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Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa (=SD) in the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools is, as Nenninger has indicated (AS 48.2 [1994], 819-832), an analogical reasoning of absolutely invisible things rather than an inference. The movement of the sun, which Vātsyāyana took for an instance of SD, had not been admitted as SD by other Naiyāyikas after him. However, Bhāsarvajña (in the mid-10th cent.) reintroduced the view that this is an instance of SD in his Nyāyabhūṣaṇa (=NBhūṣ 272.15-29).

Bhā regards the reason (sādhana, liṅga) as the element of invariable concomitance by which one concludes an inference to be valid. He divides it in two, that is to say, drṣṭa, in which case the thing to be proved (sādhyā) is perceptible or already perceived somewhere (visible), and SD, in which case it is essentially removed from perception (invisible). ¹ This classification can be considered to run counter to that of Nyāyasūtra (=NSū) 1.1.5, for the NSū divides inference into three, namely, pūrvavat, śesavat, and SD. But Bhā justifies this classification by an unreasonable interpretation of the NSū. He argues that there is only 'and (ca) ' in the NSū and so the NSū also divides inference in two and the former two should be subsumed under drṣṭa. In the case of SD one cannot apprehend empirically in advance any invariable concomitance with regard to either individual or genus. Therefore one abstracts a general relation from perceived cases and applies it to the sādhya, even though the two things are not the same as either individual or genus. Then one reaches a specific conclusion by the doctrine resting on implication (adhikaranasid-dhānta). ² Strictly speaking, this is an analogy without logicalness, for the instance and the sādhyā are common in only some points but different from each other both as individual and as genus.

According to this classification, the movement of the sun should be not SD but drṣṭa, since the movement of Devadatta is certainly visible but in the case of the
sun the movement, whose genus is the same as that of Devadatta, is inferred. Against this possibility Bhā introduces a view of 'others (anye) '. They restrict the visibility of drṣṭa to lasting visibility and well-known-ness (NBhūṣ 272.5-7). That is to say, so long as the sādhya does not disappear, one can see it even after its activity, or the sādhya is well-known to everyone at a particular point in time. In the case of the sun, since the movement can no longer be seen after its activity, nor does anyone know of it in advance, it can be included in SD. Thus the movement of Devadatta (walking) and that of the sun (revolution) cannot belong to the same genus, although they share the point of leading something to another place.

Next the validity of the inference of the movement of the sun itself is examined. Here an objection is raised to 'anye'. Namely, the change in position cannot be known in the case of the sun. It is only the disc of the sun (ādityamaṇḍala) that we can see in the sky, and neither a cardinal point (diṣ) nor a particular place is perceptible. Therefore this inference cannot be established. This objection is almost same as that of Uddyotakara (NV 149.10-15). Although Jayanta and Vācaspatimiśra also criticize the movement of the sun (NM 344.11-13, NVṬ 148.22), they claim that this inference must belong not to SD but to Šeṣavat because the sādhana and the sāadhya represent cause and effect. But Bhā does not deal with any such criticism. 'Anye' reply that the change of motion can be surely inferred or perceived. When it is inferred, a syllogism presented by Ud is first introduced (NV 149.18-150.4). He says that the change of position is inferred by the rotary motion of the sun. But 'anye' do not accept this, saying that this syllogism is not valid during a short time (ardhaghaṭikā, 12 minutes), and other attributes should prove the change of position. In response to Ud's criticism, 'anye' say that when perceived, the position is the cardinal point, and it is well-known that a cardinal point is perceptible, and even if it is not to be perceived during a short time, there is another reason why it cannot be perceived, and if it cannot be perceived, one should know it by inference. Thus the argument of 'anye' is totally counter to Ud's criticism.

While Uddyotakara and Jayanta exclude the inference of the movement of the sun from SD, they reconstruct it as inference by other inferential knowledge (anumitānumāna). In this reconstruction there may be an intention to show that it is not the sādhya 'movement of the sun', but the sādhana 'change of position' that is
invisibility As a background factor in this, some people like Prabhākaras insist that movements are absolutely invisible. As a result invisibility of the movement of the sun and visibility of the change of position came to be explained in reverse. Moreover, Naiyāyikas after Ud considered SD as inference by a sādhana which is neither cause nor effect. Ud takes 'the presence of water from the presence of cranes' and Jayanta takes 'the taste of an apple from the sight of the color' as instances of SD instead of the movement of the sun. In these instances the sādhya is clearly visible, though Vātsyāyana explicitly states that the movement of the sun is invisible (NBh 148.4).

It is against this tendency that Bhā again makes much of invisibility. 'Anye' referred to by him are opposed to Ud's view, and again consider the inference of the movement of the sun to be an instance of SD. In the Nyāya school there are said to be two conflicting traditions, that is, the lineage of Ud-Vācaspatimiśra and that of Jayanta-Bhā. 3) 'Anye' may belong to the latter tradition, but as no similar view is found in other literature, it is possible that Bhā created this view. An examination of its relationship to these conflicting traditions has still to be undertaken.

Abbreviations and Texts

MS : Manuscript of Nyāyabhidhāna. Microfilm of Manuscripts of Śrī Hemacandraśārya Jaina Jñāna Man-
NV : Nyāyavārttika in NBh. NVTT : Nyāyavārttikatāryaparavājika in NBh. NSā : Nyāyasūra in NBhūṣ. NSū : Nyāvasūra in NBh.

1) SD is classified also in the Vaiśeṣika and Sāmkhya schools according to the invisibility of the sādhya. These schools might have influenced Bhā's classification. 2) Here this must refer to sādhya in the sense that a particular thing is established if the sādhya is established as general. Cf. S. Yamakami, Nyāya gakuha no Bukkyō hihan (Analysis of the Nyāyabhidhāna Pratyakṣa-pariccheda) (Kyoto, 1999), 341f. 3) Cf. Y amakami, ibid., 381f; L. V. Joshi, A Critical Study of the Pratyakṣa Pariccheda of Bhāsarvajña's Nyāyabhidhāna (Ahmedabad, 1986), 179f, 289f, 491.
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