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RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Second Century BC was a period of revival of Vedic sacrifices and marked for the evolution of the Viṣṇu-Vāsudeva cult, which had originated earlier. During the period of Aśoka, the sacrifice of animals was discouraged but it was reinstated in the time of Puṣyamitrasunīga. In this period, the ascetic religious orders also flourished. The religious condition mainly related to sacrifice, worship and performance of appropriate rituals.

5.1. Religious beliefs and practices

The old Vedic sacrifices regained their prominence by the revival of the orthodox order and some of them began to be included in the daily life of families. So, the performance of the pāñcamahāyajña was compulsory to every house holder. According to Manusmṛti¹, they are japa (muttering of prayers), homa (the fire sacrifice), bhūtabali (the offering of food to all created beings), brāhmaṇārcana (worship of the learned brāhmaṇs, pītṛsamtarpāṇa (the offering of water to forefathers). The agniṣṭoma², rājasūya³, vājapeya⁴ are some other sacrifices they performed. Patañjali referred to the dirghasatra lasting over long periods of hundred or thousand years. But, it was not possible in practice and only heard of him ritualistic
portion of the Vedic literature. dirghasattrani varshaatikani
varshasahasrikani ca / na ca adytve kascidapi vyavaharati kevalam
rsisampradayo dharma iti krtvam yajnikah sastrena anuvidhate /5

In soma sacrifices, the soma plant was needed and used putilka grass
as substitute to soma plant, but soma had not become outmoded. vede'pi
somasya sthane putilkatrani abhishunyadityucyate na ca tatra soma
bhutapurvo bhavati6. To drink soma, certain spiritual and material
conditions have to be fulfilled. According to Yajnika school, the privilege
of drinking soma is limited to a person whose family there was no one had
suffered social degradation during the preceding ten generations. evam hi
yajnikah pathanti dasapurusanukam yasya grhe sudra na vidyeran sa
somam pibediti7. Manu 8 looks at the problem from an economic point of
view, "he who owns food to last for three years or more so as to maintain
his dependents are entitled to drink soma".

The officiating priests in the yajna-s received dakshina or sacrificial
fee. Sometimes the dakshina may be in the form of gelded bull9, sometimes
may be the cow and the same cow passed on a thousand times.
'sahasrakrtyo datvam tayam sarve te sahasradakshinah sampannah10. The
recitation of mantra-s for invoking Vedic deities plays an important part in
sacrifices. There was a restriction to use the incorrect words during the
recitation of mantra-s. The adaptable nature of Vedic mantra-s with reference to case endings not provided and it is interesting that the sāmidhenirks are counted as seventeen though they are only thirteen in number by reading the first and the last āk-s thrice each-saptadaśa sāmidhenyo bhavanti iti, triḥ prathamām anvāha triruttamām ityāvṛttitah saptadaśatavam bhavati.

Among the Vedic deities, Indra is one and the same Indra appears in different places simultaneously. śakra, puruhata and purandara are different names of Indra. The Sun and Moon were also worshipped. There exist a concept of Heaven and Hell, and one who live according the charity, entitled a place in Heaven- yo bhavatām odanam dāsyati sa svargam lokam gamisyati. One word properly known and well pronounced in accordance with the grammar would grant enable him to achieve all in Heaven. So, the idea of paraloka or next world was always present in the mind of the people during this age. Taking srāddha is a custom of satisfying the ancestors by offering tilodaka has an important role in religion- āmrāśca siktāh pitaraśca prīnitāh. There was a custom existed in that period; escort the beloved guests up to see water or forest, when they returned.
5.2. Religious cults

Theistic devotion to particular Gods expressed the new phase of religious beliefs. In that period Śiva and Viṣṇu were very popular with separate cults. Patañjali’s reference to the staging of ‘bālibandhana’ and ‘kamsavadha’\(^{20}\), were hinting the early belief in the existence of Viṣṇu cult. There was a sect of the Śiva-bhāgavata-s, who worshipped Śiva as bhagavān and whose outward sign was an iron trident-yo ayahsūlenānvicchati sa āyasūlikah? kim cātah / siva-bhāgavate prāpnoti\(^{21}\). This proves the presence of Śiva cult during that period.

