

And that knowledge

Is Different From That Derived From Testimony Or Through Inference, Because It Relates To Particulars (Of Objects). 49.

What comes from other sources like that derived from heard instructions etc. relates to generalities. Such instructions cannot describe particular properties fully because words cannot describe particular features as they are not meant to signify such features. So also in the case of inference as has been said before : *e.g.* wherever there is contact, there is motion and when there is no contact, there is no motion. (1). Thus through inference, only general conclusions can be arrived at. That is why no object of verbal communication or inference can be a particular one. Besides, a thing which is subtle, hidden from view or situated at a distance cannot be known by ordinary observation. At the same time it cannot be said that particular knowledge of a thing which cannot be established by verbal communication, inference or ordinary observation does not exist. The knowledge of particulars relating to the subtler elements or the *Puruṣa*-like Receiver (*Mahān*) is, however, obtainable by the enlightenment acquired through *Samādhi*. Therefore this particular knowledge is different from the (general) knowledge derivable from verbal communication or inference.

(1) Knowledge is obtainable of only that much for which reason can be adduced, but not in respect of other parts. For example when we see smoke we know that there is fire, but the particulars regarding the nature or the form of the fire is not understood therefrom. Knowledge derived from verbal communication and inferential knowledge is acquired with the help of words. Words, specially those denoting qualities, are expressions of generality. So verbal knowledge is knowledge of a generality.
