

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XV.

THE SIX UPĀNGAS OR PARSHANAS.

The *Upāṅgas*.—Their nature and relation to the *Āṅgas* and the *Vedas*.—Their names.—Their purpose.

After the *Āṅgas* or 'limbs,' 'organs,' come the *Upāṅgas* or 'subsidiary limbs and organs,' also six in number. Their purpose is to expound in detail the final truths contained in the *Pranava*. The essence of the *Vedas* and the *Vedāṅgas*, with regard to cognition, desire and action, is expanded in these in its application to the permutations of these three. Up a h¹ means proximity, approximation, the final co-ordination and synthesis of all details; that wherein this is expounded is *Upāṅga*. The *Upāṅga* can be mastered and practically realised only after and by means of the *Veda*, even as the *Veda* is mastered only with the help of the *Āṅga*. Hence the saying that the *Āṅga* is the means to the *Veda* and the *Veda* the means to the *Upāṅga*. The detailed exposition of the laws and methods of the World-process referred to in the *Vedas* is contained in the *Upāṅgas*; and such of the

¹ The modern form is upa, without the final aspirate.

inner significance of the *Vedas* as is not dealt with in the *Upavedas* is also expounded in them. Abbreviation and prolixity, contraction and expansion, reduction and enlargement, abridgement and detail, involution into seed and evolution into tree, one and many—in the combination of these lies the whole activity of the World-process; and the treatises which describe that process are correspondingly aphoristic and discursive, statements of principles and statements of details. That which is expanded is necessarily capable of reduction, and *vice versa*. And yet, even so, it must be borne in mind, all these *Āṅgas*, *Vedas* and *Upāṅgas* can but limitedly state the barest outlines of cosmic ideation, the principles common to all worlds. For indeed, the task of comprehending all the details of all possible world-systems within a limited compass is manifestly impossible, and there is a ‘multiplicity in unity’ i.e., a whole world-system in every atom, and in each such world there are countless atoms, and numberless worlds in each again, and so on infinitely, involving infinite particular ideations.

The six *Upāṅgas* are: *Veḍānta*, *Mīmāṃsā*, *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣhika*, *Yoga* and *Sāṅkhya*. And they all, it should be borne in mind, are based on only one Final Truth, the Logion. It is true that the conclusions each one immediately and directly

expounds differ from those dealt with by the others; but the difference is that of supplementary parts, limbs or organs, and not that of hostile opponents. One common Universal Being underlies all; the prime object of all is to declare the I-This-Not; they name Brahman by six different names as indicating six different aspects of the same thing; the different limbs have all one common heart.

(i) The *Veḍānta*.—Its general purpose: the indication of all possible lines of enquiry, and the clue to the answer of each.—Its special purpose: the declaration of the nature of Man or the individual soul, God or the Universal Spirit, and Nature or the illusion of the World-process.—Certain observations as to the stage of evolution at which metaphysical enquiry arises in the human mind.

The *Veḍānta*, ‘the end of knowledge,’ comes first among the *Upāṅgas*. All *jijñāsā*, the wish to know, all enquiry, is initiated here; hence is it the first. It expounds the nature of the *jīva* or individual ego, of Brahman, the Supreme Ego or the Absolute, and of the Necessity of the two or *Māyā*. It thus imparts sure and certain knowledge of the Universal Trinity. Also, because the Self is the principal factor of the World-process and the *Veḍānta* deals with it mainly, therefore too is it called the principal

Upāṅga. All 'desire to know,' every line of enquiry, is set forth in the *Veḍānta*, because, as the *Brahma-sūtra* declares¹: The Self pursues knowledge, Self-knowledge—this is the final truth. Or, again: All enquiry whatsoever, all wish to know, all desire for all knowledge, is rooted in the Self. Thus, then, the enquiry after the name, the work, the conditions of every atom falls within the scope of the *Veḍānta*. It has been said: That which the students of *Veḍānta* declare to be Brahman, That is I Myself, ever-manifest in every atom; this Ātmā, supreme in nature, different from and yet the support and substratum of all things, this is I Myself, this am I, this am I. The word I is used here three times. The reason is this: The I is the This, the This the Not, the Not is the I and the This—these three main facts of the work of the World-process are expounded in the *Veḍānta*. Also that in Universal Being, of the nature of Unity, which exists in every atom, there is included all *kriyā*, activity, functioning; and in that is included all Self; and in all Self is included and inherent immanently the Trinity of Brah-