5.3. Asceticism

Asceticism formed an important part of the religious life of the day, which was widely spread as early as the time of upaniṣat-s. Supreme wisdom was the principal concept behind the practice of asceticism \(^{22}\). Begging is considered as the obligatory duty of a religious mendicant-bhikṣu-‘yam dvitiyāṁ bhikṣāṁ samāśādyā pūrvāṁ na jahāti\(^{23}\). A mendicant with a single staff is called a dandin\(^{24}\) and formed a separate group dating back to the period of brāhmaṇa-s \(^{25}\) and also mentioned by Pāṇini\(^{26}\), Manu\(^{27}\) etc. The mendicant with three staves is called ‘parivrājaka’\(^{28}\) also known as māskarin parivrājaka and was so called because of their doctrine of inactivity seeking peace as the highest end – mā
Parivrajakah Gjivikii, the Buddhist sect was really a tridandin and the tridandin parivrajaka mentioned by Patañjali may identical.

5.4. Moral concepts

The concept of dharma places a very important role in Indian tradition. The Veda-s, Smṛti-s, Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Pūrva-māṁṣa are the sources of dharma. P.V. Kane observes, “dharma is one of those Sanskrit words that defy all attempts of an exact rendering in English or any other tongue. That word has several vicissitudes.” (History of Dharmaśāstras, Vol.I, P.1).

At the beginning of the text Patañjali introduces the word dharma and adharma-śabdajñāne dharmaḥ apaśabdajñāne’dharamah. The knowledge of the correct words leads to merit and the incorrect words leads to demerit. One who murder a brāhmaṇa or who drinks liquor due to ignorance, he will become a sinner. That is ignorance cannot completely serve as a resort. When words are used in the sense in which each is current in the world injunction to use the correct word is made by the śāstra for the sake of dharma- lokato’rthaprayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharmaniyamah.
Hindu ethics comments upon every householder certain moral and spiritual obligations classed as *dharmaniyama*, i.e. a restriction on oneself for the sake of religious merit. It means *niyama* for *dharma*, *niyama* for the sake of *dharma* and *niyama* having for its fruit *dharma*. By the *dharmaniyama* there are some restrictions in the daily life of the people. A cock and a pig nurtured in a village are prohibited from eating. Permission given to eat the stipulated five alone of the five-nailed animals\(^{31}\), revealed that the other five-nailed animals are not to be eaten. Similarly, man meets woman to satisfy his sexual passion, it may be had in meeting any woman deserving or non-deserving, there is the restriction made that one is approachable and the other is non-approachable – *iyam gamyā iyamagamyā iti*. The concept is that, the killing of the killer of Devadatta, never cause to the re-entry of Devadatta (*devadattahantrhatanyāya*), is one of the finest examples of their moral thought and it denotes that they never admit the killing of a person in revenge. *sannipātalakṣaṇe vidhiranimittam tadvighātasya nyāya* \(^{32}\) reflect the concepts that never destroy the thing that depend each other. It is like the saying, ‘never cut the branch while sitting’.

*Yāga*, according to Mīmāṁsaka, is the soul of *dharma*. But, Patañjali always relates; *dharma* is the correct knowledge of grammar and the preservation of Vedas and assisting in the correct performance of sacrifice is the main aim of grammar. The most popular and accepted
meaning of the term dharma, i.e. religion, is true. Thus, it is clear that in that time ethical and moral values are upheld by many rules, which highlight the exploitation of the deep-rooted concept of dharma in the Indian mind.

5.6. Philosophical thoughts

The philosophical doctrines throw a light on the metaphysical speculations current during II century BC. The rathāṅgavihṛtanyāya, the parts of a chariot when taken apart are not each of them fit for movement, their combination (samudāya) is the chariot is fit for that, reveals the Buddhist thought samghāta. It is related to Milintapañca. The identification of Maskar in with ājīvika shows the influence of the Buddhist thought in that period- triviṣṭabdakanyāya.

The rājusarparyāya, is a famous Vedanta thought, that mistaking a cord by delusion for a serpent denotes the false impression. According to them, mithya is like the serpent for the time to a man having illusion, the only truth being brahma, - brahmasatyam jaganmithya. The concept of mithya in advaitavedānta is revealed through the mrgaṭṛṣṇānyāya and gandharvanagaranyāya, i.e. things that actually do not exist but appears to be so. dagdhapatanyāya illustrates the unreality and insubstantiality of all phenomena, which referred in the vedāntasāra.
The vrksapracalananyāya\textsuperscript{38} i.e. a tree when it moves with its parts, part is evidently with in the whole suggests that the concept of avayavin\textsuperscript{39} (the parts alone are the realities while taking the whole) in the nyāya philosophy is familiar with that time. The tantupaṭanyāya\textsuperscript{40} denotes that the effect exists for a moment when the cause is destroyed, is also mentioned. The stock example for inference (anumāna), i.e. parvato vahnimān dhūmāt has paved the path for the maxim dhūmagninyāya\textsuperscript{41}.

