. 21 (vārt. 1); 7. 2. 3 (vārt. 2); and 7. 3. 85 (vārt. 4).

ED. NOTE: A large number of additional references are given here.

018

Ananyalabhyaḥ śabdārthaḥ.

The meaning of a word is that which cannot be known from any other source [such as implication &c.]. This is Mr. Venis' rendering (in the Paṇḍit, vol. vi, page 97) of the maxim in the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (chap. iv., page 280). It occurs in *Tantravārtika* (page 340) in a more extended form, namely "Yāvāneva hi ananyalabhyo'rthaḥ śabdād gamyate sa sarvaḥ śabdārthaḥ."

Prof. Gangānātha Jhā (on page 474, line 10 of his translation) translates thus: "In the case of any word, all that is not cognizable by means of any other word is held to be the meaning of that word." This, however, seems to overlook the word(s) "śabdād gamyate." The nyāya is found in its usual form in *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, page 35, line 10. In the *Pūrṇaprajña* section of *Sarvadarśanasāgraha* (page 85 of Jīvananda's edition), we have the cognate nyāya, "Ananyalabhyaḥ śāstrārthaḥ," "the rule that the sense of the sacred institutes is not to be taken from other sources than these." (Prof. Gough's translation, page 101.)

A remark of Udayana's, as to word-meanings, may be of interest. It is found in *Kusumāñjali*, vol. 2, page 132:

"Yaḥ śabdo yatra vṛddhair asati vṛttyantare prayujyate sa tasya vācako, yathā svargaśabdaḥ sukhaviśeṣe prayujyamānas tasya vācakaḥ."

019

Aniṣiddham anumatham.

That which is not objected to is agreed to. "Silence gives consent." It occurs in Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* vii. 36:

"Etasyāḥ sampradānaḥ ca śrutvā saṃsoḍhavān asi.
Aniṣiddham hyanumatam iti nyāyo'pi vartate."

The nyāya is found in a slightly different form in *Nyāyavārtika*, page 41:

"Tantrāntare mana indriyam iti paṭhyate. Tacceha na pratiśidhyate. Apratiśedhād upāttaṃ tad iti. Na. Śeṣābhidhānavaiyarthya. Śeṣānyapīndriyāṇi taiḥ pari-paṭhitāni. Tasmāt tānyapi na vaktavyāni yadyapraśedhād upādānaṃ syāditi. Na. Tantrayuktyanavabodhāt. Na bhavatā tantrayuktiḥ pariñāyate. Paramatam apratiśiddham anumatam iti hi tantrayuktiḥ."

In his comment on this passage, Vācaspatimiśra (on page 97 of *Tātparyaṭīkā*) quotes a line of Dignāga's: "Tad dūṣitaṃ dignāgena:

'Aniśedhād upāttaṃ ced anyendriyarutaṃ vṛthā."

There is another example in *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 205.

ED. NOTE: Cf. Maunam sammatilakṣaṇam. Al khamoshi nim raja? Spelling to be checked. Language??

020

Antaraṅgabahiraṅgayor antaraṅgaṃ balīyaḥ.

Of the proximate [or closely related] and the remote [or distantly related], the former is the stronger. I find it most difficult to give a rendering of this nyāya. It seems to belong primarily to the grammarians, though found also in philosophical works. It is included in Sīradeva's list of paribhāṣās, but not in that of Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa. The terms antaraṅga and bahiraṅga are, however, explained by the latter, under his paribhāṣa, "Asiddham bahiraṅgam antaraṅge," in the following manner, and I subjoin Dr. Kielhorn's translation. As this eminent scholar gives no English equivalent of the two terms here described, it may fairly be assumed that no satisfactory one is to be found.

"Antar madhye bahiraṅgaśāstrīyanimittasamudāyamadhye'ntarbhūtānyaṅgāni nimittāni yasya tad antaraṅgam. Evaṃ tadīyanimittasamudāyād bahirbhūtāṅgakaṃ bahiraṅgam."

"Antaraṅga is (a rule), the causes (of the application) of which lie within (or before) the sum of the causes of a bahiraṅga rule; in like manner (that rule), the causes (of the application) of which lie without (or beyond) the sum of the causes of that (antaraṅga rule), is bahiraṅga." The professor adds the following in a footnote:

"Antaraṅga and bahiraṅga are two Bahuvrīhi-compounds and denote a rule, or an operation, or that which is taught in a rule. The word aṅga here neither denotes a member of the body, nor is it the grammatical term aṅga as defined in P. 1. 4. 13; but it is

equivalent to upakāraka, 'that which assists (an operation),' or, in other words, it denotes the nimitta, that is, 'the cause' of an operation."

The nyāya is employed by Śabara on Jaimini 12. 2. 27, and by Ānandagiri on *Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 4; and there is another example of it in the following passage of the *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha* (page 15):

"Kāryasya tāvad upādānāpekṣā. Prathamam utpadyate paścād virodhisamsargā -bhāvāpekṣā. Tathā cāntaraṅgabahiraṅgayor antaraṅgaṃ balavad iti nyāyenāntaraṅgo -pādānaviṣayatvam eva tayor nyāyyam," where Dr. Thibaut (in his translation in *Indian Thought*, vol. i., page 80) renders it, "the principle that what is intimately connected has greater force than what is remotely connected."

It is quoted also by Ānandagiri in his comment on verse 367 of Sureśvara's *Sambandha-vārtika*:

"Antaraṅgaṃ hi vijñānaṃ pratyañmātraikasamśrayāt.
Bahiraṅgaṃ tu karma syād bāhyadravyāśrayatvataḥ."

Mr. S. B. Aiyar's rendering of the terms antaraṅga and bahiraṅga in this verse is 'subjective' and 'objective' respectively.

ED. NOTE: We have another pair of words: internal and external.

021

Antardīpikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a lamp in a central position*. Applied to something that fulfills a double purpose. It occurs in Śaṅkara's bhāṣhya on the *Muṇḍaka Upanishad* 3. 1. 5. ("Satyena labhyas tapasā hyeṣa ātmā samyagjñānena brahmacaryeṇa nityam") on which he says:

"Nityaṃ sarvadā. Nityaṃ satyena nityaṃ tapasā nityaṃ samyagjñāneneti sarvatra nityaśabdo'ntardīpikānyāyenānuṣaktavyaḥ."

It is akin to Dehalīdīpanyāya and Madhyadīpanyāya. Jīvānanda's edition of the *Muṇḍakabhāṣhya* reads, "Antyadīpakanyāyena." The reading given above is from the Ānandāśrama edition.

ED. NOTE: We are not sure if Jacob ever understood the true meaning of "Satyena labhyas tapasā hyeṣa ātmā samyagjñānena brahmacaryeṇa nityam."

022

Andhakavartakīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the blind man and the quail*. Like ajākṛpāṇīya and many others, it is used to express a wholly fortuitous occurrence. Vardhamāna, on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it thus:

"Andhakaś ca vartakā ca andhakavartakam. Andhakasya vartakāyā uparyatarkitaḥ pādanyāsa ucyate. Tattulyam andhakavartakīyam."

This authority brings the quail under the blind man's *foot*; but the commentator Śrīśrutāsāgara, who expounded the work *Yaśastilaka**, and who, in the colophon, is described as "tarkavyākaraṇachandolaṅkārasiddhāntasāhityādiśāstranipuṇamatīḥ prakṛtavyākaraṇādyanekaśāstraracanācañcuḥ," brings the bird into the man's *hands*. And, surely, such a prodigy of learning *must* be right! The verse in which the expression andhakavartakīya occurs is *Yaśastilaka* ii. 153.

"Samsārasāgaram imaṃ bhramatā nitāntaṃ
jīvena mānavabhavaḥ samavāpi daivāt.
Tatrāpi yad bhuvanamānyakule prasūtiḥ
satsaṅgatiś ca tad ihāndhakavartakīyam."

"It is altogether by chance that a soul wandering about in this ocean of repeated births is born as a man; and that he should be born into a family of repute in the world, and enjoy the society of the good is likewise as accidental as in the case of the blind man and the quail." Śrīśrutāsāgara's explanation of the last term is as follows:

"Andhakavartakīyo dṛṣṭāntaḥ. Yathā kaścid andhakaḥ pumān karatalena karaṃ tāḍayan vartate, tasya karadvayamadhye vartakaḥ pakṣivīṣeṣaḥ samāyāti, sa tu durlabhas, tathā mānavabhavaḥ satsaṅgatir durlabhā vartate."

ED. NOTE: Cf. Andheke hātha baṭera (Hindi). Jacob has a fn. on *Yaśastilaka*: This important work, described by Dr. Peterson at considerable length in his Second Report, was published in the *Kāvyaṃālā*, a valuable periodical (?) issued by the Proprietor of the Nirṇaya Sāgar Press.

023

Andhagajanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the blind men and the elephant*. A number of blind men desired to form an idea of the shape of an elephant. One touched his trunk and thought he must be like a snake; another took hold of a leg and supposed that he was like a post, and so on.

Tārānātha tells us that it is used to illustrate the divergence of views held by the ignorant in regard to Īśvara.

The story is found in the Buddhist work *Udānam* (vi. 4, pages 66-69) published by the Pāli Text Society in 1885.

It is referred to in Sureśvara's large *Vārtika* 4. 4. 566 (page 1813) as follows:

"Ekam evaīkarūpaṃ sad vastvajñātaṃ nirañjanam.
Jātyandhagajadr̥ṣṭyeva koṭīśaḥ kalpyate mṛṣā."

Also in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* ii. 93:

"Tad etad advayaṃ brahma nirvikāraṃ kubuddhibhiḥ.
Jātyandhagajadr̥ṣṭyeva koṭīśaḥ parikalpyate."

I have met with the nyāya again on pages 107 and 160 of *Syādvādamañjarī*. It occurs also in the Jainadarśana of *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* (page 46); but the passage in which it is found was taken *verbatim* from Malliṣeṇa's work, without any acknowledgment.

ED. NOTE: If these men were blind since birth, how could they relate what they found by touch only to be a snake, or post, etc.?

024

Andhagolāṅgūlanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the blind man and the cow's* [!] *tail*. The story is that an evil-disposed fellow found a blind man who, having lost his way, was wandering about helplessly. Expressing great sympathy for him and promising to help him, the man led him to a young and frisky cow and, putting her tail into his hand, told him to hold on and that she would certainly lead him to the village to which he wished to go. The result was, of course, most disastrous.

Śaṅkara, in his bhāṣya on *Vedāntasūtra* 1. 1. 7, applies the maxim to the case of a teacher who wrongly instructs his pupil in regard to emancipation and so leads him to destruction! These are his words:

"Yadi cājñasya sato mumukṣor acetanam ātmānam ātmetyupadiśet pramāṇa-
bhūtaṃ śāstraṃ, sa śraddadhānatayāndhagolāṅgūlanyāyena tadātmadr̥ṣṭiṃ na pari-
tyajet, tadvyatiriktaṃ cātmānam na pratipadyeta, tathā sati puruṣārthād vihanyetā-
nartham ca ṛcchet."

The nyāya is found, too, in *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa*, page 170.

ED. NOTE: The word "cow" is wrong, dead wrong. A young calf (male) is much friskier than a cow. Raghunātha Varmā says *goyuvānam*. Here are his exact words: *Ata eva Bhagavadpādair api Andhagolāṅgūlanyāya udāhṛtaḥ. Tatrāpi nirupapadagopadasya svarasato vṛṣabodhakatvāt. Ratnākara, p. 350.*

Here is one more example of what contribution we have made.

There are many *nyāyas* collected and explained by Jacob which occur also in R's works. But Jacob does not bring out this fact. Many a time Jacob bings in R just to condemn and criticize him.

025

Andhadarpaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a looking glass for a blind man*. It is found in *Upamitibhāvaprapañcā Kathā*, page 836, as follows:

"Kevalam jñātaśāstro'pi svāvasthām yo na budhyate.
Tasyākiñcitkaram jñānam andhasyeva sudarpaṇaḥ."

See also Śeṣānantācārya on *Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa*, page 22, line 2. The *Laukikanyāya-ratnākara* gives the following example:

"Taduktaṃ vāsiṣṭhe:-

Yasya nāsti svayaṃ prajñā śāstraṃ tasya karoti kim.
Locanābhyāṃ vihīnasya darpaṇaḥ kiṃ kariṣyati."

I have no doubt that the reference is to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, but the verse is also found in the *Hitopadeśa* (iii., 115). See, too, under *Araṇyarodananyāya*.

ED. NOTE: In spite our best efforts, we have not yet been able to trace this verse to the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. Here is a challenge for a future scholar to search and research. Apparently, the Colonel did not find it in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. In any case, he does not make any clear statement as to whether or not he tried and failed.

026

Andhaparamparānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a continuous series of blind men*. It would seem to be in this sense that Śaṅkarāchārya uses it in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 2. 30, 37. The passages stand thus:

"Anāditve'pyandhaparamparānyāyenāpratiṣṭhaivānavasthā vyavahāralopinī syān nābhiprāyasiddhiḥ." "Vartamānakālavad atīteṣvapi kāleṣvitaretarāśrayadoṣā-viśeṣād andhaparamparānyāyāpatteḥ."

In his rendering of the former passage, Dr. Thibaut has overlooked the maxim, but the latter he translates as follows: "For in past time as well as in the present, mutual interdependence of the two took place, so that the beginningless series is like *an endless chain of blind men leading other blind men*." I should add that, in the former case, Śankara is arguing against the Buddhist theory of a beginningless series of mental impressions, and, in the latter, against the Sāṅkhya notion of a similar chain of human actions and divine interpositions. Dr. Thibaut's explanation of the maxim is quite in accord with that of Dr. Garbe in his rendering of the *Sāṅkhyasūtra* iii. 81 "itarathā'ndhaparamparā." "Else there would be a tradition [comparable to a row] of blind men [leading each other]."

A very apt quotation from one of Coleridge's *Lay Sermons* is given in that useful work, *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* (now quite out of print), from which I extract the following: "The old man talked much and vehemently concerning an infinite series of causes and effects, which he explained to be a string of blind men, the last of whom caught hold of the skirt of the one before him, he of the next, and so on till they were all out of sight; and that they all walked infallibly straight, without making one false step, though all were alike blind. Methought I borrowed courage from surprise, and asked him, 'Who, then, is at the head to guide them?' He looked at me with ineffable contempt, not unmixed with an angry suspicion and then replied, 'No one; the string of blind men goes on for ever without any beginning, for although one blind man cannot move without stumbling, yet infinite blindness supplies the want of sight.'"

In the opening part of the *Padamañjarī* (*Pañḍit* x. 248) we find the expression andhaparamparāprasaṅga used with reference to testimony received through a series of blind men, and therefore of doubtful value. It is part of an interesting discussion regarding different forms of a word; why some are considered correct and others not.

"Tatra ye sādhas te śāstreṇānuśiṣyante'sādhubhyo viviktāḥ prakṛtipratyaya-vibhāgena jñāpyanta ime sādhas iti. Kathaṃ punar idam ācāryeṇa pāṇinīnavagatam ete sādhas iti. Āpiśalena ūrvavyākaraṇeṇa. Āpiśalinā tarhi kenāvagatam. Tataḥ pūrveṇa pūrvavyākaraṇeṇa. Yadyevam andhaparamparāprasaṅgaḥ. Tadyathā śuklaṃ kṣīram ram ityandhenokte kenedam avagatam iti pṛṣṭo yadā'ndhāntaraṃ mūlaṃ nir-dīśati so'pyandhāntaraṃ tadā naitad vacaḥ śauklye pramāṇaṃ bhavati tādrḡ etat."

That the nyāya is in very general use will be apparent from the following additional references. *Tantravārtika*, pages 11, 72, 75, 232, 799, 877. *Pañcapādikā*, page 98. *Bhāmatī*, pages 254, 464. *Nyāyamañjarī*, pages 234, 249, 251, 425, 492.

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references. Also noteworthy is the statement by Śaṅkarācārya: nyāyāpatteḥ.

We don't see in Jacob's long list of sources and examples quoted the *Kaṭhōpaniṣad* Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ.

027

Andhasyevāndhalagnasya vinipātaḥ pade pade.

One who leans on a blind man will fall with him at every step. This is akin to the saying, "If the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch." It occurs in *Bhāmatī* (page 20) as follows:

"Yo'yam arthaprakāśaḥ phalaṃ yasminnarthaś cātmā ca prathete sa kiṃ jaḍaḥ svayamprakāśo vā. Jaḍaś ced viśayātmānāvapi jaḍāviti kasmin kiṃ prakāśetā-viśeṣād, iti prāptam āndhyam aśeṣasya jagataḥ. Tathā cābhāṅakaḥ. Andhasyevāndha-lagnasya vinipātaḥ pade pade."

Compare the following expression in Venkaṭanātha's vṛitti on his *Tattvamuktākālāpa* iii. 50:

"Iti cāndhasya jātyandha-yaṣṭidānopamaṃ viduḥ."

Though not exactly parallel with the nyāya, the following verse of Jayanta's (page 120) will not be out of place here:

"Hastasparsādīnā'ndhena viśame pathi dhāvata.
Anumānapradhānena vinipāto na durlabhaḥ."

028

Anyaveśmāsthitād dhūmāt na veśmāntaram agnimat.

From seeing smoke rising from one house we do not infer that there is a fire in another house. This is from *Tantravārtika* (page 180, line 9) on Jaimini's sūtra "Anumānavyavasthānāt tatsaṃyuktam pramāṇam syāt" (1.3.15).

029

Anyārtham api prakṛtam anyārtham bhavati.

A thing, though made for one purpose, may also serve for another.

This is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1.1. 23 (vārt. 4), 1. 3. 12 (vārt. 5), and 6. 1. 50, as follows:

"Yat tāvad ucyate na cānyārthaṃ prakṛtam anyārthaṃ bhavatīti. Anyārtham api prakṛtam anyārthaṃ bhavati. Tadyathā. Śālyarthaṃ kulyāḥ praṇīyante, tābhyāś ca pānīyaṃ pīyata upaspr̥syate ca, śālayāś ca bhāvyante."

It is quoted by Śabara on *Jaimini* 3. 1. 12 (page 220) and is referred to by Kumārila in his long and interesting discussion of śeṣa (an accessory - that which serves the purpose of something else) in the opening part of the third chapter of the *Tantravārtika*. On page 668, line 13, we read:

"Na hi kaścid api śālikulyāsthā udakam piban madartham etāḥ praṇītā ityadhyavasyati. Tasmād anyat tādarthyaṃ anyāś copakāra itī vijñāyate."

Patañjali's illustration is found in *Pancapādikā*, page 45, and is employed by Vidyāraṇya in *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṅgraha* (page 118, line 9), where it is styled Kulyāpraṇayana-nyāya. Compare the nyāya "Jāmātrārthaṃ śrapitasya sūpāder atithyupakāraḥ."

030

Apacchedanyāyaḥ.

The law regarding *the interruption* [of a procession of priests]. It is thus explained by Goldstucker: "Used in the liturgical writings of the interruption of a procession of priests, caused by the inadvertence of one or several amongst them; thus, it being the rule that at the first Savana of the Jyotishṭoma, the priests must proceed one after the other 'in the black-ant fashion,' the one that comes after holding his preceptor by the hem of his garment, an interruption caused by the dropping of the hem on the part of one priest would be ekakartṛko'pacchedaḥ &c." This curious ceremony is discussed in *Jaimini* 6. 5. 49-56, where certain penalties are prescribed for letting go the garment (kacchavimocana). This matter is well and concisely put in the *Nyāyamālāvistara* on the above portion of *Jaimini*, and much information is contained in Kunte's notes on the same sūtras.

The nyāya is employed by writers on Vedānta. It is found, for example, in *Vedānta-kalpataruparimala*, page 10, line 8:

"Jyeṣṭhasyāpīti. Apacchedanyāyena pūrvasya pareṇa bādham āśaṅkyā tadapekṣasyeti viśeṣitaṃ. Tenottarasya pūrvāpekṣāyām upakrmādhikaraṇanyāya eva pravartata itī sūcitam ityārthaḥ."

The passage of the *Vedāntakalpataru* here explained is found on page 6, line 8: "Jyeṣṭhasyāpī paurvāparyanyāyena bādham āśaṅkyāha tadapekṣasyeti." The Paurvāparyanyāya is a part of the apacchedanyāya, and derives its name from sūtra 54, namely

"paurvāparye pūrvadaurbalyam prakṛtivat," the subject of the adhikaraṇa being that when the priests, walking in procession, let go their hold one after another, the one who does so last is liable to a penalty. This same sūtra is quoted in full in *Bhāmatī*, page 5, last line, and is immediately followed by a verse from Kumāri's *Tantravārtika*, page 819; where, however, the reading of the first line is paurvāparyabaliyastvam instead of the pūrvāt parabaliyastvam of the *Bhāmatī*. The same verse is quoted by Vācaspatimiśra at the bottom of page 59 of his *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭikā*, where the reading agrees with that of the *Bhāmatī*. The Apacchedanyāya is found in Venkaṭanātha's *Sarvarthasiddhi*, pages 210, 359, and 374; and also in *Śrībhāṣya*, page 143, where Dr. Thibaut (on page 26 of his translation) renders it, "As in the case of the Udgāṭri and Pratiharṭri breaking the chain in succession." The whole ceremony is very clearly explained on page 156 of the *Tattvadīpana*, and the passage will repay perusal.

ED. NOTE: A noteworthy worthy statement. Kunte's work to be brought to light. Also *Tattvadīpana* to be seen more thoroughly. I have my own copy now but no time. Someone, somewhere some day might carry our work forward. .

031

Aparāddheṣor iva dhānuṣkasya kaṅṭhāḍambaraḥ.

Noisy boasting like that of an [unskillful] archer whose arrows always miss the mark. This simile occurs in the *Ātmataṭṭvaviveka* (page 49), but was no doubt borrowed from *Māgha* ii. 27:

"Anirloḍitakāryasya vāgjālam vāgmino vṛthā.
Nimittād aparāddheṣor dhānuṣkasyeva valgitam."

"The chatter of a talkative man who has no knowledge of affairs is as useless as the swaggering of an archer whose arrows always miss the mark."

ED. NOTE: We don't understand how Jacob brings the plurality to the arrow and the statement "always." The poet who composed it did not come and tell Jacob what is meant here. This is one of our contributions to bring Añjali up. It seems Jacob's knowledge of Sanskrit was quite limited indeed.

032

Apavādair utsargā bādhyante.

General rules are set aside by special ones. This well-known grammatical rule, found thus in *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 1. 24 (vārt. 5) and in a variety of forms in *paribhāṣās*, is admitted to these pages chiefly because, in two of his poems, Kālidāsa has adopted it as a sort of

Mātsyanyāya to illustrate a phase of human affairs, namely the subordination of the weak to the strong.

One instance is in *Kumārasambhava* ii. 27:

"Labdhapraṭiṣṭhaḥ prathamam yūyam kiṃ balavattaraiḥ.
Apavādair ivotsargāḥ kṛtavvyāvṛttayaḥ paraiḥ."

The other is in *Raghuvamśa* xv. 7:

"Yaḥ kaścana raghūṇām hi param ekaḥ parantapaḥ.
Apavāda ivotsargaṃ vyāvartayitum īśvaraḥ."

In a note on this latter passage, Mr. Shankar P. Paṇḍit says, "Whatever may be the value of the simile as regards the similitude, it certainly cannot be said to be very poetical, being derived altogether from a pedant's life." At the end of his comment on the former verse, Mallinātha adds "Ityalam atigahanāvagāhanena," which may possibly indicate some feeling of disapproval on his part also. It is on the principle enunciated in this nyāya that the law forbidding the taking of life is superseded by the Vedic ritual which demands animal sacrifices; and it is interesting to note the famous Jaina Hemacandra's denunciation of the whole argument in the eleventh verse of his *Vītarāgastuti*, the first half of which stands thus:

"Na dharmahetur vihitāpi hiṃsā
notsṛṣṭam anyārtham apodyate ca."

In his vṛitti on the verse, Malliṣeṇa states the case from the Mīmāṃsaka's standpoint as follows: "Yo'yaṃ na hiṃsyāt sarvabhūtānītyādinā hiṃsāniṣedhaḥ sa autsārgiko mārgaḥ sāmānyato vidhir ityārthaḥ. Tataś cāpavādenotsargasya bādhitatvān na śrauto hiṃsāvidhir doṣāyotsargāpavādayor apavādo vidhir balīyāniti nyāyāt." (*Syādvādamañjarī*, page 84).

In connection with the above quotation from Hemacandra, see the *Ḍamarukamañi-nyāya*.

033

Aprāpte śāstram arthavat.

Scripture attaches a meaning [to an act &c.] when such [a meaning] has not been established [and could not be established in any other way]. I take this to be the drift of this somewhat difficult nyāya, which forms part of Jaimini's sūtra 6. 2. 18. In *Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 18, there is a discussion as to the aim of certain Śrutis which prescribe the rinsing of the mouth, before and after eating, in connection with the *prāṇavidyā*. Were they intended to enforce Ācamana as an act of cleanliness, and also as an act of

ritual directed to prāṇa? The decision is that the former was already provided for by smṛiti, and that śruti merely attached to it its significance as a religious ceremonial. Bhāratīrtha sums up the case in *Adhikaraṇamālā* 3. 3. 9, as follows: "Iti prāpte brūmaḥ 'aprāpte śāstram arthavat' iti nyāyena mānāntarāprāptam anagnatācintanam eva vidheyam ... Ācamanaṃ tu śuddhyarthatayā smṛtibalād eva prāptam iti na vidhīyate ... Tasmād ācamanasya prāptatvād anagnatābuddhir eva prāṇopāsakaṃ prati vidheyā."

The nyāya is found also in *Tantravārtika*, page 145, line 3, and again on page 232; in *Śrībhāṣya*, page 554 (where it is rendered by Dr. Thibaut, on page 133 of his translation, "Scripture has a purport with regard to what is not established by other means"); and in *Nyāyakandali*, page 5 (where Prof. Gangānātha Jhā's interpretation of it is, "An injunction has its use only in a case where its object has not been accomplished by other means"). Other references to it are *Citsukhī* i. 7 (Paṇḍit, vol. iv. page 475); the Rāmānuja section of *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha* (page 6, line 12, of Jīvānanda's edition); and *Sarvārthasiddhi* pages 93, 263. In *Tattvadīpana*, page 544, the nyāya is quoted as "Anadhigate śāstram arthavat."

034

Abhyarhitam pūrvam.

The more worthy should come first.

These words form part of Patañjali's comment on a vārtika on Pāṇini's rule 2. 2. 34 in regard to the position of words in a dvandva compound. The whole sentence is as follows: "Abhyarhitam pūrvam nipatatīti vaktavyam. Mātāpitarau śraddhāmedhe." Its use is not restricted to grammar, however, as the following extract from the first paragraph of Sāyaṇa's introduction to his commentary on the Ṛgveda shows: "Ṛgvedasya prāthamyena sarvatrāmnātātvd abhyarhitam pūrvam iti nyāyenābhyarhitatvāt tadvyākhyānam ādau yuktam."

Again, at the commencement of the twelfth chapter of the *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara*, we read as follows: "Abhyarhitam pūrvam iti nyāyam āśritya tantraprasaṅgaprati-pādakayor ekādaśadvādaśādhyāyayoḥ pūrvottarabhāva upapāditaḥ."

And in Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 4. 28: "Pradhānavādasyaiva prādhānyena nirāse hetvantaram āha sa ceti. Na kevalam abhyārhitatvāt tasya prādhānyam smṛtimūlatvād apītyāha."

ED. NOTE: More worthy or favored ? Cf. Ranganathan's Favorite Category Device in Library Classification. Would it be proper to say: Favorites first? What is our contribution? Here is one example.

035

Abhyupagamasiddhāntanyāya.

The principle of *an implied axiom* [or, dogmatic corollary]. This is taken from *Nyāya-sūtra* 1. 1. 31, which Dr. Ballantyne rendered as follows: "A 'dogmatic corollary' is the mention of a particular fact in regard to anything, not expressly declared in an aphorism, [our knowledge of the fact coming so immediately] from what *is* recognized [by the maker of the aphorisms, as to render a demonstration superfluous - the fact being thus entitled to rank not as a deduction but as a dogma]." The nyāya is applied by Udayana in *Kiraṇāvali*, page 20, line 4 from the bottom. See also under *adhikaraṇasiddhāntanyāya*.

036

Ambuni majjantyalābūni, grāvāṇaḥ plavante.

Gourds sink in water, but stones float! This is often quoted as an illustration of an absurdity. It is as old as the *Mahābhārata* and appears at the end of chapter LXIV of the *Sabhāparvan*:

"Majjantyalābūni śilāḥ plavante
muhyanti nāvo'mbhasi śaśvad eva."

I have met with it twice in Śabara's bhāṣhya. In 1.1.5 (page 11): "Evaṃjātīyakaṃ pramānaviruddhaṃ vacanaṃ apramāṇam. Ambuni majjantyalābūni grāvāṇaḥ plavanta iti yathā." In 4.3.10: "Na caivaṃjātīyakaṃ pratyakṣaviruddhaṃ vacanaṃ pramāṇam bhavati. Yathāmbuni majjantyalābūni, śilāḥ plavante, pāvakaḥ śīta iti."

Other references are *San̄kṣepaśārīraka* ii. 2 (Paṇḍit, vol. vii, page 169); and, in *Prākṛita*, just after verse viii. 31 of *Bālarāmāyaṇa*.

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references.

037

Ayam aparo gaṇḍasyopari sphoṭaḥ.

Here is another boil on the top of a previous one! An illustration of difficulty upon difficulty; trouble upon trouble. It occurs in *Bhāmatī* 2. 2. 37 as follows:

"Na hīśvarādhīnā janāḥ svātantryeṇa kapūyaṃ karma kartum arhanti. Tadna-dhiṣṭhitaṃ vā kapūyaṃ karma phalaṃ prasotum utsahate. Tasmāt svatanthro'pīśvaraḥ karmabhiḥ pravartyata iti dṛṣṭaviparītaṃ kalpanīyam. Tathā cāyam aparo gaṇḍasyo-

pari sphoṭa itaretarāśrayaḥ prasajyeta karmaṇeśvaraḥ pravartanīya īśvareṇa ca karmeti."

In the same form it is put into the mouth of Rākṣasa in *Mudrārākṣha* v (page 220). The oldest examples, however, are in Prākṛit. In the opening part of *Śakuntalā* ii., we find it as "Tado gaṇḍassa uvari piṇḍiā saṃvuttā" (or, in Dr. Pischel's edition, "Jado gaṇḍassa uvari vipphoḍao saṃvutto"); and in *Viddhaśālabhāṅjikā* i. (page 12), as "Avaro gaṇḍassa uvari piṇṭhao saṃvutto."

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references. We believe gaṇḍa and sphoṭa are two distinct separate ailments. **check**

038

Araṇyarodananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *crying in the wilderness*. Used to imply wasted effort. Molesworth defines it as "A term for unregarded or unavailing complaint or supplication." The following verse from Namisādhu's comment on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* viii. 37 includes not only this nyāya but also Raghunātha's śavodvartananyāya, uṣaravṛṣṭinyāya, śvapucchonnāmananyāya, badhirakarmaṇanyāya, and probably his andhadarpaṇanyāya; for Dr. Bohtlingk, who quotes the verse as from *Pancatantra*, gives "dhṛto'ndhamukhadarpaṇaḥ as a variant for kṛtāndhamukhamaṇḍanā.

Araṇyaruditam kṛtam śavaśarīram udvartitam
sthale kamalaropaṇam suciram uṣare varṣitam.
Śvapuccham avanāmitam badhirakarmaṇjāpaḥ kṛtaḥ
kṛtā'ndhamukhamaṇḍanā yad abudho janaḥ sevitaḥ.

See also *Pancatantra* i. 393; *Kiraṇāvali* page 5; and *Kusumāñjali*, vol. ii, page 176.

ED. NOTE: This is nidarśanālaṅkāra. N.B. See also references.

039

Aruṇaikahāyanīnyāya.

The maxim of a red [cow] one year old. This nyāya, found in *Tantravārtika* 1. 2. 41, in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 294 (line 2 from bottom), and in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 619 (line 4), is the aruṇinyāya of Jaimini 3. 1. 12, and is based on the following words connected with the ritual of the Jyotiṣtoma sacrifice: "Aruṇayā piṅgākṣyaikahāyanīnyā somam kṛiṇāti," "he buys Soma with a red-coloured, yellow-eyed [cow] of a year old." The Mīmāṃsaka delights in hair-splitting, and in trifling with language; and we have a

typical instance of this idiosyncrasy in the way in which this simple sentence is dealt with. Because the cow is not actually mentioned, and the word *aruṇā* denotes a quality (redness), an objector says "how can one buy Soma with a mere quality?" Śabara's reply to this occupies ten octavo pages, whilst that of Kumārila fills twenty-nine! The objection is concisely put in the *Nyāyamālāvistara*, part of which is as follows:

"Aruṇāśabdo'ruṇimānaṃ guṇam ācaṣṭe. Guṇiviṣayatayā prayujyamānasyāpi 'nāgrhītaviśeṣaṇā viśiṣṭe buddhiḥ' iti nyāyena guṇabodhakatvāt. Anvayavyatirekābhyāṃ guṇamātre tadvyutpatteś ca. Tasya cāruṇimaguṇasya ṛtīyāśrutyā somakrayasādhanatvaṃ pratīyate taccānupapannaṃ. Amūrtasya guṇasya vāsohiraṇyādivat krayasādhanatvāsaṃbhavāt. "

The reply to this is: "Yadyapyamūrto guṇas tathāpi hāyanavadakṣivacca godravyam avacchinatti. Tacca dravyaṃ sādhanam iti taddvārā guṇasya krayeṇānvayo bhavati. Evaṃ sati vākyabhedo na bhaviṣyati."

There is a long discussion on the nyāya in Rāmānuja's *Śrībhāṣya* 1. 1. 13, commencing on page 813 of the Benares edition. See Dr. Thibaut's translation, page 222.

ED. NOTE: Here is a recommendation for further reading. Jacob has mastered the art of making a sarcastic remark. He is a king in that domain. He has a very loose tongue. It is sharp and very long. But it does not have any leash. Why does he go to such subjects, anyway? Mīmāṃsā can survive even without his study.

040

Arundhatīpradarśananyāya.

The maxim of *the pointing out of the star Arundhatī*. The idea here is that of gradual instruction, on the principle of the *adhyāropāpavādanyāya*, for which see its proper location. Its usage is explained by Śaṅkara in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 1. 8, as follows:

"Yathārundhatīṃ didarśayiṣus tatsamīpasthāṃ sthūlāṃ tārāṃ amukhyāṃ prathamam arundhatīti grāhayitvā tāṃ pratyākhyāya paścād arundhatīṃ eva grāhayati tadvannāyam ātmeti brūyāt."

Similarly, too, in 1. 1. 12, we read: "Yathārundhatīnidarśane bahvīṣvapi tārāsva-mukhyāsvarundhatīṣu darśitāsu yā'ntyā pradarśyate sā mukhyaivārundhatī bhavatyevam ihāpyānandamayasya sarvāntaratvān mukhyam ātmatvam."

The maxim is sometimes styled *Sthūlārundhatīnyāya*, and it appears under this name in Nṛsiṃhasarasvatī's commentary on section 20 of the *Vedāntasāra* - that section which gives the views of Chārvākas and others as to the ātman.

ED. NOTE: Raghunātha Varmā has a very long discussion on this nyāya. This is far from being "popular." Yet the Colonel has given it in his very first Handful. He is not true to his own word. Condemns R without any foundation.

The nyāya in general has a great force.

Give a cross reference from Sthūlārundhatīnyāya.

041

Arke cen madhu vindeta kimarthaṃ parvataṃ vrajet.

If one can find honey on the Arka-tree [close at hand], then why go to the mountain for it? That is, if an object can be accomplished by simple means, don't adopt a more complicated method. This is well illustrated by Śaṅkara in his Vedāntasūtrabhāṣya 3. 4. 3, as follows: "Kevalāc cej jñānāt puruṣārthasiddhiḥ syāt kimarthaṃ anekāyāsa-samanvitāni karmāṇi te kuryuḥ. Arke cen madhu vindeta kimarthaṃ parvataṃ vrajed iti nyāyāt."

Its source, however, is Śabara on Jaimini 1. 2. 4. Here, the *Pūrvapakshin*, after taking exception to certain Vedic injunctions as useless, says: "Tadyathā pathi jāte'rke madhūt-sṛjya tenaiva pathā madhvarthinaḥ parvataṃ na gaccheyus tādṛśaṃ hi tat. Api cāhuḥ.

Arke cen madhu vindeta kimarthaṃ parvataṃ vrajet.
Iṣṭasyārthasya saṃsiddhau ko vidvān yatnam ācaret."

The same couplet is quoted by Aniruddha in his comment on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* i. 1; also by Vāchaspati Mīśra in his *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* 1., and again in his *Nyāyavārtika-tātparyāṅkā*, page 220. Instead of arke, however, we have in the former instance akke and in the latter arkke. Raghunātha reads akke and explains it by ḡhakoṇe. One more example of the application of this nyāya may be found in Kumārila's *Tantravārtika* 1. 2. 17: "Yadyalpān mahataś ca karmaṇaḥ samaṃ phalaṃ jāyeta tato'rke cen madhu vindetetyanenaiva nyāyenālpena siddhe mahati na kaścit pravarteta."

ED. NOTE: The word arke has various meanings and there are many interpretations of this nyāya.

Jacob's text here constitutes Bhrāntir mithyāmatir bhramaḥ. A very sharp, penetrating, discerning eye is needed to detect the irregularity.

042

Arthī samartho vidvānadhikriyate.

He has the right who has the want, the power, and the wit. This nyaya is found in the Jaimini section of *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* as follows: "Arthī samartho vidvān adhikriyata iti nyāyena darśapūrṇamāsādiviṣayāvabodham avekṣamāṇās tattvabodhe svādhyāyaṃ viniyuñjate."

Professor Cowell translated it thus: "According to the old rule 'He has the right who has the want, the power, and the wit,' those who are aiming to understand certain things, as the new and full-moon sacrifices, use their daily reading to learn the truth about them."

The saying is found in a more complete form in *Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā* 1. 3. 9, namely Arthī samartho vidvān śāstreṇāparyudasto'dhikriyate," which is itself a reproduction of the following passage in *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.3.25: "Śāstraṃ hyaviśeṣapravṛttam api manuṣyān evādhikaroti śaktatvād arthitvād aparyudastatvād upanayanādiśāstrāc ceti varṇitam etadadhikāralakṣaṇe." Dr. Thibaut renders it thus:- "The Śāstra, although propounded without distinction (i.e. although not itself specifying what class of beings is to proceed according to its precepts), does in reality entitle men only (to act according to its precepts); for men only (of the three higher castes) are, firstly, capable (of complying with the precepts of the Śāstra); are, secondly, desirous (of the results of actions enjoined by the Śāstra); are, thirdly, not excluded by prohibitions; and are, fourthly, subject to the precepts about the *Upanayana* ceremony and so on. This point has been explained in the section treating of the definition of *adhikāra* (Pūrva Mīmāṃsā vi. 1)." For the last-mentioned, see under *adhikāranīyāya*.

This question of arthitva &c will be found also in *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1. 1. 4 (page 54); 1. 3. 26, 33, 34; and 2. 2. 10.

ED. NOTE: Here is a lesson for Jacob to learn. He is not at all an *adhikārin* to study Advaita Vedānta.

043

Ardhajaratīyanyāya.

The maxim of *the semi-senile woman*. It is very difficult to fix on the exact force of this saying. Authorities differ so much as to make it almost an instance of *quot homines tot sententioe*. As expounded by Vardhamāna (iii. 195) it seems to imply *indefiniteness, half-and-half-ness, the being neither one thing nor the other*. He says: "Yathā strī na taruṇī ślathastanavāt kṣṇakeśatvān na jaratī vaktuṃ śakyate tadvat siddhāsiddham prayojanam."

This seems to accord with the meaning assigned to it by Marāṭhas, as shown by Molesworth in his Marāṭhī dictionary, where he defines it as "Action of indeterminate

character; speech vague and indefinite; a proceeding void of decided learning or bearing."

The maxim is cited by Śaṅkara in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 1. 19, and again in 1. 2. 8. In the former, after quoting *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad* ii. 1-4 in regard to annarasamaya, prāṇamaya &c. he says: "Iti vikārārthe mayappravāhe satyānandamaya evāksmād ardhajaratīyanyāyena katham iva mayaṭaḥ prācuryārthatvaṃ brahmaviṣayatvaṃ vā-śrīyata iti."

The commentators Ānandagiri and Rāmānanda (erroneously styled Govindānanda*) ignore the maxim entirely, and so does Dr. Thibaut in his translation. In the second instance, Śaṅkara says:- "Yathāśāstraṃ tarhi śāstrīyo'rthaḥ pratipattavyo na tatrārdhajaratīyaṃ labhyam," which is rendered by Dr. Thibaut, "Very well, then, it appears that the truth about scriptural matters is to be ascertained from scripture, and that *scripture is not sometimes to be appealed to and on other occasions to be disregarded.*" Ānandagiri's comment is: "Na hi kukkuṭāder ekadeśo bhogāya pacyata, ekadeśastu prasavāya kalpyate, virodhāt," "You cannot take one part of a fowl for cooking and leave the other part to lay eggs;" that is, you must take a thing in its entirety, or else leave it altogether. Rāmānanda, on the other hand, says:

"Ardhaṃ mukhamātraṃ jaratyā vṛddhāyāḥ kāmāyate nāṅgānīti so'yam ardhajaratīyanyāyaḥ, sa cātra na yuktaḥ," which seems to be based on Patañjali's words, "Na cedānīm ardhajaratīyaṃ labhyaṃ...Tadyathā. Ardhaṃ jaratyāḥ kāmāyate'rdhaṃ neti," as found in *Mahābhāṣya* 4. 1. 78.* Again we find the maxim in the Bauddha section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind., and 17 of Jivānanda's edn.), which reads thus:

Na cārdhajaratīyam ucitam. Na hi kukkuṭyā eko bhāgaḥ pākāyāparo bhāgaḥ prasavāya kalpyatām iti kalpyate," and which is identical with Ānandagiri's exposition. Prof. Gough, who translated this chapter, rendered the maxim by "semi-effete" - "Nor is a semi-effete existence admissible."

Another excellent illustration of the usage of this nyāya is given in the following passage of the *Brahmasūtratātparyavivarāṇa* 3.4.26. (The Paṇḍit vol. vi. page 220):

"Brahmavidyā svaphale karmāṇi nāpekṣate tathā svotpattāvapi nāpekṣate. Anyathā kvacid apekṣā kvacinnetyardhajaratīyatvāpattir iti prāpte āha sarvāpekṣeti. Nārdhajaratīyanyāyo योगyatāvaśād evaikasyaiva kāryaviśeṣeṣvapekṣānapekṣayor upapatteḥ. Yathā lāṅgalavahane'napekṣito'svo rathavahane'pekṣyate tadvat svotpattau tu vidyā karmāpekṣate."

Other references are the following: *Saptapadārthī*, page 26. *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 21. *Nyāyamañjarī*, pages 248. 249. *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 340.

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references. There is a statement not in English. To be translated.

There are many footnotes in the Anjali of J. Here for Govindānanda Jacob has a fn.: See Dr. Fitzedward Hall's *Index*, p. 90.

For *Mahābhāṣya* Jacob has another fn.: Vol. ii, page 23 of the edition by Dr. F. Kielhorn, who himself kindly gave me the reference.

We believe Fitzedward Hall's Bibliography is truly rare in every sense of the term. It is a collectors' item.

044

Ardhavaśasanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the slaying of one half* [of a body, whilst the other half is kept alive!]. Raghunāthavarman defines it as follows:

"Asambhavavivakṣāyām ardhavaśasanyāyaḥ. Yathā kukkuṭīmāmsabhojanakāmas tatsantatikāmaśca kaścid yavanas tadgrīvādikam chittvā bhuṅkta udaraṃ ca santānārthaṃ sthāpayatīti tasyārthaḥ."

The nyāya is therefore expressive of absurdity, contradiction, or incongruity; and so in some respects, resembles the ardhajaratīyanyāya. The earliest example, known to me, of the use of the term is in *Kumārasambhava* iv. 31, where Rati complains that, by destroying Kāma, Fate had slain half of herself. The verse stands thus:

"Vidhinā kṛtam ardhavaśasam
nanu māṃ kāmavadhe vimuñcatā.
Anapāyini saṃśrayadrume
gajabhagne patanāya vallarī."

Mallinātha points out that, as the slaying of a part involves that of the whole, Rati here announces her own destruction also, as is clearly implied in the second half of the verse. Its employment here by Kālidāsa, however, is in a literal sense, whilst the philosophical writers apply it figuratively.

In the latter part of Śaṅkara's bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 3. 18, we find the expression "Na hyardhavaśasam sambhavati," and I have noted it in *Tantravārtika*, pages 84, 89, 97 and 202.

The first of the four passages is the following:

"Avirodhe śrutir mūlaṃ na mūlāntarasambhavaḥ.
Virodhe tvanyamūlatvam iti syād ardhavaiśasam."

In this passage, as well as in the other three, contradiction or inconsistency is clearly implied. So, too, in a passage in *Nyāyakandalī*, page 6, line 3; and in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 685. One more example will suffice, namely *Bṛihadāraṇyavārtika* 1.4.1276:

"Na cārdhavaśasam yuktaṃ tattvajñāne vivakṣite.
Saṃśayo hi tathā śrotuḥ syād aniścita-vākyaṭaḥ."

Ānandagiri explains this in the manner stated above by Raghunātha, viz. "Kukkuṭāder eko deśaḥ prasavāya kalpyate, pacyate deśāntaram ityardhavaśasam tad ihāyuktaṃ. Na hi vastu brahma cābrahma ca, tattvajñānasya vivakṣitatvād viruddhasyātathātvād ityarthah."

ED. NOTE: Even the third ed. (1925) of Jacob is full of bundles of blistering blunders. The publisher has claimed that it is a revised edition. It is a white lie. It is a true copy-Makṣikāsthāne makṣikā.

045

Alābhe mattakāśinyā drṣṭā tiryakṣu kāmitā.

Failing to obtain a lovely woman, affection is seen [to have been lavished] on animals. This very stupid [dhanya dhanya, Karanala, ed.] nyāya is expounded by Raghunātha as follows:

"Yatrādhikārthālābhe'lpārthe pravṛttir na doṣāyeti vivakṣā tatrālābhe mattakāśinyā drṣṭā tiryakṣu kāmiteti nyāyaḥ. Mattakāśinī strīviśeṣaḥ."

I have met with it only in the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 130) and in Ānandabodhācārya's *Pramāṇamālā*, page 2.

ED. NOTE: The Colonel had a very severe limitation to his knowledge. He is very fond of going to the "unorthodox" sources and trying to point out that the orthodox sources have borrowed from the unorthodox ones. (See *Akṣīpātra nyāya* and also nyāya # 53 *Aśvārūḍhaḥ*). He forgets the fundamental fact that his so-called "orthodox" sources existed long before the "unorthodox" sources came into being. Ancient India had evolved a unique oral tradition, the kind of which did not exist in any other ancient civilization. Many "works" existing then may not be available today. It is also to be remembered that the oral tradition must have played a very vital role in developing, preserving, and transmitting these nyāyas from generation to generation.

See editorial notes under nyāyas 002, 045, 246, 342 (imp.).

The Colonel had a very long tongue and a biting one too. It was sharpened further by his martial environment. He calls this nyāya as "very stupid." We are told Vidyā dadāti vinayam. He proves that his vidyā did not give him any vinaya. The question is why did he discuss this nyāya at all if it was stupid. The authors of *Ātmatattvaviveka*, *Pramāṇamālā*, and *Pramāṇavārtika*--all indulged in entertaining such "very stupid" nyāyas.

It is also to be noted here that this so-called "stupid nyāya" is used not only by our orthodox schools, but also by Jacob's unorthodox ones.

The Colonel has here merely proved the age-old adage, Na hi sarvaḥ sarvam jānāti.

I have seen this nyāya in the *Pramāṇavārtika* of Dharmakīrti. ***find reference***. The commentator does not translate the word mattakaṣiṇī as "lovely" but as ...***** It can be rendered as puṁścalī, or asatī.

Also Jacob's text reads vivakṣāyām, which is as wrong as many of the statements of Colonel Jacob are. It should read vivakṣā.

Kāmitā = insatiable urge for sex.

046

Avatapte nakulasthitam.

A mongoose's standing on hot ground. Used of a fickle, changeable person who never sticks to a thing. It is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 1. 47, as follows: "Yathā'vatapte nakulā na ciram sthātāro bhavantyevaṃ kāryāṇyārabhya yo na ciram tiṣṭhati sa ucyate'vatapte nakulasthitam ta etad iti." It occurs a second time in 6. 2. 49 (vārt. 6), in company with the expression udakeviśīrṇa[?]. The compound tīrthakāka which is found in 2.1.42, has much the same meaning. Patañjali says: "Yathā tīrthe kākā na ciram sthātāro bhavanti evaṃ yo gurukulāni gatvā na ciram tiṣṭhati sa ucyate tīrthakāka iti." In Marāṭhi, however, the name is applied to "a person ever watchful after some booty or spoil," a meaning which seems more in accord with the character of the crow than that assigned to it by Patañjali!

ED. NOTE: What about māsasya dvir adhīte?

047

Avayavaprasiddheḥ samudāyaprasiddhir balīyasī.

For this *paribhāṣā*, see under *rathakāraṇyāya*. It is quoted by Kumārila in *Tantravārtika* 1. 4. 11, more than once, but one example will suffice:

"Labdhātmikā hi samudāyaprasiddhir avayavaprasiddhiṃ bādhatē. Tasyās tvātmalābho yatra pramāṇāntareṇa pūrvānubhūtāvayavārtharahite'rthe śabdaprayogo dṛṣyate. Yathāśvatvakarṇatvarahite vṛkṣe'svakarṇaśabdasya."

As a parallel to this, we might take our word cockroach, which is neither a cock nor a roach! For other examples of the *paribhāṣā*, see *Tantravārtika* pages 538, 1002, 1048, and 1149.

I have met with another reference in *Tātparyāṭikā*, page 150, line 12: "Atra ca ghrāṇādīśabdāḥ pañcajādīpadavad avayavārtham nimittīkṛtya kvacit kvacit sāmānyaviśeṣe vartante avayavārthasya pratīyamānasyāsati bādhave parityāgāyogāt. Aśvakarṇādaḥ vṛkṣaviśeṣavācāke vājīkarṇāyogena bādhave nāvayavārthaparityāgāt." See, also, *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 385, line 10; and page 534, line 15.

048

Aviravikanyāyaḥ.

The principle of the words *avi* and *avika*. Though both mean 'a sheep,' yet a derivative in the sense of the flesh of a sheep (*āvika*) can be formed only from the latter. It occurs in *Mahābhāṣya* 4. 1. 88 (vārt. 2) as follows:- "Tatra dvayoḥ śabdayoḥ samānārthayor ekena vighraho'parasmād utpattir bhaviṣyatyaviravikanyāyena. Tadyathā. Aver māmsam iti vighraḥ avikaśabdād utpattir bhavati āvikam iti."

Similarly in 8. 1. 89 (vārt. 6); 4. 2. 60; 4. 3. 131; 5. 1. 7; 5. 1. 28; and 6. 2. 11 (vārt. 2). This inaccurate compound is one of the instances brought forward by Kumārila of the way in which grammar &c. are set aside by learned writers. On this, see the *nyāya* "Aśvārūdhāḥ &c."

In *Nyāyamañjarī*, pages 413 and 414, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa joins in the attack on this irregular compound, and on grammatical deformities found in the works of such writers as Manu, Āśvalāyana, Vālmīki, and Dvaipāyana. The following is a portion of his comment:

"Bhāṣyakāro'pi aviravikanyāyēneti dvandvagarbhe tatpuruṣe prayuyukṣite 'supo dhātuprātipadīkayoḥ' iti prāptam api lopaṃ na kṛtavān. 'Anyathākṛtvā codyam anyathākṛtvā parihāra' ityatra ca 'anyathaivaṅmkathamitthamsusiddhāprayogaś cet' iti prāptam api ṇamulam upekṣya ktvāpratrayaṃ prāyunkta."

The quotation "anyathākṛtvā &c." is from Patañjali on *Pāṇini* 4. 1. 7 (vārt. 3), and the sūtra quoted is 3. 4. 27. See Kumārila's remarks on this expression in *Tantravārtika*, page 201. They would apply equally to "kathamkṛtvā coditaṃ &c." in 7. 1. 3 (vārt. 5).

ED. NOTE: R does not want to treat this as a nyāya. He has a reason. Enough is enough.

049

Aśakto'haṃ gṛhārambhe śakto'haṃ gṛhabhañjane.

I am too weak to construct a house, but I am well able to destroy one. This is found in Dhunḍhirāja's commentary on *Mudrārākshasa* iii. 11. Chāṇakya says, "Kathaṃ sparddhate mayā saha durātmā Rākṣasaḥ," and then follows the verse, "Kṛtāgāḥ Kauṭilyo bhujaga iva niryāya nagarāt &c.," on which Dhunḍhirāja remarks: "Mameva nāsya buddhibalaṃ, parantu matsaramātreṇa "aśakto'haṃ gṛhārambhe śakto'haṃ gṛhabhañjana' iti nyāyena mauryāpakāramātrāya prayatamānaḥ san kevalaṃ pauraśabalaṃ avaṣṭabhya madbuddheḥ prakarṣam atīśayitum vyavasita ityaho Rākṣasasya durvyavasitam iti."

I am indebted for this passage to the late learned Librarian at the India Office, C.H. Tawney Esqr., who has also pointed out to me *Pancatantra* i. 363 as illustrating the nyāya.

The verse reads thus:

"Ghātayitum eva nīcaḥ parakāryaṃ vetti na prasādhayitum.
Pātayitum eva śaktir nākhor uddhartum annaṭam."

ED. NOTE: Jacob is selective in borrowing from R. He takes some and omits others. Even while borrowing he is not consistent in acknowledging the debt. Sometimes he attributes it to R; sometimes does not.

We hesitate to comment upon the quality of J's translation. After all he was an Englishman. Yet it is a fact that a translation is successful only to the degree the translator has the command over both the languages. Jacob translates saktaḥ as "well able." Why not "strong enough" as opposed to "too weak", as already given by him?

Many nyāyas discussed by Jacob are merely madhurā vācoyuktis and not yuktiyuktā sūktiḥ, as we have defined it after a prolonged study of the field of nyāyas, which we have termed as Nyāyavyākhyānanidarśanadarśanam.

050

Aśokavanikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the grove of Aśoka trees*. Āpṭe says, "Rāvaṇa kept Sītā in the grove of Aśoka trees, but it is not easy to account for his preference of that particular grove to any other one; so when a man finds several ways of doing a thing, any one of them may be

considered as good as another, and the preference of any particular one cannot be accounted for." For the Aśoka-grove, see Rāmāyaṇa 1. 1. 73. The only example of this nyāya that I have met with is in Śeṣānanta's ṭīkā on Śaśadhara's *Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa*, page 11. This work was commenced in the Paṇḍit for April 1903, but is still incomplete.

ED. NOTE: This statement was made almost one hundred years ago. An effort should be made to find out if the work was ever published in full. In any case, attempt should be made to find other examples.

051

Aśmalōṣṭanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the stone and clod of earth*. Āpte, following the Vācaspatyam, explains it thus:- "A clod may be considered to be hard when compared with cotton, but is soft as compared with a stone. So a person may be considered to be very important as compared with his inferiors, but sinks into insignificance when compared with his betters." Tārānātha adds that, when it is intended to indicate that there is *very little* difference between two things or persons compared, the kindred maxim Pāṣāṇeṣṭakānyāya is used. With these Āpte compares the Marāṭhī proverb "Dagaḍāpekṣām vīṭa maū" "Brick is softer than stone." The sense, however, is not quite the same; for, according to Molesworth, the Marāṭhī saying is used "in ironical softening of a difficulty or hardship but *barely* surmountable or sufferable, by comparing it with a matter *utterly* impracticable or intolerable."

Is it not much more likely, however, that the maxim is based on *Bṛihadāranyaka Upanishad* 1. 3. 7, "Yathāśmānam ṛtvā loṣṭo vidhvamṣeta," which Śankara expounds thus:- "Yathā loke'śmānam pāṣāṇam ṛtvā gatvā prāpya loṣṭaḥ pāmsuṇḍaḥ pāṣāṇa-cūrṇanāyāśmani nikṣiptaḥ svayaṃ vidhvamṣeta visramṣeta vicūrṇībhavet?" This is referred to in *Brahmasūtrabhāshya* 3.3.6 as the "aśmalōṣṭanidarśana" and it seems to remind one of the Scripture saying "Whosoever [?] shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever [?] it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

ED. NOTE: Vacaspatyam--Apte--Jacob, this is the order. Here is a comparative study too.

An attempt should be made to find out all such cases where a nyāya is discussed by R in RR or RS, and yet it is not referred to by Jacob in his Añjali.

052

Aśvatarīgarbhanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *she-mule's being in foal*. Raghunātha explains it thus:

"Nanvajñānakāryāntaḥkaraṇavṛtṭyātmakam jñānam katham svakāraṇībhūtā-jñānanāśāya syād upajīvyavirodhād iti ced, aśvatarīgarbhanyāyād ityavehi. Baḍavā-yām gardabhād utpannāśvatarī, tasyā garbho yathā tannāśāya bhavati tathā bhavatu jñānam api svahetvajñānanāśāyetyanavadyam."

The following verse, bearing on this subject, is found in *Hitopadeśa*, ii. 135, *Pañcatantra*, ii. 32 and iv. 14:

"Sakṛd duṣṭam tu yanmitram punaḥ sandhātum icchati.
Sa mṛtyum eva gṛhṇāti garbham aśvatarī yathā."

As Dr. Peterson points out in his Note on the verse from *Hitopadeśa*, the second line is found in *Ādīparva* (Bombay edn.) CXL. 83 (not 75, as wrongly printed), and in *Śāntīparva* CXL. 30 (not 347 as stated). In a footnote to *Indische Spruche* 58, Dr. Boehtlingk quotes Nīlakaṇṭha's comment on the verse from *Śāntīparva*:

"Aśvatarī gardabhajāśvā udarabhedenaiva prasūta iti prasiddham."

Of like import are two other nyāyas quoted by Raghunātha, namely Kadalīphalanyāya and Vṛścikīgarbhanyāya. As to the former of these, compare the following, *Vanaparva* CCLXVIII. 9 (Bombay edn.):

"Yathā ca veṇuḥ kadalī nalo vā
phalatyabhāvāya na bhūtayetmanaḥ.
Tathaiva māṃ taiḥ parirakṣyamāṇām
ādāsasye [syase?] karkaṭakīva garbham." [not clear]
Check Mbh.***

This verse is quoted by Johnson in his Notes on *Hitopadeśa* II. 147, and he adds, "In the Gulistān, the Persian poet Sāadi declares that the young of the scorpion eats its way out through the mother's entrails"; and in *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 354, line 2, we are told "vṛścikādir mātur udaram nirbhidyā mṛtāj jāyate." Udayana (in *Atmatattvaviveka*, page 67, line 9) seems to assert the same thing of the crab: "Kulīrasyeva svaprasūtayuktyāpatyenaiva pratihatatvāt."

ED. NOTE: Original reads: saprasūta which is wrong. ādāsasye to be checked. Chandobhaṅga? Jacob seems to read wrong.

Another question: Is this Baḍavā or Vaḍavā?

053

Aśvārūdhāḥ katham cāśvān vismareyuḥ sacetanāḥ.

How could men of intelligence be mounted on horses and yet forget their horses! Yet grammarians and others sometimes ignore their own rules! In Tantravārtika 1. 3. 18 (according to the numbering of the Benares edition), Kumārila comments at great length on the corrupt forms of words employed by even learned writers. On page 200 he says,

"Anto nāstyapaśabdānām itihāsapurāṇayoḥ"

and then instances the curious word ubhābhya, which is made to mean "a blow given by an elephant with both tusks" (yugapad ubhābhyāṃ dantābhyāṃ prahāraḥ). On the following page he says:

"Ye'pi vyākaraṇasyaiva pare pāre pratiṣṭhitāḥ.
Sutarāṃ te'pi gāvyaḍitulyān eva prayuñjate.

Sūtravārtikabhāṣyeṣu dṛśyate cāpaśabdanam.
Aśvārūḍhaḥ kathāṃ cāśvān vismareyuḥ sacetanāḥ."

A variant of this is found in *Śālikā*, page 16, verse 41:

"Nanvevaṃ turagārūḍhas turaṅgaṃ vismṛto bhavān.
Vedaprāmāṇyasiddhyartham utthitas tat prahīṇavān."

Mallinātha probably had this in mind when, in his comment on Varadarāja's *Tārkikaraksā* (page 20), he wrote: "Tad etat turagāḍhirūḍhasya turagavismarāṇaṃ yad vedaprāmāṇyasādhane pravṛttasya mīmāṃsāguṛoḥ tatpramāda iti sopahāsaṃ pariharati."

It is very clear, however, that the nyāya came from a Buddhist source, since it is found in the following *kārikā* of Nāgārjuna's, on page 502 of the *Madhyamakavṛtti* (for the reference to which I am indebted to Prof. Poussin):

"Sa tvaṃ doṣān ātmanīyān asmāsu paripātayan.
Aśvam evāḍhirūḍhaḥ sannaśvam evāsi vismṛtaḥ."

In a footnote, the Professor gives a variant from another Buddhist work, namely, "Ghoṭāṃ evāḍhirūḍhaḥ san &c."

ED. NOTE: The entry in J's Bibliography for *Śālikā* reads: "*Śālikā or Prakaraṇapañcikā*, a treatise on Mīmāṃsā according to the School of Prabhākara, by Śālikanātha, Chowkhamba Sanskrit series, 1903. Originally published in the *Pandit* 1866-67. Portions of the work are missing."

Here is a reason why recent editions should be located and consulted. References ought to be taken from them.

On p.19 of J's *Añjali*, v. 3, the following verse appears: Nanvem turagārūḍhāḥ.. Jacob consulted 1903 ed. He was aware of Śālikā. I saw a new editon.

There has been a flood of reprints in recent years in India. Probably the Government is subsidizing the Operation Punarmudraṇa. Unless it is a revision--if it is only a punarmudraṇa of a faulty editon, it is only a punarmaraṇa.

J's text reads: evabhirūḍhaḥ, wrong, dead wrong....but not for the first time, neither for the last time.

054

Asādhāraṇyena vyapadeśā bhavanti.

Names are given in consideration of some speciality. This was perhaps taken from *Sāṅkhyasūtra* V.112: "Sarveṣu pṛthivyupādānam asādhāraṇyāt tadvyapadeśaḥ pūrvavat." "In all [bodies] earth is the material: in consideration [however] of some speciality, there is designation as this [or that other element than earth, as entering into the constitution of some given body], as in the preceding case." This is Dr. Ballantyne's rendering. The nyāya is found in the early part of the Akṣapāda section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, and I append Prof. Cowell's translation:

"Nanu pramāṇādi padārthaṣoḍaśake pratipādyamāne katham idaṃ nyāya-śāstram iti vyapadiśyate. Satyam. Tathāpyasādhāraṇyena vyapadeśā bhavanti nyāyena nyāyasya parārthānumānāparaparyāyasya sakalavidyānugrāhakatayā sarvakarmānuṣṭhānasādhanatayā pradhānatvena tathā vyapadeśo yujyate."

"But here an objector may say, 'If these sixteen topics, proof &c., are all thus fully discussed, how is it that it has received the name of the Nyāya Śāstra [as reasoning, *i. e.* *Nyāya*, or logic, properly forms only a small part of the topics which it treats of?]. We allow the force of the objection; still, as names are proverbially said to be given for some special reason, we maintain that the name Nyāya was rightly applied to Gotama's System, since 'reasoning,' or inference for the sake of another, is justly held to be a predominant feature from its usefulness in all kinds of knowledge, and from its being a necessary means for every kind of pursuit." See also *Śālikā*, page 98, line 8; and *Bhāmātī* 1-3-14 (page 208).

Ed. Note: Cf. Asidhāra. Drawn from memory.

055

Asidhārāmadhulehananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *licking honey from the edge of a sword!* This is found in the Jaina chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 45 of Jīvananda's edn.), as follows: "Sadasadvedanīyasya sukhaduḥkhotpādakatvam asidhārāmadhulehanavat," which Prof. Cowell renders, "An object recognized as simultaneously existing or non-existing produces mingled pleasure and pain, as licking honey from a sword's edge- this is *veda-nīya!*" Compare *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii-64: "Kāmair na tṛptiḥ saṃsāre kṣuradhārāmadhūpamaḥ."

Ed. Note: Cf. *Asidhārāgrasañcāraḥ ayaścaṇakacarvaṇam*.
Drawn from memory.

056

Astram astreṇa śāmyati.

A weapon is silenced by a weapon. Perhaps analogous to the saying "Diamond cuts diamond" or, "Set a thief to catch a thief." It occurs in Jñānottama's commentary on Sureśvara's *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 81, where he says: "Nanvastram astreṇa śāmyatīti nyāyena kāmyaiḥ kāmyānām, niṣiddhair niṣiddhānām nivṛttir astvityata āha na ca kāmyairiti."

Compare with this *Nītisāra* viii. 67:

"Viṣaṃ viṣeṇa vyathate vajraṃ vajreṇa bhidyate.
Gajendro dṛṣṭasāreṇa gajendreṇaiva badhyate."

ED. NOTE: Cf. *Viṣasya viṣam auśadham*.
Sthāvarajaṅgamaviṣanyāya.

057

Asnehadīpanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a Lamp without oil* [that is, from which the oil has burnt out]. Raghunāthavarma explains it thus:

"Asmimścādhyāse'jñānaṃ kāraṇam. Tattvajñānena vātadīpanyāyena tannivṛttāvasnehadīpanyāyena tadadhyāso'pi nivartate. Na ca jñānenaivobhayanivṛttīḥ kuto na syāt. Jñānaṃ ajñānasyaiva nivartakam iti nyāyavirodhāt. Dvidvidhā hi nivṛttīḥ. Virodhiṇā sāmagrīnivṛtṭyā ca. Yathā vātādīnā dīpanāśo, yathā ca tailavartyā-dīnivṛtṭyā dīpanivṛttīḥ. Tatrādyā nivṛttir ajñānasya dvitīyā kāryavargasyeti bodhyam."

I have met with the following example of the nyāya in *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 2. 1. 44, a chapter entitled Śukaniryāṇam:

"Tatra varṣasahasrāṇi nirvikalpasamādhinā.
Daśa sthitvā śaśāmāsāvātmanyasnehadīpavat."

(śaśāma asau ātmani asneha)

For the nyāya Jñānam ajñānasyaiva nivartakam, see its location and for Nirvikalpa-samādhī, see *Vedāntasāra*, pp. 55, 57, &c., and *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*, pages 109, 110.

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references. This nyāya must have been taken by Jacob from R's *Saṅgraha*. Jacob did not use *Ratnākara* for the *First Handful*.

This nyāya is missed by Jacob. His Index too is incomplete, inadequate, defective, and unreliable.

058

Ahikuṇḍalanyāyah.

The maxim of the *snake and its coils*. The expression occurs in *Brahmasūtra* 3. 2. 27, and is explained in the *bhāshya*. They read thus:

"Ubhayavyapadeśāt tvahikuṇḍalavat ... Ata ubhayavyapadeśadarśanād ahi-kuṇḍalavad atra tattvaṃ bhavitum arhati. Yathāhir ityabhedāḥ kuṇḍalābhogaprāṃ-śutvādīnīti ca bheda evam ihāpīti."

Dr. Thibaut's translation is as follows: "But on account of twofold designation, (the relation of the highest Self to the individual soul has to be viewed) like that of the snake to its coils... We therefore look on the relation of the highest Self and the soul as analogous to that of the snake and its coils. Viewed as a whole, the snake is one, non-different, while an element of difference appears if we view it with regard to its coils, hood, erect posture and so on." It is akin, therefore, to the expressions "a forest and its trees," "a lake and its waters," so often used by the Vedantists as illustrations of identity. The explanation given by Tārānātha in the *Vācaspatyam* does not coincide with the above. He says: "Aheṣ sarpasya yathā kuṇḍalākṛtīveṣṭanaṃ svābhāvikaṃ, tathā yasya svābhāvikadharmo vyapadiśyate tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ."

ED. NOTE: Yes, the explanation given by *Vācaspatyam* will not be prasaṅgasāṅgata.

059

Ahibhukkaivartanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the opium-eater and the fisherman*. I have not met with this in actual use in the literature, but include it on the authority of Raghunāthavarman, whose interpretation of it, however, seems most improbable. The word ahi is said by him to mean "an intoxicating plant, known in the language of the West as *Post*" ("unmādakara āuśadhiviśeṣaḥ posteti pāścātya bhāṣāyām"). This meaning of ahi is unknown to the lexicographers; but, in Bate's Hindi dictionary, *posta* is said to mean "the poppy-plant; an infusion of the poppy formerly much used as a slow poison;" whilst Fallon defines it as "Poppy-head or capsule; an intoxicating drug." We must take ahi, therefore, in the sense of *ahipena*, which is the original of the modern *aphīma*, opium. The story on which the maxim is said to be based is as follows:

"Ahibhukkaivartanyāyas tu tādātmyādhyāsa eva jñeyaḥ. Śrūyate hi loke kaścid ahibhug nāvam āruroha. Sa ca tatra bahunāsamudāyaṃ dṛṣṭvā kenacin me vinimayo na syād iti dhiyā svapāde rajjuṃ baddhvā tandrāṃ prāpa. Kaivartaś copahāsārthaṃ tatpādāt tāṃ mocayitvā svapāde babandha. Nāvi pāraṃ gatāyām avarohaṇasamaye-'hibhuk svapāde rajjuṃ adṛṣṭvā kaivartapāde ca tāṃ dṛṣṭvā'ham ayam ayam aham iti svahṛdi niścītyāre kaivarta, tvam aham ahaṃ ca tvam iti vivādaṃ kṛtavān."

This nonsense is meant to teach the identity of the individual with the one Self.

ED. NOTE: In response to Jacob's using the word "nonsense," we would like to say: "Thank you very much, Mr. Mighty Military Man! Might is right. Your tongue is too long, sharp, and biting too. Yadā yadā muñcati vākyabāṇam tadā tadā jātikulapramāṇam."

060

Ahṛdayavacasām ahṛdayam uttaram.

Heartless words get heartless answer. Like receives like. This occurs in *Vedāntatattva-viveka*, (The Paṇḍit for May 1903), page 14, line 4 from bottom: "Tatra cāhṛdayavacasām ahṛdayam uttaram iti nyāyena sadanyatvaṃ prapañcasyoktaṃ, na tu tattvābhiprāyeṇa."

In the *Tātparyaṭīkā*, it takes the form of "Ahṛdayavācām ahṛdayā eva prativāco bhavanti," and is combined with "Yādṛśo yakṣas tādṛśo baliḥ." The passage will be found under that nyāya in its proper location.

In his *Nyāyadīpāvali*, page 2, Ānandabodhācārya quotes the nyāya in accordance with Vācaspatimiśra.

ED. NOTE: Cf. To pay one in his own coin. Tit for Tat.

061

Ākāśamuṣṭihananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *striking the sky with one's fist*. A vain attempt at an impossibility. It occurs in the Jaimini chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 133 of *Bib. Ind.* edition, and p. 151 of Jivānanda's) as follows:

"Tasmād utpattau jñaptau ca paratastve pramāṇasambhavāt, svataḥsiddham prāmānyam ityetatpūtikūṣmāṇḍāyata iti cet, tad etad ākāśamuṣṭihananyāte."

Prof. Cowell has rendered it thus: "Therefore, as we can prove that authoritativeness is both produced and recognized by means of something external, the Mīmāṃsā tenet 'authoritativeness is self-proved' is like a gourd over-ripe and rotten. This long harangue of our opponent, however, is but a vain attempt to strike the sky with his fist."

Much older instances of the employment of the nyāya are the following: *Tantravārtika*, page 170,

"Yas tantūn anupādāya turīmātraparigrahāt.
Paṭaṃ kartuṃ samīheta sa hanyād vyoma muṣṭibhiḥ."

[With this compare the words of a great modern preacher - Dr. Maclaren - "Logic without Revelation is like a spinning-machine without cotton, busy drawing out nothing."] *Pancapādikā* page 43, line 19, "Tad yadi nāma jñānaṃ loke siddham tathāpi nirastaprapañcātma viṣayam asiddham ākāśamuṣṭihanāvan na vidhātuṃ śakyam." Then, in *Nyāyakandalī*, page 56, line 6, we find the cognate expression, "Yathā kaścin niśitaṃ kṛpāṇam acchedyam ākāśaṃ prati vyāpārayan," and again in *Nyāyakanikā*, page 219.

ED. NOTE: Jacob's poetry too is featured as prose. This is called *samadṛṣṭi* but *viśama-vṛttam*.

062

Ākhyātānām arthaṃ bruvatām śaktiḥ sahakāriṇī.

Power [of understanding on the part of the hearer] *cooperates with the verbs expressing a certain sense*. This is Dr. Thibaut's rendering of the nyāya as it appears in Laugākshibhāskara's *Arthasaṅgraha* (page 16) in a passage explanatory of *adhikāra vidhi*.

The portion connected with the nyāya, and the translation, are as follows: "Evaṃ sāmartyam apī. Ākhyātānām arthaṃ bruvatām śaktiḥ sahakāriṇī nyāyāt samartham

pratyeva vidhipravṛtteḥ." "In the same manner, capability (to perform the duty is an understood qualification); for the injunction applies only to those who are capable (by bodily strength and health, mental power &c.) to carry it out, according to the principle expressed in the words 'power (of understanding on the part of the hearer) cooperates with the verbs expressing a certain sense' (the verbs, although possessing a certain sense, have no effect on a person not able to understand it)." The commentator, Rāmeśvara Śivayogibhikṣu, explains that blind, deaf, and lame persons are excluded as being incapable of performing various parts of the sacrificial ritual.

A much earlier instance of the employment of the nyāya is met with in Sureśvara's *Sambandhavārtika*, verse 75, which I here subjoin, together with Ānandagiri's comment.

"Sahakartrī bhavec chaktir iti nyāyād bhaved yadi.
Manuṣyagocaropīti nākhyātāsamḥbhavāt tathā.

Ākhyātānām arthaṃ bodhayatām adhikāriśaktiḥ sahakāriṇīti nyāyād vidheyārthānuṣṭhānaśaktam adhikāriṇaṃ vinā vidher vidhitvāyogāt kāmyādi mumukṣur varjayed ityākhyātasya manuṣyaṃ prati svārthaṃ bodhayato manuṣyaśaktisāpekṣatvād devamātragocaratvam asyāsiddham iti śaṃkate. Sahakartrīti. Yatrākhyātam asti tatra tatsahakartrī kartṛśaktiriṣṭā. Na ca mokṣakāmī kāmyādi varjayed ityākhyātam khyātyato na manuṣyagocarato ktahetor iti samādhatte nākhyāteṭi."

The verse immediately preceding is the following:

"Na tu yādṛcchikī siddhir vaktavyeha vipaścitā.
Daivagocara evaiṣa na tu mānuṣagocaraḥ."

The two are rendered as follows in a translation (by Mr.S.V. Aiyar) which appeared in *The Paṇḍit*: "A wise man ought not to speak of success as depending on mere accident. Such a thing would be within the scope not of human effort, but of destiny. It cannot be said that it is also within the scope of human effort, on the principle that injunction implies endeavour; for there is no injunction (ākhyāta) to that effect."

The nyāya probably originated with Śabara, who makes use of it in his bhāṣya on *Jaimini* 1. 4. 30, where the reading is Ākhyātaśabdānām arthaṃ &c. The expression, "Sarvākhyātasahakāriśaktyanusāreṇa" in *Tantravārtika* 2.2.27, page 558, line 9, incorporates the same nyāya.

063

Ādāvante ce yan nāsti vartamāne'pi tattathā.

That which at the beginning and the end has no [real] existence, has none either during the intervening period. The Vedantists of Śankara's school hold that existence is of three kinds, namely, pāramārthika (true), of which Brahma is the sole representative, - vyā-

vahārika (practical), to which all phenomena belong, - and prātibhāsika (apparent), which includes such things as a snake surmised in a rope, or nacre mistaken for silver. The second and third kind, therefore, have no real existence from the beginning to the end of their supposed existence.

Raghunātha says regarding it: "Nanvādāvante ca yannāsti vartamāne'pi tattatheti nyāyād ye tuccham eva dvaitam manyante teṣāṃ brahmabodhena savikṛtyavidyā-bādho na syāt, tasya brahmasvarūpanityabodhamahimnā sadaiva bādhitatvāt."

He may have taken the nyāya, like so many others in his book, from the Yogavāsiṣṭha, where it is found as the first line of 4. 45. 45; but its real source is Gauḍapāda's kārikās on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. It occurs twice there, namely in ii. 6 and IV. 31.

ED. NOTE: cf. Avyaktādīni bhūtāni....Gītā. Prātibhāsika= Illusory.

064

Āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāyaḥ.

Watering a mango tree and, at the same time, satisfying the Manes with a libation. Bringing about two results by one operation. Its earliest occurrence is in the Mahābhāṣya, where it appears twice. In 1.1.1 (page 14) it stands thus: "Katham punar ekena yatnenobhayaṃ labhyam. Labhyam ityāha. Katham. Dvigatā api hetavo bhavanti. Tadyathā. Āmrāśca siktāḥ pitaraśca prīṇitā iti."

The second instance is in 8. 2. 3.

The nyāya in its consolidated form is found in the following passage of the *Nyāyamañ-jarī* (5. 1. 39), page 634.

"Tad evam anena caturviṃṣatijātyudāharaṇapratīsamādhānopadeśavartmanā śabdānityatvasādhane parakīyam upālambhājātam evaṃprāyam akhilam apākṛtam āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāyena bhavati bhagavatā sūtrakāreṇa."

It is not in any of the dictionaries or lists of nyāyas.

ED. NOTE: Āmrāś ca siktāḥ pitraś ca tṛptā ekā kriyā dvarthakariī prasiddhā. See Jha: *Pūrvamīmāṃsā in its source.*, p. 333] Cf. Killing two birds with one stone. This is a good example to show what the nyāyas are. Cultural difference. We, the Āryans, don't kill birds. Our tenet is Ahimsā paramo dharmaḥ. We perform pitṛtarpaṇa, oblation to the dear departed ones, the honorable respected ones.

Āmrānprṣṭa :- The three-volumed Apte's Dictionary is revised and enlarged. It contains many nyāyas. Āmrānprṣṭa--cites verbatim what is given here. At the end of the citation the editors attribute to *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*. This is all ucchiṣṭabhojana. The editors have copied the information from *Añjali*.

Also note: caturviṃśati.

065

Āmrān prṣṭaḥ kovidārān ācaṣṭe.

Questioned as to mango trees, he speaks of Kovidāra trees. This is nyāya 223 of the second part of Raghunāthavarman's large work, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*, and is applied by him as follows (page 419a of India office MS.582):

"Tathā hi loke prakṣṭaparakāśaś candra ityatra prakṣṭapadenāprakṣṭakhadyo-
tādeḥ prakāśapadenāprakāśātmakāndhakārādeśca vyavacchedena jñāsitaś candra-
prātipadikamātrārthaḥ pratipādyate. Itarathā āmrān prṣṭaḥ kovidārān ācaṣṭa iti
nyāyena vaktur ajñāsitam arthaṃ pratipādayato'śraddheyavacanatvaprasaṅgāt."

It is found in *Bhāmatī* 1.1.22 (page 145):

"Yadyapyākāśapadaṃ pradhānārthaṃ tathāpi yat prṣṭaṃ tadeva prativak-
tavyam. Na khalvanunmatta āmrān prṣṭaḥ kovidārānācaṣṭe."

In *Vedāntakalpataru* 1.4.1 (page 201):

"Jīve prṣṭe taṃ durdarśam iti tadvyatiriktaparamātmaprativacanam āmra-
praśne kovidāraprativacanavad asaṅgatam."

There is also an excellent example in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭikā*, page 187, line 16, and another on page 545 of the comment on *Tattvamuktākalāpa*. Its source, however, is *Mahā-
bhāṣya* 1.2.45 (vārt 8): "Anyad bhavān prṣṭo'nyadācaṣṭe. Āmrān prṣṭaḥ kovidārān
ācaṣṭe."

ED. NOTE: J's text has an error in the quote from *Bhāmatī*. It has omitted "Na." Not surprising at all.

Cf. Āndhara gurū bahira celā, mānge guḍa liyāve ḍhelā. NGK is a living and lovely example of this nyāya.

Even the third ed. of *Añjali* is full of faults. We can repeat this statement times without number without any fear of contradiction at all.

Āmre phalārthe nimite chāyā gandha ityanūtpadyete.

Though a mango-tree is planted for the sake of its fruit, shade and fragrance are also incidentally produced. This illustration is employed by Āpastamba in his *Dharmasūtra* 1. 7. 20. 3 which I quote together with Dr. Buehler's translation (in *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ii): "Tad yathāmre phalārthe nimite chāyā gandha ityanūtpadyete. Evaṃ dharmam caryamāṇam arthā anūtpadyante."

"Worldly benefits are produced as accessories to the fulfillment of the law,¹ just as in the case of a mango-tree, which is planted in order to obtain fruit, shade and fragrance are accessory advantages." Plain and intelligible as this is, it is invariably misquoted, and, instead of nimite (from the root mi prakṣepaṇe), we find nirmite, or the clearly impossible nimitte. The nyāya is found in Śankara's Bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 4. 3. 14, and in every edition known to me the text and comment stand thus:

"Na ca nityanaimittikānuṣṭhānāt pratyavāyānutpattimātram, na punaḥ phalāntarotpattir iti pramāṇam asti, phalāntarasyaḥpranuniṣpādinaḥ sambhavāt. Smarati hyāpastambaḥ. Tad yathāmre phalārthe nirmite chāyāgandhāvanūtpadyete evaṃ dharmam caryamāṇam arthā anūtpadyanta iti."

Then the tīkākāra is made to say "Nimitta āropite satīti yāvat." We find it again in Sureśvara's *Sambandhavārtika*, verses 96 and 97:

"Phalam nityasya nāpīha duritakṣayamātrakam.
Phalāntaraśruteḥ sākṣāt tadyathāmrasmrtes tathā.

'Āmre nimitta' ityādi hyāpastambasmṛter vacaḥ.
Phalavattvaṃ samācaṣṭe nityānām api karmaṇām."

Here, again, the unfortunate commentator is made to misquote the Sūtra, with nimitte for nimite, and to give it the meaning belonging to the latter, namely "nihite ropite." The translator of the vārtika was apparently satisfied with the reading in verse 97, which he rendered, "The mango being the cause &c." But did Sureśvara really put it thus?

Āpastamba's simile is found also in Rāmatīrtha's comment on the *Vedāntasāra*, page 90 of my edition.

I may add that the verb nimi occurs frequently in Vedic literature, and means *to set up, erect, or fix*. The root pad in combination with the two prepositions anu and ut has no place in the dictionaries, and may be peculiar to Āpastamba.

¹ "Dharma" cannot be translated by "law." It must be accepted as it is.

ED. NOTE:

Jacob says: "In every edition known to me the text and comment stand thus." However, KSS25:1000 (*Brahmasūtraśāṅkarabhāṣya*) has phalārthe nimite chāyā...He has raised a question whether Śureśvara had really put it that way. No, Śureśvara did put the correct way. Ānandgiri commented the correct way. The MRI ed. of the Vārtika clearly shows nimite and Ānandgiri absolutely and positively and clearly puts his comments correctly. Maybe Jacob saw only some primitive editions, just like the one of the Saṅgraha that came from Banaras in 1902.

Jacob always talks in a dictatorial tone and demonstrates the power of the dictum--Might is right. He reminds us of Misra the pretender-thief, who stole a good deal of material from my work on Bilhaṇa and got a Ph. D. from Tuebingen. See my work entitled *Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita and its neo-expounders*. Both compete with each other in haṭhadharmitā.

Cf. Phalavatsahakāranāya.

Ūrdhvabāhur viraumyeṣa na ca kaścit śṛṇoti me.
Dharmād arthaś ca kāmāś ca sa kim artham na sevyate.

Why not take anu as a separate avyaya meaning paścāt= follows? e.g. vācam artho-
'nudhāvati.

067

Āyur ghṛtam.

Butter is life. This scarcely deserves a place amongst maxims, but I follow Raghunātha in admitting it. It is one of the stock illustrations of writers on Alankāra, and is found in Namisādhu's comment on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* vii. 83, as follows:

"Āyur ghṛtaṃ nadī puṇyaṃ bhayaṃ cauraḥ sukhaṃ priyā.
Vairaṃ dyūtaṃ gurur jñānaṃ śreyo brāhmaṇapūjanam."

I have traced it, however, as far back as *Taiṭṭī-Saṃhitā* 2. 3. 2. 2, and have met with it again in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 59 (vārt. 6), and 6. 1. 32 (vārt. 6). For the last passage, see "Dadhitrāpusaṃ pratyakṣo jvaraḥ" in its place. Śureśvara too furnishes an excellent example of it in his large *vārtika* 1. 5 1848:

"Parīkṣya cakṣuṣā yasmāl labhate godhanādikam.
Cakṣuḥ syān mānuṣaṃ vittaṃ yathāyur ghṛtam ucyate."

