CHAPTER VII.

(14) The First Three Prameyas.

It will be seen that nearly half of this volume (i.e. TT.) is devoted to the discussion of the first category, viz., Pramāṇa. All the remaining fifteen categories are covered by the second half of the volume. The subtle and somewhat technical discussions show Gn.'s aptitude for the Navya-Nyāya, where the "प्रमाणप्रमाण न" predominates keeping the "अत्यधिकता" in the background.

Atma.

Gn. has nothing to say new about the first three Prameyas of great metaphysical importance. These three are "अत्यधिकता","अत्यधिकता","अत्यधिकता". He simply explains "अत्यधिकता" method, the respective definitions of these three as given by Ke.

He, thus, explains "अत्यधिकता" in a simple way. It would be noted here that though Gn. is a Jain saint, he does not even suggest to interpret the conception of the Atma according to the Jain school of thought. His loyalty, as a

224. Ibh. PP. 62 and 77, TT. PP. 413-415.
225.  "

*.Ibh.* F. 415
commentator, can be marked in his discourse that proves "अर्थः" to be "एतत्" and not of "विवेकादिन्यक" as conceived by Jaina. Not only that, but he also refutes the "सत्यात्मकः" theory.

Following Ke. and Gn., he also shows how "वाचोऽयं" can be different from both "अत्यत्र" and "इत्यत्र". Ke. states the "अनुज्ज्वलः" by which the existence of the अत्म is established. Gn. proves the "वृष्णि" of "वृषणि", etc., and then shows that from "वृषणि" a "वृषणि" can be inferred, and from "पराक्रमानुज्ज्वलः", उत्तरादि the ninth "दृढ़तः" is the "वृषणि" for all these special qualities.

"अत्यत्र" and "इत्यत्र"

GV., while explaining the definition of "अत्यत्र" as "प्रारम्भवतत् शक्तिः", shows that the definition of "श्रेयस्" as given by Ke.,
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requires some modification. On. endorses GV.'s statement by saying, "सत्यार्थं सूक्ष्मोऽहम् । अर्जु-नान्तोऽयं स शरीरस्तिनि श्रीरामदि। ।"


On. explains in detail this modification.

"अर्जुनसम् "

as a

"अद्वैतम् "

Incidentally, On. discusses whether "अर्जुनसम् " can be accepted as a "अद्वैतम् " or not. But he does not subscribe to any definite view in this respect.

First, he says, "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् । उपाधिनिः सविद्याम् ।"

But in the same breath, he declares "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् । उपाधिनिः सविद्याम् ।"

He agrees that here is a "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् " between "अर्जुनसम् " and "पूर्वस्वस्थवर्ष " But this "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् " is not a "सविद्याम् " here, because we have got an "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् " to justify it, and that "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् " is to be accepted in relation to the "अद्वैतमस्त्वम् ".
for "साधः", while "शास्त्रत्व" is to be accepted in relation to the "मुद्रावांतः". The "राजः" is a "दोषः", only when there is no proper "साधः". Here, it is present. So, "शास्त्रत्व" can be a "माति".

Gn. also explains the another definition of the "कृप्" given by Ke. as "-कृतस्याम्: शास्त्रम्". He clarifies the meaning of "कृप्", which according to Ke., is a "कृप्" intended for securing and avoiding the "हिट" and "उर्ध्विन्दः", respectively. Gn. concludes, "देशायम् (नेय्यमिश्र्यायामशास्त्रिनिरेक्षा उपलितविशेष था)".

...
(15) ARTHAS.

The Substance.

Arthas are considered to be fourth - Prameya. Though Gautama means the qualities like smell, colour, touch, etc., by Arthas, Ke. interprets them in a wider sense here, and suggests the six "पदार्थ" of Vaiseskas, viz., "द्रव्य - ज्ञाता - अनात्मक - निर्देशित - निरस्त - अनुस्त्रान" and afterwards accept "चौचक्र" - the seventh "पदार्थ" also.

Dreyyas.

Otn. endorses Ke.'s view that though all the "पदार्थ" can be included under Prameya, they are mentioned separately for "क्षेत्र-समाबेसे". Otn., however, is not so much interested in discussing the definition of the substance as in discussing - the significance of the term "इति" in connection with the number of the substances.

"इति कार
दियी कार".

He explores in full in which way the "इति कार" excludes the possibility of a tenth substance. According to the ancient Naiyayikas -
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the meaning of "किरदा" here may give rise to three alternatives, viz., (i) "अपस्युक्तस्वदर्शिणि",
(ii) "अतिद्युगोर्गहुप्तादि" and (iii) "अतिद्युगोर्गहुः"
while according to modern Naiyāyikas, it may be either "अपलोक्यवन्दनिः" or "अतिद्युगोर्गहुः".

Gn.'s view.

Gn. examines these alternatives and finally agrees with the author of the Lilāvati that "किरदा" implies "प्रदृष्टप्राप्त्याशि" here. He also suggests to refer the work of Raghunātha S'īromāri in this connection.

"प्रदृष्टप्राप्त्याशि" and

While explaining the substance "किरदा",
Gn. opens a discussion on "प्रदृष्टप्राप्त्याशि " but restrains himself after a while by saying that, the proper place for this discussion will be in the chapter on qualities.

Following GV., Gn. does not mention -
Apesh, and in connection with the "केशम कथा "
he shows how "रूझन रच " and "रूझनजनह " are
essential characteristics in gold, which is
"केशम " In absence of "रच " and
"रूझन " gold will not be perceived and felt
by touch respectively. Gn. suggests under the
circumstances to suppose that the "रूझनजन " and
"रूझन " although produced in gold, are sub-
dued by the "सर " and "रूझन " of the
earth, whose atoms from a majority in it.
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