The killing of animals is adharma, even if it is according to śruti as a part of sacrifice. But the dharma derived as a result of sacrifice, destroy this adharma. It is like, while digging the well the dust and mud cover the body of the digger and the water found them last will wash it off. This mīmāṁsa concept reflects in the kūpakānakananyāya\textsuperscript{42}. The niyamavidhi of mīmāṁsa reveals through the maxim of abhaksyo grāmyakukkuṭah, abhaksyo grāmyasūkaraḥ, which prescribes what to eat and what not to eat. The cloth get the name cloth after the yarn is spun, but we say that ‘spin a cloth’. Here the word is used in a prospective application, when the weaver finished the product- bhāvisamjñā-vijñānanyāya\textsuperscript{43}. This thought is obliged to the mīmāṁsa philosophy. There is a reference that when we say ‘yavāgūṁ pacati’, cooks the rice-gruel, yavāgū is used in a prospective application, because when the cooking is finished, it is called yavāgū. According to mīmāṁsaka, a thing that is changed in one part does not there
by become something else is illustrates by the ekadesavikṛtanyāya⁴⁴, which means the cutting of a tail or ear, which does not turn it into a horse or donkey, but still a dog. The eternity of the relation between the word and sense is closely related to the mīmāṃsā theory⁴⁵. In addition, the pratyāśattinyāya of them is mentioned through the āvanāntād odakāntād priyam pāntham anuvrajet nyāya. From the above reference, it is clear that these philosophical thoughts are prevalent in that period.

5.7. Nyāyās on Religion

5.7.1. ABBHAKṢANYĀYA/ VĀYUBHAKṢANYĀYA

“the maxim of living on water alone”/ “the maxim of living on air”.

 athavā santyekapadānyapyavadhāraṇāni / tadyathā-abbhakṣo vāyubhakṣa ityapa eva bhaksayati, vāyum eva bhaksatī gamyate / evamihāpi siddha eva na sādhyā iti⁴⁶ /

Bhāṣyakāra mentions this nyāya while he interpreting the meaning of siddhe in the vārttika siddhe ṣabdārthasambandhe in Paśpāšhnika. The word siddha, is synonym of the word nitya (permanent). Sometimes, there is the sense of definiteness conveyed by a single word, unaccompanied by the particle eva showing definiteness. For example, when the word abbhakṣaḥ or vāyubhakṣaḥ is used, it conveys the sense of living on water
alone or on air alone, without eating or drinking any other thing. Here without the word *eva*, the sense of definiteness conveyed. Similarly, the word *siddha*, here means, always established (*siddha eva*) or always produced, it does not mean 'to be produced' (*sādhyā*).

**5.7.2. ĀCĀRYĀCĀRANYĀYA**

'the maxim of Ācārya's usage'.

‘ācāryācārāt *samjñāsiddhiḥ / tadyathā-laukikeṣu vaidikeṣu ca kṛtāntēsu / loke tāvanmātāpitaraun putrasya jātasya samvṛtte'vakāśe nāma kurvāte devadatto yajñadatta iti / tayorūpacārādanye'pi jānanti iyamasya samjñeti / vede'pi yājñikāḥ samjñām kurvanti spayo yūpaścaśāla iti / tatra bhavatāmupacārādanye'pi jānanti iyamasya samjñeti'"\(^{47}\) /

Bhāṣyakāra uses this nyāya while he describes the sūtra 'vrddhirādait' to denote the needlessness of the use of *samjñādhikāra* sūtra, 'atha samjñā' for knowing the *samjñā*, *vrddhi*, *guna* etc. In the world, the parents in their own house secretly named kids and the others identify by hearing the name of each kid through the dealings of their parents and relatives. In the Vedas also Yajñikas named the sacrificial utensils as 'isphya', 'yūpa', *caśāla* etc. and use of those words by Yajñikas, the others understand them to be their name.
So here also, some interpreters state that in the rule ‘vrddiradaic’ the word vrddhi is samjñā and ādaic (ā, ai, au) are samjñins. Other comments that in the rule ‘sici vrddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu’ P.7.2.1, the vrddhi denotes the vowels ā, ai, and au. Therefore, we understand that with which another is denoted is samjñā and those that are denoted are samjñins. Hence, the vrddhi is samjñā and ādaic is samjñin in the loka and śāstra. So there is no need of introducing a domain sūtra like this.