ED. NOTE: Nirajana's was truly a photographic reprint--exact copy to copy. So all the errors too have been faithfully reproduced. The reprinters were interested only in making money; not in rendering any service. It was possible for them to give an "errata" if their objective had been the latter -- a noble cause. For an example of the horrible bundles of blunders reproduced by bimbapratibimbabhāva see the bottom of page 10 of the *Second Handful*.

The 3rd ed. claimed to be a "revised" ed. is only a copy to copy of the second ed., makṣikāsthāne makṣikā. It is not true to say that it is revised. We got a copy after a prolonged effort. We got it photocopied. We compared. The outcome was total frustration and disappointment.

The above statement relates to the internal aspect of the text. Yet our xerox copy of the third ed. came out to be physically much superior from the point of view of readability. It was much better than the trash brought out by Nirajana, the money-making shop.

068

Ārdraṃ vastraṃ samantād vātānītaṃ reṇujātaṃ upādatte.

A wet garment collects the dust brought to it from every side by the wind. This illustration is taken from the Jaina section of Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha (page 44 of Jivānanda's edn). The text, and Professor Cowell's translation, are as follows:

"Yathārdraṃ vastraṃ samantād vātānītaṃ reṇujātaṃ upādatte, tathā kaṣāyaja-lārdra ātmā yogānītaṃ karma sarvapradeśair grhṇāti. Yathā vā niṣṭaptāyaḥpiṇḍe jāle kṣipte'mbhaḥ samantād grhṇāti tathā kaṣāyoṣṇo jīvo yogānītaṃ karma samantād ādatte."

"As a wet garment collects the dust brought to it from every side by the wind, so the soul, wet with previous sins, collects, by its manifold points of contact with the body, the actions which are brought to it by yoga. Or as, when water is thrown on a heated lump of iron, the iron absorbs the water altogether, so the jīva, heated by previous sins, receives from every side the actions which are brought by yoga." In a footnote, the Professor adds: "Yoga seems to be here the natural impulse of the soul to act."

ED. NOTE: Jacob has presented translations of some nyāyas, i.e. their explanations.

069

Āśāmodakatrptanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *one who is satisfied with sweetmeats in prospect*. It is found in a verse quoted in *Nyāyakandalī*, page 130:

"Āśāmodakatṛptā ye ye copārjitamodakāḥ.
Rasavīryavipākādi tulyaṃ teṣāṃ prasajyate."

The same verse is quoted on page 37 of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, and is translated by Prof. Gangānātha Jhā (in the new periodical, *Indian Thought*) as follows: "But, says an objector, from your theory it would follow that *those who enjoy merely imaginary sweets*, and those who eat real sweets, would have exactly the same experiences of flavour, strength, nutritive effects, and so on. He, we reply, who flatters himself with the hope of this objection invalidating our view, truly himself *feeds upon imaginary sweets* (ityasyāpi bādhakatvam āśāmodakāyate)." In *Nyāyadīpāvalī*, p.7, we read: "Āśāmodako-pārjitamodakayor astyeva svapne'pi kiyad vailakṣanyam."

ED. NOTE: Mana ke laḍḍū phīke kyom? (Hindi).

070

Āṣāḍhavāte calati dvipendre cakrīvato vāridhireva kāṣṭhā.

When the wind is blowing in the month Āṣāḍha [i.e. in the rainy season, when strong winds prevail] *and the lordly elephant is being driven about, nothing but the sea can be the final resting place of the donkey*. That is to say, if the mighty elephant can with difficulty withstand the force of the wind, the puny donkey must inevitably be blown into the sea! I am greatly indebted to Mr. D. Sundara Rājaśarmā of Madras for giving me a reference to this nyāya in the *Vedāntāsikhāmaṇi* (a work which I had not then read). It appears in a passage on page 393, and I append an extract from Amaradāsa's comment on it:

"Vāmadevādīnām utpannabrahmasākṣātkārāṇām apyamuktāvarvācīnānām āṣāḍhavāte calati dvipendre cakrīvato vāridhireva kāṣṭheti nyāyena muktir dūrot-sāritā syāt." "Āṣāḍhavāte iti. Āṣāḍhavāyusambaddhe dvipendre gajendre calati itastato dolāyamāne sati cakrīvato rāsabhasya vāridhir eva samudra eva kāṣṭhā viśrāmāvadhīr ityarthāḥ."

Raghunātha's application of the simile is somewhat different, and makes it the equivalent of the Pradhānamallanibarhaṇanyāya. He says: "Yābhir yuktibhir atiprabala-śuṣkatarkakarkaśatvena prasiddho'pi dvaitasatyatvavādī vaiśeṣikādir jayyas, tābhir itare kṣudrāś Cārvākādayas tu dūrato nirastā bhavanti vivakṣāyām āṣāḍhavāte calati dvipendre cakrīvato vāridhireva kāṣṭheti nyāyapravṛttiḥ. Calatīti saptamyantam padaṃ dehalīdīpanyāyenobhayatra sambadhyate. Cakrīvān gardabhaḥ. Spāṣṭam anyat."

In a manuscript of the *Śikhāmaṇi* copied for me in Poona, the nyāya stands thus: "Āṣāḍhamāse valadvipendre cakrivato're bhavati dyukāṣṭhāvadhir eva kāṣṭhā." Though partly inaccurate, this clearly furnishes a variant of the simile. The reading of the India Office manuscript (No. 568, page 73 b) differs materially from above and seems hopelessly corrupt. It puts it as follows: "Āṣāḍhamāse calati dvipendre cakrivato dhāvato dhāvati kāṣṭhavāhauriti nyāyena!" Does this, in spite of its inaccuracy, indicate the existence of another variant?

ED. NOTE: Cf. Baḍe baḍe baha gaye, gadhā pūche kitanā pānī. (Hindi).

Note the variations in readings. Extensive use by many.

071

Ito vyāghra itas taṭī.

On one side a tiger, on the other a precipice! A serious dilemma! There is a good example in Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* iii. 166:

"Kuṭumbam api me preyaḥ preyāms tvam api he sakhe.
Kiṃ karomi dvidhācitta ito vyāghra itas taṭī."

Another is found in *Syādvādamanjarī*, page 151:

"Avāstavatvagrāhakaṃ pramāṇaṃ sāmṃvṛtaṃ asāmṃvṛtaṃ vā syāt. Yadi sāmṃvṛtaṃ kathaṃ tasmād avāstavād vāstavasya śūnyavādasya siddhiḥ prāptā. Tathā ca vāstava eva samasto'pi pramātrādivyavahāraḥ. Atha tadgrāhakaṃ pramāṇaṃ svayam asāmṃvṛtaṃ tarhi kṣiṇāḥ pramātrādivyavahārā vāstavatvapratijñātenaiva vyabhicārāt. Tad evaṃ pakṣadvaye 'pīto vyāghra itas taṭīti nyāyena vyakta eva paramārthataḥ svābhimatasiddhivirodhaḥ."

In the following verse on page 896 of *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, we have the nyāya as a compound:

"Ito hi maithunasyājñā itaḥ sāgaravāraṇam.
Sa vyāghradustaṭīnyāyaḥ sañjāto me sudustaraḥ."

ED. NOTE: Cf. Ubhayataḥpāsā rajjuḥ.

072

Iṣukāranyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the arrow-maker*. Used of one wholly engrossed in his work, and unconscious of his surroundings. It is based on the following verse of *Śāntiparva*, chapter 178:

"Iṣukāro naraḥ kaścīd iṣāvāsaktamānaśaḥ.
Samīpenāpi gacchantaṃ rājānaṃ nāvabuddhavān."

Śaṅkara makes use of it in his exposition of *Vedāntasūtra* 3. 2. 10 ["mugdhe'rdha-sampattiḥ pariśeṣāt." In the case of one in a swoon (there is not entrance into either of the states of sleep &c.), so, by the only remaining alternative, there is a semi-entrance (into sound sleep and another state)]. He says:

"Iṣukāranyāyena mugdho bhaviṣyati. Yatheṣukāro jāgrad apīṣvāsaktamanas-tayā nānyān viṣayān īkṣata evaṃ mugdho musalasaṃghātādijanitaduḥkhānubhava-vyagramanastayā jāgradapi nānyān viṣayān īkṣata iti. Na. Acetayamānatvāt."

Ānandagiri refers to the same nyāya in his comment on Sureśvara's large *Vārtika* 1. 5. 106 (page 816). See too *Nyāyamakarandaṭikā*, page 78. Compare with this the picture drawn by John Bunyan of "a man who could look no way but downwards, with a muck-rake in his hand. There stood also one over his head with a celestial crown in his hand, and proffered him that crown for his muck-rake; but the man did neither look up nor regard, but raked to himself the straws, the small sticks, and the dust of the floor."

ED. NOTE: The last para is noteworthy for many reasons.

073

Iṣuvegākṣayanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the gradual diminution of the speed of an arrow*. It is found in *Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 32: "Pravṛttaphalasya karmāśayasya mukteṣor iva vegākṣayān nivṛttiḥ."

Then, in *Bṛihadāranyavārtika* 1. 4. 1529 (page 736), we read as follows:

"Ārabdhaphalaśeṣaikahetutvād dehasaṃsthiteḥ.
Rāgādiratyayodbhūtir iṣucakrādivogavat."

"The experience of passion and other mental conditions, owing to the continuance of the body caused by the remnant of fructescent works, is like the [diminishing] speed of a [potter's] wheel or of an arrow." Upon which Ānandagiri remarks: "Iṣucakreti. Yathā pravṛttavegasyeṣvāder vegākṣayād eva kṣayas tathārabdhakṣayo bhogād eva. 'Bhogenā tvitare kṣapayitvā saṃpadyata' iti nyāyān na jñānād ityārthaḥ." The quotation is *Vedāntasūtra* 4.1.19.

In Śaṅkara's most interesting exposition of sūtra 4.1.15, we meet with the expression kulālacakravat in the same connection.

ED. NOTE: cf. Kulālacakrabhramaṇanyāya. It is to be noted that in the original the arrow comes first, followed by the [potter's] wheel.

074

Iṣyamāṇasyaiva prādhānyaṃ na tvicchāyāḥ.

The thing wished for is of more importance than the wish. This occurs in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 56, as follows: "Nanu vidhyanvayitvenāvivakṣitam api praiśānuvacanam anuvādyatayā yathā vidheyadaṇḍānvayi, evam icchāpi prārabhyamāṇa-brahmajñānānvayinī satī brahma jñānasya prayojanatvaṃ brahmaṇaḥ sandigdhatvaṃ ca gamayet. Iccheṣyamāṇasamabhivyāhāre ceṣyamāṇaprādhānyaṃ yajeta svargakāma ityādau kṛptam. Ata ihāpīcchāprādhānyaṃ vihāyeṣyamāṇaprādhānyam abhyupagantum yuktam."

Again, on page 62 of the same: "Pratyayārthaḥ pradhānam iti sāmānyanyāyād iccheṣyamāṇasamabhivyāhṛtāviṣyamāṇaṃ pradhānam iti svargakāmapadādiṣu kṛpto viśeṣanyāyo balavāniti bhāvaḥ."

So, too, in Rāmānuja's *Srībhāṣya*, page 31: "Jñātum icchā jījñāsā. Icchāyā iṣyamāṇa-pradhānatvād iṣyamāṇaṃ jñānam iha vidhīyate."

This is repeated *verbatim* in the Rāmānuja section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, page 69 (Jivānanda's edn.)

075

Utkrṣṭadṛṣṭir nikrṣṭe'dhyasitavyā.

The idea of something higher is to be superimposed upon something lower. This is Dr. Thibaut's rendering of the nyāya as it occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 4.1.5 (the sūtra being Brahmadṛṣṭir utkarṣāt):

"Evaṃ prāpte brūmaḥ. Brahmadṛṣṭir evādityādiṣu syād iti. Kasmāt. Utkarṣāt. Evaṃ utkarṣeṇādityādayo dṛṣṭā bhavanti. Utkrṣṭadṛṣṭes teṣvadyāsāt. Tathā ca laukiko nyāyo'numato bhavati. Utkrṣṭadṛṣṭir hi nikrṣṭe'dhyasitavyeti laukiko nyāyaḥ. Yathā rājadṛṣṭiḥ kṣttari."

To this we make the following reply. The contemplation on Brahman is exclusively to be superimposed on Āditya and so on. Why? 'On account of exaltation.' For thus Āditya

and so on are viewed in an exalted way, the contemplation of something higher than they being superimposed on them. Thereby we also comply with a secular rule, namely the one enjoining that the idea of something higher is to be superimposed upon something lower, as when we view - and speak of - the king's charioteer as a king." Vācaspatimiśra, in his comment on the above in the *Bhāmātī*, changes the form of the expression to "nikṣṭadrṣtir notkṣṭa iti laukiko nyāyaḥ," and perhaps Rāmānuja had this in mind when, in his very short comment on the sūtra, he wrote "Utkṣṭe hi rājani bhṛtyadrṣṭiḥ pratyavāyakarī, bhṛtye tu rājadṣṭir abhyudayāya."

ED. NOTE: Here is a good definition and explanation of what is a Laukikanyāya. It is noteworthy to see Śaṅkarācārya and similar supreme authorities citing laukiko nyāyaḥ as the pramāṇa, an instrument and guide for their establishing a śāstrīya siddhānta. The exact words of Śaṅkarācārya are--Tathā ca laukiko nyāyo'numato bhavati.

Also is to be considered the expression "secular nyāya" as an equivalent term for the concept of the Laukikanyāya. This is a good translation of "Laukiko nyāyaḥ.

Here we see how the nyāyas are derived, how they are expounded, and how they are used.

076

Utkhātadamṣṭroraganyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the snake whose fangs have been extracted*. The illustration is used by Sureśvara in his vārtika on *Bṛihadāranyakopanishadbhāṣya* 1.4.1746 (page 776):

"Utkhātadamṣṭroragavad avidyā kiṃ kariṣyati.
Vidyamānāpi vidhvasta-tīvrānarthaparamparā."

077

Udare bhṛte kośo bhṛtaḥ.

When his stomach is full, his coffers are full. Used of a lazy fellow who has no ambition beyond his daily food. "Whose god is his belly." It occurs in Hemacandra's *Parīśiṣṭa-parvan* iii. 113:

"Dāridryeṇa madīyena bibharṣyudaram apyadaḥ.
Udare ca bhṛte kośo bhṛta ityeva manyase."

Ed. Note: cf. Supūrā syāt kunadikā supūro muṣikāñjaliḥ.
Susantuṣṭaḥ kāpuruṣaḥ svalpakenāpi tuṣyati.

078

Upajīvyavirodhasyāyuktatvam.

It is wrong to quarrel with that on which one's livelihood depends. It is found in *Paribhāśenduśekhara* 85, as follows: "Sannipāto dvayoḥ saṁbandhas tannimitto vidhis taṁ sannipātaṁ yo vihanti tasyānimittam. Upajīvyavirodhasyāyuktatvam iti nyāya-mūlaiṣā."

Professor Kielhorn has rendered it thus:- "Sannipāta 'a combination' is the junction of two (things; that which is taught in) a rule (the application of) which is caused by such (a combination), does not cause (the application of) another (rule) which would destroy that combination. This (Paribhāṣā) is founded on the maxim that *one must not be hostile to that to which one owes one's existence.*"

There are references to the nyāya in the following works: *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 128; *Vedāntakalpataru*, pages 231, and 556 (especially the latter); *Parimala*, pages 10, 11, 12, 451; *Nyāyamakarandaṭikā*, page 149.

ED. NOTE: See other references given above. We may make one more reference to Akṛtavyūhāḥ Pāṇinīyāḥ. Nimittam vināśonmukham dṛṣṭvā tatprayuktam kāryam na kurvanti.

079

Upayannapayan dharmo vikaroti hi dharminam.

The appearance or disappearance of a quality [or characteristic] produces a corresponding change in the subject of it. This nyāya is the second line of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* ii. 35, the first being "Āgamāpāyiniṣṭhatvād anityatvam iyād dṛṣiḥ."

Although it is included in Raghunātha's list, it ought not, strictly speaking, to find a place amongst *Popular Maxims*; but I insert it in order to make a necessary correction in the printed text of the *Sarvadarśanasanigraha* where it is quoted. On page 161 of the Bibliotheca Indica edition, and on page 182 of that prepared by Jīvananda Vidyāsāgara, we read "Tataś copannastvayan dharmo vikaroti hi dharminam iti nyāyena" and this bad reading, of course, affects the translation as it appears on page 244 of the volume prepared for Trubner's Oriental Series by Professors Cowell and Gough. The explication given in *Vāchaspatyam* is as follows:

"Yathā pūrvasya rūparasādirūpadharmaparāvṛttau rūparasādyantarotpattau ca ghaṭāder dharmino vikṛtir evaṁ yasya dharmināḥ pūrvadharmasyāpagame'nyadharmas-yotpattis tatrāyaṁ nyāyo'vatarati."

080

Upavāsād varam bhikṣā.

It is better to beg than to starve. This is one of Raghunātha's nyāyas and he applies it thus:

"Yeṣāṃ tu dhīmāndyād bhūyo bhūyaḥ śrūyamāṇo'pyabhedo na buddhim ārohati, tais tūpavāsād varam bhikṣeti nyāyena bhedabuddhyāpi svapremāspada-
vighrahāvachchinneśārādhanam kāryam. Tatprasādān medhodaye, śālisamṛddhau kodra-
-vāsanatyāganyāyena tyājyā bhedadhīḥ."

It is found in *Pañcadaśī* ix. 119, 120:

"Astyevopāsakasyāpi vāstavī brahmateti cet.
Pāmarāṇam tiraścām ca vāstavī brahmatā na kim.

Ajñānād apumarthatvam ubhayatrāpi tatsamam.
Upavāsād yathā bhikṣā varam dhyānam tathānyataḥ."

ED. NOTE: The word tyāga following kodravāśana is significant.

081

Upasañjaniṣyamāṇanimitto'pyapavāda upasañjātanimittam
apyutsargam bādhate.

This is another of Raghunātha's grammatical nyāyas. It is not met with in the *Mahā-
bhāṣya*, but forms one of Nāgojībhāṭṭa's paribhāṣās. The following is Prof. Kielhorn's
rendering of it:- "An *apavāda*, even though the causes of its (application) are still to
present themselves, supersedes a general rule, the causes (of the application) of which
are already present." In connection with this paribhāṣā, we have the Devadattahantṛhata-
nyāya which we see in its place.

082

Ubhayataḥpāśā rajjuḥ.

A rope which binds at both ends. An embarrassing position; a dilemma. The following
is from the Jaimini section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 133, Bib. Ind., or 150 of
Jīvānanda's edition), with Professor Cowell's translation (page 198): "Abhāvaḥ kāraṇam
eva na bhavātīti cet, tadā vaktavyam abhāvasya kāryatvam asti na vā. Yadi nāsti

tadā paṭapradhvamsānupapattyā nityatāprasaṅgaḥ. Athāsti kim aparāddham kāraṇa-
tveneti. Seyamdubhayataḥpāśā rajjuḥ."

"If you object that non-existence (or absence) cannot be a cause, we reply by asking you whether non-existence can be an effect or not? If it cannot, then we should have to allow that cloth is eternal, as its 'emergent non-existence' or destruction would be impossible. If it can be an effect, then why should it not be a cause also? So this rope binds you at both ends."

The earliest occurrence of the nyāya is in Patañjali 6. 1. 68 (vārt. 2 and 5): and it is found in *Tantravārtika* 3. 6. 42 (page 1113) as follows: "Yadyapi na bādhas tathāpi vikalpas tāvat prāpnoti. Na hi tulyārthānām kvacit samuccayo dṛṣṭaḥ. Seyam ubhayataḥpāśā rajjuḥ."

Maṇḍanamiśra used it in *Vidhiviveka*, page 83; and we find instances of it in *Nyāyamañ jarī*, page 436, line 16; in *Kusumāñjali* iii. 6 (page 374); in the same author's *Lakṣaṇāvalī*, page 56; in *Khaṇḍana*, page 530; and in the opening part of *Citsukhī* (Paṇḍit, vol. iv., page 466).

ED. NOTE: Many noteworthy references are given here.

083

Uṣṭrakaṇṭakabhakṣaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a camel's eating thorns*. This is not in Raghunātha's list, but in the *Vācaspatyam* it is explained thus:

"Uṣṭrasya śamīkaṇṭakavedhajātaduḥkhakāle'pi śamīpatrabhakṣaṇasukhaleśo yathā tathā'bhīṣṭaviṣayopārjanaduḥkhakāle tadupārjitadravyajasukhaleśo yatropadi-
śyate tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ."

I regard this, however, as quite beside the mark. In *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2.2.1., Śāṅkara, after combating at length the Sāṅkhya theory that objects are *in themselves* sukhaduḥkhamohātmaka, says: "Śabdādyaviśeṣe'pi ca bhāvanāviśeṣāt sukhādiviśeṣopalabdheḥ," which Dr. Thibaut renders: "And, further, although the sense-object, such as sound and so on, is one, we observe that, owing to the difference of the mental impressions (produced by it), differences exist in the effects it produces, one person being affected by it pleasantly, another painfully, and so on." On which Ānandagiri says: "Śabdādīti. Bhāvanā tattajjātiyogyā vāsanā tadviśeṣād uṣṭrādīnām kaṇṭakādausukhādidarśanāt &c." Vācaspatimiśra, explains the same passage in the *Bhāmatī*, (pp.380-1), pointing out that things are not *in themselves essentially* pleasant or unpleasant, and that what causes pleasure to one may be painful to another, and that even the same thing which at one time

is agreeable may at another time be the reverse. Otherwise, thorns would be as acceptable to men as they are to a camel. Here are his words:

"Yadi punar eta eva sukhadūḥkhasvabhāvā bhavyus tataḥ svarūpatvād hemante'pi candanaḥ sukhaḥ syāt. Na hi candanaḥ kadācid acandanaḥ. Tathā nidāgheṣvapi kuṅkumapaṅkaḥ sukho bhavet. Na hyasau kadācid akuṅkumapaṅkaḥ. Evaṃ kaṅṭakaḥ kramelakasya sukha iti manuṣyādīnām api prāṇabhṛtām sukhaḥ syāt. Na hyasau kāmścit pratyevākaṅṭaka iti. Tasmād asukhādisvabhāvā api candana-kuṅkumādayo jātikālāvasthādyapekṣayā sukhaduḥkhādihetavo, na tu svayaṃsukhādisvabhāvā iti ramaṇīyam."

A camel, then, eats thorns because it likes them; a man does not eat them because he does not like them. May not the maxim, therefore, be the equivalent of our "*What's one man's food is another man's poison?*" Mr. M. R. Telang has kindly pointed out *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* i. 29. as illustrating a camel's love of thorns.

ED. NOTE: Here is one more example of how the work of Jacob has been enriched by other scholars.

084

Uṣṭralaguḍanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the camel and the stick*. The equivalent apparently, of "Hoist with his own petard" (*Hamlet*, Act iii, Scene iv). The following is Ragunātha's exposition of it:

"Svamate pareṇodbhāvyamānānām dūṣaṇānām tanmate pātane uṣṭralaguḍanyāyāvātāraḥ. Yathoṣṭreṇohyamānenaiva laguḍena tatprahāraḥ kriyate tathā tārīkoti-
thāpitadūṣaṇais tanmatam eva vedāntibhir nirākriyate. Tathāhi. Advaitavāde yad-
bhogasāṅkaryādirūpaṃ dūṣaṇaṃ tair ucyate tad aupaniṣadair vibhvanekātmavādinām
teṣām eva mate pātyate."

It occurs in the following passage of the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 54, line 16):

"Tajjātīyasya tu bāhyavad vijñānasyāpi vivecanam eveti svasaṃvedana-
bādhito'yaṃ viruddhadharmādhyāso na bhedasādhaka ityuṣṭralaguḍakaṃ. Saṃveda-
nenaivāsya sādhitatvāt."

There is another instance of it in *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 118 (where it appears as the Uṣṭralakuṭanyāya), and again in *Nyāyadīpāvali* page 6, line 11.

ED. NOTE: Additional references have been given here.

085

Uṣaravṛṣṭinyāyaḥ.

The simile of *rain on a saline barren waste*. Its application is similar to that of *araṇya-rodana*, which we see in its place. Hemacandra has a good example of it in his *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* viii. 417:

"Kaṣāyapakṣivṛkṣeṣu kṛtaghneṣu durātmasu.
Eteṣu niṣphalaṃ dānam uṣareṣvambuvṛṣṭivat."

In *Anuśāsanaparva* xc. line 4314, we read:

"Yathoṣare bījam uptaṃ na rohen na vā vaptā prāpnuyād bījabhāgam.
Evaṃ śrāddhaṃ bhuktam anarhamāṇair na ceha nāmutra phalaṃ dadāti."

086

Ṛjumārgeṇa sidhyato'rthasya vakreṇa sādhanāyogaḥ.

No one tries to accomplish in a round-about way a thing which can be effected by direct means. This nyāya is the counterpart of *arke cen madhu vindeta &c.*, and is used twice by Vācaspatimiśra in his *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*. On page 195, we read:

"Na ca karyeṇaiva kāraṇam anumīyatāṃ jīvaccharīre kiṃ vyatirekiṇā, ṛju-
mārgeṇa sidhyantaṃ ko nu vakreṇa sādheyed iti vācyam. Kāraṇamātrasya tataḥ
siddher ityuktam."

Again on page 203: "Anvayavyatirekiṇi hetau satyapi vaidharmye sādharṃyo-
dāharaṇam evocitaṃ tatra tatpūrvakatvād vaidharmyapratīteḥ, ṛjumārgeṇa sidhyato'-
rthasya vakreṇa sādhanāyogāt."

A still older example is found in *Śālika*, page 86:

"Ṛjumārgeṇārthasiddhau na vakramārgam āśrayeta."

See also, *Tarkabhāṣā*, page 48, line 5.

087

Ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat.

A thing that is changed in one part does not thereby become something else [literally, like something else]. For example, as Patañjali says under 1. 1. 56 (vārt. 10), the cutting of a dog's ears or tail does not turn it into a horse or a donkey, but it is still a dog! Other

passages of the Mahābhāṣya where this paribhāṣā occurs are as follows:- Śivasūtra 2, vārtika 4 (*i.e.* vol. i. page 21); 2. 4. 85 (vārt. 10); 4. 1. 83; 6. 1. 69 (vārt. 3); 6. 4. 149 (vārt. 2); and 8. 3. 85. The paribhāṣā is No. 37 in Dr. Kielhorn's edition of the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, and my rendering of it is based upon his. It is included in Raghunātha's list of nyāyas, and is quoted as such by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 589, line 6. For further illustrations of the paribhāṣā, see under Śvā karṇe vā &c.

ED. NOTE: Many references are given here.

088

Ekam anusandhitsato'param pracyavate.

Whilst seeking for one thing, he loses another. The saying appears twice, in this form, in the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. The first instance is in the Ārhata Section (p.27 of Bib.Ind. and 33 of Jivānanda's edn.), translated by Professor Cowell:

"Etaddoṣaparijihīrṣayā jñānaṃ jaḍatāṃ nānukarotīti brūṣe, hanta tarhi tasyā grahaṇaṃ na syād ityekam anusandhitsato'param pracyavata iti nyāyāpātaḥ."

"If in your wish to escape this difficulty, you assert that 'the perception does not follow the object in being insentient,' then there would be no perception that the object is insentient, and so it is a case of the proverb, 'While he looks for one thing which he has lost, another drops.'"

The second example, from the Akshapāda section (pp.118 and 134), is as follows: "Nanvekam anusandhitsato'param pracyavata iti nyāyena duḥkhavat sukham ityucchidyata ityakāmyo'yaṃ pakṣa iti cen maivaṃ maṃsthāḥ."

"Nor may you retort on us that we have fulfilled the proverb of '*seeking one thing and dropping another in the search,*' since we have abolished happiness as being ever tainted with some incidental pain &c."

In the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* (page 447) and in Mallinātha on *Tārīkarakṣā*, pp. 7 and 25, we meet with the nyāya in another form, namely "Ekam sandhitsato'param pracyavate," which means, "Whilst trying to reunite one [piece of a broken vessel] another falls off."

089

Ekavṛntagataphaladvayanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *two fruits attached to one stalk*. Used by writers on Alaṅkāra to illustrate a particular kind of *Paronomasia*, namely the coalescence of two meanings under one

word. It was first pointed out to me by Mr. F. W. Thomas, Assistant Librarian to the India Office, he having met with it in the commentary on *Kāvyaḍarśa* ii. 310. I have since found it in use in the *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, *Kāvyaḍradīpa*, *Sāhityaḍarpaṇa*, *Rasagaṅgādhara*, *Alaṅkāraḍaustubha*, and *Sāhityaḍaumudī*, in each case under the figure śleṣa. The maxim finds a place in Marāṭhī literature also, and is regarded by Molesworth as equivalent to our proverb, "Killing two birds with one stone."

090

Ekasambandhidarśane'nyasambandhismaraṇam.

On seeing one thing, we are reminded of others connected with it. The nyāya is found in this form in the *Nyāyapradīpa* on *Tarkabhāṣā*, page 44, where the presence of smoke is said to remind the spectator of the invariably connected fire. In Amaraḍāsa's *tīkā* on *Śikhāmaṇi*, page 93, it is quoted as "Ekasambandhiḍjñānam aparasambandhismāarakam." In both of Raghunāthavarman's books, it appears as Ekasambandhidarśanam anyasambandhismāarakam, and, in the larger of the two, he illustrates it thus:

"Yathā hastipakadarśanam hastismāarakam tathā nadyāḍijñānasya kuśakāśa-jalatumbiḍkājālūkānām tatsambandhinām smaraṇahetutvam."

Tārānātha (s.v. nyāya) quotes the saying in the form ekasambandhiḍjñānam &c. He reverses the above illustration by saying that the elephant reminds one of the driver; and adds that a word reminds one of its meaning, a statement which, in these degenerate times, is not universally true! See, too, *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 167, line 18.

ED. NOTE: An additional reference.

We don't know why Jacob calls his times "degenerate."

091

Ekākinī pratiḍjñā hi pratiḍjñātaḍ na sādhyat.

Bare assertion is no proof of the matter asserted. This is Professor Gough's rendering of the saying as found in the Bauddha chapter of the *Sarvadarśanasagaḅgraha* (page 10 of Jivānanda's edn.):

"Yadi kaścit prāmānyam anumānasya nāṅgīkuryāt taḍ prati brūyād anumānaḍ pramānaḍ na bhavatiṭyetaḍvanmātram ucyate, tatra na kiṅcana sādhanam upanyasyata upanyasyate vā. Na prathamāḅ. Ekākinī pratiḍjñā hi pratiḍjñātaḍ na sādhyat iti nyāyāt."

The following is from the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*: "Nanvekākinī pratijñā hi pratijñā ātaṃ na sādhyed iti nyāyena pratijñāyārthasiddhyabhāvān nādvaitaṃ sādhyaituṃ pāryate. Bhedavādinō jīveśābhedaṃ api na kṣamante'nyasya kā kathā. Tadbhede'pi kiṃ mānam iti cen nāham īśvara iti pratyakṣam ityavehi."

The nyāya "Nahi pratijñāmātreṅārthasiddhiḥ" is given in Raghunātha's list as one of similar import. Compare *Nyāyavārtika*, page 345, line 11: "Na ca pratijñā pratijñāṃ sādhyati."

092

Ekām asiddhiṃ pariharato dvitīyā"padyate.

Whilst avoiding one kind of fallacy, another kind appears! This is explained by Raghunātha as follows:

"Iyaṃ Bauddhādhikāre Udayanācāryoktiḥ. Yathāṅkurādyakartṛkaṃ śārīryajanyatvād ityatra śārīritiviśeṣaṇena svarūpāsiddhiṃ pariharato Bauddhasya vyāpyatvāsiddhir āpadyate."

The work here entitled *Bauddhādhikāra* is styled *Bauddhadhikkāra* in Hall's *Index* (pp. 81, 82). It is more generally known as *Ātmatattvaviveka*; and the passage in question is found on page 108, as follows:

"Astu tarhi satpratipakṣatvaṃ śārīrajanyatvād iti cen na, asamarthaviśeṣaṇatvenāsiddhabhedasyātulyabalatvāt. Asiddhiparihāreṇa viśeṣaṇaṃ samartham iti cen na. Ekām asiddhiṃ pariharato dvitīyāpatteḥ."

The same passage is clearly referred to in *Citsukhī* I. 24 (Paṇḍit, vol.v. page 110):

"Kṣityādikam akartṛkaṃ śārīryajanyatvād ākāśavad ityādāviva vyāpyatvāsiddhir iti cen maivam. Tatrākartṛtve sādhye tadekādeśasyājanyatvasyaivopādhitayā viśiṣṭasya vyāpyatvāsiddheḥ. Uktaṃ hi-- Ekām asiddhiṃ pariharato dvitīyāsiddhir āpadyata iti."

So, too, Venkaṭanātha in the comment on his *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iii. 22 (p.289), and again in his *Nyāyasiddhāñjana*, page 100. For a clear and concise definition of the three forms āśrayāsiddha, svarūpāsiddha and vyāpyatāsiddha, see Āpte's *Practical Sanskrit Dictionary*, s.v. asiddha.

093

Kaṭakagavodāharaṇam.

The illustration of *a cow [tied] in an enclosure*. This occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 632: "Yattu satyevetyuktaṃ tat kaṭakagavodāharaṇam anuharati, yataḥ sattā-pyamunā dūṣaṇenāsmābhiḥ khaṇḍanīyā." The commentator explains as follows: "Yathā kaṭake baddhā gaur bandhanarajjum ādāya vidravati, vidravadbhir aśvaiḥ saha, tathā'munā khaṇḍanena vidravatā bhedena sattāpi vidraṣyatītyarthaḥ. Yadvā yathā kaṭake gaur apasāryamāṇāpi punas tatraivāyāti tathā bahuśaḥ khaṇḍitāpi sattā punar udāharaṇatvenāyātītyarthaḥ."

I may add that the long passage beginning with the words "Kiṃ bhedaḥjñānaṃ nāsti," on page 632, down to the words ityeṣā dik" on page 637, is taken *verbatim* from Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka*, pages 70 to 72. It includes another, and probably the earliest, example of the use of the nyāya "Caurāparādhena māṇḍavyanigrahaḥ," for which, see its place.

Ed. Note: Jacob reads tathaiivāyāti.

094

Kaṇṭhacāmīkaranyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the golden ornament on the neck*. A person is supposed to have a golden ornament round the neck and yet to be unaware of it until some one points it out; a kind of illustration greatly in vogue amongst Vedantists, who tell us that although we are already Brahma and free, we are not aware of the fact until instructed by a competent teacher! For the translation of a passage of the *Vedāntaparibhāshā* bearing on this, see pages 130 and 131 of my *Manual of Hindu Pantheism*. The above nyāya is found at the top of page 130 of *Ātmatattvaviveka*.

095

Kadambakorakanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the buds of the Kadamba tree*. They are said to burst forth simultaneously. As, for example, in Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* i. 241:

"Pitrā svapāṇipadmena sprśyamāno'vanīpatiḥ.
Utkorakakadambābho babhūva pulakāṅkuraiḥ.

In the *Nyāyamañjarī*, pages 214 and 228, and in the *Bhāshāparichchheda* (verse 166) this nyāya is given as an illustration of the way in which sound is produced. The last-mentioned reads thus:

"Vīcītarāṅganyāyena tadutpattistu kīrtitā.
Kadambakorakanyāyād utpattiḥ kasyacin mate."

The commentary, *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, however, explains Kadambagolakanyāyāt and this is the form given to the maxim in the *Vāchaspatyam*, which explains it as follows: "Kadambagolakasya golākāradambasya sarvāvayaveṣu yathā yugapat puṣpodgama evaṃ sarvapradeśeṣu yugapat yatra prasāras tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ." In Vedāntin Mahādeva's comment on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* V.103, we have a third form, namely Kadambamukulanyāya.

096

Kadalīphalanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the fruit of the plantain tree*. For explanation of this see *Aśvatari-garbhanāyāya*. Another instance of it is found in *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iv. 14:

"Buddhim evāpamṛdnāti kadalīm tatphalaṃ yathā."

See, also, *Bodhicaryāvatāra* i. 12.

ED. NOTE: Omitted by the Indexer! The reader will search in vain for this nyāya in it. We don't know who compiled the index and when. Probably it was done by the original publisher (Nirnaya Sagar Press). There are several errors in the index. Nirajana couldn't care less. They were in terrible rush to release their monumental reprint. Their philosophy was--It is best to make as much money as possible and as soon as possible. After all they were reprinting a work which had long remained out of print. Something is better than nothing. The learned readers are expected to correct and then read. If they cannot detect the bundles of blunders they are not at all adhikāriṇaḥ. They are merely ādhikāriṇaḥ.

097

Kapiñjalanyāyaḥ.

The rule as to *the Kapiñjalas* [a kind of partridge]. In *Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā* xxiv. 20, we read "Vasantāya kapiñjalān ālabheta," and the question arises, *how many* of the birds are to be sacrificed? Jaimini devotes eight sūtras [11.1. 38-45] to the discussion of this point, and finally decides that *three*, the lowest figure representing *plurality* (two being merely duality), will satisfy the requirements of the śruti. Śabara's lengthy argument is very concisely summed up in the *Nyāyamālāvistara*, as follows:

"Kapiñjaleṣu tritvādya icchikās tritvam eva vā.
Ādyo bahutvasāmyān na tritvenaiva kṛtatvataḥ."

Aśvamedhe 'vasantāya kapiñjalānālabhata' iti tritvacatuṣṭvādisaṅkhyānām bahutvasāmyād icchayā yā kācid bahutvasaṅkhyā svikāryeti cet. Na. Tritvenaiva śāstrasya kṛtatvāt. Yo hi catuṣṭvādisaṅkhyām upādatte tena na tadantarbhūtaṃ

tritvaṃ varjayituṃ śakyam. Tritvam upādadānena tvanantarbhūtaṃ catuṣṭvādikam varjayituṃ śakyate. Ato'vaśyaṃbhāvitvena, prathamabhāvitvena lāghavena ca tritva upātte śāstrārthasiddhau, tato'dhikapakṣihimsāyāṃ pratyavāyāt. Tasmāt tritvam evopādeyam."

There is an admirable example in *Nyāyakandalī*, page 50, where, in commenting on Praśastapāda's "Ihedānīm caturṇām mahābhūtānām sṛṣṭisaṃhāravidhir ucyate," Śrīdhara says: "Mahābhūtānām ityukte trayāṇām eva parigrahaḥ, kapiñjalān ālabhetetivad bahutvasaṅkhyāyās tāvatyeva caritārthatvāt. Ataś caturṇām ityuktam."

It is found also in *Tantravārtika* 2.1.12 (page 394), and 3.5.26 (page 1049); in *Pari-mala*, page 550, line 3; and in *Śikhāmaṇi*, page 303. Commenting on *Manu* viii. 105, where certain offerings are directed to be made to Sarasvatī, Kullūka decides that, in accordance with the *kapiñjala-nyāya*, three are sufficient. The *nyāya* is clearly of the type of sakṛt kṛte kṛtaḥ śāstrārthaḥ, and in accord with the Marāthī phrase śāstrāpuratā.

ED. NOTE: cf. Bahūnām janmanām ante and Bahūni me vyatītāni (BG)

098

Kaphoṇiguḍanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *treacle on the elbow*. Used of something tantalizingly inaccessible. It is found in Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 26:

"Astu tarhi bhāvasvarūpātirikṭā nivṛttir nāstītyasya sopākhyeti śeṣaḥ. Nanvayam api kṣaṇabhaṅgasyoddhāraḥ, sa ca kaphoṇiguḍāyito vartate. Bhavatu vā nivṛttir asamarthā, tathāpyahetukatve tasyāḥ kim āyātam."

Then in the Akshapāda chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 116 of Bib. Indica, and 132 of Jīvananda's edition) we read: "Nanu duḥkhātyantocchedo'pavarga ityetad adyāpi kaphoṇiguḍāyitaṃ vartate, tat katham siddhavatkṛtya vyavahriyata iti cen maivam," which Prof. Cowell translates as follows: "But is not your definition of the *summum bonum* liberation, that is, the absolute abolition of pain, after all as much beyond our reach as *treacle on the elbow is to the tongue*; why then is this continually put forth as if it were established beyond all dispute?" In a footnote he says, "Compare the English proverb 'As soon as the cat can lick her ear.'" In the *Vāchaspatyam*, however, the *nyāya* is explained as meaning the *absence* of a thing, not its inaccessibility. It says:

"Kaphoṇau guḍābhāve'pi tadāśayā yathā lehanam evaṃ yatra vastvasadbhāve'pi tatpratyāśayā vyāpārabhedas tatrāśya pravṛttiḥ."

The St. Petersburg Lexicon (s.v. kaphoṇiguḍāy) renders it "like a *ball* on the elbow."

ED. NOTE: Here is a comparative study.

099

Kaṃbalanirṇajananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the cleansing of a coarse blanket* [by beating it on the feet, and so dusting them at the same time]! One of the numerous examples of the accomplishment of two objects by one operation - "Killing two birds with one stone." It is found in Śabara 2. 2. 25:

"Api ca dadhi ubhayam asamarthaṃ kartuṃ phalaṃ sādhayituṃ homaṃ ca. Nanu kaṃbalanirṇajanavad etad bhaviṣyati. Nirṇjanaṃ hi ubhayaṃ karoti. kambala-śuddhiṃ pādayoś ca nirmalatām."

The kaṃbala (the kām̐baḷa of the Marāthās) is made of extremely coarse and rough material, and generally black or black and grey. In the case of the very poor, it is often their sole garment by day as well as their only covering at night.

ED. NOTE: A cruel statement! This violates the Canon of Reticence. Jacob's views are too biased. Kambala need not be necessarily made of "extremely coarse and rough material." And it does not have to be a garment only of the poor. Even the richest persons use the blankets and they might be quite expensive too. Jacob's knowledge of real India was quite limited indeed--just confined to his military barracks. It was in reverse proportion to the length of his tongue.

Also nirṇejana does not necessarily mean "beating it on the feet" (while dry). Even the poorest person living a normal life would not beat a garment on his feet if he has to wear it. It may mean washing while pressing it by feet. The purpose is solely to clean it and not to clean the feet as well. The latter is incidental.

Cf. Kambalavantam na bād̐hate śītam.

100

Karavinyastabilvanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the woodapple on the* [open palm of the] *hand*. Said of something unmistakably clear - "as plain as a pike-staff!" It occurs in Sureśvara's large *Vārtika* 2. 1. 95:

"Ato'nupetam eva tvāṃ karavinyastabilvavat.
Brahma vijñāpayiṣyāmi yajjñāne sarvavid bhavet."

Again in 2.5.136 of the same:

"Niḥśeṣopaniṣatsāras tad etad iti sāmpratam.
Uktyāviṣkriyate sāksāt karavinyastabilvavat."

A third instance is found in 4. 3. 1334, and there is another in the vārtika on the *Taittirīyopanishadbhāṣya*, page 200. Of exactly the same import is the karasthāmalakanyāya, for which see the former *Vārtika* 3.1.14.

ED. NOTE: Cf. Hastāmalaka.

Karabadarasadṛśam akhilabhuvanatalam yatprasādāt kavayaḥ.

Paśyanti sūkṣmamatayaḥ sā jayati Sarasvatī Devī.

Also, Hātha kaṅgana ko ārasī kyā (Hindi).

101

Karibṛmhitanyāyaḥ.

The nyāya of *the trumpeting of an elephant*. The word kari is really redundant, since the whole meaning is conveyed by bṛmhitā alone - bṛmhitam karigarjitamityamaraḥ: - but the addition, in this and similar cases, is made for some special purpose. Raghunātha defines it thus:

"Viśiṣṭavācakānām api padānām sati pṛthagviśeṣaṇavācakapadasamavadhāne viśeṣyamātraparatāyām karibṛmhitanyāyaḥ pravartate."

This principle may be exemplified by the following verse from *Kāvya prakāśa* vii. 10:

"Saundaryasampat tāruṇyam yasyās te te ca vibhramāḥ.
Ṣaṭpadān puṣpamāleḥ kān nākarṣati sā sakhe."

Here the author of the *Kāvya pradīpa* remarks (page 295):

"Mālāśabdo yadyapi puṣpasyaiva sraji śaktas tathāpi na puṣpapadam apuṣṭārtham. Lakṣaṇayotkṛṣṭatvapatipādakatvāt. Ayam eva karibṛmhitanyāyaḥ." So, too, the *Udāharāṇacandrikā*: "Atra nirupapadān mālāśabdād eva puṣpasrakpratīteḥ puṣpapadam utkṛṣṭapuṣpatve saṅkramitavācyam. Evam eva karibṛmhitādiṣvapi bodhyam."

The following additional nyāyas are cited by Raghunātha as belonging to the same class:- Gajaghaṭānyāya, Nīlendīvaranyāya, Parvatādhityakānyāya, Parvatopatya kānyāya, Vājimandurānyāya, Mṛgavāgurānyāya. In each case, the first word might be omitted without affecting the meaning.

ED. NOTE: Jacob does not say squarely why two words are used after all. He has missed the boat. His knowledge of Sāhityaśāstra was quite limited indeed. He calls the first word as really redundant. We believe his talk is truly redundant. If the first word could very well be omitted, why it is used anyway? And by great writers of yore with much more lore than what was acquired by this narrow-minded military man. The fact is that the first word in reality is used for *viśeṣaguṇādhāna*, *viśiṣṭa vicchitti*. We don't know if he had ever heard these words. He professes to know everything. He is too proud of his knowledge. He does not realize that everyone does not know everything, much less a man who is suffering from superiority complex in superlative degree.

102

Karmabhūyastvāt phalābhūyastvam.

Abundance of labour produces abundance of fruit; from great pains come great gains. It occurs in the following passage of Vidyāraṇya's Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha, page 247:

"Brahmopāsanānām sarveṣām api yadyekarūpaṃ phalaṃ tadā guṇopacayā-pacayābhyām upāsanopacayāpacayau vyarthau syātām. Tathā ca karmabhūyastvāt phalābhūyastvam iti nyāyavirodhaḥ.

Compare Śabara's "Aṅgabhūyastve phalābhūyastvam" in 10. 6. 62. and 11. 1. 15. It is quoted in *Parimala*, page 600.

103

Kalañjabhakṣaṇanyāyaḥ.

The law of [abstention from] *the flesh of an animal killed with a poisoned arrow*. "Some hold the Kalañja to be the flesh of a deer killed by a poisoned arrow; others, hemp or bhang; others, a kind of garlic." (Cowell's note on page 81 of his translation of *Kusumāñjali*.) But this can hardly be correct as the garlic and bhang are mentioned in addition. It may be noticed, however, that *tāmra-kūṭa* is given as an equivalent of *kalañja*, the meaning of which is the tobacco plant. It is deduced from Jaimini 6.2.19, 20,- an *adhikaraṇa* designed to teach the evil result of doing forbidden things. The words, "Na kalañjaṃ bhakṣayitavyaṃ na laṣuṇaṃ na grñjanaṃ ca," are discussed, and the question arises as to whether this is an instance of *pariyudāsa* or of *pratiṣedha*,- whether it means *abhakṣaṇaṃ kartavyaṃ* or *bhakṣaṇaṃ na kartavyam*. The subtle intellect of the Mīmāṃsaka sees a great difference between these two, the former being something to be done and the latter being something to be avoided! The *siddhāntin* decides in favour of the latter. I would advise my readers to study pages 39-41 of Dr. Thibaut's excellent translation of *Arthasaṅgraha*, in order to get, if possible, a clear understanding of this peculiar tenet. Many years ago, when in India, I heard a statement made by a Brāhman, to the effect that the words "put no oil in the lamp," did not mean "don't put oil in the

lamp," but rather "put in the lamp" some "no-oil"; in other words, it was not a prohibition of an act, but an injunction to do something! This is just the position of the Mīmāṃsaka, who, in regard to the rule that a Snātaka must not look at the rising or setting sun, says that "not-looking is something to be done." The above nyāya is quoted by Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 4. 28, and 4. 1. 13, and is found in *Sankṣepaśārīraka*, i. 417-420, and in *Śrībhāṣya* 1. 1. 4 (page 687).

ED. NOTE: Jacob has advised his readers to study Thibaut's translation of *Arthasaṅgraha*, pp 39-41. Jacob could not acquire the true knowledge and the spirit of the subject he professed to deal with. It requires sympathetic attitude toward the culture so foreign from his past, present and maybe even future.

104

Kalaśapuraḥsaraprāsādanirmāṇatulyam.

Like the erection of a temple including the pot-shaped finial [which is placed on the summit at its completion]. Used ironically of one who considers that he is doing something as meritorious as the building of a complete temple.

In a footnote to page 73 of his translation of *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, Mr. Tawney says:- "Dr. Burgess informs me that *kalaśa* is really the finial of the spire, which is shaped like a vase or urn." Then, on page 135, there is the following footnote:- "Mr. Cousins writes in a letter, which Dr. Burgess has kindly shown me, 'I understand that the term *kalaśadaṇḍa-pratiṣṭhā* refers solely to the setting up of the *kalaśa* or pot-finial, the *daṇḍa* being the pole or stick which supports the finial and upon which it is set up. With a small *kalaśa* made solid, it would not be required, the neck of the same taking its place, but it is always required with the larger and more complex *kalaśas*, especially those made of hollow metal." Frequent mention is made by Merutunga of the erection of a *kalaśa* and *dhvaja* as the completion of a temple. The two are mentioned on pages 119 and 211, whilst on pages 219 and 222 we have the *kalaśadaṇḍapratīṣṭhā* referred to above. On pages 120 and 224, the *kalaśa* is mentioned alone. In Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* i. 14, we find *kumbha* for *kalaśa*: "Tatra caityeṣu sauvarṇadhvajakumbhamarīcayaḥ." The illustration occurs in Śārngadhara's *ṭīkā* on Udayana's definition of *dravya* in his *Lakṣaṇāvali* (page 4). The definition is: "Tatra guṇātyantābhāvādhikaraṇam dravyam," and, whilst explaining it, the commentator attacks the views of Citsukha Muni as follows:

"Yattvatra tattvapradīpikākāreṇotpattyanantarakṣaṇe avyāptim udbhāvya guṇa -vattvātyantābhāvādhikaraṇatve ca parihāram āśaṅkyotpattyanantarakṣaṇaviśiṣṭe kadācid api guṇānūdayāt punaravyāptes tadavasthatvān naivam iti parihṛtam, tat kalaśapuraḥsaraprāsādanirmāṇatulyam." It is necessary here to bear in mind the tenet of the logicians:- "Utpannaṃ dravyaṃ kṣaṇam aguṇaṃ tiṣṭhati." The *Tattvapradīpikā*, better known as *Citsukhī*, is described by Hall as "a confutation of the Nyāya philosophy, on the basis of the Vedānta." The wrath of the logicians would of course, therefore, be

kindled against it. The passage complained of above is the śloka ii. 4 with the vṛitti. The former stands thus:

"Avyāpter apyativyāpter dravyaṃ naiva guṇāśrayaḥ.
Ādye kṣaṇe guṇābhāvād guṇādāvapi vīkṣaṇāt."

ED. NOTE: As far as we know, prāsāda does not generally mean 'temple.' Even if we accept that kalaśa refers to "pot-shaped finial which is placed on the summit at its (of the temple) completion," how do we reconcile the word purassara, which will mean beginning with. Jacob has conveniently swallowed this significant word. Maybe he didn't know what he was talking about. Or, maybe, he was busy in other pressing military affairs.

There could be an alternative explanation. Kalaśasthāpanavidhi may be a ceremony that is performed in the very beginning of a holy act. Yet it cannot be applicable here (in temple) because the temple is not prasaṅgasaṅgata.

In any case, we are not satisfied with the long discussion and the opinions of other experts that Jacob has brought to bear upon his story. We have no faith in it. Many a time he just talks nonsense and rubbish.

In any case, this topic needs further investigation and exploration.

105

Kāṃsyabhojinyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the man who eats from a brazen vessel*. Raghunātha explains it thus:

"Mayā nityaṃ guruśiṣṭaṃ bhoktavyaṃ kāṃsyapātre ca bhoktavyam iti niyamavato vineyasya niyamābhaṅgāya gurur nityaṃ kāṃsyapātre bhukta iti. Yadyapya-yaṃ śāstriyas tathāpyetadvavahārasya laukikatvāt Sundopasundanyāyaval laukikeṣu parigaṇitaḥ."

The nyāya is taken from Jaimini's sūtra 12. 2. 34, where Śabara interprets it as follows: "Kāṃsyabhojivat. Tadyathā. Śiṣyasya kāṃsyapātrabhojitvaniyama upādhyāyasyā-niyamaḥ. Yadi tayor ekasmin pātre bhojanam āpadyate'mukhyasyāpi śiṣyasya dharmo niyamyeta. Mā bhūd dharmalopa iti."

The principle here laid down is that of some one's doing something which he is *not* bound to do, in order that he may not hinder another who *is* required to do it. The converse, that is, of a man's *abstaining* from doing something, possibly harmless in his case, lest another should do the same and suffer harm. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."

Examples of the nyāya are found in *Tantravārtika*, pages 393, 577 and 907; in *Vidhiraśāyana*, page 50; in *Bhāmatī*, page 478; in *Vedāntakalpataru*, pages 314, 425, 502, 517; and in *Parimala*, pages 462, 572, and 666.

ED. NOTE: Here are many additional references. Also to be noted: śāstrīya vs. laukika. Justification for treating it as laukika. The "number" for Jaiminisūtra as given by Jacob here is not correct. The correct citation is 12.2.35-38, adhi. 15.

106

Kākatālīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the crow and the Palmyra fruit*. A crow alighted on a Palmyra tree, and at the same moment some of the fruit fell on its head and killed it. The maxim is therefore used to illustrate a startling and *purely accidental* occurrence. It is well explained in the *Kāśikāvṛitti* on *Pāṇini* 5. 3. 106 (as quoted by Dr. Eggeling in a footnote to *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195):

"Kākatālīyam. Ajākrpāṇīyam. Andhakavartakīyam. Atarkitopanataṃ citrīkaraṇam ucyate. Tat katham. Kākasyāgamaṇam yādṛcchikaṃ, tālasya patanaṃ ca. Tena tālena patatā kākasya vadhaḥ kṛtaḥ. Evam eva Devadattasya tatrāgamaṇam, dasyūnāṃ copanipātaḥ. Taiś ca tasya vadhaḥ kṛtaḥ. Tatra yo Devadattasya dasyūnāṃ ca samāgamaḥ sa kākatālasamāgamasadṛśaḥ."

We find the saying in *Pañchadaśī* ix. 12 as follows:

"Ayathāvastuvijñānāt phalaṃ labhyata īpsitam.
Kākatālīyataḥ so'yaṃ saṃvādibhrama ucyate."

And again in Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* ii. 16, and in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, page 401. There is a capital example of it, too, in the following verses of the *Nyāyamañjarī* (page 106):

"Api cānāgataṃ jñānam asmadāder api kvacit.
Pramāṇam prātibhaṃ śvo me bhrātāganteti dṛśyate.

Nānarthajaṃ na sandigdhaṃ na bādhaividhurīkṛtam.
Na duṣṭakāraṇam ceti pramāṇam idam iṣyatām.

Kvacid bādhakayogaś ced astu tasyāpramāṇatā.
Yatrāparedyur abhyeti bhrātā tatra kim ucyatām.

Kākatālīyam iti cen na pramāṇapradarśitam.
Vastu tatkākatālīyam iti bhavitum arhati."

In his commentary on *Śāntiparva* clxxvii. 11, Nīlakaṇṭha Govind gives another, and less probable, definition of the maxim. He says:

"Tālaḥ karatalayoḥ śabdajanakaḥ saṁyogas tasmin kriyamāṇe utpatan kāko daivāt tatra tālābhyām ākrānto'bhūt. Tad etat kākatalīyam ityucyate. Kākasparśa-samakālam tālaphalasya tālavṛkṣasya vā patanaṁ tad ityanye." [Note anye, ed.]

Molesworth explains it thus: "Said when any occurrence synchronizing with, or immediately following, some other seems, however in truth independent of it, to have been *occasioned* by it;- as the fruit of a Palmyra falling at the alighting upon it of a crow, may appear to fall *in consequence*."

ED. NOTE: cf. *Andhakavartakīyam*. Hindi: Andheke hātha baṭera. Nyāyavyākhyāne matavaividhyam.

107

Kākadadhighātakanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a crow as a destroyer of curds*. An example of *upalakṣaṇa*, where one represents many, or a part stands for the whole. So if any one were warned to keep the crows off the curds, it would imply that all other possible raiders were also to be warded off. It is thus put by Bharṭṛihari in *Vākyapadīya* ii. 314:

"Kākebhyo rakṣyatām sarpir iti bālo'pi coditaḥ.
Upaghātapare vākye na śvādibhyo na rakṣati."

This is reproduced, with slight variations, in *Tantravārtika*, page 731, and is quoted in the same form in *Bhāmatī* 1. 4. 3 (page 287). Raghunātha's application of it is as follows: "Taduktam īśvaragītāyām.

'Ye tvimaṁ viṣṇum avyaktaṁ māṁ ca devaṁ Maheśvaram.
Ekībhāvena paśyanti na teṣāṁ punar udbhavaḥ' iti.

Atra hariharayor grahaṇaṁ kākadadhighātakanyāyena vidher apyupalakṣaṇam." The *īśvaragītā* forms part of the uttarabhāga of the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, and the verse here quoted is xi. 8. In the fourth chapter of *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (page 285), this is given as an example of *Jahadajahallakṣaṇā*. "Jahadajahallakṣaṇodāharaṇaṁ tu kākebhyo dadhi rakṣyatām ityādikam eva. Tatra śakyakākaparitāyāgenāśakyadadhyupaghātakatvapuraskāreṇā-kāke, kāke ca kākaśabdasya pravṛtteḥ."

This kind of *lakṣaṇā* is termed *bhāgalakṣaṇā* in *Vedāntasāra* 23; and *bhāgatyaḥgalakṣaṇā* in *Vivaraṇaprameya*, page 229. In the *Grahaikatvanyāya*, too, a part represents the whole.

ED. NOTE: Identification made here of *Īśvaragītā*.

108

Kākadantaparīkṣānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the examination of a crow's teeth*. Used of any useless and manifestly fruitless enquiry. It occurs in the Buddhist treatise *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, page 1, and again on page 3, line 8. Also in Śankara's Bhāshya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* i. 25.

["Naciketo maraṇam mānuprākṣīḥ"]: "Naciketo maraṇam maraṇasambaddham praśnam pretyāsti nāstīti kākadantaparīkṣārūpaṃ mā'nuprākṣīr maivam praṣtum arhasi."

We find it too in Abhinavagupta on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 19 (page 163 of Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda's edition) as follows: "Vyaṅgyo'rtho bhavatu mā vā bhūt, kastatrābhiniveśaḥ. Kākadantaparīkṣāprāyam eva tat syād iti bhāvaḥ."

It appears also in *Panacapādikā*, page 53 and 68, and in many works besides. In *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 7, line 5, it takes the form of Vāyasadaśanavimarśanyāya.

ED. NOTE: We have also seen:

Kākasya kati vīā dantā meṣasyāṇḍam kiyatpalam.
Kā vārtā Sindhusauvīreṣveṣā mūrhavecāraṇā.

109

Kākākṣigolakanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the crow's eyeball*. Crows are popularly supposed to have only one eye, which, as occasion requires, moves from the cavity on one side into that on the other. The maxim is used of a word which appears only once in a sentence but which applies to two portions of it; or of persons or things fulfilling a double purpose. I have met with it in the former sense in Svātmārāma's *Haṭhayogapradīpikā* iv. 10,

"Vividhair āsanaiḥ kumbhair vicitraiḥ karaṇair api,"

on which the commentator, Brahmānanda, says,

"Vicitrair iti kākākṣigolakanyāyenobhayatra sambadhyate."

Also in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 1,

"Padānāṃ smāraḱatve'pi padamātrāvabhāsiṇaḥ,"

where he remarks, "Apīśabdaḥ kākāḱṣinyāyenobhayaatrāpi sambadhyate."

Of its use in the second sense, we have an interesting example in Kāmandaki's *Nītisāra*, a work ascribed to the third century before Christ. Chapter xi. 24 reads thus:

"Balīnor dviṣator madhye vācātmāṇaṃ samarpayan.
Dvaidhībhāvena vartteta kākāḱṣivad alakṣitaḥ."

110

Kākādhikaraṇatvanyāyaḥ.

The being *something on which a crow is perched*. This illustration seems to have originated with Patañjali, and is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 26 (vārtikas 3 and 4):

"Anubandho'nyatvakara iti cet, tanna. Kiṃ kāraṇam. Lopāt. Lupyate'trānubandhaḥ. Lupte'trānubandhe nānyatvaṃ bhaviṣyati. Tadyathā. Katarad Devadattasya gṛham. Ado yatrāsau kāka iti. Utpatite kāke naṣṭam tad gṛham bhavati. Evam ihāpi lupte'nubandhe naṣṭaḥ pratyayo bhavati. Yadyapi lupyate jānāti tvasau sānubandhakasyeyaṃ samjñā kṛteti. Tadyathā. Itaratrāpi katarad devadattasya gṛham. Ado yatrāsau kāka iti. Utpatite kāke yadyapi naṣṭam tadgṛham bhavatyantatas tam uddeśam jānāti."

It occurs in *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha* (page 195) in the course of a discussion on Bādarāyaṇa's second sūtra: "Tataḥ kāraṇasaṃbandhino janmāder alakṣaṇattvam iti cen maivam. Kākādhikaraṇatvavad upapatteḥ. Kākādhikaraṇatvaṃ hi na gṛhe'ntarbhavati. Tathā ca sati kākavigame gṛhaikadeśabhaṅgabuddhiprasaṅgāt. Ato gṛhasyādhikaraṇatvaṃ nāmaupādhiko dharmāḥ. Sa ca pariśeṣāl lakṣaṇe evāntarbhavati. Tannirūpakasya kākasya yathā lakṣaṇatvaṃ tathā brahmaṇo'pi kāraṇatvam aupādhiko dharmo lakṣaṇāntaḥpātī."

Similarly in *Sankṣepasārīraka* i. 206:

"Yatraiṣa kāka idam eva tu Devadatta-
veśmeti lākṣaṇikavṛttir ihābhyupetā.
Kākāspadatvam avadhīrya, tathāpi veśma-
mātrākṛtir bhavati lākṣaṇikī tu buddhiḥ."

With slight modifications it is found also in *Tantravārtika*, page 277, line 8: "Yathā'nabhidhīyamānam api kākanilayanam devadattagrhaśabdasya svārtham abhidhataś cihnabhūtatam pratipadyate tadvad ākṛtiś cihnam vyaktyabhidhāne bhaviṣyati." See, also, *Khaṇḍana*, page 502.

ED. NOTE: Here is See Also. A noteworthy statement. We recall Avidyamānam sat vyāvartakam upalakṣaṇam.

111

Kākolūkaniśāvat.

The simile of *the crow's and owl's night-time*. What is day to the former is night to the latter, and *vice vers*. This characteristic of the owl is often referred to by the poets, as, for instance, in Bhartṛihari's *Nītiśataka* 93:

"Patraṃ naiva yadā karīravīṭape doṣo vasantasya kiṃ
nolūko'pyavalokate yadi divā sūryasya kiṃ dūṣaṇam."

The nyāya is found in Sureśvara's large vārtika 1. 4. 313:

"Kākolūkaniśevāyaṃ saṃsāro'jñātmavedinoḥ.
Yā niśā sarvabhūtānāṃ ityavocāt svayaṃ Hariḥ."

Ānandagiri comments on this as follows: "Kāketi. Yā kākādināṃ prasiddhā niśā tasyāṃ ulūko jāgartīti taddṛṣṭyā sāpalapyate. Yadā ca kākādayo jāgrati tadā naktam-dṛṣo niśeti kākādidṛṣṭyā sāpahnūyate yathetyarthaḥ. Evam ajñasyāyaṃ mātrādiḥ saṃsāro yadā vivartate tadā taddṛṣṭyā tattvasyāsatkalpanā. Yadā viduṣas tattvānubhavas tadā taddṛṣṭyā mātrāder asattvam iti."

The quotation in the second line of Sureśvara's verse is from *Gītā* ii-69, which reads thus:

"Yā niśā sarvabhūtānāṃ tasyāṃ jāgarti saṃyamī.
Yasyāṃ jāgrati bhūtāni sā niśā paśyato muneḥ."

In *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iii. 111, the nyāya is quoted as *Ulūkaniśāvat*. The passage stands thus:

"Anuditānastamitakūṭasthabodhamātrasvābhāvvyād ātmano duḥsambhāvyo' vidyāsadbhāva iti cenna. Avidyāprasiddhyaiva tatsadbhāvasiddher ulūkaniśāvad ityata idam ucyate.

Aho dhārṣṭyam avidyāyā na kaścid ativartate.
Pramāṇaṃ vastvanādṛtya paramātmeva tiṣṭhati."

ED. NOTE: Try to get full verse Patram naiva...

112

Kācin niṣādī putram prasūte kaścin niṣādas tu kaṣāyapāyī.

A Niṣādī gives birth to a son, and a Niṣāda drinks the decoction of herbs [prepared for her !] For the context of this ābhāṅaka, see under "Munir manute mūrkhō mucyate."

ED. NOTE: We should read tanayam to suit the meter. This nyāya is quoted again a little later here in this work itself, where Jacob reads: tanayam.

113

Kāṇḍānusamayanyāyaḥ.

The law relating to *"the performance of all prescribed acts of ritual in orderly succession for a particular object (or subject?) before performing the same acts in the same order for a second object."* This is Sir Monier-Williams' definition based on the commentary on Āśvalāyana's *Gṛihyasūtra* 1. 24. 7, which prescribes certain gifts commencing with viṣṭara and ending with go. The commentator says,

"Rtvijām madhuparkadāne dve gatī sambhavataḥ. Padārthānusamayāḥ kāṇḍānusamaya iti. Tatra padārthānusamayo nāma sarveṣām varaṇakrameṇa viṣṭaram dattvā tataḥ pādyam tato'rghyamiti. Kāṇḍānusamayo nāma ekasyaiva viṣṭarādi gonivedanāntam samāpya tato'nyasya sarvam tato'nyasyeti."

In a case of this kind, where there is merely a bestowal of gifts, and not the performance of sacrificial ritual, the definition given by Molesworth is more suitable: "The order, when a suit or set of things is to be given to each individual of a multitude, *of giving at once* all the articles composing the suit or set, as distinguished from padārthānusamaya."

The nyāya represents the purport of Jaimini 5. 2. 3. Kunte says that the word abhyāvṛtti used in the sūtra means kāṇḍānusamaya. His notes on sūtras 1-3 contain some very interesting items of information, of especial value to us of the West. See Padārthānusamayanyāya in its proper place.

ED. NOTE: A noteworthy worthy statement.

114

Kāraṇaguṇaparakramanyāyaḥ.

The principle of the reproduction, in the effect, of certain qualities, in the proportion in which they exist in the producing cause. In the *Vedāntasāra*, section 12, we read:

"Tadānīm sattvarajastamāṃsi kāraṇaguṇaparakrameṇa teṣvākāśādiṣūtpadyante." On which the commentator, Nṛsiṃhasarasvatī, remarks: "Tadānīm utpattivelāyām sattvādayas trayo'pi guṇās tāratamyena kāraṇaguṇaparakramanyāyena teṣvākāśādiṣu pañcabhūteṣūttarottarādhikyena jāyanta ityārthaḥ."

For full notes on Kāraṇaguṇa, see page 176 of the *Vedāntasāra* referred to above.

ED. NOTE: A noteworthy worthy statement. To be followed up.

115

Kārpāsarakatatādṛṣṭāntaḥ.

The illustration of *the redness of cotton* [produced by smearing the cotton-seeds with red lac]. One of the stock illustrations of the Buddhist when seeking to establish the doctrine that *all existence is momentary* (kṣaṇabhaṅgavāda). For the examination and refutation of the tenet, see Śāṅkara on *Brahmasūtras* 2. 1. 18, 2. 2. 20 &c.; and the opening part of the Ārḥata chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. The nyāya is contained in the following verse:

"Yasminneva hi santāna āhitā karmavāsanā.
Phalaṃ tatraiva badhnāti kārpāse raktatā yathā."

This is quoted in *Syādvādamañjarī*, pages 155 and 193; in Maṇibhadra's comment on kārikā 5 of *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*; in a slightly altered form, on page 1501 of *Bṛihadāranyakavārtika*; in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 443; in the vṛitti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* i. 29; and in the Ārḥata section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, where Professor Cowell renders it: "In whatever series of successive states the original impression of the action was produced, there verily accrues the result, just like the redness produced in cotton."

We find the Kārpāsarāgasaṅkrāntidṛṣṭānta in *Nyāyamañjarī* page 465, in the concluding portion of the author's *Kṣaṇabhaṅganirāsa*, and the following extract from the *Āmatattvaviveka* (page 102) explains the process: "Yathā kṣīrāvasekād amlatvaṃ parihṛtya mādhyam upādāyānuvartamānā"malakī kālāntare'pi mādhyam unmīlayati, lākṣārasāvasekād vā dhavalimānam apahāya raktatām upādāyānuvartamānaṃ kārpāsabījaṃ kusumeṣu raktatām." In the closing verses of the nirālambanavāda (*Ślokavārtika*, page 267) Kumārila deals with this Buddhist illustration in connection with a citron (*bījapūra*) instead of the cotton plant; and we meet with it again in *Bhāmatī* 1. 1. 4 (page 95).

116

Kāśakuśāvalambananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *catching at straws*. The being driven from one argument or position to another equally untenable. Tārānātha says,

"Nadyādaḥ patitasya saṅtaraṇānabhijñāsya yathā kuśakāśāvalambanaṃ nirarthakam, evaṃ prabalayuktiṣu nirākṛtāsu durbalayuktyavalambanaṃ nirarthakam ityevam avalambanasya nirarthakatvavivakṣāyām asya pravṛttiḥ."

The expression, "Kāśakuśāvalambanakaḥ," occurs in the Ārḥata chapter (p. 25 of Bib. Ind. and p. 31 of Jīvananda's edition) of the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, and again in the Pāṇini chapter (pp. 142 and 161); and in both places Prof. Cowell has rendered it, "like a drowning man's catching at a straw." We have the same, though not as compound, in *Naishkarmyasiddhi* i. 76: "Evaṃ nirākṛto'pi kāśaṃ kuśaṃ vā'valambyāha." It appears also in *Nyāyamañjarī* page 183; and again, as follows, on page 551:

"Tasmāt pramāṇato'śakye śakye vā vastunirṇaye.
Evaṃprāyam ayuktaṃ yat kuśakāśāvalambanam."

In *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 18 (page 213) we have the maxim in the following couplet:

"Arthavattvaṃ na cej jātaṃ mukhyair yasya prayojanaiḥ.
Tasyānuṣaṅgikeṣvāśā kuśakāśāvalambinī."

In expounding *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 29, Ānandagiri quotes *Amarakośa* 2. 4. 166 (Astrī kuśaṃ kuśo darbhaḥ pavitraṃ atha kattṃam) as follows: "Ata evāstrī kuśam ityamarasimhenānuśiṣtam." Does this throw any new light on the date of Amara?

In his *History of Indian Literature* (page 230), Professor Weber tells us that the *Amarakośa* cannot be widely separated from those dictionaries which we know to belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and following centuries; whilst Professor Macdonell, in his recently issued *History of Sanskrit Literature* (page 433) assigns that work to about 500 A.D.

117

Kim ādrakavaṇijo vahitracintayā.

What has a seller of ginger to do with ships? Possibly the equivalent of "No cobbler beyond his last." It occurs in the following passage of *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 62, line 10:

"Avidyaiva hi tathā tathā vivartate yathā yathānubhāvyatayā vyavahriyate. Tattanmāyopanītopādhibhedāc cānubhūtir api bhinnaiva vyavahārapatham avatarati, gaganam iva svapnadṛṣṭaghaṭakaṭāhakoṭarakuṭikoṭibhiḥ. Tad āstāṃ tāvat. Kim ādrakavaṇijo vahitracintayeti."

118

Kuṭhāracchedyatām kuryān nakhacchedyaṃ na paṇḍitaḥ.

A wise man should not imagine that he can remove with a fingernail that which can only be cut down with an axe. A caution against under-rating the strength of an enemy. It occurs in Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā, page 1044:

"Nopekṣaṇīyaṃ devena tasmād etat prayojanam.
Kuṭhāracchedyatām kuryān nakhacchedyaṃ na paṇḍitaḥ."

Compare Udayana's saying in *Kiraṇāvali*, page 74: "Na khalu nakharañjanikā paraśucchedyaṃ chinatti."

119

Kuḍyaṃ vinā citrakarmeva.

Like a decoration without a wall [to be decorated; or, like a painting without a canvas]. An unreality, like a hare's horn &c. It is found in the Nyāyamañjarī, page 103, in a disquisition on Yogipratyakṣasādhanam.

"Prasaṅgasādhanam nāma nāstyeva paramārthataḥ.
Taddhi kuḍyaṃ vinā tatra citrakarmeva lakṣyate.

Nahi nabhaḥkusumasya saurabhāsaurabhavicāro yuktaḥ."

A much older example is contained in *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 41:

"Citram yathāśrayam ṛte sthāṇvādibhyo vinā yathā chāyā.
Tadvad vinā viśeṣair na tiṣṭhati nirāśrayam liṅgam."

There is a similar thought in Aniruddha's comment on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* iii. 12. He says: "Yadyātmanā vinā dehe'ham iti pratyayas tadā mṛtadehe'ham iti pratyayaḥ syāt. Na caivam. Yathāvarakeṇa vinā na chāyā, bhittiṃ vinā na citram tathātrāpi."

See also Mallinātha on *Tārkkikarakṣā*, page 111 and 176.

ED. NOTE: Note the See also statement.

Jacob treats the poetry too as a prose. Is it to save space or just carelessness?

120

Kulyāpraṇayananyāyaḥ.

The figure of *the laying down of a water-course for irrigation*. An example of a thing made for one purpose subserving other purposes also. It is found in *Vivaraṇaprameya-saṅgraha*, page 118, line 9: "Ato na vidheyapratyaye tātṣparyam iti. Kulyāpraṇayananyāyenobhayārthatvāvidheyatvāt. Yathā śālyartham kulyāḥ praṇīyante tābhya eva pānīyaṃ ca pīyate tadvat."

For the source of this nyāya, see Anyārtham prakṛtam anyārtham bhavati.

ED. NOTE: Cf. Jāmātratham (no.) and Gṛhārtham (no.) .

121

Kūṭakārṣāpaṇanyāyaḥ.

The simile of [the unwitting employment of] *base money* [in one's business]. It is used by Kumārila (in *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 3, page 95) in the course of an argument on the relative value of Śruti and Smṛti. He maintains that if any teaching of the latter is found to be in opposition to that of the former, it must be given up; just as a man who finds that he has been using counterfeit coins must at once abstain from so doing. The portion containing the nyāya is as follows: "Yo hi kūṭakārṣāpaṇena kañcitkālam ajñō lokamadhye vyavaharati, na tena vivekajñānanajanitavyutpattināpi tathaiva vyavahartavyam."

In *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 8 (page 149, line 3 from the bottom), Kumārila compares words to coins which can be tested by intelligent people. He says:

"Śabdāpabhraṃśavad eva gaṇabhrāntyādiprayoganimitā arthāpabhraṃśā bhavanti. Te śāstrasthair evāviplutārthakriyānimittapuṇyārthibhiḥ śakyante sādhasādhu-kārṣāpaṇamadhyād iva tatparīkṣibhir vivektum."

The nyāya is found in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 162, as follows: "Nāpi bādhakābhāva-paricchedāt prāmānyaniścayaḥ. Sa hi tātkāliko vā syāt kālāntarabhāvī vā. Tātkāliko na paryāptaḥ prāmānyapariniścaye. Kūṭakārṣāpaṇādau kiñcitkālam anutpanna-bādhave'pi kālāntare tadutpādadarśanāt."

It occurs again on page 169, line 3, on page 187, line 4 from bottom and on page 531, line 1.

ED. NOTE: Jacob has used the word 'simile' for nyāya quite frequently. Probably he means *drṣṭānta* or *nidarśana*. This is a general note. He uses all kinds of words to

express the idea of the nyāya. We have chosen the expression Nyāyanidarśana-darśanam as the epithet of our total discipline.

122

Kūpakhānakanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the well-digger*. It is applied by Raguṇātha as follows: "Yathā kūpakhānake patitaṃ paṅkādi kūpānniḥṣṛtenāmbhasā prakṣālyate, tathā tattadvigrahāvachchinneśabhedabudhiḥ doṣas tadupāsanaṅjanyasukṛtamahimnotpannenādvaita-bodhena samūlaṃ nivartyata iti jñeyam."

The illustration is as old as Patañjali who made use of it in the introduction chapter of the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. i., page 11) when discoursing on the importance of the study of grammar, and on the merit which accrues to the user of correct words. He says:

"Athavābhyupāya evāpaśabdajñānaṃ śabdajñāne. Yo'paśabdāñ jñāti śabdān apyasau jñāti. Tad evaṃ jñāne dharma iti bruvato'rthād āpannaṃ bhavatyapaśabdajñānapūrvake śabdajñāne dharma iti. Athavā kūpakhānakavad etad bhaviṣyati. Tadyathā kūpakhānakaḥ kūpaṃ khaṇaṃ yadyapi mṛdā pāṃsubhiś cāvakīrṇo bhavati. So'psu sañjātāsu tata eva taṃ guṇaṃ āśādayati yena sa ca doṣo nirhaṇyate, bhūyasā cābhyudayena yogo bhavatyevam ihāpi yadyapyapaśabdajñāne'dharmas tathāpi yastvasau śabdajñāne dharmas tena sa ca doṣo nirghāniṣyate, bhūyasā cābhyudayena yogo bhaviṣyati."

123

Kūpamaṇḍūkanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a frog in a well*. It is applied to an inexperienced person brought up in the narrow circle of home and ignorant of public life and mankind. "Home-keeping youth have ever homely wits" (*Two Gentlemen of Verona* i. 1). The following passage from *Prasannarāghava-Nāṭaka* i. (page 13) illustrates the use of the term: "Kathaṃ mām api daśadigvilāsinīkarṇapūriḥkṛtakīrtipallavaṃ tribhuvanavīranāmadheyam kūpamaṇḍūka iva sāgaram avikhyātam apadiśasi."

So, too, *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā*, page 828:

"Yo na nirgatya niḥśeṣaṃ vilokayati medinīm.
Anekādbhutavṛttāntāṃ sa naraḥ kūpadarduraḥ."

ED. NOTE: Raguṇātha Varmā has a very interesting story here. Jacob does not take any note of it. He is terribly arbitrary in borrowing from R. It seems he does not want to give Raguṇātha due credit.

124

Kūpayantraghaṭikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the pots attached to the water-wheel of a well*. As the wheel revolves, some of the pots are going up and others are going down; some are full whilst others are empty; and so it is applied to illustrate the changes and chances of this mortal life. This is well put in *Mṛichchhakaṭika* x. 60:

"Kāṃścit tucchayati prapūrayati vā kāṃścin nayatyunnatiṃ
kāṃścit pātavidhau karoti ca punaḥ kāṃścin nayatyākulān.
Anyonyaṃ pratipakṣasantatiṃ imāṃ lokasthitiṃ bodhayan
eṣa krīḍati kūpayantraghaṭikānyāyaprasakto vidhiḥ."

Tārānātha's explanation of this maxim is extremely tame, not to say nonsensical! According to him, it is intended to teach that as a pot is raised by the water-wheel from a deep well, so, by means of instruction, the essence of the Śāstras is drawn up, deep though they are by reason of their complexity! See the cognate ghaṭīyantranyāya in its proper place.

ED. NOTE: Jacob calls Taranatha's explanation as nonsensical. Jacob's words are so provocative. We feel his tongue was very long and sharp as well, but senseless. Tārānātha did not have less sense than what this mighty militant military-minded man had mastered.

125

Kūrmāṅganyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the limbs of the tortoise*. Its meaning and application will be apparent from the following passage taken from the Sāṅkhya section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 150 Bib. Ind. and 170 of Jīvananda's edition):

"Yathā hi kūrmasyāṅgāni kūrmaśarīre niviśamānāni tirobhavanti, niḥsaranti cāvīrbhavantyevam kāraṇasya tantvādeḥ paṭādayo viśeṣā niḥsaranta āvirbhavanta utpadyanta ityucyante, niviśamānās tirobhavanto vinaśyanti tyucyante. Na punar asatām utpattiḥ satām vā vināśaḥ."

Prof. Cowell renders it thus: "As the limbs of a tortoise, when they retire within its shell, are concealed, and, when they come forth, are revealed, so the particular effects, as cloth &c., of a cause as threads &c., when they come forth and are revealed, are said to be produced; and when they retire and are concealed, they are said to be destroyed; but there is no such thing as the production of the non-existent, or the destruction of the existent."

Very similar language is used by Vāchaspati Miśra, too, in his *Sāṅkhyatattavakaumudī* 9 and 15. See also, *Kshurikā-Upanishad* 3, and *Gītā* ii. 58.

ED. NOTE: Here are some "See also" references.

R has a *chāyā* here of the above concept.

cf. *Nāsato vidyate bhāvo nābhāvo vidyate sataḥ.* (*Gītā*).

126

Kṛatakṣaurasya nakṣatraparīkṣā.

This is identical in meaning with *Muṇḍitaśironakṣatrānveṣaṇam*, for which see its proper place. It occurs in *Nyāyamañjarī* page 164: "*Aniścitaprāmāṇyasya tu pravṛttau paścāt tannirṇayo bhavannapi kṛtakṣaurasya nakṣatraparīkṣāvad aphala evetyuktam.*" Lower down on the same page, there is another *nyāya* of similar import, in the following verse:

"*Samarthakāraṇajñānād yo'pi prāmāṇyaniścayam.*
Brūte so'pi kṛtodvāhas tatra lagnaṃ parīkṣate."

ED. NOTE: Hindi: *Pānī pīke jāta pūchanā.* "Second Handful" in terms of reference is now redundant. Please look up for all the *nyāyas* in their appropriate places. Now they have been arranged in ONE alphabetical sequence. They have also been serially numbered for easy and quick reference and location. This is one of the major improvements we have made. It has cost us a lot of time, money and energy. If *Nirajana* had done this there would have been no immediate need for this REFORMED edition. We have also named it as a *prāyaścittātmakam saṃskaraṇam*.

127

Kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime kāryasampratyaayaḥ

The rule that "whenever it may appear doubtful whether an operation has reference to that which is expressed by the technical or to that which is expressed by the ordinary meaning of a particular term, the operation refers (only) to that which is expressed by the technical meaning of the term in question." This is Professor Kielhorn's rendering of the *nyāya* as quoted in *Nāgojībhāṭṭa's* *vṛitti* to *Paribhāṣā* ix:

"*Nanu saṅkhyāgrahaṇe bahvādīnām eva grahaṇaṃ syāt, prakaraṇasyābhidhānīyāmakatvasiddhāt, kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime kāryasampratyaaya iti nyāyāt.*"

It is taken from the Mahābhāṣya where it appears several times. In 1.1.23 (vārt. 3), it is followed by the example, "Loke gopālakam ānaya, kaṭajakam ānayeti yasyaiṣā samjñā bhavati sa ānīyate na yo gāḥ pālayati yo vā kaṭe jātaḥ."

Sīradeva includes it in his collection of *paribhāṣās*.

ED. NOTE: N.B. loke.

128

Kṛtvācintānyāyaḥ

The nyāya stands thus in *Tantravārtika* 3. 4. 1: "Yastu bhāṣyakāreṇopanyāsaḥ kṛtaḥ sa kṛtvācintānyāyēneti draṣṭavyam." On applying to my friend, Mr. Arthur Venis, for an elucidation of the nyāya, he replied as follows: "I have always understood it as the method of granting to your adversary what later you mean to refute, for which another common expression is abhyupagamavāda. The word kṛtvā is elliptical for iti kṛtvā, that is, having admitted your adversary's point, you proceed to the cintā or discussion of it." This view seems to be confirmed by the fact that in *Śāstradīpikā*, pages 615, 666, 707, 710, and 739, it takes the form of "iti kṛtvā cintyate," and that in Śabara on Jaimini 11. 3. 16, and 12, 2. 11, we read at the close of each "ityevaṃ kṛtvā cintyate. Kṛtvācinteyam."

In his *Ṣaḍdarśanacintanikā*, Mr. M. M. Kunte gives three different renderings of the expression. On page 650 (where it is attached to the title of the *adhikaraṇa*) its meaning is said to be "a point already discussed," and he claims for it the authority of Mādhava; then, on page 1999, it is rendered "an adjustment not founded on fact;" and, finally, on page 2040, "the examination of a subject after merely granting an opponent's statement." This third rendering coincides with that of Mr. Venis.

I may add that Prof. Gangānātha Jhā tells me that a paṇḍit would explain the term thus: "Kṛtvā (yadyapyetadviṣayakasamśayo nodeti tathāpi tadviṣayagatasakalavīcārasyopanyāsārtham kalpanām kṛtvā) cintā (vicāraḥ)."

Or, as the Professor himself puts it, "the bhāṣya has introduced certain points of discussion simply for *the sake of argument*, in order to exhaust all possible alternatives with regard to the subject matter of the *adhikaraṇa*." I have not met with the nyāya anywhere but in works on Mīmāṃsā.