¹आत्मनो बोधालुष्ठानं सिद्धांतं ब्रह्मसूत्रात् is the text. सिद्धांतं is obviously a case of double coalescence of letters. The modern reading would be सिद्धांत इति. The meaning of the aphorism is far from unmistakable, and the aphorism itself is not extant.

man; and all this is dealt with in the *Veḍānta*. Also, again, the general as well as the special features and characteristics and the products or effects of the activity or will or functioning of each atom, and the main function, and the chief (resultant) substance or substantiality of each atom may be studied herein. (In other words, the three aspects, substance, mobility or function, and sense-quality of each atom; what principal substance or 'element' is composed of any particular kind of atom, what is its sense-quality, touch, taste, etc., and what is its action on or reaction to other substances?)

Out of such knowledge proceeds the declaration of the knowers of the *Veḍānta*: All this belongs to all; the individual I is of no account; the equity, equality, equilibrium or identity of all I's, all This's, and all Not's, is the universal Brahman.

Thus, then, we see that all the possible objects of knowledge constitute the subject-matter of the *Veḍānta*, whence the first aphorism of the *Brahma-sūtra*: Henceforth the wish to know, the enquiry into, Brahman (in the fullness of all Its contents).

After the knowledge, *i.e.*, experience and observation of the World-process and the realisation of the fact that it is composed of pleasure and pain, arises the wish, as said at the end of the last chapter, to know and feel the unity of

Brahman (for without reduction to Unity there is no satisfactory explanation of the World-process). And with this view should the *Veḍānta* be studied, viz., the view of reducing the multiplicity of the World-process to unity.

The matter may be looked at in another way. Instead of saying that the enquiry for Brahman arises after the observation of the World-process and of the fact that it is composed of pleasure and pain, we may say that the *Veḍas* which have been studied previously expound manyness, and these exposition should be reduced to a systematic unity, and hence the enquiry into Brahman follows after the study of the *Veḍas*. But this is not quite accurate; for the mastery of the whole of the *Veḍa*, which is the ideation of Mahā-Viṣṇu and embodies the *Praṇava*, would already mean perfect knowledge; and therefore no enquiry can be left to make after that. A well-established conclusion of the *Veḍas* is that he who knows, knows nothing (i.e., the Not); and he who knows Nothing knows all; therefore, after finishing the study of the *Veḍas*, no further enquiry after Brahman is left to be made or is possible.¹ It is

¹ To reconcile this with the previous statement that the *Veḍas* are means to the *Upāṅgas* we have to understand that in that statement only a preliminary and more or less cursory study of the *Veḍas*

possible only after entering into and observing the joys and sorrows of this world. The nature of the enquiry, the wish to know, is the wish to know the source and origin of all this duality that is observable everywhere. And this wish is justified by the fact that all and every duality necessarily implies a relation, an underlying unity. As the *Nyāya* shows, the 'many,' connected together, are always connected by and in one connecting something. Here, in the World-process, we see that every atom is related to every other, and the reason thereof is the underlying unity of Universal Being, *saṭṭā-praḍhāna*.¹ The exposition of this unity running through all things is the work of the *Veḍānta*; and, hence, the answer to all possible enquiry is (briefly and potentially) present in it.

But this is so only from the standpoint of the

is meant, and not their full and final understanding which is secured only when they are studied again, on a higher level, after the study and in the light of the *Upāṅgas*. We have already had in the last preceding chapter the direction that the *Gāyatrī* and the *Mahā-vākyas* should be studied again after the *Veḍas*. All this is only illustration of the general law of spiral progress and the absence of hard and fast definition anywhere in the region of even the most concrete particularity.

¹ Modern *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣhika* speak of it as *saṭṭā-sāmānya*.

limited. Otherwise the Absolute is beyond all enquiry and declaration.

Unfixed by principles, void of details,
All-knowledge, hence unmoved by wish to
know,
Self-natured, All-complete, the Not of all,
Apart from attributes, most wonderful,
Root of all *Mantras*, *Tantras*, *Yantras* too,
Partless, pervading space, devoid of form,
Without taste or sound or speech or
speaker,
Ever the bodied I-This-Not, the Self.