5.7.3. AGNAU KARAVĀṆI NYĀYA

“the maxim of offering oblation in the fire”.

‘athavā punarastvayameva vigrahah kesabrahmacārino’syeti / nanu coktam- kathā iti prativacanam nopapadhyate iti / naiṣa dosah / agnau karavāni nyāyena bhavisyati”48 /

Patañjali mentions this nyāya under the rule ‘anekamanyapadārthe’ P.2.2.24, where a question is raised about the meaning and analysis of the compound kimsabrahmacārin. The compound is bahuvrīhi and the analysis is kesabrahmacārino'xya-who are his fellow students. The answer is kathah, i.e. he is a student belonging to the katha branch. Here the question is about a constituent meaning, which refers to a plurality of object, but the answer is only referring to single object. If the question is asking in the
form of plural word, the answer is also should be in plural, but here it is in singular word. After this discussion, by introducing the *agnau karavāṇī nyāya*, Bhāṣyakāra states that there is no difficulty in considering the singular answer. That is, somebody says to somebody, may I offer in the fire. The performer has received the reply by the words ‘offer it’, the object also permitted. In another occasion somebody else says, ‘shall it offered in the fire?’. Then the performer has received the permission by the words ‘let it be offered’, the object has also been permitted. Just as the nyāya works here, it works in the case of ‘who are his fellow students.’ When the answer is they are students belonging to the *katha* branch, because of the relation of the *katha* branch, we understood that he is a student belonging to the *katha* branch certainly. Similarly, when the answer is he is a student belonging to the *katha* branch, we have to understand that, they are students also belonging to the *katha* branch certainly, because of the relation. As a matter of fact, they cannot be referred by the compound, since they are represented in the compound by a subordinate word.

If the question concerned here is taken in the form of sentence *kesabrahmacārino'sya*, the plural word *sabrahmacārinah* becomes predominant. Therefore, since the answer refers to the *sabrahmacārin*-s, it should be put in plural-*kathāh*. But, when the answer is taken in the form of the compound *kimsabrahmacārin*, then the *anyapadārtha*-a person
having fellow students, becomes predominant, and the constituent sabrahmacārin becomes subordinate. Therefore, since the answer refers to the anyapadārtha, it should be put in the singular.

5.7.4. ĀMRASEKAPITṬTARPĀṆANYĀYA

“watering a mango tree and at the same time satisfying the forefathers”

‘dvigatā api hetavo bhavanti / tadyathā-āmrāśca siktāh pitarasca prīnitāh iti / tathā vākyānyapi dvīṣṭhāni bhavanti / śveto dhāvati, alambusānām yāteti’

In the Paśpasāhni of Mahābhāṣya on the course of discussion about ‘what are the purpose of instructions of letters’, Patañjali answered by using the āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāya, which means watering a mango tree and at the same time satisfying the grandfathers, i.e. by doing one thing brings two results. The same action provides two or more results.

The introduction of letters at the beginning is for giving a serial order of letters for the sake of knowing their correct pronunciation. If so, an authoritative utterance has to be made in the case of vowels, which are udāṭta, anudāṭta, svarita, anunāṣika, dīrgha, and pluta. It will be achieved on account of the general nature of the original utterance. Even if saying
so, the letters with the defect of _samvrta_ should be prohibited. The defects _samvrta_ and others are avoided by _gargādi-bidādipāṭha_, but there is another purpose served by _gargādi-bidādipāṭha_, so that correctness of the whole may be secured. Here arises the question, ‘how can two things are obtained by one single effort?’ For answer to this question, Bhāsyakāra uses this nyāya and says that, both are accomplished by _gargādi-bidādipāṭha_, the correct reading is understood and the defects are removed. There can be sometimes a two-fold purpose also in doing a thing. For example, by performing _pitṛtarpana_ while sitting under mango tree, the mango tree is watered, as also the grandfathers are appeased at the same time. Ordinary sentences also convey a double sense. _śveto dhāvati_-the white one runs, _śvā ito dhāvati_-the dog is running away from here, and _alam busānām yātā_- go to the country of Alambusa, _alambusānām yātā_-able to go to the waters.

The _āmrāsekāpitṛtarpananayāya_ is also seen in Padmapurāṇa.

```
'eko munistāmrarākārāgrahaustohyāmresu mule salilam dadāti /
āmrāśca siktāḥ pitaraśca trptā ekā kriyā dvayarthakarī
prasiddhā^50/.
```

5.7.5. _ĀṢOKAVANIKAṆYĀYA_

“the maxim of the grove of asoka trees”.