Ed. Note: Jacob made extensive inquiries among his friends and acquaintances for the meaning, significance, and interpretation of the nyāyas. His compilation is a collective product of many a mind.

129

Kevalair vacanair nirdhanādhamarṇika iva
sādhūn bhrāmayan.

Like an impecunious debtor deceiving the money-lenders with empty promises. This occurs in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 20, as follows: "Avastutvād iti cen nanvetad api kutaḥ siddham. Sarvasāmarthyavirahād iti cet so'yam itastataḥ kevalair vacanair nirdhanādhamarṇika iva sadhūn bhrāmayan parasparāśrayadoṣam api na paśyati.

130

Kriyā hi vikalpyate na vastu

Action may vary, but substance cannot. This is plainly set forth in *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1. 1. 2 (page 37) as follows:

"Kartum akartum anyathā vā kartuṃ śakyam laukikam vaidikam ca karma. Yathāśvena gacchati, padbhyām anyathā vā, na vā gacchatīti ... Na tu vastvevam naivam asti nāstīti vā vikalpyate." Similarly in 2. 1. 27 (page 471):- "Kriyāviṣaye hi ... vikalpāśrayaṇam ... iha tu vikalpāśrayaṇenāpi na virodhaparihāraḥ sambhavatyapurūṣatantratvād vastunaḥ."

Then, in Ānandagiri's comment on 1. 4. 1 (page 325), we find the expression "Kriyāyām iva vastuni vikalpābhāvāt," and on page 359, "Na hi vastuni vikalpo'sti." It occurs also on the first page of the Rāmānuja chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*: "Na ca sadasattvayoḥ parasparaviruddhayoḥ samuccayāsambhave vikalpaḥ kiṃ na syād iti vaditavyam, kriyā hi vikalpyate na vastviti nyāyāt. "Nor should any one say: Granting the impossibility of the coexistence of existence and non-existence, there being the rule that it is action, not *Ens*, that alternates?" This rendering is Professor Gough's. The nyāya is found, too, in *Śāstradīpikā* 1. 3. 8 (page 154, line 6), and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iii. 82.

131

Kvoṣṭraḥ kva ca nīrājanā.

What connection has a camel with the illustration of arms? None at all; and the phrase is used to indicate that certain things are not connected. The nīrājanāvidhi (as described in chapter 267 of the Agni Purāṇa) was a ceremony performed by kings or generals before going forth to battle, and consisted of the purification of the component parts of the army, including that of the horses, the elephants, and the weapons. The vājinīrājanāvidhi is mentioned in *Raghuvamśa* iv. 25, on which Mallinātha remarks: "Vājigrahaṇam gajā-dīnām apyupalakṣaṇam, teṣām api nīrājanāvidhānāt." The illustration appears in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 522:

"Nadyādivastubhedārthaṃ kathitaṃ me kathānakam.

Tvayedam tatra me bhāti kvoṣtro nīrājanā kva ca."

ED. NOTE: The term nīrājanā needs deeper thinking and investigation as to its meaning, application and occurrence. Jacob has translated it as "illustration of arms." What else could a military-minded man think? This is a ceremony which is military as well as purely religious. It also means the waving of a lamp in front of an "object" of worship or adoration. It is part also of the reception of, say, a bridegroom when he arrives at the home of his would-be-bride for marriage. This is only an example. There is a word in Hindi--āratī. In Sanskrit also they say ārārtikam kuryāt. There are special devotional songs just for this part of the idol worship. There are special āratīs dedicated to special gods and goddesses. Apte has a better explanation of this nīrājanāvidhi.

This is one of our major contributions.

132

Kṣate kṣāram iva.

Like salt on a wound. "Kṣāram kṣate kṣip has become proverbial, and means 'to aggravate the pain which is already unbearable; to make bad worse; to add insult to injury.'" (Āpte's Dictionary). He cites *Uttararāmacarita* iv. 7:

"Ya eva me janaḥ pūrvam āsīn mūrto mahotsavaḥ.
Kṣate kṣāram ivāsahyaṁ jātaṁ tasyaiva darśanam."

Also *Mṛicchakaṭīka* V. 18. I have met with it again in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā* page 5, verse 42:

"Kathāṁ kāmārthayos tasmān na kurvīta kadācana.
Kaḥ kṣate kṣāranikṣepaṁ vidadhīta vicakṣaṇaḥ."

There is another example on page 993 of the same.

133

Kṣīranīranyāyaḥ.

The simile of *milk and water*. Used to illustrate the most intimate union of two or more things. The oldest example of it known to me is in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 2. 32:

"Kṣīrodake samprkta āmiśrībhūtātvaṅ na jñāyate kiyat kṣīraṁ kiyad udakaṁ kasminnavakāṣe kṣīraṁ kasminnavakāṣa udakam iti."

Writers on Alaṅkāra employ it to exemplify the figure called *San̄kara* (Commixture), in which there is a combination of other figures. It differs from *Saṁsṛiṣṭi* (Collocation), which is compared to the union between rice and sesamum, which is less intimate and easily distinguishable. The author of the *Alaṅkārasarvasva* (page 192) says:

"Adhunaiṣāṁ sarveṣāṁ alaṅkāraṇāṁ saṁśleṣasamutthāpitam alaṅkāradvayam ucyate. Tatra saṁśleṣaḥ saṁyoganyāyena samavāyanyāyena ca dvividhaḥ. Saṁyoganyāyo yatra bhedasyotkaṭatayā sthitiḥ. Samavāyanyāyo yatra tasyaivānutkaṭa tvenāvasthānam. Tatrotkaṭatvena sthitau tilataṇḍulanyāya, itaratra tu kṣīranīrasādṛśyam. Krameṇaitad ucyate. Eṣāṁ tilataṇḍulanyāyena miśratvaṁ saṁsṛiṣṭiḥ ... Kṣīranīranāyena tu saṅkaraḥ.

Similarly, too, in *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (page 262):

"Saṁsṛiṣṭir iti vijñeyā sarvālaṅkārasaṅkaraḥ.
Sā tu vyaktā tathāvyaktā vyaktāvyakteti ca tridhā.

Tilataṇḍulavad vyaktā chāyādarśavad eva ca.
Avyaktā kṣīrajalavat pāṁśupānīyavacca sā.

Vyaktāvyaktā ca saṁsṛiṣṭir narasiṁhavad iṣyate.
Citravarṇavad anyasmin nānālaṅkārasaṅkare."

It will be noticed that here there is mention of a third kind of combination which is likened to that of man and lion. The three kinds are noticed in *Kuvalayānanda*, also (page 337), as follows:

"Athaiteṣāṁ alaṅkāraṇāṁ yathāsaṁbhavaṁ laukikālaṅkāraṇāṁ melana iva cārutvātiśayopalambhān narasiṁhanyāyena pṛthagalaṅkāravasthitau tannirṇayaḥ kriyate. Tatra tilataṇḍulanyāyena sphuṭāvagamya bhedaṅkāramelane saṁsṛiṣṭiḥ. Nīrakṣīranāyena sphuṭābhedaṅkāramelane saṅkaraḥ."

ED. NOTE: Also worded as nīrakṣīra.

134

Kṣīraṁ vihāyārocakagrastaḥ sauvīrarucim anubhavati.

"Leaving the milk suitable to the dyspeptic[?], he enjoys the sour gruel." The nyāya is found in this form in the Akshapāda section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (p. 118 of *Bib Ind.* edition and p. 134 of Jīvananda's ed.) as follows:

"Nanu sukhābhivyaktir muktir iti pakṣaṁ parityajya duḥkhanivṛttir eva muktir iti svīkāraḥ kṣīraṁ vihāyārocakagrastaḥ sauvīrarucim anubhavatīti cet tad etan nāṭakapakṣapatitam tvadvaca ityupekṣyate."

Prof. Cowell translates it thus: "But if you give up the view that liberation is the manifestation of happiness, and then accept such a view as that which holds it to be only the cessation of pain, does not your conduct resemble that of the dyspeptic patient who refused sweet milk and preferred sour rice-gruel? Your satire, however, falls powerless, as fitter for some speech in a play [rather than for a grave philosophical argument]." There can be little doubt however that Mādhava took the nyāya from Udayana's *Āmatattvaviveka*, where it appears (on page 56, line 5,) as "Kṣīraṃ vihāya rucir arocakagrastasya sauvīre." I know of no other instance of it, and it is not in Raghunātha's *Laukikanāyasaṅgraha*.

ED. NOTE: Even the so-called revised edition (the third one) copies the bundles of blunders committed in the previous editions. It is not true to say that this third edition is revised. This new edition too misreads *grastasya*. Two versions mixed by oversight or negligence.

We believe the translation of the nyāya as presented by Jacob is much inferior to what Cowell has done.

J says that this nyāya is not in Saṅgraha. What about Ratnākara? Would it be correct to infer that J had not yet consulted RR when he wrote this?

135

Khale kapotanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *pigeons alighting on a threshing-floor*. Used by writers on Alaṅkāra to illustrate the production of a certain effect by the simultaneous action of numerous causes. In *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (739) we read:

"Samuccayo'yam ekasmin sati kāryasya sādḥake.
Khale kapotikānyāyāt tatkarāḥ syāt paro'pi cet."

"The conjunction is when notwithstanding the existence of one cause sufficient to bring about an effect, there are represented others producing the same, according to the maxim of the Threshing-floor and the pigeons". See this, also, very concisely put, in *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, page 161, and in *Kuvalayānanda*, p. 240. There is further reference to this nyāya in Mallinātha on Māgha x. 16, and in *Nyāyamālāvistara* 11. 1. 3.

ED. NOTE: Jacob has given a very narrow interpretation of this nyāya. Raghunātha Varmā does not bring Alaṅkāraśāstra at all. Mīmāṃsakas use it extensively for the way words and their meanings appear and get coalesced--*Abhihitānvayavāda* vs. *Anvitābhīdhānavāda*. And, by the way, Edgerton discusses this subject and the nyāya in

his edition of the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaparakāśa*. Strangely enough, he could not get the original source of *Vṛddhā yuvānaḥ* even from his pandit in Poona. As far as we can see Jacob has overlooked this aspect.

Also Jacob is not consistent in putting the diacritical marks. Maybe the editorial work was done by someone else, an incompetent, inefficient, mercenary. Or, the printing was done in India, while the Colonel was away slumbering in his arm-chair at home.

136

Khalvāṭabilvīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the bald (or bare-headed) man and the woodapple*. Vardhamāna (iii. 195) explains it thus: "Yathā khalvāṭaḥ paryatannatarkitaṃ śrīphalataror adhastād āgato daivavaśāc ca bilvam upari patitaṃ tadvadanyo'pyubhayavastusaṃyoga evam ucyate.

Bhartṛhari, in his *Nītiśataka*, 90, brings the bald man under a *palm* tree:

"Khalvāṭo divaseśvarasya kiraṇaiḥ santāpito mastake
vāñchan deśam anātapam vidhivaśāt tālasya mūlam gataḥ.
Tatrāpyasya mahāphalena patatā bhagnaṃ saśabdaṃ śiraḥ
prāyo gacchati yatra bhāgyarahitas tatraiva yāntyāpadaḥ."

This maxim belongs to the same class as *Ajākṛpāṇīya* and *Kākatālīya*, which see.

ED. NOTE: Although the verse *Khalvāṭo* is from the prolific pen of the great celebrity Bhartṛhari, Raghunātha Varmā treats it as anonymous. Strange!

137

Gaganaromanthanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *ruminating on ether*. Equivalent to beating the air. It is found twice in the *Sarvadaraśanasanḡraha*. First, in the Rāmānuja section (page 57 of Jīvānanda's edition, and 47 of Bib. Ind.): "Tadetad gaganaromanthāyitam," which Prof. Gough renders "All this is about as profitable as it would be for a ruminant animal to ruminate on ether." Secondly in the Pāṇini section (pages 162 and 143 respectively): "Tadetad gaganaromanthakalpam," rendered by Prof. Cowell by "All this is only the ruminating of empty ether." In the *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 453, it appears in a slightly different form, in the expression, "Vyomni romanthakelivat;" and in *Śālikā* p. 154, and *Nyāyamakaranda*, page 129, we meet with *Gaganagrāsakalpa*.

ED. NOTE: Not sure if R has. Probably not.

No point reflecting on nothingness because you'll never be able to know nothingness since there's nothing to know. Whose words? Of Kamalee?

138

Gaḍḍarikāpravāhanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a continuous rush* [?] of sheep. It is used to indicate the blind following of others like a flock of sheep. So the *Vāchaspatyam*, [copies RR, ed.] which says:

"Gaḍḍalikānām avīnām saṅghād ekā cen nadyādaḥ patati tadā tatsaṅghāntar-gatāḥ sarve'pi vāryamāṇā api tatra patantīti lokaprasiddhyā, yatra vāryamāṇānām api aniṣṭamārge dhāvanam tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ."

The expression occurs in chap. viii., page 214 of the *Kāvya prakāśa*, where a very helpful note of Maheśachandra's will be found; and also in chap. vi., page 188 of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, which, however, Mr. Pramadādāsa Mitra has rendered, "in pursuance of established custom."

It is found, also, on pages 86 and 125 of Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*, and in the opening part of *Kāvya pradīpa* viii. (p. 327). There seems to be much difference of opinion as to the correct form of the first word of the maxim, since it appears in the four varieties of gaḍḍarikā, gaḍḍalikā, gaḍḍārikā and gaḍḍālikā. [Ralayorabhedah. Does not make much difference.]

ED. NOTE: Also worded as gaḍḍulikā. Also to be noted is the expression lokaprasiddhyā.

R has but Jacob does not mention. There are many such cases. We don't know the reason.

139

Gandhāśmarajasā spraṣṭo naṣṭo dīpaḥ punar jvalet.

A lamp which has gone out will burn up again if touched with sulphur-powder. The use of this illustration will be seen from the following passage of the vṛtti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii 65:

"Nanu saṃsṛtyavasthāsiddham nirayāṇam prātikūlyam svānubhūtam ca duḥkham muktaḥ paśyati vā na vā. Ādye gandhāśmarajasā spraṣṭo naṣṭo dīpaḥ punar jvalet iti nyāyena punar api duḥkhasantatir udiyāt."

Gargaśatadaṇḍananyāyaḥ.

The figure of *the infliction of a fine of one hundred on the Gargas*. There are two paribhāsās which are frequently found together in the Mahābhāṣya, viz. "Pratyekam vākyaparisamāptiḥ" and "samudāye vākyaparisamāptiḥ." Professor Kielhorn (in his translation of Nāgojībhāṭṭa) renders them (the latter slightly modified) thus:- "What is stated (in grammar of several things) must be understood (to have been stated) of each of them separately." And "sometimes (it) also (happens that what is stated in grammar of several things) must be understood (to have been stated) of all of them collectively." Patañjali's illustration of the former is "Devadattaya jñadattaviṣṇumitrā bhojyantām," where, of course, each separate person is to be fed; and his illustration of the latter is "Gargāḥ śataṃ daṇḍyantām" where the Gargas collectively are to be fined a hundred. The passages where these occur are 1. 1. 1 (vārt. 12); 1. 1. 7 (vārt. 1); 2. 1. 4; 2. 3. 46; 6. 1. 5 (vārt. 2); 8. 3. 58; and 8. 4. 2. (vārt. 3).

The two paribhāsās and examples are quoted by Śabara on Jaimini 3. 1. 12 (page 223), and the second one is referred to as follows by Kumārila in his vārtika on the same passage (page 712):

"Puraḥ punar āha satyam eṣa na doṣa iti. Kriyāprādhānye tu tadvaśīkṛta-
viśeṣaṇasamudāye vākyaparisamāptiḥ. Gargaśatadaṇḍanahomābhiṣavabhakṣavad iti
parihāraḥ. Na tu daṇḍasya daṇḍyasamskāratvād bhojanādivat pratigargam āvṛtīḥ
prāpnoti. Naiṣa doṣaḥ.

Śārīro nigrāho yatra tatra pratyekabhinnatā.
Hiraṇyādānadaṇḍas tu samudāye samāpyate."

This paribhāsā occurs also in *Tantravārtika* 1. 4. 3 (page 294, line 15), and in 1. 4. 8 (page 300); whilst the former one is quoted in 1. 4. 18 (page 314).

ED. NOTE: According to the *Mīmāṃsādarśana (Ānandāśrama, Poona)*, 4:63, Śārīro nigrāho ... is discussed under MS 3.1.12. The second verse is:

Aparādhe nimitte hi śatasaṅkhyāviśeṣitā.
Tadanuṣṭhātrapādānā rājñām vṛttir vidhīyate.

SB on this subject: Na ca pradhānam pratiguṇam bhidyate. Pratipradhānam hi guṇo bhidyata iti. Asti cāyam dṛṣṭāntaḥ -- Samudāye vākyaparisamāptir iti. Yathā Gargāḥ śataṃ daṇḍyantām iti.

ED NOTE: One more point to be noted: In the first instance *three* persons are named individually and the case ending is in plural. On the other hand, in the second instance a collective family name is used.

141

Gartavartigodhāmāṃsavibhajananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the partition of the flesh of an Iguana whilst it is still in its hole!* Used to illustrate an impossibility. Raghunātha says of it:

"Anavabuddhārthe pravṛattir bilavartigodhāvibhajananyāyenāśakyeti dhvanitam." It occurs, in the form given above, in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* page 640:

"Yadapi tathāpi ka ityādi tiryak cetyantaṃ, tad api gartavartigodhāmāṃsavibhajananyāyam anuharati, pakṣatrayasyāpyuktayuktyā ācchāditasya darśayitum aśakyatvena tadvibhāgvavasthiter anavasaranirastatvāt."

ED. NOTE: Also phrased as: bilavarti. Cf. Counting the chicken before they are hatched.

142

Gartasthamṛtasarpānyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a snake lying dead in a hole.* It is employed by Vijnāna Bhikṣu (in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 1. 2, page 36) when explaining the line,

"Prāk sṛṣṭeḥ pralayād ūrdhvaṃ nāsīt kiñcid dvijottama"

from the *Nārasimha Purāṇa*. He says, "Nāsīd iti viratavyāpāratayā kāraṇarūpeṇa gartasthamṛtasarpavad vilīnam āsīd ityārthaḥ."

Again, on page 96 of the same:

"Evaṃ sarvatra tāṃ ca prakṛtiṃ guṇatrayarupiṇīm nityām api nirvyāpāratayā gartasthamṛtasarpavat karaṇakāraṇavivikte cinmātre vilāpayanti."

On the next page we have it again, in a similar connection, as mṛtasarpavat.

143

Gale pādukānyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the shoes on the neck*. This quaint nyāya appears to be used when an opponent is compelled to accept certain conclusions, or else adopt an utterly absurd alternative. It occurs three times in *Citsukhī*. The first instance is in i. 11 (Paṇḍit, vol. IV, page 484), as follows:

"Sarveṣām api bhāvānām āśrayatvena saṃmate.
Pratīyogitvam atyantā-bhāvaṃ prati mṛṣātmatā.' 11.

Tathāhi paṭaghaṭādīnām bhāvānām svāśrayatvenābhimatās tantvādayo ye tanniṣṭhātyantābhāvapratiyogitaiva teṣām mithyātvam. Nahi teṣām anyatra sattā sambhavinī. Tatrāpi cet sā na syāt tadā gale pādukānyāyena mṛṣātvam eva paryavasayet."

This verse is quoted in the second chapter of the *Vedāntaparibhāshā*, and a translation of it, and of the comment on it, by Professor Venis will be found in the *Paṇḍit* for 1883, page 660. I subjoin that portion which contains the simile. "For the existence of these things cannot be surmised anywhere but in their substrates...., and if the existence of these things, in their substrates, cannot be surmised..., then the unreality of things is the only conclusion (forced upon us), much in the same way that a man must hang his shoes round his neck if he will not wear them on his feet." [Seems funny. ed.]. The other two examples are in i. 26, and ii. 16 (Paṇḍit, vol. v, pages 112 and 435). It is found also in *Ātmātattvaviveka*, page 45, in *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, pages 7 and 124, and in *Upamitibhava-prapañcā Kathā*, page 284, in the erroneous form "gale pādikā."

The explanation given by *Raghunāthavarman* differs entirely from the above, and is extremely far-fetched and unsatisfactory. He says:

"Sadasator utpattinivṛattyasamabhavena "Parasparavirodhe na prakārāntarasthītir" iti nyāyasiddhasya sattvasyāsattvasya vā'nupapatter gale pādukānyāyenājñāna-kāryasya bādhānupapattiyā cājñānasyānirvacanīyatvaṃ balāt svīkāryam. Yathā kasyacid gṛhasthasya grahe'nnādyarthitvacchalenāगतो niṣaṇṇasca kaścīd viṭas tena tattvato jñātvā gacchha gaccheti punaḥ punar ucyamāno'pi yadā dhaurtyena svecchayā gamanaṃ na svīkaroti tadā pādukāsahitaṃ padaṃ gale nidhāya nodayitvā ca balān nissāryate tathā prakṛate'pi bodhyam."

ED. NOTE: There are various and varied interpretations of the same nyāya.

144

Gārhapatyanyāyaḥ.

The rule as to the [application to the] *Gārhapatyā-fire* [of a mantra in which reference is made to Indra]. This represents Mīmāṃsāsūtras 3. 2. 3, 4 where the Vedic mantra "Niveśanaḥ saṅgamano vasūnām ityaindrayā gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhate" is discussed.

The question is raised whether, since the mantra makes mention of Indra, the adoration is addressed to him or to the Gārhapatya (one of the three sacred fires perpetually maintained by a house-holder, and from which fires for sacrificial purposes are lighted). Jaimini's decision is in favour of the latter on the ground that direct enunciation (*śruti*) is stronger than suggestive power (*liṅga*). The following extract from *Arthasaṅgraha*, page 6, with Dr. Thibaut's translation (page 11), will explain this:

"Seyam śrutir liṅgādibhyaḥ prabalā... Ata eva aindryā liṅgān nendropasthānārthatvam. Kintu aindryā gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhata ityatra gārhapatyam iti dvitīyāśrutyā gārhapatyopasthānārthatvam."

"Direct enunciation is stronger than suggestive power and the other proofs (by which one thing is shown to be subsidiary to another);...for this reason we do not conclude at once on the ground of suggestive power that a verse (apparently) addressed to Indra (that is, a verse containing a mention of Indra's name, or one of his attributes &c.) is really to be used for addressing Indra; but rather decide if we find at the same time a direct enunciation as, for instance, 'with a verse bearing Indra's mark he addresses the Gārhapatya' that in consequence of the direct enunciation of the second case termination (Gārhapatyam) the verse is subsidiary to the act of addressing the Gārhapatya-fire." The words "niveśanaḥ saṅgamaṇo vasūnām," which, amongst other places, are found in the *Atharvasaṃhitā* x. 8. 42, are rendered by Professor Whitney, "The reposer, the assembler of good things"; and by Mr. Griffith, "Luller to rest, and gatherer up of treasures." As quoted in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 7. 2. 1. 20, Prof. Eggeling translates it, "The harbourer and gatherer of riches!" Who shall decide between these learned doctors? The Gārhapatyanyāya is explained and applied in *Bhāmātī* 3. 3. 25 (page 613), and in other works on Vedānta. Owing to the word aindrī in sūtra 3, the adhikaraṇa is sometimes styled Aindrīnyāya.

145

Guḍajihvikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the tongue* [smeared] *with treacle* [in order to disguise an unpalatable draught]. The *Vāchaspatyam* thus explains its use:

"Yathā tiktatābhiyā nimbapānam akurvāṇasya bālasya jihvāyām guḍalepam dattvā pitrādis taṃ nimbaṃ pāyayati, evam arthavādavākyaṇi bahvāyāsasādhye karmaṇyapravarttamānaṃ puruṣaṃ svargākṣayyādikaṃ śrāvayitvā pravarttayanti. Phalaśrutir api rocanārthā."

An excellent example of this is found in *Kāvyaṇradīpa*, p.7:

"Ye sukumāramatayo'tisukhisvabhāvā rājakumārādayo nīrase nītiśāstre pravartayitum aśakyās tān kāvyaṃ kānteva sarasatāpādanenābhimukhīkṛtyopadeśaṃ grāhayati guḍajihvikayā śīśūn iva uśadham. Yathāhuḥ:-

Svādukāvyarasonmiśraṃ vākyārtham upabhuñjate.
Prathamālīḍhamadhavaḥ pibanti kaṭu bheṣajam."

It is employed in a similar manner by Abhinavagupta in his comment on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 30, and by the author of *Padamañjarī* in the early part of his work (the Pandit x. 254); and, somewhat less clearly, in *Bhāmatī*, pages 342, 534, and *Nyāyavārtikatātparyatikā*, pages 438, 441.

ED. NOTE: *Vācaspatyam* is quoted above. But it seems a straight copy of R. *Vācaspatyam* may be found to be a copy-cat. It will be a good idea to check *Vācaspatyam* for a comparison. It seems it has borrowed heavily from R.

R has discussed this nyāya, but J does not mention this fact. This is quite common but unreasonable.

146

Gṛhītvā'rtham gatās caurāḥ kas tān ācchettum arhati.

The robbers have got away with the booty; who is able to intercept them? This saying is quoted by Vācaspatimiśra in his comment (on page 59) on *Nyāyavārtika* 1, 1. 2.

"Apāyo'pi tattvajñānān mithyājñānasya svarupato vā, viṣayato vā, phalato vā syāt.Na tāvat svarupataḥ..Nāpi viṣayataḥ. Nahi śuktikājñānaṃ rajatajñānasya rajata-viṣayatām apahartum utsahate, jātaṃ hi tad rajataṃ viṣayīkr̥tya. Yathāhuḥ:-

Gṛhītvārtham gatās caurāḥ kas tān ācchettam arhatīti."

It is also found in *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, page 119.

ED. NOTE: Locking the stables after the horses have been stolen away.

147

Godohananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the milk-pail*. It is laid down that a sacrificer who wishes for cattle must bring the water for his sacrifice in a milk- pail. But that is not done in other cases. The godohana is therefore used as an illustration of something which is *occasionally*, and not universally, connected with an act or performance as an essential part of it. It occurs in *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 3. 3. 42, as follows:

"Santi karmāṅgavyapāśrayāṇi vijñānāni 'Om ityetad akṣaram udgītham upā-sīta' ityevamādīni. Kiṃ tāni nityānyeva syuḥ karmasu paṇamayītvādivad, utānityāni godohanādivad iti vicārayāmaḥ." Then, at the close of the same:- "Tasmād yathā kratvāśrayāṅyapi godohanādīni phalasaṃyogād anityānyevam udgīthādyupāsānā-nītyapi draṣṭavyam." It appears again in 3. 3. 65; 3. 4. 45, and in 4.1.6. Sureśvara quotes it also in his vārtika on the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 3. 3. 51:

"Na ca godohananyāyaḥ kāmyakarmasu yujyate.
Teṣāṃ muktiphalatve hi na mānaṃ vidyate yataḥ."

For the mantra regarding the use of this pail, see Śabara and *Nyāyamālāvistara*, on Jaimini 4. 1. 2. Other references to the nyāya are *Tantravārtika* 3. 6. 43 (page 1118); and *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 166, line 4, in connection with which a verse is quoted from *Ślokavārtika* (page 63) where mention is made of the godohana. Kunte's long note on the sūtra of Jaimini referred to above will be found useful.

ED. NOTE: Reference made to Kunte's long note. Worthy statement.

148

Gobalīvardanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of the cattle and the bull. In the *Paṇḍit* for October 1867, Rājārāma Śāstrī expounded it thus:

"Yatra gāḥ kālaya balīvardaṃ cetyucyate tatra gopadenaiva balīvarda-padasiddhau balīvardapadaṃ durdamyatvajñāpanaparavtvena saphalam iti kalpyate."

That given in the *Vāchaspatyam* is somewhat fuller:

"Balīvardasya goviśeṣatve'pi balīvardasya jhaṭiti gotvena bodhanārthaṃ yathā prayogas tathānyayoḥ sāmānyaviśeṣarūpayor jhaṭiti bodhanārthaṃ yatra prayogas tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ."

In his exposition of Manu viii. 28, where six classes of women are enumerated as having a claim to the king's protection, Kullūka says:

"Atra cānekaśabdopādāne gobalīvardanyāyena punaruktiparihāraḥ."

The commentators Rāghavānanda and Govindarāja also quote the maxim in the same connection, and we have it in *Kāvya-pradīpa* vii. 11 (page 300). Vācaspatimiśra, too, makes frequent use of it. It occurs in *Bhāmatī*, pages 518, 536; and in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, pages 11, 118, 119, and 404. It belongs to the same class as Brāhmaṇa-Vasiṣṭhanyāya and Brāhmaṇa-parivrājanyāya."

149

Gomayapāyasīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *cowdung as a milky preparation*. Some stupid person is supposed to argue that cowdung is made of milk, because it comes from the cow; hence it is used to denote an utterly absurd argument or statement. It occurs in Vyāsa's bhāṣya on *Yoga-sūtra* i. 32. He says:

"Kathañcit samādhīyamānam apyetad gomayapāyasīyanyāyam ākṣipati."

On which the *Yogavārtika* remarks: "Gomayaṃ pāyasaṃ gavyatvād ityādinyāyamatadūṣaṇaṃ samādhīyamānam apyākṣipati tiraskaroti."

See, too, *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, p. 435.

It is found also in the Bauddha section of the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 18 of Bib. Ind. and 22 of Jīvānanda's edition) in the following sentence: "Evaṃ cāyam abhedasādhako hetur gomayapāyasīyanyāyavad ābhāsatāṃ bhajet," which Professor Gough renders, "Thus this argument which you adduce to prove that there is [no] difference between subject and object, turns out a mere absurdity, like milky food made of cowdung."

The compound gomayapāyasīya is included in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196, but Vardhamāna did not explain it.

Ed. Note: Note the expression--nyāyam ākṣipati.

150

Gauṇamukhyayor mukhye kāryasampratyayaḥ.

When a word has both a primary and a secondary meaning, an operation takes effect (only) when the word conveys its primary meaning. This is an abridgment of Professor Kielhorn's rendering of Nāgojībhāṭṭa's fifteenth *paribhāṣā*; and the following extracts from the *vṛitti* may help to explain it: "A word which is employed in a secondary sense is so employed (only) because (the character of that which it denotes in) its primary sense is ascribed (to that which it denotes in a secondary sense)." "For example, the word go 'ox' conveys the secondary meaning, 'one who is only fit for bearing burdens, an unintelligent person,' because (such a person has) certain qualities such as stupidity &c. (in common with an ox)."

The nyāya appears in the above form in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 15, and 6. 3. 46; but in 1. 4. 108, and in 8. 3. 82, the word kārya is omitted. In this shortened form, it is quoted by

Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 2. 13 (page 185), and 1. 3. 14 (page 246). Then in 4. 3. 12, Śankara says, "Paraṃ hi Brahma Brahmaśabdasya mukhyam ālambanam, gaṇam aparam. Gaṇamukhyagaṇayoś ca mukhye sampratyayo bhavati."

In *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 346, line 3, we read:

"Nanu sandigdham vastu prāyadarśanān nirṇīyate. Gaṇamukhyagrahaṇa-
viśaye ca mukhye sampratyayaḥ."

In Śabara's bhāṣya on Jaimini 3. 2. 1 (which deals with the *Barhirnyāya*), we have a very interesting discussion on gaṇa and mukhya, in the course of which he says, "Na hyanabhidhāya mukhyaṃ gaṇam abhivadati śabdaḥ." The conclusion arrived at is thus expressed: "Tasmān mukhyagaṇayor mukhye kāryasampratyaya iti siddham."

Ed. Note: Gaur vāhīkaḥ.

151

Grahaikatvanyāyaḥ.

The illustration furnished by [the mention of the washing of] *one cup only*. This is the title of the *adhikaraṇa* comprising Mīmāṃsāsūtras 3. 1. 13-15, in which the passage relating to the cleansing of soma-cups is discussed. The direction given is "Daśāpavitreṇa grahaṃ saṃmārṣṭi," "He cleanses the cup with a fringed filtering-cloth." But there are many such grahas in use; is only one of them to be washed? The decision is that all may be cleansed; and this, according to Mādhava (who is closely followed by Kṛishṇa Yajvan in *Mīmāṃsāparibhāṣā*), is because one represents the whole, and also on the ground of the rule that "a subordinate act is to be repeated in the case of each principal thing." The cup is here the 'principal,' and the act of cleansing is 'subordinate,' and is therefore to be repeated until each one has been cleansed. The passage stands thus in the *Nyāyamālāvistara*: "Graham iti dvitīyayā grahasyoddeśyatayā prayojanavattayā ca prādhānyaṃ gamyate. Graham prati gaṇaḥ saṃmārgaḥ. 'Prati pradhānaṃ ca gaṇa āvartanīya' iti nyāyena yāvanto grahāḥ santi te saṃmārjanīyāḥ."

Kumārila explains this in the following kārīkā of *Tantravārtika* 3. 1. 14:

"Vyaktīruddīśya yat karma svajātyādyupalakṣitāḥ.
Vihitam gaṇabhāvena tat sarvārtham pratīyate."

For further applications of the nyāya by him, see pages 339 (line 4 from bottom) and 551 (line 13). For its use outside the Mīmāṃsā, see *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 287, line 4; and *Vedāntaśikhāmaṇi*, page 120. The grammarian Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, too, in his exposition of Kaiyaṭā on 1. 1. 14 (page 319) writes thus:-

"Graham sammārṣṭīyādau tu grahārthatvāt sammārgasya, grahasya prādhānyam iti na tadgatasāṅkhyā vivakṣiteti bhāvaḥ."

See, too, Kaiyaṭa on the closing part of Patañjali 1. 1. 69 (vol. i., p. 169 b of Benares edition; or page 450 (column 1) of the Nirṇayasāgar edition of 1908).

ED. NOTE: "See too" reference. It is to be noted also that "sammārṣṭi" does not mean washing, but only cleansing, dusting off. Remember--Daśāpavitreṇa graham sammārṣṭi. Daśāpavitreṇa vastrkhaṇḍenetyarthaḥ.

Ref. for Kumārila--*Mīmāṃsādarśana* of Pune 4.73.

152

Grāvṇi rekheva.

Like a delineation on stone. Used of something unalterably fixed.

"Tanmām Vajrakumārāya sampradattānyathā tu me.
Maraṇam śaraṇam tāta grāvṇi rekheva gīriyam."

Pariśiṣṭaparvan xii. 275. Compare Job's words (xix. 23): "Oh that my words were now written ... that with an iron pen and lead they were graven in the rock forever."

ED. NOTE: Patthar kī lakīra (Hindi). Here is an additional reference. Also a comparative study. However, we don't understand how this could be called a nyāya. Nīyate prāpyate tātparyārtho yeneti nyāyaḥ. It is only a subhāṣita. There is no logic. It is not a yuktivyuktā sūktiḥ. It cannot be used as an instrument for offence or defence. It cannot be a vādanirṇayasādhana. It cannot lead us to any tattvabodha.

153

Ghaṭapradīpanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a lighted lamp inside a vessel*. Raghunātha points out that a lamp so placed illuminates only the interior of the vessel, and he applies it to one whose knowledge of Brahman is of a low order.

The maxim is used very differently, however, by Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 33 (page 190), as the following extract will show:

"Na tveṣa vācyavyaṅgyayor nyāyaḥ. Nahi vyaṅgye pratīyamāne vācyabuddhir dūrībhavati. Vācyāvabhāsavinābhāvena tasya prakāśanāt. Tasmād ghaṭapradīpa-

nyāyas tayoh. Yathaiva hi pradīpadvāreṇa ghaṭapratītvutpannāyāṃ na pradīpa-
prakāśo nivartate tadvad vyaṅgyapratītau vācyāvabhāsaḥ."

Abhinavagupta, when explaining *Dhvanyāloka* i. 12, refers to this passage in the following words: "Ata eva tṛtīyodyote ghaṭapradīpadrṣṭāntabalād vyaṅgyapratītikāle-
'pi vācyapratītir na vighaṭata iti yad vakṣyati tena sahāsyā granthasya na virodhaḥ."

According to these great authorities on Alaṅkāra, therefore, the nyāya teaches that as the lamp continues to burn after it has lighted up the interior [?] of the vessel, and is indeed essential to the continuance of that illumination, so the expressed meaning of a sentence is absolutely essential as a basis for the figurative meaning which it also conveys.

ED. NOTE: Not explained well. The lamp stays out [!] even after illuminating the jar. What is meant here is the continuation of the awareness of the vācyārtha. In the example given from *Dhvanyāloka*, the idea of exterior or interior does not play any role. The lamp is outside the ghaṭa and illuminates all objects to the extent its light reaches them.

A common note for us: Such notes to be collected for Introduction. What have we done? Our contribution: Correcting Jacob's wrong readings and wrong interpretations, and condemnation of his preaching of his own biased views on religion and philosophy.

Nyāya= a dṛṣṭānta, yet it has some force.

154

Ghaṭīyantranyāyaḥ.

This has the same meaning and application as the kūpayantraghaṭīkānyāya, for which see its place. It occurs in Sureśvara's large *Vārtika* 4. 4. 248, and 6. 2. 155, as follows:

"Anirjñātātmatatvaḥ san kāmabandhanabandhanaḥ.
Ghaṭīyantravad aśrānto baṃbhramītyaniśaṃ naraḥ."

"Ghaṭīyantravadaśrāntā evam eva punaḥ punaḥ.
Parivartanti saṃsāre karmavāyusamīritāḥ."

Similarly, in his *Vārtika* on the *Taittirīyabhāṣya* 2. 1. 221 (page 86):

"Mṛtibījaṃ bhavaj janma janmabījaṃ tathā mṛtiḥ.
Ghaṭīyantravad aśrānto baṃbhramītyaniśaṃ naraḥ."

It is found too in a third work of his, namely *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 42. Also in the Jain treatise *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 62, as follows:

"Āpadgaṭaṃ hasasi kiṃ draviṇāndhamūḍha
lakṣmīḥ sthirā na bhavatīti kimatra citram.
Kiṃ tvam na paśyasi ghaṭī jalayantracakre
riktā bhavanti bharitā bharitāś ca riktāḥ."

In *Upamitibhavaprapancā Kathā*, page 52, and 418, it appears as araghaṭṭaghaṭī-yantranyāya. In *Kirtikaumudī* vi. 43, we have the compound bhramadghaṭīsaṅghaṭī-tāraghaṭṭakhāṭkāraśabdaiḥ. The word araghaṭṭa has become rāhāṭa in Marāṭhī, as in rāhāṭagāḍagem.

155

Ghaṭṭakuṭīprabhātanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of day-break in the vicinity of the toll-collector's hut. A man, anxious to avoid paying toll, takes another road, but losing his way in the dark, finds himself, at day-break in the vicinity of that very toll-gate! The saying is employed to illustrate uddeśyāsiddhi, as Prof. Cowell puts it, that is, failure to accomplish a desired object. It occurs in the Pāṇini section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* as follows:

"Nanu sphoṭavācakatāpakṣe'pi prāguktavikalpaprasareṇa ghaṭṭakuṭīprabhātā-yitam iti cet, tad etan manorājyaviṣmbhaṇam, vaiśamyasambhavāt," which is thus rendered by Prof. Cowell: "But even on your own hypotheses that there is a certain thing called *sphoṭa* which expresses the meaning, the same untenable alternative will recur which we discussed before; and therefore it will only be a case of the proverb that '*the dawn finds the smuggler with the revenue-officer's house close by.*' This, however, is only the inflation of the world of fancy from the wide difference between the two cases." [house or post? ed.]

Śrīharsha, too, used the simile in his *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhāḍya* (page 35): "Tarhi kāraṇasya sattām abhyupagatavān asīti ghaṭṭakuṭṭyāṃ prabhātam iti cen na."

See also *Siddhāntaleśa*, pages 40 and 116; *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 62; *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, pages 63, 146, 219, 371; *Citsukhī*, i. 12; ii. 24 (Paṇḍit iv. 518; v. 510), and *Kusumāñjali* iii. 16 (page 496).

ED. NOTE: "See also" references.

156

Ghuṇākṣaranyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the letter made by the woodworm ghuṇa*. This worm bores holes in wood and in books which sometimes assume the shape of a letter of the alphabet; hence its use to intimate the occurrence of something quite accidental. Here is Vardhamāna's (iii. 195) description of it: "Ghuṇotkiranāt kathañcin niṣpannam akṣaram ghuṇākṣaram. Tadviva yadakuśalena daivān niṣpadyate tad ghuṇākṣarīyam."

The simile is found in the opening part of the *Prasannarāghava* (page 9) as follows: "Aho ghuṇākṣaranyāyo yad idaṃ bhramaradvayaṃ prati mayoktaṃ bandidvayaṃ prati phalitaṃ vacaḥ."

Also in Rājataranṅinī iv. 167:

"Trīn vārān samare jītvā jītaṃ mene sa Mummunim.
Sakṛjjayam arer vīrā manyante hi ghuṇākṣaram."

Māgha iii. 58 may also be referred to.

ED. NOTE: "See also" reference. It is to be noted that all kinds of animals and insects have been brought to evolve and illustrate the nyāyas, all taken from the living world, day-to-day human experiences.

157

Cakrabhramaṇanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the [continued] revolving of the potter's wheel*. Followers of both Sāṅkhya and Vedānta have asked why, on attaining to right knowledge, a man is not immediately liberated. Kapila's answer is contained in Sūtra iii. 82. "Cakra-bhramaṇavad dhṛtaśarīraḥ."

On which Aniruddha says: "Yathā daṇḍāpagame saṃskāravaśāc cakraṃ bhramati, tathā vivekinām api dehadhāraṇakarmaṇo'kṣīṇatvān na tatkṣaṇān muktiḥ kintūpabhogādīnā karmakṣayād iti.

Tathā ca śrutiḥ.

Dīkṣayaiva naro mucyeta tiṣṭhen mukto'pi vighrahe.
Kulālacakramadhyastho vicchinno'pi bhramed ghaṭaḥ."

Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 4. 1. 15 teaches the same thing from the Vedāntist's standpoint, and propounds the very important doctrine that whilst accumulated and current works are destroyed by true knowledge, fructescent works, which brought about the present existence, are not. Therefore, the Jīvanmukta has to continue here until death - just as the potter's wheel continues to revolve until the impetus given to it exhausts itself.

ED. NOTE: Cf. Iṣuvegakṣayanyāya.

158

Candananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *Sandal-oil*. Bādarāyana uses this as an illustration in sūtras 2. 3. 23, 24. As the application of a drop of the oil to one part of the body produces a pleasant sensation in the whole of it, so soul, abiding in one part, namely in the heart, is yet perceived as present in the entire frame. Śaṅkara's exposition of the former sūtra is as follows:

"Yathā haricandanabinduḥ śarīraikadeśasambaddho'pi san sakaladehavyāpinam āhlādaṃ karotyevam ātmāpi dehaikadeśasthaḥ sakaladehavyāpinīm upalabdhim kariṣyati. Tvaksambandhāc cāsyā sakalaśarīragatā vedanā na virudhyate. Tvagātmanor hi sambandhaḥ kṛtsnāyāṃ tvaci vartate. Tvak ca kṛtsnaśarīravypinīti."

Ed. note: We don't see any oil here! It is only a paste that is applied. Note the word bindu. .

159

Candracandrikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the moon and its light*. Used of two inseparable things. It is found in Ānandagiri's *Śaṅkaravijaya*, page 124:

"Ataḥ sarvadevakāraṇasya rudrasya yā śaktiś candracandrikānyāyena tad-udbodharūpiṇī svādhīnavallabheti prasiddhā saiva bhavānī."

ED. NOTE: Jacob's text has an error here. Even the third "revised" edition has not removed the errors of the previous editions.

160

Citrāṅganānyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a woman in a picture*. An illustration of that which has only an appearance of reality. Raghunātha connects with this the citrāṅganānyāya and citrāmṛtanyāya, and, in his larger work, Bhagavān Vasiṣṭhaḥ is quoted as follows:

"Citrāmṛtaṃ nāmṛtam eva vidhi

citrānalam nānalam eva viddhi.
Citrāṅganā nūnam anaṅganeti
vācāvivekastvaviveka eveti."

Like his other quotations from Vāsiṣṭha, this, too, is from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, where it stands as verse 4. 18. 69. Others of a like nature are 4. 1. 11 and 12:

"Citrodyānam ivotphullam arasaṃ sarasākṛti.
Prakāśam api nistejaś citrārkānalavat sthitam.

"Anubhūtaṃ manorājyam ivāsatyam avāstavam.
Citrapadmākara iva sārasaugandhyavarjitam."

Also 6. 57. 28:

"Citrāgnidāho vijñāto yathā dāhyeṣu niṣphalaḥ.
Tathāhambhāvasargādi jñātaṃ niṣphalatām iyāt."

161

Cintāmaṇiṃ parityajya kācamaṇigrahaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *giving up the fabulous gem Cintāmaṇi and taking instead a mere piece of quartz!* Its application is obvious. Raghunātha applies it to the man who abandons the search for knowledge of Brahma in order to enjoy the pleasures of this life. *Śāntiśataka* 12, in Haeberlin's Anthology, bears on this:

"Janmedaṃ vandhyatāṃ nītaṃ bhavabhogopalipsayā.
Kācamūlyena vikṛīto hanta cintāmaṇir mayā."

So, too, *Hitopadeśa* ii. 60:

"Maṇir luṭhati pādeṣu kācaḥ śirasi dhāryate.
Yathaiṅvāstu tathaiṅvāstu kācaḥ kāco maṇir maṇiḥ."

There is an additional example in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 420:

"Nirvāṇasukhasaṃsāra-sukhayoś ca parasparam.
Cintāratnasya kācena yāvat tāvad guṇāntaram."

Then, lower down on the same page, this and eight other figures are employed to illustrate the folly of one who, though acquainted with the Jaina creed, still clings to evil. The whole passage is reproduced for the benefit of those who have not the book to refer to.

Yo jainam api samprāpya śāsanam karmanāśanam.
Himsākrodhādipāpeṣu rajyate mūḍhamānasaḥ.

Samhārayati kācena cintāmaṇim anuttamam.
Karotyāṅgāravāṇijyaṃ dagdhvā gośīrṣacandanam.

Bhinatti nāvaṃ mūḍhātmā lohārthaṃ sa mahodadhau.
Sūtrārthaṃ dārayatyuccair vaiḍūryaṃ ratnam uttamam.

Pradīpayati kīlārthaṃ devadroṇīm mahattamām.
Ratnasthālyāṃ pacatyāmlakhalakaṃ mohadoṣataḥ.

Sauvarṇalāṅgalāgreṇa likhitvā vasudhāṃ tathā.
Arkabījaṃ vapatyeṣa tūlārthaṃ mūḍhamānasaḥ.

Chitvā karpūrakhaṇḍāni kodravāṇāṃ samantataḥ.
Vṛttiṃ vidhatte mūḍho'yam ahaṃ saśrutikaḥ kila."

On page 170 there is yet another word of Siddharṣi's in regard to the *Cintāmaṇi*, namely "Nirlakṣaṇanaro naiva cintāmaṇim avāpnute."

ED. NOTE: Jacob has reproduced six verses "for the benefit of those who have not the book to refer to." This fact will justify our attempt to reproduce all such citations which he has omitted. Here is a challenging assignment for a scholar who might follow us.

162

Cetansya yatnahīnasyordhvagatiś cetanāntarādhīnā.

Movement upward on the part of a quiescent intelligent being is dependent on [the action of] some other being of intelligence. I should call this an axiom rather than a maxim; but as Ānandagiri terms it a *Laukikanyāya*, I include it here. It occurs in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 4.3.5, as follows: "Cetansya yatnahīnasyordhvagatiś cetanāntarādhīneti laukikanyāyena yatnahīnānām gantṛṇām gamayitāro'rcirādayaś cetanāḥ syur iti sūtrayojanayā brūte."

ED. NOTE. It is worth our finding out what is the difference between an axiom and a maxim. Since Ānandagiri has included, Jacob has included. Following the same principle R includes many. But he is condemned by J. J has a dual personality and dual way of thinking.

Also note *Laukikanyāyena*! This statement gives a lot of force to the concept and nature of the *nyāyas*.

We don't have facility to make a *dirgha* ṭṛ, which is needed here for ganṭṛ.

163

Caurāparādhān māṇḍavyanigrahanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of the punishment of Māṇḍavya for the crime committed by robbers. The story of the Rishi Aṇi-Māṇḍavya is told at length in *Ādiparva* cvii, cviii. Whilst he was practising severe austerities in conjunction with the *mauna-vrata*, some robbers concealed themselves and their plunder in his Āśrama. The king's guard found them there, and, believing the sage to be implicated in the affair, carried him off together with them and impaled them all together! Māṇḍavya was eventually removed from the stake, but its point (aṇī) remained in him; hence the name, given him by the people, of Aṇi-Māṇḍavya. The maxim is found in the Pūrṇaprajña's chapter of *Sarvadarśanasanġraha* (page 73 of Jivānanda's edition, and 62 of Bib. Ind.):

"Tasmān na bhedaṇṭṛyaḥ suprasaram iti cet kiṃ vastusvarūṇṭṛpabheda-vāḍinaṃ ṭṛti imāni dūṣaṇānyudghuṣyante, kiṃvā dharmibhedavāḍinaṃ ṭṛti. Prathame caurāparādhān māṇḍavyanigrahanyāyāṇṭṛtaḥ."

But its earliest occurrence is in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 70, line 15, where we read, "Evaṃ hi caurāparādhena vyaktam ayaṃ māṇḍavyanigrahaḥ syāt."

And it was from this source that the Khaṇḍanakāra, too, derived the nyāya together with several pages of context! Compare pages 633-636 of Śriharṣa's work with pages 70 and 71 of Udayana's.

ED. NOTE: The last para above is noteworthy. Re. the above nyāya we have collected and presented a great deal of information in our "Viveka" of the *Ratnākara*. Shri Joshiji of Rajkot has contributed a great deal of information on this.

The idea of this nyāya is termed various ways. For example,

Caurādhvani Māṇḍavyanigrahaḥ. Caurādhvani hataḥ. Saṅgateḥ saṅgadoṣeṇa kāṣṭha-ghaṇṭāviḍambanā. Śiṣyāparādhē guror daṇḍaḥ. Gehūṃ ke sātha ghuna pīsanā (Hindi).

Also to be noted is the expression nyāyāṇṭṛtaḥ.

164

Chattrinyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the men with umbrellas*. The thought here is of a crowd of men, *many* of them with umbrellas up, and so *all* seeming to have them. Its application will be apparent from the examples which follow. We have one in Śankara's bhāshya on *Katha-Upanishad* iii. 1 ("ṛtaṃ pibantau" &c.): "Ekas tatra karmaphalaṃ pibati bhuṅkte netaras, tathāpi pātṛsambandhāt pibantāvityucyate chattrinyāyena."

Again, in his bhāshya on *Vedāntasūtra* 3. 3. 34, where the same text is expounded: "Ṛtaṃ pibantāvityatra tu jīve pibatyaśanāyādyatītaḥ paramātmāpi sāhacaryāc chattrinyāyena pibatītyupacaryate."

On the former of these two passages, the commentator Gopāla Yatīndra says:

"Chattrinyāyenetī. Yathā loke chattriṇo gacchantīti prayoge saparivāre rājñi gacchati chatryachattrisamudāye chattriśabdo vartata ekasamūhavāhitvenaivaṃ pibadapibatsamudāye pibatir vartata ityarthaḥ."

I have met with the maxim in the *Kuvalayānanda*, also under the figure "ullāsa," and in Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 2. 11; 1. 4. 12.

But the nyāya is found long before Śankara's time, and perhaps originated with Śabara, in whose bhāshya on Jaimini 1. 4. 28 we read, "Yathā chattriṇo gacchantītyekena chattriṇā sarve lakṣyante"; and in *Tantravārtika* 1. 4. 13, "Tasmād ekadeśasthair api Viśvedevair upalakṣitānām chattrinyāyena tatprakhyatayaiva sarveṣām nāmadheya-tvam."

165

Chāyāpīśācīnyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *a shadow mistaken for a she-goblin!* It is found in Nṛsiṃhasarasvatī's commentary on the last section of the *Vedāntasāra*, as follows:

"Nanvaprāptasya kriyāsādhyasya vastuno vidyamānānarthanivṛtteś ca puruṣārthatvaṃ dṛṣṭam, atra tadabhāvāt kathaṃ puruṣārthatvam iti cen na. Tayor eva puruṣārthatvam iti niyamābhāvāt, svacchāyāyām āropitarakṣaso vismṛtakaṅthagata-cāmīkarasya bhrāntapurūṣasyāptavākyena tayor nivṛtyāptyor api puruṣārthatvadṛṣṭeḥ. Atra saṅgrahaḥ.

'Ātmājñānamalaṃ nirastam amalaṃ prāptaṃ ca tatvaṃ paraṃ
kaṅthasthābharaṇādivad bhramavaśāc chāyāpīśācī yathā.
Āptoktyāptinivṛttivacchrutiśirovākyād guror utthitād
dhvastadhvāntanirāsataḥ parasukhaṃ prāptaṃ tayor ucyata' iti."

ED. NOTE: It is disappointing to see in Jacob's edition poetry featured as prose. But this is not always the case. Dhig dhig jālma.

166

Jalakatakareṇunyāyaḥ.

The simile of *particles of the Kataka nut [placed] in water [in order to clear it]*. Manu refers to it in vi. 67 thus:

"Phalaṃ katakavṛkṣasya yadyapyambuprasādakam.
Na nāmagrahaṇād eva tasya vāri prasīdati."

In the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* the nyāya is explained as follows: "Yathā hi sapaṅkajale nikṣiptāḥ katakasyauśadhiviśeṣasya reṇavo rajāṃsi tasmāj jalāt paṅkaṃ vilāpya svayam eva vilīyante, tathā tatvajñānaṃ savilāsājñānaṃ nivartya svayameva nivartate."

The larger work, the *Laukikanyāratnākara*, adds the following quotation in support of the definition: "Taduktaṃ bhagavatpādaiḥ:-

"Ajñānakaluṣaṃ jīvaṃ jñānābhyāsād vinirmalam.
Kṛtvā jñānaṃ svayaṃ naśyej jalaṃ katakareṇuvat."

The "worshipful feet" are those of Śaṅkarāchārya, and the verse is *Ātmabodha* 5.

Sureśvara has given a capital illustration of the application of this in his large *Vārtika* 4. 3. 975-6 (page 1553):

"Apāṃ katakasamṣparkād yathā'tyantaprasannatā.
Apāstāśeṣasamṣārabhāvanasyaivam ātmanaḥ.

Svāsthyaṃ prasannataitasmin suṣupte bhavatītyataḥ.
Samprasādam imaṃ prāhuḥ suṣuptaṃ tadvido janāḥ."

There is an interesting example, too, in Hemachandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* ii. 4:

"Guruvākvatakakṣoda-samṣaktam abhavat sadā.
Praśāntadurdhyānamalaṃ tanmanovāri nirmalam."

Venkaṭanātha, however, does not altogether hold with this simile; for in the vṛtti to his *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii 50 (page 215), he says:

"Na tu kvacid api dravyanāśaḥ. Avasthāntarāpattyā cādarśanam. Katakara-jō-nidarśanam ca bālapralobhanam. Na hi payasi pañkaḥ katakarajasā śāmyate, viśleṣamātradrṣṭeḥ. Na ca svayaṃ tatra naśyatyaśaṃśleṣamātrasiddheḥ."

ED. NOTE: *Yogavāsiṣṭha* makes frequent references to this nyāya. Also Kākatālīya.

167

Jalatum̐bikānyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a gourd in water*. The idea is that of a gourd, thickly covered with mud, and therefore sinking in the water, but gradually resuming its buoyancy as the mud is washed off. The Digambara Jains use the figure to illustrate the release of the soul from the encumbrance of the body. Raghunātha puts it thus:

"Yathā pañkaliptā tumbikā nadīsamudrādaḥ majjantī pañke kṣīṇe'vakāśa āgatya tiṣṭhati tathā jīvo dehādīpañke kṣīṇe'lokākāśe gatvā tiṣṭhati. Ayam eva tasya mokṣa iti digambarāḥ. Iti jalatum̐bikānyāyaḥ."

This description, without mention of the nyāya, is found in very similar language in the Jaina chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 48 of Jīvānanda's edition), and also in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, for which see the Pañjaramuktapakṣinyāya in its proper place. The former passage is as follows:

"Yathā vā mṛttikālepakṣtam alābudravyaṃ jale'dhaḥ patati, punar apeta-mṛttikābandham ūrdhvaṃ gacchati, tathā karmarahita ātmā asaṅgatvād ūrdhvaṃ gacchati, bandhacchedād eraṇḍabījavaccordhvagatisvabhāvāc cāgnīśikhāvat."

The figure of the castor-oil seed is found in the *Parimala* passage also. The term *alokākāśa*, which appears in Raghunātha's definition, is the name of a subdivision of one of the five categories (*astikāya*) of the Jaina system. It is explained as follows by Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2.2.33 (page 563): "Ākāśastikāyo dvedhā laukikākāśo'laikikākāśaś ca. Lokānām antarvartī lokākāśaḥ. Tadupari mokṣasthānam alokākāśaḥ." This is referred to in a verse quoted by Mādhava in the immediate context of the passage already cited from the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, namely:

"Gatvā gatvā nivartante candrasūryādayo grahāḥ.
Adyāpi na nivartante tvālokākāśamāgatāḥ."

Professor Cowell's rendering is, "However often they go away, the planets return, the sun, moon, and the rest; but never to this day have returned any who have gone to *Ālokākāśa*." This should, of course, be *Alokākāśa*, as the long vowel includes the preposition *ā* 'up to,' 'as far as,' "those who have *reached* *Alokākāśa*" (*ā alokākāśam*).

ED. NOTE: Even the most elementary teaching of the Vyākaraṇa will bring in the application of the nyāya in the form of Jalatumbikānyāyena rephasyordhvagatiḥ.

168

Jāteṣṭinyāyaḥ.

The law regarding *the oblation on the birth of a son*. This is the subject of Jaimini 4. 3. 38, 39. The question arises whether the offering is for the benefit of the father or the son (Tatra sandehaḥ kim ātmaniḥśreyasāya uta putraniḥśreyasāya), and the answer is that it benefits the latter. In the commentary on *Lakṣaṇāvalī*, this is applied as follows:

"Nahi caitrānuṣṭhitāgnihotrajanitam apūrvaṃ caitrasamavetaṃ maitraṃ svargaphalabhāginam kartum utsahate. Putreṣṭipitṛyajñavad etat syāt. Na. Tatrā-pyatiśayasya putrādisamavetatvenaivābhyupagamāt."

169

Jāmātr̥suddhinyāyaḥ.

The story of *the son-in-law's revision* [of a book]. This is the original of the Marāṭhī Jāmvaīśodha, which Molesworth defines as "A phrase, founded on a popular story, to express the examination of a piece of a composition by a shallow-witted fellow incapable of discerning its merit." The popular story, as given on pages 6-9 of Merutunga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, is to the effect that Vararuci, having been instructed by Vikramāditya to find a suitable husband for his daughter, the princess Priyaṅgumañjarī, in revenge for a supposed insult offered him by her when his pupil, palmed off upon her an ignorant cowherd as a man of learning! The king accepted him, and he became his son-in-law. "In accordance with the advice of the paṇḍit, the herdsman preserved unbroken silence; but the princess, wishing to test his cleverness, entreated him to revise a newly-written book. He placed the book in the palm of his hand, and with a nail-parer proceeded to remove from the letters in it the dots and the oblique lines at the top of the indicating vowels, and thus to isolate them, and then the princess discovered that he was a cowherd. After that the 'son-in-law's revision' became a proverb everywhere." This quotation is from Mr. C. H. Tawney's admirable translation of Mertunga's work; the original being as follows:

"Paṇḍitopadiṣṭam sarvathā maunam evālabamāno [mahiṣīpālah] rājakanyakayā tadvaiddagdhyañjñāsāyā navalikhitapustakasya śodhanāyoparuddhaḥ. Karatale pustakam vinyasya tadakṣarāṇi bindumātrārahitāni nakhacchedinyā kevalā-nyeva kurvan rājaputryā mahiṣīpāla eva nirṇītaḥ. Tataḥprabhṛti jāmātr̥suddhir iti sarvataḥ prasiddhir abhūt."

In the subsequent part of the story we are informed that the cowherd eventually became the famous poet Kālidāsa! For a similar account from a Buddhist source, see *Indian Antiquary*, vol iv. page 103; also vol vii page 116.

ED. NOTE: Here is a reference to an additional source for further information. Also to be noted is the fact that Jacob is limited to just one modern Indian language, Marāṭhī.

170

Jāmātrarthaṃ śrapitasya sūpāder atithyupakāraṭvama.

Broth cooked for the son-in-law is also useful for the unexpected guest. This, like the dehalīdīpanyāya and many others, resembles our proverb "killing two birds with one stone." I have met with it only in *Kuvalayānanda* (page 98) under the figure dīpaka.

The passage is as follows: "Nahi dīpasya rathyāprāsādayor yugapad upakāraṭvena jāmātrarthaṃ śrapitasya sūpasyātithibhyaḥ prathamapariveṣaṇena ca prāsaṅgikaṭvaṃ hīyate &c." This passage also illustrates another of Raguṇātha's nyāyas, namely Gṛhārthaṃ āropitasya dīpasya rathyopakāraṭvama.

ED. NOTE: cf. Āmrāśca siktāḥ...

171

Jñānaṃ ajñānasyaiva nivartakama.

Knowledge [of Brahma] abolishes nothing but the ignorance [which obscures that Impersonality]. This is a bit of Vedantism pure and simple, and has scant claims to a place amongst popular maxims. It is admitted solely because Raghunatha includes it in his list. His explanation is as follows:

"Asmiṃścādhyāse'jñānaṃ kāraṇama. Tatvajñānena vātadīpanyāyena tannivṛttā -vasnehadīpanyāyena tadadhyāso'pi nivartate. Na ca jñānenaivobhayanivṛttih kuto na syāt. Jñānaṃ a jñānasyaiva nivartakama iti nyāyavirodhāt. Dvididhā hi nivṛttih, virodhinā sāmagrīnivṛtṭyā ca. Yathā vātādinā dīpanāśo, yathā ca tailavartṭyādī -nivṛtṭyā dīpanivṛttih. Tatrādyā nivṛttir ajñānasya, dvitīyā karyaavargasyeti bodhyama."

The so-called nyāya [? ed.] is found in *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṅgraha* page 8, line 9, and in *Pañcapādikā*, page 1.

ED. NOTE: When a military commander orders FIRE; he does not advance any reasoning. Even in writing on Vedānta, the Colonel displays his military mind and might. He has

included most abstruse and technical nyāyas which are not at all used in the bazaar. In fact at a certain point in time, he had realized this anomaly and thought of dropping the word "popular" altogether from the title of his compilation, but gave up the idea because he felt that it had become so *popular* by usage. It is to be remembered that this nyāya has been used by great writers of yore.

172

Jvaraharatakṣakacūḍāratnālaṅkāropadeśavat.

Like instructions for obtaining Takshaka's crest jewel as a febrifuge! An illustration of utter impossibility. It occurs in the *Nyāyabinduīkā* page 3, line 9, in a passage regarding the *anubandhas*. It runs thus:

"Atas teṣu saṁśayo yuktaḥ. Anukteṣu tu pratipattṛbhir niṣprayojanam abhidheyaṁ sambhāvyetāsya prakaraṇasya kākadantaparīkṣāyā iva. Aśakyānuṣṭhānaṁ vā prayojanam. Jvaraharatakṣakacūḍāratnālaṅkāropadeśavat. Anabhimataṁ vā. Mātṛ vivāhakramopadeśavat."

I am indebted to Professor C. Bendall for pointing out this passage to me. It is applied by Vācaspatimiśra, in the same sense, in his *Tātparyatīkā*, page 3 and in the *Nyāyakanīkā*, pages 338 and 417.

ED. NOTE: Here is an example to show how Jacob's compilation has been enriched by other scholars.

Also there is an additional reference here and of the *kākadantaparīkṣānyāya*.

173

Ṭiṭṭibhanyāyaḥ

The simile of *the bird named Ṭiṭṭibha* [Parra Jacana]. It is based on the story of this bird as given in the *Hitopadeśa*, and is used as an illustration of a ridiculous conceit. The verse which paves the way for the story is ii. 137:

"Aṅgāṅgibhāvama jñātvā kathāṁ sāmārthyanirṇayaḥ.
Paśya ṭiṭṭibhamātreṇa samudro vyākulīkṛtaḥ."

ED. NOTE: On the use of the word "ridiculous": Jacob has missed the boat! His approach is just like a cockroach! Incomplete, inadequate, inaccurate, unscholarly, unacademic, simply foolish. Jacob was truly a COLONEL. He had a very long tongue and it had no leash. He belonged to the Ruling Class who were in India just to help the Indians--to uplift

them from the abysmal darkness of ignorance, wretched poverty, and the lowest level of semi-barbaric life. Jacob was an unfortunate victim of a high class of superiority complex.

R has this. Also *Utseka udadher yadvat*--Gauḍapādācārya had this. Śrī Śaṅkacārya had this. They did not take any exception to this. Anubhūtiśvarūpācārya concurred. Ānandagiri accepted. Śrī Vidyāraṇyasvāmipāda in his *Jīvanmuktiviveka* narrated the entire episode. Yet, in the learned opinion of Colonel Jacob all these saints, sages, and scholars were engaged in "ridiculous" activities!

Our reaction to the Colonel would be: *Yadā yadā muñcati vākyabāṇam tadā tadā jātikulapramāṇam.*

174

Ḍamarukamaṇinyāyaḥ.

The *ḍamaruka* or *ḍamaru*, is a sort of small drum, shaped like an hour-glass, and held in one hand: The *maṇi* is, I suppose, the small piece of wood attached to the string tied around the middle of the drum, which strikes each end alternately as it is shaken in the hand, thus fulfilling a double purpose. The *gāruḍīs*, or conjurors, use a drum of this kind; and Apte's dictionary tells us that the *Kāpālikas* carry one. (For a description of the latter, see Wilson's *Religion of the Hindus*, vol. i. pages 21 and 264). The *nyāya* is found in *Syādvādamañjarī*, page 84, where in explaining the words "notsṛṣṭam anyārtham apodyate ca" in Hemacandra's eleventh *kārikā*, Malliṣeṇa says, "Anyārtham iti madhyavartī padaṃ ḍamarukamaṇinyāyenobhayatrāpi sambandhanīyam." See the *nyāya* *Apavādair utsargā bādhyante*" and compare also the *Ghaṇṭālolānyāya* on page 35 of *Syādvādamañjarī*.

ED. NOTE: Śaṅkarācārya has used *Madhyamaṇinyāya*. There are many additional references here.

Also note: *Ghaṇṭālolānyāya*. It seems to be an unfamiliar *nyāya*.

175

Takrakauṇḍinyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *buttermilk for Kauṇḍinya*. This is one of Raghunatha's grammatical *nyāyas*, taken from *Mahābhāṣya*, and is intended to indicate a special exception to a general rule as in the sentence *Brāhmaṇebhyo dadhi dīyatāṃ takraṃ kauṇḍinyāya*, where an exception is made in the case of *Kauṇḍinya*, though included amongst the *Brahmans*. It occurs in *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika* 1. 6. 71 (page 881):

"*Takrakauṇḍinyavan nyāyo na cehāpyavasīyate.*

Utsargānavakāśatvāc chūnyataivāta āpatet."

On which Ānandagiri comments as follows:

"Abhinnaśabdasya bhedanīṣedhitve'pi na bhedasya śūnyatā, sarvatra prāptasya kāraṇe niṣedhād. Āryebhyo dadhi dīyatām ityāryopādhau prāptasya dadhnaḥ, takraṃ Kauṇḍinyāyeti Kauṇḍinye niṣedhe'pyaśūnyatāvad ityāśaṅkyāha takreti.

I have noted down seven instances of the occurrence of this illustration in the *Mahābhāṣya*, namely: 1.1.47; 6.1.2.(4); 6.2.1; 6.4.163(2); 7.1.72(3); 7.2.117(2); and 7.4.61(4). It will suffice to quote the first, as the other six are practically the same:

"Laukiko'yaṃ dṛīṣṭāntaḥ. Loke hi satyapi saṃbhava bādhanam bhavati. Tadyathā. Dadhi brāhmaṇebhyo dīyatām takraṃ kauṇḍinyāyeti satyapi saṃbhava dadhidānasya takradānam nivartakam bhavati."

See also. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa's *paribhāṣā* LVII, and Professor Kielhorn's translation of the same. Other instances of it will be found in *Vākyapadīya*, ii. 352; *Ślokaṅkārtika*, page 617 (verse 15); *Tantravārtika*, page 262 (last 2 verses); and *Bhāmati*, 3. 3. 26 (page 628).

ED. NOTE: Thanks, very many Nirajana: You have done a great service to the cause of Sanskrit scholarship. It was a clean and clear reproduction. It did not matter to you at all if certain parts of the book were not legible. You picked up a faded copy. You did not search for a better one. You were in great haste. You did not realize that haste makes waste. You had no time to waste. You had to deliver the book to the anxious readers instantaneously. Where was the time for this search and research? So many impatient readers were lined up outside your shop. You had no choice.

Also to be noted is the fact that you reproduced the 1911 ed. This was superseded by a new revised THIRD edition published in 1925. Your monumental reproduction appeared only in 1983. Why didn't you take that one for your reproduction? It would have been the production of enormous profit anyway?

And, by the way, we have secured a copy of the 1925 Ed. It is far more superior to what you might have had. But it came to us at a very late stage, long after we had finished our struggle and had detected and corrected most of the bundles of horrible blunders contained in an earlier edition which you reproduced. For example, your reprint reads here: **kaunḍinyanyāyeti!**

P.S.

The above note was made before we carefully compared the text of the reprint with that of the so-called "revised" third edition. This edition copies all the bundles of horrible blunders permeating the earlier editions. It is not fair to claim that it is revised. The publishers must have preserved the plates of the original composition and got them run on

the printing machines. However, the text of our xerox copy of the third edition is much more readable. In this respect it is much superior.

Also to be noted is the vital statement: Laukiko'yam dr̥ṣṭāntaḥ.

176

Taṭādarśīśakuntapotanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a young bird which* [has got out to sea on a floating log and] *is unable to discover the shore.* Its application is obvious. It occurs in the second line of verse 19 of Hemacandra's in *Syādvādamañjarī*, as follows:

"Tatas taṭādarśīśakuntapota-
nyāyāt tvaduktāni pare śrayantu."

Malliṣeṇa explains it thus: "Taṭam na paśyatīti taṭādarśī yaḥ śakuntapotaḥ pakṣi-śāvakaḥ tasya nyāya udāharaṇam, tasmād. Yathā kila katham apyapārapārāvārāntaḥ - patitaḥ kākādiśakuniśāvako bahimirjigamiṣayā pravahaṇakūpastambhādes taṭa-prāptaye mugdhatayoḍḍīnaḥ samantā jalaikārṇavam evāvalokayaṃs taṭam adr̥ṣṭ-vaiva nirvedād āvṛtya tadeva kūpastambhādisthānam āśrayate gatyantarābhāvād, evaṃ te'pi kutīrthyāḥ prāguktapakṣatraye'pi vastusiddhim anāsādayantas tvaduktam eva caturthaṃ bhedābhedaḥpakṣam anicchayāpi kakṣīkurvāṇās tvacchāsanam eva pratipadyantām."

ED. NOTE: We fail to understand why a "floating log" had to be brought in. The Colonel did not come across Payodhimadhyasthitapotaḥkūpaka ... *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* of Mahākavi Vidyāpati Bilhaṇa (2:38). None brought this to his attention. Note the text cited above has Pravahaṇakūpastambhādeḥ.

Jacob text reads :udāharaṇam. Tasmādyatha.....We believe this is wrong. Tataḥ seems to have been commented upon as tasmād.

177

Tatkratunyāyaḥ.

The principle of *meditation on that* [viz. Brahman]. Or, *one who meditates on that.* This is taken from *Brahmasūtra* 4. 3. 15,

"Apratīkālaṃbanān nayatīti Bādarāyaṇa ubhayathā'doṣāt tatkratuś ca."

The bhāṣya on the last term is as follows: "Tatkratuś cobhayathābhāvasya samartha-ko hetur draṣṭavyaḥ. Yo hi brahmakratuḥ sa brāhmanam aiśvaryaṃ āsīdediti śliṣyate 'taṃ yathā yathopāsate tadeva bhavati' iti śruteḥ. Na tu pratīkeṣu brahmakratutvam

asti, pratīkapradhānatvād upāsanasya. Nanvabrhmakratur api brahma gacchatīti śrūyate, yathā pañcāgnividyāyām 'sa enān brahma gamayati [Chā 5. 10. 2] iti. Bhavatu yatraivam āhatyavāda upalabhyate. Tadabhāve tvauntsargikeṇa tatkratunīyāyena brahmakratūnām eva tatprāptir netareṣām iti gamyate."

I subjoin Dr. Thibaut's rendering, with a few additions of my own in parentheses. "The words, 'and the meditation on that,' state the reason for this twofold relation [*viz.* of those who meditate on Brahman with qualities, and those who worship by means of symbols or images]. For he whose meditation is fixed on Brahman reaches lordship like that of Brahman, according to the scriptural relation, 'In whatever form they meditate on him, that they become themselves.' In the case of symbols, on the other hand, the meditation is not fixed on Brahman, the symbol being the chief element in the meditation.-- But scripture says also that persons whose mind is not fixed on Brahman go to it; so in the knowledge [rather, the *doctrine* (*vidyā*)] of the five fires, 'He leads them to Brahman.'-- This may be so where we observe a direct scriptural declaration, the general rule is that those only whose purpose is Brahman [*i.e.* whose mind is fixed on B.] go to it, not any others."

This is a noteworthy passage. It practically condemns the use of symbols, or images, in worship, by declaring that the mind of the upāsaka is directed to the *pratīka*, and not to Brahman (or Īśvara). The śruti "Taṃ yathā yathopāsate &c., which is quoted also in 3. 4. 52, may mean much more than Śāṅkara sees in it; for it is an undoubted fact that, *in the present life*, the worshipper becomes assimilated to the object of worship; that the characteristics of that object, as conceived by him, become his own characteristics; and that a man never rises above the moral or spiritual level of that which he worships. This was clearly set before the Jewish nation in the teaching of Psalms CXV and CXXXV, where, with reference to the making and worshipping of images, we read, "They that make them shall be like them, every one that trusteth in them" (Revised version).

The tatkratunīyāya, which, in its full form seems to be tatkratus tad bhavati (as in Ānandagiri on the closing part of 4. 3. 15), is constantly quoted in the *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*. It will be found on pages 229 (three times), 230 (line 9), 235 (line 11), 246 (line 6), 478 (line 1), 591 (line 4 from bottom), 669 (line 10), and 730 (lines 9 and 15). Also *Pañcadaśī* ix. 145.

ED. NOTE: Jacob did not realize the true meaning - sense and essence- of Pratīkopāsana. He is excited and thrilled that he has found one more occasion to condemn the heart of Paurāṇika Bhāratavarṣa, the mūrtipūjā. He probably never came across the following:

Ajñātaśivatattvānām ākārādyarcanam kṛtam.
Yojanādhvanyaśaktasya krośādhvā parikalpyate.

He ought to have studied sopānārohaṇanyāya and sopānāvarohaṇanyāya. His education was incomplete, inadequate, insufficient, ardhapakva.

Tatprakhyanyāyaḥ.

The principle that *there is another scriptural passage declaratory of it* (namely, of the *secondary matter connected with a sacrifice, such as the deity to whom it is offered, the materials to be used &c*). The nyāya represents Jaimini's sūtra 1. 4. 4 (Tatprakhyam cānyaśāstram), and is one of the four means by which Mīmāṃsakas prove that an injunction comes under the head of nāmadheya ('name'), and is not a guṇavidhi ('an injunction relating to the *accessories* of the sacrifice,' provision being made for them in other scriptural passages). The three other tests are styled matvarthalakṣaṇā ('possessive indication') vākyabheda ('split of the sentence' caused by the inclusion of two or more distinct topics), and tadvyapadeśanyāya (which see yathāsthānam).

The following extracts from the *Arthasaṅgraha*, with Dr. Thibaut's renderings, illustrate the nyāya.

"Karmasvarūpamātrabodhako vidhir utpattividhiḥ. Yathāgnihotraṃ juhōtīti ... Nanu yāgasya dve rūpe dravyaṃ devatā ca. Tathā ca rūpāśravaṇe'gnihotraṃ juhōtīti katham utpattividhiḥ. Agnihotraśabdasya tu tatprakhyanyāyena nāmadheyatvād iti cen na. Rūpāśravaṇe'pyasyotpattividhitvāt. Anyathā rūpāśravaṇād dadhnā juhōtītyayam evotpattividhiḥ syāt. Tathā cāgnihotraṃ juhōtīti vākyam anarthakaṃ syāt." (page 4).

"That injunction which merely indicates the general nature of some action is called 'originative injunction,' as, for instance, the passage 'He is to offer the Agnihotra oblation.' But it may be objected, the two forms (aspects) of a sacrifice are the material (offered) and the divinity (to whom the material is offered). How then can the passage 'He is to offer the Agnihotra-oblation,' in which neither of these two forms is mentioned, be considered an originative injunction, the word Agnihotra (which seemingly indicates the divinity of the sacrifice, viz. Agni) being merely a name (and not indicating the divinity) according to the principle of (the existence of another scriptural passage) declaratory of it. To this objection we reply:- The passage is an originative injunction although neither of the two forms of the sacrifice is mentioned in it. Otherwise the passage, 'He is to perform the oblation by means of sour milk,' would have to be considered as the originative injunction (of the Agnihotra) as it contains a statement of one of the two forms (viz. the material), and then the passage, 'He is to offer the Agnihotra,' would be purposeless." (page 7)

Again on page 20 of the same: "Evaṃ ca prayājeṣu samidādidevatānām samidhaḥ 'samidho agna ājyasya vyantu' ityādimantravarṇebhyaḥ prāptatvāt. Samidho yajatītyādiṣu samidādīśabdās tatprakhyāśāstrāt karmanāmadheyāḥ."

"In the same manner the pieces of firewood called samidh and other things are established as the divinities of the Prayāja oblations by means of the Mantras 'the samidhs may partake of the butter &c.,' and therefore the words 'samidh' &c. which occur in the

injunctions 'He sacrifices the samidh &c.' are to be taken as names of certain sacrifices (not as denoting secondary matters) on account of another scriptural passage declaratory of it."

The nyāya is explained in almost identical language in Āpadeva's work, *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*, and is applied in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 150, line 7. We find it, also, in Nāgeśa's *Uddyota* (vol.3, page 623), under sūtra 2. 3. 3.

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references. Sarvathā śāstrīyo'yam nyāyaḥ, na tāval laukika ityasmākam matam.

179

Tatsthānāpanne taddharmalābhaḥ.

One who takes the place of somebody else takes upon himself also the functions of the latter. This is Professor Kielhorn's rendering of the maxim as found in Nāgojībhāṭṭa's comment on paribhāṣā CXVI. It may have originated with Kaiyaṭa. On Pāṇini's sūtra 1. 1.56 (sthānivādādeśaḥ &c.) Kātyāyana says, "Sthānyādeśapṛthaktvād ādeśe sthānivad-anudeśo guruvad guruputra iti yathā." Patañjali follows with the remark, "Lokata etat siddham. Tad yathā. Loke yo yasya prasaṅge bhavati labhate'sau tatkāryāṇi. Tad-yathā. Upādhyāyasya śiṣyo yājyakulāni gatvā agrāsanādīni labhate." Then Kaiyaṭa says, "Lokata iti. Loke hi vacanam antareṇāpi tatsthānāpattiyā taddharmalābho dṛṣṭaḥ."

Under sūtra 1. 1. 4, Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa prepares us for this with the remark (on page 209 of his *Pradīpodyota*), "Aśāstrīyasyāpi tasya 'tatsthānāpanne taddharmalābha' iti lokanyāyenātideśa iti sthānivatsūtre vakṣyate."

ED. NOTE: Here we see the mähātmya of lokavyavahāra. A very significant siddhānta is propounded here- "Lokata etat siddham." This phenomenon is very well seen in the game of chess.

180

Tadantāpakarṣanyāyaḥ.

This nyāya, which is found in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 581, line 9, and again in line 8 of the next page, is taken from the Tadādītantanyāya of Jaimini 5. 1. 23, 24, the anuyājadyutkarṣaprayājāntāpakarṣādhikaraṇa, which Kunte renders, "The subject of the forward transference of acts which follow the Anuyāja-offerings and the backward transference of acts which precede Prayāja-offerings together with the offerings themselves." Regarding the Tadādītantanyāya, he says:- "*Tadādi* signifies the first

part of that; the *Tadanta* signifies *the last part of that*. These are Bahuvrīhi compounds, and therefore signify that of which the first part is taken, and that of which the last part is taken. When forward transference is to be made, the *Tadādi* is taken, and when backward transference is to be made, the *Tadanta* is taken. The following illustration will explain this. When the *Anuyāja*-offerings are to be transferred in point of time, the *Sūktavāka* and the *Shanyuvāka* which follow it, are to be transferred along with it, because the *Anuyāja* is the first part. Again, when *Prayāja*-offerings are to be transferred in point of time, the *Āghāra* and the *Sāmidhenī* which precede it, are to be transferred along with it, because the *Prayāja* is the last part."

ED. NOTE: Jacob uses all kinds of words to denote the concept of the *nyāya* such as simile, illustration, etc. We have noted most of them.

Question: *Shanyuvāka* or *Śamyuvāka*?

181

Tadāgame hi tad dṛśyata iti nyāyaḥ.

The law that *a certain thing is seen to appear when a certain other thing appears* [thus establishing a connection between them].

Raghunāthavarman expounds it thus:

"*Jāgradādau buddhau satyāṃ duḥkhādayo dṛśyante. Susūptyādau tannivṛttau nopalabhyanta iti taddharmā eva nātmadharmāḥ susūptāvapyupalabdhiprasaṅgād ityatra tadāgame hi taddṛśyata iti nyāyo'vatarati. Dṛśyate hi tailād anudbhūtasparśatejo'vayavāgame santāpopalabdhir iti taddharma eva na tailādidharma iti.*"

I have met with it in the following passage of the *Tantravārtika* (page 348), and quote Prof. Gangānāth Jhā's translation of it:

"*Tathā kramavator nityaṃ prakṛtipratyayāṃśayoḥ.
Pratyayaśrutivelāyāṃ bhāvanātmāvagamate.*

Na kevalam etāvevānvayavyatirekau yau parasparaparityāgena lakṣyete tasminneva hi pade tadāgame hi taddṛśyata ityanena nyāyena viveko'vadhāryate."

"The Root and the Affix are always found to appear in a definite order of sequence; and, as a matter of fact, we find that it is only when the Affix is heard to be pronounced, that we have an idea of the *Bhāvanā*; and this, too, leads us to the conclusion that the *Bhāvanā* is denoted by the affix. Because the invariable concomitance of any two objects is not only such that one cannot exist in the absence of the other, but also of a kind which we find in the present case, where we find that it is only where a particular word -the Affix for instance- is pronounced that there is a denotation of the *Bhāvanā*; and as such,

in accordance with the rule that when one object is always seen to appear when another appears, there is always an invariable concomitance between the two, we must admit that the *Bhāvanā* is denoted by the Affix." (p.483)

I may add that the passage here cited from the *Tantravārtika* is closely connected with that quoted under the nyāya "Prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārthaṃ saha brūtaḥ," which see yathāsthānam.

182

Tadvyapadeśanyāyaḥ.

The principle of *a name indicating resemblance to something*. This is the title of Jaimini's sūtra 1. 4. 5, where the sentences "Athaiṣa śyenenābhicaran yajeta," "Athaiṣa sandaṃśenābhicaran yajeta" and "Athaiṣa gavābhicaran yajeta" are discussed, and it is decided that śyena, sandaṃśa and go are not the materials of the various sacrifices, but their *names*. This is well put in Colebrooke's Essay on the Mīmāṃsā:

"It is a question whether the hawk-sacrifice (śyenyāga) which is attended with imprecations on a hated foe, be performed by the actual immolation of a bird of that kind. The case is determined by a maxim that 'a term intimating resemblance is denominative.' *Hawk*, then, is the name of that incantation; 'it pounces on the foe *as* a falcon on his prey.'" So *tongs* is a name for a similar incantation; 'which seizes the enemy from afar *as* with a pair of tongs'; and cow, for a sacrifice to avert such imprecations."

This nyāya, as pointed out under Tatprakhyanyāya, is one of the proofs applied in the Mīmāṃsā in support of the nāmadheya division of the Veda, and Laugākṣibhāskara (on page 20) explains it thus:

"Śyenenābhicaran yajetetyatra śyenaśabdasya karmanāmadheyatvaṃ tadvyapadeśāt. Tena vyapadeśād upamānāt tadanyathānupapatter iti yāvat. ... Yadā tu śyenasamjñako yāgo vidhīyate tadārthavādena śyenopamānena tasya stutiḥ kartuṃ śakyata iti śyenaśabdaḥ karmanāmadheyam tadvyapadeśād iti."

In this passage, and in a similarly worded one in *Āpadevī*, upamāna is given as the equivalent of vyapadeśa, whilst Kumārila employs sādṛśaya. The dictionaries, however, are silent as to any such sense of the word. In his translation, Dr. Thibaut renders it "comparison."