(ii) The *Mīmāṃsā*.—Its three divisions: *Pūrva*, *Uttara* and *Apara*.—Karma, action, the subject of the science.—*Pūrva* deals with self-referring action, birth, growth, etc.—*Uttara*, with action in relation with others, ethical action.—*Apara*, with the activities that take place during pralaya.—Etymological explanations.—Triplets.—Significance of sacrificial acts.—Their subservience to mokṣha.—Allegorical and special interpretations.—Three kinds of karma having ethical consequence.

The second *Upāṅga* is the *Mīmāṃsā*, reflexion, examination, 'minding' over and over again, (from man, to think) devoted to karma. And there too, we have three sub-divisions, *Pūrva*, *Uttara*, and *Apara*. In the *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* the internal functions, the activities dwelling in the self or directed immediately

towards or within itself are described; e.g., the ways in which it enters the uterus, the conditions it passes through, the manner of its growth, its preservation and nourishment and so on. In the *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā* all karma whatever is described, that is to say, the operations of the jīva in external transactions with others (its dealings with or actions as affecting others, which give rise to karma in the technical sense, acts of merit or sin bearing reward and punishment). The *Apara-Mīmāṃsā* describes the activities of pralaya, dissolution born of the Negation, the conditions which lead to such dissolutions and those which exist during them. These three parts or sub-divisions are obviously inter-related, and the summation of them all is the *Mīmāṃsā*.¹

¹ The views of the text are obviously very different from those now current. According to the latter, *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* is *Mīmāṃsā* proper, and *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā* is only another name for *Veṅṇa*, while *Apara-Mīmāṃsā* is non-existent. Again, the modern idea is that the *Mīmāṃsā* deals only with ceremonial or ritual karma, religious rites, actions whose basic idea is that of interchange between humans and superphysical beings; whereas the text here makes karma the subject-matter of the science, in its widest possible sense and all its possible three sub-divisions, (a) self-evolving or psycho-physical, (b) ethico-religious and (c) self-

We thus see the trinity appearing here also as everywhere else. In the *Vedānta* it consists of the question, the answer and the satisfaction (or from another standpoint, Jīva, Māyā, and Brahman, Man, Nature and God). It is the same with every *Upāṅga*. In the construction of each there appears this threefold activity corresponding to A, U, and M.

Because it deals with karma is the name *Mīmāṃsā* given to this science. The syllable mī indicates mṛtaṃ, death, connected with Eṭaṭ, This; mā or mām is Aham, I; sā is Not, of the nature of Relation and of pralaya or dissolution (or sleep, during which power is accumulated anew for another period of activity).

All actions become (or are connected with or point to) but eṭaṭ, this. Mām's and sā's become, i.e., appear and disappear in mī. The I and the Not appear and disappear only in and by action, the action of birth and death (necrobiosis, metabolism). Thus, because it deals with three kinds of activities is the Science called *Mi-mām-sā*.

As regards the common conception on the subject, it is true that the *Mīmāṃsā* says that nitya and naimiṭṭika, i.e., daily and involving, dissolving, potentialising and making latent.

special occasional sacrifices should be performed diligently and animals slain for sacrifice and the sacrificial meat eaten and wine drunk ritually, so that the sacrificer may enter heaven and even gain mokṣha, for drinking sacrificial wine is drinking the nectar of immortality. Still all this should be interpreted in consonance with the other declarations that the jīva attains mokṣha by karma performed in accordance with duty and that duty should ever be performed with a constant reference to the All-Self and there should be no slaying, for the human jīva knowing all beings to be one should feel itself in every atom and love all beings always. If these statements had been really contradictory, they would not have been placed together. It is a well-established rule that opposites do not occur in the same place, in the region of the limited; though from the transcendental standpoint all exists everywhere.