203
While Nāgēśa interprets the words gaurāśvapuruṣoḥasti, which is in the Paśpasāhṇika, he uses this nyāya. Here he arises a question that, why Bhāṣyakāra uses the words gauḥ, aśva etc. in the examples of current words in reply to the question kesāṁ saṃdānāṁ, instead of he has to refer more common words like ghaṭa, pata etc. For clearing this question, he explains this nyāya and says that, Rāvana kept Sītā in the grove of aśoka trees, when he could keep her in any garden. 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 being considered as good as another, and the preference of any particular one cannot be accounted for.

5.7.6. 

ĀVANĀNTĀT 

ODAKĀNTĀT 

PRIYAM 

PĀNTHAMANUVRAJET NYĀYA

“follow until see a forest or water”
The use of the word ṭīvra with ‘ṛ’ in the sūtra ‘prāgīśvarāṇnipātāḥ’
P.1.4.56, is to apply nipātasaṃjñā up to the sūtra ‘adhirīśvare’ P.1.4.97. If the word ṭīvra is used there, nipātasaṃjñā will apply up to the rule ‘ṭīvare tosunkasunau’ P.3.4.13. Here arise a doubt when use the word ṭīvra that, whether the word ṭīvra is in the rule ‘adhirīśvare’ or ‘ṭīvare tosunkasunau’. But, the application of the word ṭīśvara is clear this doubt. Here Patañjali quotes this nyāya and says that, here is no difficulty in applying the word ṭīvra. There is custom that accompany the beloved guests up to see a forest or the water when they returned. Here they are followed up to the first sight of a forest or the water. Likewise, the word ṭīvra will only apply to the first rule adhirīśvare and not apply to the later.

5.7.7. DĪRGHASATRANYĀYA

‘to be treated like dīrghasattrā’

‘aprayukte dīrghasattravat / yadyapraprayuktā, avaśyam
dīrghasattravallakṣaṇenaśnuvidheyah / tadyathā-dīrghasattraṇi
Bhāṣyakāra says in Paśpaśāhnikā- correctness of words is determined from usage. If words were not in use, they would not be called correct. The words like āsa, tera, cakra, peca etc. are not in use now. Then how can it treat as correct word. Patañjali answered that there are no unused words because, words are used to convey sense and to these words attached the meanings in which they are used. It can be seen the word uṣitā used in place of the meaning of āsa, in the sense of tera- tīrṇa, in the sense of cakra kṛtavantah, in the sense of peca pakvavantah. Although such words are not found in use, they have to be explained in grammar by framing rules, just as sacrificial sessions of long duration which last for a hundred years or for a thousand years, are not at present held by anybody. Still, writers on sacrifices prescribe and explain them, simply because usages, which are followed by ancient sages, are to be looked upon as religious, have to be sanctioned although they may not be current.

5.7.8. GURUVATGURUPUTRANYĀYA

"treating the preceptor’s son like the preceptor "

206
Bhāṣyakāra describes the nyāya guruvatguruputra when there arise a question why should ‘vat’ be read in the sūtra ‘sthānivadādeso’nalvidhau’. In the palace Rājaguru have a prominent place and get full respect from the King and the others. In his absence, his son does all things in respect of the Rājaguru and his son gets all respects what Rājaguru gets. Here he is treated only like Rājaguru, but not as Rājaguru. In the sūtra ānōyamahanah, the ātmanepada conjugation is employed. According to ‘hanovadhaluṇi’ sūtra, vadhādeśa employed to ānō. If sthānim is the samjñā of ādeśa, vadhā deśa became the name of sthāni. Then the ātmanepada termination will be used only after vadh with ‘ā’ and not after han with ‘ā’. If vat is read, this effect cannot arise, since ādeśakārya can be analogized with a sthānikārya, same as how the Guru’s son gets homage instead of the Guru.

5.7.9. INDROPASTHITI NYĀYA

“presence of Indra at a time in all sacrifices in various places”
During the interpretation of the sūtra ‘sarūpāṇāme kaśeṣa ekavibhaktau’ P.1.2.64, Bhāsyakāra uses the indropasthitinyāya. In the world, various people for the attainment of desire at the same time conduct many sacrifices in various places. At the time of sacrifice, they offer obligation to Indra by pronouncing the word ‘indra’. Indra being a single God, he accepts all the offerings from various persons from various places simultaneously. This is the indropasthitinyāya.