ED. NOTE: The dictionaries too have their own limitations. They follow the literature--usage by the great writers. We have to recall-- gosadṛśo gavayaḥ. That is upamānam.

183

Tapanīyam apanīya vāsasi granthikartāram upahasasi, svayaṃ ca kanakam upādāya gaganāñcale granthiṃ karoṣi.

Thou ridiculest the man who taking his gold ties it up in a corner of his garment, and then thyself taking the gold tuest it up in the skirt of the sky! It is found in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, (page 58, line 3 from bottom), as follows:

"Tasmānīlādīnām prakāśamānatvaṃ paripālayatā grāhyalakṣaṇe yatnaḥ kartavyaḥ. Parihartavyaṃ vā prakāśamānatvam. Anyathā tapanīyam apanīya vāsasi granthikartāram upahasasi, svayaṃ ca kanakam upādāya gaganāñcale granthiṃ karoṣīti. Seyaṃ sarvaprakāram asiddhiḥ, sarvaprakāram cānaikāntikam iti."

ED. NOTE: "Tasmānīlādīnām" was a guesswork only. Printed letters were not visible, thanks Nirajana. A note made subsequently-- We have secured good copies of the first and second Handful of the third edition. We have also xeroxed them. One more comparison of our text with these has proved very useful. Our guesswork was right. Tasmānīlādīnām is correct.

The publishers of the third edition have claimed that it is a revised edition. We were not sure how far it was true. Finally we found that it was sarvathā mithyāvādaḥ.

184

Taptaṃ taptena sambadhyate.

Hot goes with hot. Like loves like. This is found in the following passage of *Bhāmātī* 3. 3. 25 (page 620):

"Na ca sannidhānam api sambandhakāraṇam. Ayam eti putro rājñāḥ puruṣo' pasāryatām ityatra rājñā ityasya putrapuruṣapadasannidhānāviśeṣān mā bhūd avinigamanā. Tasmād ākāṅkṣā niścayahetur vaktavyā ... Satyapi sannidhāne ākāṅkṣābhāvād asambandhaḥ. Tathā cābhāṅakaḥ. Taptaṃ taptena sambadhyate iti. Tathā cākāṅkṣitam api na yāvat sannidhāpyate tāvan na sambadhyate."

Mr. M. R. Telang has given me another excellent example in *Vikramorvaśī* ii. 16:

"Sādhāraṇo'yam ubhayoḥ praṇayaḥ smarasya
taptena taptam ayasā ghaṭanāya योग्यम्."

Compare, too, "Ratnaṃ ratnena saṅgacchate" of *Mṛicchakaṭīka*; (page 40). It might be used as the equivalent of, "Birds of a feather flock together?"

ED. NOTE: Jacob has translated the word sambadhyate as "goes." We think "unites" would be better. Cf.

Śaśinam upagateyam kaumudī meghamuktam
jalanidhim anurūpam Jahnukanyāvātīrṇā.
Iti samagūṇayogapṛītayas tatra paurāḥ
śravaṇakaṭu nṛpāṇām ekavākyam vivavruḥ.

Raghuvamśa. 6:85

185

Taptāyaḥpītāmbuvat.

The simile of [a drop of] *water consumed by hot iron* [when thrown upon it]. Rāma-tīrtha employs it when expounding the words, "Na tasya prāṇā utkrāmanti," in the last section of the *Vedāntasāra*. He says: "Nirguṇabrahmasākṣātkāravataḥ prāṇā notkrāmanti kintu pratyagbrahmaṇyeva taptāyaḥpītāmbuval līyanta ityatra pramāṇam āha na tasyeti."

In Nṛsiṃhasarasvati's comment on the same portion, the nyāya is expanded and made clearer: "Asya jīvanmuktasyopādhivigamasamaye prāṇākhyam liṅgaśarīram atitapta-lohaksiptanīrabinduvat pratyagabhinnaparamānande līnatvāt sthūlaśarīram nottiṣṭhati iti. Atra śrutim āha na tasyeti."

Neither of them, however, was the originator of the simile; for it is clearly an adaptation of the line, "Santaptāyasi samsthitasya payaso nāmāpi na jñāyate," which forms the commencement of *Pañcatantra* i. 250, and also of Bharṭhari's *Nītiśataka* 67.

ED. NOTE: And where did they get it? Such universal truth is *anādi* and *ananta*. It is only revealed after each creation. It is not created or made by the user. All these are natural laws.

186

Tamaḥprakāśanidarśanam.

The illustration [of the co-existence] of *light and darkness*. It is found in *Pañcapādikā*, page 3, as follows:

"Ko'yaṃ virodhaḥ kīḍṣo vā itaretarabhāvo'bhipreto yasyānupapattes tamaḥprakāśavad iti nidarśanam. Yadi tāvat sahānavasthānalakṣaṇo virodhas tataḥ prakāśabhāve tamaso bhāvānupapattiḥ. Tadasat. Dṛśyate hi mandapradīpe

veśmanyaspaṣṭam rūpadarśanam, itaratra ca spaṣṭam. Tena jñāyate mandapradīpe veśmani tamaso'pīṣad anuvṛttir iti."

The substance of this is reproduced in *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 10.

ED. NOTE: An important point to note. Further reference.

187

Tamodīpanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *darkness and the lamp*. This is found in the *Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvali* (page 125), where we read:

"Tad ayaṃ tamodīpanyāyaḥ. Tathāhi.

Ajñānam jñātum icched yo mānenātyantamūḍhadhīḥ.
Sa tu nūnam tamaḥ paśyed dīpenottamatejasā."

"Hence the well-known illustration of darkness and the lamp:- Thus that dullest of dullheads who would cognize Nescience by means of a pramāṇa, would forsooth go looking for darkness with a brilliant lamp."

This verse is most probably based on that of Sureśvara in *Taittirīyavārtika* 2. 1. 177:

"Pramāṇotpannayā dṛṣṭayā yo'vidyāṃ draṣṭum icchati.
Dīpenāsau dhruvaṃ paśyed guhākukṣigataṃ tamaḥ."

188

Taskarakandunyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a thief* [who engaged himself] *as a cook*. His inability to perform the duties, however, led to his discovery and arrest. This is intended to teach the folly of undertaking to do something quite beyond our powers! Sureśvara is the only author in whose works I have met with it. The following verse, which contains it, appears in his large *Vārtika* (page 610), and also in that on the *Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣya* (page 169), the preceding context, too, being identical in both cases:

"Aśakye viniyukto'pi kṛṣṇalāñ śrapayed iti.
Sarvātmanāpyasau kurvan kuryāt taskarakanduvat."

The following is an extract from Ānandagiri's comment on the former passage:

"Tatra yadyapi santāpamātram kṛṣṇaleṣvapi śakyaṃ kartuṃ, tathāpi viklitti-pradhānaḥ pacater artha iti nyāyena santāpajanyāṃ tām eva teṣu kurvannāyāsa-mātrabhāgī syād. Yathā loke taskaraḥ san kandur apūpādipaktṛṣu svayam'pi praviśya tatkarma kurvannaśakyakāritvād āyāsamātrabhāg bhavatyevam aśakyatvājñāne'pi na vaidhī pravṛttir ityārthaḥ."

The same commentator's explanation of the nyāya as it appears in the latter work is somewhat different. He says:

"Kaścic cauryaṃ kṛtvā svakīyacauryasaṃvaraṇārthaṃ sannihitaṃ kandugṛhaṃ praviṣṭaḥ grhasvāminā kandunā kandukarmaṇi niyuktas tatkarmaṇyaśakye viniyuktatvāt tat kurvan rājapurūṣais taskaram anveṣamānais tatra jhaṭiti samāgatair ukte karmaṇyakuśalatāṃ samālocya taskaro'yam iti jñātvā grhīto vyarthakleśabhāgī yathā taskarakanduḥ saṃvṛttas, tathā brahmajñāne niyukto'pi tasya kartum aśakyatvāt tat kurvan vyarthakleśabhāgī bhaved ityārthaḥ."

The nyāya occurs again on page 181 of the *Taittirīyavārtika*:

"Adṛśyaṃ paśya ityevaṃ niyukto'pi na śaknuyāt.
Śaknuyāt san niyogāc cet kuryāt taskarakanduvat."

189

Taskarasya, purastāt kakṣe suvarṇam upetya sarvāṅgodghāṭanam.

A thief's offer of his limbs for examination when the gold has been found under his armpit! This occurs in the Jaimini chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 134 of Bib. Ind. edition, and page 152 of Jivānanda's) of which the following is an extract:

"Yad atra Kusumāñjalāvudayanena jhaṭiti pracurapravṛtteḥ prāmānyaniścayā-dhīnatvābhāvam āpādayatā pranyagādi....Tadapi taskarasya purastāt kakṣe suvarṇam upetya sarvāṅgodghāṭanam iva pratibhāti."

Professor Cowell's rendering of the passage is as follows:- "As for the argument urged by Udayana in the *Kusumāñjali*, when he tries to establish that immediate and vehement action does not depend on the agent's certainty as to the authoritativeness of the speech which sets him acting ... all this appears to us simple bluster, like that of the thief who ostentatiously throws open all his limbs before me, when I had actually found the gold under his armpit."

ED. NOTE: Atra taskarasyeti is kartari ṣaṣṭhī. Taskarakartṛkam sarvāṅgodghāṭanam ityārthaḥ.

190

Tilataṇḍulanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *rice and sesamum seeds*. Used to illustrate an easily distinguishable union of two or more things, in contradistinction to the more intimate and indistinguishable union exemplified by the commingling of milk and water. For examples, see Kṣīranīranīyāya. Also Rudrata's *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* x. 25.

ED. NOTE: Here is a "See also" reference.

191

Tulonnamananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the raising* [with the hand, one scale] *of a balance*. That, of course, causes the other scale to go down; and so the simile is used to illustrate the bringing about of two or more results by one operation. It occurs in the following passage of *Pañcapādika* (page 38):

"Nedaṃ rajatam iti yatra viparyāsapātraṃ nirasyate na vastutattvam avabodhyate tatra tathā bhavatu. Iha punar vijñānam eva tādrśam utpannam yadvirodhi-nirākaraṇam antareṇa na svārtham sādhayitum alaṃ, tulonnamanavyāpāra ivānamanāntarīyakaḥ. Tathāhyunnamanavyāpāraḥ svaviṣayasya tulādravyasyordhvadeśasambandham na sādhayitum alaṃ, tatkālam eva tasyādhodeśasambandham anāpādya. Na vonnamanakārakasya hastaprayatnāder ānamane'pi kārakatvam."

In commenting on this, Prakāśātman says, "Anyaviṣayavyāpārād anyaviṣayasya nāntarīyakasiddhiṃ sādhayati tathāhyunnamanavyāpāra iti."

Other good examples of it will be found in *Nyāyavārtika* 3. 2, 12 (top of page 412), the substance of which is reproduced in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 456; in *Ślokaṅkārikā*, page 311 (where it is seen in conjunction with the padmapatraśatavyatibhedanyāya); and in *Vivaraṇaprameya*, page 99, line 4.

ED. NOTE: "See also" references.

192

Tuṣakaṇḍananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the grinding of chaff*. Used, like Piṣṭapeṣaṇanyāya, of any unnecessary and useless effort. It occurs in *Pañcapādika*, page 68, as follows: "Tena puruṣārtharūpatā'nanyasiddhatā tatpratipādyatā ceti bhidyante viṣayasambandhaprayojanāni,

tāni ca trīṇyapi pravṛtṭyaṅgam. Nāpuruṣārthe kākadantaparīkṣāyāṃ tuṣakaṇḍane vā pravartate prekṣāvān."

Also in the *Hitopadeśa* iv. 13:

"Avicārayato yukti-kathanam tuṣakaṇḍanam.
Nīceṣūpakṛtam rājan vālukāsviva mūtritam."

Sureśvara, too, makes very frequent use of it. We find it on pages 676, 1036, 1334, 1505, and 1572 of his large *Vārtika*; and on page 176 of his *Taittirīyavārtika*.

The nyāya is not in Raghunātha's book, but he has others of the same meaning which I have not met with in the literature, namely Jalamanthananyāya and Gardabharomamagaṇananyāya. The same idea is expressed in the following sentence of the *Nyāyamañjarī* (page 645):

"Kimayaṃ dagdho dahyate, mṛto vā māryate. Anaikāntikahetūpanyāsenaiḥ khalvayaṃ tapasvī nighṛto'sādhanāṅgavacanād iti kiṃ hetvantarākhyanigrahasthān-āntarodīraṇeti."

193

Tuṣyatu durjananyāyaḥ.

This saying is explained by Tārānātha as follows: "Tuṣyatu durjana iti nyāyo yatra prativādyuktapakṣam duṣtam api vādinā prauḍhivādenāṅgīkṛtyāpi dūṣaṇāntarasya dānam tatrāsya pravṛtṭiḥ."

It would therefore seem to mean, "Let this evil fellow, my opponent, chuckle over his apparent success in this argument, but what about so-and-so?" I have met with it in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 14, in the following sentence: "Yathāsvarūpam kim adhikaraṇam utādheyam. Yadvā pratītikālaḥ kiṃ vā pratītir eva. Utāvachedakadeśo vetyatra vinigamanāviraḥāt tuṣyatu durjananyāyena svīkāre'pi na nirvāhaḥ."

It occurs again on page 16. In the *Bhāmati*, page 243, we have it in the form "tuṣyatu paraḥ" as follows: "Yadyeṣa parasyāgraho dharminyagrhyamāṇe taddharmā na śakyā grahītum iti. Evaṃ nāmāstu, tathā tuṣyatu paraḥ. Tathāpyadoṣa ityarthaḥ."

This is decidedly the clearest example. In his translation of Haridāsa's comment on *Kuṣumāñjali* i. 3, Prof. Cowell's rendering of the nyāya is "the principle of satisfying an opponent."

194

Tṛṇajalāyukānyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the caterpillar*. This illustration is used and explained in *Brihadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4. 4. 3 as follows: "Tadyathā tṛṇajalāyukā tṛṇasyāntaṃ gatvā'nyamākramam ākramyātmānam upasaṃharatyevam evāyam ātmedaṃ śarīraṃ nihatyāvidyāṃ gamayitvā'nyam ākramam ākramyātmānam upasaṃharati."

I include it because it is found in Raghunātha's list; but it is of no practical value.

ED. NOTE: According to Jacob, this nyāya has no practical value. We don't know how he determines the practicality of a particular nyāya. He has done a great favor to Raghunātha Varmā by including it in his compilation! It must be concluded that ALL the nyāyas that he has included without being compelled to do a favor to Raghunātha are bubbling with practical value. Thanks, Mr. Colonel!

There is a vacana reading as follows:

Yathā tṛṇajalūkeyam nāpayātyapayāti ca.
Na tyajen mryamāṇo'pi prāgdehābhimatim janaḥ.

As cited by Apte from *Bhāgavata*, 4.29.77.

It may be akin to Calatyekena pādena tiṣṭhatyekena buddhimān.

The word jalaukā is spelled in various ways.

195

Tṛṇabhakṣaṇanyāyaḥ.

The custom of *taking grass in the mouth* [lit. of eating grass] *as a token of submission*. This interesting illustration is found in *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 93:

"Vairiṇopi hi mucyante prāṇānte tṛṇabhakṣaṇāt.
Tṛṇāhārāḥ sadaivaite hanyante paśavaḥ katham."

Mr. Tawney renders it thus: "Since even enemies are let off, when near death, if they take grass in their mouths, how can you slay these harmless beasts [deer &c.] which always feed on grass?" In a note on page 210, it is stated that we have here an allusion to a most ancient custom. There is a reference to it in *Harṣacarita* (Bombay edn. 1892) page 132, line 11, on which, the translators, Cowell and Thomas, remark, "To carry a straw in the mouth was a sign of surrender; compare Acworth's *Marāṭhā Ballads*, page 43;

'And' twixt the teeth a straw is fit

For curs who arm but to submit."

These two lines are deduced from the three words, "Ghyāveṃ tomḍāṃta ṛṇa," of the original.

Merutuṅga refers to this custom again on page 300:

"Nātho naḥ Paramardyanena vadananyastena saṃrakṣitaḥ,
Pṛthvīrājanarādhipād iti ṛṇaṃ tatpattane pūjyate."

"Grass is now worshipped in Paramardin's city because, when taken in the mouth, it preserved our lord Paramardin from Pṛthvīrāja, the king of men." (Tawney's translation, page 189).

The late Colonel Meadows Taylor, who was so thoroughly acquainted with Indian life, put the following into the mouth of one of his characters in *Seetā* (chapter XLVii): "We have a good many prisoners, for I could not kill the wretches *who had put grass in their mouths* and were crying for quarter."

196

Ṭṛṇāraṇimaṇinyāyaḥ.

The simile of *straw, araṇi wood and the burning gem* [as means of producing fire]. The kind of fire produced by each varies (just as that of a lighted lamp differs from that of burning wood or cowdung); and the method of production, too, is different; that being in one case blowing, in another attrition, and in the third the rays of the sun. The application of the nyāya will be seen from the following passage of *Nyāyamañjarīsāra*, page 3, line 5:

"Atra navyāḥ-- ṛṇāraṇimaṇinyāyena vighnadhvaṃsaviśeṣa eva maṅgalasya phalaṃ, vighnadhvaṃsaviśeṣāntaraṃ ca Vināyakastavapāṭhādeḥ phalam. Samāptis tu vighnasamsargābhāvādikāraṇakalāpajanyā." For an interesting discussion as to the 'capacity' (śakti) residing in straw &c., see *Kusumāñjali* pages 58-72, and Prof. Cowell's translation, pages 6 and 7. The nyāya is not included in Raghunātha's collection, but is explained in the *Vācaspatyam* (s.v. nyāya) as follows:

"Tāṛṇavahnim prati ṛṇasya, āraṇeyavahnim pratyaraṇeḥ, maṇijanyavahnim prati maṇeś ca kāraṇatvaṃ, na tu vahnitvāvachchinnam prati ṛṇādeḥ kāraṇatvaṃ, parasparavyabhicārāt. Evaṃ yatra kāryakāraṇabhāvabāhulyaṃ kāryatāvachchedakaṃ kāraṇatāvachchedakaṃ ca nānā tatrāsya pravṛtiḥ."

197

Tailakaluṣitaśālibījād aṅkurānudayaniyamaḥ.

The certainty of the nonappearance of shoots from grains of rice spoiled by [contact with] oil. It occurs in Vedāntakalpataru, page 545, line 17:

"Kriyābhogaśaktyoḥ satyorapi tatpratibandhāt kāryānudayaḥ sambhavati tailakaluṣitaśālibījād aṅkurānudayanīyamavat." In *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2. 3. 31, we read: "Yathā loke puṁstvādīni bījātmanā vidyamānānyeva bālyādiṣvanupalabhyamānānyavidyamānavad abhipreyamānāni yauvanādiṣvāvirbhavanti, nāvidyamānānyutpadyante, ṣaṅdhādīnām api tadutpattiprasaṅgāt." Of the ādi in ṣaṅdhādīnām, Ānandagiri says:

"Tailakaluṣitabījādigrāhārtham ādipadam." See also *Nyāya-makaranda*, page 60. Compare the Mūṣikabhakṣitabījādāvaṅkurādījananaprārthanā, in its place.

ED. NOTE: "See also" references.

198

Tailapātradharanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a man carrying a vessel full of oil* [and who is to be put to death if he spills a drop of it!] . This curious [! ed.] illustration is given in *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii-70, and applied to one who has adopted the ascetic life:

"Tailapātradharo yadvad asihastair adhiṣṭhitaḥ.
Skhalite maraṇatrāsāt tatparaḥ syāt tathā vratī."

ED. NOTE: cf. Asidhārāgrasañcāraḥ. ..."

199

Tyajed ekaṃ kulasyārthe.

One should abandon an individual for the sake of a whole family. This is the first pāda of *Hitopadeśa* i. 115, which reads thus:

"Tyajed ekaṃ kulasyārthe grāmasyārthe kulaṃ tyajet.
Grāmaṃ janapadasyārthe ātmārthe pṛthivīm tyajet."

It is quoted by Ānandagiri, in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 1. 22, as follows: "Tyajed ekaṃ kulasyārtha iti nyāyād bhūyasīnām Brahmaliṅgaśrutīnām anugrahāyā-kāśaśruter ekasyā bādha ityāha."

Raghunātha expounds it thus in the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*: "Yatrobhayakoṭikasamśaye ekatra bahvarthahānir, dvitīyasvīkāre tvekāarthahānis tatra dvitīyapakṣaḥ svīkartavya iti vivakṣāyāṃ tyajed ekam kulasyārtha iti nyāyaḥ prasarati."

Further on he says, "Yastu tyajed ekam iti nyāyaṃ nānusrati, so'lpasya hetor bahu hātum icchan vicāramūḍhaḥ pratibhāsi me tvam iti nyāyaviṣayatāṃ nātivartate."

A nyāya of similar import to the one under consideration is "Sarvanāṣe samutpanne ardhmaṃ tyajati paṇḍitaḥ," which see in its proper place.

ED. NOTE: Why not in RR too?

200

Dagdhapāṭanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the burnt cloth*. When a piece of cloth, or a leaf, is thrown into the fire and consumed, its outline is still visible in the charred remains; and this the Vedāntists use to illustrate the unreality and unsubstantiality of all phenomena. It occurs twice in Nṛsiṃhaśarasvatī's commentary on the *Vedāntasāra*, namely on pages 55 and 66, as follows:

"Yadvā sarvaṃ khalvidaṃ brahmaitadātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ ityādiśrutibalāt sarvaṃ aham iti girinadīsamudrātmakaṃ sarvaṃ jagat svābhinnasaccidānanda-brahmatvenānubhūya tasya dagdhapāṭanyāyena prapañcabhāne'pyadvaitaṃ saccidānandalakṣaṇaṃ vastu bhāsata evetyarthaḥ." (Page 55).

"Nanvetādṛśasya jīvanmuktasya dehendriyādibhānam asti na vetyāśaṅkya dagdhapāṭanyāyenendrajālanirmitasaudhasamudrādivac ca bādhitānuvṛtṭyā mithyā-tvena bhāne'pi paramārthatayā bhānaṃ netyāha -- ayamityādinā na paśyatītyantena." (Page 66).

201

Dagdhabījanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the burnt seed*. An illustration of that which has forever ceased to be an operative cause. It appears in a verse of *Syādvādamañjarī*, page 208:

"Dagdhe bīje yathātyantaṃ prādurbhavati nāṅkuraḥ.
Karmabīje tathā dagdhe na rohati bhavāṅkuraḥ."

The following is from the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 206:

"Rājapratigrahadagdhānām brāhmaṇānām yudhiṣṭhira.
Dagdhānām iva bījānām punarjanma na vidyate."

Merutuṅga ascribes it to a Purāṇa. Vijnāna Bhikṣu quotes from some Smṛti another of a like kind, under *Yogavārtika* ii. 3:

"Bījānyagnyupadagdhāni na rohanti yathā punaḥ.
Jñānadagdhais tathā kleśair nātmā sampadyate punaḥ."

See also a verse ascribed to a Chārvāka in *Prabodhacandrodaya*, page 35.

ED. NOTE: Here is a See also reference. If Rājapratigraha ... is an anuṣṭup, then one letter is in excess.

202

Dagdhendhanavahninyāyaḥ

The simile of *the fire which has consumed the fuel* [and therefore goes out]. This immediately follows the *jalakatakareṇunyāya* in Raghunātha's list, and is meant to teach much the same thing. He says: "Dagdhānīndhanāni yena so'gnir yathā svayam eva śāmyati tatheti pūrvavat."

We have an instance of the employment of the figure in *Śvetāśvatara* Upaniṣad vi. 19; and again in Śāṅkara's bhāshya on *Brahmasūtra* i.i.4 (page 76), and Sureśvara's large *Vārtika*, pages 1593 and 1840. The following is *Paramārthasāra* 77:

"Tyaktvā karmavikalpān ātmasthaṃ manaḥ kevalaṃ kṛtvā.
Dagdhendhana iva vahniḥ sarvatrātmā bhavec chāntaḥ."

203

Daṇḍāpūpikānyāyaḥ

The maxim of *the stick and the cakes*. If a number of cakes (chapātis) are attached to a stick, and the stick is carried off or eaten by mice, the inference is that the cakes have shared the same fate. The application of the maxim is obvious. In the *Sāhityakaumudī* (xi. 8), and in the *Kuvalayānanda* (page 244), it is used to illustrate the figure arthāpatti and kāvyārthāpatti respectively.

"Daṇḍāpūpikayā'nyārthāgamor'arthāpattir iṣyate. [8]"

Mūṣikeṇa daṇḍo bhakṣitaś ced ihasthaḥ pūpo'pi tena bhakṣita iti nyāyo daṇḍā-pūpikā. Tayā'nyārthāgamo'rthāntarapratyayo'rthāpattir ityarthaḥ." (*Sāh.*)

"Kaimutyenārthasamsiddhiḥ kāvyārthāpattir iṣyate.
Sa jitas tvanmukhenenduḥ kā vārtā sarasīruhām."

"Atra sa ityanena padmāni yena jītānīti vivakṣitaṃ. Tathā ca so'pi yena jitas tena padmāni jītānīti kimu vaktavyam iti daṇḍāpūpikānyāyena padmajaya-rūpasyārthasya samsiddhiḥ kāvyārthāpattiḥ. Tāntrikābhimatārthāpattivyāvartanāya kāvyeti viśeṣaṇam." (*Kuv.*)

See also *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣyavārtika*, page 909, verse 135.

ED. NOTE: There is a "See also" note above. R has drawn from *Kuvalayānanda*.

If chapatis are taken to mean cakes, we will have to tell the Colonel, in the words of Raghunātha Varmā, bhrānto'si ... Apūpa is a kind of juicy preparation. It is not a capāti. In Hindi it is called mālapuā or simply pūā.

Jacob has a fn. on Kaimutyena. ... The author of *Rasagaṅgādhara* finds fault with this definition. See page 487 of Durgāprasād's edition, Bombay, 1888.

204

Daṇḍinyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a man with a stick* [or, men with sticks]. The first instance, which I know of, of the employment of this nyāya is in a curious [? ed] passage of Patañjali's on Pāṇini 8.2.83, for reference to which I am indebted to Professor Kielhorn. It occurs also in the *Nyāyavārtika* on sūtra i. 37. In this, and in the preceding sūtra, there is a definition of *udāharāṇa*, in the course of which the term *taddharmabhāvī* occurs. In regard to this, the *Vārtikakāra* remarks:

"Anye tu--taddharmabhāvītyetat padam anyathā nirākurvanti. Taddharma-bhāvī bhavannuṣṇabhojinyāyena vā bhaved daṇḍinyāyena vā bhavet. Tadyadi tāvad uṣṇabhojinyāyena uṣṇaṃ bhoktuṃ śīlam asyetyuṣṇabhojī, taddharamṃ vā bhāvayituṃ śīlam asyeti taddharmabhāvī. Atrāpi bhāvayituṃ gamayituṃ yāvad uktaṃ syād iti. Nāyaṃ sūtrārtha iti na kiñcid etat. Daṇḍinyāyas tu daṇḍo yasyāstīti sa daṇḍī, taddharmabhāvo yasyāsti sa bhavati taddharmabhāvī."

The following from Vacaspatimiśra's *Tattvabindu* closely resembles the explanation given of the *Chatrinyāyaḥ* - "Daṇḍino gacchantūtyatra tu daṇḍyadaṇḍiṣu samūhiṣu lakṣyamāṇeṣu tadantargatasya viśeṣād daṇḍiśabdārthasya parigrahaḥ."

ED. NOTE: Jacob has a good supply of the word "curious" in his pocket. He uses it quite generously.

205

Dattam ekadhā sahasraguṇam upalabhyate.

That which is given once is received back a thousand times. This is found in Merutuṅga's work, page 266, and I append Mr. Tawney's rendering: "Atha Vīradhavalasyāyuhparyante, pratitīrtham prasthitena dattam ekadhā sahasraguṇam upalabhyata iti rūḍheḥ Śrītejaḥpālena janmasukṛtam dade."

"Then, when Vīradhavalā's life was approaching its termination, Tejaḥpāla, who was on his way to a holy place, in accordance with the proverb that what is given once is received back a hundred[?] times, gave him the merits of his last birth." Though the illustration is fable, the principle is true. "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom." Among the Turks there is the saying, "Who gives alms sows one and reaps one thousand." (Rev. T. Long's *Eastern proverbs and emblems*, page 187).

ED. NOTE: See the book by T. Long. Seems to be important. Here is a comparative study.

206

Dattaṇḍhamarṇa iva svap.

To sleep like a debtor whose debt has been paid. To sleep like a top! It occurs in Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*, ii. 563:

"Iti snuṣāyā dauḥśīlyāmarṣacintāṃ vihāya saḥ.
Suṣvāpa dattaṇḍhamarṇas tatra nirbharam."

ED. NOTE: Would it be better to say, "who has paid his debt?"

207

Dadhitrāpusaṃ pratyakṣo jvaraḥ.

Curds and cucumber are fever personified! That is, they cause fever. This is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1.1.59 (vārtika 6), and 6.1.32 (vārt. 6), as follows:

"Antareṇāpi nimittaśabdaṃ nimittārtho gamyate. Tadyathā. Dadhitrapusaṃ pratyakṣo jvaraḥ. Jvaranimittam iti gamyate. Naḍvalodakaṃ pādarogaḥ. Pādaroga-nimittam iti gamyate. Āyur ghṛtam. Āyūṣo nimittam iti gamyate."

This closely resembles Raghunātha's Dadhipayasī pratyakṣo jvaraḥ which I have not yet met with anywhere. See āyur ghṛtam and lāngalaṃ jīvanam in their proper places.

ED. NOTE: An important note to be looked into.

208

Davadāhasya vetrabījavināśakatvaṃ rūpāntarajanakatvaṃ ca.

The forest-fire which destroys the seeds of the Ratan is also [by that means] the promoter of the growth of another form [namely, the plantain]. This is found in Citsukhī i. 15, as follows:

"Yathā ca davadāhasya vetrabījavināśakatvaṃ rūpāntarajanakatvaṃ ca, tathā doṣānām api yathārthajñānapratibandhakatvam ayathārthajñānanajanakatvaṃ ca kiṃ na syāt."

The same idea, with the express mention of the plantain tree, is found under i. 14, and also in the following passage of the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā* page 57:

"Dṛṣṭaṃ ca duṣṭānām api kāraṇānām autsargikakāryapratibandhena kāryāntarotpādakatvam. Tadyathā vetrabījānām dāvāgnidagdhānām kadālīprakāṇḍa-janakatvaṃ, bhasmakaduṣṭasya caudaryasya tejaso bahutarānnapānapācakatvam."

The same passage is found in *Bhāmatī* page 18, line 7; and, one of the same nature, in *Śikhāmaṇi*, page 134, line 8; whilst, in *Sarvāthasiddhi* ii. 46 (page 207), Venkaṭa says, "Dagdhavetrabījasya rambhāṅkurārambhakatvaṃ dṛśyate." See also *Maṇiprabhā* iii. 14 (page 55), and *Nyāyamakaranda*, page 75, line 6.

ED. NOTE: There are many "see also" references here. Jacob's text reads pātrakatvam. There are many such misreadings throughout the book.

209

Dānavyālakatanyāyaḥ

The maxim of the *Asuras*, *Dāma*, *Vyāla* and *Kaṭa*. This is expounded by Raghunātha in the following manner:

"Dānavyālakāṭanyāyo na tava syāt kadācana.
Bhīmabhāsadr̥dhanyāyaḥ sarvadā te'stu Rāghava."

"ityādinā Vāsiṣṭha idaṃ nyāyadvayaṃ saprapaṅcam upanyastam. Tatrā-
dyasyoccatarāṃ daśāṃ āpannasyāpyajñasyātinīcadaśāprāptir avaśyaṃ kālena
bhavatīti tattvabodho'vaśyaṃ sampādyā iti vivakṣāyāṃ pravṛttiḥ. Dānavyāla-
kāṭakhyās trayo'surāḥ Śāmbareṇa svamāyayā nirmitās, te ca talaprahārādinā
mervādicūrṇīkarāṇe śaktā apyajñānaprabhāvāt kālena maśakādiyoniṃ prāpur iti
prasiddhaṃ tatra.

"Tattvavin na kadāpi svapadāt patatīti vivakṣāyāṃ dvitīyasyāvatāraḥ.
Te'pyasurās tenaiva tathā nirmitās ciraṃ jīvanmuktisukham anubhūya nirvāṇapadaṃ
prāptā iti saṅkṣepaḥ. Prapaṅcas tu tatraiva draṣṭavyaḥ."

"Vāsiṣṭha," means the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, in Book 4 (chapter xxv- xxxiv) of which we have
a detailed account of these six Asuras. The verse quoted by Raghunātha is not found in
the printed edition exactly in that form, but 4. 34. 34 reads thus:

"Dānavyālakāṭanyāyas tasmān mā te'stu rāghava.
Bhīmabhāsadr̥dhanyāyo nityam astu tavānagha."

There is one of similar import in the opening part of their history, and Mr. M. R.
Telang has pointed out a third in the closing part of chapter xxiv.

ED. NOTE: Some important notes are given above; to be followed up. Divergence of
readings between R's words and the ākaragranthas.

210

Dīrghaśaṣkulībhakṣaṇanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the eating of an elongate* [confection called] *Śaṣkulī* [said, by the
commentator on *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* i. 173, to be snehapakvagodhūmavikāraḥ]. The nyāya
is well defined in the following extract from the *Viśiṣṭādvaitin* (vol. i. p. 102), for which I
am indebted to my friend, Dr. Grierson: "*Śaṣkulī* is a stick-like edible, which a person
begins to eat from one end. While he so eats there are several sensations present, such as
the hardness or the softness of the thing; its surface, round, square &c. All the sensations
do not affect the person simultaneously, but one after another. When he is intent on the
taste, he is non-intent on the color; when he is intent on the smell, he is non-intent on the
surface; though all the sensations seem to come to him simultaneously, by reason of the
infinitesimal interval of time dividing one sensation from another."

Nyāyasūtra i. 16 defines *Mind* as that in which knowledge [of more things than one]
does not arise simultaneously; and we find the following in Mallinātha's comment on
Tārīkaraḥṣā 29, where that sūtra is referred to:

"Na ca dīrghaśaṣkulībhakṣaṇādaṁ jñānayaugapadyasambhavād asambhavi lakṣaṇam iti vācyam. Śatapatraśātanavad āsubhāvanibandhano yaugapadyābhimāno yata iti sarvam avadātam."

Again, in the *Nyāyapradīpa* on the definition of manas in *Tarkabhāṣā* (p. 126) we read: "Aṅviti. Vibhutve dīrghaśaṣkulīm bhakṣayataḥ puṁso rūparasādyanekaviśayāṇi jñānāni yugapaj jāyeraṇ, ātmendriyaviśayasambandhātmikāyāḥ sāmagryāḥ sattvād. Aṅvute tvindriyāprāpter na yugapajjñānāni bhaviṣyantīti bhāvaḥ."

In a discussion on the same subject in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 497, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa brings forward three examples of *apparent* simultaneity, the first of which is quaintly versified as follows:

"Sugandhiṁ śītalāṁ dīrghāṁ aśnantaḥ pūpaśaṣkulīm.
Kapilabrāhmaṇās santi yugapat pañcabuddhayaḥ."

ED. NOTE: There is an ukti reading like śaṣkulī parilelihan... . Śaṣkulī in Hindi is called ghujiyā. What about karnaśaṣkulī?

For *Viliṣṭādvaitin*: Here is a reference to an old periodical vol. not listed in either of the two bibliographies. The reference is as good as nothing. How to locate it? J has condemned such vague references made by others which cannot lead the reader to reach the desired goal-searching the needle in a haystack.

211

Dūrasthavanaspātinīyāḥ.

The illustration of *distant trees* [i.e. of two trees standing apart, but which, owing to their distance from the spectator, seem to be one]. It is contained in the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* (IO MS. 582, page 219a), but not in the smaller work. Its author most probably derived it from *Citsukhī*, where the following passage is found at the beginning of the second chapter:

"Nanu kṣīranīrayor vidyamānabhedayor api svarūpagrahaṇe bhedagraho na dṛśyata iti cen maivaṁ. Tatra samānābhīhāralakṣaṇadoṣapratibandhād eva tadagrahopapatteḥ. Etena dūrasthavanaspātyor api bhedagrahaprasaṅgaḥ pratyuktaḥ."

The Muni then quotes *Sāṅkhyakārikā vii. "Atidūrāt &c."*; and the same kārikā, with a somewhat similar context, is cited in the Pūrṇaprajña section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. The simile of the two trees is met with in the much older work, *Sankṣepaśārīraka* (i. 44), namely:

"Dūrasthayor nanu vanaspativastunos tad
bhedo na dṛṣṭiviṣayo'vagata ca te naḥ."

We have it again in the *Pañcapādikā* (page 7, line 13). It is interesting to compare with Īśvarakṛiṣṇa's causes of anupalabdhi those assigned by Patañjali in *Mahābhāṣya* 4. 1. 3 (vol. ii. page 197). He says:

"Ṣaḍbhiḥ prakāraiḥ satām bhāvānām anupalabdhir bhavatyatisannikarṣād ativi prakarṣān mūrtyantaravyavadhānāt tamasāvṛtatvād indriyadaurbalyād atipramādād iti."

ED. NOTE: Here is a reference to the London MS. of the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*, complete in every respect. Jacob had digested pretty well both the works of R in MS form. He owes a great deal to R. This is one of the reasons why we have been devoting so much of our time, energy and money to REFORM and publish this *Añjali*. After all this is a great yaśogāna of Raghunāha Varmā Udāsīna. It is also a prāyścitta of the abominable, despicable, disgusting, horrible sin committed by Nirajana by bringing out a deformed reprint of such a holy work.

Cf. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛiṣṇa.

Note the exact and detailed citation of RR.

212

Devadattaśauryanyāyaḥ.

The figure of *Devadatta's bravery*. Equivalent to Horace's "Caelum non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt." The illustration is used by Śankara in his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 3. 10:

"Ekasyām api śākhāyām śrutā guṇāḥ śrutā eva sarvatra bhavanti, guṇavato bhedābhāvāt. Na hi devadattaḥ śauryādiguṇatvena svadeśe prasiddho deśāntaram gatas taddeśyair avibhāvitaśauryādiguṇo'pyatadguṇo bhavati. Yathā ca tatra paricaya viśeṣād deśāntare'pi devadattaguṇā vibhāvante."

The Devadattaśauryanidarśana is mentioned again in the bhāṣya on the next sūtra. Compare with this the following from *Tantravārtika*, (page 1108): "Yathaiva devadattasya sthānopaveśanagamaśayanādyavasthābhede'pi devadattatvaṃ nāpaiti &c." See, also, *Ślokovārtika*, page 780; and compare the following from *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 1 (vārt. 13):- "Nanu ca bho abhedakā api guṇā dṛśyante. Tadyathā. Devadatto muṇḍyapi jaṭyapi śikhyapi svām ākhyām na jahāti." Commenting on this, Kaiyaṭa says: "Muṇḍena hi kṛte caurye kuntalitvāvasthāyām api cauro'yam iti vyapadiśyate."

ED. NOTE: Here is a quote in non-English.

213

Devadattahantṛhatanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the slaying of the murderer of Devatta*. The point is that the death of the murderer does not bring his victim to life again. It is applied by Raghunātha as follows:

"Nanvajñānabādhake jñāne vinaṣṭe punar ajñānodayena bandhaprasaṅga iti śaṅkāyāṃ devadattahantṛhatanyāyāvātāraḥ. Yathā devadattahantari hate'pi na devadattasya jīvanam tathā prakṛte'pi." He probably took it from Nāgojībhṛta's comment on *paribhāṣā* LXIV [Upasañjanīṣyamāṇanimittaḥ &c., which see *yathāsthānam*] where it reads thus: "Atra devadattasya hantari hate devadattasyonmajjanam neti nyāyasya viṣaya eva nāsti. Hate devadatte unmajjanam na. Devadattahananodyatasya tu hanane bhavatyevonmajjanam."

Nāgojī, on the other hand, derived it from the *Mahābhāṣya*, where (in 1. 1. 57, vārtika 4) it appears as, "Na hyanyasyāsiddhatvād anyasya prādurbhāvo bhavati. Na hi devadattasya hantari hate devadattasya prādurbhāvo bhavati." So, too, in 6. 1. 86 (vārt. 3). It is quoted in the consolidated form in *Pradīpoddyota* 1. 1. 5 (page 213).

ED. NOTE: Here are some additional references.

214

Dehalīdīpanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a lamp on the threshold*. A lamp so placed gives light both inside and outside the house, and is, therefore, used as an illustration of anything which fulfills a double purpose. Śābara refers to such a lamp in his bhāṣya on *Jaimini* 12 1. 3: "Yathā prāsāde kṛtaḥ pradīpaḥ sannidhānād rājamārgē'pyupakaroti." There is a similar expression, too, in *Kuvalayānanda*, page 97. Another good example of the nyāya is found in the commentary on *Saptapadārthī*, page 52. The text stands thus:

"Dravyānāraṃbhakaṃ kāryadravyam antyāvayavi prāgabhāvavat kāryam. Bhogāyatanam antyāvayavi śarīram," on which Mādhava Sarasvatī remarks:

"Śarīralakṣaṇē'ntyāvayavipadañānāya tallakṣaṇam āha dravyeti. Yadyapyuddeśānantaram lakṣaṇasya vaktavyatvāc charīralakṣaṇānantaram bhogādivad antyāva-

yavī lakṣayitum ucitas, tathāpyatra dravyapadavyavacchedyatvena prāptatvād dehalī
-pradīpanyāyenobhayatropakāryatayātraiva lakṣita ityadoṣaḥ."

My friend Professor Cowell pointed out another instance of the use of the nyāya in
Ānandagiri's *Śaṅkaravijaya* xi, page 82. The maxim is akin to Kākākṣigolakanyāya and
Jāmātrartham śrapitasya sūpāder atithyupakārakatvam."

ED. NOTE: Also to be noted is another nyāya, similar in nature. It is termed as
Antar[antya]dīpikā and is used by Śaṅkarācārya in his *Bhāṣya* of *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*. 3.1.5.

215

Dhanañjayanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *Arjuna*. Used to show that something, though once done, may be done
again, as in the case of Arjuna who defeated the Kuru race after Kriṣṇa had already
defeated them. Raghunātha says: "Nityabodhamahimnā bādhite'pi dvaite
vākyajabodhasya Dhanañjayanyāyena bādhakatvopatteḥ. Yathāhuḥ:-

'Nityabodhaparipīḍitaṃ jagad-
vibhramaṃ nudati vākyaajā matiḥ.
Vāsudevanihataṃ Dhanañjaya
hanti Kauravakulaṃ yathā punaḥ."

"Knowledge effected through Vedic sentences destroys that error termed the world,
which had already been destroyed by eternal knowledge (Self, Brahman); just as Arjuna
slays again the Kuru race already slain by Vāsudeva." The verse is *Śaṅkṣepaśārīraka* ii.
38, and the translation is that of Mr. Arthur Venis in the *Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvalī* (page
174) where the verse is quoted.

ED. NOTE: Nihatam and hanti does not mean defeated or defeat only. Han means
slaying.

Also see *Mayā hatāṃms tvam jahi mā vyathiṣṭhāḥ*. *Gītā*. 11.34.

216

Dhānyapālanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *grain and its husk*. The earliest example of this figure is in the
Brahmabindu Upaniṣad verse 18:

"Grantham abhyasya medhāvī jñānavijñānatattvataḥ.

Palālam iva dhānyārthī tyajed grantham aśeṣataḥ."

This verse, with others of similar import, is quoted in *Pañcadaśī* iv. The following, from *Bhāmatī*, page 54, appears also, without any acknowledgement, in the first chapter of *Sarvadarśanasan̄graha*:

"Avarjanīyatayā duḥkham āgatam api parihṛtya sukhāmātram bhokṣyate. Tadyathā. Matsyārthī saśalkān sakaṇṭakān matsyān upādatte. Sa yāvad ādeyaṃ tāvad ādāya vinivartate. Yathā vā dhānyārthī sapalālāni dhānyānyāharati. Sa yāvad ādeyaṃ tāvad upādāya nivartate."

Vācaspatimiśra however, was not the originator of the illustration. It occurs four times in the *Mahābhāṣya*, namely 1. 2. 39; 3. 3. 18; 3. 4. 21 (vārt 2); and 4. 1. 92. The following is the passage, the substance of which is reproduced in the *Bhāmatī* and *Sarvadarśanasan̄graha*: "Kaścid annārthī śālikalāpaṃ sapalālam satuṣam āharati nāntarīyakatvāt. Sa yāvad ādeyaṃ tāvad ādāya tuṣapalālānyutsṛjati. Tathā kaścin māmsārthī matsyān sakaṇṭakān saśakalān āharati nāntarīyakatvāt. Sa yāvad ādeyaṃ tāvad ādāya śakalakaṇṭakān utsṛjati."

See, also, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa's *paribhāṣā* 73. The nyāya seems to have a different application in Marāṭhī literature. Molesworth's definition is as follows: "The law of the corn and its straw. Conquer the king and you conquer his subjects; accomplish or acquire a matter and you attain all it sustains or involves."

ED. NOTE: A "See also" reference. Also a different interpretation.

217

Dhārāvāhikabuddhiḥ.

A persistent state of cognition. This is Mr. Arthur Venis' rendering of the expression as it occurs in *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (The Pañḍit, vol. iv., page 105), and he elucidates it in a footnote as follows: "It may be described as a series of states throughout which the same object is presented in consciousness. Each state of consciousness lasts only for a moment, a *kṣaṇa* or unit of appreciable time, and perishes. A second state then succeeds and is lost, and so on." We find the expression (in the plural) in the *Prakaranapañcikā*, page 127, and as Dhārāvāhikajñānāni on page 40; whilst, on page 56, the author refers to it as the Dhārāvāhikanyāya. I have met with it elsewhere also. Yet, strange to say, the Vācaspatyam is the only Sanskrit dictionary that contains it. The term dhārāvāhin (with vāhika also) is there defined as "Santatyā pātuke krameṇāvicchedena jāyamāne ca," and then follows a quotation from *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* which immediately succeeds that referred to above: "Kiñca siddhānte dhārāvāhikabuddhisthale na jñānabhedah [kintu yāvad ghaṭasphuraṇaṃ tāvad ghaṭākārāntaḥkaraṇavṛttir ekaiva na tu nānā]". "Moreover, according to (Vedantic) tenet, there is no variation of knowledge in the case

of a persistent cognition; but as long as there is a presentation of the jar so long the modification of the internal organ in the form of the jar is one and the same and not various"(Venis). As found in Marāṭhī, it has the meaning "Closeness or intentness of thought; undiverted and unintermitting prosecution (of any subject of meditation or study)" (Molesworth). Strictly speaking, I ought not to include this expression in my pages; but as Boehtlingk, Monier-Williams, and Apte have ignored it, I admit it in the hope that it may assist some perplexed student of Indian philosophy. And let me add that readers of Mr. Venis' excellent translations will find there many valuable explanations of technicalities, which they will search for in vain elsewhere.

ED. NOTE: Here is a noteworthy worthy statement. All such statements and references to be collected and put together at the end of our work. This is a general guide for the future editor, if anyone is so lucky as to come forward.

218

Na khalu śālagrāme kirātaśatasankīrṇe
prativasannapi Brāhmaṇaḥ kirāto bhavati.

A Brāhman does not become a Kirāta by living on the Śālagrāma mountain filled with hundreds of those barbarians! This is equivalent to our saying, "A horse does not become an ass by being born in the stable of the latter." Compare, too, Śaṅkara's "Na hyaśvasthāne gāṃ paśyannaśvo'yam ityamūḍho'dhyavasyati" in Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 1. 4. 1. The saying as given above is found in Vācaspatimiśra's comment on Yogabhāṣya i. 5; and he makes use of it again in his Bhāmatī i. 1. 5 (page 126) in the sentence, "Anyathā kirātaśatasankīrṇadeśanivāsino Brāhmaṇāyanasyāpi kirātatvāpatteḥ."

ED. NOTE: What is Śālagrāma? Find out!

219

Na ca sarvatra tulyatvaṃ syāt prayojakakarmanām.

Acts which impel others to action are not always of the same kind. This is the first line of a verse in Kumārila's Ślokavārtika (page 710), the context of which is as follows:

"Na ca sarvatra tulyatvaṃ syāt prayojakakarmanām.
Calanena hyasiṃ yoddhā prayuṅkte chedanam prati.

Senāpatistu vācaiva bhṛtyānām viniyojakaḥ.
Rājā sannidhimātreṇa viniyuṅkte kadācana."

A remark of Śaṅkarācārya's in his comment on *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad* 3. 1. 1, illustrates this. He says: "Sa tvanaśnannanyo'bhicākaśīti paśyatyeva kevalam. Darśanamātreṇa hi tasya prerayitṛtvam, rājavat."

220

Naḍvalodakam pādarogaḥ.

Water in a bed of reeds is disease of the feet. That is, it causes disease in the feet. See under Dadhitrapusaṃ pratyakṣo jvaraḥ."

ED. NOTE: Many so-called nyāyas collected and discussed by Jacob are merely madhurā vācōyuktis and not yuktiyuktā sūktīḥ as we have defined the nyāya to be. They belong to a collection of *subhāṣitāni*. Jacob has condemned Raghunātha unjustifiably many a time for this kind of imaginary fault. His attempt deserves contempt of the highest kind. Jacob's criticism is truly unscholarly and unacademic. And yet he himself does the same act of folly. He is a victim of Bhūliṅgaśakuninyāya. Āyur ghṛtam is another example of this nature. It is only a nītivacana.

221

Na yad giriśṛṅgam āruhya gṛhyate tad apratyakṣam.

A thing does not become imperceptible because perceived by one who has ascended a mountain peak. This saying, quoted from *Trantravārtika* 1. 2. 2. (page 6), appears in the *Nyāyamañjarī* (page 422) in the course of a discussion on the sādhutva and asādhutva of words. The passage is as follows:

"Nanu yadi śrotarakaraṇakenaiva pratyayena sādhutvāsādhutve pratipattāraḥ pratipadyante vyākaraṇādhyayanavandhyabuddhayo'pi pratipadyeran. Na ca pratipadyante, tasmān na te indriyaviṣaye iti. Naiṣa doṣaḥ. Vaiyākaraṇopadeśasāhāyā-kopakṛtaśrotrendriyagrāhyatvābhyupagamāt. Yathā Brāhmaṇatvādijātir upadeśa-savyapekṣacakṣurindriyagrāhyā'pi na pratyakṣagamyatām apojjhati. Yathāha 'Na yadgiriśṛṅgam āruhya gṛhyate tad apratyakṣam iti.'"

Jayanta quotes it on pages 96 and 222, also.

222

Narasimhanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the union of man and lion*. Used to illustrate a particular kind of Alaṅkāra consisting of a combination of figures. See the quotations from *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa* and *Kuvalayānanda*, under Kṣīranīraṇyāya.

Ed. note: There is a "See" reference above.

223

Nartakanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a dancer*. One dancer gives pleasure to many spectators, just as one lamp gives light to many persons [? ed]. It occurs in *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvīstara* 11. 1. 10 as follows:

"Pratyāṅgikāryānyaṅgāni tantreṇotāṅgino yataḥ.
Ekaikasyopakāratvaṃ tasmāt pratyāṅgyanuṣṭhiṭiḥ.

Vidhānavad anuṣṭhānaṃ sakṛd evopakārakam.
Taddeśakālakartṛṇām ekatvān nartakādivat."

The last pāda is thus explained:

"Yathā bahūnām purato nṛtyan nartakaḥ sarveṣām sukhaṃ yugapan nir-vartayati tadvat." Of the same kind, apparently, is the following expression of the *Nyāya-vārtika* i. 10 (page 70): "Kṛtasaṅketānām vṛddhānām ekasminnartakābhrūkṣepe yugapad anekapratyayavat," which is reproduced in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, page 354 (line 9 from bottom) in these words: "Uktam etad yathā nartakābhrūlatābhaṅge ekasmin bahūnām pratisandhānam iti."

ED. NOTE: This nyāya is applicable to many situations.

224

Naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the lost horses and burnt chariot*. This is based on the story of two men travelling in their respective chariots, and one of them losing his horses and the other having his chariot burnt, through the outbreak of a fire in the village in which they were putting up for the night. The horses that were left were harnessed to the remaining chariot, and the two men pursued their journey together. Its teaching is -- union for mutual advantage. That the story is very old is clear from the fact that the saying is quoted in the 16th *vārtika* ("Samprayogo vā naṣṭāśvadagdharathavat") to *Pāṇini* 1. 1.

50, and again in Śabara's *bhāṣya* 2. 1. 1. It appears also in Sureśvara's *Bṛhadāraṇya-bhāṣyavārtika* 2. 1. 38, which reads thus:

"Naṣṭāśvadagdharathavan nyāyaṃ cāśritya bhūmipam.
Prāha mānuṣavittādhyāṃ daivavittasamanvitaḥ."

On which Ānandagiri says: "Adhikāriṇe vidyāṃ vaktuṃ gārgyaś ced upacakrame tarhi योग्याṃ Brāhmaṇaṃ hitvā kimiti rājānam upetya bravīti. Tatrāha naṣṭeti. Yathāhur -- yuktaḥ saṃyogo'dhikārārthena hetunā naṣṭāśvadagdharathavad iti."

Rāmatīrtha, too, quotes the maxim in his comment on the *Vedāntasāra* (page 93, line 3): "Naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāyena 'karmaṇā piṭṭloka' iti śrutir upapaddyate," of which the following translation is found in *The Paṇḍit* for May 1872:

"The Vedic text 'The world of progenitors is attained by works,' can be explained according to the analogy of two men, of whom the horses of the one are lost and the chariot of the other burnt, [for the horses of the latter may be yoked to the car of the former, and they may travel together; and in like manner, constant and occasional works, though no special result has been recorded of them, may supply a cause for the attainment of the world of the progenitors, which requires some special works as a condition]." See also *Tantravārtika*, pp. 15, 709, 832, and *Bhāmatī*, page 81.

ED. NOTE: It is very difficult to decide which particular nyāya is popular and which is not -which one is specialized and which one is general. Great writers of yore have used many nyāyas which might seem too trifling to us. Yet they have propounded and expounded highly sophisticated principles of their specialized disciplines through such nyāyas which seem so trifling to us.

On October 25, 1996 I found a "name" for the "discipline" we have been working upon. It may be called Nyāyanidarśanadarśanam, a science of the exposition and interpretation through the examples of the nyāyas. Subsequently I found a better name--Viśva-nyāyavyākhyānanidarśanadarśanam.

225

Nasi protoṣṭranyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a camel with a rope fastened in its nostrils*. It is found in verse 78 of *Tattvamuktāvali*:

"Māyā yasya vaśaṃ gatā balavatī trailokyasammohinī
vijñeyāḥ prabhur īśvaraḥ sa bhagavān ānandasaccidghanaḥ.
Yas tasyā vaśaṃ āgataḥ khalu nasi protoṣṭrakalpaḥ sadā
jñātavyaḥ sa hi jīva ittham anayor astyeva bhedo mahān."

"He under whose control is that mighty illusion which deceives the three worlds, He is to be recognized as the Supreme Lord, the adorable, essentially thought, existence, and joy; but he who is himself always under her control, like a camel drawn by a string through his nostrils, is to be recognized as the individual soul--vast indeed is the difference between the two." The translation is Prof. Cowell's. The dictionaries give references to three works where the figure is used, but always as nasyota, and either in text or comment, applied to a bullock, not to a camel. The passages will be found in *Tait. Saṃhitā* 2. 1. 1. 2, *Vanaparva* xxx. 26, and *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 6. 3. 12. The second one reads thus:

"Īsvarasya vaśe tiṣṭhen nānyeṣāṃ nātmanaḥ prabhuḥ.
Mañiḥ sūtra iva proto nasyota iva govṛṣaḥ."

Compare, too, *Māgha* xii. 10, with its description of a vain attempt to load a pack-bullock, though held by its nose-cord (nasyā).

ED. NOTE: Here is an additional reference.

226

Nahi kaṭhorakaṅṭhīravasya kuraṅgaśāvaḥ
pratibhaṭo bhavati.

A young fawn cannot stand up against a full-grown lion. This is found in the Akshapāda chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 136 of Jīvananda's, and 119 of Bib. Ind.): "Naitat pariḥkṣāksamam iksyate nahi kaṭhorakaṅṭhīravasya kuraṅgaśāvaḥ pratibhaṭo bhavati," which Prof. Cowell renders, "This pretended inference will no more stand examination than the young fawn can stand the attack of a full-grown lion." Compare "Nālpīyasā mahato'bhībhavaḥ sambhavati." of *Śālikā*, page 94, and see the nyāya "Nahi bhavati tarakṣuḥ &c." yathāsthānam.

227

Nahi karakaṅkaṇadarśanāyādarśāpekṣā.

One does not need a looking-glass in order to look at a bracelet on the wrist. The nearest approach to this that I have met with is in the *Karpūramañjarī*, page 17, line 2: "Ahavā hatthakakaṅgaṃ kiṃ dapaṇeṇa pekkhīdi," which is, in Sanskrit, "Athavā hastakaṅkaṅgaṃ kiṃ darpaṇeṇa dṛśyate [prekṣyate, ed.]."

ED. NOTE: Hātha kaṅgana ko ārasī kyā. (Hindi.) Here is one more example of the contribution this prāyaścitta prakāśaṇa has made.

228

Nahi kākinyāṃ naṣṭāyāṃ tadanveṣaṇaṃ kārṣāpaṇena kriyate.

If a man has lost a cowrie, he does not spend a kārshāpaṇa in the search for it. That would be like expending a sovereign in order to recover a farthing! It occurs in the following portion of Śabara's bhāshya 4. 3. 39: "Na hi kapāle naṣṭe tadanveṣaṇārthā iṣṭir yuktā. Na hi kākinyāṃ naṣṭāyāṃ tadanveṣaṇaṃ kārṣāpaṇena kriyate."

ED. NOTE: Hindi: *Ṭake kī murgī, nau ṭakā cunthāī!* The Colonel has given some wrong information here. One kākīṇī equals 20 kapardas or cowries, and there are 80 cowries in a kārṣāpaṇa.

229

Nahi kvacid aśravaṇaṃ anyatra śrutam
nivārayitum utsahate.

A thing's not being heard in one place does not get rid of the fact of its being heard elsewhere. This is applied by Śankara in Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 2. 4. 1 (page 681) as follows:

"Nanu keṣucit pradeśeṣu na prāṇānām utpattiḥ śrūyata ityuktaṃ tad ayuktaṃ, pradeśāntareṣu śravaṇāt. Na hi kvacid aśravaṇaṃ anyatra śrutam nivārayitum utsahate." It is quoted as a nyāya in *Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā* 2. 3. 2 (sūtra 8). Compare with it *Ślokavārtika* iv. 161:

"Na kvacit saṅkarābhāvāt sarvatraiva nivartate.
Kvacicca saṅkaraṃ dṛṣṭvā saṅkaro'nyatra kalpyate,"

and see Dr. Gangānāth Jhā's rendering of that and the previous verse.

Compare, too, a saying of Vācaspatimiśra's on *Yogabhāṣya* ii. 22: "Na hi rūpam andhena na dṛśyata iti cakṣuṣmatā'pi dṛśyamānam abhāvaprāptaṃ bhavati."

Ed. note: There are many additional references here.

230

Nahi khadiragocare paraśau palāśe dvaidhībhāvo bhavati.

The Palāśa tree is not cleft when the axe is applied to the Khadira tree. The saying is used to indicate that two objects are essentially distinct. I have met with it in three of Vācaspatimiśra's works.

It occurs in *Bhāmatī* 2. 2. 28 (page 438) in the following connection:

"Svarūpaṃ vijñānasyāsatyākārayuktaṃ prameyaṃ. Prameyaprakāśanaṃ pramāṇaphalaṃ, tatprakāśanaśaktiḥ pramāṇam. Bāhyavādinor api vaibhāṣikasautrāntikayoḥ kālpanika eva pramāṇaphalavyavahāro'bhimata ityāha 'satyapi bāhye'rtha' iti. Bhinnādhikaraṇatve hi pramāṇaphalayos tadbhāvo na syāt. Nahi khadiragocare paraśau palāśe dvaidhībhāvo bhavati. Tasmād anayor aikādhikaraṇyaṃ vaktavyam."

Then in *Yogabhāṣyaṭīka* i. 7, we read: "Nanu puruṣavartī bodhaḥ kathaṃ cittagatāyā vṛtteḥ phalam. Nahi khadiragocaravyāpāreṇa paraśunā palāśe chidā kriyata iti."

And very similarly in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭīkā*, page 67: "Atha pramāṇaphalayor bhinnaviṣayatvena vipratipattyā pramāṇaphalabhāvāyogāt. Nahi panasaviṣayeṇa paraśunā khadire dvaidhībhāvo bhavati."

But he is not the only writer who makes use of it, for in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 93, we read, "Tayor bhinnādhikaraṇavṛttitve khadiragocare paraśau palāśe dvaidhībhāvo bhavet."

For earlier references to this nyāya, see the Superaddenda to the *Third Handful*.

ED. NOTE: Cf. *Ślokavārtika*, *Pratyakṣasūtra*, *Kārikā* 75, Chedane khadiraprāpte. R has at least in some form.

This "Superaddenda" not yet seen. Does it still exist in some ed.? Or, has it been merged into some ed.? Matter to be investigated.

231

Nahi godhā sarpaṅtī sarpaṅād ahir bhavati.

An Iguana creeping along does not on that account become a snake. This is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 23 (4) as follows:

"Na khalvapyanyat prakṛtam anuvartanād anyad bhavati, na hi godhā sarpaṅtī sarpaṅād ahir bhavati ... Yad apyucyate na khalvanyat prakṛtam anuvartanād anyad bhavati, na hi godhā sarpaṅtī sarpaṅād ahir bhavati. Bhaved dravyeṣvetad evaṃ syāt. Śabdā tu khalu yena yena viśeṣeṇābhisambadhyate tasya tasya viśeṣako bhavati." The same passage reappears in 1. 3. 12 (5), and in 6. 1. 50.

232

Nahi grāmasthaḥ kadā grāmaṃ prāpnuyām
ityaraṇastha ivāśāste.

A man who is already in a village does not express a longing to get there, such as a man might who was out in the jungle! This is found in Bṛihadāraṇyakabhāṣya 1. 3. 28, page 87: "Na hi prāṇātmanyutpannātmābhimānasya tatprāptyāśamsanaṃ sambhavati. Na hi grāmasthaḥ kadā grāmaṃ prāpnuyām ityaraṇastha ivāśāste. Asannikṛṣṭaviṣaye hyanātmanyāśamsanaṃ, na tat svātmani sambhavati."

233

Nahi triputro dviputra iti kathyate.

A man who has three sons could not be designated as a man with two sons. Therefore, if an order were given to bring the father of two sons, it would not do to bring one who had three! This nyāya of Raghunāthavarman's, taken from the Kāśikāvṛitti (with the substitution of kathyate for vyapadiśyate), is based on the words "Na hi dviputra ānīyatām ityukte triputra ānīyate," which form part of Patañjali's comment on Pāṇini's sūtra 6. 4. 96 (chāderghe'dvyupasargasya). The meaning of that sūtra is that when the affix gha (i.e. the kṛit-affix a) follows, the root (technically described as chādi) is shortened to chada when there are not two upasargas. So we say pracchada, and dantacchada; but samupacchāda because there are two upasargas. But would the root vowel be shortened if there were more than two upasargas? No, for we say samupābhicchāda. Yet the sūtra seems to make no provision for this. Patañjali comments on it as follows: "Adviprabhṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam. Ihāpi yathā syāt. Samupābhicchāda iti. Tat tarhi vaktavyam. Na vaktavyam. Yatra triprabhṛtayaḥ santi dvāvāpi tatra stas tatrādvypasargasyetyeva siddham. Na vā eṣa loke sampratyayaḥ. Na hi dviputra ānīyatām ityukte triputra ānīyate. Tasmād adviprabhṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam."

Patañjali was fond of this kind of illustration. The following one is employed again and again in various parts of the bhāṣya, and always in connection with the paribhāṣā nañ ivayuktam anyasadṛśādhikaraṇe tathā hyarthagatiḥ. It reads thus: "Abrāhmaṇam ānayetyukte brāhmaṇasadṛśā ānīyate nāsau loṣṭam ānīya kṛtī bhavati." It occurs in 3. 1. 12 (vārt 4); 3. 3. 19; 6. 1. 45; 6. 1. 71 (vārt 7); 6. 1. 135 (vārt 12); 6. 3. 34 (vārt 7); 7. 1. 37 (vārt 7). The words abrāhmaṇam ānaya appear also in 2. 2. 6. The paribhāṣā just quoted is rendered by Prof. Kielhorn thus:- "(An expression) formed by the addition of the negative nañ or (of the particle of comparison) iva (to some word or other) denotes something which is different from and yet similar to (what is denoted by the latter), because it is so that (such expressions) are (generally) understood (in ordinary life)." With the paribhāṣā, Nāgojī has also taken the illustration. In Kaiyaṭa's comment on a

portion of the bhāṣya under sūtra 1. 1. 57 we find the expression, "Na hi triputro dviputravvyapadeśaṃ labhate."

ED. NOTE: It is remarkable to note how lokavyavahāra is used as a means for the samādhāna of a śāstrīya samasyā. This shows the value, validity, and force of the laukikanyāyas.

In other words, the "lokasampratyaya" plays a vital role in the formation and use of the laukikanyāyas. The understanding, convention, and belief among the people plays a vital role in the device and application of the Nyāyas. Na vā eṣa loke sampratyayaḥ. This is a foundation of the Laukikanyāyas.

234

Nahi nārikeladvīpavāsino'prasiddhagośravaṇāt
kakudādimadarthapratipattir bhavati.

From hearing the unfamiliar word 'cow,' an inhabitant of Coconut Island would gain no perception of an object possessed of a hump &c.. This sentence is found in the Nyāyavārtika on sūtra 3. 1. 67. Again, in Praśastapāda's Vaiśeṣikabhāṣya, page 182, we read:

"Anumānaviṣaye'pi nārikeladvīpavāsinaḥ sāsnamātradarśanāt ko nu khalvayaṃ prāṇī syād ityanadhyavasāyo bhavati." The commentator, Śrīdhara, remarks on this: "Nārikeladvīpe gavām abhāvāt tatradyo loko'prasiddhagojātīyaḥ."

With some hesitation I have admitted the above into my collection of 'inferences from familiar instances,' on account of the reference to the unfamiliar Coconut Island, and its cowless condition! The following passage from Professor Beal's translation of Hiuen Tshang's work (Vol. ii. page 252) is supposed to refer to this island:- "The people of this island are small of stature, about three feet high; their bodies are those of men, but they have the beaks of birds; they grow no grain; but live only on cocoanuts." The editor and translator of Itsing's Record thinks that the island in question is one described by that pilgrim as lying to the north of Sumatra, and therefore probably one of the Nicobar group. See page xxxviii of that work.

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa refers more than once to the ignorance of these islanders. See *Nyāyamañjarī* page 118, line 5; page 121, line 23; and page 391. Also *Tātparyāṭikā*, p 66. In *Sarvārthasiddhi*, page 561, amongst strange things found in ordinary life, Venkaṭanāth includes "Nārikeladvīpavāsīnām apakvānnaiva dehadhāraṇam." It is interesting to note that, according to Praśastapāda (page 267, line 6), the people of south India were at that time as unacquainted with the *camel* as those islanders were with the cow! Śrīdhara says: "Uṣṭro dākṣiṇātyasyātyantānanubhūtākāratvād āścaryabhūto'rthaḥ."

ED. NOTE: "Inferences from familiar instances." This is a reference to Buehler, who characterized the nyāyas in this manner, introducing to the world his find from Kashmir of the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* by Raghunātha Varmā. So this work had gone all the way up to the Himalayas! A very important point to note. This may be the MS. in Sharda characters still deposited at the Bhaandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune. I tried my best to get access to this MS. but without any success. Sarvaḥ svārtham samīhate. Here the word "artha" does not mean "meaning."

Let it also be noted here that the only printed edition of the *Saṅgraha*, which we have named as "vinā rasam duṣkaraṇam," was based on a single MS. that was obtained by the editor from a Rājaguru of Nepal.

There is a recommendation here to see more.

235

Nahi nindā nindyaṃ nindituṃ prayujyate kiṃ tarhi ninditād
itarat praśamsitum.

Blame is not employed in order to blame something that is blameworthy, but rather to praise something other than that. This is the form taken by the nyāya in Śabara on Jaimini 2. 4. 20. In *Tantravārtika*, page 16, it appears as "Na hi nindā nindyaṃ nindituṃ pravartate api tu vidheyam stotum," and Ānandagiri quotes this reading of it in his comment on *Bṛihadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya* 2. 5. 16.

The following passage from *Āgamaprāmānya*, page 51, admirably illustrates the meaning of the nyāya:

"Nanu cedam vedamūlatvaṃ pañcarātratantrāṇām anupapannaṃ vedanindādarśanāt. Uktaṃ hi caturṣu vedeṣu puruṣārtham alabhamānaḥ śāṅḍilya idaṃ śāstram adhītavān iti. Anavagatavacanavyakter ayaṃ paryanuyogaḥ. Na hi nindā nindyaṃ nindituṃ pravartate api tu ninditād itarat praśamsitum. Yathaitareyakabrāhmaṇe 'prātaḥ prātar anṛtaṃ te vadanti' ityanuditahomanindā uditahomapraśamsārtheti gamyate. Yathā mānave (iv. 124).

'Rigvedo devadaivatyo yajurvedas tu mānuṣaḥ.
Sāmavedas tu pitryaḥ syāt tasmāt tasyāśucir dhvaniḥ.'

Iti Sāmavedanindā itaravedapraśamsārthā. Yathā vā Bhārate --

'Catvāra ekato Vedā Bhāratam caikam ekataḥ.
Samāgatais tu ṛṣibhis tulayāropitam purā.

Mahattve ca gurutve ca dhriyamāṇaṃ yato'dhikam.

Mahattvāc ca gurutvāc ca Mahābhāratam ucyate.'

Iti Mahābhārataprasāṃsārtheti gṛhyate, na Vedanindeti. Evaṃ Pañcarātraprasāṃseti gamyate."

Another reference to the nyāya will be found in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 273.

236

Nahi padbhyāṃ palāyitum pārayamāṇo jānubhyāṃ
raṃhitum arhati.

It is not likely that a man who could flee on his feet would crawl on his knees. This is a part of Śaṅkara's argument on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 1. 10: "Tasmāt karmaiva śīlopalakṣitam anuśayabhūtaṃ yonyāpattau kāraṇam iti Kārṣṇājīner matam. Na hi karmaṇi sambhavati śīlād yonyāpattir yuktā. Na hi padbhyāṃ palāyitum pārayamāṇo jānubhyāṃ raṃhitum arhatīti."

"It is, therefore, the opinion of Kārṣṇājīni that the remainder of works only - which is connoted by the term 'conduct'- is the cause of the soul's entering on new births. For as work may be the cause of new births, it is not proper to assume that conduct is the cause. If a man is able to run away by means of his feet, he will surely not creep on his knees." This is Dr. Thibaut's rendering.

237

Nahi pūtaṃ syād gokṣīraṃ śvadṛtau dhṛtam.

Even cow's milk would cease to be pure if placed in a vessel made of dog skin. This nyāya of Raghunātha's is found in the following passage of *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara*, 1. 3. 4:

"Śākyoktāhiṃsanaṃ dharmo na vā dharmāḥ śrutatvataḥ.
Na dharmo na hi pūtaṃ syād gokṣīraṃ śvadṛtau dhṛtam.

Brahmacaryam ahiṃsāṃ cāparigrahaṃ ca satyaṃ ca yatnena rakṣed iti śrutā-vahiṃsādir dharmatvenoktaḥ. Sa eva dharmāḥ Śākyenāpyuktaḥ. Tasmāc chākya-smṛtir dharme pramāṇam iti cet. Na. Svarūpeṇa dharmasyāpi gokṣīranyāyena Śākya-sambandhe satyadharmatvaprasaṅgāt. Tadiyagranthenāhiṃsādir nāvagantavyaḥ. Tasmān na sā smṛtir dharme pramāṇam."

Mādhava, no doubt, took it from Kumārila's vārtika on sūtra 7 of the same adhikaraṇa, where he speaks of the moral teaching of Śākyas and others as "Śvadṛtinikṣiptakṣīravād anupayogyavisraṃbhaṇīyaṃ ca." The simile in this form is found, too, in Yāmunācārya's *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, page 11 line 8, in a context of the same import.

Colebrooke's excellent summary of the teaching of this part of the Mīmāṃsādarśana, given in his *Essays* (i. 337), may be usefully quoted here: "Besides the evidence of precept from an extant revelation or recorded hearing (*śruti*) of it, another source of evidence is founded on the recollections (*smṛti*) of ancient sages. They possess authority as grounded on the Veda, being composed by holy personages conversant with its contents ... The *Śākyas* (or *Bauddhas*) and *Jainas* (or *Ārhatas*), as Kumārila acknowledges, are considered to be Kshatriyas. It is not to be concluded, he says, that their *recollections* were founded upon a Veda which is now lost. There can be no inference of a foundation in *revelation* for unauthentic recollections of persons who deny its authenticity. Even when they do concur with it, as recommending charitable gifts and enjoining veracity, chastity, and innocence, the books of the Śākyas are of no authority for the virtues which they inculcate. Duties are not taken from them: the association would suggest a surmise of vice tainting what else is virtuous." Raghunātha uses the nyāya as a warning to a *guru* to be careful in the selection of his disciples; for *Asatpātre sadupadeśo'pyapavitratam yāti*. On this point, see *Vishṇu-smṛti* xxix. 9, and *Manu* ii. 114.

ED. NOTE: Also read as: *Yato na hi pavitram syāt gokṣīram śvadṛtau dhṛtam*. It reads better. There are additional references to be looked into.

238

Nahi bhavati tarakṣuḥ pratipakṣo hariṇaśāvakasya.

A hyena does not find a suitable opponent in a young fawn. This may be contrasted with the saying, "Na hi kaṭhorakaṅṭhīravasya kuraṅgaśāvaḥ pratibhaṭo bhavati." It is found in the Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā, page 33: "Tulyabalau hi mithaḥ pratipakṣau bhavato na tu durbalottamabalau. Na hi bhavati tarakṣuḥ pratipakṣo hariṇaśāvakasya, kintu samarakaṅṭhūnighnaviṣāṇakotīsamullikhitagaṇḍaśailasya vipinamahīṣasya."

ED. NOTE: Is the above quotation all prose or there is a poetry as well in part? Sounds like poetry in part.

239

*Nahi bhikṣukāḥ santīti sthālyo nādhiśrīyante
na ca mṛgāḥ santīti yavā nopyante.*

Men do not refrain from setting the cooking-pots on the fire because there are beggars [who may come to ask for some of the contents], nor do they abstain from sowing barley because there are wild animals [which may devour it]. This oft-quoted saying appears three times in the Mahābhāṣya, namely in 1. 1. 39 (vārt 16), 4. 1. 1 (vārt 15), and 6. 1. 13

(vārt 13), and this is probably the original source of it. I have met with it in two of Vācaspatimiśra's works, as follows.

In the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, page 62: "No khalvayaṃ prekṣāvatāṃ samācāro yad duḥkhabhiyā sukhaparityāga iti. Api tu sukhaṃ duḥkhād vibhidyopādadate duḥkhaṃ ca varjayanti. Na hi mṛgāḥ santīti śālayo nopyante, bhikṣukāḥ santīti sthālyo nādhiśrīyanta iti."

Similarly, on page 441 of the same. In *Bhāmatī*, page 54, we read: "Tasmād duḥkhabhayān nānukūlavedanīyam aihikaṃ vāmuṣmikaṃ vā sukhaṃ parityaktum ucitam. Na hi mṛgāḥ santīti śālayo nopyante, bhikṣukāḥ santīti sthālyo nādhiśrīyante."

The same passage, with a good deal of the preceding context, reappears, without acknowledgment, in the Chārvāka chapter of the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. We find the saying in a modified form in the *Pañcapādikā*, page 63: "Ato'jīrṇabhayān nāhāraparityāgo, bhikṣukabhayān na sthālyā anadhiśrayaṇaṃ. Doṣeṣu pratividhātavyam iti nyāyaḥ."

It appears in this form in *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, (page 8) also, and is there ascribed to Ānandabodhācārya. See his *Pramāṇamālā* page 21. Then we have the well-known verse, *Hitopadeśa* ii 50:

"Doṣabhīter anārambhaḥ kāpuruṣasya lakṣaṇam.
Kair ajīrṇabhyād bhrātar bhojanaṃ parihīyate."

ED. NOTE: Raghunātha Varmā has split this nyāya into two. The last verse reminds us: Prārabhyate na khalu vighnabhayena nīcaiḥ....

Jacob's text abounds in destructive dance of printer's devil. No proper proof-reading. Maybe he was across the seven seas (in England) and did not read the proofs himself. It is to be remembered that his "Handful" went into several revised editions.

240

Na hi bhikṣuko bhikṣukāntaraṃ yācitum arhati
satyanyasminnabhikṣuke.

A beggar ought not to ask alms of another beggar, so long as there is anyone [to beg from] who is not a beggar! The saying appears in this form in *Śāstradīpikā* 8. 3. 5; but Śābara, in the same adhikaraṇa (sūtra 11), puts it thus: "Na ca bhikṣukā bhikṣukād ākāṅkṣanti satyanyasmin prasavasamarthe'bhikṣuke." See, also, the *Nyāyamālāvistara* on the same portion. The following, from *Ivanhoe* (Chap. xi.), runs parallel with the

nyāya: "He is too like ourselves for us to make booty of him, since *dogs should not worry dogs where wolves and foxes are to be found.*"

ED. NOTE: Cultural difference. Note the expression : runs parallel.

Durbhagā editors have distorted this nyāya in a miserable manner. I have named their production as Durbhagākṛtir durbhagākṛtir. That is the worst publication I have seen in my entire life. And I have seen tens of thousands.

241

Nahi bhūmāvambhoruham sad iti duṣṭākṣasyāpi nabhasi tad avabhāsate.

Not even to a man whose sight is defective does a lotus on the ground appear to be in the sky! It appears in *Citsukhī* i. 17 (Paṇḍit, vol. iv, page 594): "Na ca deśāntare sattvād atrāsattvāc ca khyātibādhayor anyathāpyupapattiḥ. Anyatra sattāyā iha pratītya-hetutvāt. Na hi bhūmāvambhoruham sad iti duṣṭākṣasyāpi nabhasi tad avabhāsate."

ED. NOTE: R has this.

242

Nahi yad devadattasya yudhyamānasya sthānam avagataṃ tad eva bhuñjānasyāpi bhavati.

The position occupied by Devadatta when eating is not that which he occupies when fighting! The force of this *driṣṭānta* is best seen from the *dārṣṭāntika* in *Tantravārtika*, p. 575:

"Ekatve'pi hi śabdasya śaktibhedāḥ prayojane.

Tatra kāryāntarasthānaṃ na syāt kāryāntareṣvapi.

Na śabdaikatvena yatkiñcitkārye sthānaṃ dṛṣṭasāmarthyam tad evānyatrāpīti śakyate vaktum. Na hi yad Devadattasya yudhyamānasya sthānam avagataṃ tad eva bhuñjānasyāpi bhavatīti gamyate. Kāryaprayuktā hi sthānaviśeṣādayo na svarūpa-prayuktāḥ."

ED. NOTE: cf. Ahikuṇḍala. Kuṇḍalī yāti, kuṇḍalī bhuñte.

Nahi varavighātāya kanyodvāhaḥ.

The bride is not married for the destruction of the bridegroom. This is found in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 4. 1. 2, and in the Pūrṇaprajña chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jivānanda's edn.). It occurs also in *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, page 101 (line 4 from bottom). In the *Vācaspatyam* and in the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*, the maxim is given in the *positive* form, viz. "Varaghātāya kanyāvaraṇam," with the other as a possible variant. Tārānātha explains it thus:

"Viṣakanyāyāṃ vṛtāyāṃ yatra varasya ghātaḥ sambhāvyaṭe tatra tām nodvāhe evaṃ vivakṣāyāṃ asya pravṛttiḥ. Tathā cāniṣṭāntarapātādisambhāvanāyāṃ abhīṣṭahetur apī vastu na varaṇīyam ityevaṃ tannyāyatātparyam. Ayam eva nyāyaḥ kvacin na hi varaghātāya kanyāṃ udvāhayatīti nyāyatayā paṭhyate."

We have a reference to "poison-damsels" in *Kathāsaritsāgara* xix. 82, which reads thus:

"Vidadhe viṣakanyāś ca sānye paṇyavilāsinīḥ.
Prāhiṇot puruṣāṃścaiva niśāsu cchadmaghātinaḥ."

In a foot-note to his translation of the passage, Mr. Tawney says, "One of these poison-damsels is represented as having been employed against Chandragupta in the *Mudrā-Rākṣasa*. Compare the xith tale in the *Gesta Romanorum*, where an Indian queen sends one to Alexander the Great. Aristotle frustrates the stratagem."

ED. NOTE: A noteworthy worthy statement.

Nahi vidhīsatēnāpi tathā puruṣaḥ pravartate
yathā lobhena.

Not even a hundred injunctions could move a man to action as readily as the desire for gain does. This is found in *Tantravārtika* 3. 4. 34 (page 999):

"Ṛtvigbhyo dakṣiṇāṃ dadyād iti dānaṃ vidhīyate.
Lobhād evārjanāṅgatvāt prāptas teṣāṃ pratigrahaḥ.

Na hi dadyād ityasya pratigrhṇīyād ityayam artho bhavati. Bhaved apī sāmartyād yadi tadākṣepam antareṇa dānavidhir nopapadyate. Sa tu lobhaprāpta-pratigrahabalenopapadyamāno na śaknotyākṣeptum. Na hi vidhīsatēnāpi tathā puruṣaḥ pravartate yathā lobhena."

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (on page 361) puts the matter quaintly thus:

"Capetāparihārāya modakaprāptaye'pi vā.
Pravartate baṭur nāsau juhudhīti niyogataḥ."

Compare *Nyāyakaṇikā*, page 407: "Na ca vidhimātram api pravṛtīhetuḥ. Anicchato vidhīnām śatenāpyapravṛteḥ."

See, too, verses 1040 and 1041 of *Sambandhavārtika*, and *Anubhūtiprakāśa* xiii. 277.

But many centuries before any of these worthies, the same view had been expressed by Patañjali in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 3. 72: "Kriyāphalaṃ kartāram abhipraiti. Yājakā yajanti gā lapsyāmaha iti. Karmakarāḥ kurvanti pādikamahar lapsyāmaha iti." See another quotation from the same source under the nyāya, "Prayojanam anuddīśya &c."

ED. NOTE: Here is a madhurā vācouktiḥ:-

Adhīṣva putrkādhiṣva tubhyam dāsyāmi modakān.
Ydvā'nyasmai pradāsyāmi karṇāvutpāṭayāmi te.

245

Nahi Śyāmākabījaṃ parikarmasahasreṇāpi
kalamāṅkurāya kalpate.

Not even by the employment of a thousand processes can Śyāmāka grain be made to germinate as rice. Vācaspatimiśra was fond of this kind of saying. That above is from his *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 55, and another of the same class occurs twice in the *Bhāmāṭī*. On page 180 (1. 2. 18), "Na hi jātu vaṭāṅkuraḥ kuṭajabījā jāyate," and on page 704 (4. 1. 1.) "Na khalu kuṭajabījād vaṭāṅkuro jāyate."

Compare, too, Manu ix.40:--

"Anyad uptaṃ jātam anyad ityetan nopapadyate.
Upayate yaddhi yadbījaṃ tat tad eva prarohati."

They all remind us of those sayings from another part of the Orient: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" and again, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

ED. NOTE: Here are some comparisons.

246

Nahi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti.

Everybody does not know everything. Near the end of the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* Raghunātha describes his effort in the following verse:

"Vyākhyātaṃ nyāyavṛndaṃ nijamatim anatikramya yāvan mayāptam
pāraṃ prāptuṃ tu śakto na hi bhavati guruḥ kaḥ punar mādr̥śo nā.
Sarvaḥ sarvaṃ na vetti prathitam idam ato nāsti me'trāparādhaḥ
śiṣṭā jñeyāḥ svayaṃ vai suvimalamatibhiḥ samyagārādhitāryaiḥ."

He then connects various nyāyas with the pādas of the above; namely, Yāvat tailaṃ tāvad vyākhyānam and Yāvat snātā tāvat puṇyam with the first pāda, and the maxim which we are now considering with the third. I think the second of these should read yāvat snānam. In the larger work, the reading is yāvat snātam. Our present nyāya is found in *Upamitibhavaprapañcā Kathā*, page 501, as follows:

"Vimarśaḥ prāha naivātra kopaḥ kāryas tvayā yataḥ.
Sarvaḥ sarvaṃ na jānīte siddham etaj jagattraye."

On the other hand, we have the following query in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 94: "Tathāpi cānubhavakalpanāyāṃ sarvaḥ sarvadā sarvaṃ jānāti na tu niścinoṭīti kiṃ na syāt."

