[德] Eberhard Guhe 艾伯哈德·顾鹤

Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna's "Brief Notes on the Modern Nyāya System of Philosophy and its Technical Terms"

Introduction, Edition and Annotated Translation

大自在月正理宝的《新正理哲学体系及其术语简释》：
导论、文本与译注

［德］Eberhard Guhe 艾伯哈德·顾鹤

Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna's "Brief Notes on the Modern Nyāya System of Philosophy and its Technical Terms"

Introduction, Edition and Annotated Translation

大自在月正理宝的《新正理哲学体系及其术语简释》：
导论、文本与译注

Preface

When I started studying Navya-Nyāya as a student, I got a copy of Maheśa
Chandra* Nyāyaratna's "Brief Notes on the Modern Nyāya System of Philo-
sophy and its Technical Terms" (cf. BN) from my supervisor Gerhard Ober-
hammer. He told me that this short Sanskrit work dating from the end of the
nineteenth century was especially recommended as an introduction to Navya-
Nyāya terminology by his teacher Erich Frauwallner. Daniel H. H. Ingalls also
used it extensively for his pioneering "Materials for the Study of Navya-Nyāya
Logic" (cf. Ingalls 1951). So, it occurred to me that Maheśa Chandra's manual
might become a very effective didactic instrument for the training of future
Navya-Nyāya adepts if a reliable annotated translation were also available.

When I chose BN as a textbook for a Sanskrit reading class which I offered
at Fudan University/Shanghai in summer term 2012, I was not aware that the
work had already been translated by Ujjwala Jha (cf. Jha 2004). I came to
know about Jha's monograph only after I had finished my own translation[†]
and then I considered to give up my original plan to publish it. But when I had
studied Jha's book, which is certainly well done, I realized that it might still
make sense to have another edition and annotated translation.

---

*Since this is the transliteration of his name in BN and in NNBP (cf. in particular the
biographical notes referring to Maheśa Chandra in NNBP: 95f), I will stick to it here. In Jha
2004 we find different spellings, namely "Mahesha Chandra", "Maheshchandra" and "Mahesh-
candra". "Maheśacandra", the standard transliteration of the Devanāgarī version of the name
(cf. NNBP: 1), does not seem to be the preferred spelling.

†I am indebted here to Jonardon Ganeri, who was so kind to give me a copy of Jha's
book as a present.

Jha's edition and translation are not based on the primary text (BN), but on a later edition (NNBP), which is not always reliable.[‡] Several passages of the original (especially some of the footnotes in BN) are missing in NNBP. Otherwise the text of BN is more or less just reproduced in NNBP with some tacit corrections of obvious misprints. *saṃdhi* abnormalities in BN are mostly retained in NNBP.

Apart from providing an edition and a translation which are based on BN a major concern of the present work is to make the primary text accessible to students and scholars in China, where studies on Navya-Nyāya are still a novelty. Although Jha diligently explains the Sanskrit text in her notes, less experienced Sanskritists might appreciate to have a more literal translation when they track the original by means of the translation. A synopsis of the contents and a glossary of Sanskrit termini technici in BN (including those not mentioned in BN, but referred to in the introduction) should render further assistance.[§]

[‡]I am indebted to Parimal Patil for sending me a copy of NNBP. Jha refers already in the sub-title of her monograph to NNBP ("Navya-Nyāya-Bhāṣā-Pradīpa of MM Mahesha Chandra Nyayaratna") and she states explicitly that her own edition is based on NNBP: "The text of *Navyanyāyabhāṣāpradīpa* which appears continuously in the Calcutta Sanskrit College Publication, is presented here by dividing it into different numbered units, such as: . . . " (Jha 2004: 18)

NNBP contains also a translation into Bengali and the commentary Suprabhā by the editor Kalipa Tarkāchārya. Since I am not proficient in Bengali, I could not consult the translation. The Suprabhā seems to be rather an elaboration of Maheśa Chandra's ideas and is probably not indispensable for a correct understanding of the primary text.