It has been said that karma is a means to mokṣha. But action is impossible without knowledge preceding it. So long as the jīva does not know what to do and how to do it he cannot act. And therefore mokṣha by means of karma alone is not possible. It is possible only when the latter is conjoined with jñāna and ichchhā. Yet again, karma has an infinite variety, but all karma does not lead

to mokṣha. It may be asked here how, when mokṣha is a thing apart, different from everything else, when it is Negation, can there arise any question of means to its accomplishment. The answer is that the Negation has in it the element of Necessity and wherever there is necessity, there the distinction between means and obstacles, facilities and hindrances necessarily arises. Thus, only those actions are means to liberation which it is necessary to perform, which are matter of duty. If all actions were regarded as equally necessary at all times, all succession could be ignored; but that is not possible from the standpoint of the limited. Everything cannot be done at once by any one. Only that should be done at any one time which it is necessary to do at that time. Looked at thus, it will be seen that havya and kavya, offerings of flesh to the gods and the manes respectively, have no connexion with mukṭi. The hanana (ordinarily, slaughter) of paśhus (animals) in a yajña (sacrifice) means the *understanding* of paḍārṭhas, (things, objects, facts; the analysis, the dissection, the laying bare of the inmost nature of all animate and inanimate things, of the whole World-process in fact). The verb root han has two meanings, to slay and to approach; and the use of such a word, having two senses, in such a connexion, shows a

special purpose; both senses should be regarded as intended, from different standpoints. In the matter of leading to liberation or to heaven, the second meaning, avagamana, leading to, approaching, understanding, is the one intended.¹ The root gam has four senses, (a) to go, (b) to gain deliverance (to pass away or beyond), (c) to obtain or reach, (d) to understand (to reach by the mind); and the last one is appropriate here. So, too the surā recommended to

¹ The other and more literal would be the proper one in some other connexion, probably the 'black' or 'left-hand' rites; other allegorical interpretations of the sacrifices of animals, as the sacrifices of one's own animal passions, have been already referred to in the chapter on *Yajurveda*, III. vi. (ii) One purpose of sacrifices, with their elaborate ritual, in their other or literal interpretation, now current, is expressly declared to be to hamper and restrain and regulate the indulgence of the grosser cravings. It is much if cannibals can be induced to refrain from human flesh and to confine themselves to animal meats; much, if daily orgies can be reduced to once a year. See the *Vishṇu-Bhāgavata*, XI. v. 11. The world is made up of true and false, good and evil, white and black. The Religion of All-knowledge, dealing with both, providing for souls of all grades, realising the futility of striving to abolish the evil entirely, endeavors to minimise it and gradually lead jīvas from it to the good. See Appendix at the end of this chapter.

be drunk during the Sauṭrāmaṇi sacrifice means the elixir of immortality which is the realisation of Brahman.

Māmsam¹ means the operations resulting from the moods or functionings of the mind, (mānasaṃ) on which all achievements depend. (The other import) the actual flesh of animals is entirely forbidden, and for this reason; even as the food is, of any creature, such too is his work, such his actions, for the body is built up from the food; and as the body is, so are its functionings. Consequently the flesh of animals produces functionings and developments like theirs in the consumer. It helps on the intenser performance of physical and worldly actions (within the domain of the lower intelligence, whose function is to promote separative, individualistic

¹ Modern Samskr̥t would not recognise this onomatopœic philology and etymology; according to it repeated mananam, thinking, is mīmāṃsanam. But Manu's etymology of māmsam is in keeping with that of the text: it is that "māmsam or flesh is so called because he, saḥ, will in the future eat me, mām, whom I am eating now." See *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. ii. p. 325 (Old Edn.) as to the interpretation of the real scriptures. The text here helps us to realise how *Nirukta* must have been a most indispensable science for the proper understanding and the manifold interpretation of the *Veḍas*.

and material life). But subtler thinking, the following up of worlds within atoms and atoms within worlds is rendered impossible thereby. Hence the prohibition.

The ultimate conclusion of the Science of *Mīmāṃsā* thus is, that karma should be ever undertaken and performed but in the altruistic spirit, with the universal consciousness, for the good of all, and that such karma only conduces to mokṣha; it, indeed, is the very realisation of Brahman.

We see then that the *Mīmāṃsā* deals with karma. The exact description of all the activity present in each atom, of the everlasting behaviour of the Not-Self in short, is to be found here. This karma is, like everything else three-fold, prārabḍha, sañchita, and prāpta.