ED. NOTE: Jacob does not bring in the *Mudrārākṣasa* of Viśākhadatta -- Na hi sarvaḥ sarvaṃ jānāti. He knew more of Vedānta than of Sāhitya. He proves the validity of this nyāya. He himself provides an example of the specific nyāya. A Mother's Maxim: If every body jumped off a cliff, would you? Kamalee)

247

Nahi sahasreṇāpyandhaiḥ pāṭaccarebhyo gṛhaṃ rakṣyate.

Not even a thousand blind men can protect a house from robbers. This is another of the sayings of Vācaspatimiśra, and is found in his *ṭīkā* on *Nyāyavārtika* 1. 2. 2 (the definition of jalpa). To see the aptness of the saying it would be necessary to transcribe a lengthy passage of the *bhāṣya* and *vārtika*; but the scholar can easily refer to them himself.

ED. NOTE: Jacob says: "Scholar can easily refer to them himself."

I don't think this nyāya is true - 1,000 blind men could possibly protect a house from robbers by sensing their presence, Kamalee.

248

Nahi sutīkṣṇā'pyasidhārā svam chettum āhitavyāpārā.

The edge of a sword, even though very keen, is not employed to cut itself. The nyāya is found in this form in *Syādvādamañjarī*, page 89, in combination with that which immediately follows; and Mr. Thomas, the Librarian at the India Office, tells me that he has met with the two together in Nāgārjuna's *Īśvarakartṛtvanirākaraṇa*, but there the sword-nyāya takes the form of "Na hi kharatarakaravāladhārā svam ātmānam chettum samarthā bhavati." In *Madhyamakavṛtti*, page 62, it again occurs in conjunction with another simile: "Yathāpi nāma tayaivāsīdhārayā saivāsīdhārā na śakyate chettum na tenaivāṅgulyagreṇa tad evāṅgulyagram śakyate spraṣṭum &c." For the latter, see its proper place. Further instances will be found in *Tātparyaṭikā*, page 255; *Nyāyamakaranda*, page 131; and others of a like nature in Venkaṭanātha's *Sarvārthasiddhi*, page 391.

ED. NOTE: Here are additional references.

249

Nahi suśikṣito'pi naṭabaṭuḥ svaskandham
adhiroḍhum paṭuḥ.

No young actor [acrobat? ed.], however well-trained, is clever enough to get on his own shoulder. This is Malliṣeṇa's version of the nyāya, as cited in conjunction with the cognate one above. In *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 54, Śankara quotes it as, "Na hi naṭaḥ śikṣitaḥ san svaskandham adhirokṣyati." In the vārtika on *Taittirīyabhāṣya*, page 108, Sureśvara puts it thus:

"Nālam svaskandham āroḍhum nipuṇo'pīha sādhaḥ."

Other varieties are the following: "Na hi suśikṣito'pi vijñānī svena skandhenātmānam voḍhum utsahate," *Bhāmatī* 1. 3. 41 (page 277); "Na hi suśikṣito'pi naṭabaṭuḥ svaskandham āruhya nṛtyati," *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 592; and, finally, "Na hi paṭutaro'pi naṭabaṭuḥ svaskandham āruhya narīnarti," *Vidyāsāgarī* on *Khaṇḍana*, page 57. It will thus be seen that no two authors agree as to the form of the maxim!

ED. NOTE: An important statement. Interpretation and the form (wording) of the nyāyas differs. Vāgarthau na tāveva sarvatra sarvadā. Nyāyavyākhyāne padapadārtha-vaividhyam.

250

Nahi svato'satī śaktiḥ kartum anyena śakyate.

If a power is not of itself present [in a person or thing], it cannot be supplied by another. In *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 24, we have part of a discussion as to Brahman's ability to produce the world without extraneous aid. It is urged that he has this power in himself, just as the power to produce curds resides in milk. The objection is then raised that, since curds are not produced without the action of heat, milk is not independent of other agencies, and so the argument breaks down. The reply is as follows:

"Yadi svayaṃ dadhibhāvaśīlatā na syān naivausṇyādināpi balād dadhibhāvam āpadyeta. Na hi vāyur ākāśo vausṇyādinā balād dadhibhāvam āpadyate. Sādhanasāmagryā ca tasya pūrṇatā sampādyate." On this last clause Ānandagiri says: "Sādhaneti. Na hi svato'satī śaktiḥ kartum anyena śakyata iti nyāyād vidyamānaiva kṣīrādiśaktiḥ sādhanasāmagryopacīyata ityarthāḥ." The nyāya is taken from *Śloka-vārtika* ii. 47 (page 59), of which verse it forms the second line. The first line is:

"Svataḥ sarvapramāṇānāṃ prāmāṇyam iti gamyatām."

Dr. Gangānāth Jhā's rendering of the verse is as follows: "You must understand that authoritativeness is inherent in all means of right notion. For a faculty, by itself non-existing, cannot possibly be brought into existence by any other agency." The whole verse is quoted in *Nyāyakanikā*, page 168; and in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 165. Compare the above maxim with the following from *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 2. 20: "Na hi yo yasya svato dharmo na sambhavati so'nyasya sādharṇyāt tasya sambhaviṣyati."

ED. NOTE: The nyāya is a poem in part. R has, but in a different form.

251

Nahi andhasyājyāvekṣaṇopete karmaṇyadhikāro'sti.

A blind man is not qualified for work [specific holy act] involving the examination of butter. This is found in *Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā* 3. 4. 2 (sūtras 18-20), where it is followed by, "Nāpi paṅgor viṣṇukramādyupete karmaṇyadhikāraḥ." It was doubtless taken from *Tantravārtika* 1. 4. 24 (page 332), where we read:- "Nanvanenaiva nyāyena "yathā śaknuyād" iti vākyaśeṣād andhādīnām ājyāvekṣaṇādirahitaḥ karmādhikāraḥ syāt." This sūtra 24 is Jaimini's sūtra 30, under which we have Śabara's "Ākhyātaśabdānām artham bruvatām śaktiḥ sahakāriṇī" which see in its proper place.

Ed. Note : R has, but in a different form.

Yathāśaktyupabandho hyavaśyakartavyatā- bījam. Is this relevant ? Applicable?

252

Nahi anyasya vitathabhāve'nyasya vaitathyam bhavitum arhati.

The falseness of one person does not prove somebody else to be false. This is from Śabara 1. 1. 2 (page 5, line 6):

"Nanu sāmānyato dṛṣṭam pauruṣeyam vacanam vitatham upalabhya vacana-sāmyād idam api vitatham avagamyate. Na, anyatvāt. Na hyanyasya vitathabhāve-'nyasya vaitathyam bhavitum arhati. Anyatvād eva. Na hi Devadattasya śyāmatve yajñadattasyāpi śyāmatvam bhavitum arhati."

See the same in verse in *Ślokavārtika*, page 100; on which Pārthasārathi says: "Na hyanāptavākyasya vaitathye satyāptavākyasyāpi vaitathyam." That Kumārila, however, had a poor opinion of human veracity in general is shown from the following verse on page 88:

"Sarvadā cāpi puruṣāḥ prāyeṇānṛtavādinaḥ.
Yathā'dyatve na visrambhastathātītārthakīrtane."

Again, on page 178:

"Na ca puṃvacanam sarvam satyatvenāvagamyate.
Vāgiha śrūyate yasmāt prāyād anṛtavādiniḥ."

Compare with this nyāya, "Na hi khadiragocare paraśau palāśe dvaidhībhāvo bhavati," and "Anyaveśmāsthītād dhūmān na veśmāntaram agnimat."

Ed. Note : What about stenam manaḥ, anṛtavādiniḥ vāk? A good common sense!

253

Nahi aprāpya pradīpaḥ prakāśyam prakāśayati.

A lamp does not illuminate until it [i.e. its light] reaches the object to be illuminated. It, therefore, comes under the head of prāpyakārī, for which, and its opposite, see Nyāya-kandalī, page 23. It occurs in the Nyāyamañjarī on 5. 1. 7 (page 624):-

"So'yam hetuḥ prāpya vā sādhyam sādhyed aprāpya vā. Prāpya ced dvayor labdhasvarūpayor aprāptir bhavātīti kiṃ kasya sādhyam sādhanam vetyaviśeṣaḥ. Aprāpya tu sādhatvam anupapannam atiprasaṅgāt. Na hyaprāpya pradīpaḥ prakāśyam prakāśayātīti."

Also in *Tārkikarakṣā*, page 271: "Na hi dāhyam aprāpto dahano dahati, prakāśyam aprāpya pradīpaḥ prakāśayati." Then, in *Sarvārthasiddhi* (on *Tattvamuktākālāpa* i. 32) we read:- "Aprāptotpādane sarvasmāt sarvam utpadyeta. Prakāśyam aprāpya vā dīpaḥ prakāśayed, dāhyam aprāpya vā dahano dahet." Compare Nāgārjuna's kārīkā vii.ii:-

"Aprāpyaiva pradīpena yadī vā nihataṃ tamaḥ.
Ihasthaḥ sarvalokasthaṃ sa tamo nihaṇiṣyati."

254

Nahi eṣa sthāṇor aparādho yadenam andho na paśyati.

It is not the fault of the post that a blind man cannot see it. Vācaspatimiśra quotes this on page 87 of his *Tātparyatikā*, prefacing it with the words "Yathāhur niruktakārāḥ." It will be found on page 112 of the second volume of the *Nirukta*. We meet with it again in the opening sentence of *Kusumāñjali* v.:- "Nanvīśvare pramāṇopapattau satyāṃ sarvam etad evaṃ syāt, tadeva tu na paśyāma iti cet. Na hyeṣa sthāṇor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati."

255

Nāgrhīte viśeṣaṇe viśiṣṭabuddhir udeti.

Particular [or distinguishing] knowledge does not arise until that which particularizes [or defines the object in question] has been grasped. It is in this form that the nyāya is found in *Kusumāñjali* iii. 21 (page 527), but in *Tantravārtika*, page 258, it appears in the contracted form, "Nāgrhītaviśeṣaṇetinyāyena," and; on page 287, as "Agrhītaviśeṣaṇā viśiṣṭabuddhir na dṛṣṭā." In Mādhava's *Nyāyamālāvistara* 3. 1. 6, it is quoted as "nāgrhītaviśeṣaṇā viśiṣṭabuddhiḥ," and in *Saptapadārthī*, page 2, line 6, as "Nāgrhītaviśeṣaṇā viśeṣyabuddhiḥ." In his commentary on *Tārkikarakṣā*, Mallinātha twice (namely, on pages 47 and 107) cites the maxim in the contracted form adopted by Kumārila, whilst Raghunāthavarman's version of it is, "Nājñātaviśeṣaṇā viśiṣṭabuddhir viśeṣyam saṅkrāmati."

In *Nyāyasūtravṛtti* ii. 126 (=2. 2. 58), it appears as Nāgrhītaviśeṣaṇānyāya, and Dr. Ballantyne renders it, "Cognition which does not apprehend the distinction, cannot infer [the nature of] what is to be distinguished." The nyāya occurs five times in *Nyāyamañjarī*, and each time in a different form! The references are as follows:- page 320, line 19; 433, line 4 from bottom; 449, line 3 from bottom; 538, line 6; and 543, line 7.

In Sir Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, viśiṣṭabuddhi is defined as "differenced or distinguishing knowledge (e.g. the knowledge of 'a man carrying a staff' which distinguishes him from an ordinary man)"; whilst Molesworth explains viśiṣṭajñāna as

"knowledge of an object distinguished or characterized by something (whether a property or an accident) standing out in some speciality (inherent or attached)."

Identical in meaning with the above, though differing somewhat in form, is Śabara's "Na hyapratīte viśeṣaṇe viśiṣṭaṃ kecana pratyetum arhanti" (1. 3. 33, page 82).

Ed. Note : This nyaya is somewhat technical.

256

Nānyadr̥ṣṭaṃ smaratyanyaḥ.

One person does not remember what another has seen. This is the first pāda of *Kusumāñjali* i. 15, the whole verse being as follows:

"Nānyadr̥ṣṭaṃ smaratyanyo naikaṃ bhūtaṃ apakramāt.
Vāsanāsaṅkramo nāsti na ca gatyantaraṃ sthira."

Professor Cowell translates thus:- "One does not remember what another has seen; the body remains not one and the same from decay; there cannot be transference of impressions, and if you accept a non-momentary existence there is no other means[?ed]." The kārikā, however, is hardly intelligible apart from the preceding context of which it is a sort of summing up. The nyāya did not, however, originate with Udayana, since it is quoted in Vyāsa's *Yogabhāṣya* iii. 14, and in *Nyāyabhāṣya* 1. 1. 10. It is found, too, in *Syadvādamañjarī*, pages 61 and 154; also in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 437, line 10.

257

Nāsādhitam karaṇam.

That which itself is not an accomplished fact cannot be an instrument [with which to bring about some other result]. In the *Mīmāṃsāparibhāṣā*, page 31, this nyāya is quoted in the discussion on the expression, "Agnihotraṃ juhōti." The passage is as follows:

"Na ca homasya pratyayavācyāyām arthabhāvanāyām karaṇatvāt tannāmatve' gnihotreṇeti tṛtīyā syāj jyotiṣṭomenetivad iti vācyam, dvitīyāyā eva lakṣaṇayā karaṇā-rthakatvāt. Nāsādhitam karaṇam iti nyāyenāsādhitasya karaṇatvāyogāt."

For a rendering of this, see page xxxi of Prof. Gangānātha Jhā's Introduction to his translation of *Ślokavārtika*.

Kṛiṣṇa Yajvan perhaps took the nyāya from the *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvīstara*, where, in connection with the same subject, under the *Tatprakhyanāyā*, we find the following kārikā:

"Nāsādhite hi dhātvarthe karaṇatvaṃ tato'sya sā.
Sādhyatāṃ vakti saṃskāro naivāśaṅkyāḥ kriyāvataḥ."

Ed. Note : All such references to be gathered and put together as a supplement. This nyāya is somewhat technical.

258

Nāsikāgreṇa karṇamūlakarṣaṇanyāyaḥ.

The figure of *pulling the root of the ear with the tip of one's nose!* It occurs in Sureśvara's *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika* 4. 3. 1184, as follows:-

"Samastavyastatām eva sati vyācakaṣate'tra ye.
Karṣanti nāsikāgreṇa karṇamūlaṃ sukhena te."

On which Ānandagiri remarks:- "*Asaṃbhāvitārthavādinām bhrāntatvaṃ drṣṭāntenāha karṣantīti.*" It may be compared with the acrobat's sitting on his own shoulders, and with the edge of a sword's cutting itself.

Ed. Note: Cf. earlier statement of J where he has chosen the word "actor" and I have suggested "acrobat". Naṭa is here better explained by the word "acrobat." It means a person skilled in the art of manouvering the body.

259

Nirāmayasya kimāyurvedavidā.

What need has a healthy man of one skilled in the science of medicine? "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (pages 106-7) there is a story about the poet Bāṇa and his brother-in-law, the poet Mayūra, who were favourites of the King Bhoja. The former, owing to the curse pronounced by his sister (the wife of the latter), was attacked by leprosy; but, being healed by the intervention of the Sun, he appeared at court - to quote from Mr. Tawney's translation - "with his body anointed with golden sandal-wood, and clothed in a magnificent white garment. When the king saw the healthy condition of his body, Mayūra represented that it was all due to the favour of the Sun-god. Then Bāṇa pierced him in a vital spot with an arrow-like speech. 'If the propitiating of a god is an easy matter then do you also display some wonderful performance in this line.' Mayūra replied as follows:-

"Nirāmayasya kimāyurvedavidā. Tathāpi tava vacaḥ satyāpayiṭṭam nijapādaḥ
pāṇi ca churyā vidārya, tvayā ṣaṣṭhe kāvyē sūryaḥ paritoṣito'hṃ tu pūrvasya kāvyasya

ṣaṣṭhe'kṣare bhavānīm paritoṣayāmīti pratiśrutya, sukhāsanam āsīnaś caṇḍikāprāsāda-
-paścādbhāge niviṣṭo 'Mā bhāṅkṣīr vibhramam' iti ṣaṣṭhe'kṣare pratyakṣīkṛtacaṇḍikā-
prasādāt pratyagrathamānavapuhpallavaḥ svasaṁmukhaṁ ca tatprasādam
ālokyābhimukhāgatair nṛpatipramukharājaloakaiḥ kṛtajayajayāravo mahatā mahena
puram prāvīkṣat."

As pointed out by Mr. Tawney in a footnote, the poem here ascribed to Mayūra is the *Caṇḍīsataka* of which Bāṇa was the author. It was published in the *Kāvya-mālā* for 1887, and the first verse commences thus:-

"Mā bhāṅkṣīr vibhramam bhrūr adhara vidhuratā
keyam āsyāsyarāgam,
Pāṇe prāṇyeva nāyam kalayasi kalaha-
śraddhayā kiṁ triśūlam."

Ed. note. Here is an important note for the editor. Here we have *Caṇḍikāprāsāda* for temple. If it is true, then we have to reconsider our comments on *Kalāśapurassara-prāsādanirmāṇatulyam*, where we have expressed our doubt as to whether the word *prāsāda* can mean temple."

260

Niṣādasthapatinyāyaḥ.

The topic of *a king who is a Niṣāda by caste*. This forms the subject of *Jaimini* 6. 1. 51, 52 and is thus expounded by Kunte (in *Ṣaḍdarśanacintanikā*, page 1788):- "The term *Niṣādasthapati* occurs in the Veda. The question is - how is it to be interpreted? Is the term *Niṣādasthapati* a *Karmadhāraya* compound or *Tatpuruṣa* compound? The *Karmadhāraya* overrules the *Tatpuruṣa*; because, in the latter, a case not directly seen has to be understood, and because metonymy is thus involved. A direct statement is always to be preferred to metonymy. The *Karmadhāraya* makes a direct statement and, therefore, does not involve metonymy. He who is a *Niṣāda* is a *Sthapati*; and, therefore, a superior *Niṣāda* is entitled to perform the *Raudra* sacrifice." In other words, the compound when dissolved is not *niṣādānām sthapatīḥ*, but *niṣāda eva sthapatīḥ*. [*niṣādaś cāsau sthapatīś ca*, ed.]

In explaining the term *brahmaloka* in Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on *Vedāntasūtra* 1. 3. 15, *Vācaspatimiśra* says (on page 213, line 3 from bottom):-

"Atra tāvan niṣādasthapatinyāyena ṣaṣṭhīsamāsāt karmadhārayo balīyān iti sthitam eva. Tathāpīha ṣaṣṭhīsamāsanirākaraṇena karmadhārayasthāpanāya līṅgam apyadhikam astīti tad apyuktaṁ sūtrakāreṇa."

The nyāya is quoted by Rāmānuja in his exposition of the same sūtra, and Dr. Thibaut translates as follows:- "That this explanation of the 'Brahma-world' is preferable to the one which understands by Brahma world 'the world of Brahman' is proved by considerations similar to those by which the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā sūtras prove that 'Nishāda-sthapati' means a headman who at the same time is Nishāda." The nyāya is also explained in full in *Vedāntakalpataru* on this passage, and again in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*. It is quoted by Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, 3. 3. 24, and by Nāgeśa on Kaiyaṭa 1, 1. 3. For the origin of the Niṣāda, see Manu x. 8.

Ed. note. Sthapati does not mean king. At its best it can mean only a chieftain.

261

No khalvandhāḥ sahasram api pānthāḥ panthānaṃ vidanti.

Not even a thousand blind travellers can discover the road [to be taken]. This is contained in Bhāmatī 1. 1. 5 (page 124) in the following passage:- "Na hi prādhānikāny-antarbahīṣkaraṇāni trayodaśa sattvapradhānānyapi svayam evācetanāni tadvṛttayaśca svam vā param vā veditum utsahante. No khalvandhāḥ sa hasraṃm api pānthāḥ panthānaṃ vidanti. Caḅṣuṣmatā caikena ced vedyate, sa eva tarhi mārgadarsī svatantraḥ kartā netā teṣāṃ."

262

Paṅkaprakṣālananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of the *washing off of mud*. It is evidently deduced from *Pañchatantra* ii. 157, a verse intended to strengthen an argument against the possession of riches under any circumstances, and which reads thus:-

"Dharmārthaṃ yasya vittehā tasyāpi na śubhāvahā.
Prakṣālanāddhi paṅkasya dūrād asparśanaṃ varam."

"If a man desires wealth for charitable purposes, even to him it will bring no good; for, better than the washing off of mud is the keeping away from it altogether." The nyāya is therefore the equivalent of our, "Prevention is better than cure." In his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 2. 22, Śaṅkara twice quotes the second line of the above couplet; and, in commenting thereon, Ānandagiri uses the maxim three times. It is again applied twice by him on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 4. 1. 16, as follows:-

"Agnihotrādīnām api puṇyāntaravad vināśyatvāt paṅkakṣālananyāyāpātād āruruḅṣuṇāpi tāni nānuṣṭheyāni"; "Dhīnāśyānām api karmaṇām anuṣṭhānasya vidyot-

pattyarthatayā pañkaprakṣālananyāyānavakāśāt, pūrvaṃ jñānād anuṣṭheyānyagni-hotrādīnīti siddhāntapratijñāṃ vivṛṇoti."

See also *Bhāmatī* and *Bhāshyaratnaprabhā* on the same, and *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 97, line 14.

Ed. note. Here are some see also references.

263

Paṅgvandhanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the lame man and the blind man*. The conception is that of a lame man mounted on the shoulders of one who is blind, so that the former is furnished with the power of locomotion and the latter with sight. It is intended to illustrate mutual dependence for mutual advantage, as exemplified in *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 21, the text of which, with Colebrooke's translation, is as follows:-

"Puruṣasya darśanārthaṃ kaivalyārthaṃ tathā pradhānasya.
Paṅgvandhavad ubhayor api saṃyogas tatkr̥taḥ sargaḥ."

"For the soul's contemplation of Nature, and for its abstraction, the union of both takes place, as of the halt and blind. By that union a creation is framed." Vāchaspati Miśra ignores the illustration, but Paṇḍit Tārānātha has a helpful note on it. He says:-

"Uktārthe dṛṣṭāntaḥ paṅgvandhavad iti. Yathā gatiśaktirahitasya paṅgor gati-sādhanāya gatimato'ndhasyāpekṣā, dṛṣṭiśaktirahitasya cāndhasya gatiśaktisattve'pi svābhīṣṭadeśagamaṇaṃ darśakam antareṇa na saṃbhavati, tathā ca yathā svasva-kāryāya tayor anyonyāpekṣā, tathā kriyārahitasya puruṣasya sakriyapradhānasyāpekṣā, dṛṣṭiśaktirahitasya ca pradhānasya dṛṣṭiśaktiyuktapuruṣasyāpekṣetyata ubhābhyāṃ anyonyam apekṣya svasvakāryaṃ niṣpādyata ityārthaḥ."

The above *kārikā* is quoted on the last page of the Sāṅkhya section of *Sarva-darśanasāṅgraha*, and is preceded by a very clear explanation of the maxim.

Ed. note! Also worded as Andhapaṅgunyāya. There are additional references.

264

Pañjaracālananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the moving of the bird-cage*. An illustration of the power of united effort. In a discussion on *prāṇa*, under *Vedāntasūtra* 2. 4. 9, Śankara introduces this maxim and explains it thus:-

"Nanu pañjaracālananyāyenaitad bhaviṣyati. Yathaikapañjaravartina ekādaśa pakṣiṇaḥ pratyekaṃ pratiniyatavyāpārāḥ santaḥ sambhūyaikaṃ pañjaraṃ cālayanti. Evam eka arīra artina ekādaśaprāṇāḥ pratyekaṃ pratiniyatavṛttayaḥ santaḥ sambhūyaikāṃ prāṇākhyāṃ vṛttiṃ pratilapsyanta iti."

Dr. Thibaut translates the passage as follows:- "But, an objection may be raised, the thing may take place in the manner of the moving [of the?] bird-cage. Just as eleven birds shut up in one cage may, although each makes a separate effort, move the cage by the combination of their efforts, so the eleven prāṇas which abide in one body may, although each has its own special function, by the combination of these functions, produce one common function called prāṇa."

265

Pañjaramuktapakṣinyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a bird let loose from its cage*. Used to illustrate the upward flight of the soul when released from the body. It occurs in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 443, as follows:-

"Ūrdhvagamaṇaṃ jīvasya svabhāvaḥ. Dehe sthitis tatpratibandhakakarmā-dhīneti matam āśrityoktam. Kecit tu cirakālaśarīrāvasthitaprayuktābandhamuktā-vūrdhvagamaṇaṃ manyante. Te khalvevamāhuḥ. Bandhamuktasyordhvagamaṇaṃ dṛṣṭam, yathā pañjaramuktaśukasya, yathā vā vārinirbhinnapariṇatairaṇḍabījasya, yathā vā dṛḍhapaṅkaliptajalanimajjanaprakṣiṇapaṅkalepaśuṣkālābūphalasya."

It will be noticed that there are three illustrations in the last clause, - the third being really the Jalatumbikānyāya, which see yathāsthānam.

Could we read śarīrāvasthiti?

266

Paṇḍakam udvāhya mugdhāyāḥ putraprārthanam.

It is better to leave this untranslated. The Paṇḍakopākhyāna is found in Vyāsa's *Yogabhāṣya* ii. 24, as follows:-

"Atra kaścit paṇḍakopākhyānenodghāṭayati. Mugdhayā bhāryayā svabhartā-'bhidhīyate : Paṇḍaka āryaputra, apatyavatī me bhaginī, kimarthaṃ nāma nāham iti. Sa tām āha mṛtas te'ham apatyam utpādayiṣyāmīti."

On this, Vācaspatimiśra remarks: "Atra kaścīn nāstikaḥ kaivalyaṃ paṇḍakopākhyānenopahasati."

The nyāya, as given above, is found in the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, page 29:- "Yadi hi pakṣaṃ vihāya bahir eva sapakṣāsapakṣayor avinābhāvo gamyeta tadā bahir vyāptimātrabalena pakṣadharmo'pi hetur na pakṣe sādhyam sādhyet. Asiddhā hi tatra svasādhyena vyāptiḥ. Tadetat paṇḍakam udvāhya mugdhāyāḥ putraprārthanam iva."

See, too, *Citsukhī* ii. 26 (Paṇḍit, vol. v. page 514), where reference is made to Vācaspati's use of the nyāya; and the same objection is taken to it by Śrīharsha in the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 354.

Ed. Note : Why so shy Colonel! You don't want to translate. Then why did you include it? Kathāpi khalu pāpānām alam aśreyase yataḥ. Also Prakṣālanād hi paṅkasya dūrād asparśanam varam. In any case, some remarks made at the end are noteworthy.

Probably he would have been horrified if he had even looked into the nyāya worded as Adhikam praviṣṭam na tu me kiñcid hīnam. Here are the words of R: Liṅgam me'syā yonāvadhikam praviṣṭam, te pādprahārān na tu me kiñcid hīnam.

267

Padārthānusamayanyāyaḥ.

Sir M. Monier-Williams defines it thus:- "The performance of one ritual act for all objects in orderly succession before performing another act for all objects in the same order." When it is not a matter of sacrificial ritual, but merely of the bestowal of gifts, the definition given by Captain Molesworth is more suitable; namely:- "The order or method (when a set or number of things is to be given to each individual of a multitude) of giving first one article of the set to each person all round; going round again with another article, and again with a third; and thus, until all the articles composing the set shall have been received by each person." The nyāya summarizes the teaching of Jaimini 5. 2. 1, 2. See Kāṇḍānusamayanyāya, and Karkācārya on Kātyāyana's *Śrautasūtra* i. 114.

Ed. Note : Some useful notes appear above.

268

Paratantram bahir manaḥ.

As to externals mind is dependent on others. This oft-quoted nyāya would seem to have originated with Maṇḍanamiśra. It is found in the following verse of his *Vidhiviveka*, page 114:-

"Hetvabhāve phalābhāvāt pramāṇe'sati na pramā.
Cakṣurādyuktaviṣayaṃ paratantraṃ bahir manaḥ."

Students of the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* will remember that the second line is quoted (without mention of its source) in the first chapter of that work, and Prof. Cowell translated it thus:- "The eye &c. have their objects as described, but mind externally is dependent on the others." The dependence of *manas* is pointed out in three other passages of *Vidhiviveka*, on pages 120, 161, and 178. The nyāya is found in *Citsukhī* i. 12 (The Paṇḍit, vol. iv, page 513) in the words, "Na ca manaso bahirarthaiḥ sambandhaḥ, paratantraṃ bahirmanā itī nyāyāt." It is employed also by the author of *Vidyāsāgarī* on *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 307:- "Rajatajñānasyaindriyaikatvavādī vaktavyaḥ kiṃ tanmānasam uta bahirakṣajam. Nādyo, manaso bahirarthe'svātantryād. Etac ca Tattvaviveke sarvajñādūṣaṇaprastāve Maṇḍanamīśrair abhihitam." He then cites the verse "Hetvabhāve &c." Is this *Tattvaviveka* identical with Maṇḍana's *Vidhiviveka*, or is it the name given to a section of it?

Ed. note. A question: Is this pramāṇe sati or pramāṇe asati? If latter, then the text of J is wrong. We have changed it. One of the two readings is wrong. See the next nyāya: Paraspara---

269

Parasparavirodhe hi na prakārāntarasthitiḥ.

This is the first line of *Kusumāñjali* iii. 8, the second being "Naikatāpi viruddhānām uktimātravirodhataḥ."

The following is Professor Cowell's translation of the verse and of a portion of Haridāsa's explanatory comment:- "In the case of contradictories, there can be no middle course; nor can you assume the two contradictories to be identical, because the fact of their contradiction is directly asserted." "There can be no middle course,' i.e. you cannot make some third supposition different from either, from the very fact that they are contradictories [and, therefore, the one or the other must be true]; nor can you assume them to be identical." Raghunātha's explanation of the first line, in his larger work, coincides with this. He says:- "Na prakārāntarasya tābhyām anyasya prakārasya sthitiḥ, kintu tadanyatarasyetyarthaḥ."

The nyāya is quoted in the vṛitti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iii. 48, and in the last sentence of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* iii (page 561); and the whole verse in the commentary on Udayana's *Lakṣaṇāvalī*, page 47, and in the second chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. In *Tattvadīpana* page 234, line 13, it appears in a somewhat modified form, namely, "Parasparapratipardhinor anyataraniṣedhe'nyataravyavastheti nyāyāt."

270

Parjanyaavat.

Like the rain [which falls on all places alike]. It is found in the following passage of *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 2. 9 and 6. 1. 127:- "Kṛtakāri khalvapi śāstraṃ parjanyaavat. Tadyathā. Parjanyo yāvad ūnaṃ pūrṇaṃ ca sarvaṃ abhivaṛṣati." This is quoted by Nāgojībhāṭṭa under paribhāṣā cxi - Parjanyaavallakṣaṇapraṇṭhiḥ," which Professor Kielhorn translates thus:- "The rules of grammar are like the rain [in this that they are] applied [both where they produce a change and where they do not; just as the rain falls upon that which already is full of water as well as upon that which is empty]."

There is another example of this in the Pāṇini chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*:- "Prakṛtyādivibhāgakalpanāvatsu lakṣyeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣarūpāṇāṃ lakṣaṇāṇāṃ parjanyaavat sakṛd eva praṇṭtau bahūnāṃ śabdānāṃ anuśāsanopalambhāc ca."

"And again, since general and special rules apply at once to many examples, when these are divided into the artificial parts called roots &c., (just as one cloud rains over many spots of ground), in this way we can easily comprehend an exposition of many words." The translation is Prof. Cowell's. We meet with it again in a most interesting passage of *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 3. 42, where Śankara tells us that, just as the rain causes the production of barley, rice, shrubs, &c., by its action on the seeds, so God, making use of men's previous works, impels them to either good or evil! There can be little doubt that the mischievous [!] saying, "Kartā āṇi karavitā Īśvara āhe," current among the Marāṭhās, was derived from this source.

On page 226 of Merutunga's work, the following verse is quoted as from *Kāmandakīyanītisāra*. It is not to be found, however, in the printed edition of that work, but stands as verse 161 of *Hitopadeśa* i:-

"Parjanya iva bhūtānāṃ ādhāraḥ pṛthivīpatiḥ.
Vikale'pi hi parjanye jīvyate na tu bhūpatau."

"The king is the mainstay of creatures, like the rain-cloud. For, even if the rain-cloud be somewhat wanting, it is possible to live, but not if the king is wanting in any respect" (Tawney, page 138).

Ed. note. Merutuṅga's work : *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*.

271

Paṇamayīnyāyaḥ.

The simile of "the spoon" made of the Parṇa wood. Various spoons are used in the sacrifices, as described in the footnote to Professor Eggeling's translation of *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1. 3, 1. 1; and, of these, the juhū is *always* made of the wood of the Parṇa (*i. e.* the Palāśa) tree. This is in accordance with *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 3. 5. 7, where the praises of that tree are sung, and blessings promised in connection with the use of the juhū made of its wood, as pointed out in Śabara on Jaimini 3. 6. 1-8. The parṇamayītvā of the juhū employed in the sacrifices is therefore used to illustrate something *invariably* present, in contradistinction to that which is so *occasionally*, as in the case of the godohana. For a passage containing both of these, see under Godohananyāya. Other examples will be found in *Bhāmatī* 3. 3. 61; *Parimala* pages 624 to 626; *Śālikā*, page 157.

Ed. note. Other examples are given here for further study. This is a highly technical nyāya, far from being popular. Śāstrīyo'yam nyāyaḥ. Na tāvallaukikaḥ. Moreover, to call a sruk as a spoon betrays the poverty of the English language.

272

Palālakūṭasya sādṛśyaṃ kuñjarādīnā.

Seeing resemblance to an elephant in a heap of straw. An illustration of mere semblance of resemblance (sādṛśyābhāsātā). A real likeness is said to be that which stands the test of a close examination. The figure is contained in Kumārila's *Ślokavārtika*, page 446.

"Yatra tvasadṛśād eva kalpayitvopajāyate.
Sādṛśyapratyayas tatra tadābhāsativakalpanā.

Bādhakapratyayāc caiṣā sādṛśyābhāsātā matā.
Yathā palālakūṭasya sādṛśyaṃ kuñjarādīnā.

Samīpastho'pi jānāti sādṛśyaṃ neti tatra hi.
Na bādhyate samīpādaḥ yattu sādṛśyam eva tat."

Prof. Gangānāth Jhā renders the passage thus:-

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

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

273

Paśyasyadrau jvaladagniṃ na punaḥ pādayoradhaḥ.

Thou seest the fire burning on the mountain, but not that which is under thy very feet!
"Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" The above is the first line of Hemacandra's *Parisiṣṭaparvan* i. 382, the second line being,

"Yatparaṃ śikṣayasyevaṃ na svaṃ śikṣayasi svayam."

The next verse continues the rebuke:-

"Kā hi puṃgaṇanā teṣāṃ ye'nyaśikṣāvicakṣaṇāḥ.
Ye svaṃ śikṣayituṃ dakṣās teṣāṃ puṃgaṇanā nṛṇām."

The teaching here is akin to that of the Bhūliṅganyāya, namely "Practise what you preach."

Ed. note. cf. Paropadeśe pāṇḍityam.

274

Pāṭaccaraluṅṭhite veśmani yāmikajāgaraṇam.

The vigilance of the watchman after the house has been plundered by thieves.
Equivalent to our proverb, "Shutting the stable door after the horse is gone." It occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 45:-

"Prayojanānupayukte kāle tasya svarūpato'vasthānaṃ pāṭaccaraluṅṭhite
veśmani yāmikajāgaraṇavṛttāntam anuhatati."

275

Pāṭanam antareṇa viṣavraṇānāṃ nopaśāntiḥ.

Poisoned wounds will not heal without the use of the lancet. This is found in *Jaiminīya-nyāyamālāvistara* 3. 8. 4, as follows:-

"Na hi duḥkharūpaṃ tapo vinā duḥkhapradaṃ pāpaṃ naśyati. Yathā loke
pāṭanam antareṇa viṣavraṇānāṃ nopaśāntiḥ."

This is perhaps the source of Raghunātha's Vraṇaṃ śīśamayīṣoḥ śāstragrahaṇanyāyaḥ, which he makes use of thus: "Nirantaraṃ duḥkhamayasamsāraparivṛttiśrāntānāṃ jīvanāṃ kañcit kālaṃ vikṣepaviḡamasamullasadātmānandānubhavena viśrāntiṃ sampādayitukāmasya tasya samhārāya tamograhaṇasya duścikitsyavraṇapīḡitānāṃ vraṇaṃ śīśamayīṣoḥ śāstragrahaṇanyāyena

'Nidānājñasya bhiṣajo rugṇahiṃsāṃ prayuñjataḥ.
Na kiṃcid api nairghṇyaṃ ghṇaivātra prayojikā.'

Iti Śivapurāṇe vyākhyātena niratiśayakarūṇāmbudhitvaliṅgāt."

To understand this somewhat involved sentence, it is necessary to bear in mind that sampādayitukāmasya refers to Śiva, whose benevolent intentions toward humanity are the subject of the immediate context. Contrast with the above the following saying of Sureśvara's (in *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika* 4. 3. 176),

"Na dāhajvaranuttartham agninā syād bhiṣakkriyā."

Ed. note: J's text reads bhrāntānām. We believe it should read: śrāntānām.

276

Pāṭhakramanyāyaḥ.

The law of *textual sequence*. It forms the subject of Jaimini 5. 1. 4-7. According to the Mīmāṃsā, there are six kinds of sequence; namely, (1) *Śrutikrama*, or 'direct sequence,' which is treated of in the first sūtra of this chapter. It is known as the *Śrutibalīyastva-nyāya*, and is regarded as the strongest of the six. Then (2) *Arthakrama*, or 'logical sequence,' which is discussed in sūtra 2, and in which the sequence is determined by the sense rather than by the order of the text. For example, take the sentence "Agnihotraṃ juhotyodanaṃ pacati," where the boiling of the rice must necessarily precede the offering of the agnihotra, although the former is mentioned first. Again when we read, "Jāte varam dadāti, jātam añjalinā grṇāti, jātam abhiprāṇiti," the logical sequence, as Śabara shows, is in the reverse order of the textual. Then comes (3) *Pāṭhakrama*, as above, which Śabara illustrates by the following Vedic passage:- "Samidho yajati, tanūnapātaṃ yajati, iḡo yajati, barhiryajati, svāhākāraṃ yajati iti." To quote Kunte:- "These are what are called the five Prayāja oblations; and the sequence in which these texts occur shows the order in which they are to be offered. This is the application of what is called Pāṭhakrama, or textual sequence." Under the Rājapurapraveśanyāya (*yathāsthānam sanniviṣṭa*) will be found a passage from *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 58 (vārt. 1) which furnishes a good example of the supersession of this kind of sequence by *Arthakrama*. The next is (4) *Pravṛttikrama*, which forms the subject of sūtras 8-12. Kunte calls it 'practical sequence.' "In a series of acts, to be performed upon a series of objects, a beginning is made from some one object; then, in performing all the acts, the same object is acted upon first. This sequence is called Pravṛttikrama, which signifies sequence determined by the conduct of the individual." It is known as the

Prāvartikakramanyāya. The remaining two varieties are the Sthānakrama and Mukhyakrama.

Kunte's notes on this portion are well worth a reference; and much help, too, is to be had from Dr. Thibaut's translation of the *Arthasaṅgraha*, where (on pages 11-15) the six forms of *krama* are explained under Prayogavidhi.

The use of these technical terms is not confined to the Mīmāṃsakas, but is very common amongst writers on Vedānta also. Four of the above varieties of *krama* are mentioned in *Bhāmātī* 1. 1. 1, pages 47-49, beginning with the words,

"Mā bhūḍ agnihotrāyavāgūpākavadārthaḥ kramaḥ &c.," and enlarged upon in *Vedāntakalpataru*, pages 32-34; then, in *Bhāmātī* 4. 3. 6, we read, "Pāṭhakramād arthakramo balavān iti yathārthakramam paṭhyante sūtrāṇi," and so sūtra 12 is next explained, and afterwards sūtra 7. For the *pāṭhakrama* only, see Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 3. 15 (page 620).

Ed. note. Many additional references are given here. All very useful.

277

Pādaprasārikā.

Professor Venis tells me that the Benares paṇḍits regard this as a shortened form of the Bhikṣupādaprasāraṇanyāya (which see yathāsthāna) and that it means "unduly extending one's claim or one's position generally." Its equivalent in Marāṭhī is pāya pasaraṇem, which, Molesworth tells us, means "to establish one's self freely and fully: to extend one's power far and wide." He gives, as an example of its use, the Marāṭhī proverb, "Bhaṭṭāsa dilī osarī, bhaṭṭa pāya pasarī," which is the equivalent of our, "Give him an inch and he'll take an ell." In the passages, however, in which I have met with the expression, it seems to employ a *dogged adherence to a position* in spite of previous failure, and when there is little prospect of further success. Two passages in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, pages 798 and 907, seem to confirm this:-

"Etat sarvam anālocya kṛtvā pādaprasārikām.
Vivekacakṣuḥ sammīlya svapanti nanu jantavaḥ."

"Tato viṣādam āpannaḥ sarvakarmaparāṅmukhaḥ.
Sthito'haṃ maunam ālambya kṛtvā pādaprasārikām."

There are two other instances of it on pages 656, 657 of the same, and it occurs three times in the *Nyāyamañjarī*, as follows. On page 113: "Evaṃ hi dvividhaṃ pratibandham anumeyāvvyabhicāranibandhanam anuktvā kevalasāhacaryaniyamamātravarṇanam

yat prasārikā saiveti. Ucyate. Pādaprasārikaiva sādhyasī sthūladṛṣṭibhir avalambitā varam, na sūkṣmadṛṣṭibhir utprekṣitās tādātmyādipratibandhāḥ."

On page 121:

"Yaṃ kañcid artham ālokya yaḥ kaścinnāvagamyate.
Kañcid evākṣipatyartham arthaḥ kaścid iti sthitiḥ.

Tatra vastusvabhāvo'yam iti pādaprasārikā.
Dṛśyate hyavinābhūtād arthād arthāntare matiḥ."

On page 504:- "Na ca na kadācid anīdṛṣaṃ jagad iti pādaprasārikāmātraṃ kartum ucitaṃ, sargaprabandhapralayaprabandhasya samarthitvatvād iti.

Ataśca pakṣāntaradurbalatvād
yathoditaḥ sidhyati bhūtavargaḥ.
Taṃ yas tu paśyannapi nihnuvīta
tasmai namaḥ paṇḍitaśekharāya."

There is one instance of it in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* (page 31) also:- "Na ca sattābhedānantyam astyevetyapi pādaprasārikā nistārāya," which is rendered by Prof. Gangānātha Jhā:- "Nor will you escape from this predicament by *taking the long step* of assuming an infinity of different kinds of real existence." *Indian Thought*, page 17.

Ed. note. The reprint here is much worse than other places. The copy used must have been faded. The reprinter did not care at all. As long as a white paper was blackened even a little bit it had acquired the power of producing full profit. What did it matter if it was readable or not at all? Books are bought in Indian libraries today generally not on the basis of their internal as well as external qualities, but on the basis of something else. The booksellers know and the librarians too know. There are exceptions too, and all honor to them. Thanks, Nirajana, you have rendered a great service to the scholars of Sanskrit around the world.

It is disgusting to see even a poetry featured as prose. Yet the book runs in several editions and then brings a lot of money to the reprinter.

278

Piṇḍam utsṛjya karaṃ leḍhi.

Leaving the sweet morsel, he licks his hand! It is found in *Pañcapādikā*, page 49, as follows:-

"Atha vedādhikaraṇe vedāṃścaike sannikarṣam iti viśeṣābhidhānād vaidika-
tvasiddhir iti. So'yamābhāṅako loke piṇḍam utsrjya karam leḍhīti sūtrakārasyaṅpya-
kauśalam pradarśitam syāt."

In Raghunātha's list, it appears as Piṇḍam hitvā karam leḍhi. We compare it with the saying, "Kṣīram viḥyārocakagrastaḥ sauvīrarucim anubhavati."

Ed. note. Here "grastaḥ" is correctly put. Elsewhere (1:22) it is put as "grastasya" which is wrong.

279

Piṇyākayācanārthaṃ gatasya khārikātailadātṛtvābhyupagamaḥ.

He went to crave the leavings of the oil-seed, and had instead to agree to give 16 measures of oil. Used of one completely worsted in argument. I render piṇyāka in accordance with its meaning in Pañchatantra iii. 99 ("Śreyas tailam ca piṇyākāt"). The maxim is found in the Pūrṇaprajña section of the Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jīvānanda):- "So'yam piṇyākayācanārthaṃ gatasya khārikātailadātṛtvābhyupagama iva," which Prof. Gough renders:- "And thus it must be allowed that, in raising the objection, you have begged for a little oil-cake, and have had to give us gallons of oil."

Ed. note. SDS commentator discusses this nyāya and displays poverty of his understanding. He interprets this nyāya in an absurd manner. He says: He (the man) goes for begging a little piṇyāka (small piece of the leavings of oil, probably called khalī in Hindi) but gets instead oil measured khārikā (a large quantity). Nonsense and rubbish. Mukham astīti vaktavyam. The commentator totally overlooks the word dātṛtva. In reality, his mission turns out to be disastrous for him.

280

Pitranusṛtastanandhayanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a father's conforming to [the ways of] his little child*. This is set forth as a model for the knower of Brahma, that, by a lowly and humble demeanour, he may attract the ignorant. It is thus explained in the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*:

"Kṛtakṛtyasya tattvavidō'tattvaviduddhārītiriktakartavyābhāvād yathā tadud-
dhāraḥ syāt tathaiva kartavyam. Surendrādīpūjyēnāpi viduṣā pitranusṛtastanandha-
yanyāyēnāñjō'nusartavyaḥ. Tair nindyamāno'pi dehasya nindyatvam ātmano'vāñ-
manasagamyatvaṃ ca jānan nodvijet. Kintu pratyuta tacceṣṭānusāreṇa svayam apyā-
caret."

In the larger work, the following passage is quoted by way of illustration: "Taduktam vṛddhaiḥ: ...

Avidvadanusāreṇa vṛttir buddhasya yujyate.
Stanandhayānusāreṇa varttate tatpitā yataḥ.

Adhikṣiptas tāḍito vā bālena svapitā tadā.
Na kliśnāti na kupyec ca bālaṃ pratyuta lālayet.

Ninditaḥ stūyamāno vā vidvān ajñair na nindati.
Na stauti kintu teṣāṃ syād yathā bodhas tathācaret."

The "elder" is Vidyāraṇya, and the verses are *Pancadaśī* VII. 286-288.

Ed. note. The saṃśodhaka mahāśaya of the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* (Varanasi, 1902), makes this nyāya to read: Pitṛā mṛtastanandhaya ! Editorial excellence at its best. The work of a Mahāmahopādhyāya, and a Professor at the Govt. Sanskrit College in the holy city of Varanasi, which has been a great seat of learning since time immemorial. We don't know how a father can be an instrument of the murder of his own son! Note the original. It says *stanandhaya*. This Mahāmahopādhyāya gave only his name and title to the title-page. He gave neither his time nor attention to the contents. And yet he had the audacity to call himself saṃśodhaka while he was actually a duḥśodhaka..

The job of seeing the book through the press--just blackening the white paper--was entrusted to a junior janitor of the college, who performed this job in between his cleaning of two toilets. It is a great credit to the College that even a junior janitor could perform so well. It is the mähātmya of a puṇyakṣetra.

281

Piśācānāṃ piśācabhāṣayaivottaraṃ deyam.

Piśācas should be answered in the Piśāca language. This nyāya is found on pages 214 and 410 of *Sarvārthasiddhi* (on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 49 and iv. 13), in the first instance in conjunction with "Yakṣānurūpo baliḥ," with which it is clearly synonymous. See "Yādṛśo yakṣas tādṛśo baliḥ."

Ed. note. Cf. *Jasa munha tasa thapaḍā* (Hindi). *Yādṛśam mukham tādṛśī capeṭā.*

282

Piṣṭapeṣaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the grinding of that which is already ground*. Fruitless reiteration, unproductive repetition. The oldest instance known to me of the employment of the nyāya is by Śabara on Jaimini 9. 2. 3:- "Na hi snigdhasya snehanam śakyam kartum, piṣṭasya vā peṣaṇam." It occurs again in 12. 2. 16, and in *Tantravārtika*, pp. 54 and 477. We find it likewise in Śaṅkara's bhāṣya on *Kena-Upanishad* 32:- "Yadi tāvac chrutasyārthasya praśnaḥ kṛtas tataḥ piṣṭapeṣaṇavat punarukto'narthakaḥ praśnaḥ syāt," and in Sudarśanārya's comment on *Āpastamba-Gṛihyasūtra* xiv. 9 ("Pumsavanam vyakte garbhe tiṣyeṇa"), where he says, "Idam api sīmantavat prathama eva, na tu pratigarbham, piṣṭapeṣaṇanyāyāt."

Compare Tuṣakaṇḍananyāya.

283

Purastād apavādā anantarān vidhīn bādhante nottarān.

This *grammatical nyāya* is *paribhāṣā* LIX in Nāgojībhaṭṭa's treatise, and is taken from *Mahābhāṣya* 6. 1. 89 (under vārtika 2). Professor Kielhorn translates as follows:- "Apavādas that precede [the rules which teach operations that have to be superseded by the Apavāda-operations] supersede only those rules that stand nearest to them, not the subsequent rules." It is found also in Patañjali 1. 1. 28; 3. 2. 1 (6); 3. 3. 95; 3. 4. 85; 4. 1. 55 (4); 4. 3. 132 (6); 4. 3. 156 (7); 6. 1. 102 (6); 6. 4. 163 (2); and 8. 3. 112. In not one of these examples, however, do the words "nottarān" appear.

284

Puṣṭalaguḍanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a stout cudgel*. Such a stick, hurled at a yelping cur, may at the same time strike and silence other dogs near it; and so the nyāya seems to be used somewhat in the sense of "Killing two birds with one stone." It is thus defined by Raghunātha:-

"Ekātāntrikamatānirāsāya prayuktayā yuktyā tatsadṛśamatāntaranirākaraṇam yadā vivakṣyate tadā puṣṭalaguḍanyāyapravṛttiḥ. Yathā bahūnām śunām madhya ekasya śunaḥ prahārārtham prakṣiptaḥ puṣṭalaguḍas taṁ prahr̥tyānyānapi praharati, tathā Brahmakāraṇavādibhiḥ sāṅkhyābhimatapradhānakāraṇavādanirāsāya prayuktā 'Īkṣaternāśabdam' 'Racanānupapatteś ca nānumānam' ityādisamanvayāvirodhādhyāya-gatasūtrasthā yuktayas taṁ nirasya yogābhimatapradhānakāraṇavādam api sāmyān nirākurvantīti dik."

The simile is employed in this sense in *Advaitabrahmasiddhi*, page 100:-

"Na cedam doṣatrayam vaiśeṣikeṣūktam tad eva vijñānavādiṣu kimartham āpa-
dyata iti vācyam. Puṣṭalaguḍanyāyena vaiśeṣikamata iva 'antaḥ sat' itivādino 'bahih
sat' itivādinaś ca Bauddhasya mate'pi prasaratītyabhiprāyāt."

It is akin to Pradhānamallanibarhaṇanyāya, which see in its place. [There are no
more three separate sequences and no more frustrating search. ed.]

Ed. note. Jacob has drawn a great deal of his "matter" from both the works of
Raghunātha Varmā Udāsīna. Yet he seldom has a kind word for him.

285

Pūrvam hyapavādā abhiniviśante paścād utsargāḥ.

Special rules are taken into consideration first, and afterwards general rules. "The
meaning is this that he who is guided solely by the rules (of grammar) first looks about to
find out where the *Apavāda* applies, and having thus ascertained that a particular form
does not fall under that (*Apavāda*), he employs for its formation the general rule." See
Dr. Kielhorn's translation of Nāgojī's *paribhāṣā* 62. It is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 4. 85
(vārt. 11); 3. 1. 3 (vārt. 10); 3. 2. 124 (vārt. 10); 4. 1. 89 (vārt. 2); 6. 1. 5 (vārt. 2); 6. 1.
161 and 186.

286

Prakalpya vāpavādaviṣayam tata utsargo'bhiniviśate.

This is another of Raghunātha's samples of grammatical rules and is closely connected
with *pūrvam hyapavādāḥ &c.*, to which it forms an alternative. Dr. Kielhorn's translation
of it, in the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, is as follows:- "Or (we may say that) first all forms
which fall under the *Apavāda* are set aside, and that subsequently the general rule is
employed (in the formation of the remaining forms)." It is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 4. 85
(vārt. 11); 3. 1. 3 (vārt. 10); 3. 2. 124 (vārt. 10); 6. 1. 5 (vārt. 2); 6. 1. 161; and 6. 1. 186.
In each case it is immediately preceded by the *paribhāṣā pūrvam hyapavādāḥ &c.*, the
latter standing alone only in 4. 1. 89 (vārt. 2).

287

Prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārtham saha brūtaḥ.

*The base and the suffix jointly [simultaneously] convey the meaning which is under-
stood [from the word].* This is found in Patañjali 3. 1. 67, vārtika 2, and the rendering is
that which was given me (in 1903) by my learned friend, Dr. Kielhorn, who also
explained that *pratyayārtham* is equivalent to *pratīyamānārtham*. This seems to be the

only reasonable explanation of the term. The nyāya is used in the above form by Śabara on Jaimini 3. 4. 13 (page 320), and 10. 8. 24 (page 677), and appears also in *Tantravārtika* 3. 1. 12 (page 686). It is quoted, however, with a slight addition in *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 4, line 14, where it becomes "Prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārthaṃ saha brūtaḥ prādhānyeneti nyāyena," and (in *Indian Thought* for January 1907, page 51) it is rendered by Dr. Thibaut, "According to the principle 'that the root and the affix of a verb conjointly signify *principally* what the affix denotes,'" - a rendering which differs materially from that given above. In this altered form, it is found again in the Rāmānuja section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, where Mr. Gough gives as its English equivalent, "The base and the suffix convey the meaning conjointly, and, of these, the meaning of the suffix takes the lead." This would seem to be based on an expression of Mādhava's in *Nyāyamālāvistara* 3. 4. 8, namely, "Prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārthaṃ saha brūtas, tayos tu pratyayaḥ prādhānyeneti śābdikair udghoṣaṇāt.

"To say that whilst the root and the suffix unitedly convey the meaning, the latter is the more important factor, is a very different thing from asserting that the two parts together convey the meaning of one of them! Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, on page 403 of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, says truly,

"Prakṛtipratyayau parasparāpekṣam artham abhidadhāte, na ca prakṛtyā pratyayārtho 'bhidhīyate, niyogasya dhātuvācyatvāt. Na ca pratyayena prakṛtyartho 'bhidhīyate yāgādeḥ liṅvācyatvānupapatteḥ. Na ca tau pṛthak pṛthak svakāryaṃ kurutaḥ."

One more example of the nyāya may be adduced from *Tantravārtika* 2.1.1 (page 348), with Prof. Gangānāth Jhā's translation: "Śāstre tu sarvatra pratyayārtho bhāvaneti vyavahāraḥ. Tatrāyam abhiprāyaḥ :-

Pratyayārthaṃ saha brūtaḥ prakṛtipratyayau sadā.
Prādhānyād bhāvanā tena pratyayārtho 'vadhāryate."

"In the Mīmāṃsā Śāstra, however, the Bhāvanā is always held to be signified by the affix. The sense of this theory may be thus briefly explained. The sense of the affix is always expressed by the root and affix taken together; and as the Bhāvanā is the most important factor in this joint signification, it is held to be signified by the affix."

The word bhāvanā means 'a creative energy,' or 'productive energy,' or 'tendency to realize something.' So Dr. Thibaut. In the *Arthasāṅgraha* (page 2), it is defined as "Bhavitur bhavanānukūlo bhāvayitur vyāpāraviśeṣaḥ," "the particular activity of some productive agent (bhāvayitṛi) which tends to bring about the existence of something which is going to be (bhavitṛi); which is capable of future existence" (Trans. p. 3). It is further declared to be twofold, as śābdī and ārthī. For the meaning of these, see, specially, Professor Cowell's translation of the Jaimini section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, page 182.

Ed. note. Further references are given here. They are valuable.

288

Pratinidhinyāyaḥ.

The rule as to *the substitution* [of one material for another, in a sacrifice]. This subject is dealt with in Jaimini 6. 3. 13-17, the five sūtras being styled "Nitya-karmaṇo'nityaprārabdhakarmanāś ca pratinidhinā samāpanādhikaraṇam." Other aspects of pratinidhāna are discussed in all the subsequent sūtras of the pāda. Kunte's summary of the teaching of this pāda is well worth reading. [Imp. to note. Ed.]

The nyāya occurs in the following passage of Śaṅkara's bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3.3.40, and I append Dr. Thibaut's translation:- "Bhojanalope'pyadbhirvā'nyena vā dravyeṇā-viruddhena pratinidhānanyāyena prāṇāgnihotrasyānuṣṭhānam iti." "Even in the case of the omission of eating, the agnihotra offered to the Prāṇas has to be performed by means of water or some other not altogether unsuitable material, according to the Mīmāṃsā principle that, in the absence of the prescribed material, some other suitable material may be substituted." It must not, however, be supposed that the choice of the "suitable material" was left to the sacrificer; the substitute was as rigidly prescribed as that for which it might be substituted. For instance, the juice of the Pūtīka plant was the only allowable substitute for that of the Soma plant, and Nīvāra for rice. Rāmānuja mentions both in *Śrībhāṣya*, page 508, and Patañjali speaks of one, in his discussion of ādeśa, in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 56 (vārt. 13). The passages from the two authors stand thus:

"Somābhāve ca pūtīka-grahaṇam śruticoditam.
Somāvayavasadbhāvād iti nyāyavido viduḥ.
Vrīhyabhāve ca nīvāra-grahaṇam vrīhibhāvataḥ." (R)

"Vede'pi somasya sthāne pūtīkatṛṇānyabhiṣuṇuyād ityucyate." (P)

289

Prati pradhānam guṇa āvartanīyaḥ.

A subordinate act is to be repeated in the case of each principal thing. The nyāya in this form is found in *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara* 3.1.7, and in the *Mīmāṃsāparibhāṣā*, page 36, in connection with what is termed the Grahaikatvanyāya, which is based on the Vedic injunction "Daśāpavitreṇa graham saṃmārṣti." Mādhava says:- "Graham iti dvitīyayā grahasyoddeśyatayā prayo janavattayā ca prādhānyam gamyate. Graham prati guṇaḥ saṃmārgaḥ. Pratipradhānam ca guṇa āvartanīya iti nyāyena yāvanto grahāḥ santi te saṃmārjanīyāḥ."

In *Jaiminīyasūtravṛtti*, the nyāya is quoted as "Pratipradhānam aṅgāvṛttiḥ." Prof. Gangānātha's rendering (on page xxxiii of the Introduction to his translation of *Śloka-*

vārtika) is, "with regard to each Primary, the Secondary is to be repeated." See the *Grahaikatvanyāya* in connection with this.

290

Pratyakṣe kim anumānam.

When there is sense-perception, what need is there of inference? So, Raghunātha; but I have nowhere met with the saying in this form. It is a well-known principle, however. Kumārila says in *Tantravārtika*, page 87:

"Vedavākya-numānam hi tāvad eva pravartate.
Tadarthaviṣayaṃ yāvat pratyakṣaṃ nopalabhyate.

Pratyakṣe śrūyamāṇe tu na vidyeta-numānikam.
Na hi hastini dṛṣṭe'pi tatpadenānumeṣyate."

Amalānanda, too, in *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 368: "Pratyakṣe ca yāgavidhāvānumānikavidhikalpanā'nupapannā."

In Śābara 3.1.12 (page 216) we read Pratyakṣam anumānād balīyaḥ, but Patañjali points out (in *Mahābhāṣya* 3. 2. 124) that this is not always the case. He says:

"Bhavati vai pratyakṣād apyanumānabalīyastvam. Tadyathā. Alātacakraṃ pratyakṣaṃ dṛśyate-numānācca gamyate naitad astīti." There are two references to this in *Nyāyamañjarī*. On page 461 (line 7 from bottom) we read: "Yadyapi ca naiṣa niyamaḥ pratyakṣānumānāyor virodhe pratyakṣaṃ balīya iti, tvaritataraparibhramitacakrībhavadalātagrāhiṇaḥ pratyakṣasyānumānabādhitatvadarśanād iti &c." And on page 609 (line 6 from bottom):- "Atha manuṣe niyama evaiṣa pratyakṣānumānāyor virodhe pratyakṣam eva balīya iti, tad evānumānasya bādhakam ucitaṃ nānumānāntaram iti. Tadasat. Alātacakrādaḥ pratyakṣam apyanumānenānanyathāsiddhena bādhyata eva. Nanu bhramaṇavirataḥ parimitaparimāṇolmukagrāhi pratyakṣam eva tatra pratyakṣasya bādhakam nānumānam iti. Maivam. Anavarataparibhramaṇasamudbhūta-cakrāvabhāsasamaya evānumānena tadbhāntatāniścayāt."

For Alātacakra, see also *Nyāyasūtra* 3.2.59; *Bhāmātī*, page 373, line 15; *Śālikā*, page 36; and *Vākyapadīya*, i. 131.

With the quotation from Kumārila, compare the following from *Nyāyakanikā*, page 268, and *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 27: "Na hi pratyakṣeṇa kariṇi dṛṣṭe'pi cītkāreṇa tam anumimate prekṣāvantaḥ."

Śāṅkara Mīśra cites this in his comment on *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* 3. 2. 10.

Ed. note: Jacob reads: ...numiṣyate.

291

Pradīpavat.

The simile of a lamp. We have here another of the many lamp illustrations. In *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 49 (vārt. 4), an *adhikāra* is said to be of three kinds, and, in the first, it is likened to a lamp in the following words:- "Kaścīd ekadeśasthaḥ sarvaṃ śāstram abhijvalayati, yathā pradīpaḥ suprajvalita ekadeśasthaḥ sarvaṃ veśmābhijvalayati." In the opening part of 2. 1. 1, where the question is asked, "Kaḥ punar *adhikāra-paribhāṣayor viśeṣaḥ*," the *paribhāṣā*, and not the *adhikāra*, is likened to a lamp, in the same words as above.

Nāgeśa (in vol. iii. page 8 of the *Uddyota*) quotes the following verse:-

"Ekadeśasthitā śāstra-bhavane yāti dīpatām.
Parito vyāpṛtām bhāṣām paribhāṣām pracakṣate."

We find the same figure in Jaimini's *sūtra* 11. 1. 60, which Śabara explains thus: "Pradīpa ekasmin pradeśe bhūñjānānām brāhmaṇām ekasya sannidhau prajvalitaḥ sarveṣām upakāraṃ karoti." In dealing with this *adhikāraṇa* Mādhava substitutes the figure of a single *dancer* amusing a number of spectators. See the *Nartakanyāya* in its place.

292

Pradīpe pradīpaṃ prajvālya tamonāśāya yatamānaḥ.

Trying to remove the dimness of a lamp by lighting another. Used of foolishly superfluous and misdirected effort. It occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhāṇḍakhāḍya*, page 294:- "Laghor upāyāt sādhyasiddhau bhavantiyām...gurāvupāye pravartamānasya tavaivedaṃ doṣodbhāvanam pradīpe pradīpaṃ prajvālya tamonāśāya yatamānasyeva puṃsaḥ."

In a footnote, the editor says:- "Pradīpaṃ prajvālya pradīpe tamonāśāya yatamānasya puṃsa ivetyanvayaḥ."

In *Upadeśasāhasri* xvii. 41 (page 215), we read:-

"Na hi dīpāntarāpekṣā yadvad dīpaprakāśane.
Bodhasyātmasvarūpatvān na bodho'nyas tatheṣyate";

and, in Sureśvara's *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika* 4. 3. 501:-

"Nanu dīpaḥ svam ātmānaṃ svātmanaivāvabhāsayan.
Dr̥ṣṭo dīpaprakāśārthaṃ na hi dīpāntarāhṛtiḥ."

See also *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 625, on *Nyāyasūtra* 5. 1. 10.

Ed. note. Here is a see also reference.

293

Pradhānamallanibarhaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the destruction of the chief antagonist*. The principle that when the most formidable enemy has been defeated, the less formidable are already virtually overcome. In the bhāṣya on *Vedāntasūtra* 1. 4. 28 ("Etena sarve vyākhyātā vyākhyātāḥ"), we read: "Ataḥ pradhānamallanibarhaṇanyāyenātidiśati. Etena pradhānakāraṇavādapraṭiṣedha-nyāyakalāpena sarve'ṇuvādikāraṇavādā api praṭiṣiddhatayā vyākhyātā veditavyāḥ."

Here, there is undoubtedly a play on the word *pradhāna*, the Sāṅkhya theory of the *Pradhāna* being the chief antagonist met and overcome in the foregoing *Sūtras* and *bhāṣhya*. The same expression appears again in the *bhāṣhya* on *Sūtra* 2. 1. 12, and the maxim is found, too, in the Rāmānuja chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 54 of Jivānanda's edition, and p. 45 of Bib. Ind. edition).

294

Prapānakarasanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *sherbet*. Used to illustrate the production of some new thing by the union of others, just as *sherbet* is the result of the commingling of various ingredients. It appears in *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 46, as follows:

"Pratīyamānaḥ prathamam pratyekaṃ hetur ucyate.
Tataḥ saṃvalitaḥ sarvo vibhāvādiḥ sacetasām.
Prapānakarasanyāyāc carvyamāṇo raso bhavet."

Yathā khaṇḍamaricādīnāṃ sammelanād apūrva iva kaścid āsvādaḥ prapāna-
karase sañjāyate, vibhāvādisammelanād ihāpi tathetyarthaḥ."

This is meant to show how Flavour is single, though spoken of as resulting from a composition of causes. Dr. Ballantyne translates thus:- "First each reason [or cause ? ed.] is mentioned separately as being perceived; and [then we say] let all this commingled--the Excitants and the rest--constitute, like the [composite] Flavour of *sherbet*, the flavour tasted by the intelligent. As from the commingling of sugar, pepper

&c., a certain unprecedented relish is produced in the shape of the flavour of the sherbet, so is it here also, from the commingling of the Excitants &c., such is the meaning."

The same illustration is found in *Nyāyamañjarī* (page 372) with pānaka instead of prapānaka. "Padārthebhyo'nya eva vākyārthaḥ pānakādivat. Yathā pānakaṃ śarkarā-nāgakeśaramaricādibhyo'rthāntaram eva, yathā ca sindūraharitālākṣādibhyo'rthāntaram eva citraṃ, tathā padebhyo vākyam padārthebhyo vākyārthaḥ."

Also *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 219, line 26.

Ed. Note:- Jacob reads carvyamāṇe for carvyamāṇo.

295

Pramāṇavattvād āyātaḥ pravāhaḥ kena vāryate.

Who can resist a stream [of argument] flowing [steadily on] because established by proof? This seems to be the sense of the nyāya as quoted at the beginning of the Ārḥata section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. The passage is as follows:

"Atha manyethāḥ "Pramāṇavattvād āyātaḥ pravāhaḥ kena vāryata" iti nyāyena yat sat tat kṣaṇikam ityādinā pramāṇena kṣaṇikatāyāḥ pramitatayā &c."

Professor Cowell renders it thus:- "But the opponent may maintain "The unbroken stream (of momentary sensation) has been fairly proved by argument, so who can prevent it? In this way, since our tenet has been demonstrated by the argument, whatever is, is momentary &c." In a footnote to page 62 of his translation of this portion of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* in *Le Bouddhisme d'apres les sources brahmaniques*, Professor L. de la Vallee Poussin has recorded Professor Leumann's comment on the above rendering which he considers inaccurate in respect of the nyāya. The criticism is just, but, unfortunately, the printer has made a mess of the rendering which the critic proposes to substitute for Mr. Cowell's.

ED. NOTE: I wish Jacob could see to what extent his printer has made a mess of his text.

296

Pramāṇavantyadṛṣṭāni kalpyāni subahūnyapi.

Unseen influences [springing from actions, and eventually producing certain effects], however numerous, may be assumed [as the causes of those effects], if of established credibility. This nyāya is the first line of a verse in *Tantravārtika* 2. 1. 5, where the important dogma of the existence of apūrva is discussed. The second line is,

"Adṛṣṭaśatabhāgo'pi na kalpyo hyapramāṇakaḥ."

The whole verse is quoted in Sureśvara's *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika*, page 1124, and again on page 1797; whilst the first line is found in *Tātparyaṭikā*, page 437, as follows:

"Na cānekādṛṣṭakalpanābhayān mukhyārthaparityāgo nyāyyaḥ, pramāṇasiddhe -niyogaparyanuyogānupapatteḥ. Yathāhuḥ. Śrutasiddhyartham aśrutopalabdḥau yatnavatā bhavitavyaṃ. na tu śrutaśaithilyam āīyam iti. Tathā pramāṇavantyadṛṣṭāni kalpyāni subahūnyapi."

There is another example in *Citsukhī* i. 23 (Paṇḍit, vol. v, page 27):-

"Etenobhayapadalakṣaṇāsvīkāre gauravadoṣo nirasto veditavyaḥ. Bubhutsitārthapratipādanaprayojanatayā gauravasyaivocitatvāt pramāṇavantyadṛṣṭāni kalpyāni subahūnyapītinyāyāt."

A third will be found in *Khaṇḍana*, page 74, on which the commentator says, "Yatrādṛṣṭe pramāṇaṃ pravartate tad adṛṣṭam api ... prāmāṇikair abhyupagamyate." See, too, *Tattvadīpana*, page 416, and *Bhāmātī*, page 463.

Raghunāthavarman gives the verse in a different form. According to him, the first line is "Bālāgraśatabhāgo'pi na kalpyo niṣpramāṇakaḥ," whilst "pramāṇavanti &c." is the second. In the numbered part of his larger work, it is called the Bālāgraśatabhāgo'pi nyāya; but, towards the end of the volume, he quotes (without acknowledgment) the above-cited passage of *Citsukhī* (together with a good deal of the context), which contains the nyāya in its proper form. On page 514 of his translation of the *Tantravārtika*, Prof. Gangānātha Jhā renders the whole verse thus:- "It is a rule, in all cases, that a large number of unseen agencies may always be assumed, when all of them are justified by some authority; while even the hundredth part of an unseen agency should not be assumed, if there is no authority for it."

It may be well to call attention here to this transcendental power adṛṣṭa, or apūrva, invented [thank you very much, Colonel, ed.] by the philosophers in order to account for present things without divine intervention. In his article on Mīmāṃsā (*Essays*, vol. i, page 343), Colebrooke says:- "The subject which most engages attention throughout the *Mīmāṃsā*, recurring at every turn, is the invisible or spiritual operation of an act of merit. The action ceases, yet the consequence does not immediately ensue. A *virtue* meantime subsists, unseen, but efficacious to connect the consequence with its past and remote cause, and to bring about at a distant period, or in another world, the relative effect. That unseen virtue is termed apūrva, being a relation superinduced, *not before* possessed." Goldstucker (s. v. apūrva) quotes Kumārila to the effect that Mīmāṃsakas apply that term *exclusively* to the unseen influence which follows a *sacrificial* act; that attending action of other kinds being styled saṃskāra. The passage will be found in *Tantravārtika*, page 367. A helpful description of apūrva is given also in *Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* (pages 149 and 150), where it is rendered by Fitzedward Hall

"requitative efficacy." In K. M. Banerjea's excellent work, *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*, page 140, adṛṣṭa is defined as follows:- "Technically, in the usage of philosophers, it means a power or influence inhering in things both animate and inanimate. As inherent in the former, it implies an unseen power, both intellectual and active; as inherent in the latter, it signifies a material power, perhaps partly the effect of previous combinations and motions ... This unseen moving power in men is again the consequence of works done in a previous life, and hence it stands sometimes for dharma and adharma (virtue and vice) and karma (works)." I imagine that it would tax the ingenuity of even a Mīmāṃsaka to produce *proof* of adṛṣṭa and its working; yet they tell us that it is not to be accepted without proof!

Ed. note. A non-believer in Faith fails to realize full significance of a transcendental phenomenon--the Ultimate Reality. Jacob is quite sarcastic where only Faith and Tradition rule supreme. No question is raised in such matters. Accept it or don't go near it. He is today's Cārvāka. Unfortunately, however, he is not a Cāruvāk.

Cf. Kratau supte jāgrat... *Śiva-Mahimnaḥ stotram*, 20.

297

Prayojanam anuddiśya na mando'pi pravartate.

Even a stupid person does not adopt a course of action without a motive. This oft-quoted line is found in the *Ślokavārtika* (page 653) in connection with an argument regarding a Creator of the universe. The need of a motive for action is pointed out on page 4 also of the same work. The following passage from *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 191, is a reminiscence of Kumārila's argument that, if the Creator acted without a motive, his intelligence would be at fault:-

Kim kim api prayojanam ananusandhāya jagatsarge pravartate prajāpatir eva vā. Niṣprayojanāyām pravṛttāvaprekṣāpūrvakāritvād unmattatulyo'sau bhavet."

On page 339 of the *Nyāyakanikā*, Vācaspati Miśra says: "Prekṣāvatām hi pravṛtṭiḥ prayojanavattāvyāptā, prayojanavattābhāve na bhavati śiṃśapāvatvam iva tarutvābhāva ityarthaḥ."

We find the nyāya quoted in full by Ānandagiri in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 2. 1. The two passages are the following:- "Tat triguṇam pradhānam mṛdvad acetanam cetanasya puruṣayārtham sādhayitum svabhāvenaiva vicitreṇa vikārātmanā vivartata iti." "Cetanasyeti. Arthaśabdo bhogāpavargārthaḥ. Acetanasya prayojanaparijñānābhāvād apravṛtṭiḥ. Prayojanam anuddiśya mando'pi na pravartata iti nyāyād ityāśaṅkyāha svabhāveneti."

Patañjali (in *Mahābhāṣya* 3. 1. 26, vārt. 14) tells us that, with whole classes of people, *the motive* which actuates them is a purely selfish one. He says:

"Neha kaścit paro'nugrahītavya iti pravartate. Sarva ime svabhūtyartham pravartante. Ye tāvad ete guruśuśrūṣavo nāma te'pi svabhūtyartham eva pravartante pāralaukikaṃ no bhaviṣyatīha ca naḥ pṛito gurur adhyāpayiṣyatīti. Tathā yad etad dāsakarmakaraṃ nāmaite'pi svabhūtyartham eva pravartante bhaktaṃ celaṃ ca lapsyāmahe paribhāṣās ca na no bhaviṣyantīti. Tathā ya ete śilpino nāma te'pi svabhūtyartham eva pravartante vetanaṃ ca lapsyāmahe mitrāṇi ca no bhaviṣyantīti."

Compare a passage from the same source under the nyāya "Na hi vidhiśatenāpi &c." Bhartṛihari reproduces Patañjali's view in the following verse (*Vākyapadīya* iii. page 255):-

"Nimittebhyaḥ pravartante sarva eva svabhūtaye.
Abhiprāyānurodhe'pi svārthasyaiva prasiddhaye."

Ed. note. What about Na vā are patyuh kāmāya patiḥ priyo bhavati ... ātmanas tu kāmāya sarvam priyam bhavati. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. 2. 4. 5. Also Sarvaḥ svārtham samīhate. Māgha.

Jacob's text reads: prayojanamamanusandhāya. It is wrong. We have changed it to prayojanam ananusandhāya.

298

Prasaktaṃ hi pratiṣidhyata iti nyāyaḥ.

This nyāya, which is quoted by Amaradāsa in his ṭīkā on *Vedāntaśikhāmaṇi*, page 262, is apparently another form of the more concise Prasajyapratīṣedha which, as it occurs in the Yoga section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*, is rendered by Prof. Cowell, "Express negation." In a footnote (on page 250) he explains it thus:- "Where the negation is prominent, it is called *prasajyapratīṣedha*; but where it is not prominent, we have the *paryudāsa* negation. In the former, the negative is connected with the verb:- in the latter, it is generally compounded with some other word; as, for example, (a) 'Not a drum was heard, not a funeral note.' (b) 'Unwatched, the garden bough shall sway.' The former corresponds to the logicians' *atyantābhāva*, the latter to *anyonyābhāva* or *bheda*."

In the Vācaspatyam, the nyāya is quoted under Prasajyapratīṣedha as follows:- "Prasajya prasaktiṃ sampādyāropyeti yāvat, pratiṣedhaḥ. Atyantābhāve. 'Prasaktaṃ hi pratiṣidhyata' iti nyāyena āropitaprasaṅgasyaiva niṣedhaḥ. Tena vāyau rūpaṃ nāstī -tyādāvapi vāyau rūpāropaṃ kṛtvaiva niṣedho nañā bodhyata iti vivekaḥ."

According to this, then, the meaning of the nyāya is, "that which has been applied or asserted is subsequently withdrawn or denied."

Both the forms of negation are contained in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 4. 50 &c., in *Vākyapadīya* ii. 86, and in Sureśvara's large vārtika 3. 9. 73. Verses defining the two are quoted on page 214 (Chap. vii.) of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, and renderings will be found on page 254 of Mr. Pramadādāsa's translation. Compare Molesworth's definitions of the terms.

ED. NOTE: Here are some important notes.

299

Prastarapraharaṇanyāyaḥ.

The rule as to *the throwing into the sacrificial fire of a handful of Darbha grass*. Kunte says: "The Prastarapraharaṇanyāya is well-known among the Mīmāṃsakas. Prastara is a handful of Darbha-grass ready for use before a sacrifice is begun. It is spread on the sacrificial ground (Vedi) and serves as a seat for the sacrificial vessels. When a sacrifice is finished, it is thrown into the sacrificial fire as an offering. A Vaidika text states:- "The handful of grass is to be thrown into the fire with the Sūktavāka." The nyāya forms the subject of Jaimini 3. 2. 11-14, which is otherwise termed, "Sūktavākasya prastarapraharaṇāṅgatādhikaraṇam." The question which has to be decided is thus put by the author of the *Śāstradīpikā*:-

"Darśapūrṇamāsayoḥ śrūyate sūktavākena prastaraṃ praharatīti. Tatra saṃśayaḥ. Kiṃ prastarapraharaṇasya sūktavākasya ca kālārthaḥ saṃyogothavāṅgāṅgibhāvaḥ."

The decision is that the Sūktavāka mantra is subordinate to the act of offering up the grass, whilst the latter serves the double purpose of a resting-place for the vessels and an offering to the gods.

The term pratipatti, which is found in sūtra 14 is thus explained by Kunte:- "The rule is that all things connected with a sacrifice are somehow or other to be used in performing the same; nothing is to be thrown away, nothing is to be preserved. The final disposal of sacrificial things for the sake of getting rid of them is called Pratipatti."

300

Prāvartikakramanyāyaḥ.

See this explained under *Pāṭhakramanyāya*.

301

Phalavatsannidhāvaphalaṃ tadaṅgam.

The principle that *whatever has no result of its own, but is mentioned in connection with something else which has such a result, is subordinate to the latter*. This is Dr. Thibaut's rendering of the nyāya as it occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 14 (page 443), and he explains it thus in a footnote:- "A Mīmāṃsā principle. A sacrificial act, for instance, is independent when a special result is assigned to it by the sacred texts; an act which is enjoined without such a specification is merely auxiliary to another act." The source of the nyāya is Śābara 4. 4. 19, and Mādhava applies it in *Nyāyamālāvistara* 4. 3. 16 (sūtra 37). I have met with it also in *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, page 178, line 2; and in *Vivaraṇa-prameyasāṅgraha*, page 117, line 11; and page 147, line 9 from bottom.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references.

302

Phalavatsahakāraṇyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a fruitful mango-tree*. Such a tree not only produces luscious fruit, but also affords shade and fragrance for the weary traveller in the hot season. Some of us know from experience how charming a camping-ground a mango-grove is! Raghunātha's explanation of the nyāya in connection with the worship of Gaṇeśa is as follows:

"Ekaphalākāṅkṣayā tadārādhanaṃ anyad api phalaṃ prayacchatīti vivakṣāyāṃ tu phalavatsahakāraṇyāyaḥ. Yathā sahakāra 'āmraścūto rasālo'sau sahakāro-tisaurabha' ityabhidhānād atisaurabha āmravṛkṣo'timadhurapakvaphalanamitaśākhaḥ svam upasannāya chāyārthine janāya phalaṃ parimalaṃ cāprārthitaṃ api dadāti tathā prakṛte'pītyarthaḥ."

The quotation here is from *Amarakoṣa* IV. 33 (page 87). The thought expressed in the above seems to be that of *Āpastambadharmasūtra* 1. 7. 20. 3. viz. "Āmre phalārthe nimite chāyā gandha ityanūtpadyete," which see in its place.

303

Bakabandhananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the capture of a crane*. Raghunātha explains it thus:- A man wishing to secure a crane puts butter on its head, which, when melted by the sun, goes into its eyes and blinds it, so that he can then take hold of it! He clearly took this explanation from the

Tattvadīpana, a commentary on the *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa* (itself a commentary), and I subjoin a portion of each. *Vivarāṇa*, page 283, line 4:

"Nanu svargakāmino yāgakartavyatā svargasādhanam antareṇānupapannā. Tacca sādhanatvaṃ kṣaṇabhaṅginaḥ karmaṇo madhyavartikāryam antareṇānupapannam iti śrutārthāpattya'pūrvaṃ gamyate. Tatra śabdasya sāmartyaṃ grhyata iti so'yaṃ bakabandhaḥ."

On this the *Dīpana*, page 779, bottom line:- "Bakabandha iti. Bakabandhasamānānyāya ityarthaḥ. Bakagrahaṇe ka upāya iti kenacit pṛṣṭe kharataradinakarasaṃparkāt tanmastakanihitānavanītabindubhir nayanayoḥ pūrṇatāyāṃ tatgrahaṇaṃ sukaram iti kaścit tucchamatih prativakti. Na ca tad upapadyate. Bakagrahaṇam antareṇa tanmastake navanītaprakṣepānupapatteḥ. Tasmiṃśca pariḡhīte tatprakṣepo'pi mudhā."

Then follows his application of the nyāya. Both writers evidently regard it as an illustration of something ridiculous; and to me it recalls the nursery tradition that the way to catch a sparrow is to put salt on its tail! However, Raghunātha classes it with nyāyas deprecating a roundabout way of doing a thing. Amongst these, he gives the *Daṇḍasarpamāraṇanyāya*, where a man, whilst looking for a stick with which to kill a snake, comes upon an axe; but instead of using that against the enemy, he goes out to cut a stick with it.

In *Vivarāṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 262, line 9, we again find the *Bakabandhaprayāsa*.

304

Badhirakarṇajapanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *whispering in the ear of a deaf man*. A good example is found in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 1062:

"Badhire karṇajāpo'yam andhe nṛttapradarśanam.
Uṣare bījanikṣepas tasya yā dharmadeśanā."

Compare the following from *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 450:

"Tadetad badhirasya Rāmāyaṇaṃ varṇitam asmābhir ya evam api śrutvā vedārthaparigamābhyupāyaṃ mṛgayate." Also, the expression, "Badhiresviva gāyanam," in *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iv. 21. For similes of a like kind, see *Āraṇayarodānānyāya*.

Ed. note. This is *Nidarśanālaṅkāra*. Many references are given here.

305

Barhirnyāyaḥ.

The question of *Kuśa grass*. This is based on the sentence, "Barhir devasadanam dāmi," "I cut grass as a seat for the gods," which forms the subject of Jaimini 3. 2. 1. 2. The question is whether the word barhis is to be taken in its primary sense or in a secondary one; and the conclusion is, "Mukhyagaṇayor mukhye kāryasaṃpratyayaḥ," which see in its proper place in the form of Gaṇamukhyayoḥ &c.

306

Balavad api śikṣitānām ātmanyapratyayaṃ cetaḥ.

The mind of even those who are highly educated is distrustful of itself. This is the second verse in *Śakuntalānāṭak*.

In *Tārkkarakṣā* (page 208), in an exposition of vāda, we find the following:

"Vāde tu daivād āgatāḥ sadasyā vādiativādibhyāṃ saṃpratipattiyā prāmādikakathābhāsaśaṅkāvyāvartanāyāṅgikriyante, na jalpavitaṇḍayor iva prameyādi vyavasthāpanārtham aṅgatvenopādīyante."

On which, Mallinātha comments as follows:- "Vāde viśeṣam āha vāde tviti. Daivād āgatānām vā kiṃ prayojanam ata āha prāmādiketi. Balavad api śikṣitānām ātmanyapratyayaṃ ceta iti nyāyād iti bhāvaḥ."

For the benefit of any who may consult the original, I may add that the quotation from the *Nyāyavārtika* which immediately follows in Varadarāja's text, is found on page 161 of that work; and that from Vācaspatimiśra's *īkā*, on page 224.

Ed. note. The first half of Balavad api is--Ā.

Paritoṣād viduṣām sādhu na manye prayogavijñānam.

Also here is an important note for further study.

307

Bahuchidraghaṭapradīpanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a lamp in a vessel with many holes*. Raghunātha explains it as follows:

"Cakṣurādīdvārā bahirnirgatyaiḥ jīvopādhibhūtā dhīr bāhyaviṣayān vyāpnoti. Tadyogācca cidābhāso'pi niḥsrta iva pratīyata, iti vivakṣāyāṃ bahuchidraghaṭa-pradīpanyāyo'vatarati. Ayam bhagavatpādaiḥ saṃkṣepeṇa bhāṣyatātparyaprakāśake Śrīdakṣiṇāmūrtistotre sodāharaṇam uktaḥ :

Nānāchidraghaṭodarasthitamahādīpaprabhābhāsvaraṃ
jñānaṃ yasya tu cakṣurādīkaraṇadvārā bahiḥ syandate.
Jānāmīti tam eva bhāntam anubhātyetat samastaṃ jagat
tasmai Śrīgurumūrtaye nama idaṃ Śrīdakṣiṇāmūrtaye' iti."

