mind. Invested with this subtile frame, they, for the sake of fruition, connect themselves ever anew with Nature, thus, as it were, creating for themselves ever new forms of material existence; and it is only on his attaining perfect knowledge, whereby the ever-changing modes of intelligence cease to be reflected on him, that the Purusha is liberated from the miseries of Samsara.

The reputed founder of this school is the sage Kapila, to whom tradition ascribes the composition of the fundamental text-book, the *(Sânkhya-sûtra,* or) *Sânkhya-pravachana, @@1* as well as the *Tattva-samAsa,* a mere catalogue of the principles. That the Sutras have undergone subsequent modifications might be inferred from the fact that they twice refer to the opinion of Pahchaśikha, who elsewhere is stated to have received his instruction from Asuri, the disciple of Kapila, as well as from the sage himself, of the commentaries on the Sutras, that by Vijnâna Bhikshu, @@2 a writer probably of the 16th century, is the most approved. An independent treatise by the same author, the *Sânkhya-sâra, @@2* consisting of a prose and a verse part, is probably the most valuable compendium of Sânkhya doctrines. Another admirable and highly-esteemed treatise is Iśvara-krishna’s *Sârikhya-kârikâ,@@3* which gives, in the narrow compass of seventy-five ślokas, a lucid and complete sketch of the system. Though nothing certain is known regarding its author, @@4 this work must be of tolerable antiquity, considering that it was commented upon by Gaudapada, @@5 the preceptor of Govinda, who, on his part, is said to have been the teacher of Sankaracharya.

1. The *Yoga* system is merely a schismatic branch of the preceding school, holding the same opinions on most points treated in common in their Sûtras, with the exception of one important point, the existence of God. To the twenty-five principles *(tattva)* of the Nirîśvara Sânkhya, the last of which was the *Purusha,* the Yoga adds, as the twenty-sixth, the *Nirguna Purusha,* or Self devoid of qualities, the Supreme God of the system. Hence the Yoga is called the *Seśvara* (theistical) *Sânkhya.* But over and above the purely speculative part of its doctrine, which it shares with the sister school, the theistic Sankhya has developed a complete system of mortification of the senses—by means of prolonged apathy and abstraction, protracted rigidity of posture, and similar practices, —many of which are already alluded to in the Upanishads,—with the view of attaining to an ecstatic vision of, and reunion *(yoga)* with, the Supreme Spirit. It is from this portion of the system that the school derives the name by which it is more generally known. The authoritative Sutras of the Yoga, bearing the same title as those of the sister school, viz., *Sânkhya-pravachana,* but more commonly called *Yoga-śâstra,* are ascribed to Patanjali, who is perhaps identical with the author of the “great commentary” on Pânini. The oldest commentary on the Sutras, the *Pâtahjala-bhâshya,* is attributed to no other than Vyâsa, the mythic arranger of the Veda and founder of the Vedânta. Both works have again been commented upon by Vâchaspati-miśra, Vijnâna-bhikshu, and other writers.
2. (6) The *Nyâya @@6* and *Vaiśeshika* are but separate branches of one and the same school, which supplement each other and the doctrines of which have virtually become amalgamated into a single system of philosophy. The special part taken by each of the two branches in the elaboration of the’system may be briefly stated in Dr Röer’s words :—“ To the Nyâya belong the logical doctrines of the forms of syllogisms, terms, and propositions; to the Vaiśeshikas the systematical explanation of the categories (the simplest metaphys­ical ideas) of the metaphysical, physical, and psychical notions, — which notions are hardly touched upon in the Nyaya-sutras. They differ in their statement of the several modes of proof,—the Nyaya asserting four modes of proof (from perception, inference, analogy, and verbal communication), the Vaiseshikas admitting only the two first ones.” The term Nyaya *(ni-âya,* “in-going,” entering), though properly meaning “analytical investigation,” as applied to philosophical inquiry generally, has come to be taken more commonly in the narrower sense of “logic,” because this school has entered more thoroughly than any other into the laws and processes of thought, and has worked out a formal system of reasoning which forms the Hindu standard of logic.

