the (*Sãnkhya-sütra,* or) *Sankhya-praυachana,@@*1 as well as the *Tattυa- samäsa,* a mere catalogue of the principles. But, though the founder would seem to have promulgated his system, in some form or other, at a very early period, these works, in their present form, have been shown to be quite modern productions, going probably not farther back than the 14th century of our era. Probably the oldest existing work is Isvarakrishça’s excellent *Sankhya-kärikä@@*2 which gives, in the narrow compass of sixty-nine slokas, a lucid and com­plete sketch of the system. Though nothing certain is known regarding its author,@@3 this work must be of tolerable antiquity, considering that it was commented upon by Gaudjapada,@@4 the preceptor of Govínda, who, on his part, is said to have been the teacher of Sankarãchärya. Of the commentaries on the Sutras, the most approved are those of Aniruddha@@5 and Vijñãna Bhikshu,@@6 a writer probably of the latter part of the 16th century, who also wrote an independent treatise, the *Sãnkhya-sara@@*7 consisting of a prose and a verse part, which is probably the most useful com­pendium of Sãnkhya doctrines.

4. The *Yoga* system is merely a schismatic branch of the preceding school, holding the same opinions on most points treated in common

in their Sütras, with the exception of one important point, the existence of God. To the twenty-five principles

*(tattva)* of the Nirïsvara Sãnkhya, 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 *Sesvara* (theistícal) *Sãnkhya.* But over and above the purely speculative part of its doctrine, which it has adopted from the sister school, the theistic Sãnkhya 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 complete concentration (yoga) on, and an ecstatic vision of, the Deity, and the acquisition of miraculous powers. 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. *Sãnkhya-pravachana,* but more commonly called *Yoga- sastra,* are ascribed to Patañjalî, who is perhaps identical with the author of the “ great commentary ” on Panini. The oldest commentary on the Sutras, the *Pätañjala-bhashya,* is attributed to no other than Vyãsa, the mythic arranger of the Veda and founder of the Vedanta. Both works have again been commented upon by Vãchaspati-misra, Vijñãna-bhikshu, and other writers.

5, 6. The *Nyãya@@*8 and *Vaiéeshika* 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 Nyãya belong the logical doctrines of the forms of syllogisms, terms and propositions ; to the Vaiseshikas 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 Nyãya-sütras. They differ in their statement of the several modes of proof—the Nyãya asserting four modes of proof (from perception, inference, analogy and verbal communication), the Vaêieshikas admitting only the two first ones.” The term Nyãya *(ni-ãya,* “ in-going,” entering), though properly meaning “ analytical investigation,” as applied to philo- sophical 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

*(padartha)*: substance *(draυya),* quality *(guna)* action *(karma),* generality *(sämänya),* particularity *(υisesha),* intimate relation *(samaυaya)* and non-existence or negation *(abhaυa).* 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, comprising 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 (effect -

ing 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, characterized only by “ particularity *(υisesha)."* It is from this predication of ultimate “ particulars ” that the Vaiseshikas, the originators of the atomistic doctrine, derive their name. The Nyãya 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 *(jïvätman),* which are numerous, infinite and eternal, and the Supreme Soul *(Pararnãtrnan),* which is one only, the seat of eternal knowledge, and the maker and ruler *(isυara)* 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 Professor Cowell’s notes to Colebrooke’s *Essays,* 2nd ed., i. p. 314.

The original collection of *Nyäya-sütras* is ascribed to Gotama, and that of the *Vaiseshika-sütras* to Kanãda. 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 Kãáyapa. Both sutra-works have been interpreted and supplemented by a number of writers, the commentary of Visvanãtha on the Nyãya and that of Sankara-misra on the Vaiseshika-sutras 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 Kesava-misra’s *Tarka-bhäshä,* the *Tarka-sangraha@@*9 and the *Bhäshä-parichchheda@@*10 A large and im­portant book on logic is Gangesa's *Chintämani,* which formed the text-book of the celebrated Nuddea school of Bengal, founded by Raghunãtha-siromani about the beginning of the 16th century. An interesting little treatise is the *Kusumänjali,@@*11 in which the author, Udayana Ächãrya (about the 12th century, according to Professor Cowell), attempts, in 72 couplets, to prove the existence of a Supreme Being on the principles of the Nyãya 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-Brãhmanical sects, the Jainas and Buddhists. While the original works of the former are written mostly in a popular (the Ardha- mãgadhï) dialect, the northern Buddhists, it is true, have produced a considerable body of literature,@@12 composed in a kind of hybrid Sanskrit, but only a few of their sacred books have as yet been published;@@13 and it is, moreover, admitted on all hands that for the pure and authentic Bauddha doctrines we have rather to look to the Pãli 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 *Chärvakas,* 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 Bphaspati; but their authoritative text-book, the *Barhaspatya-sütra,* is only known so far from a few quotations.

The *Päncharätras,* or *Bhägavatas,* are an early Vaishnava sect, in which the doctrine of faith, already alluded to, is strongly developed. Hence their tenets are defended by Rãmãnuja, though they are partly condemned as heretical in the Brahma-sutras. Their recognized text-book is the *Närada-Pancharätraj@@*14 whilst ‘the *Bhaga- vadgttä* is also supposed to have had some connexion with this sect. According to their theory the Supreme Being (Bhagavat, Vãsudeva, Vishrιu) 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 *Päéupatas.* one of several âaiva (Mãhesvara) sects, hold the Supreme Being *(Iiυara),* whom they identify with Siva (as *paéu-pati,* or “ lord of beasts ”), to be the creator and ruler of the world, but not its material cause. With the Sãnkhyas they admit the notion of a plastic material cause, the *Praähäna;* while they follow Patañjalî in maintaining the existence of a Supreme God.

III. Grammar *(Vyãkarana).—*We found this subject enumerated as one of the six “ limbs of the Veda,” or auxiliary sciences, the study
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