The above is verse 4 of Śaṅkara's poem, to the exposition of which Sureśvara devotes 37 verses in his *Mānasollāsa*.

Ed. note. We are not sure as to what is the motive of J behind the above statement, nindā or stuti, praśamsā or upahāsa.

308

Bahurājakadeśanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a country with several kings* [working in opposition to one another]. It occurs in chap. XIX of the *Anubhūtiprakāśa*, which deals with the Kena Upaniṣad. The passage is contained in verses 12 and 13:

"Vākcakṣuḥśrotramukhyāni prerayet karaṇāni kaḥ.
Īśvaraś cet kim eko'sau bahavo'mītyuteryatām.

Pravartyānām anantatvād vailakṣaṇyāc ca naikatā.
Naikamatyaṃ bahutve syād bahurājakadeśavat."

The nyāya is sufficiently explained by the example. Raghunātha links it with the Bahuvṛkākṛṣṭamṛganyāya, which is otherwise unknown to me.

Ed. note. An important note. So there are some nyāyas which are not known even to this great collector.

Cf. Nāikī barāta meṃ jane jane ṭhākura (Hindi).

309

Bahūnām anugraho nyāyyaḥ.

The association of many is good policy. Raghunāthavarman explains thus:- "Anugrahaḥ sāhāyyam. Nyāyyo nyāyād anapetaḥ tadupetaḥ, kāryasādhaka iti yāvat," and then quotes *Pañcatantra* i. 331 by way of illustration:

"Bahūnām apyasārāṇām melanaṃ kāryasādhakam.
Tṛṇaiḥ saṃpādyate rajjus tayā nāgopi badhyate."

For the many variants of this verse, see *Indische Sprueche* 4425, and Peterson's *Subhāshitāvali* 2742. The maxim is found in *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara* 7. 1. 5, and in Nāgeśa on Kaiyaṭa, page 16.

Ed. Note: Here are some additional references.

Nyāyyaḥ=nyāyād anapetaḥ. Just, not violating justice, i.e. in accordance with justice, leading to the success, fulfilling the mission.

Jacob has not brought out the full significance of this nyāya. The foreword-writer of Añjali has provided a living example of the well-known nyāya--Andhena nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ. We believe it means-- Go by the majority.

310

Bālasya pradīpakalikākṛīḍayaiva nagaradāhaḥ.

The burning of a city just by a child's playing with the wick of a lamp. "Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth." I assume that kalikā means the bud-like charred excrescence which often forms on the top of a wick in an open oil-light. The saying is found in *Kusumāñjali* v. 3, page 89:-

"Nanu tasya sarvadā sarvatrāviśeṣe kāryasya sarvadotpattiprasaṅga iti nira-pekṣeśvarapakṣe doṣaḥ, sāpekṣe upekṣaṇīya evāstviti bālasya pradīpakalikākṛīḍayaiva nagaradāhaḥ, parantu tanna, sthemabhājo jagata evākāraṇatvaprasaṅgāt."

Udayana seems to use the phrase ironically, but I do not quite grasp the drift of this. We meet with Pradīpakalikā again in *Syādvādamañjarī*, page 157:- "Sā ca kṣaṇasantatis taddarśanaprasiddhā pradīpakalikāvan navaṇavotpadyamānā."

Ed. note. A noteworthy statement re. Udayanācārya.

311

Bījāṅkuranyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *an eternal series of seed and shoot*. As the seed produces the shoot, so the latter in turn reproduces the former. Each, therefore, is a cause and an effect. The maxim is met with very frequently in the literature. We find it in *Brahmaśūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 36 (on the eternity of the world) as follows:

"Na ca karmāntareṇa śarīraṃ saṃbhavati. Na ca śarīraṃ antareṇa karma saṃbhavati tītaretarāśrayatvaprasaṅgaḥ. Anāditve tu bījāṅkuranyāyenopapatter na kaścid doṣo bhavati," which is rendered thus by Dr. Thibaut:- "Without merit and demerit, nobody can enter into existence, and again, without a body, merit and demerit cannot be formed; so that - on the doctrine of the world having a beginning - we are led into a logical see-saw. The opposite doctrine, on the other hand, explains all matters in a manner analogous to the case of the seed and sprout, so that no difficulty remains." It occurs again at the end of the *bhāṣya* on 3. 2. 9. Also in the Ārḥata section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 31 of Bib. Ind., and 37 of Jīvananda), in Rāmatīrtha's commentary on *Vedāntasāra* (page 110), and in *Pañcapādikā*, page 12, line 12.

312

Bubhuṅṣitasya kiṃ nimantraṅgraha utkaṅṭhitasya kiṃ
kekāra vaśrāvaṇam.

What need has a hungry man of pressing invitation [to eat]; why direct the attention of a longing one to the cry of the peacock? In the Kumārapāla chapter of *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 212, we are told that the king, having given Hemacandra (a Jain) a pressing invitation to join him in a pilgrimage to the temple of Somanātha (dedicated to Śiva), the hermit replied as follows:-

"Bubhuṅṣitasya kiṃ nimantraṅgraha utkaṅṭhitasya kiṃ kekāra vaśrāvaṇam iti lokarūḍhes tapasvinām adhiḅṅṅatīrthādhiḅṅṅarāṇam ko nāma nṛpater atra nirbandhaḥ."

"What need is there to show much zeal about inviting one who is hungry? Why make one who is longing listen to the cry of the peacock? So runs the popular proverb, and, in accordance with it, I ask, why does your Majesty exert yourself to press hermits whose very profession is the visiting of sacred places?" This is Mr. Tawney's rendering on page 130 of his translation. Indian writers often tell us that the cries of the peacock intensify the longings of separated lovers! For example, *Raghuvamśa* xiii 27:

"Snigdhaś ca kekāḅ śikhinām babhūvur
yasminnasahyāni vinā tvayā me."

Ed. note. cf. Snigdhaśyāmalakāntilīptavīyato... payodasuhṛdām ānandakekāḅ kalāḅ.
Sāhityadarpaṇa has !
Also note : Lokarūḍheḅ.

313

Brāhmaṇagrāmanyāyaḥ.

The figure of *a village in which Brāhmins abound*. This is in Raghunātha's list, but hardly deserves a place amongst nyāyas.

In *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 188, a distinction is drawn between the expression, *pracurabrāhmaṇo grāmaḥ* and *brāhmaṇapracuro grāmaḥ*, the meaning, in the former case, being a village in which Brāhmins are more numerous than in some other village, and, in the latter, a village in which the Brāhmins outnumber the other castes. The passage is as follows:

"Prācuryasya dharmiviśeṣaṇatvena nirdeśa eva vyadhikaraṇasajātīyālpatvasya nirūpakatvaṃ dṛṣṭam. Yathā pracurabrāhmaṇo grāma ityatra prācuryasya grāmāntara-gatabrāhmaṇālpatvaṃ nirūpakam dṛṣṭam iti. Tasya svadharmiviśeṣyatve tu samānādhikaraṇavijātīyālpatvam eva nirūpakam. Ata eva brāhmaṇapracuro grāma iti prayoge tatgrāmagataśūdrālpatvāpekṣam prācuryaṃ pratīyate." See also *Tantravārika*, p. 1066 line 2. Akin to this is the *Mallagrāmanyāya*.

Ed. note. Acc. to Jacob this nyāya hardly deserves a place among them. In response we can only say: Thank you very much, Colonel! *Svabhāvo duratikramaḥ*. We fail to understand what criteria of judgment are applied by Jacob to assert this personal opinion in face of the use of this nyāya by so many great writers of yore. The might is right. We are told that the pen is more powerful than the sword. This mighty military man possessed both. What he did not possess is the *viveka*. And as declared by a great *nītikāra*, *Vivekabhraṣṭānām bhavati vinipātaḥ śatamukhaḥ*..

314

Brāhmaṇaparivrājakanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the Brāhmins and the mendicants*. In such a sentence as, *Brāhmaṇā bhojayitavyāḥ parivrājakāś ca*, the separate mention of the latter, who are really included in the former term, merely emphasizes their position as a special part of the general body. It is thus the exact parallel of the *Gobalīvardanyāya* and of the *Brāhmaṇa-vasiṣṭhanyāya*. It is used by Śāṅkara three times in his exposition of the *Vedāntasūtras*, namely under 1. 4. 16, 2. 3. 15, and 3. 1. 11; but I forbear to quote his words, for, without a lengthy portion of context, they would be unintelligible. It appears also in *Tantravārtika*, pages 423, 590.

Ed. note. An important statement to help those who want to go beyond and deeper.

315

Brāhmaṇavasiṣṭhanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the Brāhmins and Vasishṭha*. This is of the same type as Brāhmaṇa-parivrājakanyāya, which see. Satyavrata gives as a reference, "halantyaṃsūtra-bhāṣyaṃ," *i.e.* Patanjali on *Pāṇini* 1. 3. 3. But the reference is a pure delusion; and I think I may safely say that the maxim is not to be found in any part of the *Mahābhāṣya*. It would not be unreasonable, however, to infer that the author of the *Padamañjarī* had this nyāya in view when he penned the following:- "Vaidikānāṃ laukikatve'pi prādhānyakhyāpanārthaṃ pṛthag grahaṇaṃ, yathā Brāhmaṇā āgatā Vasiṣṭho'pyāgata iti." (*The Paṇḍit*, vol. x, page 282). Compare Takrakaṇḍīnyanyāya in its place.

Ed. Note: Jacob has not used diacritical marks consistently throughout as a rule. For example, Patañjali appears as Patanjali..

316

Brāhmaṇaśramaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the Brāhmana-ascetic*. The śramaṇa is a Buddhist ascetic, and, therefore, not a Brāhman, but the expression Brāhmaṇaśramaṇa implies that, though now a Buddhist, he was formerly a Brāhman. The maxim is used by the authors of the *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* (page 68) and the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (article 257) in exactly the same connexion. After giving an example of 'suggested meaning' in the form of 'semblance of contradiction' (virodhābhāsa), the author of the latter work says:

"Atrāmita ityādāvapiśabdābhāvād virodhābhāso vyaṅgyaḥ. Vyaṅgyasyālaṅkāryatve'pi Brāhmaṇaśramaṇanyāyād alaṅkāratvam upacaryate," which Mr. Pramādā-dāsa Mitra renders thus:- "Here, from the absence of the particle *api* after the words *amita* &c., the semblance of the ornament named 'contradiction' is suggested. The suggested meaning, though strictly what is ornamented, is figuratively spoken of here as the ornament, with reference to its being an ornament in another condition [*i.e.* when it is *expressed*, not suggested], just as we use the word Brāhman-mendicant, which, though it etymologically means an absurdity, *viz.* a mendicant, or one not a Brāhmaṇ, who is a Brāhman, tropically [? ed.] signifies one who *was* a Brāhman."

Ed. Note. Is this "topically?" If so, thanks to all who are responsible for an absurdity.

317

Bhakṣite'pi laśune na śānto vyādhiḥ.

Although the garlic has been eaten, the disease is not cured. This proverb is applied as follows by Nṛsimhasarasvatī in his comment on the opening verse of the *Vedāntasāra*:

"Nanu bhakṣite'pi laśune na śānto vyādhir iti nyāyena prapañcasyādhiṣṭhānavyatiriktatayā pratiyamānatvāt katham advaitasiddhir ityāśaṅkāṃ tṛṅikurvannāha akhaṇḍam iti."

It is found also in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 37.

Ed. note. Here is a see also reference.

318

Bharchunyāyaḥ.

The illustration afforded by *Bharchu*. We learn from the commentary on *Sankṣepaśārīraka* i. 14 that Bharchu was a Brāhman and highly esteemed by the king of his country. This, however, brought him into disfavour with the jealous hangers-on at the royal court; and, to get rid of him, they one day blind-folded him and carried him off to a forest; at the same time telling the king that he was dead and had become a goblin! After a long time he returned to the town in company with some foresters, but was prevented by his enemies from entering it. On one occasion, when in a pleasure-ground outside the city, the king actually saw him; but, in consequence of the false statement that had been made, he supposed it to be his ghost! Eventually the whole thing came to light, and the king discovered that he had been deceived and that the supposed ghost was really his own protege, Bharchu himself.

The verse containing the nyāya is as follows:

Puruṣāparādhamalinā dhiṣaṇā
niravadyacakṣurudayāpi yathā.
Na phalāya bharchuviṣayā bhavati
śrutisaṃbhavāpi tu tathātmani dhīḥ."

As under the next verse we have a further short comment on the illustration, and, as the verse itself furnishes another good example of the *maṇimantranyāya* in its place, I subjoin both:

"Puruṣāparādhavigame tu punaḥ
pratibandhakavyudasanāt saphalā.
Maṇimantrayor apagame tu tathā
sati pāvakād bhavati dhūmalatā."

"Mānameyayor upaniṣadbrahmaṇor nirdoṣatvāt, pariśeṣāt pramātṛdoṣa eva phalapratibandhaka iti śāstrīyeṇa vicāreṇa, satyaprāmānyaśaṅkā-rūpapratibandhābhāvāt punas tasmād eva nirdoṣavedavākyāt saphalā dhīr udeti, yathā bharchur durjanair araṇye prakṣipto jīvanneva punar āgata ityupapattyā bharchujñānāprāmānya-

śaṅkākaṛaṇapurūṣāparādhavigame sati tadviṣayā bharchur evāyam iti saphalā dhīr udeti."

Raghunāthavarman gives a different version of the story, but names no authority in support of it. He calls it a "Laukikī gāthā."

319

Bhasmanyājyāhutiḥ.

Offering clarified butter on ashes [instead of on the sacrificial fire]. An illustration of wasted, or misdirected, effort. *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 240:

"Akāryavāraṇodyukto mūḍhe yaḥ parikhidyate.
Vāgvistaro vṛthā tasya bhasmanyājyāhutir yathā.

Nopadeśāsatēnāpi mūḍho'kāryān nivartyate.
Śītāṃśugrasanāt kena rāhur vākyair nivāritaḥ."

There is another instance in Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* i. 58:-

"Dadhyau caivam sa rājarṣir aho teṣāṃ kumantriṇām.
Sanmāno yo mayākāri sa bhasmani hutam dhruvam."

This nyāya was doubtless derived from *Chhāndogya Upanishad* 5. 24. 1:- "Sa ya idam avidvān agnihotraṃ juhōti yathāṅgārān apohya bhasmani juhuyāt tāḍṛk tat syāt." It is found also in *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 16:-

"Antareṇa vidhiṃ mohād yaḥ kuryāt sāmparāyikam.
Na tat syād upakārāya bhasmani va hutam haviḥ."

320

Bhāṇḍānusārisnehavat.

The simile of [a remnant of] *oil adhering to* [the sides of] *a vessel* [out of which oil has been poured]. In the bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 1. 8, there is a lengthy and important discussion as to whether, on returning to earth, in some new birth, after a residence in the moon, a man brings with him a remnant of the works which took him there,- this remnant being technically styled *anuśaya*. Śaṅkara affirms that he does, and says:

"Kaḥ punar anuśayo nāmeti. Kecit tāvad āhuḥ. Svargārthasya karmaṇo bhuktaphalasyāvaśeṣaḥ kaścīd anuśayo nāma, bhāṇḍānusārisnehavat. Yathā hi snehabhāṇḍam ricyamānam na sarvātmanā ricyate, bhāṇḍānusāryeva kaścīd snehaśeṣo'vatiṣṭhate, tathānuśayo'pīti."

The question is then asked, why does he not remain in that blissful region until the whole of his merit is exhausted? The answer is that, just as a servant who has long served in a king's household finds his wardrobe at last reduced to the slender proportions of a pair of shoes and an umbrella, and is therefore unfit to continue in that exalted position, so, too, a man is unworthy of a residence in the moon who has only a small balance of merit remaining to his credit! Here is this unique reply in Śankara's own words:

"Nanu niravaśeṣakarmaphalopabhogāya candramaṇḍalam ārūḍhāḥ. Bāḍham. Tathāpi svalpakarmāvaśeṣamātreṇa tatrāvasthātum na labhyate. Yathā kila kaścit sevakaḥ sakalaiḥ sevopakaraṇai rājakulam upasṛptaś cirapravāsāt parikṣīṇabahūpakaraṇaś, chatrapādukādīmātrāvaśeṣo na rājakule'vasthātum śaknoti, evam anuśaya-mātraparigraho na candramaṇḍale'vasthātum śaknotīti."

This is a portion of the system which is regarded as the highest flight of the Indian mind, and to which some restless folk in Europe and America are betaking themselves, in order to find rest for their souls! There are not a few in India today, however, who have found that rest by turning from these gropings in the dark, to the midday light afforded by an accredited revelation. To quote a modern writer:- "The painful, toilsome, searching of the creature into things too high for it, only ends in perplexity and bitter disappointment."

Ed. note. Colonel Jacob has provided here a living example of the nyāya worded as bhasmanyājyāhutiḥ. What is needed is deep faith, Colonel! This military-minded man is terribly prejudiced. His opinion is horribly biased. He suffers from abominable superiority complex. His study of the Vedānta did not bring him its real spirit. It was only a recital of Rāma Rāma by a parrot. His words ring a harsh discordant note in our ears.

The Colonel, a true representative of the Imperialist Great Britain, loses no opportunity to condemn what he is not able to understand. He possesses and thrives on āsurī vṛtti.

321

Bhāṇḍālekhyanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the design on a jar*. Used, apparently, of something variable at will. It is found in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* (page 289 of Medical Hall Press edition) in the following passage:

"Athānyatrāstu yadvā tadvā karaṇam pramāvivaṣitajātiviśeṣavyapadeśakam pramāṇam. Catastraḥ khalvimāḥ pratyakṣādipramitayo bhinnabuddhivyapadeśa-bhājaḥ. Na ca pramātā prameyam vā tadbhedahetuḥ. Pramāṇāni tu yathāyatham catasṛṣvasādhāraṇānīti bhinnabuddhivyapadeśanibandhanānīti. Maivam. Vivakṣitapadam tāval lakṣaṇe bhāṇḍālekhyam iva, puruṣecchānām aniyataviśayatvāt."

The commentator, Śankara Mīśra, explains the nyāya thus:- "Bhāṇḍālekhyam iveti. Yathālekhyam rekhoparekhādi sarvabhāṇḍasādhāraṇam na bhāṇḍaviśeṣalakṣaṇam tathā puruṣādhīnavivakṣāpi na viśeṣiketyarthaḥ."

In the edition of Śri-Harṣa's work, however, [now in course of publication] (together with the commentary *Vidyāsāgarī*) in the Chaukhambā Sanskrit Series (page 528), the form of the simile differs, and a different explanation of it is given:

"Maivam iti. Bhaṇḍo vipralambhakas tasyālekhyam bhaṇḍālekhyam. Deva-dattasya jāyā kim apatyam janayiṣyatīti prṣṭe putro na putrīti vipralambhakasya kuḍyoparyālekhyam na viśayaviśeṣanīyatam, niśedhasyobhayathā yojayitum śakya-tvāt, tathā vivakṣitapadam api puruṣecchānām aniyatatvena catuṣṭayajātīyasya niyamena pratyetur aśakyatvāt kasyacit catasraḥ pramīyato vivakṣitāḥ kasyacit pañ ceti."

The simile is found in *Tātparyāṭikā* (page 496, last line) as Bhāṇḍālekhyā.

322

Bhāraikadeśāvatarānyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the lowering of one part of a load* [and so easing one's burden]. This is found under *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 22 (page 222):

"Dṛḍhaviṣayajñānānantaram sahasaiva ca samyagjñānotpādātibhārād bhāraikadeśāvatarānāram saṁśayothhāpanāmātram eva tāvad yuktam."

Prof. Gangānātha Jhā renders the passage thus:- "When a certain conclusion to the contrary has been laid out in an exceptionally strong manner, if one proceeds to immediately point out the true theory, it involves a very hard work; and hence with a view to lighten this burden, the present sūtra proceeds only to weaken the contrary view by throwing it open to doubt."

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa reproduced this on page 419 of the *Nyāyamañjarī* as follows:

"Pūrvapakṣikoktayuktisamutthāpitasthirataraviṣayajñānasamanantaram sahasaiva samyagjñānotpādanātibhārād bhāraikadeśāvatarānyāyena saṁśayas tāvad upapadyate."

323

Bhikṣupādaprasāraṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a beggar's obtaining a firm footing* [in a patron's house]. Perhaps approaching our "give him an inch and he will take an ell." Tārānātha explains it thus:

"Yathā kaścīd bhikṣur yatheṣṭabhojanācchādanavāsagrāhādilābhārthaṃ kasya-
cid dhanino grhe praviśya yugapat sarvābhīṣṭālābhaṃ manyamānaḥ prathamam dhani-
-grhe me pādprasāraṇam astu paścād anena paricayam utpādyā sarvam abhīṣṭam
sāmpādayiṣyāmīti dhiyā svalpām api bhikṣam bahumanyamānaḥ paścāt krameṇa svā-
bhīṣṭam sāmpādayatyevaṃ yatra vivakṣā tatrāsyā pravṛttiḥ."

It occurs in the Bauddha chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind. edn.) as follows:- "Mādhyamikās tāvad uttamaprajñā ittham acīkathan -- bhikṣupādaprasāraṇanyāyena kṣaṇabhaṅgādyabhidhānamukhena sthāyitvānukūlavedanīyatvānugata sarvasatyatvabhramavyāvartanena sarvaśūnyatāyām eva paryavasānam."

Here is Prof. Gough's rendering: "The Mādhyamikas, excellently wise, explain as follows, namely that the doctrine of Buddha terminates in that of a total void (universal baselessness or nihilism) by a slow progression *like the intrusive steps of a mendicant*, through the position of a momentary flux, and through the (gradual) negation of the illusory assurances of pleasurable sensibility, of universality, and of reality."

I have met with one other example only, namely in Venkaṭanātha's *Tattvamuktākālāpa*, page 254:- "Astvevam iti cen na. Bhikṣupādaprasāraṇanyāyena nirīśvaravādāvatārād, ataḥ krodhāvaśyambhāvād īśvarasyāpi duḥkhāvaśyambhāvaḥ."

The subject under discussion here is āgamikeśvarasiddhi.

For the cognate expression, pādprasārikā, see its place.

Ed. Note:- *Vācaspatyam* is a copy-cat. Compare R's text. A copy with some change here and there. The end as imagined by Vacaspatyam may not be the same. The bhikṣu could be kicked out too.

324

Bhīmabhāsadr̥ḍhanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the three Asuras: Bhīma, Bhāsa, and Dr̥ḍha*. See this explained under Dāmavyālakaṭanyāya.

325

Bhūtaṃ bhavyāyopadiśyata iti nyāyaḥ.

It is declared [by Mīmāṃsakas] *that an accomplished* [sacrificial] *act is* [not an end in itself, but] *for the bringing about of a result in the future* [such as the attainment of Heaven]

&c.]. And this, they say, necessitates belief in an *Apūrva* as a connecting link between the two. See the arguments for and against this theory, in Professor Gangānātha Jhā's translation of *Tantravārtika* 2. 1. 5. Most of us will be thankful for the aid of so able an interpreter of the teaching of that terribly difficult book!

The nyāya is found, in slightly different form, in the *Sankṣepaśārīraka* i. 143; and, in its usual form, in the commentary. I quote only the second half of the verse:

"Bhūtaṃ bhavyapradhānaṃ bhavati hi na punaḥ
svapradhānaṃ kadācic
Chāstrasthāḥ śabdaśaktisthitinipuṇadhiyo
vistarād evaṃ āhuḥ."

"Bhūtaṃ bhavyāyopadiśyata iti Jaiminiśabarasvāminor mataṃ. Tau ca vedārthanirṇaye'dhikṛtāviti taduktam eva grahītum ucitam ityabhipretyāha -- Bhūtam iti. Siddham ityārthaḥ. Bhavyaṃ sādhyam pradhānaṃ yasya bhavyaśeṣam ityārthaḥ."

In verse 312 of the same chapter, we meet with it again, and also in the altered form in which a Vedantist would apply it to his system:

"Bhavyāya bhūtam iti kiñca vidhipradhāne
kāṇḍe nayo'yam iha tadviparītam āhuḥ.
Bhūtāya bhavyam iti bhūtaparam hi sarvaṃ
vedāvasānam iti sūtrakṛd ācacakṣe."

"Bhavyāya bhūtam iti. Vidhiḥ pradhānaṃ pratipādayiṣito yasmin kāṇḍe tasmin. Iha brahmakāṇḍe. Tadviparītam bhūtabhavyanyāyaviparītam. Tadvaiparītyam evāha. Bhūtāya bhavyam iti. Hir hetau. Yataḥ bhūtaparam satyasiddhabrahmaparam vedāvasānam vedāntam Sūtrakṛd ācacakṣe, samanvayasūtrapramukhaiḥ sūtraiḥ uktavān, ato bhāṣyakārādaya evaṃ āhur ityārthaḥ."

The above extracts will be found in *The Paṇḍit*, vol. iv, page 583; and vol. v, page 473.

The nyāya occurs again in i. 395 (*Paṇḍit*, vol. vi, p. 167) in a context dealing with *bhāvanā*, that topic so dear to the Mīmāṃsaka, for a right understanding of which nothing could be better than the perusal of Dr. Thibaut's translation of the *Arthasaṅgraha*, pp. 3-5. Verse 482 of the same chapter contains a fourth example. It appears also in *Tattvadīpana*, page 377, line 7 from bottom, and page 427, line 9 from bottom; also in the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*, page 16, section 36.

ED. NOTE: Cf. Vedāntavākyaṣvaḥaḍam hi meyam. Nyāya 345 Mānādhīnā meyasiddhiḥ.

Bhūmirathikanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the man who* [in order to become proficient] *makes drawings of a war-chariot on the ground.* This nyāya is found in Śabara's bhāṣya on Jaimini 7. 2. 15, and again (in conjunction with Śuṣkeṣṭinyāya) in 9. 2. 13. The latter passage is as follows:

"Yat tāvad upādhyāyaḥ śiṣyasannidhāvadhīte tadgrahaṇārtham. Yacchiṣyas taddhāraṇārtham. Grahaṇadhāraṇe prayogārthe bhūmirathikavat śuṣkeṣṭivad vā. Tadyathā bhūmirathiko bhūmau ratham ālikhya śikṣāṃ karoti saṅgrāme prāsubhāvo bhaviteti, yathā ca chātraḥ śuṣkeṣṭīḥ prayuṅkte, prayoge prāsūkarmā bhavitāsmīti, evam etad draṣṭavyam."

In his *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* (page 186 b of India office MS. 582), Raghunāthavarman applies these two nyāyas and the Śakunigrāhakagatinyāya as follows:- "Paramatanirākaraṇaṃ ca śiṣyāṇāṃ abhyāsadārḍhyenā saṃbhāvanādisamucchedāya, na tu para-dveṣeṇeti vivakṣāyāṃ bhūmirathikanyāyaḥ śuṣkeṣṭinyāyaḥ śakunigrāhakagatinyāyaśca pravartate."

His explanations of the three are taken from *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara* 9. 1. 6 and 9. 2. 2. [An imp. point to note. ed.]

Ed. note. Once more we have here a full reference to the IOL MS of the *Ratnākara*. Jacob has made many such references. Yet the Durbhagākṛtir Durbhagākṛtiḥ has made the Ratnākara as ajñātakartṛka. We believe their statement is ajñānanītam mugdhamiśra yugalavacanam.

Jacob shows R's indebtedness to earlier writers from whom he draws his information.

327

Bhūliṅganyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the bird Bhūliṅga*. It is supposed to say, "*mā sāhasam*," "don't do anything desperate," and then does desperate deeds itself! The purport of the nyāya would, therefore, seem to be, "Practise what you preach." There are two references to this bird in *Sabhāparva*. The first is in XLI. 18 (Bombay edition):

"Na gāthā gāthinam śāsti bahu ced api gāyati.
Prakṛtiṃ yānti bhūtāni bhūliṅgaśakunir yathā."

This is explained by the second passage (XLV. 27-32):-

"Atha caiṣāṃ na te buddhiḥ prakṛtiṃ yāti bhārata.
Mayaiva kathitam pūrvam bhūliṅgaśakunir yathā. (27)

Bhūliṅgaśakunir nāma pārśve himavataḥ pare.
Bhīṣma tasyāḥ sadā vācaḥ śrūyante'rthavigarhitāḥ. (28)

Mā sāhasam itīdam sā satataṃ vāsate kila.
Sāhasaṃ cātmanātīva carantī nāvabudhyate. (29)

Sā hi māṃsārgalaṃ bhīṣma mukhāt siṃhasya khādataḥ.
Dantāntaravilagnaṃ yat tadādatte'lpacetanā. (30)

Icchataḥ sā hi siṃhasya bhīṣma jīvatyasaṃśayam.
Tadvat tvam apyadharmiṣṭha sadā vācaḥ prabhāṣase. (31)

Icchatāṃ bhūmipālānāṃ bhīṣma jīvasyasaṃśayam.
Lokavidviṣṭakarmā hi nānyo'sti bhavatā samaḥ." (32)

In the Calcutta edition of 1834, the chapters are XL and XLIII respectively. Raghunātha's remark on the simile is as follows:-

"Yo bhūliṅganyāyena paropadeśamātrakuśalaḥ svayaṃ ca yatheṣṭācaraṇaśīlaḥ
so'pi dāmbhikatvāt tyaktavyaḥ. Bhūliṅgākhyāḥ pakṣī mā sāhasaṃ kurviti punaḥ
punar uccair vadan siṃhadamṣṭrāntarlagnaṃ māṃsalavaṃ jighṛkṣatīti prasiddham."

For the following interesting example of the application of this nyāya (though the bird is not mentioned by name), I am indebted to my friend, Mr. C. H. Tawney, C.I.E. It is found on pages 138-9 of the *Pariśiṣṭaparvana*:

"Tataḥ kamalavyūce he nātha kamalānana.
Māsāhasaśakunivan mā tvam sāhasiko bhava. (141)

Tathā hyekaḥ pumān deśāntare durbhikṣapīḍitaḥ.
Cacāla svajanaṃ hitvā sārthena mahatā saha. (142)

Ekasyāṃ ca mahāṭavyāṃ sārtha āvāsate sati.
Āhartuṃ tṛṇakāṣṭhādi sa eko'pi viniryayau. (143)

Tadā ca suptavyāghrāsyaṭ pakṣyeko vanagahvare.
Dantalagnāmiṣakhaṇḍānyādāyārohad aṅghripam. (144)

Mā sāhasam iti muhuḥ sa bhaṇan māṃsakhādataḥ.
Śakunis tena jagade puruṣeṇa savismayam. (145)

Rauṣi mā sāhasam iti vyāghrāsyaṇ māsam atsi ca.
Mugdhas tvam dṛśyase vāco'nurūpaṃ kuruṣe na ca. (146)

Hitvā sāksād bhavasukhaṃ tadadrṣṭasukhecchayā.

Tapaś cikīrṣus tvam asi māsāhasakhagopamaḥ." (147)

An interesting conversation on the inconsistency of not practising what one preaches (though not in connection with this nyāya) is found also in the *Bhāgavat Purāṇa* X. 33, 27-40.

Ed. note. Here is something for Jacob to learn and practice: Follow what you preach. He is himself a living example of this nyāya!

328

Bhautavicāranyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the reflections of a madman*. The story connected with this is told in the following passage of *Āmatattvaviveka*, page 64: "Tac ced vicārāsaḥ kim tena bhautavicārakalpena. Tathāhi kenacid bhautena rājadvāri dviradam ālokya vikalpitaṃ -- kim ayam andhakāro mūlakamattyāhosvijjalavāho balākān varṣati garjati ca. Yadvā bāndhavo'yaṃ 'rājadvāre śmaśāne ca yastiṣṭhati sa bāndhavaḥ' iti paramācāryavacanāt. Athavā yo'yaṃ bhūmau dṛśyate tasya chāyeti dūṣitaṃ ca. Tatra nādyas tasya śūrpayugalaprasphoṭanābhāvāt. Na dvitīyas tasya stambhacatuṣṭayābhāvāt. Na tṛtīyas tasya laguḍabhrāmaṇābhāvāt. Na caturthas tasya naraśiraḥśatodgiraṇābhāvāt. Tato na kiñcid idam iti. Kimetāvataḥ dviradarūpaṃ nivartatām."

ED. NOTE: Jacob has a fn. here. *Pañcatantra*. V. (*Indisch sprueche* 1221.)

329

Bhraṣṭāvasaranyāyaḥ.

The law that [something does not take place] *when the occasion* [for its taking place] *has once gone*. This is Prof. Kielhorn's rendering of the nyāya as it occurs under Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa's *Paribhāṣā* lxiv. The sentence is as follows:

"Ata eva nirdeśāt bhraṣṭāvasaranyāyasyātra śāstre nāśrayaṇam. Dhvanitaṃ cedam Iko guṇa iti sūtre bhāṣya iti bhāṣyapradīpodyote nirūpitaṃ."

The reference is to the *Uddyota* on 1. 1. 3, and the nyāya will be found in vol. i. pages 185, 186, 190.

There is an instance of it in *Tantravārtika* 3. 5. 46 (page 1060):

"Yadapi yajamānasya bhraṣṭāvasaram kriyamāṇam viguṇam bhavatīti tadapi guṇalope mukhyasyetyanena viruddham."

The nyāya is expressive of *a lost opportunity*.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references. This nyāya is akin to Akāle kṛtam akṛtam syāt.

330

Maṇiprabhāmaṇimatinyāyaḥ.

The supposition that the light of a gem is itself the gem. This follows Mr. A. E. Gough's explanation of a slightly varied form of the nyāya which is found in the Bauddha section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*. He adds that, in this case, "we may yet handle the gem, because it underlies the light, while, if we were to take nacre for silver, we could not lay hold of any silver." The correction of this view is established by an important passage at the beginning of *Pañcadaśī IX*, which treats of dhyāna as a means of arriving at a right knowledge of Brahman. Such meditation, being directed towards Brahman with qualities, is of course erroneous, inasmuch as that Impersonality has no qualities; but it nevertheless leads to the underlying *nirguṇa* Brahman, just as the mistaken notion regarding the sparkle of the gem leads to the discovery of the gem itself. This is styled *saṃvādi-bhrama*, an error which has a corresponding reality underlying it. To mistake the distant shining of a lamp through the keyhole of a door for a gem, is an illustration of *visaṃvādi-bhrama*, an error entirely devoid of an underlying reality. The passage is as follows:

"Maṇipradīpaprabhayor maṇibuddhyā'bhidhāvatoḥ.
Mithyājñānāviśeṣe'pi viśeṣe [ṣo? ed.] 'rthakriyām prati.

Dīpo'pavarakasyāntar vartate tatprabhā bahiḥ.
Dṛśyate dvāryyathānyatra tadvaddṛṣṭā maṇeḥ prabhā.

Dūre prabhādvayaṃ dṛṣṭvā maṇibuddhyā'bhidhāvatoḥ.
Prabhāyāṃ maṇibuddhistu mithyā jñānam dvayor api.

Na labhyate maṇir dīpaprabhāṃ pratyabhidhāvātā.
Prabhāyāṃ dhāvatāvaśyaṃ labhyetaiva maṇir maṇeḥ.

Dīpaprabhāmaṇibhrāntir visaṃvādi-bhramaḥ smṛtaḥ.
Maṇiprabhāmaṇibhrāntiḥ saṃvādi-bhrama ucyate."

The commentator, Rāmakṛishṇa, ascribes verses 2-5 to a *vārtika*; whilst Citsukha Muni, in his comment on verse 2 which is quoted in the *Nyāyamakaranda* (page 148), names Dharmakīrti as its author. This is not improbable; for Dharmakīrti is known to

have composed *vārtikas* on the works of Dignāga, a famous Buddhist writer of the sixth century (See Mr. K. B. Pāṭhak's paper "On the authorship of the Nyāyabindu"). In *Nyāyamañjarī*, pages 24 (line 1), 33 (line 4 from bottom), and 158 (line 10), the nyāya is found as Maṇiprabhāmaṇibuddhivat. Then on page 308 (line 9 from bottom), there is the following passage which corresponds with the extract from *Pancadaśī*, namely:- "Arthaṃ hi mūlavartinam upalabhya pravartamānas tam āpnoti apavarakanihitamaṇiprasṛtāyāṃ kuñcikāvivarānirgatāyāṃ iva prabhāyāṃ maṇibuddhyā pravartamānaḥ. Yatra tu mūle'pyartha nāsti tatra vyāmohāt pravartamāno vipralabhyate dīpaprabhāyāṃ iva tathaiva maṇibuddhyā pravartamānaḥ."

The nyāya occurs again on page 317.

Other references to it are *Śālikā*, page 22, line 4; *Nyāyakandalī*, page 190; *Ātmatattva-viveka*, page 45; and *Tārkikarakṣā*, page 16.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references. I think I have seen the above vacanāni in *Pramāṇavārtika* of Dharmakīrti.

331

Maṇimantrādinyāyaḥ.

The nyāya of *a gem or charm &c.* [as an obstructor or exciter of fire &c., by its presence or absence]. This obscure nyāya is not in Raghunāthavarma's collection, but is defined as follows in the *Vācaspatyam*, page 4166:-

"Maṇimantrādīnāṃ vahner dāhaṃ prati yathā svātantryeṇa pratibandhakatvaṃ lokasiddhaṃ, na ca tatra yuktyapekṣā, evaṃ kāmīnījñāsāyā api jñānamātraṃ prati pratibandhakatvaṃ ityevaṃ yatra pṛthak pratibandhakatvaṃ tatrāsya pravṛtīḥ."

I am much indebted to Mr. Arthur Venis for the following note elucidating the nyāya: "In their analysis of the notion of cause and effect, many Indian writers distinguish between those cases in which the processes that intervene (avāntaravyāpāra) between the cause and its final product (kārya) are known by ordinary experience (lokasiddha), and those other cases in which the intermediate stages are not thus known. Of the latter cases, we know as a fact (say these writers) that, for example, a maṇi or a mantra will produce a certain effect or prevent it from coming into existence, we are quite unable to explain the rationale of the process in terms of ordinary experience. All that can be said in such cases is that the maṇi or the mantra has the power (śakti) to produce this or hinder that result. This postulate of a power transcending ordinary experience is the Maṇimantrādinyāya, and its proper application (pravṛitti) is to the class of causes thus roughly described. If I remember rightly, another, and to us Westerners a more interesting, example of this nyāya is the double fact of *attention to* something and

attention away from something else. The lover, intent on discovering his mistress (Kāminī-jijñāsā) is psychologically dead to all that does not concern her. But *how* should his attention *to* her cause attention *away from* all the world beside? Here, says the Indian psychologist, analysis of the *how* can proceed no further. The postulate of the maṇimantra must be applied here; or, in other words, we can only say that *attention to* a thing has the power to cause (śakti) attention away from something else." This question is discussed in *Kusumāñjali* i. 10, and Prof. Cowell's translation of the *kārikā* and Haridāsa's comment will be found helpful. I have met with the nyāya in the *Sankṣepa-śārīraka* iii. 87, 88, 91; in *Tattvamuktākālāpa* iv. 103, and, better still, in v. 99; and in *Vidvanmaṇḍana*, page 59.

Ed. note. Acintyo hi maṇimantrauśadhīnām prabhāvaḥ. *Kāvyaikalpalatākaviśikṣāvṛtti* of Amaraçandra Yati. Specific reference to the page yet to be located***.

Jacob has given many references here to other works. The statement as to pratibandha-katvam lokasiddham is quite significant. This is a foundation of Laukika-nyāyas.

332

Maṇivikrayadr̥ṣṭāntaḥ.

The illustration afforded by *the sale of gems*. It is intended to teach that, in disposing of precious stones, one who understands their value will derive greater advantage than one who is without that knowledge. This would undoubtedly be the case if the seller were a Śabara and the buyer a dealer in gems! The illustration is Śankara's, and is used by him in his exposition of *Chāndogya* 1. 1. 10, which sets forth the value of an *intelligent* use of the syllable *Om*. The passage is as follows:- "Tenobhau kuruto yaś caitad evaṃ veda yaśca na veda. Nānā tu vidyā cāvidyā ca. Yad eva vidyayā karoti ... tad eva vīryavattaraṃ bhavati." An objector here urges that the result of action does not depend upon the intelligence of the performer of it, but on the due performance of the act itself, and he supports his view with the following homely illustration, "Dr̥ṣṭaṃ hi loke harītakīṃ bhakṣayatō tadrāsābhijñetarayor virecanam." The Siddhāntin disallows this, and gives another illustration:-

"Dr̥ṣṭaṃ hi loke vaṇikśabarayoḥ padmarāgādimaṇivikraye vaṇijo vijñānādhi-kyāt phalādhikyam. Tasmād yadeva vidyayā vijñānena yuktaḥ san karoti karma ... tad eva karma vīryavattaram avidvatkarmaṇo'dhikaphalaṃ bhavati."

The nyāya is quoted, in a slightly different form, by Ānandagiri in his comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 42; and again by Amalānanda, in the same connection, in company with the drug-illustration.

Ed. note. Once again we see the force of dr̥ṣṭaṃ hi loke.

333

Maṇḍūkaplutinyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a frog's leap*. Used by grammarians and others to express the passing from one rule to another over intervening ones. I noted it in the following portions of the *Mahābhāṣya*:- 1. 1. 3 (vārt. 2); 5. 2. 4 (2); 6. 1. 17 and 3. 49; and 7. 2. 117. I have met with it also in Jayaratha's commentary on *Alaṅkārasarvasva* 20 ("viṣayasyāpahnave-'pahnutiḥ"), where he says:

"Kecana maṇḍūkaplutinyāyenānuvartanasyānucitatvād bhrāntimadanantaram apahnutiḥ granthakṛtā lakṣitā, ullekhaś cātiśayoktyanantaram iti granthaṃ viparyāsitavantāḥ. Na caitat."

See, too, *Bhāmatī* 1. 3. 39, and Ballantyne's *Aphorisms of the Nyāya*, ii. 80.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references.

334

Maṇḍūkavasāktākṣāṇām vaṃśeṣūragabhramaḥ.

Mistaking bamboos for snakes on the part of those whose eyes have been smeared with the fat of frogs. This curious (!) illustration, taken from *Ślokavārtika*, page 520, is found in the following passage of *Tātparyāṭīkā*, page 314:-

"Na ca maṇḍūkavasāktākṣāṇām ivānavagatāsmṛtoragāṇām api prathamākṣasannipātād vaṃśeṣūragāropa iti sāmpratam. Sarvāsām eva bhrāntīnām pramāṇagrhitāropyāropaviṣayagrahaṇapurāḥsarvatvaniyamāt. Tadanusāreṇa maṇḍūkavasāktākṣāṇām api vaṃśeṣūragabhramo vyākhyeyaḥ. Vaṃśānām tāvad asti bhūyaḥ sārūpyam urageṇa, tena caite tanmātreṇa rūpeṇa śaknuvanti grhitāḥ smārayitum uragam. Evam api yad anyeṣāṃ bhramo na bhavati tatra sarpākāravivṛttavaṃśa graho hetuḥ, maṇḍūkavasāñjanaṃ ca vaṃśākārapidhānamātrahetuḥ."

The *Ślokavārtika* passage containing the nyāya forms the second quotation in the following excerpt from *Sarvārthasiddhi* on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 64: "Saṅkocakānām niśeṣakṣīṇatvān na cātra

'Kāṇatām janayed dīpo nimbavṛndākareṇumān' itivat kiñcinnimittam antareṇa svataḥprāptaprakāśaikadeśabhaṅgaḥ syāt.

'Maṇḍūkavasayāktākṣā vaṃśān uragabuddhibhiḥ' itivad vā kenacid hetunā prāg anukūleṣu pratikūlabuddhir yukta."

Another instance of the nyāya is to be found in *Parimala*, page 43, line 9.

Ed. note. Here is an additional reference.

335

Madaśaktivat.

The simile of *the power of an intoxicant*. It is employed by Śaṅkara in his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 3. 53:

"Atraike dehamātrātmadarśino lokāyatikā dehavyatiriktasyātmano'bhāvaṃ manyamānāḥ samastavyasteṣu bāhyeṣu pṛthivyādiṣvadr̥ṣtam api caitanyaṃ śarīrākāra-pariṇateṣu bhūteṣu syād iti sambhāvayantas tebhyaś caitanyaṃ madaśaktivad vijñānam, caitanyaviśiṣṭaḥ kāyaḥ puruṣa iti cāhuḥ."

Ānandagiri comments on the latter part thus:- "Madeti. Yathaikaikasmāt tāmbūlāder adṛṣṭāpi madaśaktiḥ saṅghāte dṛśyate, tathedaṃ jñānam ekaikasminnadṛṣṭam api dehākārapariṇatabhūteṣu saṃhateṣu bhavatīti cāhur iti yojanā." In the Lokāyatika section of *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, kārikā 94 reads thus:

"Pṛthvyādibhūtasamhatyāṃ tathā dehādisambhavaḥ.
Madaśaktiḥ surāṅgebhyo yadvat tadvat sthitātmatā."

See, too, *Śālikā*, page 146, line 7 from bottom.

The illustration is found also in *Nyāyamañjarī* (page 439, line 4 from bottom):- "Yattu madaśaktivad ityuktaṃ tatra madaśakter dṛṣṭatvād abhyupagamo, na tu jñānasya tatra darśanam."

336

Madhu paśyasi durbuddhe prapātaṃ nānupaśyasi.

O foolish one! thou seest the honey but dost not see the precipice. This is the second line of *Śāntiparva* cccxi. 7. (cccx Bombay edn.), the first being:

"Svādukāmuka kāmānāṃ vaitṛṣṇyaṃ kiṃ na gacchasi."

Ānandabodhācārya quotes it in his *Nyāyamakaranda* (page 77) as:

"Madhu paśyasi durbuddhe prapātaṃ kiṃ na paśyasi."

The editor of that work was apparently unaware of the existence of the passage in the Mokṣadharmā, for he considered the ābhāṅaka to be based on the following verse of the *Devībhāgavata*:

"Madhu paśyati mūḍhātmā prapātaṃ naiva paśyati.
Karoti ninditaṃ karma narakān na bibheti ca."

Thanks to the St. Petersburg Lexicon, we can refer to five other passages of the Mahābhārata where the same illustration is found. In *Vanaparva* ccxxxv. 21 (Calc.), we read:

"Madhu prapaśyanti na tu prapātaṃ
yad dyūtam ālambya haranti rājyam."

In *Udyogaparva* L. 27:

"Viśamaṃ nāvamanyante prapātaṃ madhudarśinaḥ.
Saṃyugaṃ ye gamiṣyanti nararūpeṇa mṛtyunā."

In *Droṇaparva* Li. 11:

"Na lubdho budhyate doṣān mohāl lobhāt pravartate.
Madhulipsur hi nāpaśyaṃ prapātaṃ aham īdṛśam."

Again in cxxxiii. 10:

"Dhanaṃ dhaneśvarasyeva hṛtvā pārthasya me sutaḥ.
Madhuprepsur ivābuddhiḥ prapātaṃ nāvabudhyate."

Lastly, in *Strīparva* i. 37:

"Madhu yaḥ kevalaṃ dṛṣṭvā prapātaṃ nānupaśyati.
Sa bhraṣṭo madhulobhena śocatyevaṃ yathā bhavān."

Compare the following from *Sāstradīpikā* 3. 6. 3, page 340:

"Yo hi madhunyeva dattadṛṣṭir durbalāṃ śākhām adhirohati tasya vinipāta
eva bhavati. Tadvad ihāpi.

"Madhudṛṣṭivad evāsya guṇakāmaṃ prapaśyataḥ.
Kriyāphalavināśātmā vinipātaḥ prasaṃjate."

Madhyadīpikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the central lamp*. The idea is of a lamp in a central position shedding its light on all sides. It occurs in the *Muṇḍaka-bhāṣya* 1. 1. 3 (Śaunako ha vai mahāśālo 'ṅgirasam vidhivad upasannaḥ papraccha): "Śaunakāṅgirasoh sambandhād arvāg vidhivadviśeṣaṇād upasadanavidheḥ pūrveṣām aniyama iti gamyate. Maryādā-karaṇārthaṃ madhyadīpikānyāyārthaṃ vā viśeṣaṇam."

Also in Rāmatīrtha on *Vedāntasāra* (page 129):- "Madhyapradīpanyāyenottaratrāpi jāgradvāsanyatra kośatrayapadaṃ sambadhyate," which is thus rendered by Prof. Gough (in the *Paṇḍit* for Feb. 1873, p. 212):- "The term triad of sheaths has a double connection [with both the preceding and following clauses], after the manner of a lamp placed in the middle of a door [and throwing light both inwards and outwards]."

The following from *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 212, further illustrates the nyāya:-

"Gṛhe dadhighaṭīm draṣṭum ānīto gṛhamedhinā.
Apūpān api taddeśān prakāśayati dīpakaḥ."

Akin to this is *Madhyamaṇinyāya*, which is explained in the *Paṇḍit* for Dec. 1867 as referring to the central ruby of a nose-ring which casts a lustre on the pearl on each side of it.

Ed. note. Cf. *Antarvartidīpikānyāya*. Here is a homely illustration.

338

Madhye'pavādāḥ pūrvān vidhīn bādhante nottarān.

In the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, this paribhāṣā stands between *Purastād apavādāḥ* &c., and *Anantarasya vidhīr vā* &c., which see in its place. Professor Kielhorn's translation of the present one is as follows:- "*Apavādas* that are surrounded (by rules which teach operations that have to be superseded by the *Apavāda*-operations), supersede only those rules that precede, not those that follow, them." "The reason for (the validity of) this *Paribhāṣā* is this that (an *Apavāda*, when it has become effective) by superseding the rule which presents itself first, no longer wants (to supersede something else)." It appears in *Mahābhāṣya* 3. 2. 1 (vārt 6); 4. 1. 55 (vārt 4); 4. 1. 114 (vārt 4 and 6); 4. 3. 132 (vārt 6); 4. 3. 156 (vārt 7); 6. 1. 102 (vārt 6); 6. 1. 166; 6. 3. 68 (vārt. 5); 6. 4. 148 (vārt. 5); and 7. 2. 44 (vārt. 4). In no case, however, are the words *nottarān* found in the *paribhāṣā*.

Ed. note. It is remarkable to note so many references given here. This is a *vyākaraṇa-paribhāṣā*.

339

Mandaviṣanyāyaḥ.

The simile of a *slow-poison*. It forms nyāya 150 of the Pūrvabhāga of *Laukikanyāya-ratnākara*, and is used in opposition to Tīvraviṣanyāya as follows:

"Evaṃ hi saṃśayādinivṛttir mandaviṣanyāyena sukarā. Bodhādārḍhye prati-vādyāpāditam tu saṃśayādi tīvraviṣanyāyena duṣpariharam syāt. Sadyobhuktaṃ viṣam mandam anyathā tīvram." It occurs in *Śāstradīpikā* 1. 3. 4 (page 148, line 2 from bottom): "Itthaṃ ca sambhavati prāmāṇye nāprāmāṇyaṃ yuktam iti bhavati keṣāñcid ākāṅkṣā, sāpi mandaviṣanyāyena nirākartavyetyevamartham idam adhikaraṇam."

Ed. note. Jacob does not deal with tīvraviṣanyāya separately.

340

Mahatāpi prayatnena tamisrāyāṃ parāmṛśan.
Kṛṣṇaśuklavivekaṃ hi na kaścid adhigacchati.

Not even by the most thorough examination, could one distinguish between black and white, in intense darkness. The verse is Kumārila's, and is used by him (in *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 1) to illustrate the impossibility of tracing the sources from which Manu and other Smṛiti- authors derived their laws. [See note below, ed]. Just before the śloka, he says:- "Na ca tad vijñāyate kīḍṛśād vākyād idam manvādibhiḥ pratipannaṃ, kiṃ vidhiparād utārthavādarūpād iti." Then, immediately after the verse:- "Na ca manvādivacanād vedamūlatvaṃ niścinumaḥ." This latter clause, as the *Nyāyasudhā* points out, is with reference to Manu's own statement, in chapter ii. 7, to the effect that every precept of his was deduced from the Veda.

Ed. note. It is interesting to observe that even Kumārila had difficulty in tracing the vacanāni to their original sources.

Tamisrā tāmasī rātris. Amara. Check.***

341

Mahati darpaṇe mahan mukhaṃ tad eva kanīnikāyām aṇu.

The very same face which looks large [when seen] in a large mirror, appears small [when reflected] in the pupil of the eye. The illustration is found in *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page

137, line 16:- "Ekam api vyañjakabhedād utkarṣavan nikaṣavad dṛṣṭam, yathā mahati darpaṇe mahan mukhaṃ tad eva kanīnikāyām aṇviti."

342

Mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvārpaṇanyāyaḥ.

This very curious [?] simile is found in the commentary on Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* i. 4, the first half of which reads thus:

"Kṣaṇasāmpad iyaṃ sudurlabhā
pratilabdhā puruṣārthasādhanī."

The *ṭīkā* commences as follows:

"Aṣṭākṣaṇavinirmuktasya kṣaṇasya sāmpattiḥ samagrātā. Iyaṃ sudurlabhā. Suṣṭhu duḥkhena labhyata iti kathañcit prāpyā. Mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvārpaṇopamā."

In a footnote, the editor tells us that Professor Kern was unable to get any satisfactory meaning out of the *nyāya*, but proposed the following: "As the entering of the tortoise's neck into the hole of the yoke formed by the great ocean." Before him, Burnouf, who was equally puzzled, suggested, "It is as unlikely to happen as if a tortoise should put its neck into a hole opening every yuga in the world's ocean." This was all that I knew when writing on it early in 1904. A note, however, contributed to the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* for 1906-1907, by Mr. Harināth De, M. A., threw considerable light on the subject. He gave extracts from three Pali works in which the simile is more or less directly referred to, and one of them, namely that from the *Majjhima Nikāya*, is said by him to be "the original passage in which the comparison first occurred." Mr. De did not translate it, but I take the following to be the sense of it:- "If a man were to throw into the sea a one-holed yoke, and it were tossed to and fro between north and south, and east and west, and if, once in a hundred years, a tortoise, blind of one eye, were to rise to the surface, would it be likely that its neck would enter that yoke?"

It was not until after I had made use of this in a note on the simile which I contributed to the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* in October 1909, that I became aware that my friend, Mr. F. W. Thomas, had really explained it six years previously! It came about on this wise. In the September number of the *Indian Antiquary* for 1903, in an article entitled *Mātrīceṭa and the Mahārājakanikālekha*, he quoted a verse from a Tibetan work, and gave the following translation:- "When like the neck of a tortoise entering the hole of a yoke in the ocean, I had obtained the state of man, attended with the great festival of the good religion." He then added this explanatory remark:- "The reference to the blind tortoise, which rises from the bottom of the ocean once in a hundred years, and by a rare chance happens to insert his neck into a yoke floating on the surface of the ocean, is used to

illustrate the extremely rare chance by which a living creature is born as a human being." After pointing out the recurrence of the simile in two other Buddhist works, he added:- "I have noted also a fourth recurrence of it in the Tibetan version of a work entitled *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, and ascribed to Sūra. This reference will now be familiar to M. Levi, who has himself discovered in Nepal the Sanskrit text of the work ... The Sanskrit original here reads ... as follows:

Ata evāha bhagavān mānuṣyam atidurlabham.
Mahārṇavayugachhidre kūrmaḡrīvārpaṇopamaḡ.

Is it not probable that we have here a saying ascribed to Buddha, which we may hope also to find in the Pali literature? [I now learn from Prof. Rhys Davids that it does occur in the *Majjhima Nikāya*: see the edition of Mr. Chalmers iii. page 169]."

This is the passage of the *Nikāya* quoted by Mr. Harinātha De, but, as he makes no reference to Mr. Thomas' article, I infer that he, too, in 1907, was as unacquainted with it as myself.

Orthodox writers, such as Kumārila, Vācaspati Mīśra and others, have not hesitated to make use of illustrations employed by Buddhist writers, and that now under consideration forms no exception. I have recently met with a slightly modified form of it in the *Bodhasāra*, a modern Vedantic work by Śri-Narahari, published, together with a commentary, in the Benares Sanskrit Series in 1906. On page 223, the author quotes a verse from "*Vāsiṣṭha*" (probably the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*) which I subjoin together with the comment:-

"Calārṇavayugacchidra-kūrmaḡrīvāpraveśavat.
Anekajanmanām ante vivekī jāyate pumān.

Caleti. Calārṇavayugacchidrakūrmaḡrīvāpraveśavat. Calau cañcalau yā-varṇavau ... tāvarṇavau taraṅgau ... tayor yugaḡ yugmaḡ tasya cchidraḡ madhyavartyākāśaḡ tatra sthito yaḡ kūrmaḡ kamaṭhas tasya kacchapasyobhayapārśve bahukālaḡ nirantaraḡ taraṅgakṛtatāḍanena vihvalatve ḡrīvāpraveśo ḡrīvā kaṅṭhas tadupa-lakṣitatadādyāṅgapraveśo yathā jāyate tadvat pumān puruṣārthyanekejanmanām anantaJanmamarāṇopalakṣitasukhaduḡkhānāḡ sparśena khinnas tadantaḡkaraṇa-bāhyakaraṇāni svasvaviṣayebhyo vyāvartya vivekyātmānātmavivekavāñ jāyate bhavati."

According to this interpreter, then, we have the tortoise swimming between two boisterous seas (or *waves*, according to him), and becoming so distressed by the buffeting which it receives that it thrusts its neck (which is said to stand for the whole body) into something or other not specified! And this is intended to illustrate the distress caused to a man by the ills of endless existences in the *bhavasāgara*, and also his final enlightenment and restraining of his organs of sense from the external objects which formerly attracted them!

A *propos* of the above remark as to the adoption by orthodox writers of illustrations taken from so-called heretical authors [strīratnam duṣkulādapi! ed.], I may add that possibly even the great grammarian Patañjali borrowed his "Āmrān pṛṣṭaḥ kovidārān ācaṣṭe" from a Buddhist source; for, in Childer's Pāli Dictionary, under the word Seyyathā, we find the following quotation from the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*:

"Seyyathāpi, bhante, ambaṃ vā puṭṭho labujaṃ vyākareyya, labujaṃ vā puṭṭho ambaṃ vyākareyya, evam evaṃ &c." "As a man, Sir, who was asked about a mango, might answer about a bread fruit, and vice versa, even so &c."

Ed. note. Get the other half of kṣaṇasampad iyam. ... Gahano'yam viṣayaḥ. Naike naikadhā vyākhyātum arhanti.

343

Mahiṣīsnehapratibaddhabhikṣudṛṣṭāntaḥ.

The illustration of a devotee who was hindered [in the religious life] by the affection which he had for a courtesan [when he was a householder]. It is said to be the subject of a *Gāthā*, and is cited to show that the past, equally with the present or future, may injuriously influence the seeker after the knowledge which leads to emancipation. It is found in *Pañcadaśī* ix. 41:

"Atītenāpi mahiṣīsnehena pratibandhataḥ.
Bhikṣus tattvaṃ na vedeti gāthā loke pragīyate."

We are told in the next verse that the Guru, making use of that self-same incident as an instrument for the conveyance of *Brahmajñāna*, brought about its removal and secured the man's emancipation! The commentator puts it thus:

"Gurus tasya tattvopadeṣṭā tadīyaṃ mahiṣīsneham anuṣṭya tasyām eva mahiṣyāṃ tattvaṃ tanmahiṣyupādhikaṃ brahmoktavān, tataḥ so'pi mahiṣīsnehalakṣaṇapratibandhakāpagamena gurūpaḍiṣṭaṃ tattvaṃ yathāvat śāstroktapra-kāreṇaiva jñātavān ityārthaḥ."

The three verses immediately preceding the above will be found under the *Hiraṇya-nidhidṛṣṭānta*.

344

Mātsyanyāyaḥ.

The simile *drawn from fish*. It is used to illustrate the oppression of the weak by the strong. In Raghunāthavarman's list, it follows the Sundopasundanyāya, and he explains it thus:

"Ayaṃ [Sundopasundanyāyaḥ] tulyabalayor virodhe prasarati. Prabalanirbala-virodhe sabalena nirbalabādhavivakṣayāṃ tu mātsyanyāyavatāraḥ. Ayaṃ prāya itihāsapurāṇādiṣu dṛśyate. Tathāhi Vāsiṣṭhe Prahlādākhyāne tatsamādhim prastutyoktam:

'Etāvatā'tha kālena tad rasātalamaṇḍalam.
Babhūvārājakaṃ tīkṣṇaṃ mātsyanyāyakadarthitam.'

Yathā prabalā matsyā nirbalāṃ tān nāśayanti tathārājake'mukadeśe prabalā janā nirbalān narān nāśayantīti nyāyārthaḥ."

The verse quoted here is *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 5. 37. 7. There is a good example of the usage of this nyāya in *Kāmandakīya-Nītisāra* ii. 40, which reads thus:

Parasparāmiṣatayā jagato bhinnavartmanah.
Daṇḍābhāve paridhvamsī mātsyo nyāyaḥ pravartate.

My friend Mr. Tawney has given me a reference to the commentary on i. 13 of the same work, and also to *Kathāsaritsāgara* cii. 63 which I here subjoin together with his translation (vol. ii, page 390):

"Nāstyevārājakaṃ kiñcid bata ko'pi prajāsvaho.
Rājaśabdaḥ suraiḥ sṛṣṭo mātsyanyāyabhayād ayam."

"There is no race in the world without a king; I do believe the gods introduced the magical name among men in their alarm, fearing that otherwise the strong would devour the weak, as great fishes eat the little." Kullūka gives "Jale matsyān ivāhimṣyuḥ" as a various reading in the second line of *Manu* vii. 20, and adds, "Atra balavanto durbalān himṣyur iti matsyanyāya eva syād ityuktam." For this, also, I am indebted to Mr. Tawney.

345
Mānādhīnā meyasiddhiḥ.

To know the thing to be measured, you must know the measure. This is quoted in the opening part of the Akshapāda section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*: "Mānādhīnā meyasiddhir iti nyāyena pramāṇasya prathamam uddeśe tadanusāreṇa lakṣaṇasya kathanīyatayā prathamoddiṣṭasya pramāṇasya prathamam lakṣaṇam kathyate."

Prof. Cowell's translation is as follows:- "In accordance with the principle that 'to know the thing to be measured, you must first know the measure,' proof (pramāṇa) is first enunciated, and as this must be done by defining it, we have first a definition of proof." We find it, too, in *Tattvapradīpikā* (or *Citsukhī*) ii. 18, as follows:

"Mānādhīnā meyasiddhir mānasiddhiś ca lakṣaṇāt.
Taccādhyakṣādimāneṣu gīrvāṇair api durbhaṇam."

Compare also the following from *San̄kṣepasārīraka* (i. 487):

"Mānena meyāvagatiś ca yuktā
dharmasya jāḍyād vidhiniṣṭhakāṇḍe.
Meyena mānāvagatis tu yuktā
Vedāntavākyeṣvajadam hi meyam."

See, too, *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 86, and *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 4 ("Prameya-siddhiḥ pramāṇādhi").

Ed. note. On *San̄kṣepasārīraka* J has a fn.: Its author Sarvajñātmanuni was a pupil of Sureśvarācārya. See K. R. Pathak's valuable paper *Bhartṛhari and Kumārila* (1892), p. 24. (No more details!).

The translation of the nyāya presented by Jacob here looks very poor.

Would it be proper to conclude that here is an answer to the question as to why Raghunātha Varmā discussed the "Prameya" first?

346

Māraṇāya gṛhīto'ṅgacchedaṃ svīkaroti.

One who has been seized in order to be put to death, [gladly] agrees to the amputation of a limb [as an alternative]. The nearest approach to this nyāya of Raghunātha's is found in the following verse of Bodhicaryāvatāra (iv. 72):

"Māraṇīyaḥ karaṃ chittvā muktaś cet kim abhadrakam.
Manuṣyaduḥkhair narakān muktaś cet kim abhadrakam."

On the former part of this, the commentator says:- "Yo hi māraṇam arhati sa yadi hastamātraṃ chittvā mucyate tadā na kācit kṣatir asti, pratyuta labdhalābham ātmānaṃ manyate. Atyalpam idaṃ maraṇaduḥkhāt karacchedanaduḥkham iti."

347

Mālatīgandhaguṇavid darbhe na ramate hyaliḥ.

The bee that knows the excellence of the perfume of jasmine cares not for darbha grass. This is found in the following passage of Upamitibhavaprapāñcā Kathā, page 1031:-

"Ata evāgamajñasya yā kriyā sā kriyocyate
Āgamajño'pi yas tasyāṃ yathāśaktyā pravartate.

Cintāmaṇisvarūpajño daurgatyopahato nahi.
Tatprāptyupāyavaicitrye satyanyatra pravartate.

Na cāsau tatsvarūpajño yo'nyatrāpi pravartate.
Mālatīgandhaguṇavid darbhe na ramate hyaliḥ."

ED. NOTE: Pāṇau śoṇatale tanūdari darakṣāmā kapolasthalī
vinyastāñjanadigdhalocanajalaiḥ kim mlānim ānīyate.
Mugdhe cumbatu nāma cañcalatayā bhṛṅgaḥ kvacit kandalīm
unmllannavamālatīparimalaḥ kim tena vismāryate.
(drawn from memory).

348

Māṣarāśipraviṣṭamaṣīnyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a grain of soot in a heap of spotted beans*. Perhaps akin to a needle in a haystack. It seems to have originated in that very ancient drama, the *Mṛicchakaṭika*, where it is found (on page 40) in the following Prākṛit passage:- "Śakāraḥ. Bhāve bhāve, balie kkhu andhaāle māśalāśipaviṣṭā via maśīguḍiā dīśantī dīśantī jeva paṇaṣṭā vaśantaśeṇiā."

(=Bhāva, balavatyandhakāre māṣarāśipraviṣṭeva maśīguḍikā dṛśyamānaiva pranaṣṭā Vasantasenā.) In vol. ix of the Harvard Oriental Series, Dr. A. W. Ryder (in imitation of the Śakāra) renders it thus:- "But mashter, it's pitch dark and it's like hunting for a grain of soot in a pile of spotted beans. Now you see Vasantasenā and now you don't."

The nyāya is quoted in Udayana's *Kiraṇāvali*, page 79:- "Sa tu māṣarāśipraviṣṭamaśīvan mahāprakāśasamāhārān nekṣyate," and again on pages 208 and 451 of Venkaṭanātha's *Sarvārthasiddhi*, the latter being as follows:- "Yathā māṣarāśau maśī, yathā vā nīlotpalavane kādambas tadbhedāgrahāt tad apṛthagbhāvenābhimanyate vyavahriyate ca."

349

Mithilāyāṃ pradīptāyāṃ na me dahyati kiñcana.

If Mithilā should be in flames, nothing of mine would be burnt up. This is the second line of a verse in *Śāntiparva*, chapter 178, the first line being,

"Anantaṃ bata me vittaṃ yasya me nāsti kiñcana."

It is used to indicate the freedom from anxiety of one who has nothing to lose; like Juvenal's "*Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator.*" Śaṅkara quotes the phrase in his exposition of the words, "na hāsya karma kṣīyate," in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopanishad* 1. 4. 15:- "Na hāsya karma kṣīyate. Karmābhāvād eveti nityānuvādaḥ. Yathā viduṣaḥ karma-kṣayalakṣaṇaṃ saṃsāraduḥkhaṃ santatam eva, na tathā tad asya vidyata ityarthāḥ. Mithilāyāṃ pradīptāyāṃ na me dahyati kiñcaneti yadvat." [MRI ed. p. 109]

It appears also in the following verse of the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 278:

"Tathāhi mithilānātho mumukṣur nirmamaḥ purā.
Āhedaṃ mithilādāhe na me kiñcana dahyate."

Ed. note. Also relevant is:

Atrāpyudāharantīmam itihāsam purātanam.
Gītam Videharājena Janakena praśāmyatā.

Anantaṃ bata me vittaṃ yasya me nāsti kiñcana.
Mithilāyāṃ pradīptāyāṃ na me dahyati kiñcana.
(drawn from memory).

A non-English quote to be translated into English.

350

Muñjād iṣīkoddharaṇanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the extraction of the interior spike of the Muñja grass.* The following verse from the *Pañcadaśī* (i. 42), with an extract from Rāmakṛishṇa's comment thereon, will fully explain the meaning and application of the saying:

"Yathā muñjād iṣīkaivam ātmā yuktyā samuddhṛtaḥ.
Śarīratritayād dhīraiḥ paraṃ Brahmaiva jāyate."

Yathā yena prakāreṇa muñjād etannāmakāt tṛṇaviśeṣād iṣīkā garbhasthaṃ komalaṃ tṛṇaṃ yuktyā bahir āvarakatvena sthitānāṃ sthūlapatrāṇāṃ vibhajana-

lakṣaṇenopāyena samuddhriyata evamātmāpi...śarīratritayāt...dhīraiḥ... samuddhṛtaḥ
pṛthak kṛtaś cet sa paraṃ Brahmaiva jāyate."

The illustration is a very ancient one, since it is employed in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 4. 3. 3. 16, and in *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* vi. 17. The latter instance is as follows:- "Taṃ svāc
charīrāt pravṛthen muñjādiveṣīkām dhairyena." For the former, see this nyāya in the
Superaddenda to *Third Handful*. It is found also in *Bṛihadāraṇyakavārtika* 4. 4. 1277.

Ed. Note : Job refers to the "Superaddenda in the *Third Handful*." I have not yet seen it.
Here are some additional references.

351

Muṇḍitaśironakṣatrānveṣaṇam.

*Enquiring as to a suitable date for the shaving of one's head when one has already
performed that ceremony!* It occurs in the following passage of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, page
171:

"Yat punaḥ kālāntare tanniścayakaraṇe dūṣaṇam itaretarāśrayatvaṃ vā
muṇḍitaśironakṣatrānveṣaṇavad vaiarthyaṃ veti varṇitaṃ tatrādrṣṭe viṣaye
prāmānyaniścayapūrvikāyāḥ pravṛtter abhyupagamān netaretarāśrayaṃ cakrakam
vā."

This saying was explained to me by my learned friend, the Principal of the Government
Sanskrit College at Benares. It is similar to two given by Raghunāthavarman, namely,"
Kṛte kārye kiṃ muhūrtaprasāna," and "Na hi vivāhānantaraṃ varaparīkṣā kriyate."
See also Kṛtakṣaurasya nakṣatraparīkṣā in its proper place.

352

Munir manute mūrkhō mucyate.

A sage meditates [on Brahman] and a fool is emancipated! An impossible sequence.
Compare *Ezekiel* xviii. 2: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are
set on edge." The nyāya forms part of an interesting passage on page 37 of
Vedāntatattvaviveka: "Etenedam apāstaṃ munir manute mūrkhō mucyata ityetac-
chāstraphalaṃ prayoktarīti nyāyaviruddham.

Tathā cābhānakāḥ.

Kācin niṣādī tanayaṃ prasūte
kāscin niṣādas tu kaṣāyapāyīti.

kaścin niṣādas tu kaṣāyapāyīti.

Munikartṭkaśravaṇādividhiphalasya sāksātkārasya mūrkhē'nabhyupagamāt. Tatphalasyāpyavidyānivṛtter munipratyañmātragatatayā tāvanmātratayā mūrkhāniṣṭhatvābhāvāt. Dṛṣṭaphalānām yathādarśam upapatteś ca." For the nyāya Śāstraphalam prayoktari, see its place.

ED. NOTE: Here we have tanayam and not putram, which is preferable.

353

Mūṣāsiktatāmranāyāḥ.

The simile of [molten] *copper poured into a mould* [and assuming its shape]. Raghunāthavarman expounds it thus: "Cakṣurādivārā bahir niṣṭasyāntaḥkaraṇasya mūṣāsiktatāmranāyāyena viṣayākāratā bhavati. Taduktam bhagavatpādaiḥ:-

'Mūṣāsiktam yathā tāmram tannibham jāyate tathā.
Rūpādīn vyāpnuvac cittam tannibham dṛśyate dhruvam iti.'

This verse is Śaṅkarācārya's *Upadeśasāhasrī* xiv. 3, Rāmatīrtha comments as follows:- "Mūṣā'ntaḥsuṣirā mṛtpratimā. Yathāgnisamparkād dravībhūtam tāmram mūṣāyām niṣiktam niṣiptam sat tannibham jāyate tatsamānākṛti bhavati tathā cittam api rūpādīn viṣayān vyāpnuvat tannibham dṛśyate tadākāram jāyata ityarthah."

I may add that the nyāya which immediately follows this in Raghunātha's list, namely Vyañjakavyaṅgyanyāya, is based on the very next verse of the *Upadeśasāhasrī* ["Vyañjako vā yathā" lokaḥ &c.], and his explanatory remarks are taken *verbatim* from Rāmatīrtha's comment. The nyāya we are now examining appears also in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 1. 12 in the expression, "Mūṣāniṣiktadrutatāmradīpratimāvat," and in *Taittirīyavārtika* (page 94):

"Vidyād annamayenaiva mūṣāyām drutatāmrvavat.
Sarvān prāṇamayādīms tām racitām puruṣākṛtīm."

354

Mūṣikabhakṣitabījādāvaṅkurādījananaprārthanā.

Looking for the production of germs when the seed has been eaten by a mouse! This seems to belong to the same category as the Kākadantaparīkṣā. It occurs in the Bauddha chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 14 of Jīvānanda's edition). The whole passage is too long for quotation, but the nyāya-portion is as follows: "Dvītye sthāyitvavṛttyāśā mūṣikabhakṣitabījādāvaṅkurādījananaprārthanām anuharet."

Ed. note. Jacob says: The whole passage is too long for quotation. It will be helpful to give such passages in an Appendix. Work on Añjali may be continued for years and years by successive generations.

355

Mṛtaṃ duṇḍubham āsādyā kāko'pi garuḍāyate.

Even a [cowardly] crow can assume the bearing of an eagle, when it comes upon a dead lizard! This is the first line of *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii. 72, the second being:

"Āpad ābādhatē'lpāpi mano yadi [hi?] durbalam."

How true to nature this is!

Ed. note: Here is a basis for the evolution of the *lalukikanyāyas*.

356

Ya eva karoti sa eva bhunkte.

He who performs an action will himself reap the fruit thereof [whether in the form of reward or retribution]. This doctrine, common to all the orthodox schools, is found in *Nyāyavārtika* 3. 1. 4 and is directed against the belief that the body is the soul, and that, when the body is cremated, the man, with all his deeds, ceases to exist. This is reasserted in *Tātparyāṭikā*, page 403, thus:

"Ya eva karmaṇaḥ kartā sa eva tatphalasya bhokteti sarvair āstikapathānu-sāribhir abhyupeyam."

The emphasis here, therefore, is not so much on the fact that *whatsoever* a man soweth that shall he also reap, as that *whosoever* soweth the same shall also reap. This, of course, implies that the reaper will be *conscious* of the fact that he was the sower, for otherwise the precept would be of no moral value. It is difficult to see how anyone can hold with the above, and at the same time be a believer in the doctrine of transmigration, the advocates of which are compelled to admit that the subjects of those repeated births have absolutely *no consciousness* of previous existences. I am not unmindful of the fact that the followers of the Yoga system [sūtra iii. 16] profess to attain to a knowledge of the past and the future by means of *saṃyama* (that is, by *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, and *saṃādhi* collectively); but, even if that were so, the number affected would be infinitesimal.

Ed. note. This militant military-minded mighty man in Colonel could not imbibe the spirit--the real sense and essence of what he read and what he wrote on. He might not have read Śrīharṣa--Śraddhārāddhaguruślathīkṛta...

Also to be noted is:

Yasya deve parā bhaktiḥ yathā deve tathā gurau.
Tasyaite kathitā hyarthaḥ prakāśante mahātmanaḥ.

357

Yaḥ kārayati sa karotyeva.

He who causes a thing to be done by another is himself the real doer of it. "Facit per alium facit per se." This nyāya is of common occurrence. There is a good instance of it in Ānandagiri's comment on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 2. 11. Explaining *Muṇḍaka Upanishad* 3. 1. 1, Śaṅkara says: "Evam ekenāpi pibatā dvau pibantāvucyete. Yadvā jīvas tāvat pibatīśvaras tu pāyayati. Pāyayannapi pibatītyucyate. Pācayitaryapi paktṛtva-prasiddhidarśanāt," on which Ānandagiri remarks: "Pāyayanniti. Pradhānakartari pra-yogo guṇakartari katham ityāśaṅkyāha pācayitarīti. Yaḥ kārayati sa karotyeveti nyāyād ityarthaḥ."

See also *Tātparyāṭikā*, page 187, line 1.

Ed. note. Here is something in non-English. To be translated.

358

Yat karabhasya pṛṣṭhe na māti tat kaṅṭhe nibadhyate.

*That for which there is no room on a camel's back is tied to his neck! Illustrates the piling up of misfortunes almost beyond endurance. Perhaps akin to our, "It is the last straw which breaks the camel's back." It occurs in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 394:*

"Mayā cintitam. Aho hatā daivena vyaṃ mandabhāgyāḥ. Tad idam ābhānakam āyātam. Yad uta yat karabhasya pṛṣṭhe na māti tat kaṅṭhe nibadhyata iti. Tathāhi Vaiśvānarapāpamitrayogenaiva kumārasya gāḍham udvejitā vyaṃ, yāvatayam aparā kṛtyevāsyā bhāryā sampanneti."

Kṛtyā is a female deity [spirit? ed.] who is invoked for evil purposes. There is another example on page 895 of the same:

"Mahābhārasamākrānta-mūrter āraṭīkāriṇaḥ.
Yatpṛṣṭhe māti noṣṭrasya galake tan nibadhyate."

359

Yat kṛtakam tad anityam.

Anything that has been made is non-eternal. In other words, that which has a beginning has also an end; except, of course, the Naiyāyika's Pradhvaṃsābhāva, which has a beginning but no end! The nyāya is found in the *Nyāyabindu*, page 108, and its converse, *Yad anityam tat kṛtakam*, on page 116. The following are additional examples of its use. *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, page 240, line 3: "Ato yat kṛtakam tad anityam ityādinyāyanusāreṇānityatvādikam mokṣasya prāpnoti."

Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā, page 187, line 8 from bottom: "Evam anityam śabdaṃ bubhutsamānāyānityaḥ śabda ityanuktvā yadeva kiñcid ucyate kṛtakatvād iti vā yat kṛtakam tad anityam iti vā, kṛtakaśca śabda iti vā, tat sarvam asyānapekṣitam āpātato'sambaddhābhidhānam, tathā cānavahito na boddhum arhatīti. Yat kṛtakam tat sarvam anityam, yathā ghaṭaḥ, kṛtakaśca śabda iti vacanam arthasāmarthyē naivāpekṣitaśabdānityatvaniścāyakam ityavadhānam atreti cenna, parasparāśrayatva-prasaṅgāt."

Part of this latter passage is quoted in *Citsukhī* i. 23 (Paṇḍit, vol. V. page 27).

Ed. note. Here is a kind of See also reference.

360

Yatrākṛtis tatra guṇāḥ.

Where there is a good outward appearance, there also are good qualities. This is found in Hemacandra's *Parīśiṣṭaparvan* iii. 233:

"Asyākṛtyanusāreṇa guṇān api hi niścinu.
Yatrākṛtis tatra guṇā iti loke'pi gīyate."

It is contained also in verse 5076 of *Indische Sprüche*, but whether as a quotation or not, I cannot say:

"Yatrākṛtis tatra guṇā vasanti naitaddhi samyak kavibhiḥ praṇītam.
Kenāticārvaṅgyapi me hr̥disthā dunāti gātraṃ virahe priyā'sau."

Professor Boehtlingk took it from Kosegarten's edition of the *Pancatantra* (i. 208), but I cannot find it in the Bombay edition. Some work on Śṛṅgārāsa is a much more probable source.

Ed. note. Jacob does not conclude this nyaya with "vasanti."

We recall this also reading as Nahyākṛtir guṇān vyabhicarati.

361

Yad abhidhitasitaṃ tad abhidhīyatām, phale vyaktir bhaviṣyati.

Say what you wish to say about a thing, but its real value will be shown by the advantage derived from it. In the opening part of the *Tārkkikarakṣā*, the author says: "Prāripsitasya granthasya prekṣāvadupāditsāprayojikām abhimataphalasādhanatām abhidhāya śrotṛbuddhim anukūlayan vartiṣyamāṇam evāgre darśayati --

Niḥśreyasaphalaṃ prāhur yeṣāṃ tattvāvadhāraṇam.
Pramāṇādipadārthās te lakṣyante nātivistaram."

On which Mallinātha comments thus: "Nanu yad abhidhitasitaṃ tad abhidhīyatām phale vyaktir bhaviṣyatīti nyāyāt kiṃ mṛṣā'gre vakṣyamāṇārthapratijñāḍaṃbaravilambair ityādyaślokākṣepam āśaṅkya samādhatte prāripsitasyeti. Prekṣāvatām dhīmatām upāditsā svacikīrṣā tatra prayojikām hetubhūtām ityarthah. Prekṣāvatpravr̥tteḥ prayojanaññānādhīnatvāt tajñāpanāyāgre pratijñā kāryeti bhāvaḥ."

362

yadaśvena hṛtaṃ purā.

Tat paścād gardabhaḥ prāptuṃ kenopāyena śaknuyāt.

By what means can a donkey overtake [so as to bring back] that which has been carried off long before by [one mounted on] a horse? This phrase, borrowed from *Tantravārtika* (page 730), is introduced into the *Nyāyamañjarī* (page 262) in the course of a discussion on the relative value and authority of *Śruti* and *Smṛti*, in the following verse:

"So'yam ābhāṅako loke yad aśvena hṛtaṃ purā.
Tat paścād gardabhaḥ prāptuṃ kenopāyena śaknuyāt."

According to Kumārila, a man who has accepted the teaching of *Śruti* will not allow it to be upset by a contradictory *Smṛti*, and *vice versa*. This is expressed, as follows, in two passages of *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 3. (as pointed out by the editor of *Nyāyamañjarī*): "Na ca śrutijanitapratyayasya smṛtijanito bādhatvāṃ pratipadyate.

Smārtasya bādhaḥ śrauto balavattvāt pratīyate.
Pratyakṣe cānumāne ca prāg etaddhyavadhāritam.

Na ca śīghraḥṛte'rthe'sti cirād āgacchato gatiḥ.

Aśvair apahr̥taṃ ko hi gardabhāiḥ prāptum arhati."

Page 92. Again on page 94: "Yo hi śrutim̐ prathamam̐ aśrutvā smṛtim̐ evaikām̐ paśyati tasyāpratihataśrutyanumāne vṛtte --

Na paścāc chrūyamāṇāpi śrutih̐ syāt pratibandhikā.
Gardabhenāpanītaṃ hi haren nāśvaś cirād gataḥ."

363

Yadgrahe yadapekṣaṃ cakṣus tadabhāvagrahe'pi
tad apekṣate.

That on which the eye depends to perceive an object, it must also depend on to perceive that object's absence. This is Professor Cowell's rendering of the nyāya in the Aulūkyā chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 126, Jīvananda's edn.):- "Na cālokābhāvasya ghaṭādyabhāvavadrūpavadabhāvatvenālokaśapekṣacakṣurjanya jñānaviṣayatvaṃ syād ityeṣitavyaṃ. Yadgrahe yadapekṣaṃ cakṣus tadabhāvagrahe'pi tadapekṣata iti nyāyenālokaḥ grahe ālokapekṣāyā abhāvena tadabhāvagrahe'pi tadapekṣāyā abhāvāt."

"And you need not assert that this absence of light must be the object of a cognition produced by the eye in dependence on light, since it is the absence of an object possessing colour [*i.e.* light possesses colour, and we cannot see a jar's absence in the dark], as we see in the case of a jar's absence; because, by the very rule on which you rely, namely, that on which the eye depends to perceive an object, it must also depend on to perceive that object's absence, it follows that as there is no dependence of the eye on light to perceive light, it need not depend thereon to perceive this light's absence."

Most probably Mādhava took this from Udayana's *Kiraṇāvali* where it stands (on page 18) in a similar context. It occurs also in *Lakṣaṇāvalīṭīkā*, page 12.

364

Yadvīśeṣayoḥ kāryakāraṇabhāvo'sati bādḥake
tatsāmānyayor api.

This nyāya is found in Raghunātha's larger work, the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara* (India Office MS. 582, page 185 *a*), and on page 6 of *Śikhāmaṇiṭīkā*. Prof. Cowell, however, quoted and explained it in a footnote to his translation of Haridāsa's comment on *Kusumāñjali* v. 4. I quote a portion of the comment to elucidate the note. "You may not say that 'volition of the conscious agent is the cause in effort only, and not in all action generally,' because, even though a particular kind of volition may be the cause in the case of effort, this does not preclude volition generally; otherwise, because a particular seed is the cause of a particular shoot, it would follow that seeds in general [*i.e.* the class, seed] could not

be the causes of shoots in general." The following is the footnote. "This argument depends on two principles: *a. The same relation of cause and effect which exists between two particulars, exists likewise between their respective classes, 'Yadvīśeṣayoḥ kāryakāraṇabhāvas tatsāmānyayor api,'* and *b. The general causes only produce their effects when conjoined with the particular causes, 'Sāmānyasāmagrī viśeṣasāmagrī-sahitaiva kāryaṃ janayati.'* Thus Archbishop Whately has made a book on Logic,-- man can therefore make logical books; only in each particular case we require the concurrents, education, leisure &c."