[§]Apart from the Sanskrit-English dictionaries Apte 1992 and Monier Williams 1899 I consulted Ingalls 1951 for appropriate English equivalents, especially as regards Navya-Nyāya termini technici. The only major deviation from Ingalls is my translation of *prakāra* as "characteristic" instead of "chief qualifier" (cf. Ingalls 1951: 43). Since Maheśa Chandra explains that *prakāra* and *viśeṣaṇa* ("qualifier") are used synonymously in Navya-Nyāya (cf. BN: 20, 2), I chose a translation for *prakāra* which means roughly the same as "qualifier", namely

The formal reconstruction of Navya-Nyāya logic which I am undertaking
in the introduction goes far beyond Jha's explanations. It is – like any such
reconstruction – a matter of interpretation and therefore maybe less important
for novices in the field of Navya-Nyāya studies whose aim is to acquire some
basic knowledge about the system. However, logicians, whom I am especially
addressing there, might be interested in the much heralded connections between
Navya-Nyāya and modern logic. Therefore I felt the need to comment on this
topic in a way which I find satisfactory and so far I have not yet come across
any alternative approach in the literature which really convinces me.

Since a scanned version of Maheśa Chandra's manual is easily available on
the internet, I saw no need to replicate the Devanāgarī text. I have provided
a transliterated version with normalized *saṃdhi*s instead, because less experi-
enced Sanskritists might be baffled by the abundance of violations of *saṃdhi*
rules in the original.

Moreover, partly owing to the fact that Jha chose NNBP as a textual basis
there are some defects in her replication of the Sanskrit text and some errors
or inaccuracies in her translation need to be corrected as well.

1) She skipped some passages of the original, in particular all the footnotes.
This is a list of Jha's omissions:

BN: 10, 25 – 27; 11, 18 – 27; 11, 15 – 12, 2 (*asmin ... varttate.*); 12, 7 (*evaṃ
... ekaikasmin*); 13, 21 – 29; 14, 7 – 8 (*nāpi ... varttate.*); 15, 4 – 5 (*niyāmakaḥ
... yaś ca*); 16, 15 (*gandhasya ... avacchedakaḥ.*); 16, 23 – 26; 18, 24 – 26; 19,
20 – 27; 20, 5 – 6 (*viśeṣaṇam ... giritvañ ca*); 21, 23 – 28

"characteristic". It is only for the sake of indicating that there are different lexical items in
the Sanskrit text that I use also different expressions for translating *prakāra* and *viśeṣaṇa*.

2) In several cases Jha (or rather the editor of NNBP) has tacitly corrected misprints of the original. But new typos have also slipped in. Some of them are listed below (including omissions of individual words):[¶]

- *evaṃ* (Text 1: 21, 1), read: *eva* (BN: 8, 9)

- *siddhāntitam* (Text 6: 30, 10), read: *siddhāntitaḥ* (BN: 9, 12)

- *daṇḍapuruṣayoḥ* (BN: 9, 14) is missing in Text 7: 33, 2

- *viśeṣyaviśeṣaṇabhāvaprayojakaḥ* (Text 7: 33, 2), read: *viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhā-vaprayojakaḥ* (BN: 9, 14)

- *saṃyogasambandhaḥ* (Text 7: 33, 2), read: *saṃyogaḥ sambandhaḥ* (BN: 9, 14f)

- *sambanddhau* (Text 12: 45, 3), read: *sambaddhau* (BN: 10, 8)

- *tiṣṭhati sati svāśraya-puruṣāśrayatva-sambandhena* (Text 17: 54, 2), read: *tiṣṭhati svāśrayapuruṣāśrayatvasambandhena* (BN: 11, 10)