Is padārtha depending on dravya or ākṛti? Patañjali says that dravya-s are many and ākṛti is one and only and exists everywhere simultaneously. As the one Indra can be seen everywhere simultaneously, ākṛti also seen everywhere simultaneously. In the destruction of dravya, ākṛti exists. Because of the non-dependence of the ākṛti to dravya, ākṛti will not disappear, if the dravya destructed.

5.7.10. NĀTYANTĀYĀJÑĀNAM ŚARAṆAM BHAVITUMARHATI

NYĀYA

“ignorance cannot wholly serve as a refuge”.

208
In the Paspaśahnika of Mahābhāṣya, the Pūrvapakṣin arises a doubt in the verse ‘vāgyogavit duṣyati cāpaśabdaḥ, that, whether one who knows correct words knows incorrect words, and just as one obtains merit by the knowledge of correct words, demerit also incurs with that of incorrect words. The demerit becomes greater, since the incorrect words are greater in number and each correct word having a large number of corrupt forms. For example, the correct word gauḥ has the corrupt forms gāvī, gonī, gotā, gopotalika and the like.

To clear this doubt, Patañjali mentions this nyāya. Ignorance cannot completely serve as a resort. He who kills a Brāhmaṇa, or who drinks wine through ignorance becomes a sinner. One should know the existing rules, ignorance is not an excuse, and knowledge is his resort.

5.7.11. RŚISAHASRADAKŚINĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of alms-giving of thousand cows’

‘etadapi siddham / katham? lokataḥ / tadyathā- rśisahasramekāṁ kapilamekaikaśaḥ sahasrakṛtvṛ datva tayā te sarve sahasradakśināḥ sampannāḥ / evamihapi anekāctvam bhaviṣyati’
The objection is occurred in ekāc and anekāc while the akāra is one and the same. This can be solved by the repetition of vowel sound. But, in the words like kirinā, girinā, only the final syllable will be accented since there is only one vowel ‘i’ in both. Bhāsyakāra removes the defect by quoting ‘ṛṣisahasradaksinanyāya’ in the sūtra ‘a i u ṣ’.

In Yāga-s, Sages, one thousand in number presented one and same cow in one thousand times, have achieved the merit of having presented one thousand cows. Similarly, words with the same vowel occurring twice will be looked upon as two-vowelled or multi syllable.

5.7.12. SAPTADĀŚASĀMIDHENĪNYĀYA

‘the maxim of seventeen fuel sticks’

‘ekājanekājgrahaṇeṣu cāvrttisamkhyanātanekāctvam bhaviṣyati /
tadyathā- saptadāśasāmidhenyo bhavantī triḥ prathamāmanvāha,
triruttamāmityāvṛttitaḥ saptadāśatvam bhaviṣyati / evamihāpi āvṛttito’ne-
kāctvam bhaviṣyati’

Bhāsyakāra uses the ‘saptadāśasāmidhenīnyāya’ in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘a i u ṣ’. If accepting the view that the akāra is one and the same, there will arise a confusion regarding the application of the terms ekāc, anekāc and the like. The problem can be solved by counting separately the
repeated vowel sounds in the word. For example, in *dārśapaurṇamāśiyāga*, there seventeen hymns consecrated for offering the fuel sticks. But hymns are only thirteen. The thirteen sacred hymns being counted as seventeen by the repetition of the first hymn as three and, the last one also. Similarly the one the same *ākāra* is treated as different in different occasions. So in the words *kiriṇā*, *giriṇā* and the like, the multi syllabification (*anekāctvam*) will be explained by the vowel ‘*i*’ occurring twice in these words.

5.8. Nyāyās on Philosophy

5.8.1. ANVAYAVYETIREKANYĀYA

“the maxim of logical continuance and logical discontinuance”.

‘*ko’sāvanvayo vyetireko vā? yah śabdo hīyate tasyāsāvartho yo hīyate, yah śabda upajāyate tasyāsāvartho yo’rtha upajāyate, yah śabdo ’nvayī tasyāsāvartho yo’rtho ’nvayīt*’