ED. NOTE: Quite detailed description of R's R. Yet the worthless creatures personified as Darbhanga editors branded the *Ratnākara* as *ajñātakartṛka*. *Na hyeṣa sthānor aparādho yad enam andho na paśyati.*

365

Yavavarāhādhikaraṇanyāyaḥ.

In Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 3. 45, we read: "Yavavarāhādhikaraṇanyāyena lokaprasiddhiḥ śāstrīyaprasiddhyā bādhyetyāha." There is no *adhikaraṇa* of this name in *Mīmāṃsā* or *Vedānta*, but the reference is doubtless to the *Śāstraprasiddhārthaprāmāṇyādhikaraṇa*, otherwise styled the *Āryamlecchādhikaraṇa*, which comprises Jaimini's sūtras 1. 3. 8 and 9, under which the words *yava*, *varāha*, and others having a double meaning, are discussed by the *bhāṣyakāra*. These two sūtras are quoted by Śāṅkara on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 4. 42, and explained by Ānandagiri. The matter is well put in Colebrooke's *Essay on Mīmāṃsā* (page 339):- "A very curious disquisition occurs in this part of the *Mīmāṃsā*, on the acceptance of words in correct language and barbaric dialects, and on the use of terms taken from either. Instances alleged are *yava*, signifying in Sanskrit, *barely*, but in the barbaric tongue, the plant named *priyangu*; *varāha* in the one a hog, and in the other a cow [or, rather, a crow]; *pīlu*, a certain tree, but among barbarians an elephant; *vetasa*, a ratten cane and a citron [or, rose-apple, *jaṃbu*]. The *Mīmāṃsā* concludes that, in such instances of words having two acceptations, that in which it is received by the civilized (*Āryas*), or which is countenanced by use in sacred books, is to be preferred to the practice of barbarians (*Mlecchha*), who are apt to confound words or their meanings." The above is of importance to students of *Vedānta*; for, in addition to the passages named above, it is discussed in *Bhāmatī* 3. 3. 52, and enlarged upon in *Vedāntakalpataru*, pages 461, 462. The brief allusion, too, to the same thing, in *Bhāmatī* 1. 3. 22, in the words:

"Na hi gāvo varāham anudhāvanti kṛṣṇavihaṅgānudhāvanam upapadyate gavām, api tu tādṛśasūkarānudhāvanam," is quite unintelligible alone. See, too, *Śālikā*, page 192; *Tātparyaṭīka*, page 292; *Kusumāñjali*, vol. 2, pages 130, 154; and *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 288, line 26.

Ed. note. Here are some "see too" references for further study.

366

Yaś cobhayoḥ samo doṣo na tenaikaś codyo bhavati.

When the same fault attaches to both sides of an argument, it cannot be urged against one alone. This is Professor Cowell's rendering of the nyāya in the Pāṇini chapter of *Sarvadarśanasanḡraha* (page 142, Bib. Ind., and 161 Jivānanda's edn.) It originated, however, with Patañjali, and is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 6. 1. 9 (vārt. 2) as, "Yaś cobhayor doṣo na tenaikaś codyo bhavati." Śabara (on sūtra 8. 3. 14) quotes it as, "Yaś cobhayor doṣo nāsāvekasya vācyah." In a form differing slightly from these, it is quoted in *Nyāyakaṇikā* (page 225, line 4 from bottom), and is still further changed in the following verse of Aniruddha's on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* i. 6:

"Yatrobhayoḥ samo doṣaḥ parihāro'pi tādrśaḥ.
Naikaḥ paryanuyoktavyas tādr̥garthavicāraṇe."

For other references to the nyāya, see *Tantravārtika*, page 947; *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 95, line 10 from bottom; and (in the poetical form) *Tarkabhāṣā*, page 88. The Khaṇḍanakāra cites the first two words of the nyāya, on page 531, and ascribes it to Bhaṭṭa (Kumārila).

Ed. note: Here is one more misreading in Jacob's text. It says: tamekaś codyo.

367

Yasya nāsti putro na tasya putrasya krīḍanakāni kriyante.

Toys are not made for the son of a man who has no son! This is used by Śabara to illustrate Jaimini's sūtra 10. 3. 5:- "Na cāṅgavidhir anaṅge syāt." He says: "Nahyanaṅge karmaṅyaṅgasya viśeṣo vidhiḥ syāt. Bhavati ca viśeṣavidhiḥ 'āśvabālaḥ prastara' iti. Na hyasati prastare prastaraviśeṣaḥ śiṣyeta. Yathā yasya nāsti putro na tasya putrasya krīḍanakāni kriyante."

Then, in Pārthasārathi's *Nyāyaratnamālā*, page 111, we find the expression, "Sarvam idam ajātaputrakrīḍanakam āpadyate."

ED. NOTE: How homely down to the earth nyāya! What a great writer and how simple is the writing of the sāmānyajana. Cf. Jisake hovegā khilaiyā, vo levegā ciraiyā. Hindi.

Yasyājñānaṃ bhramas tasya bhrāntaḥ samyak ca vetti saḥ.

He who has Nescience [as an upādhi] is the subject of delusion; [but though] deluded, he is also possessed of sound knowledge. This is affirmed of the individual Self, who, though a portion 'as it were' of the undivided and indivisible Self, is also the āśraya of Nescience. This is one of the mysteries of the *advaitavāda*. For a full description of jīva as found in Śaṅkarācārya's famous bhāṣya, see Notes to my edition of the *Vedāntasāra*.

The above nyāya is found in Raghunātha's two treatises, but his exposition of it is extremely meagre, since he ignores the second pāda of the line. He says: "Yasyānātmani dehādāvātmabhramo'sti tasyājñānam iti kalpyate."

The verse of which it forms the first line is quoted in full by Rāmatīrtha in his discussion of the term adhyāropa in Section 6 of *Vedāntasāra*. In the Calcutta editions of 1829 and 1886, the reading of the second pāda is, "Bhrāntaḥ samyak karoti saḥ," whilst Prof. A. E. Gough, in his translation published in *The Paṇḍit* of August 1872, followed the reading, "Bhrānto'samyak karoti saḥ." In my edition of 1894 (page 104), I adopted the reading, "Bhrāntaḥ samyañ na vetti saḥ," but I now see that in so doing I was exemplifying the truth of the first pāda! There was manuscript authority for it, however, and so *Vidyāsāgarī*, p. 443.

In its true form, the nyāya is found in the commentary on *Sankṣepaśārīraka* iii. 8 (The Paṇḍit, vol. viii. page 660), and again in *Tattvadīpana*, page 179 (with the mislection Bhrānti- for Bhrāntaḥ). The former passage is as follows:

"Nanu mithyātattvajñānāyor viṣayavaiṣamye'pi

Yasyājñānaṃ bhramas tasya bhrāntaḥ samyak ca vetti sa

iti nyāyād ajñānabhrāntitattvabodhānām ekāśrayatvānīyamād ajñānāśrayacinmātrāśrayatvam eva bhrāntyādeḥ syāt, &c."

If anyone can trace Rāmatīrtha's verse to its source, I shall be glad. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a very likely *ākara*; but, with the weight of seventy summers upon me, I am not myself prepared to join in the search.

Ed. note. A VERY IMPORTANT POINT. A great challenge to the future generations! Jacob had the weight of only 70 summers. We have had ten more. However, our Vedas declare and we firmly believe and work on the principle of Śatāryur vai puruṣaḥ. Kurvanneveha karmāṇi jijīviṣec chatam samāḥ. Also Yāvajjīvam agnihotram juhoti.

Vidyād iti kriyāpadam. Where does this go? Is this related to Jaḍam na vidyāvedyatvān nāto jñānam jaḍāśrauyam, [?]. Where does this too go? Not clear to us at all.

369

Yasyonmūlanāya yasya prasaktir bhavati tatas
tasya balavattvam.

He who is bent on destroying [?] another must be stronger than he. This is contained in an extract (given by Prof. Kielhorn) from Bhairavamiśra's comment on Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa's paribhāṣā cxii, namely Niṣedhās ca balīyāṃsaḥ (=Pratiṣedhās ca balīyāṃso bhavanti of Pantañjali 1. 1. 63, vārtika 6), which runs thus:

"Iyaṃ ca paribhāṣā lokasiddhanyāyamūliketyāha. Vidhyunmūlanāyeti. Prāptasya vidher nivartanāyetyarthaḥ. Etena yena nāprāptanyāyena vidhiśāstrasya niṣedhaśāstreṇa bādha iti darśitam. Loke'pi yasyonmūlanāya yasya prasaktir bhavati tatas tasya balavattvaṃ, kaṃsāt kṛṣṇasyeva."

The example given here, of one of superior might overcoming a less mighty one, is that of Kṛṣṇa and the demon Kaṃsa. The death of the latter is described in *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa*, Book V, chapter xx. Those who are familiar with the English Bible will call to mind the words, "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace; but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils." The 'strong man,' here is the Prince of this world- "that old Serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world" - his 'goods' are human souls and bodies; the 'stronger than he' is Christ, the Prince of Peace, - to whom has been given the commission "to bring out the prisoners from the prison."

Ed. note. First of all we have to pay attention to the words-- lokasiddhanyāyamūlikā.... loke'pi. ... A very vital statement. All such references to be collected and put together.

We have also a comparative study here.

370

Yācitakamaṇḍananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *borrowed ornaments*. Appearing in borrowed plumes. It is well illustrated by *Naiṣadhacarita* vii. 56:

"Asyā mukhaśrīpratibimbam evaṃ
jalāc ca tātān mukurāca mitrāt.
Abhyarthya dhattaḥ khalu padmacandrau
vibhūṣaṇaṃ yācitakaṃ kadācit."

On which Mallinātha comments thus: "Yācitakam yāñcānirvṛttam." Yāñcayāptam yācitakam ityamarah. Apamityayācitābhyām kakkanāviti kanpratryayaḥ (Pāṇ. 4. 4. 21). "Vibhūṣaṇam kadācid abhyarthya dhatto dadhāte khalu. Etadīyam eva suhṛl-labdham anayor yācitam maṇḍanam na svābhāvikam ityutprekṣā." In the above form, the nyāya is found in *Tārkikarakṣā*, page 46: "Tenāyathārthasyāpi yathārthānubhava-janitatvena yathārthatvavyapadeśa iti yācitakamaṇḍanakamanīyam eva smṛter yāthārthyam."

As *Yācitamaṇḍana*, I have met with it in *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, page 62, and in *Kāvyapradīpaṭīkā* of Vaidyanātha Tatsat, page 173.

Ed. note. We fail to understand how the Colonel could call this a nyāya? Nīyate prāpyate tātparyartha yeneṭi nyāyaḥ. What is the practical value? It is only a *subhāṣita* at its best. It is not based on any logic. It cannot prove anything. It cannot be used for parapakṣakhaṇḍana or sva-pakṣamaṇḍana. It does not meet our definition of the nyāya -- Sadyuktisādhitā sūktir dhatte nyāyapadam param. Nyāya is a logical law to prove or disprove a point in vāda.

371

Yādṛśo yakṣas tādṛśo baliḥ.

As is the Yaksha, so should be the offering. This is included in Raghunātha's list, but without any definition of its meaning. It is embedded, however, in the philosophical part of his treatise, as follows:

"Yastvanekajanmārjitapāpapuñjajanyadurāgrahād ekabhakticchalenānyam nindati, asakṛd bodhyamāno'pi carjumārgenābhedaṃ nopaiti, bhrāmayati ca mandān sa yādṛśo yakṣas tādṛśo baliriti nyāyāt tatpratipāditotkarṣāpakarṣaviparītotkarṣāpa-karṣopapādanena vijitya, paścāt pūrvoktarītyātyantābhedopapādanena bodhanīyaḥ. Evaṃ hi sa māraṇāya gṛhīto'ngacchedaṃ svīkarotīti nyāyenābhedaṃ svīkariṣyati."

I have found the nyāya in use in the following works of Vācaspatimiśra's and of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. In the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyaṭīkā*, page 115: "Aḥṛdayavācām aḥṛdayā eva prativāco bhavanti. Yakṣānurūpo balir iti hi laukikānām ābhānakaḥ."

Also in the *Bhāmātī* 4. 1. 15 (page 723): "Na ca kāryam api bhayakampādi vastusat. Tasyāpi vicārāsahatvenānirvācyatvāt. Anirvācyāc cānirvācyotpattau nānupapattiḥ. Yādṛśo yakṣas tādṛśo balir iti sarvam avadātam."

The two which follow are from the *Nyāyamañjarī*. Page 54:

"Abhāvaś ca kvacil liṅgam iṣyate bhāvasaṃvidah.
Vṛṣṭyabhāvo'pi vāyvabhra-saṃyogasyānumāpakaḥ.

Tasmād yuktam abhāvasya nābhāvenaiva vedanam.
Na nāma yādṛṣo yakṣo balir apyasya tādṛśaḥ."

On page 637:

"Yādṛg yakṣo balirapi tathetyevamādhāya buddhau
Yastu brūyāt kaluṣam aphaḥas tasya śuddho'pi hetuḥ."

It occurs also in Śrīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*, page 144, line 13, and, finally, in the vṛitti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 49, where it is immediately followed by, "Piśācānāṃ piśācabhāṣayaivottaraṃ deyam iti nyāyāc ca." The general sense of the nyāya would seem to be that of "tit-for-tat," "a Roland for an Oliver."

Ed. note. Here is a comparison. N.B. Laukikānām ābhāṇakaḥ.

Even the so-called revised third edition is a mithyāvāda as far as the revision is concerned. The "Matter" had been kept "standing" by some means. The book was reproduced exactly the way it was stored. The text was not recomposed. All the dance of the printer's devil is demonstrated once again in the same frightening form and manner. It is truly a bimba-pratibimbabhāva.

The verse Yādṛg yakṣo was treated by Jacob as an anuṣṭup-- both lines centered with the same indention. Disgusting!

372

Yāvad vacanaṃ vācanikam.

Conveying the meaning actually expressed [and therefore needing nothing to supplement it]. Kumārila puts it thus in *Tantravārtika* 3. 5. 19: "Kaścātra viśeṣaḥ. Sa yadi vācanikas tato yāvad vacanam eva kartavyaḥ."

Compare, too, the latter part of Śabara on 2. 3. 2. It occurs twice in *Bhāmatī*. On 4. 1. 4 (page 710) we read:

"Yasmād yasya yanmātrātmatayopāsanam vihitam tasya tanmātrātmatayaiva pratipattavyam, yāvadvacanam vācanikam iti nyāyān, nādhikam adhyāhartavyam, atiprasaṅgāt."

Again on 4. 3. 4 (page 742) as follows: "Na cāmānavasya puruṣasya vidyudādiṣu voḍhṛtvadarśanād arcirādīnām api voḍhṛtvam unneyam, yāvadvacanam hi vācanikam, na tad avācye sañcārayitum ucitam."

It is found also in the philosophical portion of *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* (I.O. MS. 1031, page 45 b.): "Yā tu piśācamocanākhyāne piśācasyāpi tatsnānāt piśācyanaśoktiḥ sā niśādasthapatīṣṭivad yāvadvacanam tāvad vācanikam iti nyāyāt tanmātraviṣayaiva. Na ca liṅgasya kāśīpraveśāt pāpanāṣe vaco'sti. Tasmāt kāśyutpannaviṣayaṇi tattalliṅgadarśanādinaikadvādi janmapāpakṣayabodhakāni vacāmsītyāhuḥ."

See, too, Nāgeśa's Uddyota, vol. i., p. 574.

Ed. note. Jacob refers to only one MS of the *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha* from the IOL. We have secured and consulted two.

373

Yena nāprāpte yo vidhir ārabhyate sa tasya bādhako bhavati.

Here is another of Raghunātha's grammatical nyāyas. It forms paribhāṣā 57 in Nāgojī-bhaṭṭa's work, and is rendered by Professor Kielhorn as follows:- "A rule which is given (in reference to a particular case or particular cases) to which another (rule) *cannot but apply* (or, in other words, which all fall already under some other rule), supersedes the latter." "The meaning of the words yena nāprāpte is 'while another rule is *necessarily* applying,' for the two negatives (na and a) import more force to the word (prāpte, than this word would possess without them)." The Professor adds the following in a footnote:- "This paribhāṣā teaches us the meaning of the term, apavāda, and in doing so tells us the reason why an apavāda possesses greater force than antaraṅga and other rules. An apavāda is a *special* rule; it is given in reference to particular cases which all fall under some *general* rule (utsarga); as it is not applicable in any case which does *not* fall under the general rule, it must necessarily supersede the latter, because it would otherwise not serve any purpose whatever." Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa generally quote it in the shortened form of Yena nāprāptinyāya. Under this paribhāṣā, Nāgojī introduces and discusses the Takrakaṇḍinyanyāya, namely, "Brāhmaṇebhyo dadhi dīyatām takraṃ kaṇḍinyāya." The paribhāṣā is found in the following passages of the *Mahābhāṣya*:- 1. 1. 6 (vārt. 1.); 1. 1. 28; 3. 4. 85 (vārt. 2); 6. 1. 2 (vārt. 4), where the Takrakaṇḍinyanyāya is brought in; 6. 1. 166; 6. 3. 68 (vārt. 5); 6. 4. 163 (vārt. 2), with Takrakaṇḍinya again; 7. 2. 44 (vārt. 4); 7. 2. 117 (vārt. 2), with Takrakaṇḍinya; 8. 2. 23 (vārt.5); 8. 2. 72; and 8. 3. 112.

Ed. note. Many more references to see.

374

Rathakāranyāyaḥ.

374

Rathakāranyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the Rathakāra*. There is a Vedic text which says, "In the rainy season a Rathakāra ought to establish a sacred fire." The question then arises, what is meant by the word Rathakāra? Does it mean a chariot-maker, or is it a member of the caste produced by the marriage of a Māhiṣya (the offspring of a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya-woman) with a Karaṇī (the offspring of a Vaiśya and a Śūdra-woman), which is called Rathakāra? The question is discussed in Jaimini 6. 1. 44-50, and is decided in favour of the latter. The discussion is thus summarized in *Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara*:

"Ādhāne śrūyate. Varṣāsu rathakāra ādadhīte. Tatra ratham karotīti vyutpattiyā traivarnīko rathakāra iti cet. Naivam. Saṅkīrṇajātiviśeṣe rūdhatvāt. Vaiśyāyām kṣatriyād utpanno māhiṣyaḥ. Śūdrāyām vaiśyād utpannā karaṇī. Tasyām karaṇyām māhiṣyādutpanno rathakāraḥ. Tathā ca Yajñavalkyaḥ: 'Māhiṣyeṇa karaṇyām tu rathakāraḥ prajāyata' iti. Tasya ca rathakārasyādhānakālo varṣartuḥ."

The nyāya is quoted by Nāgojībhāṭṭa in his *vṛitti* on the ninety-eighth paribhāṣā (Avayavaprasiddheḥ samudāyaprasiddhir balīyasī), which Prof. Kielhorn renders thus:- "The (conventional) meaning which a word conveys when taken as a whole, is stronger than the (etymological) meaning derived from (a division of the word into) its parts." In other words, rūdhir yogam apaharati, which Raghunātha exemplifies by this word Rathakāra. The vidhi on which this is based is quoted in full in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 140, line 3.

Ed. note. Here is an additional reference.

375

Rājaputravyādhananyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the king's son* [who was brought up] *as a hunter*. The story is that a young prince, abandoned by his parents at his birth, was adopted by a hunter and brought up as his own son. The boy remained in ignorance of his real origin until he was discovered by a kindly person and restored to his rightful position. Śaṅkarācārya seems to have been the first to utilize the tale, and he gives it as follows in his bhāṣya on *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2. 1. 20:

"Atra ca sampradāyavida ākhyāyikām sampracakṣate. Kaścit kila rājaputro jātamātra eva mātāpitṛbhyām apavidhho vyādhagrhe samvardhitaḥ. So'muṣya vaṁśatām ajānan vyādhajātīpratyayo vyādhajātikarmāṇyevānuvartate, na rājā'smīti rājajātikarmāṇyanuvartate. Yadā punaḥ kaścit paramakāruṇīko rājaputrasya rājāśrī-prāptiyogyatām jānannamuṣya putratām bodhayati, na tvam vyādhomūṣya rājñāḥ

putraḥ kathañcid vyādhagrham anupraviṣṭa iti, sa evaṃ bodhitas tyaktvā vyādha-jātipratyayakarmāṇi pitṛpaitāmahīm ātmanaḥ padavīm anuvartate rājā'ham asmīti."

Sureśvara refers to this several times in his large Vārtika. On page 71 we read:

"Taccāvidyānirāsyeva vyādhabhāvanayāñjitaḥ.
Rājasūnoḥ smṛtiprāptau vyādhabhāvo nivartate."

Then, on pages 970-2, he devotes ten verses to the nyāya, and returns to it once more on page 1845.

The author of the *Siddhāntaleśa* (on page 20) cites it as the "Vyādhakulasamvardhitarājakumārādṛṣṭānta," and it is reproduced, in a slightly different form, in the comments of Aniruddha and Vedāntin Mahādeo on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* iv. 1. See also *Bhāmati* 1. 4. 22. Raghunāthavarman links with the above the *Siṃhameṣanyāya*, which tells of a lion's cub being brought up as a ram; but I have not yet met with it elsewhere.

Ed. note. A noteworthy note.

376

Rājapurapraveśanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the manner of entering a royal city*. It is found in both of Raghunāthavarman's treatises, but the following explanation of it is taken from the *Vācas-patyam*:

"Viśṅkhalatayā rājapurapraveśe rājapurarakṣakais tāḍanādikaṃ kriyeteti bhiyā śreṇībhūtatayā yathā tatpurapraveśa evaṃ suśṅkhalatayā yatra kārya-karaṇasya vivakṣā tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ."

Raghunātha points out that we do not grasp the meaning of a long sentence as a whole, but that the sense of each word enters the mind singly, on the principle of rājapurapraveśanyāya, - "Tatra hi krameṇaiva bahūnāṃ puruṣāṇāṃ praveśo bhavati na yugapat."

I have met with the nyāya in Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa's comment on Kaiyata. In *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 58 (under vārtika 1) we read:

"Anānupūrvyenāpi sanniviṣṭānāṃ yatheṣṭam abhisambandho bhavati. Tadyathā. Anaḍvāham udahāri yā tvam harasi śirasā kumbhaṃ bhagini saccīnam abhidhāvantaṃ adrākṣīr iti. Tasya yatheṣṭam abhisambandho bhavati. Uдахāri bhagini, yā tvam kumbhaṃ harasi śirasā'naḍvāham saccīnam abhidhāvantaṃ adrākṣīr iti."

Kaiyaṭa remarks on this: "Pāṭhakramād ārthakramo balīyāniti yatheṣṭam atrābhi-saṃbandhaḥ," and on these words Nāgeśa says, "Ārthakramo nāma rājapurapraveśa-nyāyena svasyākāṅkṣitārthānvayakramaḥ. Evaṃ ca kalpitāsannavākyād bodhaviṣaye tātparyam niyāmakam iti bhāvaḥ."

The passages here quoted will be found on pages 389 and 390 of vol. i. of the edition of *Mahābhāṣya* with the *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota*, published at the Nirṇayasāgar Press in 1908.

Ed. note. A noteworthy note. The view of R presented here represents only a pakṣa.

377

Rājārthaupayikaṃ nityam uṣṭro vahati kuṅkumam.

This is the second line of a verse on page 372 of the *Tantravārtika*. To make it intelligible I quote a portion of the context as interpreted by Professor Gangānātha Jhā in his translation (page 511, last line): "It has been urged above that, if the *Apūrva* inhere in the Soul, then it becomes only an end in itself desirable by men. But this does not affect our position; because one thing becomes subservient to another only when its sole use lies in the serving of some purpose of this latter, and not merely when it rests in this; for instance, *though the Red Dye is carried by the camel* (and as such rests upon its back), *yet it serves the purposes of the king* (for whom it is carried)."

378

Rātrisatranīyāyaḥ.

The rule as to *a night-sacrifice*. This is the topic of Jaimini 4. 3. 17-19, and is largely used by writers on Vedānta as a type of scripture-passage conveying no direct promise of reward, and therefore dependent on an arthavāda-passage for such promise. Though Śaṅkara does not mention the nyāya in his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 3. 3. 38, it is evident that he has it in view, and Ānandagiri, and Amalānanda (in the *Kalpataru*), expressly connect his remarks with it. So also the *Kalpataruparimala*. The last-mentioned work quotes it again on page 255 (in connection with *Brahmasūtra* 1. 2. 24):

"Tathā sarvapāpapradāho'pi brahmalīngapraśnottarābhyāṃ prādhānyena prati-pipādāyīṣitatayopakrāntasyopāsanasya phalākāṅkṣayā rātrisatranīyāyenārthavādika-phalavipariṇāme kartavye pradhānārthavāda ivāṅgārthavāde śrutasyāpi phalasya grahaṇaucityāt."

The nyāya is found also in *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa*, page 122, line 8 from bottom, and again on page 134, line 9 from the bottom. The latter passage is as follows:

Ed. Note : Here are some additional references.

379

Rādhāvedhopamā.

The simile of *piercing the central figure of a target*. That is, hitting the bull's eye. It is used of something difficult of accomplishment, and requiring great skill. "In Prākṛit the *rādhā* is generally called *puttaliyā*, literally 'a little figure,' as apparently a little human figure was painted in the middle of the butt." This note, contributed by Professor Leumann to Mr. Tawney's translation of Merutuṅga's work, is probably a correct explanation of the word *rādhā*, rather than the dictionary meaning, "an attitude in shooting." The illustration appears on pages 412, 420, and 434 of *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, as follows:

"Sā ceyatī bhavet kasya sāmāgrīyaṃ sudurlabhā.
Rādhāvedhopamānena dharmaprāptiḥ prakīrtitā."

"Eṇaṃ saṃsāravistāraṃ vilaṅghya katham apyadaḥ.
Mānuṣyaṃ prāpya duṣprāpaṃ rādhāvedhopamaṃ janaḥ."

"Bho bhavyāḥ pravihāya mohalalitāṃ yuṣmābhir ākaṇḍyatām
ekāntena hitaṃ madīyavacanāṃ kṛtvā viśuddhaṃ manaḥ.
Rādhāvedhasamaṃ kathaṅcid atulaṃ labdhvāpi mānuṣyakaṃ
hiṃsākrodhavaśānugair idam aho jīvaiḥ purā hāritam."

Two more examples will be found on pages 575 and 981 of the same.

The above meaning of *rādhā* fully explains the epithet *rādhābhedin* as applied to the renowned archer Arjuna.

Ed. Note: Here are some additional references.

380

Rudhirasamparkavato viṣasya śarīre prasarpaṇam.

The circulation within the body of poison which has entered the blood. Used as a warning against the beginnings of evil in however small a degree. The figure is found in *Bodhicaryāvatāra* vii. 69:

The circulation within the body of poison which has entered the blood. Used as a warning against the beginnings of evil in however small a degree. The figure is found in Bodhicaryāvatāra vii. 69:

"Viṣaṃ rudhiram āsādyā prasarpati yathā tanau.
Tathaiva chidram āsādyā doṣaś citte prasarpati."

The commentary runs thus:

"Aṇumātrasyāpi doṣasyāvakāśo na dātavyaḥ. Anyathā tanmātrasyāpyanu-praveśe citte tatprasārāvarodhasya kartum aśakyatvāt. Yathā hi svalpavraṇe'pi rudhirasamparkavato viṣasya śarīre. Tasmād aṇumātrakleśaprahāranivāraṇe'pi tātparyam kuryāt."

Compare "The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water; therefore leave off contention before there be quarrelling."

Ed. note. Here is a comparison.

381

Rumākṣiptakāṣṭhanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *wood thrown into the salt-lake* [or mine] *Rumā*. The *Medinī* kośa explains *Rumā* as "Viśiṣṭalavaṇākare," and it is said to be situated near Ajmer. The tradition is that anything thrown in there becomes saline itself. The earliest mention of *Rumā*, with which I am acquainted, is in the following verse of *Tantravārtika* (page 132):

"Yathā rumāyā lavaṇākareṣu
merau yathā vojvalarukmabhūmau.
Yajjāyate tanmayam eva tat syāt
tathā bhaved vedavidātmatuṣṭiḥ."

[Could we read *rumāyām*? We have *merau*, ed.]

Kumārila seems here to regard *Rumā* as the *region* in which the salt mines are situated, rather than as the mine itself; and this may give some ground for the footnote by the editor of the *Medinī*, (Calcutta, 1869) where he defines *Viśiṣṭalavaṇākaraḥ* as "Lavaṇa-khanibhūyiṣṭhadeśaviśeṣaḥ." In his translation of the above verse, Prof. Gangānātha Jhā omits *Rumā* altogether. He says:- "Just as in the case of salt mines, and in that of Meru the land of bright gold, whatever is produced [? ed.] in them, becomes salt and gold (respectively),-so also in the case of the inner satisfaction of one who knows the Veda (which imparts Vedic authority to all that it touches)."

We have an example of the nyāya in Vācaspati Miśra's comment on *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* iv. 14. The sūtra is

"Pariṇāmaikatvād vastutattvam" on which he says: "Bahūnām apyekaḥ pariṇāmo dṛṣṭaḥ. Tadyathā. Gavāśvamahiṣamātāṅgānām rumānikṣiptānām eko lavaṇatvajātīyalakṣaṇaḥ pariṇāmo, vartitailānalānām ca pradīpa iti."

Then Veṅkaṭanātha uses the illustration in *Tattvamuktākalāpa* v. 28, and in his vṛitti thereon, as follows:

"Syād uṣṇaḥ kṛṣṇavartmā salilam api tathā śītam astu prakṛtyā.
sparśo'nyo'pyatra dṛṣṭas sa tu bhavatu rumākṣiptalāvaṇyavac cet."

"Uṣṇaḥ kṛṣṇavartmā tathaiva jalam api śītam ityupalabhyate prakṛtyā. Atra kaścīd āha--anyo'pi sparśo dahane salile ca kadācid upalabhyate, sa tu rumākṣiptakāṣṭhādilavaṇanyāyena tasyaiva pariṇativiśeṣa iti." In the vṛitti on ii. 1 of the same, the author says: "Guṇasaṅkramo na kvacid api. Na cātra rumākṣiptakāṣṭhanyāyaḥ."

ED. NOTE: Here is something for a comparative study:

Jaradgavah kambalapādukābhyām
dvāri sthito gāyati gītakāni [also maṅgalāni].
Tam Brāhmaṇī pṛcchati putrakāmā
Rājan Rumāyām lavaṇasya ko'rthaḥ.
(probably from *Tattvapradīpikā*, i.e. Citsukhī.

Kumārila has more:

Evam ca vidvadvacanād vinirgatam
prasiddharūpam kavibhir nirūpitam.
Satām hi sandehapadeṣu vastuṣu
pramāṇam antaḥkaraṇapravṛttayaḥ.
(*Mīmāṃsādarśana*, Pune, 2:129).

Of course, the second half is taken from that immortal work, *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* of Kālidāsa. The first half is:

Asaṃśayam kṣatraparigrahaḥ samā
yad āryam asyām abhilāṣi me manaḥ.

Jacob has derived a great deal of his information from the living scholars as well as the departed ones.

To the reference given by Jacob for *Tantravārtika* above may be added the following:
Kumārila on MS. 1.3.7 (*Mīmāṃsādarśana*, Poona, v.2, p.129).

382

Rūḍhir yogam apaharati.

Popular usage overpowers etymological meaning. There is a capital illustration of this in the *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha* 3 (pages 134, 135) where Bādarāyaṇa's first sūtra is under discussion:

"Nanu jijñāsāśabdo vicāre rūḍhaḥ. Bhāṣyakārādibhis tatra vicāravivakṣayā prayuktatvāt. Ato rūḍhir yogam apaharatīti nyāyenāvayavārthasvīkāro na yuktaḥ. Tato'thaśabdo 'pyadhikārārtho bhaviṣyatīti vicārasya prārabdhum śakyatvād iti cen maivam. Rūḍhir yogam apaharatīti nyāyasyātrāprasarāt ... Tatra yaḥ śabda ekatrārthe rūḍho'paratra yaugiko, yathā cchāge rūḍho'jaśabda ātmani yaugikas, tatrājam paśyetyukte rūḍhir yogam apaharatīti nyāyaḥ prasarati. Iha tu jijñāsāśabdo na vicāre rūḍhaḥ."

The following verse is quoted in the *Nyāyapradīpa*, a commentary on *Tarkabhāṣā*, page 5:

"Labdhātmikā² satī rūḍhir bhaved yogāpahāriṇī.
Kalpanīyā tu labhate nātmānaṃ yogabādhataḥ."

The editor cites a very modern author who ascribes the verse to Kumārila. See also *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa* pp. 132-3; *Vedāntakalpataru*, p. 207; and Ānandagiri on *Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya*, 1. 3. 42.

Ed. note. Here are some "see also" references.

383

Rekhāgavayanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the sketch of the Bos Gavaeus (Gayāl)*. Raghunāthavarmā explains and applies it as follows:

"Kīdrśo gavaya iti grāmīṇena prṣṭo vanyo likhitvā darśayāmāsa. Sa carju-buddhitvād rekhāgavayam eva gavayam mene. Paścād vane gavayam dṛṣṭvā rekhāyām tadbuddhiṃ tatyājeti laukikī gāthā. Tathaiṣa puruṣa [Sa vā eṣa puruṣo'nna-

² Having established itself?

sthūlārundhatyām, yathā vā rekhāgavayanyāyena nityaśabdapratipattyupāyatayā nānāvyaḅkaraṇaiḥ parasparabhinnaprakṛtipratyayavibhāgena kṛṭṛiṃśabda iti bhāvaḥ."

A third example is found in the following extract from Kaiyaṭa on *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 46:- "Asatyaprakṛtipratyayopadeśena satyasya padasya vyutpādanaṃ kriyate rekhā-gavayeneva satyagavayasya." See also *Śrībhāṣya* page 322, and page 77 of Dr. Thibaut's translation.

Ed. note. Here is a see also reference. N.B. Laukikī gāthā.

384

Rohaṇācalalābhe ratnasampadaḥ sampannāḥ.

On acquiring the mountain Rohaṇa, one acquires the wealth of gems contained in it. This occurs in the Pratyabhijñā-section of *Sarvadarśanasanḡraha* (page 106 of Jivānanda's edn.): "Parameśvaratālābhe hi sarvāḥ sampadas tanniṣyandamayyaḥ sampannā eva, rohaṇācalalābhe ratnasampada iva. Evaṃ parameśvaratālābhe kim anyatprarthānīyam. Tad uktam Utpalācāryaiḥ:

'Bhaktīlakṣmīsamṛddhānāṃ kim anyad upayācitam.
Enayā vā daridrāṇāṃ kim anyad upayācitamiti.'

Professor Gough renders it thus: "For, when the nature of the Supreme Being is attained, all felicities, which are but the efflux thereof, are overtaken; as if a man acquired the mountain Rohaṇa (Adam's Peak), he would acquire all the treasures it contains. If a man acquires the divine nature, what else is there that he can ask for? Accordingly Utpalācārya says: 'What more can they ask who are rich in the wealth of devotion? What else can they ask who are poor in this?'"

For a story in connection with the mountain Rohaṇa as a mine of wealth, see *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 3.

Ed. note. An important reference for further study.

385

Lakṣaṇapramāṇābhyāṃ vastusiddhiḥ.

[The existence, or nature, of] *an object is established by means of some distinguishing characteristic, and by a recognized form of proof* [such as sense-perception, scripture &c.]. "Yathā gandhavattvādīlakṣaṇena pratyakṣapramāṇena ca pṛthivyādisiddhiḥ."

Lakṣaṇapramāṇābhyāṃ vastusiddhiḥ.

[The existence, or nature, of] *an object is established by means of some distinguishing characteristic, and by a recognized form of proof* [such as sense-perception, scripture &c.]. "Yathā gandhavattvādīlakṣaṇena pratyakṣapramāṇena ca pṛthivyādisiddhiḥ."

Or, just as the wonders of creation establish the "eternal power and Godhead" of the invisible Deity, to which Scripture also bears testimony.

Raghunāthavarmā quotes the nyāya in the following passage on page 28 of the Benares edition of his work:

"Evam agnīndrādityeśvaravādā api tanmāhātmyopapādakaśrutītihāsapurāṇa-vacanānyāśritya tatraiva prapañcitā jñeyāḥ. Tattadbhaktā api sargādihetutva-rūpeśvaralakṣaṇaṃ śrutyādīpramāṇaṃ ca tatra darśayanto lakṣaṇapramāṇābhyāṃ vastusiddhir iti nyāyeneśvaratvaṃ sādhyanti."

Commenting on the opening verse of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, the author of the *Śikhāmaṇi* says:- "Nanu brahmaṇi lakṣaṇapramāṇābhāvena tasyaivāsiddheḥ katham jīva-brahmābhedaḥ śāstrārtha iti cen, na tāvat pramāṇābhāvo, bhūtabhautikotpatter eva pramāṇatvāt." Amaraśāstra's ṭīkā on this begins as follows: "Lakṣaṇapramāṇābhyāṃ vastusiddhir iti nyāyam āśrityāśāṅkate nanviti."

Ed. note. Here is a reference to 3M trash! (Banaras ed.). It is not banā rasa but bahuta baḍā bigaḍā nīrasa rasa, or, vinā rasaṃ duṣkaraṇam.

386

Lāṅgalaṃ jīvanam.

A plough is existence. That is, it is a *means* of existence; cause and effect being here identified as in āyur ghṛtam. The nyāya is found in Sureśvara's *Sambandhavārtika*, page 9, as follows:

"Yathoktavidyābodhitvād grantho'pi tadabhedataḥ.
Bhaved upaniṣannāmā lāṅgalaṃ jīvanam yathā."

On which Ānandagiri remarks:

"Sādhyasādhanayor abhedopacāreṇa sādhyasābdasya sādhanē prayoge dṛṣṭāntam āha lāṅgalaṃ iti." We may compare with this the phrase "The plough supports the bullocks," which occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 2. 4:- "Yathā lāṅgalaṃ gavādīn udvahatīti nimittamātratvād evam ucyate, na tu pratyakṣam eva lāṅgalaṃ gavādīn udvahati."

Ed. note. *jīvanam*. Is it existence or life? Life is more than this.

387

Loṣṭaprastāranyāyaḥ.

This occurs in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 16 (page 159) in the following sentence: "Tena loṣṭaprastāranyāyenānantavaicitryam uktam," and in the first edition, I said that it could only mean the maxim of *an expanse of clods of earth* [as in a roughly ploughed field]. Regarding however *prastāra* as a mislection for *prastara* it would mean the maxim of *a stone and a clod of earth*, and would be synonymous with *Aśmalloṣṭanyāya* of the dictionaries. Mr. M.R. Telang (of the Bombay High Court) has, however, kindly suggested the following, with which I was quite unfamiliar. He says:- "Loṣṭa means a pebble and *prastāra* a table showing the varieties of metres &c. formed by different arrangements of the short and long syllables in prosody, music &c. The Indians make use of this process to find out the number of varieties of any number of given things. So the meaning of the *nyāya* can be better explained by the maxim of *the process of permutations and combinations*."

It may be asked what *loṣṭa* (a pebble) has to do with permutations and combinations. In finding out the number of varieties of any number of given things, a pebble is used for marking certain figures according to the Indian process with the help of *prastāra*, *khaṇḍameru*, *naṣṭoddiṣṭa* &c. These processes are well known to any one conversant with books on Indian music or prosody. The following references to books on the subject will support my statement. *Vide Saṅgītaratnākara* Chap. i verses 61 to 69. (pages 57-60); *Saṅgītarpaṇa* Chap. i ver. 144 to 154."

Ed. note. Here is one more evidence to show how Jacob's work is a collective contribution by many a mind. *Bahūnām anugraho nyāyyaḥ*.

Cf. *Bahūnām apyasārāṇām samudāyo hi dāruṇaḥ.*
Tṛṇaiḥ sampādyate rajjus tayā nāgo'pi badhyate.

Alpānām api vastūnām samhatīḥ kāryasādhikā.
Tṛṇir guṇatvam āpannair badhyante mattadantinaḥ.

Drawn from memory.

Also there are some additional references.

388

Vaṭe yakṣanyāyaḥ.

The belief as to *a Yakṣa in a Banyan tree*. A popular belief, based solely on the tradition of the elders, that a Yakṣa, or goblin, lives in every Banyan tree. It is used as an illustration of *aitihya* ('tradition'), which some regard as a *pramāṇa*, but which Gautama rejects as such. See *Nyāyasūtra* 2. 2. 1. The *Nyāyasūtravivarāṇa* expounds the term thus:

"Aitihyam iha vṛkṣe yakṣaḥ prativasatīti lokaprasiddhiḥ. Tatra mūlavaktra-nirdeśenāptoktatvāniścayena tādṛśaniścayasya śābdabodhetutayā nāsyā śabda-pramāṇe'ntarbhāvaḥ."

This is the position of the objector who maintains that tradition *is* a distinct *pramāṇa*; the refutation is contained in *sūtra* 2. In Ballantyne's *Aphorisms of Nyāya Philosophy*, Book ii, page 66, we have the following rendering of a portion of the *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*: "A rumour (*aitihya*) is what is expressed in this way- 'thus indeed people say' &c. for it is an assertion which has come from one to another, without any first assertor being indicated: for example, 'In every Bengal fig-tree there is a goblin,' and the like." In a foot-note to page 329 of Colebrooke's *Essays*, vol. i, Professor Cowell gives to *aitihya* the meaning of "fallible testimony (as opposed to infallible *śruti*)," whilst Colebrooke himself, on page 427, renders it by 'tradition.' In *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 194, the *nyāya* is applied in the following way by the disbeliever in the existence of God:

"Na ca prasiddhimātreṇa yuktam etasya kalpanam.
Nirmūlatvāt tathā coktaṃ prasiddhir vaṭayakṣavat."

And at the top of page 64, there is the following, forming the second half of a verse:

"Aitihyaṃ tu na satyam atra hi vaṭe yakṣo'sti vā neti vā
ko jānāti kadā ca kena kalitaṃ yakṣasya kīdṛg vapuḥ."

In *Ślokavārtika* (page 492) we read:

"Jagati bahu na tathyaṃ nityam aitihyam uktaṃ
bhavati tu yadi satyaṃ nāgamād bhidyate tat,"

which Prof. Gangānātha Jhā renders by "Much of what is known in the world as 'Tradition' is not always true; and whatever happens to be true, that does not differ from 'Valid Testimony.'" Pārthasārathi's comment on this is:- "Puruṣavacanaparamparā aitihyaṃ, vaṭe vaṭe vaiśravaṇa ityādi. Taccānirṇāyakatvāt pramāṇam eva na bhavati. Tad-bhāve'pyāgamāntarbhāvāt." See, too, *Tārkikarakṣā*, page 117.

Ed. note. Also read as *vaṭe vaṭe yakṣaḥ*. There are additional references too.

Q. Is this śābdabodhahetutayā or śābdabodhāhetutayā? Jacob's text reads the former which seems wrong to us.

389

Vadhūmāṣamāpananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the measuring out [or distribution] of beans by the daughter-in-law*. I am much indebted to Mr. Govind Dās Honorary Magistrate of Benares, for giving me what seems to be the real meaning of this hitherto-puzzling nyāya. He believes it to be the adaptation of a Maithila proverb with which the following story is connected. "A very miserly old Brāhman used to have a *fistful* of grain given daily by his wife to every beggar who came to the door. The old man having married his son, the idea struck him that if he got his daughter-in-law to do the distribution instead of his old and ugly wife, the smaller fist would measure out a smaller quantity of grain! But, unluckily for him, the girl was very beautiful, so even persons who were not in need began to drop in, disguised as beggars, in order to admire her! The result was that, while each measure was less, the total amount given away was very much more."

It occurs in the *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 87, line 12, as follows: "Na cānavasthā, avaśyavedyatvānabhyupagamān niścayavad, anyathā tvaniścitaniścayasya nādyaniścayo'pi sidhyeta. Na cāsāvātmanyaniścaya iti. Tad idaṃ vadhūmāṣamāpana-vṛttāntam anuharati."

Ed. note. Here is an important point to note. The real significance of many *laukika* nyāyas may be found only through the *loka* and not necessarily from published literature. The above nyāya was derived, so we are told, from a Mithilā (Bihar) proverb. Here is an oral tradition. It is a means to solve difficult puzzles.

Evaluate the word "fistful" meaning muṭṭhībhara in Hindi. It is used by an Englishman.

Cf. Subhagābhikṣukanyāya.

A commentator of Udayana has interpreted this nyāya in an absurd manner. Maybe someone who follows us may get the details.

390

Vadhyaghātakanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of the *destroyer and its prey*. Used of two things which cannot exist together. It occurs in *Taittrīyavārtika* 2. 1. 66 (page 53):

"Pratipadya padārthaṃ hi virodhāt tadvirodhinaḥ.

Paścād abhāvaṃ jānāti vadhyaghātakavat padāt."

Ānandagiri explains it thus: "Yathā [tā]vacchyenamūṣakādīnā dūṣitāṃ bhūmim upalabhya tadvirodhino ghātakasya mārjārāder abhāvo'rthād avagamyate, tathā satyādi-padāt padārthaṃ paramārthatvādikam pratītya pratītaparamārthatvādivirodhino 'satyatvāder abhāvo'rthāpattiyā jñāyate, na hi satyāder asatyādeścaikādhikaraṇatvaṃ ghaṭate." See also Praśastapāda's *Vaiśeshikabhāṣya*, pages 112, 113; and the latter part of *Citsukhī* iv. 4. (Paṇḍit vi. 390). Compare the bādhyabādhakabhāva of *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i, 55 pañcāsyoraṇayoḥ), and iii. 85 (ākhunakulayoḥ).

Ed. note. The reprint reads: Yathāvacchyena. Only Nirajana can tell us what it means. Could we read: Yathā tāvacchyena. The original to be seen.

It is claimed that the third edition is a revised edition. It is not true. It is exact reproduction. Here we have yathāva.

Here are some notes for comparative study.

391

Vadhyatām vadhyatām bālaḥ.

As Raghunāthavarman had the temerity [!] to include this in his list of nyāyas, I introduce it in order to show its origin and its worthlessness[!!]. At the bottom of page 53 of the Benares edition of *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*, it stands thus: "Tathā ca

'Vadhyatām vadhyatām bālo nānenārtho'sti jīvatā.
Svapakṣahānikartṛtvād yaḥ kulāṅgāratām gataḥ.'

iti nyāyaviṣayatām nātivartate."

This verse, and the words which follow it, are taken bodily from *Citsukhī* i. 16 (The Paṇḍit, vol. iv, page 534); but the real source of the śloka is *Vishṇu Purāṇa* 1. 17. 31, where it reads, "Durātmā vadhyatām eṣaḥ," the remainder being the same as the above. I got the clue from the *Laukikanyāyaratnākara*, where Raghunātha apologetically says: "Idaṃ Viṣṇupurāṇe Prahlādādam uddīśya Hiraṇyākṣavacanāṃ pūrvair nyāyatvenodāhṛtatvāt tattvenodāhṛtam."

Ed. note. Thanks, Mister Martial Colonel! Raghunātha Varma himself says: Pūrvair nyāyatvenodāhṛtatvāt... In the very beginning he had explained:

Arthād artho na Śabdārtha ityādyā vṛddhasūktayaḥ.

Pūrvair nyāyatayā proktā vadiṣyāmas tatas tathā. Ārambhaśloka 16.

So all the early sages and saints were the victims of temerity!! R might have had the temerity or not, but Jacob had a very long and bitter tongue and it was unbridled. The mighty power of British Imperialism had puffed a lot of hot air in his brain. All the study of Vedānta had not helped him at all. We are told Vidyā dadāti vinayam. He seems to have acquired some temporal vidyā undoubtedly, but was there any vinaya? We don't see any. We don't know what did he think of himself anyway!

For bālaḥ we have a variant reading: eṣaḥ, which may be better because it comes from the father anyway.

Note the reference to the printed edition of the *San̄graha*. We call it durgrahagrasta duṣkaraṇa.

Mahāmohagrahagrastaḥ saṅgrahendur ha hā hataḥ.

392

Vanasimhanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *a lion in a forest*. Used of things which mutually aid or protect each other. This, and the Hradanakranyāya which is of similar import, occur together in the following passage of the *Vedāntakalpataruparimala* (page 100): "So'yaṃ vanasimhahradanakranyāyaḥ. Kirātair hantuṃ śakyo'pi simho mahad vanam śaraṇam praviśya durādharṣas tebhyo na bibheti, vanam ca tatsimhādhiṣṭhānānugrhitam tair duṣpraveśam bhavati."

Similarly, the lake shelters the alligator, and the alligator protects the lake. There is another reference to the Vanasimhanyāya on page 627 of the same work: "Tathā ca vanasimhanyāyena pramāṇatarkanyāyena vobhayor apyaṃśabhedena parasparāpekṣāyām api na parasparāśrayadoṣaḥ."

The source of the nyāya is doubtless *Udyogaparva* xxxvii. 46, for the reference to which I am indebted to Professor Dr. R. Pischel. The verse is as follows:

"Na syād vanam ṛte vyāghrān vyāghrā na syur ṛte vanam.
Vanam hi rakṣyate vyāghrair vyāghrān rakṣati kānanam."

Compare also verse 64 of the same.

Ed. note: Is this vane simhaḥ or vanam simhaś ca.

393

Varam samsayikan nishkad asamsayikaḥ karsapanah.

Better is a certain karsapana than an uncertain nishka. This and the proverb immediately following are found in the second chapter of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (page 19), and are the equivalents of our saying, "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."

Ed. note. All such parallels could be brought together by someone, some day, somewhere in future. *Kālo hyayam niravadhir vipulā ca pṛthvī.*

394

Varagoṣṭhīnyāyah.

The maxim of *the discussion of matters with a view to obtaining a husband* [for one's daughter]. It is thus explained by Raghunāthavarman: "Goṣṭhir anyonyavartā, varalābhāya goṣṭhir varagoṣṭhis, tayā yathā varavadhūbandhūnām aikamatye sati vivāharūpam ekaṃ kāryaṃ niṣpādyate tathetyarthaḥ."

I have met with the expression twice in the *Pañcapādikā* (pages 72, 73), in a description of the erroneous views of common people (such as the Laukāyatikas &c.) in regard to the *ātman*. The passages are as follows: "Evam indriyāṇyeva cetanāni ātmetyapare. Indriyāṇaṃ cakṣurādimaṇaparyantānām ekaikasminnasatyeva śarīre rūpādiṅṅānānām abhāvāt, teṣām eva vyastānām cetanatvam ahaṃpratyayaviṣayatvaṃ ca manyante, krameṇa ca varagoṣṭhīvad itaretaraguṇabhāvaṃ ca."

Again: "Yadi tāvad vyastānām yugapat parikalpyeta tataḥ svārthaprayuktatvāt pravṛtter aṅgāṅgibhāvo nāvakalpeta. Na cāṅgāṅgibhāvam antareṇa saṅghāta upapadyate. Tasmān na vyasteṣu yugapadbhogaḥ. Astu tarhi krameṇa [ā?] virodhād varagoṣṭhīvaditi. Naitad evaṃ yuktam."

It needs a more intimate acquaintance with varagoṣṭhī than we Westerners possess in order to grasp the full significance of the nyāya, and I must confess to a certain amount of haziness as to its exact sense in the passages here cited. In a later part of his treatise, Raghunātha gives us the maxim "Yadvivāhas tadgītagānam," appended to which is the remark "Kecit tu prāg udāhṛtaṃ varagoṣṭhīnyāyam etadarthakatvena vyācakṣate." The way in which he applies the latter will be apparent from the following excerpt from the philosophical portion of his work: "Evaṃ hi vādino yadvivāhas tadgītagānam itinyāyanūsārīṇi svasveṣṭadevamāhātmyavākyāni paśyanto'nyāni tu paśyanto'pi durāgrahapinaddhṛṣṭitvād apaśyanta iva tadekavākyatādikaṃ cā jānanto'ndhagajanyāyenānyonyam vivadate'buddhvaiva ca matāntaram kūpamaṇḍūkanyāyān nirākurvanto budhair upahasanīyatam yānti."

Compare Kumārila's "Kanyāvaraṇārthāgatamūrkhavaragotrāpraśnottaravat. Yad eva bhavatām gotraṃ tad asmākam apīvat."

Tantravārtika, page 169-70. Prof. Gangānāth Jhā points out that if the would-be-bridgroom were really of the same *gotra*, it would make the marriage impossible!

Ed. note. How many nyāyas in just one sentence! A mahān camatkāra of Raghunātha Varmā which invokes śata śata namaskāra.

395

Varam adya kapotaḥ śvo mayūrāt.

Better is a pigeon to-day than a peacock tomorrow. See Varam sāmśayikān niškād. ... N. 393.

Ed. note: This is only a subhāṣita-- nītivacana-- and not a nyāya. This not based on logic and could not be svapakṣasādhyasādhana.

396

Varconyāyaḥ.

The topic of *glory* [or splendour]. This forms the topic of Jaimini 3. 8. 25-27. The point discussed is whether, in using the mantra, "Mamāgne varco vihaveṣvatu," "Fire! Let there be glory for me in the offerings," the officiating priest (at the new and full moon sacrifices) is to enjoy the fruit, or whether it falls to the sacrificer. The pūrvapakṣin holds the former view, but the decision is that it goes to the latter. In this adhikaraṇa there is mention of karaṇa-mantras, but the term is not explained. Kunte says that a karaṇa-mantra is that which regulates sacrificial operations, and that which is merely chanted in the course of a sacrificial operation is called akarmakaraṇamantra.

Ed. note. Both the mantras to be studied further. R has a discussion on this topic. There we read karaṇa and vacana. Karaṇasya parivīrasi. Vacanasya parivīrasi,

397

Vikrītagavīrakṣaṇam.

Retaining possession of a cow after it has been sold to someone else. This illegality is dealt with by Nārada and Yājñavalkya in the Vikrīyāsampradānaprakaraṇam," "The non-delivery of a sold chattel." In chapter viii. 1, the former defines it thus:

"Vikrīya paṇyaṃ mūlyena kretur yanna pradīyate.
Vikrīyāsampradānaṃ tad vivādapadam ucyate."

The latter lays down the law on the subject in chapter ii. 254-58. Udayana's application of the above in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 58, is as follows:

"Yad anātmāna evaitāś catasraḥ koṭayo bhāsante na vā pratibhāntīti. Tatrā-pratibhānam anuttaram. Pratibhāne tu grāhyalakṣaṇāyoge'pi grāhyabhāva iti ced evam etat ... Prakāśamānatvaṃ tu nīlādīnām aśakyāpahnavaṃ. Tāvanmātraṃ cāsmākam abhimatam iti cet tad etad vikrītagavīrakṣaṇam."

The drift of this is not very clear.

Ed. note. We believe the drift is quite clear: "You have lost your case. You are defeated. Yet you are not accepting your defeat--not admitting the loss of your arguments." In Hindi we have a saying: Gire to gire ṭānga to ūncī. I am fallen down. So what? My leg is still up. In any case, it is a challenge for those who might follow us. Vāde vāde jāyate tattvabodhaḥ.

398

Vipulakadalīphalalipsayā jihvācchedanam.

Cutting off the tongue while trying to get a fine [!] plantain. This is found in the Pūrṇaprajña section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 64 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jīvananda's edn.) as follows:

"Evaṃ ca parameśvarābhedaṭṭṣṇayā viṣṇor guṇotkarṣasya mṛgatṭṣṇikā-samatvābhidhānaṃ vipulakadalīphalalipsayā jihvācchedanam anuharati. Etādṛśa-viṣṇuvidveṣaṇād andhatamasapraveśaprasaṅgāt."

Prof. Gough renders it thus: "Thus the statement of those (Advaitavādins) in their thirst to be one with the Supreme Lord, that the supreme excellence of Vishṇu is like a mirage, is as if they were to cut off their tongues in trying to get a fine plantain, since it results that through offending this supreme Vishṇu they must enter into the hell of blind darkness."

Ed. note. Vipula does not mean fine. Why anyone would cut his tongue if the 'kadalīphala' would be slender? It means too large. The tongue was cut to accommodate the oversize fruit. cf. vipulajaghanā. Here is one more reason why we have called this edition as the Reformed edition.

399

Vilūnanāsikasyādarśadarśanam.

Showing a looking-glass to a man whose nose has been cut off! An incitement to wrath! It occurs in *Prabandhacintāmani*, page 291, as follows:

"Prāyaḥ sampratikopāya [? ed.] sanmārgasyopadeśanam.
Vilūnanāsikasyeva yadvad ādarśadarśanam."

"As a general rule, pointing out the right way leads to immediate wrath, as does the showing of a mirror to one whose nose has been cut off." This is Mr. Tawney's rendering, and I have adopted the reading of his manuscripts in the first line. In the second line, the MSS. read Viśuddhādarśadarśanam.

Ed. note. The wrath is not to be qualified with the word immediate. Sampratikopāya is to be taken to mean one who gets angry all of a sudden--flares up instantaneously without any reason, a short-tempered man! On vilūnanāsikasya we may bring a parallel -- kṣate kṣāram. Jale para namaka chiḍakanā (Hindi).

Here is one more proof of how this edition can be called a Reformed edition.

400

Viśvajinnyāyaḥ.

The law regarding *the Viśvajit-sacrifice*. It forms part of the great sacrifice called *Gavām ayana* which lasts for a year; for a description of which see Dr. Egging's translation of *Śatapatha- Brāhmaṇa*, vol. 2, page 427. A quite new explanation of this sacrificial session is propounded in a book by the learned Librarian of the Mysore Govt. Oriental Library, entitled *Gavām Ayana, the Vedic era*. It was favourably reviewed by Prof. L. D. Barnett in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for April 1909. The Viśvajit is discussed in Jaimini 4. 3. 10-16, and 6. 7. 1-20. In the former, the question is raised of the reward which is to follow the offering of the sacrifice, since none is mentioned in the scripture prescribing it; and the decision is that in this, and in all similar cases, heaven is to be understood to be the reward. This is somewhat quaintly put by Śabara under sūtra 16: "Anādiṣṭaphale karmaṇi svargaḥ phalam. Iti pratyayo loke. Evam ucyate. Ārāmakṛd devadatto niyato'sya svargaḥ. Taḍāgakṛd devadatto niyato'sya svarga iti. Ittham anena nyāyena svarge sampratyaḥ bhavati, yasmāt svargaphaleṣu karmasu kartavyeṣu phalavacanam naivocārayanti, gamyata eveti. Tasmād apyavagacchāma evaṃjātīyakeṣu svargaḥ phalam iti."

The offerer of the Viśvajit is required to surrender all his property to the sacrificing priests, a point which gives rise to a very curious discussion in the Sixth Book. Is he then

to give away his father and mother; or, if a reigning monarch, is he to part with all the lands of his kingdom? These and many other interesting points are fully argued out by Śabara; and, for some of them, the English reader may with advantage refer to Colebrooke's Essay [5?] on the Mīmāṃsā, vol. i., page 345.

This nyāya is very frequently quoted by writers on Vedānta and Nyāya. The following are examples. *Bhāmatī*, page 86:

"Na ca brahmabhūyād anyad amṛtatvam ārthavādikam kiñcid asti yena tat-kāma upāsanāyām adhikṛiyeta, viśvajinnyāyena tu svargakalpanāyām tasya sātīsayatvam kṣayitvam ceti na nityaphalatvam upāsanāyāḥ."

Vedāntakalpataru, page 430: "Sannihitakaraṇopakāre sambhavati na viśvajinnyāyena svargakalpanā, nāpi darśapūrṇamāsaphalasvargasyānuṣaṅgaḥ." See, too, *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa*, pages 134 (line 9), 137 (line 13), and 164 (line 6 from bottom). *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 524, line 13 from the bottom: "Paraprakaraṇaparipāṭhanavirahācca nāsya sampadādividhivat pradhānādhikāraniveśitvam, ato viśvajīdadhikaraṇanyāyena svargakāmam adhikāriṇam iha yāvad upāttam adhyavasāmas tāvad eva ca na punarāvartate &c."

There is another good example of it in the early part of the Jaimini chapter of *Sarva-darśanaśaṅgraha*.

Ed. note. Note *loke* and *nyāyena*. Jacob's text reads *paṭhaṇa!* Wrong. Note the date 1909 in the first paragraph. Jacob seems to be still active. This is the second reference of this kind.

401

Viśakumbhaṃ payomukham.

A bowl [? ed.] *of poison with milk on the surface*. A wolf in sheep's clothing. The illustration is found in Merutunga's work, the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 153:

"Parokṣe kāryahantāraṃ pratyakṣe priyavādinam.
Varjayet tādṛśaṃ mitraṃ viśakumbhaṃ payomukham."

"The friend who behind one's back tries to impede one's business, but in one's presence speaks kindly, such a friend one should avoid, a bowl of poison with milk on the surface." This is Mr. Tawney's rendering (on page 92), and he points out in a footnote that the verse is quoted in Boehtlingk's *Indische Spruche*, and ascribed by him to Cāṇakya.

The maxim of *worms bred in poison (or in manure)*. Āpte's Dictionary alone gives us this nyāya which he describes as follows: "It is used to denote a state of things which though fatal to others, is not so to those who, being bred in it, are inured or naturalized to it." In this case it might represent our "What is one man's food is another man's poison." Āpte gives no reference to a passage where the maxim is used, and I am indebted for one to that veritable *Ratnākara*, Dr. Boehtlingk's *Indische Sprueche* (6164). It consists of a quotation from *Vṛddha-Cāṇakya*, a work which appears to exist in MS. only. It runs thus:

"Viprāsmin nagare mahān kathaya kas tādardrumāṇāṃ gaṇaḥ
ko dātā rajako dadāti vasaṇaṃ prātar gṛhītvā niśi.
Ko dakṣaḥ paradāravittaharaṇe sarvo'pi dakṣo janaḥ
Kasmāj jīvasi he sakhe viśakṣṇīnyāyena jīvāmyaham."

The Doctor renders the last line by "Wozu lebst du, o Freund? Ich lebe nach Art des Mistkaefers (d.i. Ich suche das Beste heraus)." If this is correct, the nyāya must be expressive of "living in clover," or, amidst "marrow and fatness!"

Ed. note. Such nyāyas, common to many cultures and languages, might be grouped together. They represent universal truth. After years of study and work we have found out an expression which represents the sense and essence of our discipline. We would like to call it Viśvanyāyavyākhyānanidarśanadarśanam.

403

Viśavṛkṣanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the poisonous tree*. This appears to be based on the second half of *Kumārasambhava* ii. 55 (or *Pañcatantra* i. 245), which runs thus:

"Viśavṛkṣo'pi saṃvardhya svayaṃ chettum asāmpratam."

"It would be improper to cut down even a poisonous tree after cultivating it oneself." This is used as a maxim by the author of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā* (page 727) in the following sentence:

"Ete sarve tarkāḥ ... Asmābhir eva tarkapadavyām abhiṣiktās tato na prabandhena nirasyante

'Viśavṛkṣo'pi saṃvardhya svayaṃ chettum asāmpratamiti.'"

There is another capital instance of it in *Upamitibhāvaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 715:

"Hā hā mayedaṃ no cāru kṛtaṃ yat sutabhartsanam.
Viśavṛkṣo'pi saṃvardhya svayaṃ chettum asāmpratam."

"Ete sarve tarkāḥ ... Asmābhir eva tarkapadavyām abhiṣiktās tato na prabandhena nirasyante

'Viṣavṛkṣo'pi saṃvardhya svayaṃ chettum asāmpratamiti."

There is another capital instance of it in *Upamitibhāvaprapañcā Kathā*, page 715:

"Hā hā mayedaṃ no cāru kṛtaṃ yat sutabhartsanam.
Viṣavṛkṣo'pi saṃvardhya svayaṃ chettum asāmpratam."

404

Vīcī taraṅganyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *wave-undulation*. This is used by the author of the *Bhāṣāpariccheda* (verses 165, 166) to account for the production of sound. He says:

"Sarvaḥ śabda nabhovṛttiḥ śrotrotpannas tu gṛhyate.
Vīcī taraṅganyāyena tadutpattis tu kīrtitā.

Kadambakorakanyāyād utpattiḥ kasyacin mate."

Almost the same words are used by Vedāntin Mahādeva (latter part of 17th century) in his comment on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* V. 103:- "Kintu śabda eva vīcī taraṅganyāyena kadambamukulanyāyena vā śrotradeśaṃ gataḥ śrotreṇa gṛhyate." "But sound comes to the seat of hearing in the same manner as the undulating waves [of water], or as the anthers of a [globulous] Kadamba flower and is thus apprehended by the ear." The translation is Dr. R. Garbe's.

405

Vṛkṣapṛakampananyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the shaking of a tree*. A man is supposed to be up a tree whilst others are standing below it. One of the latter points to a particular branch which he wishes to be shaken, and the others point out other branches for the same purpose; so the man shakes the whole tree at once and thus satisfies everybody by the one effort! Raghunātha applies this in the following way:

"Yatraikasya vastuno matabhedena bahūni rūpāṇi tattacchāstreṣu pratipādyamānānyupalabhya kṛiyā hi vikalpyate na vastviti nyāyād vastuni vikalpāsambhavaṃ matvā viruddhānāṃ samuccayasyāpyasambhavana teṣvekamatapratipāditāṃ sarvāviruddhaṃ vastu svīkriyate tatra vṛkṣapṛakampananyāyaḥ pravartate."

In his larger work, Raghunātha says that the simile is also found as Vṛkṣapracalana-nyāya, and in this form I have met with it in *Mahābhāṣya*, vol. i. page 23 (bottom), "Vṛkṣaḥ pracalan saḥāvayavaiḥ pracalati." Also in 6. 1. 1. (vārt. 13).

Ed. note. Jacob has omitted the vital part of the subject matter while presenting a translation, viz. One person wants the entire tree to be shaken. This has a crucial bearing on the objective to be achieved here in shaking the entire (whole) tree.

Here are the exact words of Raghunātha Varmā: Yathā vṛkṣm ārūḍhaḥ pumān adhaḥsthitair naraiḥ pratham iyam śākhā prakampitavyā, pratham iyam śākhā prakampitavyeti bhinnabhinnaśākhāprakampane niyojitaḥ, TADHAHSTHENAIVA KENACIT SARVAVṛkṣaparakampane niyojitaḥ san, sarvaiḥ prathamaparakampānasyā" jñaptatvena yaugapadyasyāsambhavana, kramavikalpo'pagame'pi sarvāvirodhāsiddhes taccikīrṣayā vṛkṣam prakampayati, tat prakampanena hi sarvāḥ śākhā api prakampitāḥ syur iti bhavati sarvair avirodhaḥ.

406

Vṛddhakumārīvākyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the request of the aged spinster*. This is recorded in *Mahābhāṣya* 8. 2. 3 as follows:

"Athavā vṛddhakumārīvākyavad idaṃ draṣṭavyam. Tadyathā. Vṛddhakumārīndreṇoktā varam vṛṇīsveti. Sā varam avṛṇīta--putrā me bahukṣīraghṛtam odanaṃ kāmasyapātryāṃ bhuñjīranniti. Na ca tāvad asyāḥ patir bhavati, kutaḥ putrāḥ, kuto gāvaḥ, kuto dhānyam. Tatrānayaikena vākyena patiḥ putrā gāvo dhānyam iti sarvaṃ saṃgrhītaṃ bhavati."

This would be applied to a sentence having a variety of meanings. In *Tantravārtika* 2. 2 (page 452) we meet with it as Vṛddhakumārīvaraprārthana; in the *Pañḍit* for December 1867 (page 156), we find exactly the same kind of thing under the heading Vṛddhabrahmaṇavaranyāyaḥ. This worthy was not only old, but blind, and his request was "Svapautraṃ rājasimhāsanasthitam īkṣitum icchāmīti."

Ed. note. First of all vara is not a request but a boon. R has a very elaborate discussion of this nyāya in connection with Kāśīmaraṇān muktiḥ. This nyāya is phrased in various ways. Bhuvaneśa has digested the *Mahābhāṣya* very well.

407

Vṛddhim iṣṭavato mūlam api te naṣṭam.

Wishing to grow, you have destroyed your root. This is Prof. Cowell's rendering of the saying as it appears in the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 27 Bib. Ind., p. 33 Jīvananda): "Tathā ca vṛddhim iṣṭavato mūlam api te naṣṭam syād iti mahat kaṣṭam āpannam."

In the *Vācaspatyam*, however, we have the literal and more usual meaning of the nyāya, namely "Whilst seeking to obtain interest, the creditor loses [that and] the capital too."

"Vṛddhim iṣṭavato mūlam api vinaṣṭam iti nyāyaḥ. Vṛddhir dhanaprayoge-
'dhamarṇāt prāpyāṁśabhedalābhaḥ. Tām iṣṭavata uttamarṇasyādhamarṇadauṣṭyād
yathā mūlam naśyatyevaṁ yatrābhīṣṭāntarasampādanāya prayatamānasya mūlam
naśyati tatrāsyā pravṛttiḥ."

See also *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, p.31; *Pañcadaśī*, vii. 81; *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 321; and *Syādvādamañjarī*, page 19. An amusing illustration of this saying is found in *Kuvalayānanda*, under the figure Viṣama.

"Iṣṭārtham uddīśya kiñcit karmārabdhavato na kevalam iṣṭasyānavāptiḥ kintu
tato'niṣṭasyāpi pratilambhaś cet tad api viṣamam. Yathā bhakṣyaprepsayā sarpa-
peṭikāṁ daṣṭvā praviṣṭasya mūśakasya na kevalam bhakṣyālābhaḥ kintu svarūpa-
hānirapīti."

Raghunātha has two other maxims of the same kind, namely, "Putralipsayā devaṁ
bhajantyā bhartāpi naṣṭaḥ," and "Carmatantau mahiṣīm hanti."

ED. NOTE: We are not sure if the nyāya Carmatantau mahiṣīm hanti fits in here very well.

408

Vṛścikabhiyā palāyamāna āśīviṣamukhe nipatitaḥ.

Running away through fear of a scorpion, he falls into the jaws of a poisonous snake!
Avoiding Scylla, he falls into Charybdis! The nyāya occurs in the following passage of
the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā*, page 53:

"Yadyapi rāgādinivṛttihetur nairātmyadarśanam, tathāpi nāsti karma nāsti
karmaphalam iti dṛṣṭeḥ paramaṁ nidānam. Evaṁ pretyabhāvābhāvajñānasya ca.
Tathā ca duḥkhaheṭor heyavargasyābhāvān na taddhānāyānena ghaṭitavyam. Na
cāghaṭamāno hyayaṁ hātum arhati. So'yaṁ vṛścikabhiyā palāyamāna āśīviṣamukhe
nipatitaḥ."

It is found also in *Kusumāñjali* ii. 3 (page 328), in *Vidvanmaṇḍana*, page 4, and in *Nyāyamakaranda*, page 223. Of somewhat similar import is the nyāya "Ekām asiddhiṃ pariharato dvitīyāpadyate," which see in its place.

409

Vṛścikīgarbhanyāyaḥ.

For this, see the Aśvatarīgarbhanyāya. (N. 053).

ED. NOTE: It is useful to give the serial no. in this manner.

410

Vyāpakavyāvṛtṭyā vyāpyavyāvṛtṭiḥ.

This highly technical nyāya is found in both of Raghunāthavarman's works. I have taken it from a passage in the Bauddha section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 11 in Jivānanda's edition), and subjoin Professor Gough's rendering (italicizing the words which represent the maxim):

"Tatra kṣaṇikatvaṃ nīlādikṣaṇānām sattvenānumātavyam. Yat sat tat kṣaṇikaṃ. Yathā jaladharapaṭalam. Santaś cāmī bhāvā iti. Na cāyam asiddho hetuḥ. Artha-kriyākāritvalakṣaṇasya sattvasya nīlādikṣaṇānām pratyakṣasiddhatvāt. Vyāpakavyāvṛtṭyā vyāpyavyāvṛtṭinyāyena vyāpakakramākrmavyāvṛtṭāvākṣaṇikāt sattvavyāvṛtṭeḥ siddhatvāc ca."

"Of these points of view, the momentariness of fleeting things, blue and so forth, is to be inferred from their existence; thus, whatever *is* is momentary (or fluxional) like a bank of clouds, and all these things *are*. Nor may any one object that the middle term (existence) is unestablished; for an existence consisting of practical efficiency is established by perception to belong to the blue and other momentary things; and the exclusion of existence from that which is not momentary is established, provided that we exclude from it the non-momentary succession and simultaneity, according to the rule that *exclusion of the continent is exclusion of the contained*." In *Śālikā* page 119, line 14, we find the nyāya as "Vyāpakanivṛtṭir hi vyāpyanivṛtṭyā vyāptā," and, on page 67, line 2 "Vyāpakābhāve vyāpyaṃ nāsti."

Ed. note: So Jacob has taken even such a "highly technical nyāya" in his collection of POPULAR maxims. This is called Paropadeśe pāṇḍityam. What does he mean by the term "popular" ? We would like to know.

411

Vyālanakulanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the snake and the mungoose*. The well-known innate antipathy of these two for one another (*Pāṇini* 2. 4. 9.) is a commonly-used illustration of inherent opposition between two things. Mr. Tawney has reminded me of the story in *Pañchatantra* V. 2. which speaks of the enmity between them in the following words:

"Atrāntare daivavaśāt kṛṣṇasarpo bilān niṣkrāntaḥ. Nakulo'pi taṃ svabhāvavairiṇaṃ matvā bhrātū rakṣaṇārthaṃ sarpeṇa saha yuddhvā sarpaṃ khaṇḍaśaḥ kṛtavān."

The nyāya is employed by Udayana in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 53, as follows:

"Svasaṃvidi tadrūpatvād iti cet, tat kim aṅgapariṇataśānter āśramapadam iva, vijñānam āsādyā vyālanakulāder iva, nīladhavalādeḥ śāśvatikavirodhatyāgo, nibhṛtavairāṇaṃ tatphalatyāgo vā. Na tāvat prathamāḥ, parasparaniṣedhavidhināntariyaka-vidhiniṣedhayor avirodhe jagati virodhocchedaprasaṅgāt."

It is more commonly known as Ahinakulanyāya.

Ed. note. cf. Yeṣām ca virodhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ.

412

Śakunigrāhakagatinyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the movements of a bird-catcher*. It is found in Śabara on Jaimini 9. 1. 22, as follows:

"Yathā śakunigrāhakasya śakuniṃ jighṛkṣataś chadmanā gatiḥ bhavati, śanaiḥ padanyāso dṛṣṭipraṇidhānam aśabdakaraṇaṃ ca, katham anavabuddhaḥ śakunir grhyeteti, evam ihāpyanavabuddham iva grahītuṃ yajñāṃ pracchannagatir upāṃśutvaṃ nāma. Yathā śakunigrāhakasya yasmin deśe śanaiḥ padanyāso na sa taddeśārtho'pi tu taddeśābhigatasya śakuner arthena kṛiyata, evam ihāpyupāṃśutvaṃ na taddeśānāṃ padārthānāṃ arthena kriyate, taddeśābhigatasya yajñasyārthena gamyate."

See also Bhūmirathikanyāya.

Ed. note: Great sages of ancient India writing on deep philosophical thoughts are seen using commonplace events and incidents to prove their point of view. This is remarkable. This demonstrates the value and validity of the Laukikanyāyas.

The simile of [the time for sounding] *the conch-shell*. An offering called upāṁśuyāja, or 'low-voiced offering,' is performed *between* the cake-oblation to Agni and that to Agni-Soma at the full-moon, and *between* the cake-oblation to Agni and that to Indra-Agni at the new-moon (Dr. Eggling's trans. of Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, vol. i. page 192). Sometimes, however, the second oblation is omitted; and then the question arises, how is the Upāṁśuyāja to be offered, since that comes *between* the two? The subject is discussed in Jaimini 10. 8. 62-70, and the above question is answered by Śabara as follows:

"Yo hi dvayoḥ puroḍāśayor madhya iti kālo'vagamyate sa eva pūrvasmād uttara iti. Evam ced yadyapyekapuroḍāśāyām dvau puroḍāśau na stas, tathāpi sa pūrva āgneyo'sti tasmād uttaraḥ sa eva kālo yo'sāvantarālena lakṣitaḥ. Yathā nāgavelāyām āgantavyam,' 'śaṅkhavelāyām āgantavyam,' 'paṭahavelāyām āgantavyam,' iti, yasmin grāme na nāgā na śaṅkhā na paṭahas tasminnapi sa eva kālas tatra hyāgamanam kriyate. Evam ihāpi draṣṭavyam. Tasmād ekapuroḍāśāyām upāṁśuyājaḥ kartavya iti."

The simile might well be called Śaṅkhadhvanivelānyāya, but I have adopted the name given in the Nyāyamālāvistara on this *adhikaraṇa*, which also explains it more fully:

"Śaṅkhanyāyenopalakṣakasyāgnīṣomīyapuroḍāśasyaivābhāve'pyupalakṣye kāle yāgo'sti. Yathā śaṅkhadhvanivelāyām rājasevārtham pratidinam āgantavyam ityukte kasmimścid dine tam śaṅkham dhamataḥ puruṣasyābhāvenopalakṣakasya dhvaner abhāve'pyupalakṣite tasmin kāle sevakāḥ samāgacchanti tathātrāpi draṣṭavyam."

This is very clear, but what is the meaning of nāgavelā? To be in harmony with the rest of the sentence it ought to indicate some thing which, like the sounding of the *śaṅkha* or the beating of the *paṭaha*, takes place regularly every day; but how can any such sense be got out of *nāga*, unless it refers to the trumpeting of the royal elephants at some particular time of the day?

The Śāstradīpikā, Nyāyamālāvistara, and Jaiminīyasūtravṛitti ignore the expression altogether.

In Appai Dīkṣita's *Vidhirasāyana* page 22, we have an instance of the śaṅkhanyāya as follows:

"Upalakṣaṇāpāye'pyupalakṣyānapāyasya pratidinam śaṅkhavelāyām āgantavyam ityādau prasiddhatvāt. Na hi kālaviśeṣopalakṣaṇatayopātte śaṅkhadhvanau kvacid divase daivād akṛte sati tadupalakṣitaḥ kālo nāstīti nāvagamyate." See also *Vidhiviveka*, page 7.

Compare the expression "Cockshut-time," in Shakespeare's *Richard iii* (Act V. Scene 3):

"Thomas the Earl of Surrey, and himself,
Much about cock-shut time, from troop to troop.
Went through the army, cheering up the soldiers."

In Chambers' *Twentieth Century Dictionary* the expression is said to mean "Twilight; probably referring to the time when poultry are shut up." Webster's *International Dictionary* gives a different explanation.

Ed. note. This military-minded martial man, the Colonel could not think of anything else but the elephants and their trumpeting with reference to a word like nāga. Śaṅkha is an instrument of sound. Paṭaha too is a kind of drum. So nāga must be related to the sound of music. Fortunately, MW gives a word nāgadhvani (p. 53, col. 1) and explains that the word in music means a rāga. So this could be a melodius song sung at a particular hour in the morning. Apte is very specific and pertinent here. He says that Nāgavelā means the hour when a serpent-like instrument is blown [played?]. And then he quotes Śabara (MS 10.8.69)...nāgavelāyām āgantavyam....Yet he is not specific about the exactness of the hour-- 6 a.m. or 7 a.m.? Śaṅkhadhvani relates to mid-day, the time of the main meals.

See my ed. of the *Vikramāṅkābhyudaya*, p. 31, bottom-- Anantaram bhojanasamaya-śaṃsī manaḥprītikaraḥ śravaṇamadhuraḥ śaṅkhadhvanir udagāt. Consequently we may infer that the Paṭahadhvani signifies the time of the evening.

So the nāga is not an elephant here, but the name of a serpent-like musical instrument played early in the morning. The context demands this kind of interpretation.

Here is an example of Hamane kyā dīye lagāye hain. (Hindi).

Finally for upāṃsuyāja see Śakunigrāhakagatinyāya.

414

Śatapatrapatraśatabhedanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the* [apparently simultaneous] *piercing* [with a needle] *of one hundred lotus leaves*. It is found under the figure samuccaya in *Kuvalayānanda*, in connection with the following example:

"Bibhrāṇā hṛdaye tvayā vinihitam premābhidhānaṃ navam
śalyam yad vidadhāti sā vidhuritā sādho tad ākarṇyatām.
Sete śuśyati tāmyati pralapati pramlāyati preṅkhati
bhrāmyatyulluṭhati praṇāśyati galatyunmūrcchati trutyati.

Atra kāsāñcit kṛiyāṇaṃ kiñcitkālabhedasaṃbhave'pi śatapatraśatabhedanyāyena yaugapadyaṃ virahātiśayadyotanāya vivakṣitam iti lakṣaṇānugatiḥ."

In the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, also, we have the same idea somewhat differently expressed in the description of asaṃlakṣyakṛamavyaṅgya. The following is the passage (on page 102) with Mr. Pramadādāsa Mitra's translation:

"Atra vyaṅgyapratīter vibhāvādipratītikāraṇakatvāt kramo'vaśyam asti, kintu-utpalapatraśatavyatibhedaval lāghavān na saṃlakṣyate."

"Now, the perception of the suggested, caused as it is by, and hence succeeding, the perception of the Accessories &c., has necessarily a process, but from its quickness it is not perceived, like the *process of the apparently simultaneous* piercing through of a hundred lotus leaves *placed one upon another*." The expression "Utpalaśatapatraśatavyatibhedavat" is used by Aniruddha in his comment on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* ii. 32; and Dr. Garbe thinks that he took it from the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. See his Preface to the *Sāṅkhyasūtravṛitti*. There are two examples of this nyāya in Śrīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*. On page 23:

"Yad gacchati tat sannihitavyavahitārthau krameṇa prāpnoti tat kathaṃ. Śākhā-candramasos tulyakālopalabdhir iti ced, indriyavṛtter āśu sañcāritvāt palāśaśatavyatibhedavat kramāgrahaṇanimitto'yaṃ bhramo, na tu vāstavaṃ yaugapadyam."

The other is on page 158.

A much older example is found in *Ślokavārtika*, page 311 (verse 157), to which I append Mr. Gangānātha Jhā's translation:

"Yatpradīpaprabhādyuktaṃ sūkṣmakālo'sti tatra naḥ.
Durlakṣas tu yathā vedhaḥ padmapatraśate tathā."

"You have brought forward the case of the lamp and the light emitted by it as an instance of the simultaneity of the cause and the effect. But in this case also, there is a minute point of time (intervening between the appearance of the lamp and that of the light), though this is imperceptible; just as is the case with the piercing (with a needle) of the hundred petals of the lotus." Professor Jacobi has kindly pointed out an instance of it in *Nyāyavārtika*, page 37, in the form utpaladalaśatavyatibhedavat, from which, perhaps, Aniruddha took the nyāya, rather than from the very modern *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. The same expression, utpalapatraśatavyatibhedavat, is found in the Jaina work, *Syādvādamañjarī* (page 92). Besides these, I have met with the nyāya in *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 334, line 2 (in the form śīghratarabāṇahetukaśatapatraśatavyatibhedavat); in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 498 (as sūcyagrabhidyamānakokanadalakadambakavat); in *Tarkabhāṣāṭīkā*, page 126 (as śatapatraśātanavat); and in *Citsukhī* ii. 9 (śatapatraśatavyatibhedānubhavavat).

Ed. note. The *Ālaṅkārikas* have used this nyāya quite extensively.

415

Śate pañcāśat.

Fifty [is contained] *in a hundred*. The greater includes the less. In the *Vācaspatyam*, the nyāya is thus defined:

"Vyāpakaśatasamkhyāyām yathā vyāpyapañcāśatsankhyā niviṣṭā evaṃ yatra vyāpake vyāpyasya niveśas tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ."

I have met with it only in the *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 121, line 12, where a highly technical passage from Śabara 6. 1. 43 is discussed, regarding the pronouncement of the names of Pravaras at new and full moon sacrifices. A reference to Kunte's *Ṣaḍ-darśanacintanikā*, page 1776, would throw light on this dark passage.

Ed. note. Once again Jacob makes a reference to Kunte's work. He seems to have a great regard and respect for it. Monier-Williams too in his Dictionary discusses the nyāyas. He has this one.

416

Śarapuruṣīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the man and the arrow*. Vardhamāna explains this as follows, in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 196:

"Śaraś ca kṣiptaḥ prākārāc ca puruṣa utthitaḥ sa tena hataḥ. Tattulyaṃ śarapuruṣīyam."

An arrow is discharged from a bow, and at the same moment a man rises up from behind a wall (rampart? ed.) and is killed by it. It illustrates, therefore, a purely accidental and unforeseen occurrence, and must be classed with the ajākṛpāṇīya, khalvāṭa-bilvīya, and others of a like nature.

417

Śarkaronmajjanīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the pebble and the* [man's] *emerging* [from the water]. This, like that immediately preceding, is found in Vardhamāna's work, and on the same page. He explains it thus:- "Śarkarā ca kṣiptā puruṣasya conmajjanaṃ tattulyaṃ śarkaronmajjaniyam."

At the moment that the pebble is thrown, a man who has been diving or swimming emerges from the water and is struck by it. This, too, therefore, belongs to the ajākṛ-pāṇīya and kākatālīya category.