- *tasya* (BN: 12, 5) is missing in Text 19: 57, 3f

- *evañ ca* (BN: 12, 9) is missing in Text 19: 57, 6

- *ekasminn* (Text 19: 57, 8), read: *ekaikasminn* (BN: 12, 11)

- *tatra viṣayāḥ ghaṭapaṭādayo jñānecchādau viṣayitāsambandhena vartan-te. viṣayatāsambandhena ca jñānecchādayo ghaṭapaṭādau viṣaye tiṣṭhan-tīti.* (Text 21: 61, 1f), read: *tatra viṣayāḥ ghaṭapaṭādayo jñānecchādau viṣayatāsambandhena varttante. viṣayitāsambandhena ca jñānecchādayo ghaṭapaṭādau viṣaye tiṣṭhantīti.* (BN: 12, 16f)

- *pūrvoktayor ūdāharaṇayoḥ* (Text 23: 66, 5), read: *pūrvoktayoḥ udāhara-ṇayoḥ* (BN: 13, 3)

[¶]I render Maheśa Chandra's text here without any emendations. Jha's edition is divided into several sections entitled "Text 1, Text 2" etc. In references to her edition I count only the lines in these sections.

– *vāyuḥ rūpābhāvasya anuyogi* (Text 25: 73, 6), read: *vāyuḥ rūpābhāvas-yānuyogī* (BN: 13, 18)

– *ekatra* (BN: 14, 3) is missing in Text 26: 75, 2

– *paṭasya* (BN: 14, 4) is missing in Text 26: 75, 4

– *bahirvṛttitvarūpeṇa* (Text 26: 75, 4), read: *bahirvṛttitvaviśiṣṭapaṭatvarūpe-ṇa* (BN: 14, 5)

– *samavāyasambandhāvacchinnapratiyogitāko* (Text 27: 78, 7f), read: *sama-vāyasambandhāvacchinnaghaṭatvāvacchinnapratiyogitāko* (BN: 14, 17f)

– *'tva' 'tal͂(?)' (tā) prabhṛtibhāvapratyayaniṣpanno* (Text 30: 92, 1f), read: *'tva'-'tā'-prabhṛti-bhāvapratyayaniṣpanno* (BN: 15, 13f)

– *bhavati* (BN: 15, 23) is missing in Text 31: 94, 3

– *tadavacchedakadharmāḥ* (BN: 15, 26 – 27) is missing in Text 32: 96, 1f

– *avyāpyavṛttipadārthasya vṛttitāyāḥ kaścit sīmāparicchedakaḥ asti.* (Text 34: 99, 1), read: *avyāpyavṛttipadārthasya kaścit vṛttitāyāḥ sīmāparicche-dako 'sti.* (BN: 16, 9)

– *sambandhasya* (BN: 17, 2) is missing in Text 36: 105, 2

– *dharmiṇaḥ* (BN: 18, 9) is missing in Text 40: 112, 3

– *sādhyatā-avacchedaka-avacchedako* (Text 42: 115, 1), read: *sādhyatāvac-chedakatāvacchedako* (BN: 18, 17)

– *śvāsapraśvāsayor virāmaḥ iti* (BN: 18, 19) is missing in Text 42: 115, 3

– *śvāsa-praśvāsa-virāmatvarūpam* (Text 42: 115, 3), read: *śvāsapraśvāsavi-rāmarūpaṃ* (BN: 18, 19)

– *yathā* (BN: 18, 23) is missing in Text 43: 116, 2

– *kasyāpi* (Text 43: 116, 3), read: *kasyacid* (BN: 19, 1)

– *vahnitvāvacchinnasya* (BN: 19, 1f) is missing in Text 43: 116, 4

– *sarvam eva* (Text 46: 122, 3), read: *sarvvadaiva* (BN: 19, 15)

- *samṛdhdo* (Text 47: 125, 5), read: *samṛddho* (BN: 20, 5)

- *samṛdhdau* (Text 47: 125, 7), read: *samṛddhau* (BN: 20, 7)