Patañjali introduces this nyāya in the rule ‘*arthavadadhūturapratyayah prātipadikam*’ P.1.2.45, to accomplish the *arthavatva* of śabdā-s like *vrksa*. Kaiyata explains- *anvaryah anugamah sati śabde arthāvagamah, vyatirekah śabdābhāve tadarthānavigamah.*
If there is an effect, there is a cause. If there is no cause, there is no effect. Since the stem is always related to pratyaya, the stem alone can never be used. Because of the incapacity to denote anything by itself, the arthavatvam is not acceptable. This is the objection raised. It is achieved by anvaya and vyatireka-says Patañjali. On hearing the word vrksa it is understood that the stem vrksa ending in ‘a’ and also the pratyaya ‘s’ and getting ‘a’ meaning that one having roots, branches, fruits and leaves and the idea of being one. When the word vrksau is read a portion of the original word ‘s’ is dropped, a new word ‘au’ is added and the stem vrksa remains as it was-ending in ‘a’ is intact. A portion of the meaning is also dropped and something is newly brought in and a portion remains as it was, that is the idea of being one is discarded, the idea of being two is newly brought in and the idea of one having roots, branches, fruits and leaves remains same. From this it is clear that the part of the word which is dropped has for it the meaning which has been discarded, that the newly added part in the word has for it the meaning which is newly introduced and the part of the word which remains unchanged as for it the meaning which remains undamaged.

5.8.2. ĀTMĀ NYĀYA

"maxim of antarātma and sarīrātma"
Bhāsyakāra quotes the ātmānyāya while he interpreting the sūtra ‘neraṇau yatkarma naucet sa kartānādhyāne’ P.1.3.67. This sūtra means that ātmānepada appears in nyantaprayoga, if only the karman in the anyantaprayoga is the karman in the nyantaprayoga, if it becomes the kartr in the nyantaprayoga, and sad memory is not denoted. Then the doubt arises that why the ātmānepada ghātayate not occurs in the example hanti ātmānam, ghātayati ātmā by this sūtra, because when ātmā is the kartr in the nyantaprayoga ghātayati, and the ātmānam is the karman in the anyantaprayoga hanti. So Vārttikakāra introduces the vārttika navānyante’nyasya kartrtvāt and says that the ātmānepada need not be mentioned since the kartāātmā in the nyantaprayoga is one other than the karman ātmā in the anyantaprayoga. Whenever the karman in anyantaprayoga becomes the kartā in nyantaprayoga, there only occur ātmānepada in the nyantaprayoga.

For explaining this matter, Patañjali quotes the ātmā nyāya. There are two ātmā-s, antarātmā-the ātmā inside and the śarīrātmā- the physical body. antarātmā does any action, which produces pain, and pleasure to the
physical body and the physical body does that action which produces pain and pleasure to the antarātmā. Here the karman in the first sentence should be the kartṛ in the later. But here both are different. The karman in the first sentence is sarīrātmā and the kartṛ in the second sentence is antarātmā. Therefore, the ātmanepada does not occur in hantiātmānam, ghātayatiātmā. This nyāya is also found in the bhāṣya under the sūtra, ‘karmavat karmanā tulyakriyāḥ’ P.3.1.87.

5.8.3. DAGDHAPAṬANYĀYA

“the maxim of the burnt cloth”

‘kṛtsnasya dhātorlope guṇavrddhiprasaṅgābhāvādānarthako niśedhah syāditi sāmarthyāt dhātvekadeśalo po’tra dhātulopo’bhimatah / avayavakriyāyā’pi samudāyasya vyapadeśadarśanāt / yathā paṭo dagdha iti”

Pradīpakāra uses this nyāya while he interpreting the sūtra ‘na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke’ P.1.1.4. It means that guṇa and vrddhi in the place of ‘ik’ do not obtain when ārdhadhātuka affix conditioning deletion of part of the root follows. When the whole root is deleted, there is no chance to obtain guṇa and vrddhi. Then the sūtra ‘na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke’ is also meaning less. So here dhātulopa means
dhātvekadesalopa i.e. deletion of root means deletion of a part of root. Here introduces the dagdhapatanyāya and says that sometimes a piece of cloth that is set on fire, is said that the whole cloth is burned, and at the same time, if the cloth is burned we use that the part of cloth is burned. Likewise, here also the word root (dhātu) means a part of a root (dhātvekadeśa).

5.8.4. PRAKRṬIVIKṛTINYĀYA

"the maxim of prakṛti and vikṛti"

‘katham jñāyate dravyam hi nityam ākṛtiranityeti / evam hi drśyate loke-mrtkadāciākṛtyā piṇḍo bhavati / pindākṛtirupamrdya ghatikāh kriyante / ghaṭikākṛtirupamrdya kundikāh kriyante / ākṛtiranyā cānyā ca bhavati / dravyam punastadeva / ākṛtyupamardena dravyamevāvaśīṣyate'⁶²/

In the vārttika siddhe śabdārthasambandhe Bhāṣyakāra says that dravya is considered eternal and ākṛti is non-eternal by the prakṛtivikṛtinyāya. It is seen in the world that earth is one shape becomes a clod, it is broken and it is converted in to small pots; by crushing the pots, small pitchers are made. So also, gold invested with a certain forms like a bar, by destroying the bar shape, rings are made, they are destroyed it is
made into bracelets, that shape is crushed and it is made into ear rings as bright as red hot charcoal of khadira wood. The shape changes from one to another but the substance remains the same. Though the shape is destroyed, the substance alone remains.

