

INTRODUCTION

The Cosmic world has got the first and foremost responsibility of awaking all our efforts. The world aware us in many different ways--- it is trying to make us cautious, but not enthrall. We are cautious because of enjoying our own conscious-authority.

A prince is handed to the teacher so that he will make able the Prince to rule the nation by removing his unwillingness through teachings. But sometimes it would seem that the teacher captivates the prince so much by his learning and when the prince gets the ruler ship, existing in name only. Ultimately the teacher ruled over the King, i.e. the teacher has great influences on the King by way of converting him. When the outer world becomes so powerful that it tries to take out our entire attempts, it is called *vāsanā*. This psychological process attached us to the various object of cosmic world. When something is presented in front of us, it draws our attention. In this way our mind become scattered in worldly objects. This is the easiest method to interact with other.

If *vāsanā* does not stop in a proper place, its excessiveness becomes prior to our life, and then our life cannot come out from this dark (*tāmasika*) situation. We cannot prove and fill our own authority. We are outside masters without gaining any kind of wealth. The present attraction takes us from one of our smaller to the smallest. In this situation man cannot build any permanent object.

This *vāsanā* is going to stop at desire (*icchā*). The objective of *vāsanā* is an outside affair; on the contrary, the goal of desire is an inner intention. Desire is the thing of heart. All of the *vāsanā* is bound up by the desire around a sincere purpose. The desire does not allow *vāsanā* to wonder outside as such.

Then people come from one to many. But if *vāsanā* is stronger than will, if it does not want to accept the intention, only then the external authority grows up and minimizes inner authority. And finally the purpose is lost. Then the work of human creation does not function. Where the will power is strong, where the authority is well established in heart, people evoke the attraction of darkness (*tāmasika*) and excel in *rājasika* qualities.

But the subject of *vāsanā* is as diverse as it is. In the same way, the subject of will is not only one in the realm of desire. Many more intentions come to mind in a couple of times. The intentions of learning, wealth, fame etc., become chief to an individual. Thus anarchy is created in the world of desire. This anarchy is dispelled when we associate all of our desire with the will of the world. That desire is the good-will of the world. It is neither just my wish, nor just your will, it is the basic eternal desire of the Cosmic world 1.

The desire is at the root of the universe, and hence, the *Upaniṣada* says about it-“*svābhāvīkījñānavalakriyāca*” i.e., it is easy and independent. There is no artificial influence outside of it. Our will when bound with the original eternal desire of the Universe leads to all of its actions that are normal in nature. That is, all of its actions are not done by any inclination. Pride does not let it push, the imitation of folk society does not create him, encouragement of communal factionalism does not give strength, blasphemy does not hurt him, harassment does not stop him, the misery of the material does not deter him.

Those who have associated their will to the will of Mars, they gain the immortal power of the Universe, that natural power of action ----there is a lot of

evidence of it in history. We may cite the instances of Goutam Buddha, Jesus Christ etc.

Buddha avoided the happiness and prosperity of Kapilāvastu and went to the welfare of the world, the treasury and soldiers had nothing to do with him. He is then equal to the tenants of his ancestral kingdom in external materials. But as he associated his desire with the eternal desire of Universe, his desire gained the natural action. Though he has lost his mortal body since a few centuries, but the natural desire of his good deeds is still going on today. It can still be seen in the secluded temple of Buddhagaya, a devotee surrenders to the world-welfare will and praying with his folded hands: "*Buddham śaranam gacchāmi*". Even today his teachings are giving life to people; his words are giving fearlessness to the people. His will still in action today, a thousand years later.

Another such radiant personality is Jesus. He was born in a stable and remote village --- not in any scholar's house, not in any King's palace, not in any opulent capital, even not in a great field of pilgrimage. Only a few Algerian youths who made living by fishing became his disciples. When the Roman emperor ordered him to be crucified, no sign was ever revealed the particular day that the day will be blessed forever in the history of the world. His enemies thought everything was gone; this tiny spark was completely crushed and extinguished. But no one can't put him out. The Lord Jesus reconciled his will with the will of Father--- that desire does not die; there is no end to his normal actions. What manifested itself in an extreme lean way on that day, has conquered the Universe after two thousand years.