- *viśeṣaṇatayā-pratīyata* (Text 47: 125, 7f), read: *viśeṣaṇatayā pratīyate* (BN: 20, 8)

- *sidhdaṃ* (Text 49: 128, 1), read: *siddhaṃ* (BN: 20, 15)

- *sidhdaṃ* (Text 49: 129, 5), read: *siddham* (BN: 20, 19)

- *viśeṣyamadhye* (Text 49: 129, 6), read: *uddeśyamadhye* (BN: 20, 20)

- *asidhdam* (Text 49: 129, 6), read: *asiddham* (BN: 20, 20)

- *viśeṣyamadhye* (Text 49: 129, 6), read: *uddeśyamadhye* (BN: 20, 20)

- *asidhdam* (Text 49: 129, 6), read: *asiddham* (BN: 20, 20)

- *vṛttitayā vidhānam.* (Text 50: 129, 4), read: *vṛttitayā) vidhānam.* (BN: 20, 23)

- *ekasmin viśeṣye* (BN: 21, 9) is missing in Text 52: 132, 1

- *ekasminn eva* (BN: 21, 10f) is missing in Text 52: 132, 2

- *tadabhāvaś ca* (Text 52: 132, 4), read: *manuṣyatvābhāvaś ca* (BN: 21, 13)

3) In cases where I agree with Jha's reading of the text I have tried to correct some errors or inaccuracies in her translation:[||]

- *upādhir api punaḥ sakhaṇḍopādhir akhaṇḍopādhiś ceti dvividhaḥ. khaṇ-*
  dena (aṃśena) saha vartata iti sakhaṇḍaḥ. yaś cāṃśato vibhaktuṃ śakya-
  te sa sakhaṇḍopādhir dharma iti yāvat. (BN: 8, 19f)

  "*Upādhi* (the other type of property) is also of two types: divisible and indivisible. That which has part (parts) is divisible and that which cannot be divided into parts is called an indivisible property." (Jha 2004: 28)

[||] The corresponding Sanskrit passages will be quoted from Maheśa Chandra's text in accordance with my own edition (including emendations and normalization of *saṃdhi*s).

Cf. my translation: "Imposed property is twofold, namely compound imposed property <literally: imposed property with parts> and simple imposed property <literally: imposed property without parts>. 'With parts' [means] 'It occurs with a part (with a fragment)'; and that is to say, what can be broken up into parts that property is a compound imposed property."

– *yathā bhāvatvaṃ tad dhy abhāvatvavirodhī kaścana dharma iti* ... (BN: 8, 26f)

"... e.g. *bhāvatva* or being. It is some property opposite to non-being or absence." (Jha 2004: 29)

Cf. my translation: "Such as reality. This is a certain property which is opposed to absenceness."

– *jāter apy aṃśavibhāgo nāsti.* (BN: 9, 1)

"Even jāti or universal does not have any parts." (Jha 2004: 29)

Cf. my translation: "A universal has also no division into parts."

– *sambandhaḥ saṃnikarṣaḥ* ... (BN: 9, 13)

"Relation is closeness or proximity." (Jha 2004: 33)

Cf. my translation: "A relation is a connection ..."**

– *yāvadādhāraṃ yāvadādheyaṃ vā samavāyas tiṣṭhatīti samavāyo nitya-sambandha ity ucyate.* (BN: 9, 22f)

"Inherence is called an eternal relation because it continues (to exist) so long as either the locus or the located exists." (Jha 2004: 40)

Cf. my translation: "Or one talks about inherence as an eternal relation in the sense that inherence occurs insofar as there is a substratum and a

---

**This translation seems more appropriate, because later Maheśa Chandra points out that there is no limit to the distance between the members of an indirect relation, as Jha herself notices (cf. Jha 2004: 47).

superstratum."