The followers of these schools generally recognize seven categories *(padârtha)*:—substance *(dravya),* quality *(guna),* action *(karma),* generality *(sâmânya),* particularity *(viśesha),* intimate relation *(sarnavâya),* and non-existence or negation *(abhâva).* Substances, forming the substrata of qualities and actions, are of two kinds:— eternal (without a cause), viz., space, time, ether, soul, and the atoms of mind, earth, water, fire, and air; and non-eternal, com­

prising all compounds, or the things we perceive, and which must have a cause of their existence. Causality is of three kinds :— that of intimate relation (material cause); that of non-intimate relation (between parts of a compound); and instrumental causality (effecting the union of component parts). Material things are thus composed of atoms *(anu), i.e.,* ultimate simple substances, or units of space, eternal, unchangeable, and without dimension, character- ized only by “ particularity *(viśesha). ”* It is from this predication of ultimate “ particulars ” that the Vaiseshikas, the originators of the atomistic doctrine, derive their name. The Nyâya draws a clear line between matter and spirit, and has worked out a careful and ingenious system of psychology. It distinguishes between individual or living souls *(jîvâtman),* which are numerous, infinite, and eternal, and the Supreme Soul *(Paramâtman),* which is one only, the seat of eternal knowledge, and the maker and ruler *(Îśvara)* of all things. It is by his will and agency that the un­conscious living souls (soul-atoms, in fact) enter into union with the (material) atoms of mind, &c., and thus partake of the pleasures and sufferings of mundane existence. On the Hindu syllogism compare Prof. Cowell’s notes to Colebrooke’s *Essays,* i. p. 314.

The original collection of *Nyâya-sâtras* is ascribed to Gotama, and that of the *Vaiśeshika-sûtras* to Kanada. The etymological meaning of the latter name seems to be “little-eater, particle- eater,” whence in works of hostile critics the synonymous terms *Kana-bhuj* or *Kana-bhaksha* are sometimes derisively applied to him, doubtless in allusion to his theory of atoms. He is also occasionally referred to under the name of Kâśyapa. Both sutra-works have been interpreted and supplemented by a number of writers, the commentary of Viśvanâtha on the Nyâya and that of Śankara-miśra on the Vaiśeshika Sûtras being most generally used. There are, moreover, a vast number of separate works on the doctrines of these schools, especially on logic. Of favourite elementary treatises on the subject may be mentioned Ke^ava- misra’s *Tarka-bhâshâ,* the *Tarka-sangraha, @@7* and the *Bhâshâ- parichheda. @@8* A large and important book on logic is Ganges’s *Chintâmani,* which formed the text-book of the celebrated Nuddea school of Bengal, founded by Raghunatha-śiromani about the beginning of the 16th century. An interesting little treatise is the *Kuswmâhjali, @@9* in which the author, Udayana Acharya (about the 12th century, according to Prof. Cowell) attempts, in 72 couplets, to prove the existence of a Supreme Being on the principles of the Nyâya system.

As regards the different heretical systems of Hindu philosophy, there is no occasion, in a sketch of Sanskrit literature, to enter into the tenets of the two great anti-Brahmanical sects, the Jainas and Buddhists. While the original works of the former are written entirely in a popular (the Ardha-mâgadhi) dialect, the northern Buddhists, it is true, have produced a considerable body of litera­ture, @@10 composed in a kind of hybrid Sanskrit, but only a few of their sacred books have as yet been published; @@11 and it is, more­over, admitted on all hands that for the pure and authentic Bauddha doctrines we have rather to look to the Pali scriptures of the southern branch. Nor can we do more here than briefly allude to the theories of a few of the less prominent heterodox systems, however interesting they may be for a history of human thought.

The *Chârvâkas,* an ancient sect of undisguised materialism, who deny the existence of the soul, and consider the human person *(purusha)* to be an organic body endowed with sensibility and with thought, resulting from a modification of the component material elements, ascribe their origin to Brihaspati; but their authoritative text-book, the *Bârhaspatya-sûtra,* is only known so far from a few- quotations.

The *Pâncharâtras,* or *Bhâgavatas,* are an early Vaishnava sect, in which the doctrine of faith, already alluded to, is strongly developed. Hence their tenets are defended by Ramanuja, though they are partly condemned as heretical in the Brahma-sutras. Their recognized text-book is the *Nârada-Pahcharâtra. @@*12 According to their theory the Supreme Being (Bhagavat, Vâsudeva, Vishnu) became four separate persons by successive production. While the Supreme Being himself is indued with the six qualities of know­ledge, power, strength, absolute sway, vigour, and energy, the three divine persons successively emanating from him and from one another represent the living soul, mind, and consciousness respectively.

The *Pâśupatas,* one of several Saiva (Mâheśvara) sects, hold the Supreme Being *(Îśvara),* whom they identify with Śiva, to be the creator and ruler of the world, but not its material cause. With the Sânkhyas they admit the notion of a plastic material cause, the *Pradhâna*; while they follow Patanjali in maintaining the exist­ence of a Supreme God.
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