418

Śalabhanyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *the moth*. The destruction of the silly moth by flying into a lighted lamp is a figure often met with in Sanskrit works; as, for example, in *Śiśupālavadhā* ii. 117, *Kumārasambhava* iv. 40, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* vii. 375, and *Kāmandakī* i. 43. According to Merutuṅga, however, the poor moth is moved with envy at the brilliance of the light, and so seeks to diminish it! He says (on page 211, at the bottom):

"Ujvalaguṇam abhyuditaṃ
kṣudro draṣṭuṃ na katham api kṣamate.
Dagdhvā tanum api śalabho
dīpraṃ dīpārciṣaṃ harati."

"The mean man cannot anyhow endure to behold the exaltation of the man of radiant merit; the moth even burns its own body to extinguish the bright flame of the candle." (Tawney's translation, page 130).

419

Śavodvartananyāya.

The simile of *perfuming a dead body*. For the application and illustration see *Araṇya-rodananyāya*.

420

Śākhācandranyāyaḥ

The simile of *the moon upon a bough*. Molesworth defines it thus:- "A Sanskrit phrase adduced as a simile or an illustration when an object seen or a matter debated has its position or relation assigned to it as at, on, in consistency with &c. a particular object or matter, simply from the appearance of contiguity or connection which, under one line of view or one train of reasoning, it ordinarily presents; whilst actually and truly it is remote from it so widely as to preclude altogether affirmation of connection. We say the sun sinks in the ocean by the same law as we say the moon is upon a bough of a tree, speaking in both cases from the appearance presented." It is thus akin to the *Arundhatī-pradarśananyāya*. The following example is found in *Taittirīyabhāṣyavārtika* 2. 1. 232 (page 88):

"Taruśākhāgradṛṣṭyaiva somaṃ yadvat pradarśayet.
Niṣkośaṃ kośadṛṣṭyaiva pratīci brahma darśyate."

And in *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṅgraha*, page 202, we read: "Nanvatra sūtre Brahma svarūpalakṣaṇaṃ noktaṃ, na ca tadantareṇa svarūpam avagamyate. Prakṛṣṭaparakāśātmavam anuktvā śākhāgre candra ityevokte candrasvarūpānavagamāt."

Ed. note: Molesworth's definition here is terribly involved.

421

Śānte karmaṇi vetālodayaḥ.

When the [prescribed] ritual [for the removal or prevention of evil] is at an end, up comes a goblin! This implies ultimate failure in spite of effort. It occurs in Citsukha Muni's comment on *Nyāyamakaranda*, page 16, as follows: "Nanu so'yaṃ śānte karmaṇi vetālodayaḥ, abhedam sādhyaituṃ pravṛttena bhedaśruter udāhṛtatvāt."

In *Bhāmatī*, page 93, line 17, the nyāya is quoted as "Śāntikarmaṇi vetālodayaḥ," which makes the goblin appear *during the performance* of the Śānti, the rite to avert evil. So, too, in Maṇḍana-Miśra's *Vidhiviveka*, page 210. The purport however, is the same as in the other case. In Āśvalāyana's *Gṛhyasūtra* 4. 6. 1, śāntikarma is prescribed when a *guru* dies, or on the loss of a son or of cattle.

422

Śābdyākāṅkṣā śabdenaiva pūryate.

Verbal expectancy is satisfied [or fulfilled] by words only. This nyāya of Raghunātha's is very frequently met with. It occurs in the last chapter of *Sarvadarśanasāgraha* (page 157 of Bib. Ind. and 177 of Jīvananda's edn.) with pūryyā as the last word; in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala* page 232 (in the erroneous form śābdā sākāṅkṣā); in Haridāsa's vṛtti on *Kusumāñjali* iii. 15 (page 35) also in Rucidatta's commentary on the same portion (page 478); and, finally, in *Sāhityadarpaṇa* ii. 18 (with prapūryate).

In paragraph 70 of the *Tarkasaṅgraha* we are told that there are three requisites to the intelligibility of a sentence, namely, expectancy (*ākāṅkṣa*), compatibility (*yogyatā*), and juxtaposition (*sannidhi*). In para 71, the first of these is thus explained: "Expectancy means a word's incapacity to convey a complete meaning, this being occasioned by the absence of another word [which, when it comes as expected, will complete the construction and the sense]." Then in para 72 we read: "a collection of words devoid of expectancy &c., is no instrument of right knowledge; for example, 'cow, horse, man, elephant,' gives no information, from the absence of expectancy, [the words having no

reference one to another, and not looking out for one another]." This is Dr. Ballantyne's translation, accompanying the text; and the same subject is explained by him in his lucid rendering of *Sāhityadarpaṇa* i. 6.

423

Śālyādiviṣayasya muśalādeḥ karaṇasya śyāmāke'bhihatir bhavati.

A blow with an instrument such as a pestle, directed towards the rice, falls instead on the śyāmāka grain. Aiming at a pigeon and killing a crow. It occurs in Nyāyavārtika, page 46:

"Katham punar anyaviṣayaṃ karaṇam anyaviṣayāṃ kṛiyāṃ karoti. Śālyādiviṣayasya muśalādeḥ karaṇasya śyāmāke'bhihatir bhavati. Nānīyamād iti. Yadvīṣayaṃ karaṇam tadviṣayā kṛiyeti na niyamo'sti. Dṛṣṭā hi vṛkṣādiviṣayasya chedanasyāvayavakriyeti. Vṛkṣaś chidyate'vayave kriyeti."

424

Śāstraphalaṃ prayoktari.

The fruit promised in Scripture [in connection with a sacrificial or other act] is for the performer [of that act]. These are the first words of Jaimini's sūtra 3. 7. 18. They are quoted as a nyāya in a passage of Vedāntatattvaviveka, for which see, "Munir manute, mūrkhō mucyate." It is cited by Vācaspati Miśra, also, in Tātparyāṭikā, page 296, line 6 from the bottom, and page 403, line 4, and in his Bhāmatī, pages 28 and 492. Also in Śribhāṣya 2. 3. 33 (p. 1688), and 3. 4. 45 (p. 2028), where Dr. Thibaut renders it, "the fruit of the injunction belongs to the agent." The first part of Tattvamuktākalāpa ii. 59 reads thus:

"Anyāś ced anyakarmaprajanitaphalabhuk
śāstravaiyākulī syāt &c.,"

on which the author comments as follows: "Anyasyānyakṛtakarmaphalabhoge śāstraphalaṃ prayoktarīti vyavasthābhaṅgāc chāstrasya vyākulatā syāt &c." Compare Patañjali on Pāṇini 1. 3. 72.

Ed. note. Note "Compare."

425

Śibikodyacchannaravat.

The simile of *men carrying a palanquin*. Used by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa to show how all the words in a sentence *unitedly* convey the sense of the latter. It occurs in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 397, line 12:

"Yathā hi bāhyāni karaṇāni kāṣṭhādīni pāke vyāpriyante, yathā ca śibikāyā udyantāraḥ sarve śibikām udyacchanti, yathā trayo'pi grāvāṇa ukhām bibhrati, tathā sarvāṅyeva padāni vākyārtham avabodhayanti." Again, on page 400, line 11 from bottom:- "Śibikodyacchannaravat sarvāni padāni kārye saṃhatya vyāpriyante ityetad api satyam eva." Cf. *Bṛhadārṇyavārtika*, 1. 4. 1600.

Ed. note. Note Cf.

426

Śiraśchede'pi śataṃ na dadāti, viṃśatipañcakaṃ tu prayacchatī
śākaṭikanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the carter who would be beheaded rather than pay a hundred, but will at once give five score!* It occurs in the Pūrṇaprajña section of *Sarvadarśanasanḡraha* (page 71 of Bib. Ind. and page 83 of Jīvānanda's) as follows: "Nanu prapañcasya mithyātvam abhyupeyate nāsattvam iti cet, tad etat so'yaṃ śiraśchede'pi śataṃ na dadāti viṃśatipañcakaṃ tu prayacchatī śākaṭikavṛttāntam anuharen, mithyātvāsatvayoḥ paryāyātvād, ityalam atiprapañcena."

"If you say that you accept the falsity of the universe, but not its unreality, you are simply acting like the carter who would lose his head rather than pay a hundred pieces of money, but at once gives five score! For falsity and unreality are synonymous. But enough of prolixity."

It is found also in *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 31), from which Mādhava probably took it. In *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 71 (page 244) it takes the Śatam aditsataḥ śatārdhadvaya-dānam," and there is still another variety of it in *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, page 74, namely "Śiracchede'pi kākaṇīm[? ed.] na dadāti pañcagaṇḍakāms tu dadāti." Compare with this the following from *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 432:- "Athocyate na pratyakṣa ātmā kintva-parokṣa iti nedam arthāntaravacanāṃ, śīśava evaṃ pratāryante na prāmāṇikāḥ."

427

Śiroveṣṭanena nāsikāsparśanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *touching the nose by encircling the head* [with one's arm]. That is, putting the arm round the head instead of bringing it directly to the face. Raghunāthavarmā classes it with nyāyas expressive of a round-about way of doing things. It is quoted by

Ed. Note: A great challenge thrown at the pandits of India. Can anyone accept the challenge and meet it?

The great foreword-writer to the money-making reprint of this *Añjali* might not have even seen this. He was busy in congratulating the reprinter for his monumental enterprise (kalaśapurassaraprāsādanirmāṇa) and collecting his own money received in exchange for congratulating the reprinter.

They say: Something is better than nothing. Reprinting a set of booklets by photo-offset method and getting them bound together itself was an epoch-making act that could offset all its shortcomings. Take whatever is being given. And be thankful. Greed is no good.

428

Śilāghanamadhyasthapradīpasahasraprathanavat.

The simile of *the shining-forth of a thousand lamps standing in the midst of solid rock!* It occurs in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 2. 28, near the end:

"Kiṃcānyat, pradīpavad vijñānam avabhāsakāntaranirapekṣam svayam eva prathata iti bruvatā pramāṇagamyam vijñānam anavagantṛkam ityuktaṃ syāt. Śilāghanamadhyasthapradīpasahasraprathanavat."

Dr. Thibaut renders it thus: "Moreover, if you maintain that the idea, lamplike, manifests itself without standing in need of a further principle to illuminate it, you maintain thereby that ideas exist which are not apprehended by any of the means of knowledge, and which are without a knowing being; which is no better than to assert that a thousand lamps burning inside some impenetrable mass of rocks manifest themselves."

429

Śīrṣe sarpo deśāntare vaidyaḥ.

A snake in the head, and the doctor in another country! This occurs, in Prākṛit, in *Karpūramañjarī* iv. (page 100). It is found in somewhat similar form in *Mudrārākṣasa* i. 21, also in Prākṛit. The *chhāyā* is as follows:

"Upari ghaṇam ghanaratiṭam
dūre dayitā kim etad āpatitam.
Himavati divyaauśadhayaḥ
śīrṣe sarpaḥ samāviṣṭaḥ."

Ed. note: A snake in the head or on the head?

A snake in the head, and the doctor in another country! This occurs, in Prākṛit, in *Karpūramañjarī* iv. (page 100). It is found in somewhat similar form in *Mudrārākṣasa* i. 21, also in Prākṛit. The *chhāyā* is as follows:

"Upari ghaṇaṃ ghanaraṭitaṃ
dūre dayitā kim etad āpatitaṃ.
Himavati divyaauśadhayaḥ
śīrṣe sarpaḥ samāviṣṭaḥ."

Ed. note: A snake in the head or on the head?

430

Śukanalikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the parrot and the Nalikā-tree*. Illustrative of causeless fear. In *Udyoga-Parva* xcvi. 42 we read,

"Kākudīkaṃ śukaṃ nākaṃ akṣisantarjanaṃ tathā,"

on which the commentator, Nīlakaṇṭha, says: "Kākudīkaṃ ityādayo'ṣṭāvastrajātayaḥ ... Yena śukanalikānyāyena abhaye'pi bhayadarśino hayarathādipādeṣu gādhaṃ śliṣyanti tac chukamohanaṃ nāma."

I have met with it also in a MS. (No. 233 of 1882-83 in Deccan College, Poona) of Nārāyaṇa's commentary on *Gopālottaratāpanīya-Upanishad* 8 (corresponding with 21 and 22 of *Bib. Ind.* edition), where, expounding the words "Yo hi vai kāmena kāmān kāmāyate &c.," he says: "Vāstavaṃ kartṛbhokṛtvaṃ bandhamokṣādīkaṃ ātmano nāsti, kintu svakāmaparikalpitaṃ śukanalikānyāyena."

Ed. note: We are unable to follow the meaning of this nyāya as given by the Colonel. We are not sure if he himself followed it. Sakhi me caturo bhartā svayam api likhitaṃ svayam na vācayati. (drawn from memory).

431

Śuṣkeṣṭinyāyaḥ.

The figure of a *sham-sacrifice*. That is, the performance of sacrificial ceremonies, by a pupil, with a view to his becoming proficient in them, without the offering of a real sacrifice. This is classed with *bhūmirathika* in Śābara's *bhāṣya* on Jaimini 9. 2. 13, and an extract from the passage will be found under that nyāya. The term *śuṣkeṣṭi*, as

adopted in Marāṭhī, is thus explained by Molesworth:- "Dry exercise or blank practising; performance or doing, antecedently to the occasion, of a work or matter in which the performer is ignorant or inexpert (in order that the necessary knowledge or ability may be acquired in provision for occasions anticipated)."

ED. NOTE: Sham-sacrifice=Dry run?

432

Śṛṅagrāhikānyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *seizing oxen by their horns*. That is, by way of *specification*, and not in the sense of our proverb "Taking the bull by the horns!" This is very clearly put in Rāmakṛishṇa's commentary on Śaṅkarānanda's *Ātmapurāṇa* iv. 561-2. The text runs thus:

"Śāstraṃ cātra pravṛttam sat pravṛttiṃ kurute dvidhā.
Vidhānena niṣedhena lokadṛṣṭisamāśrayāt. 561.

Śṛṅagrāhikayā yaddhi bodhayet tad vidhāyakam.
Yathā loke kare te'sti phalam ityādibhāṣaṇam" 562.

On the latter verse, Rāmakṛishṇa says:

"Tatra vidhāyakaśāstrasya lakṣaṇam laukikam udāharaṇam cāha śṛṅgeti. Śṛṅgasya grahaṇam yasyām kriyāyām sā śṛṅagrāhikā. Sañjñāyāmiti ṇvul. (Pāṇ. 3. 3. 108-9.) Yathā govraje kā madīyā gaur iti gopaḥ pṛṣṭaḥ śṛṅgam ḡṛhītvā gām pra-darśayet tathā bodhakaṃ śāstraṃ vidhāyakam ucyate."

So too, in Sureśvara's vārtika on *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya* 1. 4. 866:

"Śṛṅagrāhikayā śrutyā brahmatāpoditā sphuṭam," [? ed.]

on which Ānandagiri says: "Yathā gomaṇḍalasthām gām śṛṅgam ḡṛhītvā viśeṣato darśayatyeṣā bahukṣīreti &c." The same sense is attached to the maxim in Nīlakaṇṭha on *Udyoga-Parva* XLV.9

"Mado'ṣṭādaśadoṣaḥ sa syāt purā yo'prakīrtitaḥ,"

where we read: "Aprakīrtita iti damavirodhina eva prātikūlyādayo madadoṣatvena sūcitā api śṛṅagrāhikayā prakarṣeṇa vidhimukhena na proktā ityarthāḥ."

A fourth instance of the employment of this maxim in the same sense is found in the metrical comment on *Śāṅḍilya-sūtra* 87:

"Na tāvat samavāyena bhedasambandhagauravāt.
Śabdānām samayo'pyevaṃ śṛṅgagrāhikayā laghuḥ."

The passage is translated by Prof. Cowell as follows: "It will not do to hold that the connexion between the cause and its effect may be that called 'Intimate relation and not that called 'Identity,'-because it is a much more cumbrous assumption than ours and involves the connexion of 'difference,' and by our own we easily get at the true meaning of the various Śruti passages,- seizing them one by one, as oxen by their horns." In a footnote he adds:- "That is, such passages as 'Uktha is Brahman,' 'Prāṇa is Brahman' &c. *Śṛṅgagrāhikānyāya* is a proverb sometimes explained as 'catching an unruly bull first by securing one horn and then the second,' and sometimes, 'driving many oxen into a stall, by seizing them one by one by their horns.'" In *Bhāmatī* 3. 2. 22 (page 566) we have the phrase again: "Yathā gavādayo viśayāḥ sākṣāc chṛṅgagrāhikayā pratipādyante pratīyante ca naivaṃ Brahma."

Mr. F.W. Thomas has pointed out to me the *Śīrṣagrahaṇanyāya*, which is quoted in the commentary on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa* ii. 368. I think its usage must be similar to that of the above.

Ed. note. An important point to note: *Śīrṣagrahaṇanyāya* seems to be something new.

433

Śyenakapotīyanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the hawk and the pigeon*. Vardhamāna, in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it in the following way: "Śyenakapotayor iva śyenakapotīyo duryogaḥ. Yathā kapoto'tarkitam āgatena śyenaena grhītas tathākasmiko yo duryogaḥ sa evam ucyate."

This must be classed therefore with *śarapuruṣīya* and others of a similar kind. We have a *Śyenakapotīyam upākhyānam* given in the table of contents which forms the opening part of the *Mahābhārata*, and the story will be found in *Vanaparva* cxcvi. There is another in chapter cxxxi.

Ed. note. Some additional references are given here.

434

Śrutibalīyastvanyāyaḥ.

See this explained under *Pāṭhakramanyāya*.

435

Śvaḥ kāryam adya kurvīta.

One should do today that which one intends to do tomorrow. "Boast not thyself of tomorrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth." The verse containing this nyāya of Raghunātha's occurs three times in *Śāntiparva*, namely in chapters CLXXV, CCLXXVIII, and CCCXXIII of Calcutta edition. It reads as follows:

"Śvaḥ kāryam adya kurvīta pūrvāhṇe cāparāhṇikam.
Na hi pratīkṣate mṛtyuḥ kṛtaṃ vā'sya na vā kṛtam."

It is quoted in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, page 111, and Mr. Tawney (on page 68 of his translation) renders it thus:- "One should do to-day the duty of tomorrow, and in the forenoon, the duty of the afternoon, for death will not consider whether one has done one's work or not."

Compare the following well-known story. "An old Rabbi was once asked by his pupil when he should fulfil a certain precept of the law, and the answer was 'The day before you die.' 'But,' said the disciple, 'I may die tomorrow.' 'Then,' said the master, 'do it to-day.'"

Ed. note. A good example and incentive for a comparative study of the nyāyas prevalent in various cultures and languages.

436

Śvapucchonnāmananyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the attempt to straighten a dog's tail*. An illustration of wasted effort. It occurs in the following verse of the *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā*, page 448:

"Na caiṣa śakyate kartuṃ namro yatnaśatair api.
Ko hi svedaśatenāpi śvapucchaṃ nāmayiṣyati."

See also under *Araṇyarodananyāya* in its proper place.

437

Śvaliḍham iva pāyasam.

Like a milky preparation that has been licked by a dog. Used of something which has become impure and therefore unacceptable. It is found in the following verse of the last

chapter of the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha*: "Phalābhisandher upaghātakatvam abhihitam bhagavadbhir Nīlakaṇṭhabhāratīśrīcaraṇaiḥ:

Api prayatnasampannaṃ kāmenopahataṃ tapaḥ.
Na tuṣṭaye maheśasya śvalīḍham iva pāyasam."

Compare with this the nyāya "Na hi pūtaṃ syād gokṣīraṃ śvadṛtau dhṛtam."

Ed. note. Here is a comparison of two nyayas.

Also read as : Yato nahi pavitram syāt gokṣīraṃ śvadṛtau dhṛtam.

438

Śvaśrūnirgacchoktinyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the mother-in-law who said, 'Be off.'* This quaint illustration appears in Sureśvara's *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* i. 28, as follows: "Abhyupagatābhyupagamāc ca śvaśrūnirgacchoktivad bhavato niṣprajanaḥ pralāpaḥ."

"And since you now express agreement with that which we also acknowledge, your protracted discussion was as unreasonable as was the mother-in-law's saying [to the mendicant] 'Be off.'" The commentator, Jñānottama, explains this in the following manner:

"Bhikṣām aṭate māṇavakāya bhikṣām pratyācaksāṇām ātmanaḥ snuṣām bhart-sayitvā, śvaśrūḥ punas tam āhūya samāgate tasmin nāsti bhikṣā nirgaccheti, tathaiva pratyācaṣṭe." [R has a chāyā of this. ed.]

"After abusing her daughter-in-law for refusing to give alms to a wandering mendicant, the mother-in-law called him back, and, when he had come, said to him, 'There are no alms, be off,' thus refusing also herself!"

439

Śvā karṇe vā pucche vā chinne śvaiva bhavati nāśvo na gardabhaḥ.

A dog, when an ear or its tail has been cut off, is still a dog, not a horse or a donkey! This is Patañjali's illustration of the vāritka Ekadeśavikṛtam anyavāt (which see at its location), and is referred to by Nāgeśa in his comment on Kaiyaṭa (under Śiva sūtra 2, vāritka 4), as the chinna-pucchaśvadṛṣṭānta. Compare also Nāgojībhāṭṭa's paribhāṣā XXXVII. Akin to this illustration is Kumārila's "Na hi gor gaḍuni jāte viṣāṇe vā bhagne gotvaṃ tirodhīyate," which is found in *Tantravārtika* 2. 1. 34, page 418; and "Na hi

kevalabhojī devadatto'nyaiḥ saha paṅktyāṃ bhuñjāno'nyatvaṃ prapadyate," on page 617.

440

Ṣoḍaśigrahaṇāgrahaṇanyāyaḥ.

The rule as to *the use or omission of the Ṣoḍaśistotra* [at the Atirātra-sacrifice]. In very common use as an indication of option being allowable in regard to something. From the introduction to the third volume of Dr. Eggeling's translation of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, we learn that "the distinctive feature of the Atirātra-sacrifice, as the name itself indicates, is an 'overnight' performance of chants and recitation...At the end of each round, libations are offered, followed by the inevitable potations of Soma-liquor...and the performance partook largely of the character of a regular nocturnal carousal." Then, as to the Ṣoḍaśin, he says (page xviii)- "As regards the ceremonies preceding the night-performance, there is a difference of opinion among ritualists as to whether the Ṣoḍaśistotra is or is not a necessary element of the Atirātra...Aśvalāyana (5. 11. 1) refers incidentally to the Ṣoḍaśin, as part of the Atirātra, though it is not quite clear from the text of the sūtra whether it is meant to be a necessary or only optional feature of that sacrifice." There can be little doubt, however, that the learned writers who use the nyāya, regard the use of the stotra as optional. For example, as illustrations of option in action, Śaṅkara, in his bhāṣya on sūtra 1. 1. 2 (page 37), and again on sūtra 2. 1. 27 (page 471), quotes the Vedic sentences, "Atirātre ṣoḍaśinaṃ gṛhṇāti," "nātirātre ṣoḍaśinaṃ gṛhṇāti."

Then at the close of 1. 4. 13, he says: "Apekṣābhedāc ca samāne'pi mantre jyotiṣo grahaṇāgrahaṇe. Yathā samāne'pyatirātre vacanabhedāt ṣoḍaśino grahaṇāgrahaṇe tadvat"; and in 3. 3. 2, "Na hi ṣoḍaśigrahaṇāgrahaṇayor atirātro bhidyate". In his comment on 3. 3. 26 (page 893, line 5 from bottom), Ānandagiri makes use of the expression, "ṣoḍaśigrahaṇāgrahaṇavad vikalpe prāpte," and repeats it three lines down. In *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, page 539 (line 7 from bottom), we read, "Ṣoḍaśigrahaṇanyāyena vikalpo bhaviṣyati," and on page 656 (line 4), "Ṣoḍaśigrahaṇāgrahaṇanyāyasañcāraṇe tathaiva virodhaparihārāya vikalpo'bhyupagantavyaḥ." The optional character of the stotra is made use of by Laugākṣibhāskara also, in *Arthasaṅgraha*, page 24, from line 14; and by Nāgeśabhaṭṭa in the *Pradīpodyota* on Mahābhāṣya 1. 1. 44 (vārt. 7).

ED. NOTE: Highly technical, not at all popular.

441

Sakṛt kṛte kṛtaḥ śāstrārthaḥ.

To do a thing once is sufficient to satisfy the demands of the Śāstra. The nyāya is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 6. 1. 84 (vārt 4), 108 (vārt. 3), and in 6. 4. 104 (vārt. 3). Also in Śbara

11. 1. 28, 35; and 12. 3, 10. It seems to resemble the marāṭhī phrase Śāstrāpuratā, which Molesworth thus defines:- "To be enough indeed for the supplying, serving, or fulfilling of any matter or point required by the Śāstra, but without excess beyond; to exist in just sufficient quantity or to be performed with just sufficient definiteness of action, as to warrant the name or designation borne, and to preclude disallowal of its existence or its performance; *to be enough to swear by.*" The Sanskrit phrase occurs also in *Vivarāṇa-prameyasāṅgraha*, page 154 (line 2 from bottom):

"Nanu sakṛt kṛte kṛtaḥ śāstrārtha iti nyāyena sakṛd adhyayanād eva nityā-dhyayanavi[dhi]siddher āvṛttir na labhyeteti cen na."

See too *Bhāmātī* 4. 1. 12, and compare Kapiñjalanyāya.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references.

There is an error too. One letter "dhi" swallowed. Does not matter to Nirajana any way. They are not concerned at all. The printed page must bring them the artha (money). The word may bring the artha (meaning) or not at all. People should have enough intelligence to correct and then read. The spoon-feeding is meant only for the babies. The world of Sanskrit learning should remain eternally grateful to the Nirajana reprinters for having made this book easily available-- to make a durlabha object so sulabha. It had remained out of print long enough. They did not read; so how could they follow the nyāya Yato nahi pavitram syāt gokṣīram śvadṛtau dhṛtam.

Even the so-called "revised" edition is a white lie--complete mithyāvāda. All the ugly typographical errors have been faithfully or frightfully reproduced. This exact bimba-pratibimbabhāva is possible only in a photographic reproduction.

442

Sakṛt pravṛttāyāḥ kim avaguṇṭhanena.

A woman who has fallen once need veil her face no more. This occurs in *Tantravārtika*, page 703, 704, in the course of the discussion (under 3. 1. 12) of the meaning of the expression,

"Aruṇayā piṅgākṣyaikahāyanyā somam kṛiṇāti." On page 703, we read: "Aruṇā-śabdāś tāvād avaśyam eva kenacid guṇinā sambandhaniyaḥ. Ekahāyaniśabdasyāpi kriyāsambandhāt svātantryam apanītam. Tatra padāntarasambandhe'pi sakṛt pravṛttāyāḥ kim avaguṇṭhanenetivat tasya tāvatyeva śrutipīḍeti." The nyāya is quoted by Pārthasārathi in *Śāstradīpikā* 1. 4. 4 (page 177, line 6 from the bottom), while discussing the subject of words like Agnihotra &c., as the names of sacrifices.

443

Sakṛdgatinyāyaḥ.

This is Nāgojībhāṭṭa's shortened form of the paribhāṣā Sakṛdgatau vipratīṣedhe yad bādhitam tad bādhitam eva, which Professor Kielhorn renders thus: "When (two rules), while they apply (simultaneously), mutually prohibit each other, that which is once superseded is superseded altogether." This is illustrated by the following from ordinary life:- "Yathā tulyabalayor ekaḥ preṣyo bhavati. Sa tayoh paryāyeṇa kāryam karoti, yadā tam ubhau yugapat preṣayato nānādikṣu ca kārye tadobhayor na karoti, yauga-padyāsambhavāt."

The paribhāṣā is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 56 (vārt. 25, 26, 27); 1. 4. 2 (vārt. 7); 6. 3. 42 (vārt. 5); 6. 3. 139; 6. 4. 62 (vārt. 2); 7. 1. 26; 7. 1. 54; and 7. 1. 73. The illustration is met with in 1. 4. 2 (vārt. 5), and 6. 1. 85 (vārt. 3).

444

Satranyāyaḥ.

The rule regarding *a sacrificial session*. For this kind of sacrifice, lasting several days, not less than seventeen sacrificers are absolutely necessary. But what if one of them should leave or die before the completion of the ceremony? In such a case he *must* be replaced by a substitute, or the whole thing becomes null and void. This, however cannot be done when there is only one sacrificer engaged in a sacrifice. The nyāya is the subject of Jaimini 6. 3. 22. In sūtras 23 to 26 it is laid down that the substitute does not reap the benefit of the sacrifice, but that it goes to the man whose place he has taken. It is very clear, from the above, that the mention of the Satranyāya on page 430, line 5 of *Vedāntakalpataru*, is wrong, and that the reference is really to the Rātrisatranyāya, which we see in its location.

445

Sadṛśāt sadṛśodbhavaḥ.

Like produces like. Jayanta Bhāṭṭa denies that this is a fixed principle, on the ground that scorpions are produced from cowdung. He puts it thus (page 466):

"Na caiṣa niyamo loke sadṛśāt sadṛśodbhavaḥ.
Vṛścikādeḥ samutpādo gomayād api dṛśyate."

This "old wives' fable" regarding the scorpion was deeply rooted in the Indian mind! It is found in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 4. 30, and is used as an illustration by Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 2. 1. 6. Rāmānuja followed suit. Udayana, too, has it in his vṛtti on *Kusumāñjali* ii. 2, and the commentator Haridāsa remarks that a scorpion can be produced from cowdung as well as from a scorpion.

Thanks, however, to the now well-established Law of Biogenesis, we are better informed at the present time. To quote Henry Drummond:- "It is now recognized on every hand that Life can only come from the touch of Life. Huxley categorically announces that the doctrine of Biogenesis, or life only from life, is 'victorious along the whole line at the present day.' And even whilst confessing that he wishes the evidence were the other way, Tyndall is compelled to say, 'I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life'."

Ed. note. The subject is beyond our field of knowledge. However, loke is noteworthy. Kimvadantī janaśrutiḥ. Jacob must be laughing in his sleeves! He has found one more cause to condemn a basic fundamental thought of his subject nation.

446

Sandigdhasya vākyaśeṣān nirṇayaḥ.

The meaning of an ambiguous expression is to be determined from the context. In *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 3. 14, there is a discussion as to the meaning of the 'small ether' of *Chhāndogya Upaniṣad* 8. 1. 1, and Ānandagiri makes the following comment on the closing part of it:

"Samuccayeti. Sandigdhasya vākyaśeṣān nirṇaya itī nyāyād ādau tasmin-yadantar itī tacchabdo'nantaram apyākāśam abhilaṅghya hr̥tṣuṇḍarīkaṃ parāmr̥śati, tatra yad antarākāśam tad anveṣṭavyaṃ vijijñāsītavyaṃ cetyupasaṃharati." The nyāya is quoted again in his ṭīkā on 3. 3. 52. It is taken from Jaimini's sūtra 1. 4. 29, "Sandigdheṣu vākyaśeṣāt," which is quoted and applied by the author of the *Śāstradīpikā*, in his discussion, under 1. 3. 8, of such words as yava, varāha, pīlu and others, to which the Āryas attach one meaning and the Mlecchas another. We find it, too, in Kumārila's lengthy exposition of the same portion, in the words:

"Sandigdheṣu ca sarveṣu vākyaśeṣeṇa nirṇayam"

(page 148); and again under 3. 4. 36 (page 1003):

"Sandigdham vākyaśeṣeṇa nirṇeyam avadhāritam.
Vidhyuddeśeṇa nirṇīte kiṃ tu [nu? ed.] śeṣaḥ kariṣyati."

See also *Bhāmatī* 3. 3. 34 (page 641).

Ed. note. This is a very important nyāya, applicable in many fields. The context determines the meaning when in doubt. A passage is to be interpreted in consonance with the context. Words taken out of context are meaningless.

Also here is a "see also" reference. There is an error too.

447

Sandigdhe nyāyaḥ pravartata iti nyāyaḥ.

When there is doubt, reason comes into play. This is found in Jñānottama's comment on *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* iv. 3. He says:

"Sandigdhe nyāyaḥ pravartata iti nyāyāt sandigdhasyaiva vicāryatvāt tat pariśodhayitum avipratipannam arthaṃ tāvad darśayati."

Akin to this is the nyāya "Sandigdham saprayojanaṃ ca vicāram arhati," which is found in the earlier part of the same work (namely in the comment on i. 29), and which Raghunātha expounds thus in his smaller work: "Vicārapāṭavena yāvad yāvad viveka-dārḍhyaṃ bhavati tāvat tāvad bhramaśaithilyaṃ jāyate, taratamabhāvāpanna-sādhanaḥ phalaṃ taratamabhāvāpannam iti nyāyāt. Vicāra viśayatvaṃ ca nājnātasya, nāpi niścitasya, kintu sandigdhasya, sandigdham saprayojanaṃ ca vicāram arhatīti nyāyāt."

Ed. note. A very important nyāya. Value of the nyāyas in general. The word "reason" for nyāya is quite significant. cf. Viśayo viśayaś caiva. ...

448

Samudāye vākyaparisamāptiḥ.

For this paribhāṣā, see under Gargaśatadaṇḍananyāya.

449

Sambhavatyekavākyatve vākyabhedaś ca neṣyate.

When a sentence can suitably be regarded as one, it is not right to divide it. This oft-quoted line of Kumārila's was directed against an older writer, named Bhavadāsa (so Pārthasārathi tells us), who proposed to divide Jaimini's sūtra 1. 1. 4 into two parts. The line is found in *Ślokavārtika*, page 135. It is quoted in *Bhāmānī* 1. 1. 28 (page 159), 1. 3. 13 (page 206), 1. 4. 3 (page 286), 1. 4. 16 (page 308), 3. 3. 57 (page 668), and 3. 4. 20 (page 678). In Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 2. 15, we read: "Vaktṛbhede'pyekavākyatā sākāṃkṣatvāt, pūrvottaravākyayor ekārthatvaṃ, vākyaikyasambhave tadbhedasyāyogād ityarthah," and, in the latter part of the bhāṣya on 1. 4. 3, Śaṅkara himself has a good deal to say on Ekavākyatā. Then Ānandagiri quotes the nyāya in his comment on 2. 3. 2 and 3. 3. 14. "A vākyabheda- split of the sentence-takes place according to the Mīmāṃsā when one and the same sentence

contains two new statements which are different." (Dr. Thibaut's Translation of Śaṅkara's bhāṣya, vol.i. page 177 note). See, too, Prof. Cowell's long note on page 68 of his Translation of Śāṅḍilya sūtras.

Ed. note. The principle of ekavākyatā. Also here is an important see reference.

Think of R's words: Daharaśāṅḍilyādupāsanaprakaraṇa. Is there any connection between this Śāṅḍilya and that?.

450

Sambhava vyabhicāre ca syād viśeṣaṇam arthavat.

A qualifying word is of use when it is appropriate [that is, when it suits the viśeṣya], and when [without it] a wrong meaning would be conveyed.

The nyāya is quoted as above in the commentary on *Sanḅsepaśārīraka* i. 347 (The Paṇḍit, vol. v. page 676), and on page 401 of *Vidyāsāgarī* (a comment on *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍakhādyā*); whilst, on page 215 of the latter, it appears without syāt. There is another good example on p. 592.

I have traced it, however, as far back as Kumārila, but cannot say whether he was its author or not. In *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 18 (=Jaimini 1. 3. 24.) there is a discussion (as a *pūrvapakṣa*) of the reasons assigned by Patañjali for the study of grammar. One of these is that, without knowledge of grammar, the performance of the injunction, "Brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇo dharmah ṣaḍaṅgo vedo'dhyeyaḥ," would be impossible; on which the *pūrvapakṣin* says:

"Ṣaḍaṅgo veda ityuktaṃ śrutilingādyapekṣayā.
Tair ṣaḍbhiḥ pravibhaktaḥ san sa hi karmavibodhanaḥ.

Nanu bāhyāṅgānapekṣatve vedasvarūpāntargataśrutyādyapekṣayā viśeṣaṇam anatharkaṃ prasajyate. Tathāhi--

Sambhavavyabhicārābhyāṃ syād viśeṣaṇasambhavaḥ.
Śrutyādyavyabhicārāt tu tair aṅgaiḥ kiṃ viśeṣyate."

Dr. Gangānāth Jhā renders this (and the preceding clause) as follows:

"We must explain the expression 'the Veda with its six subsidiary sciences' as referring to its constituent parts, in the following manner. The 'six subsidiaries' referred to must be taken to be the six means of interpretation--Direct Assertion &c.; as it is only when interpreted through these that the Veda becomes capable of rightly pointing out *Dharma*. An objection is here raised:- If the subsidiaries referred to be taken as those contained in

the Veda itself (*i.e.* Direct Assertion, &c.), then in that case the qualification *with the six subsidiaries* would be absolutely meaningless. Specially as we can have a qualification, only when such a one is possible, and when a qualification is actually needed for the purpose of setting aside certain incongruities (or contradictions); and as there is certainly no incongruity in the Veda with regard to Direct Assertion &c. what could be specified by a qualification of these subsidiaries? [That is to say, Grammar not being invariably concomitant with the Veda, a qualification is needed in order to make it an object of study together with the Veda, and hence any qualification of these would be absolutely meaningless]." Page 281.

Another good example is furnished by Sureśvara in his vārtika on *Bṛihadāraṇyako-paniṣadbhāṣya*. At the beginning of the second Brāhmaṇa of the sixth Chapter, referring to the prayer, "Agne naya supathā rāye &c.," at the end of the *seventh* chapter of the *Āraṇyaka* (the *fifth* of the *Upaniṣad*), he says:

"Saptamāvasitāvuktaṃ mārgaprārthanam agnitaḥ.
Supatheti śrutam tatra śrutyā mārgaviśeṣaṇam.

Sambhava vyabhicāre ca viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyayoḥ
dṛṣṭam viśeṣaṇam loke yathehāpi tathekṣyatām."

Ānandagiri explains verse 3 as follows: "Sambhava iti. Nīlam utpalam ityatra viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyayoḥ sambhava viśeṣaṇam vinā viśeṣyasya vyabhicāre prasakte nīlam iti viśeṣaṇam arthavad dṛṣṭam. Tathā supathā nayetyatrāpi vyabhicārasambhava viśeṣaṇam arthavaj jñeyam ityarthah."

The fourth verse of the vārtika elucidates it still further:

"Supatheti tato yuktaṃ sambhava bhūyasām pathām.
Viśeṣaṇam ato vācyāḥ panthānaḥ karmahetavaḥ."

451

Sarvaṃ jñānaṃ dharminyabhrāntaṃ prakāre tu vyatyayaḥ.

No cognition is erroneous in respect of a thing as possessed of certain properties; but there may be error in regard to the exact form of the thing. For example, a man sees a glittering object on the ground, and supposes it to be silver; but it turns out to be nacre and not silver. There is no mistake in his cognition of the shining object, but his conception of the *nature* of the object is erroneous. The nyāya is found in *Citsukhī* ii. 18 (The Paṇḍit vol. v. page 496):

"Sarvaṃ jñānaṃ dharminyabhrāntaṃ prakāre tu vyatyaya iti vadadbhir, idaṃ rajatam iti vibhramaḥ jñānam idamaṃśe pramaṇam apramaṇam rajatāṃśe'bhyupa-gamyate parīkṣakaiḥ."

Underlying the words, "Savikalpakanirvikalpakayos tu pramāyām apramāyām cāntarbhāvaḥ" on page 25 of the *Saptapadārthī*, we find the following comment:- "Rajate evedaṃ rajatam iti savikalpakaṃ pramā. Arjate rajatajñānaṃ bhrama ityarthāḥ. Nirvikalpakaṃ tu pramāyām evāntarbhavati. Tasya prathamākṣasannipātajasya vastusvarūpamātraviśayasya kvāpyabādhāt. Sarvaṃ jñānaṃ dharmaṇyabhrāntaṃ prakāre tu vyatyaya iti nyāyāt. Nirvikalpakasya ca prakārabhāvāt."

Another interesting example is to be found in *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iv. 104. I subjoin the second half of the verse and a portion of the author's own vṛtti on it:

"Ātmasvātmāmśayoś ca kvacid api na bhaved
bhrāntir aṃśāntare'pi
syādeṣā na svarūpe kvacana param asau
dviprakāre prakāre."

"Aṃśāntare'pi viśayāṃśe'pyeṣā bhrāntiḥ. Svarūpe kvacana na syāt. Sarvaṃ jñānaṃ dharmiṇyabhrāntam iti vacanāt. Tathā ca viśaye'pi svarūpāṃśe sarvajñāna-sādhāraṇyāt prāmāṇyasya svābhāvikatvam eva yuktam ityarthāḥ. Tarhi kutra bhrāntir ityata āha param iti. Asau bhrāntir dviprakāre prakāre. Dviprakāre svarūpanirūpakadharme nirūpitasvarūpaviśeṣakadharme cetyarthāḥ. Idaṃ rajatam ityatra svarūpanirūpa kadharmivaiparītyam. Pītaḥ śaṅkha ityatra nirūpitasvarūpaviśeṣakadharmavaiparītyam iti vibhāgaḥ."

On page 403 of Vidyāsāgara's ṭīkā on *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, the nyāya is ascribed to Līlāvātikāra. I would commend to students a helpful note (No. 34) at the end of Professor M.N. Dvivedi's edition of the *Tarkakaumudī*, as bearing on the principle enunciated in this nyāya.

Ed. note. A noteworthy worthy recommendation to read more.

452

Sarvaṃ balavataḥ pathyam.

Everything is suitable [or proper] *for the strong*. "Might is right." In other words, a strong man may be lawless with impunity; or, to quote Prof. Gangānātha Jhā's explanation of it, "For a pious man all actions are equally lawful." This is quite in accord with the teaching of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* x. 33. 30, 31:

"Dharmavyatikramo dṛṣṭa īśvarāṇāṃ ca sāhasam.
Tejryasāṃ na doṣāya vahneḥ sarvabhujō yathā.

Naitat samācarej jātu manasāpi hyanīśvaraḥ.
Vinaśyatyācaran maudhyād yathā rudro'bdhijaṃ viṣam."

Kumārila quotes the nyāya (in *Tantravārtika*, page 134, line 14) in the course of a long explanation of the evil doings attributed to certain holy personages; but, in order to discourage persons of less piety from imitating them, adds: "Mandatapasām gajair iva mahāvaṭakāṣṭhādibhakṣaṇam ātmavināśāyaiva syāt."

In the opening part of the *Tātparyaṭīkā*, Vācaspati Miśra reproduces Kumārila's warning in the following words:

"Tapaḥprabhāva eva hi tādrśas teṣāṃ yata evaṃvidhāḥ pāpmāno vilīyanta iti. Na cāsmadādīnām mandatapasām ayaṃ prasaṅgaḥ. Na hi gajānām udaryyaṃ tejo vaṭakāṣṭham aśitaṃ pacatītyasmadādīnām apyudaryyeṇa tejasā tathā bhavitavyam."

453

Sarvanāṣe samutpanne ardham tyajati paṇḍitaḥ.

When the loss of all is impending, a wise man will give up half [if by so doing he can save the other half]. It occurs twice in the *Pañcatantra*, namely in iv. 27, and v. 42, as follows:

"Sarvanāṣe samutpanne ardham tyajati paṇḍitaḥ.
Ardhena kurute kāryaṃ sarvanāśo hi dustaraḥ."

In the second passage, the final word is duḥsahaḥ. See Dr. Buehler's note on samutpanne ardham. The first half of this couplet is quoted in Kumārila's *Tantravārtika*, page 91, but there the reading is hyardham. [which is better. ed.]

Ed. note. Here is a useful note to be followed up.

454

Sarvaśākhāpratyaṃ ekam karma.

All the different schools of a Veda acknowledge one and the same sacrificial action. The followers of the Mīmāṃsā evidently regard this as an important point, for Jaimini devotes 25 sūtras, viz. 2. 4. 8- 32, to the discussion of it. Kunte's remarks on the bearings of the question, in his *Ṣaḍdarśanacintanikā*, are worthy of perusal. The nyāya is frequently quoted in the philosophical works. Instances of it will be found in *Tantravārtika*, page 84, line 7; in *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa*, page 167, line 3 from the bottom; in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 256, line 16; in *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṅgraha*, page 169, line 17; and in *Srībhāṣya* 3. 3. 53. Raghunāthavarman makes use of the nyāya, but does not include it in his numbered list.

Ed. note. Raghunātha Varmā brings in many nyāyas to deliver a discourse on the subject and establish his siddhānta by contradicting the views of his opponent. These nyāyas are used as instruments of offence as well as defence. R does not attempt to establish or expound such nyāyas. They are already well-established. In such cases he merely uses them to make his point. This is an important point to note.

455

Saviśeṣaṇe hīti nyāyaḥ.

In this contracted form, the nyāya is quoted by the author of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (chapter vii, page 411); in its entirety it reads thus: Saviśeṣaṇe hi vidhiniṣedhau viśeṣye bādhe sati viśeṣaṇam upasaṃkrāmataḥ."

The following is Mr. Arthur Venis' rendering of it (in *The Paṇḍit*, vol. vii. page 460):- "An affirmation or a negation, when made of a subject together with its predicate, applies to the predicate if a bar exists to the affirmation or negation being attached to the subject." An extract from *Rational Refutation of Hindu philosophical Systems* (page 232) may tend to elucidate the above. "When the Vedāntins give to intelligence appropriated to the internal organ the name of subject of right notion, we are to understand, that the character which they ascribe to intelligence associated with the internal organ, really belongs to that organ. They have a maxim, -which all the other Systems subscribe to, - that 'An affirmation, or a negation, when predicated of anything together with its associate, if debarred from the object substantive, is to be referred to the object adjective.' In their opinion, the quality of being a cognizer cannot be assigned to the soul, and, consequently, is debarred from it."

The nyāya is found in *Tātparyaṭīkā*, page 31, line 5, and in *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 72, line 3 from bottom; but, in both cases, without the words "Viśeṣye bādhe sati." It is quoted, too, in *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*, page 69, line 15 [a trash production, ed.]

456

Sahaiva daśabhiḥ putrair bhāraṃ vahati gardabhī.

Though possessing ten sons, the mother-donkey carries the load! This evidently well-known saying, taken from *Tantravārtika*, page 807, is found in *Bhāmatī* 3. 4. 33 (page 691) in the following connection:

"Sahakāritvaṃ ca karmaṇāṃ na kārye vidyāyāḥ, kiṃ tūtpattaḥ. Ko'rthaḥ. Vidyāsahakārīṇi karmāṇītyayam arthaḥ. Satsu karmasu vidyaiva svakārye vyā-priyate. Yathā sahaiva daśabhiḥ putrair bhāraṃ vahati gardabhīti, satsveva daśa-putreṣu saiva bhārasya vāhiketi."

The saying is quoted by Ānandagiri also, in his comment on the same portion of the bhāṣya. See, too, *Vedāntaśikhāmaṇī*, p. 168.

457

Sākamedhīyanyāyaḥ.

The law relating to the *Sākamedha* offerings. This is the topic of Jaimini 5. 1. 19-22. The group of offerings called *Sākamedhāḥ* form the third of the three seasonal, or four-monthly (cāturmāsya), sacrifices which are performed at the *parvans* (or commencement of the spring, rainy, and autumn seasons), and which, in the case, last for two days; three of the group (consisting of seven) being offered on the first day, and the remainder on the second day. An objector urges that two days are required for each group, but this is set aside, and the ruling is above. For a full description of these four-monthly sacrifices, see Dr. Eggeling's translation of the *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa*, vol. i. pages 383 and 408.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references. Four-monthly sacrifices are called cāturmāsyaḥ.

This is a highly technical śāstrīya nyāya.

458

Sākṣaḥ puruṣaḥ pareṇa cen nīyate nūnam akṣibhyāṃ na paśyati.

If a man with eyes is led by somebody else, it is clear that he does not see with his eyes! This is found in Śabara on Jaimini 1. 2. 31 and is used by an objector to illustrate his argument that it is not necessary to understand the meaning of Vedic sentences employed in sacrificial rites, since the way in which they are to be used is clearly laid down in works prepared for the purpose. The illustration is quoted by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in *Nyāyamañjarī*, page 286, line 12.

459

Sāmānyavidhir aspaṣṭaḥ

An injunction in general terms is indefinite. It appears as a nyāya in the second part of the *Laukikanyāyatnākara* (I.O. MS, page 319 a), where Raghunāth applies it thus:- "Loke kañcid deśaṃ jigamiṣuṃ prati tatratyāni vastūnyāneyānīti sāmānyato vidhāyedaṃ āneyam idam āneyam iti spaṣṭīkṛiyate." It is doubtless derived from the following verse in *Tantravārtika* 3. 4. 47 (page 1020):

"Sāmānyavidhir aspaṣṭaḥ saṃhriyeta viśeṣataḥ.
Spaṣṭasya tu vidher nānyair upasaṃhārasaṃbhavaḥ."

The verse is cited in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala* (page 253), where the second line reads:

"Spaṣṭasya tu vidher naivam upasaṃhāra iṣyate,"

and the first line is quoted by the author of the "*Nyāyasudhā*" in his comment on *Tantravārtika* 1. 2. 42 which defines the term *parisaṅkhyā* ('limitation,' or 'exclusive specification,' as Dr. Thibaut and M. M. Kunte respectively render it).

The lack of definiteness in general statements is alluded to by Śabara, also, on Jaimini 10. 8. 16, where he says "Na hi sāmānyavācī śabdo viśeṣān abhivadati," but Kumārila points out (on page 1027) that the *Viśeṣa* requires the *sāmānya*. He says:- "Na tu niḥ-sāmānyaḥ kaścīd viśeṣa upapadyate. Tataśca vṛkṣam ānāyetyukte śiṃśapām itya-virodhāt paścād ucyamānaṃ na virudhyate."

Ed. note. I believe Jacob has taken only half of the *nyāya* and has run away with it. The point is not only *Sāmānyavidhir aspaṣṭaḥ*, but also *saṃhriyeta viśeṣataḥ*.

460

Sāvakāśaniravakāśayor niravakāśo balīyān.

That [injunction] which leaves no room [for others] is stronger than one that does. For example, an injunction directing animal sacrifice ["*agnīṣomīyaṃ paśum ālabheta*"] and which leaves no room for option, overpowers the more general one forbidding the taking of life ["*Na hiṃsyāt sarvā bhūtāni*"]. In this way one *Smṛiti* may prevail over another. The *nyāya* is found in Raghunātha's list, and is applied by him as follows:

"*Na cānubhavena śruter bādhaḥ śakyaḥ, śruter niravakāśatvāt. Niravakāśasya ca sāvakāśaniravakāśayor niravakāśo balīyān iti nyāyād bādhatvopapatteḥ.*"

A reference to *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 1 will fully explain the two terms of this expression. In his comment on it, Ānandagiri quotes the *nyāya* twice, and again under 2. 1. 4, 6, and 13. In immediate connection with the first of the five, Ānandagiri quotes also the *nyāya* "*Sāpekṣanirapekṣayor nirapekṣasya balavattvam*," and the two occur together in the following verses of Yāmunācārya's *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, page 63:

"*Sāpekṣanirapekṣatve na hi bādhasya kāraṇam.*
Śuktau rajatabodhasya nirapekṣasya bādhakam.

Nedaṃ rajatavijñānaṃ tatsāpekṣam apīṣyate.
Seyaṃ jvāleti saṃvittes tailavartivināśajā.

Anumā bādhikā dṛṣṭā sāpekṣā'pyakṣajanmanaḥ.
Ato niravakāṣena sāvakāśaṃ niṣidhyate."

See also Citsukha Muni on *Nyāyamakaranda*, pages 7 and 148; and "Sāpekṣam asamarthaṃ bhavati" in *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 1. 69 (vārt.6) and *Syādvādamañjarī*, page 19.

Ed. note. Here are some additional references.

461

Siṃhasyaikapadaṃ yathā.

Like a lion's first step. This obscure nyāya occurs in Merutuṅga's work, page 278:

"Vicāryāvicārya vā kṛtaprayāṇo'yaṃ mahānarendraś cālitaḥ. Siṃhasyaika-
padaṃ yatheti nyāyāc calita eva rājate."

Mr. Tawney renders it thus (on page 174): "Whether with due consideration or not, this great king has been set in motion, and has started on his expedition; on the principle of the lion's first step, he cuts a good figure on the march."

Does the illustration mean that a lion in motion presents a finer appearance than one at rest?

Ed. note. A question yet to be resolved. Does ekapadam mean ready to pounce upon his prey?

462

Siṃhāvalokananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *a lion's glance*. This is based on a lion's habit of looking in front and behind, after killing its prey, to see if there is any rival to dispute possession! [?] It is applied, says Tārānātha, where a word in a sentence is connected with what precedes and with that which follows it. It is not, however, restricted to this. The expression occurs four times in the *Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya*, namely in ii. 51, iv. 4, xiii. 3 and 15. Prof. Whitney remarks as follows on the first instance of its occurrence: "The 'and' of this rule [vargavaccaṣu], the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series." It is found also in Nīlakaṇṭha's comment on *Vanaparva* ccxxi. 1.

(Gurubhir niyamair jāto bharato nāma pāvakaḥ): "Siṃhāvalokananyāyena Śamyoh̄ putram Ūrjaputram Bharataṃ stauti sārhdhena gurubhir iti."

It was a favourite maxim of Vācaspatimiśra's, and I have met with it eight times in three of his writings. It occurs in *Bhāmatī* 2. 3. 6 (page 473); in *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī*, 7 (page 36); and in *Nyāyavārtika-tātparyāṭikā*, pages 97, 199, 230, 322, 403, 405. An example of a different kind is found in Hemachandra's *Parīśiṣṭaparvan*, i. 63:

"Siṃhāvalokananyāyenālīḍhaḥ kṣatratejasā.
Pratyakṣān iva so'drākṣīt tān amātyān sutadviṣaḥ."

Ed. note. We have seen this nyāya being used in the sense of reviewing what has gone before.

463

Sikatākūpavat.

The simile of *a well [dug] in sandy soil [the sides of which are incessantly falling in]*. Used of an argument that will not hold water. It is found in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 2. 32: "Kiṃ bahunā sarvaprakāreṇa yathā yathā'yaṃ vaināśikasamaya upapattimattvāya parīkṣyate tathā tathā sikatākūpavad vidīryata eva. Na kāñcid atropapattim paśyāmaḥ."

464

Sikatātailanyāyaḥ.

The figure of *oil from sand*. A non-entity like a hare's horn. The following is from Bhartṛhari's *Nītiśataka* (verse 5):

"Labheta sikatāsu tailam api yatnataḥ pīḍayan
pibecca mṛgatṛṣṇikāsu salilaṃ pipāsārditaḥ.
Kadācid api paryāṭaṃ chaśaviṣāṇam āsādayen
na tu pratiniviṣṭamūrkhajanacittam ārādhayet."

In *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 1. 16, we read:- "Yacca yadātmanā yatra na vartate na tat tata utpadyate, yathā sikatābhyas tailam." Compare with this, *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 2. 5. 23, "

Na yatnenāpi mahatā prāpyate ratnam aśmataḥ,"

where tailam aśmataḥ is given as a variant. American rock-oil was not known in those days! There are two good examples of this illustration in *Nyāyamañjarī*. On page 493, line 1: "Tailārthī hi tilasarṣapān upādatte na sikatāḥ. Asattve ca tailasya ko viśeṣaḥ sarṣapāṇaṃ sikatābhyaḥ."

On page 494:

"Tailārthī sikatāḥ kaścīd ādadāno na dṛśyate.
Adṛṣṭvā cādya nānyo'pi tadarthī tāsu dhāvati."

Compare also *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* viii. 152:

"Vyāhārṣīn munir apyevaṃ prasīda mṛgalocane.
Asmāsu bhavati dravyaṃ kiṃ tailaṃ vālukāsviva."

Ed. note. This is nidarśanālaṅkāra.

465

Sundopasundanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *Sunda and Upasunda*. Used of conflicting and mutually destructive things. It is thus explained by Raghunāthavarmā in his *Laukikanyāyasaṅgraha*:

"Anyonyanāśyanāśakabhāvavivakṣāyāṃ Sundopasundanyāyaḥ. Yathā hi Sundopasundasañjñau sahodarāvasurau Tilottamārthaṃ vadhyaghātakabhāvenobhāvapi naṣṭāviti Bhārāte prasiddham. Tathā vīcītarāṅganyāyenotpannānāṃ kāryaśabdanāśyānāṃ antyopāntyaśabdau paraspareṇa nāśyāvāntya upāntyenopāntyaścāntyeneti kecit tārkiḱāḥ."

The story of Sunda and Upasunda is told at great length in *Ādīparva* ccix-ccxii, but is condensed into six verses in *Kathāsaritsāgara* xv., of which the following is Mr. Tawney's translation:- "There were two brothers, Asuras by race, Sunda and Upasunda, hard to overcome, in as much as they surpassed the three worlds in valour. And Brahmā, wishing to destroy them, gave an order to Viśvakarman, and had constructed a heavenly woman named Tilottamā, in order to behold whose beauty even Śiva truly became four-faced, so as to look four ways at once, while she was devoutly circumambulating him. She, by the order of Brahmā, went to Sunda and Upasunda, while they were in the garden of Kailāsa, in order to seduce them. And both those two Asuras, distracted with love, seized the fair one at the same time by both her arms, the moment they saw her near them. And as they were dragging her off on mutual opposition, they soon came to blows, and both of them were destroyed." The simile is met with in *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* 13, as follows:

"Nanu parasparavirodhaśīlā guṇāḥ Sundopasundavat parasparaṃ dhvaṃsanta ityeva yuktaṃ prāḡ eva teṣāṃ ekakriyākartṛtāyāḥ."

See also Kāmandakīya *Nītisāra*, ix. 61. In *Sarvārthasiddhi* (on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 53) we have the expression "Sundopasundaviṣanāśakaviṣanyāyena." This nyāya is

used, says Raghunātha, when the things in opposition are of equal strength; but when they are of unequal strength, and the weaker go to the wall, the *Mātsyanyāya* is employed.

Ed. note. Here is a see also reference.

466

Subhagābhikṣukanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *Subhagā and the mendicant*. The following is Raghunāth's explanation of it:

"Ekatra viruddhānekadharmasamāveśāsambhavavivakṣāyām tu subhagābhikṣukanyāyaḥ pravartate. Yathā subhagatvaṃ bhikṣukatvaṃ strītvam puṃstvam ca tathāvidhapadadvayasāmānādhikaraṇyāt pratiyamānam api viruddhatvād ekasmin yugapanna sambhavati, tathāikasminnīśārūpāptavacane prāmāṇyāprāmāṇyalakṣaṇa-viruddham dharmadvayaṃ na sambhavatīti kecit.

Anye tu yathā subhagābhikṣukau prabalaghātakabhayāt kañciccharaṇam prapannau, sa ca śaraṇāgatatyāgadoṣaśraṇāt sarvaprayatnenobhayo rakṣaṇe prabalārikṛtasvaghātabhayena tyāge vā prāpte'pi, subhagāṃ rakṣati bhikṣukaṃ tyajatīti yat tatra tasyecchaiva niyāmikā, na tu kiñcid vinigagamakam asti. Tathā prakṛte'pīśa-vacanatvād ubhayoḥ prāmāṇye pauruṣeyatvān mūlapramāṇasāpekṣatayā dharmādau tadabhāvād aprāmāṇye vā prāpte'pyuktavibhāge tārkiecchaiva niyāmiketyartham āhuḥ."

This seems to me very unsatisfactory, but I can suggest nothing better. The only work in which I have met with the nyāya is the *Ātmatattvaviveka* (page 54), where it is wrongly printed as Subhagābhikṣukanyāya. It would need a long extract to make it intelligible, so I must refer the reader to the work itself.

Ed. note. The reader is referred to the work itself. I had seen this. I had noted this. But now the reference and matter both are lost. It was not copied properly in its place.

Subhagābhikṣukanyāya has been discussed very well by Raghunāthavarmā in *Ratnākara*.

467

Sūktavākanyāyaḥ.

The law as to *the Sūktavāka* [or song of praise]. This is the topic of Jaimini 3. 2. 15-18, and immediately follows the *Prastara- praharaṇanyāya* with which it is closely connected.

Both form a part of the New and Full Moon sacrifices in connection with which there is the direction, "Sūktavākena prastaraṃ praharati."

The question then arises as to whether the whole of the mantras which comprise the Sūktavāka are to be repeated on each of the two occasions, or only a part. Śabara's argument is thus paraphrased by Kunte: "Though the Veda mentions positively that certain mantras are to be used in certain sacrifices, they are not to be so used blindly. The mantra which serves some purpose of a sacrifice is to be used. Though the Veda prescribes the use of the whole mantra, yet it is not to be obstinately maintained that the whole is to be recited. A whole mantra like the Sūktavāka, or a part only, is to be recited according as it is necessary. This is to be ascertained by the sacrificer himself. Hence it cannot be said that the whole Sūktavāka is to be recited on the occasion either of the new or of the full moon day." Again:- "That portion of the Sūktavāka which is recited at the new or full moon sacrifice, is the whole of it in reference to the sacrifice itself; because the Veda never prescribes a certain text as constituting the Sūktavāka, and because the Veda simply states that the Sūktavāka, is to be recited....The Sūktavāka is not one text only, but is composed of different texts. The principle god connected with a sacrifice is mentioned in the middle of the Sūktavāka, while something connected with the sacrifice to be performed is described at its beginning and end. ... All that is sought is the accomplishment of the new or full moon sacrifice. Hence there is no necessity for discussing whether the whole Sūktavāka or a portion of it is to be recited; because whatever mantras are sufficient to accomplish a sacrifice constitute the whole Sūktavāka, so far as the sacrifice is concerned."

468

Sūcīkaṭāhanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the needle and the boiler*. It is explained as follows in Molesworth's Marāṭhī dictionary: "A phrase used as an illustration upon the occasion of two matters of which the one is superlatively simple and easy, or altogether insignificant, and the other indefinitely greater, more difficult, or more important, arising at once to be done; and of which it is intended to intimate that the trifling one should be despatched first." It occurs in the opening part of chapter iv of *Kāvya-pradīpa*, and again on page 70. Also in the commentary on *Sāhityakaumudī* iv. 1, where the same *kārikā* is expounded. The following is from the *Saptapadārthī*, page 21. The text runs thus:

"Anubhavo'pi dvividhaḥ. Pramā'pramā ca. Apramā'pi saṃśayo viparyayaś ca. Pramā pratyakṣam anumitiś ca."

On which the commentator remarks, "Pramānirūpyatvāt parastād vibhaktām apya-pramāṃ sūcīkaṭāhanyāyena prāg vibhajate'pramāpīti."

There is another good example of the maxim, with a lucid translation by Dr. Ballantyne, in the introduction to Book ii of his *Aphorisms of the Nyāya*.

Ed. note. A noteworthy worthy note above.

All such references to be noted and put together in an Appendix marked "Suggestions of Jacob for further study. There are many nyayas which are discussed by R but not noted by J.

469

Sūtrabaddhaśakuninyāyaḥ.

The simile of *a bird tied by a cord*. It is found in the *Chhândogya Upaniṣad* 6. 8. 2, namely: "Sa yathā śakuniḥ sūtreṇa prabaddho diśaṃ diśaṃ patitvā'nyatrāyatanam alabdhvā bandhanam evopaśrayata evam eva khalu somya tanmano diśaṃ diśaṃ patitvā'nyatrāyatanam alabdhvā prāṇam evopaśrayate, prāṇabandhanam hi somya mana iti."

Vidyāraṇya versified the above in his *Anubhūtiprakāśa* (iii.81) and *Pañcadaśī* (xi. 47) respectively as follows:

"Śakuniḥ sūtrabaddho yaḥ sa gacchan vividhā diśaḥ.
Alabdhvā"dhāram ākāśe bandhanasthānam āvrajet."

"Śakuniḥ sūtrabaddhaḥ san dikṣu vyāpṛtya viśramam.
Alabdhvā bandhanasthānam hastastambhādyupāśrayet."

I have omitted, in each case, a second verse relating to the *Dārṣṭāntika*.

Ed. note. Jacob has omitted, but we must bring in what is omitted. Cf. *Taṭādarśiśakuntapota*. Also Bilhaṇa: *Payodhimadhyasthitapotakūpakasthitā śakuntīva muhuḥ prakampate*. *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, 2:31. cf. Mero mana anata kahān sukha pāve. Jaise uḍa jahājako paṅkhī phira jahāja para āve. Hindi. *Sūradāsa*.

470

Sūtraśāṭikānyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the thread* [about to be woven into a] *garment* [and already regarded as a garment]. Raghunātha explains it thus: "Yatra tu bhāvisamjñayā nirdeśo yathā Nārudro vaset kāśyām ityatra tatra sūtraśāṭikānyāyāvātāraḥ. Sūtrasya śāṭikāṃ vāyayatītyatra yathā sūtrāvasthāyāṃ bhāvinyā śāṭiketisamjñayā nirdeśas tathā dārṣṭāntike'pīti bodhyam."

It is no doubt derived from the following passage in the *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 3. 12 (vārtika 2):

"Ātmanepadeṣu cāpi netaretarāśrayaṃ bhavati. Katham. Bhāvinī saṃjñā vijñāsyate sūtraśāṭakavat. Tadyathā. Kaścit kañcit tantuvāyam āha asya sūtrasya śāṭakaṃ vayeti. Sa paśyati yadi śāṭako na vātavyo'tha vātavyo na śāṭakaḥ. śāṭako vātavyaś ceti vipraśiddham. Bhāvinī khalvasya saṃjñābhipretā, sa manye vātavyo yasmin nute śāṭaka ityeta bhavatīti."

This is repeated in 2. 1. 51 (vārtika 4). Kumārila employs the illustration in *Tantra-vārtika* 3. 7. 33 (page 1145):

"Yathavāsya sūtrasya śāṭakaṃ vayetyukte vānena śāṭakaḥ kriyata iti hi bhāvi-saṃjñāvijñānād avirodho vijñāyate tathavātra pratyetyam."

Light is thrown upon this by the following extract from Ballantyne's *Aphorisms of the Nyāya*, ii. 127. The sūtra so numbered is "Sahacaraṇasthānatādarthyā &c." "Though its meaning be not so and so, it is figuratively so employed in the case of a Brāhman, a scaffold, a mat...in consideration of association, place, design...Though it be not so and so, *i.e.*, though such be not the direct meaning of the word, it is figuratively employed; for example, the word 'staff' &c., is employed for a Brāhman &c., because of association...In like manner...from the 'design' (*tādarthyā*), 'He makes a mat' (*kaṭa*) implies his aiming after a mat; for the mat, inasmuch as it is a thing non-existent [*until* made] can have [at the time when one is spoken of as making it] no maker."

Again, under sūtra 4. 1. 50 [*buddhisiddham tu tad asat*], the author of the vṛtti says (as interpreted by Dr. Ballantyne):- "The weaver sets himself to work, having considered that, 'In these threads [*i.e.*, constituted by these threads] there *will be* a web,' but not with the understanding that 'there *is* a web'; for, if *that* were the case, then, the product being supposed extant, there would be no setting one's self to work, because desire [precluded by possession] would be absent." See also a passage in *Tātparyāṭikā*, page 254, beginning at line 14; and *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on kārikā 9, pages 52, 53.

Ed. note. Here are some see also references. Jacob says vāpayati for vāyayati.

471

Sopānatke pāde dvitīyām upānaham aśakyatvān nopādatte.

A man does not [attempt to] put a second shoe on a foot already shod, for it would be an impossibility. This is found in the bhāṣya on Jaimini 1. 2. 33, where the *pūrvapakshin* objects to certain Vedic texts as unnecessarily setting forth things already known.

472

Sopānārohaṇanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the ascent of a staircase*. Used of knowledge arrived at gradually, by easy steps. "Line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little." There is an instance of its use in *Bhāmatī* 1. 3. 8 (page 201):

"Evaṃ cānātmavida ātmānaṃ vividiṣor Nāradasya praśne paramātmānam evāsmāi vyākhyāsyāmītyabhisandhimān Sanatkumāraḥ sopānārohaṇanyāyena sthūlād ārabhya tattadbhūmavyutpādanakrameṇa bhūmānam atidurjñānatayā parama-sūkṣmaṃ vyutpādayām āsa."

473

Saubharinyāyaḥ.

The illustration afforded by *Saubhari*. The story of this sage is told in Book 4, chapter 2, of the *Vishṇu Purāna*, and, with less detail, in Book 9, chapter 6, of the *Bhāgavata Purāna*. We there learn that, after remaining immersed in a piece of water for twelve years, the Muni was so much impressed by the happiness of the little fish which disported themselves around their great progenitor named Sammada, that he determined to marry and raise up progeny himself! He accordingly went to king Māndhātā, the father of fifty charming daughters, and asked for one of them in marriage. Taken somewhat aback by the appearance of this old and emaciated suitor, but fearing to displease him, the king replied that it was the custom for princesses to select their own husband, but that if any one of them chose him as such, he could take her to wife. He was accordingly conducted to the ladies' apartments; but on the way there, he transformed his repelling person into one of handsome and youthful appearance, and the consequence was that each of the fifty maidens fell violently in love with him and demanded him as a husband, and so he married them all! Each of them lived in a beautiful mansion by herself, surrounded by every luxury. After a time, the king went on a visit to them to see how they fared. The first one pointed to her lovely surroundings and told of her husband's goodness to her, but added that there was one thing which troubled her very much, namely, that her husband was *always* with her, and therefore her sisters could never enjoy his society at all. The king then visited each of the others in turn, and heard exactly the same thing from each; and so the necessary inference is that the sage *entered into fifty bodies* at one and the same time, and this is the sole point of the nyāya! It occurs in *Bhāmatī* 4. 4. 11 as follows:

"Saubharer abhivinirmitavividhadehasyāparyāyeṇa māndhāṭṛkanyābhiḥ pañcā-śatā vihāraḥ pauraṇikāiḥ smaryate." Venkaṭanātha is the only other writer in whose works I have met with it. On page 65 of the *Nyāyasiddhāñjana*, we read:- "Bhāskaramate tu nityasarvajñasyopādhiyoga eva parihāsyāḥ. Upādhibhiś ched anādyayogena brahmaṇa eva saṃsāritvānapāyaḥ. Upādhisāñcāre pratikṣaṇaṃ bandhamokṣaprasaṅgaḥ. Saubharyādivad upādhibhede'pi pratisandhānasya dustyajatvāt. Chedābhyupagame cācchedyatvavādavirodhaḥ."

In his vṛtti on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* iii. 22, where the same subject is discussed, we find the following:

"Na ca svenānyadehāder adhiṣṭhānādisambhavaḥ.
Saubharinyāyatastattatpratibandisaprasaṅgataḥ."
[There is one letter in excess in the 4th quarter. ed.]

It occurs again in the text and comment of verse 31.

Ed. note. Many episodes connected with the nyāyas are translated by Jacob very well. The Saubharivṛttānta is very interesting. A collection of such tell-tale type nyāyas may be brought together and published as a separate book for the general reader. That will be truly a popular publication.

474

Sthālīpulākanyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the rice in the cooking-pot*. "In a cooking-pot, all the grains being equally moistened by the heated water, when one grain is found to be well-cooked, the same may be inferred with regard to the other grains. So the maxim is used when the condition of the whole class is inferred from that of a part." (Aṭṭe's Sanskrit Dictionary). It is therefore equivalent to "*Ex uno disce omnes*." Patañjali seems to have laid the foundation of the nyāya in the following words, in *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 4. 23 (vārt. 15):- "Paryāpto hyekaḥ pulākaḥ sthālyā nidarśanāya."

Then we find it in Jaimini 7. 4. 12, the sūtra with a portion of Śabara's bhāṣya being as follows: "Liṅgasya pūrvavattvāc codanāśabdasāmānyād ekenāpi nirūpyeta, yathā sthālī pulākena.

... Etannyāyapūrvakaṃ liṅgam ekatrāpi dṛśyamānaṃ tulyanyāyānāṃ sarveṣāṃ dharmavattāṃ jñāpayati. Yathā sthālyāṃ tulyapākānāṃ pulākānāṃ ekam upamṛdyā-nyeṣāṃ api siddhitāṃ jānāti."

Other instances of its occurrence are *Tantravārtika* 3. 5. 19; *Vedāntakalpataru*, page 446; *Kalpataruparimala*, pages 115, 468, 667, 685; and *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, 293. Of similar import is the following line from Hemachandra's *Parisiṣṭaparva* vii. 94:

"Sikthenāpi droṇapākaṃ jānanti hi maṇiṣiṇaḥ."

Ed. note. Note other instances.

475

Sthāvarajaṅgamaviṣanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *vegetable* [or mineral] *poison and animal poison* [jaṅgamaviṣa]. An illustration of one thing being counteracted by another. In his smaller work, Raghunāthavarman places this amongst the purely grammatical nyāyas, immediately after the Pūrvātparabalīyastvanyāya, and describes it as follows:

"Sthāvarajaṅgamaviṣanyāyaś ceḥa bodhyaḥ. Rajatādiḥjñānatadbādhaḥjñānayoḥ sarpavatsanābhādirūpajaṅgamasthāvaraviṣayoś cottareṇa pūrvabādhaḥ prasiddho yathā tathā prakṛte'pi."

In the larger work, it stands amongst miscellaneous nyāyas near the end of the *uttarabhāga*, and is numbered 242. I extract from it the following:

"Sthāvareṇa vatsanābhādiviṣeṇa jaṅgamasya sarpaviṣāder bādho, jaṅgamena ca sthāvarasyeti prasiddham. Sāmānyena parasparabādhyabādhakabhāvavivakṣāyāṃ Sundopasundanyāyaviṣaye'sya pravṛttiḥ. Pūrvam nivartyānyasya svayam eva nivṛttau vivakṣitāyāṃ dagdhendhanavahninyāyaviṣaye'syāvatarāṇam. Pareṇa pūrvabādhamātravivakṣāyāṃ pūrvāt parabalīyastvanyāyasyeti bodhyam. Apacchedanyāyastvaspaṣṭam udāharaṇam, ubhayatrāṇiyatapūrvāparībhāvenāṇiyatabādhyabādhakabhāvāt."

An example of animal poison proving an antidote to the other kind is found in *Ādi-parva*, chap. cxxviii (Calc.). The wicked Duryodhana mixed some *kālakūṭaka* in Bhima's food and, when he had eaten it and become unconscious, threw him into the water. The story then continues thus:

"Sa niḥsamjño jalasyāntam atha vai Pāṇḍavo'viśat.
Ākrāman nāgabhavane tadā nāgakumārakān.

Tataḥ sametya bahubhis tadā nāgair mahāviṣaiḥ.
Adaśyata bhṛśaṃ Bhīmo mahādaṃṣṭrair viṣolbaṇaiḥ.

Tato'sya daśyamānasya tadviṣaṃ kālakūṭakam.
Hṛtaṃ sarpaviṣeṇaiva sthāvaram jaṅgamena tu."

Compare the Viṣanāśakaviṣanyāya in *Sarvārthasiddhi* on *Tattvamuktākalāpa* ii. 53.

Ed. note. An important note for comparison.

476

Sthūṇānikhanananyāyaḥ.

The maxim of *the driving in of a post*. As a post is driven into the ground by repeated efforts, so a position is strengthened by the bringing forward of a succession of facts or arguments. It occurs three times in Śaṅkara's bhāṣya on the *Vedāntasūtras*, as follows:

"Punaś ca jagajjanmādihetutvam īśvarasyākṣipyate sthūṇānikhanananyāyena, pratijñātasārthasya dṛḍhikaraṇāya" 2. 1. 34. "Ākṣepapūrvikā hi parihāroktir vivakṣite'rthe sthūṇānikhanananyāyena dṛḍhām buddhim utpādayati" 3. 3. 53. "Satyaṃ prasādhitaṃ, tasyaiva tu sthūṇānikhananavat phaladvāreṇākṣepasamādhāne kriyete dārḍhāya" 3. 4. 2. But Śābara seems to have originated it in his bhāṣya on Jaimini 7. 2. 1.

Ed. note. Cf. Dvirbaddham subaddham bhavati.

477

Sphaṭikalauhityanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the redness of the crystal*. Such redness is owing to the proximity of a red object, such as a rose &c. The illustration is much used by writers on Vedānta &c. For example, we read in *Paramārthasāra*, verses 16 and 61:

"Nānāvidhavastūnām varṇān dhatte yathāmalaḥ sphaṭikaḥ.
Tadvad upādher guṇabhāvitasya bhāvaṃ vibhur dhatte. 16.

Vigatopādhiḥ sphaṭikaḥ svaprabhayā bhāti nirmalo yadvat.
Ciddīpaḥ svaprabhayā tathā vibhātīha nirupādhiḥ." 61.

So, too, Aniruddha on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* ii. 35: "Yathā japākusumasamsargāt sphaṭike lauhityaṃ, tadapagamāt sphaṭikaḥ svarūpeṇāvatiṣṭhate."

See also *Atmabodha*, 14; and a verse by some unknown author, quoted in the Pāṇini section of *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (page 144 Bib. Ind., and 163 in Jīvananda's edn.) In the *Kuvalayānanda* (page 289), under the figure atadguṇa, we read:

"Anyadīyaguṇagrahaṇāgrahaṇe ca raktasphaṭikavastramālinyādinyāyenānya-dīyaguṇenaivānurañjanānanurañjane vivakṣite."

See also *Vivaraṇaprameya*, page 214.

Ed. note. Here are many see also notes.

478

Svabhāvo duratikramaḥ.

Nature is hard to overcome. This is no doubt based on *Hitopadeśa* iii. 56:

"Yaḥ svabhāvo hi yasya syāt tasyāsau duratikramaḥ.
Śvā yadi kṛiyate rājā tat kiṃ nāśnātyupānaham."

Raghunātha applies it in the following manner:

"Nanu savilāsājñānabādhakasvabhāvatvaṃ ced bodhasya tadā svabhāvo duratikrama itī nyāyāt tattvajñasya jñānodayanantaram savilāsājñānabādhanād dehapātas tātkaḷikāḥ syāt. Tathā cocchinnaśaṃpradāyakatvād upaṇiśadām abodhātvalakṣaṇāprāmānyaprasaṅga itī śaṅkānirāsāya, yadā'jñānasya nāśe'pyārabdhakarmanā pratibandhān na dehādikṣaya, ārabdhakarmanāś ca bhogalakṣaṇakāryakṣayād eva kṣaya itī samādhīyate tadeśuvegakṣayanyāyapavṛtīḥ. Dhanuṣaḥ sakāśān muktasyeṣor bāṇasya karmanāḥ prārabdhavegakṣayād eva kṣaya itī prasiddham."

The expression occurs also in the following verse of the *Kusumāñjali* (i. 7):

"Ekasya na kṛamaḥ kvāpi vaicitryaṃ ca samasya na.
Śaktibhedo na cābhinnāḥ svabhāvo duratikramaḥ."

Ed. note. Note prasiddham. Lokaprasiddhi is a foundation--mūlādhāra of the laukikanyāyas in general.

479

Svaviṣamūrcchito bhujāṅga ātmānam eva daśati.

The snake stupified by its own poison bites its own body! This saying is found in Udayana's *Ātmatattvaviveka*, page 67, line 6: "Yadi hi na jñātaṃ kiñcid astītyādīpratijñā-rthaḥ pratijñāṃ sprīset katham ayam arthaḥ pratyetyavyaḥ. Na cet katham sānupapannā. Tadupapannatve ca katham punaḥ pratijñārtha upapadyate. Tadidam āyātaṃ svaviṣamūrcchito bhujāṅga ātmānam eva daśatīti."

480

Svāṅgaṃ svavyavadhāyakaṃ na bhavati.

One's own body does not hinder one. It is found at the end of the Akṣhapāda section of the *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha*, as follows:

"Na ca svātantryabhaṅgaḥ śaṅkānīyaḥ, svāṅgaṃ svavyavadhāyakaṃ na bhavatīti nyāyena pratyuta tannirvāhāt." "Nor need you object that this would interfere

with God's own independence [as He would thus seem to depend on others' actions], since there is the well-known saying, 'One's own body does not hinder one;' nay rather it helps to carry out one's aims." This is Professor Cowell's translation.

Other instances of its employment are *Bhāmatī* 3. 4. 20 (page 682); *Tātparyāṭikā*, pp. 72. 90; *Tārkikarakṣāṭikā*, page 50; *Nyāyamakarandaṭikā*, pp. 201, 215; and *Khaṇḍanoddhāra*, pages 58, 62.

Ed. note. Some other instances are given here.

481

Svāṅgulijvālayā paraṃ didhakṣuḥ sa paraṃ dahed vā na vā,
svāṅgulidāham anubhavati.

A man who tries to burn his enemy by setting fire to his own fingers may or may not burn the enemy, but certainly burns his own fingers! It occurs in *Nyāyavārtika* 2. 1. 12 in reference to a person who denies the validity of Proof. Sūtras 8 and 12, as translated by Dr. Ballantyne, are as follows:- "[Perhaps some one will say] the nature of a Proof does not belong to sense &c., for it cannot be so at any of the three times [into which Time is divided]." "[If there be no such thing as Proof] because [forsooth] nothing can be such at any of the three times, then the objection itself cannot be established." On this the author of the vārtika says:- "Yat khalu triṣvapi kāleṣu na sādhaḥ tad asādhanam iti bruvatā pratiśedhasyāsādhakatvaṃ svavācaivābhyupagataṃ bhavati. Yathā kaścit svāṅgulijvālayā paraṃ didhakṣuḥ, sa ca paraṃ dahedvā na vā, svāṅgulidāham anubhavati."

482

Svāmibhṛtyanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *the relation as master and servant*. "It is used to mark the relation of the feeder and the fed, or the supporter and the supported, subsisting between any two objects." Āpte's *Sanskrit Dictionary*. It is of very common occurrence. For instance, in Śāṅkara's bhāṣya on *Brahmasūtra* 2. 1. 4 in a discussion as to the relation between Brahma and the world, he says:

"Nahi sāmye satyupakāryopakārahāvo bhavati. Nahi pratīpau paras-
parasyopakurutaḥ. Nanu cetanam api kāryakāraṇaṃ svāmibhṛtyanyāyena bhoktur
upakarīṣyati. Na. Svāmibhṛtyayor apyacetanāṃśasyaiva cetanam pratyupakāra-
katvāt."

Also in 2. 3. 43, we read: "Tataśca jīveśvarayor apyupakāryopakārahāvābhyupa-
gamāt kiṃ svāmibhṛtyavat sambandha āhosvid agnisphuliṅgavad ityasyāṃ
vicikitsāyām aniyamo vā prāpnoti."

See, too, Rāmatīrtha on *Vedāntasāra* 19 (page 141, last line).

Ed. note. Here is a See too reference.

483

Svedajanimittena śāṭakatyāganyāyaḥ.

The illustration of *throwing away a garment [?] because of a louse in it!* It occurs in *Upamitibhavaprapaṅcā Kathā* (page 160, line 10):

"Yato'ham anantāpatyāpi durjanacakṣurdoṣabhayād Avivekādibhir mantribhir vandhyeti prakhyāpitā loke mamaivāpatyānyanyajanāpatyatayā gīyante. So'yaṃ svedajanimittena śāṭakatyāganyāyaḥ."

Compare Raghunātha's *Yūkābhiyā kanthātyāganyāyaḥ*.

Ed. note. Here is a recommendation for comparison.

484

Hiraṇyanidhidṛṣṭāntaḥ.

The illustration afforded by *buried treasure* [over which men may walk again and again, unconscious of its existence]. It is found in the *Chhāndogya Upaniṣad* 8. 3. 2 as follows: "Yathāpi hiraṇyanidhiṃ nihitam akṣetraññā uparyupari sañcaranto na vindeyur evam evemāḥ sarvāḥ prajā aharahar gacchatya etaṃ brahmalokaṃ na vindantyanṛtena hi pratyūdhāḥ."

Sureśvarācārya makes use of it in *Sambandhavārtika*, verses 294 and 295:

"Kutas taj jñānam iti cet taddhi bandhaparikṣayāt.
Asāvapi ca bhūto vā bhāvī vā vartate'thavā.

Adhīta vedavedārtho'pyata eva na mucyate.
Hiraṇyanidhidṛṣṭāntād idameva ca darśitam."

The translator of the *vārtika*, Mr. S. Venkaṭaramaṇa Aiyar, gives "the illustration of the golden mine," as the rendering of the *nyāya* in verse 295; and adds in a footnote, "people, other than professional detectives of mines, will not discover a rich mine of gold hidden deep beneath the surface of the earth;" but I think that my rendering is more in accord with Śaṅkarācārya's interpretation of it in the Vedic passage. He says:

"Hiraṇyanidhiṃ hiraṇyam eva punar grahaṇāya nidhātṛbhir nidhīyata iti nidhis taṃ hiraṇyanidhiṃ nihitaṃ bhūmer adhastān nikṣiptam."

There is no thought here of a *mine*, but of treasure buried in the ground with a view to its being taken up again on a future occasion.

The two verses from the *Vārtika* reappear as *Pañcadaśī* ix. 39, 40, preceded by the following:

"Punaḥpunarvicāre'pi trividhapratibandhataḥ.
Na vetti tattvam ityetaḍ vārtike samyag īritam."

485

Hradanakṛanyāyaḥ.

The simile of *an alligator in a lake*. Used of things which mutually aid or protect each other. See *Vanasimhanyāya*.

Iti Śrī