The first is that which has been done in the past and has begun to take effect; the fruit whereof is being experienced now. It is true that "this ever-moving world is tāt-kālika, instantaneous, ever-present, an eternal now," also. But this is so only from the transcendental standpoint of the Absolute. From the standpoint of the limited, we have the succession of past, present and future, in the 'ever-moving,' of cause and effect, of act in the past and fruit in the present, or act in the present and fruit in

the future. We have examples of this all about us. A child is born this instant but cannot do the work of the world this instant; he matures gradually, passing through infancy, childhood, boyhood, youth and then only enters into business. The food taken now generates force only after assimilation. Kashāya or vairāgya too bears fruit only when 'ripe'.

Sañchiṭa is also but a variety of prārabḍha. It is the order or succession of accumulated karma present in the prārabḍha.

Prāpṭa too is but a variety of the prārabḍha. It is that which has 'arrived' or 'is approached,' is being done now; the consequences of which will be experienced in the future.¹

¹ For a popular and fuller exposition of the three kinds of karma, the reader may be referred to *The Advanced Text-Book of Hindūism* I. iv. There are two main views on the subject of karma (as cause of births and experiences) current in Hindū philosophy, at the present time: (a) The *eka-bhāvika* (*Yoga-sūtras* and *Vyāsa-Bhāṣya*, ii. 13) and (b) that karma is divided up into three kinds (which are by some reduced to two, and by others increased to four). One way of describing these is that, according to (a), the *whole* of a jīva's past karma is summed up at each death, and takes shape as *one* effect at each new birth, and

As hinted before, the three divisions of time govern these three divisions of karma. The *Mīmāṃsā* deals with all these. It describes all kinds of actions, physical and superphysical,

that, according to (b), only a portion of it called the prārabḍha is selected, by the powers concerned, and brought into play for a new birth, that the bulk is left for use in the future, as sañchiṭa, the 'accumulated,' and that the *new* karma done in the new birth is the āgāmi ('coming') or kriyamāṇa ('being done') or varṭamāna ('coming into existence') here called prāpṭa, also to fructify in the future. The difference is only apparent. The one view is true from the metaphysical or transcendental standpoint; the other, from the empirical and practical. Even in the *Yoga-Bhāṣya*, ii. 13, referred to, distinctions are made between various kinds of karma, one taking effect forthwith, another being neutralised by or swallowed up in another, a third waiting on for fructification and so on. The reconciliation seems to be indicated by the words of the text here. Metaphysically, the *one* present (=the new birth) sums up in itself and is the *single* result of the *whole* of the past (=karma) as *one*; it also sums up in itself and is the *single* cause of the whole of the future (=phala) as *one*. But each of these three ones is a triplet, which we may perhaps describe as static, dynamic and neutral. The 'resultant of all the conflicting tendencies and forces' which make up the whole of *endless* past

including 'rites and ceremonies,' in their aspect of 'cause' of future ethical consequence in pleasure or pain of specific kinds. It also describes the groups of subsidiary and derivative actions (of the nature of 'radiating influences')

karma is one new life which includes the whole of *endless* future consequences—the various forces deciding amongst themselves by conflict, which shall (a) manifest now as consequences in the shape of joy and sorrow, which (b) go into latency after causing new acts, and which (c) remain latent—with reference to the succession of past, present and future. In other words, the *one* cause, including in itself the *succession* of all past actions, brings about the *one* effect which also includes the *succession* of all future actions; for the *order* of manifestation is also an effect. Apparently, of these three divisions of the one resultant, (a) those which manifest now as results, joys and sorrows, are the *prārabdha*, those that have 'begun' to pass into effect, (b) those which remain latent and 'accumulated' are *sañchiṭa* and (c) those which cause *new* actions (under the silent pressure of the *sañchiṭa*) and then go into latency for future fructification in joy or sorrow are *prāpṭa*, the 'approaching'. In this way, *prārabdha* while distinguishable from the other two, is seen also to carry both within itself. For the manifested 'living creature' embodies *prārabdha* obviously and also carries in itself all its past as result and all its future as powers and potencies for good and evil act and glad and sad experience.

or 'reverberating changes,' in the language of the modern sociologist) which tend necessarily to arise out of each principal action, and their appurtenant 'experiences'. And thus the

In the terms of Yoga and Vedānta, the manifest-*śarīra* may, in one view, be said to correspond to *prārabdha*; the *sūkṣma-śarīra* to *karm-āshaya*; the *kāraṇa* to *vāsanā*, and all three and any others that there may be, in summation, to *avidyā*.