The absolute good-power manifested his knowledge, power and action through the midst of unknown poverty. Evidence of this fact has been found repeatedly in history. From the above discussion we may easily draw our conclusion how important the role of desire plays in our lives. We cannot afford to violate it. Desire is inextricably linked with our existence.

Human beings have got their autonomy to think something in his own manner. The role of desire is of two -fold: -creative aspect and cognitive aspect. Any sort of creation is rooted in the seed of desire. On the same way, the 'desire' is a fundamental factor in epistemology, because it prompts us to perform certain activities. If human being is alienated from 'desire', then how much an atmosphere of peculiarity, mechanical and absurdity hanging over the whole life, has been shown by Rabindranath Tagore in his dance drama '*Tāserdeśa*' 2. Beside this he also has made an effort here to show that there is always a victory of one's desire ('*jai, icchār jai*'). In this drama Rabindranath introduces us to the land of artificiality having no room for autonomy. Mechanical order (*niyama*) has taken first and foremost position in the land of cards. That is why; the inhabitants of the land of cards are bound with so many rules which make them artificial and rule-based. Even the normal physical movements towards left or right, to bent shoulder etc are prohibited (*ghaḍbānkiyonāko...*).

In the very beginning of *Tāserdeśa*, same sort of disgusting attitude is found in the Prince. The cause of it was enquired by businessman, i.e. what is the reason of being fickle-minded? The Prince replied that this fickleness is what is called 'natural' which is found in the group of swans rushing towards the Himalayas in a body. He has expressed his wish to the businessman that he wants

to fly in the sky like those birds, free from all the bindings. Sometimes he feels that as usual life of palace had made himself just like a bird confined within a golden cage. Due to fickleness of his mind, he is starting blame all the rules and rituals of palace which make his life boring. He wants to be free from all these rites and rituals, and decides to go somewhere else like those birds, in spite of having a permanent residence. He has made a number of instances in favor of his decision. The businessman asked the royal Queen (*Rājamātā*) that the Prince was determined in searching of knowing the unknown. Finally the royal Queen blessed the prince towards his unknown destiny.

The Prince came in new-land along with his attendant acting as co-businessman. According to his own words, '*elem natundeśe* (we have arrived at a new country). But the businessman criticizes the term '*natundeśe*' after observing the peculiar activity of the inhabitants of the land and has defined it as a land of death (*marādeśa*).

They were enjoying after seeing various peculiar activities of the inhabitants of that land. At that time the Prince thinks that these kinds of attitudes hint the fact that such type of absurdness is a kind of an imposition, made by the masters of land of cards. The purpose behind there is that they have to read off such veil of artificiality so that the natural form of life may come out and will make wonder.

Prince and businessman have defined those activities of the inhabitants of the land as 'dance of ghosts in a dying-land' (*marādehe bhūternṛtya*) and they were laughing at it. This was noticed by the inhabitants of this land and they think that prince and businessman cut joke about them. They take it too seriously and

have got angry and said that 'laughing' is strictly prohibited here as it violates 'order' (*niyama*) in *Tāserdeśa*'.

Prince replied that whatever they were performing has no significance or meaning at all. During this conversation they introduce themselves together and came to know that they have reached in a new land, named '*Tāserdeśa*'. And the Desire is revealed in the form of beauty, prayer, truth, love and enjoyment. For Rabindranath Tagore, desire of God is twofold- 1) Where desire manifested in the form of rules (*vidhāna*) is nature (*prakṛti*) and the same desire manifested in the form of enjoyment (*ānanda*) is regarded as self (*ātman*). We prayed to God as he is the possessor of *icchāvṛtti* or a desirable state of mind; he is regarded as '*ānandarūpam-amṛitamī*. i.e., in the form of Bliss and Immortality.'