– *sambandhāntaraghaṭitaḥ (yasya sambandhasya nirmāṇe sambandhānta-rāpekṣā vidyate tādṛśaḥ) sambandhaḥ paramparāsambandhaḥ. yathā sva-samavāyisamavetatvarūpeṇa sāmānādhikaraṇyanāmakena paramparāsam-bandhena paṭe tantor api rūpam asti.* (BN: 9, 28f)

"A relation which consists of another relation (i.e. a relation such that it expects another relation to come into being) is called an indirect relation, namely, co-locatedness in the form of being inherent in a locus where it itself is inherent' [sic!], the colour of threads also resides in the cloth." (Jha 2004: 43)

Cf. my translation: "An indirect relation is a relation which is brought about by another relation ([i.e.] such [a relation] which has dependence on another relation when the relation is fabricated). On account of the indirect relation called 'co-occurrence' in the form of the being inherent of one's own [property] in what is inhered in, e.g., the colour of the thread is in the cloth."

– *yatheccham sambandhisambandhādikam ādāya dīrghadīrghataradīrghata-mā asaṃkhyā eva te kalpayitum śakyante.* (BN: 10, 7f)

"One can imagine an indirect relationship, long-longer and longest, by arbitrarily taking any relatum and any relation of any number." (Jha 2004: 46)

Cf. my translation: "With relata, relations etc. according to one's wishes they <i.e. indirect relations>, which are distant, quite distant or very distant, can be regarded as countless."

– *tathā hi svasamrāḍadhikṛtarājyatvasambandhena bhāratavarṣīyāḥ sarva evāryā anāryāś cemlaṇḍe santi. imlaṇḍīyāś ca tatra sthitā api svarāj-yeśvarīsāmrājyasambandhena bhāratavarṣe tiṣṭhantīti.* (BN: 10, 9f)

"All Indians - *aryas* [sic!] as well as *anāryas* - exist in England by the indirect relation, namely, 'the state of being the kingdom under the authority of their own king (actually queen)'. Similarly, all English people reside in India, though actually they are in England, by the (indirect) relation, 'the state of being the empire of their own queen'." (Jha 2004: 46)

Cf. my translation: "Thus, those Indians who come from a noble family and those who do not come from a noble family are all in England on account of the relation 'possessing a government which superintends one's own government'. And although they are there <i.e. in England>, the Englishmen are in India on account of the relation between [the Indians'] own government and the empire of the queen."

– *yathā pūrvokta udāharaṇe svaśabdena bhāratavarṣīyān abhipretya sva-samrāḍadhikṛtarājyatvasambandhasyārambhaḥ. tac ca rājyatvam imlaṇḍe vartata iti tasyemlaṇḍe paryavasānam. atas tena sambandhena bhārata-varṣīyā imlaṇḍe tiṣṭhanti.* (BN: 10, 13f)

"As, in the example mentioned before, the people of India are intended to be referred to by the word 'itself', which is the beginning (point) of the relationship, namely, the state of being the kingdom under the rule of one's own emperor, such a state of being the kingdom, is existent in England and so England is the termination (point) of the same (relation) and hence the people of India exist in England by that relationship." (Jha 2004: 47)

Cf. my translation: "In the afore-mentioned example, e.g., the Indians, who are meant by the word 'own', are the beginning <i.e. the initial point> of the relation 'possessing a government which superintends one's own government'. And since this <i.e. the British> government resides in England, this [relation] has its final end in England. Therefore, the

Indians depend on England on account of this relation."