By this nyāya, Bhāṣyakāra indirectly denotes parināmavāda of Sāṅkhya philosophy and the vivartavāda of Vedānta philosophy.63

5.8.5. RATHĀNGARATHANYĀYA

'can't go with a separate parts of a chariot, but can go with the assembly of its parts'.

*ime punarvarṇāḥ atyantam evanarthakāḥ yathā tarhi rathāṅgāni vihṛtāni pratyekam vṛajikriyām pratyasamarthāni bhavanti / tatsamudāyaśca rathah samarthah / evamesām varṇānāṁ samudāya arthavantah, avayavā anarthakā ātī64/

The rathāṅgarathanyāya is explained in the interpretation of the sūtra ‘arthavadadhāturaprtyayah prātipadikam’ P.1.2.45. It is explained here a reply to a question that the letters have meaning or not. It is said that letters have meaning on account of the collection having meaning. For example, one thread is not capable to protect a man from cold, but woolen cloth made up by the collection of threads is capable to protect. Similarly,
one rice cannot remove hunger, but collection of rice can do it and the one grass-stem cannot bind, but the rope, collection of grass-stem, can do it. On the other hand, it is seen that the whole has meaning not connected with that of the parts, i.e. even a particular thread can protect a certain person from the cold, one rice can remove hunger of a particular person and one grass stem can bind certain things.

But, Bhāṣyakāra says, these letters have absolutely no meaning when they are in parts. Here he uses the rathāṅgarathanyāya and says that just as a chariot stripped into parts cannot go from place to place and when they assembled together can go, so also the collection of words have meaning and parts have no meaning.

5.8.6. VĪCĪTARAṄGANYĀYA/ KADAMBAMUKULANYĀYA

'the maxim of wave undulation or the maxim of the buds of the kadamba tree'

'srotrasambandhastu pradeśāntarotpannaśabdasyāpi vīcītarṅga-
nyāyena kadambamukulanyāyena vā tatrāntare vyupādita eva'65 /

Uddyotakāra uses these nyāya-s during the discussion of definition of śabda in the sūtra 'a i u १'. The letter pronounced at other places, how could it contact with our ears? To answer this question, he uses the
vīcītaṁgaranyāya and kadambamukulanyāya, and says that sound comes to
the seat of hearing in the same manner as the undulation waves of water or
as the anthers of a kadamba buds and thus apprehended by the ear. The
vīcītaṁgaranyāya is referred in the Bhāṣāparicceda like this;

'sarvah śabdo nabhovṛttih śrotropannastu grhyate /

vīcītaṁgaranyāyena tadutpattistu kīrtita'¹⁶⁶ //

The maxim of the kadamba buds means that the bursting forth of the
buds of the kadamba tree at one and the same time, they are said to burst
forth simultaneously. This nyāya is also given as an illustration of the way
in which sound is produced in our ears. kadambakoraka nyāya is used in
the Pariśiṣṭaparva of Hemacandra also.⁶⁷

5.8.7. VRKŚASTHĀVATĀNANYĀYA

"existence of wine on a tree while destroying the tree"

'drayaviniśe ākrteravinśah/ kutah? anaikāmyāt / anekātmā
ākrterdravyasya ca / tadyathā-vrkṣastho'vatānato vrkse chinnepi na
vinaśyati'¹⁶⁸ /

Patañjali answers to the vyaktivādin by justifying the view of jātivādin
in the rule 'sarūpānāmekasesa ekavibhaktau' P.1.2.64. It is not proper the
opinion that the ākṛti destructed in the destruction of dravya. The nature of ākṛti and dravya are entirely different. ākṛti is eternal one and found everywhere simultaneously. dravya is not so. Here Patañjali illustrates the vrksasthāvatānanyāya, and says that because of the different nature, the wine on a tree will not be destroyed, if that tree is either destroyed or cut and removed. Likewise in śāstra also due to the different nature ākṛti does not disappear when dravya is destroyed. The existence and origin of guṇa is under the control of dravya. So, when dravya destroyed, guṇa also destroyed.
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