From another standpoint, we may say that *sañchiṭa* corresponds to the Sum-Total of Infinite Energy, static plus dynamic, which, remaining ever the same, is the one cause of all particular movements and cessations therefrom, past, present and to come; that *prārabdha* is a portion of it, which, in any given time and place, is passing from the static into the dynamic condition; and that *prāpṭa* is another portion of it, which, similarly, in a given time and place, is passing from the dynamic into the static condition.

Prāpṭa (the arrived or approaching), *āgāmi* (coming), *varṭamāna* (existing, coming into being), and *kriyamāṇa* (being done) are used as synonyms. *Bhāvi* (to be) is sometimes added as a fourth kind. But we know that synonyms do not mean exactly the same thing. And therefore nice distinctions may be drawn with regard to all these terms.

For theoretical purposes, it is essential to bear in mind the principle that the Law of Karma is

Mīmāṃsā becomes, not only a scientific manual of ethics to regulate new and future action, but also a guide-book which helps us to read past and future lives by the facts of the present, with the help of *Jyotiṣha*. But the Self transcends all this.

absolutely nothing else than the Law of Cause and Effect, extended to the subtler planes, astral, mental, etc., as well as the physical, and with an ethical and psychological significance in terms of consciousness added, as a common factor or co-efficient on both sides of an equation. A pleasure or a pain given becomes a pleasure or a pain received later. A pleasure or a pain given consciously becomes a pleasure or a pain received consciously. The former is the Law of Cause and Effect. The latter, the Law of Karma. In the former, the factors are called merely cause and effect. In the latter they are called merit or sin and reward or punishment. The degree of the 'consciousness' which is the common co-efficient (and the illusion of I-ness) on both sides, in the latter, is very various, ranging from the sub-conscious to clear knowledge. The details covered by this general principle must obviously be very many. Even in the domains of 'physical' science, many kinds of causes and effects are distinguished, efficient, material, final, instrumental, conditional, etc., etc. These have their place on the subtler planes as well; and others may be 'seen' from other standpoints and for other purposes.

What wotteth It of actor, acted on,
Or act in time, past, present and to come !
One Endless Cipher seems Its vast account
Of countless debts and loans and karmic bonds,
Advanced, repaid, set off, exchanged, dis-
charged,

The *modus operandi* of the Law of Karma is the Law of Action and Re-action as well as the Parallelogram of Forces, to put it briefly and comprehensively. But here too, of course, the details are endless.

For 'practical' purposes, we may say that the whole series of births and experiences which a monad-jīva plans out for itself, from the beginning to the end of a cycle, in a world, under the guidance of its Logos or Īshvara and the total amount of energy, needed for the execution of the plans, which is taken by it from the general store of that Ruler—corresponds to the *sañchita*. The experiences of any one particular birth and manifestation and the energy needed for it—correspond to the *prārabha*. Those of and for the next succeeding birth—to the *prāpta*; and these are seldom wholly, and may or may not be even in part, the immediate outcome of the present birth and its appurtenant energy and experiences, though these must also bear further fruit in *some* future time, and therefore are rightly called *āgāmi*.

For analogy, a person starts on a year's tour round the earth, with certain funds to meet expenses. He plans to visit and halt at various places

Unerring in their huge bewilderment
Of supergods and gods and nature-sprites,
Mankind and lowerkind, plants, minerals,
All bound in mutual bonds, incessantly,
Of an infinite revel of Sacrifice.

(iii). *Nyāya*.—Its main business.—The classification of all the facts of life under sixteen heads or categories, from the subjective point of view of the 'investigator'.—The explanation of each category.—Their reduction to the primal four, cognition, desire, action and summation.—The three kinds of *Nyāya*.—The uses of the study of the Science.—The Absolute.—Comparative Note on Eastern and Western 'logic'.