– *samavāyasambandhena punar dvitvasaṃkhyā dvayor ekaikasminn api tiṣ-ṭhatīti samavāyasambandhena dvitvāśraya ity artham abhipretya dvitva-vān iti prayogaḥ. tataś cāyaṃ na dvau kiṃtu dvitvavān iti vākyasyāyaṃ na paryāptisambandhena dvitvavān kiṃtu samavāyasambandhena dvitva-vān ity arthaḥ.* (BN: 12, 10f)

"But number two resides in each of both by the relation of inherence and hence the usage: (this) possess number two occurs with the intention that this is the locus of number two by the relation of inherence. And thus, the sentence, 'this is not two but possesses number two', simply means, 'this does not possess number two by the relation of *paryāpti* but by it has number two by the relation of inherence.'" (Jha 2004: 58)

Cf. my translation: "But since the number 'twoness' depends on each of two [things] via inherence relation there is the usage 'It has twoness' with the intended meaning 'It is the substrate of twoness via inherence relation'. And therefore the sentence 'This is not two, but it possesses twoness' has the meaning 'This does not possess twoness via *paryāpti* relation, but it possesses twoness via inherence relation.'"

– *yo 'bhāvo yasya virodhī pratipakṣo yaś cābhāvo yasya ghaṭasyābhāvaḥ pa-ṭasyābhāva ity ādirītyā yatsambandhitayābhāvaḥ pratīyate tat tasyābhā-vasya pratiyogi bhavati.* (BN: 13, 13f)

"(To explain:) when an absence has a counterpositive; it is an absence of whatever (object) like absence of pot, absence of cloth etc. as the absence is understood as related to something then that something is the counter-positive of that absence." (Jha 2004: 73)

Cf. my translation: "That is the counterpositive of that absence which absence is the opposite counterpart of that <counterpositive> and which

is an absence of that as whose relatum the absence is cognized on account of usages like 'The absence of pot, the absence of cloth' etc."

– *yathā śuklapaṭavati gṛhe paṭatvarūpeṇa sāmānyadharmeṇa vartamānas-yāpi paṭasya nīlaghaṭatvarūpeṇa viśeṣadharmeṇa bahirvṛttitvaviśiṣṭapaṭa-tvarūpeṇa vā viśiṣṭadharmeṇa paṭaghaṭobhayatvarūpeṇa vobhayatvapuras-kāreṇābhāvo bhavati.* (BN: 14, 3f)

"For example, in the house, where (only) white cloth exists, even if it exists in the form of cloth (in general), it is absent in the house by the specific property (in the particular form) of blue cloth or (in the form of) by the specific property of being existent outside or by promoting (the absence) both-ness in the form of cloth and pot both." (Jha 2004: 76)

Cf. my translation: "When a house, e.g., possesses a white cloth, there is absence of the cloth, which occurs with a generic property in the form of clothness, due to a specific property in the form of blue-clothness, or due to a qualified property in the form of clothness specified by occurring outside, or due to prefixing 'being both' in the form of 'being both, [i.e.] cloth and pot'."

– *yena sambandhena yena vā dharmeṇāvacchinnā bhavati sa sambandhaḥ sa ca dharmas tasyāḥ pratiyogitāyā avacchedako bhavati.* (BN: 14, 13f)

"By whatever relation or by whatever property the counter-positiveness is delimited, that relation of that property is (said to be) the delimitor of that counter-positiveness." (Jha 2004: 79)

Cf. my translation: "That relation and that property are <each> a limi-tor of this counterpositiveness by which it is limited."

– *athavā sthūlata evaṃrītyā bodhyaṃ pratiyogibodhakaviśeṣyapadottaraṃ tvatāprabhṛtibhāvapratyayaniṣpanno (niṣpannapadavācyaḥ) dharmaḥ pra-tiyogitāvacchedako bhavati.* (BN: 15, 13f)

"Or in a broader manner one should understand like this: whichever word stands for a counter-positive, a suffix standing for abstraction such as *tva* or *tā* should be added to it and then whatever word is thus obtained - the property which is the meaning of such a word is the delimitor of counter-positive." (Jha 2004: 92)

Cf. my translation: "Or it is to be understood roughly in this way: A property produced ([or rather:] expressed by a word produced) by means of suffixes for "being" like -*tva* [or] -*tā* etc. after the word for the qualificand indicative of the counterpositive is the limitor of the counterpositiveness."