The third *Upāṅga* is *Nyāya*, 'bringing up, bringing together, adjusting'. Its work is *nirṇaya*, 'leading out (to legitimate conclusion and make various purchases and go through various experiences at each. Now the halt and the purchases at each are not the direct consequence of the halt and purchases at the preceding place—though all are more or less connected with each other. Also, in exceptional cases, as if the traveller commits a crime at one place and is thrown into prison, the whole of subsequent plans *may* be affected by a disturbance in a preceding portion. So *Manu* says: "Excessive and abnormal sin or merit bear fruit immediately (otherwise at future times in the distance)."

sion), 'marshalling forth,' 'determination' of the exact nature of all *padārthas*, 'word-meanings,' 'things denoted by words,' 'imports,' *i.e.*, all objects whatsoever. The typical method of determination is this: The Self is distinguishable from the Not-Self, and the Not-Self from the Self; yet the two are ever inseparable. Such is the *śiḍḍhānta*, the 'final and established conclusion,' a conclusion 'de-termined' by the examination (and reconciliation) of opposite views, antinomies. (In other words the business of *Nyāya*-logic is to make clear that the world and therefore everything in the world is made up of opposites, that 'every question has two sides,' and that the whole truth is always to be found in the combination of the two half-truths).¹ The *Nyāya* proves that all difference or conflict is only apparent, and that in reality all motives, causes or forces, and all things, objects or

¹ Which is exactly the reverse of what modern 'logic,' in East as well as West, tries to do. Current 'logic' only emphasises distinctions and differences. This is in accordance with the characteristic of the fifth principle or intelligence, the 'lower mind,' *manas*—as opposed to *buddhi*, the higher Reason, which seeks to reconcile. This 'lower mind' appears *ethically* as 'separative egoism,' *practically* as 'the struggle for life and competition and continual conflicts,' and *intellectually* as the 'distinction-seeking logic'.

substances are one, (being only endless varieties of Self-realisation and Self-substance).

As means to this 'determination' it expounds 'the Many' under classified categories, *viz.*, (1) *pramāṇa*, measure, standard, evidence, means of proving or ascertaining, (2) *prameya*, 'the to-be-measured or ascertained,' all facts, (3) *samśaya*, doubt, (4) *prayojana*, motive, (5) *ḍṛṣṭānta*, illustration, instance, (6) *śiddhānta*, conclusion, etc., altogether sixteen categories. As a fact, these all are but aspects of and reducible into the ultimate four *padārthas* or facts; namely, cognition, desire, action and summation, the endless permutations and re-permutations of which make the endless expanse of the universe.

Out of one seed grows one tree which 'expresses' 'manifests,' 'brings into experience,' all the endless potentialities of that seed, the 'many' hidden within it. This tree reproduces the 'many' as many seeds. These sprout again into new trees which show variations from the parent tree (because of the inherent manyness coming into contact with various extraneous influences in the course of 'becoming') as well as approximation to it (because of the unity of the primal seed).¹ Such is the multiplication of num-

¹ In this sentence we may find the explanation of the 'spontaneous variation' assumed by modern

bers by successive permutations. And as the earlier and nearer generations approximate to and resemble more closely the primal parent than the later and more distant ones, so this *first variation* of the penultimate four in four ways each, or sixteen altogether, is more essential than the later and more numerous. In the same way the primary variation or multiplication of three is by three, of two by two, of one by one. It is true that four may enter into *parivartana*, permutation or variation, with three or two or one; but that subserves other purposes. Thus, within the single number one, by subdivision through others, halves, thirds, quarters, we arrive at pseudo-infinity. Infinity within infinity is in the law—everywhere.

In illustration of this law, the systems of *Mahā-Nyāya*, etc., deal with one hundred or one thousand categories. We confine ourselves to sixteen, of which, again, three are chief, namely *pramāṇa*, *prameya*, and *samśaya*, evidence, fact, and doubt.¹

evolutionists, amidst which 'natural selection' works.

¹ This is the *prima facie* order, in current experience; we (a) see (b) a thing, and (c) then begin to doubt what exactly it is. Then comes further investigation, or more evidence, then established conclusion; *i.e.*, doubt is the third in external experience; but in 'internal' or psychological

Pramāṇa is the element of cognition, whereby all decision takes place.