– *evaṃ rūpābhāvasya pratiyogivācakaṃ rūpapadam. tatra tvapratyayaniṣpannapadasyārtho rūpatvaṃ jātiḥ. rūpābhāvasya pratiyogitāyā avacchedikketi.* (BN: 15, 17f)

"Similarly, the word *rūpa* i.e. colour Stands (sic!) for the counter-positive of the absence of *rūpa* i.e. colour, here when the suffix *tva* is added, the meaning we obtain from the word (*rūpa* + *tva* = *rūpatva*) is the universal *rūpatva* or colourness and the same (*rūpatva*) is the delimitor of the counter-positiveness of the absence of colour." (Jha 2004: 92)

Cf. my translation: "In the same way the word 'colour' expresses the counterpositive of the absence of colour. In that case the meaning of the word produced by the suffix -*tva* is the universal colourness. It is particularizing for <i.e. it has a particularizing effect on> the counterpositiveness of the absence of colour."

– *tathāhi dvitīyābhāvaḥ (ghaṭābhāvābhāvaḥ) pratiyogi(ghaṭa)svarūpas tṛtīyābhāvaḥ (ghaṭābhāvābhāvābhāvaḥ) prathamābhāva(ghaṭābhāva)svarūpa iti prathamābhāvasya (ghaṭābhāvasya) ghaṭa iva dvitīyābhāvo 'pi (ghaṭābhāvābhāvo 'pi) pratiyogī.* (BN: 15, 27f)

"The second absence (absence of absence of pot) is same as the counterpositive; the third absence (absence of absence of the absence of pot)

is same as the first absence (namely, absence of pot) and therefore, the counter-positive of the first absence (i.e. absence of pot) is pot as well as the second absence (i.e. absence of a (sic!) absence of pot) also." (Jha 2004: 96)

Cf. my translation: "So, the second absence (the absence of the absence of pot) is essentially identical to the counterpositive (pot). The third absence (the absence of the absence of the absence of pot) is essentially identical to the first absence (the absence of pot). So, the second absence (the absence of the absence of pot) is like 'pot' of the first absence (the absence of pot) a counterpositive."

Introduction

The "Brief Notes on the Modern Nyāya System of Philosophy and its Technical Terms" by Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna do not give a complete overview over the main concerns of Navya-Nyāya philosophy. The author rather focuses on the particular language used by the adherents of this system in order to explicate the content of verbalized and unverbalized cognitions. The semantic structure of a sentence is only considered insofar as it mirrors the objective content of the underlying cognitive event, i.e. the ensemble of perceived entities interrelated according to the rules of an ontological grammar. A Navya-Nyāya description of a cognitive event ultimately boils down to the relation between a property (*dharma*) and its locus (*adhikaraṇa*). Maheśa Chandra recognizes the important role attributed to these objective correlates of a cognitive event in Navya-Nyāya and he deals with them right in the beginning of his treatise.

Since the essentials of Vaiśeṣika, the system from which the Navya-Naiyā-yikas inherited their ontological categories, are easily accessible through many excellent publications (such as Frauwallner 1956 and Halbfass 1992), the present introductory remarks will be confined to a discussion of Maheśa Chandra's specification of the concepts "property" and "relation" from the point of view of modern logic. In Guhe 2008 I have argued that some interesting logical problems in other works of the Navya-Nyāya tradition, namely the anonymous Upādhi-darpaṇa (cf. UD) and Gaṅgeśa's Tattvacintāmaṇi (cf. TC), can be analysed by means of a Quine/Morse-style extension of Bealer's property calculus T1. I will use this approach in the present introduction as well. So, my presentation of the logical tools used for interpreting Navya-Nyāya logic (I) is basically the same as in Guhe 2008. Their applicability will be demonstrated by discussing four pertinent examples, namely Maheśa Chandra's reduction rules for iterated absences (II), his application of operations to properties and relations (III),