Prameya, is or corresponds to action or the Not-Self. Thus, the facing of each other by the Self and the Not-Self is cognition. The viśhaya or object of cognition is the cognised or cognisable (and the subject, the cognisor). It may be said that cognition stands between the two as means of conjunction, and therefore these two should be mutually cognisor and cognisable to each other. But though Self and Not-Self are inseparably related, they are not identical, for if they were, then indeed there would be no relation needed at all. They are substrate and supported; similar (by mutual superimposition of attributes) but not one. Exactly equal reciprocity between them is not possible.¹ But there is an appearance of reciprocity. Because of the predominance therein of saṭṭā, being, the Self of the nature of chiṭ, becomes the cognisor; and the Not-Self becomes the cognisable because of the prevalence in it of saṭ or action. The I is the only actor, ruler, enjoyer of all things. 'I do,' 'I become,' 'I am great,' 'I am little,' 'I am thus,' 'I am otherwise'—

investigation, it comes first. All this corresponds to the five-step syllogism of Indian philosophy.

¹ See *The Science of Peace*, p. 203 and p. 265 for a view of the way in which the Not-Self cognises the Self.

everywhere, everywhen, everyway, only the manifestation of the I. All other things and facts are named the This. The I is the knower; the This, the known. Thus, then, cognition based on the Paramāṭmā is pramāṇa; kriyā connected with Eṭaṭ is prameya.

Samśhaya, doubt, is in desire. 'Is this so or not; is this going to happen or not?' Such is doubt. And it is always based on desire, 'I wish it were so; I wish this occurred; but is it so or not; will it be so or not?' Without a wish, manifest or hidden, there is no occasion for doubt. From the transcendental standpoint, all is and happens by necessity. To introduce desire, from the personal standpoint, into this necessary succession is to create doubt. (From the ordinary standpoint also, to attach an element of desire to any course of events is to suffer anxiety and 'active' doubt, with reference to it, otherwise, when no personal interests are involved, there is 'indifference and perfect calmness and freedom from care and worry').

Such are the three main paḍārthas. It is true that doubt is 'no thing'. For that very reason it corresponds to M; as proof or evidence to A and fact to U. All the other paḍārthas are included in these three.

The summation of the three is prayojana, motive, purpose, aim, end.

Dr̥ṣhtānta is included in pramāṇa. It is the succession or successive unfolding of the latter. It is true, the Naiyāyikas declare that analogies, instances, illustrations, do not suffice for complete determination (in other words, induction can never be universally exhaustive), still, whatever value it has, it has because it is of the nature of pramāṇa.

Siddhānta, conclusion, is similarly included in prameya; it is the succession, development, disclosing and unfolding thereof. It is the prameya that is 'concluded,' determined, established by means of pramāṇas, proofs, data. This 'establishment' is only the understanding of it, (the acceptance of it as fact and truth by an intelligence). For, from the standpoint of mere existence, all is siddhānta, even the non-siddhānta, or error (as it may appear to that same intelligence), for it also exists. In reality the latter is 'nothing,' naught. It thus results that a 'conclusion,' a 'judgment,' depends upon the particular necessity of particular times and successions of events. In all-time, from the view-point of the Transcendent, all possible views are true judgments. In this specified time, place and circumstance, this only is the true judgment, with reference to the need of the moment, the necessity of the circumstances, the requirements of the particular evolution and the world-system

we may be concerned with. Hence those who weigh their words well always say, "this is the right judgment, the right course to pursue, *here*;" the indication being that what is opposed to present facts may be perfectly true elsewhere.

Avayava, 'limb,' 'part,' syllogistic proposition (including both kinds, premiss and conclusion, is included in Doubt. Doubt arises only in connexion with a premiss, a part, in an argument. It is only while we are dealing with the limited, with parts of the whole, that doubt is possible. When All is known, the Whole achieved, it is no longer possible. See; wherever there is 'whole'-hearted, full and complete desire for anything, that desire is necessarily and surely fulfilled. For desire itself is necessity and *vice versa*. All things 'become,' come forth, happen by necessity, (and a desire precedes every happening). Whenever a desire remains apparently unfulfilled, the reason is that it exists only in a 'part' of the Whole, other parts having other desires and so for the time overpowering the first. If it existed in the 'whole' (of an individual, a host, a world) its fulfilment would be certain. The case of doubt is the same; the predominant facts resolve and terminate it; the unknown and subordinate ones do not receive consideration and effect.