Gradually, Prince and businessman realize that each and every smallest activity is regulated by 'order' in land of cards. The slogan of this land is '*calo niyamamata*' i.e. 'to move forward as per rules'. But the prince opposed this view point and hinted at the forest, fountains, hills where there is no restrictive order. Actually, the inhabitants of *Tāserdeśa* have taken 'order' in an objective manner; they think that it is (*niyama*) rule which moves us throughout our whole lives. They are of the view-point that why will a man move forward? But it is restrictive order which will drive the movers (*calā! calābe keno tumi! calābe niyama*). There regulation is identified with self.

In the last section of the dance drama we see that Prince and his co-businessman have got success in their plan to some extent in order to bring changes in women of *Tāserdeśa*. The flow of new thoughts extends to the entire land and these have made them realized that how much artificiality they are

holding their life. And also realize the important role of desire in the field of individual being. Now they are in a new chapter in their life.

This particular desire (*icchā*) impels us to obtain knowledge and to perform different types of action autonomously. So, desire and intellect is not contradictory to each other, rather they are complementary to one another. Desire makes us curious for knowing the unknown, seeing the unseen and exploring the unexplored.

The concept of desire is revealed by the old Naiyāyikas as a quality (*guṇa*) of soul. Soul is defined as '*jñānadhikaraṇam*' (i.e. the substrate of *jñāna* or cognition). And soul is of two types –Supreme Soul (*paramātmā*) and Finite Soul (*jīvātmā*). TSD defines Supreme soul as 'the substrate of an eternal state of consciousness'; on the contrary Finite Soul is many in number, eternal and ubiquitous. In TS it is further stated that the word '*jñānadhikaraṇa*' (locus of cognition) alone cannot be taken as a mark of defining soul; '*icchādhikarana* and *prayatnādhikaraṇa* – these two terms also hint both forms of soul. Annam Bhatta asserts that cognition (*jñāna*), desire (*icchā*) and volition or effort (*prayatna*) - these three are equally stated as the qualities (*guṇa*) of soul. The Neo-logicians also admit (*icchā*) desire as one of quality among 23 qualities mentioned in *Bhāṣāpariccheda*³.

'Desire' is something which serves as window in human civilization. Through 'desire' (*icchā*) one can exert oneself. Hence where there is excessive will, there is desirelessness. For this reason it makes a human being artificial dealing with only law. Implementation of law without giving any freedom is not desirable at all, as it leads to dishonor to human being. An individual is

combination of both choice and intellect. Any type of creation, social changes are made possible through desire of an individual. Whenever we perform any action, or we go in quest of something is because of desire. Desire can represent the different aspects of this-worldly phenomenon.

The *Nyāya* philosophy is a famous school of thought among six orthodox (*āstika*) systems as admitted in Indian Philosophy. The *Nyāya* philosophy has been divided into two parts after Udayanācārya –*Prācīna* and *Navya**Nyāya*. This particular system primarily concerns with object of knowledge (*pramā*) and means of knowing (*pramāṇa*). Sometimes *Nyāya* Philosophy is called *anvīksikī*, which comes from the words ‘*anu*’ (*afterwords*) and ‘*īkṣā*’ (*viewing*). Hence the term *anvīkṣā* means critical viewing 4. The school primarily dealing with such critical observation is called *ānvīksikī* or the science of reasoning or Logic.

A comparative study between old and neo-logicians can be discussed on the basis of following points 5.

- 1) Maharṣi Gotama is said to be the profounder of *Nyāya* school of thought and his time of appearance is almost 6th-7th century. The world view he has formulated is known as *Prācīna**Nyāya*. Apart from him, the great thinkers named with Vātsyāyana, Uddyotakara, Vācaspati Miśra, Udayana and Jayanta Bhatta are included in this old-discipline.

The well-known works of this discipline, such as Gotama’s *Nyāyasūtra*, Vātsyāyana’s *Nyayabhāṣya*, Vācaspati’s *Nyāyavārtika*, Udayana’s *Nyaya-Vārtika-tātparyaṭīka* are collectively known as *Nyāyacaturagranthikā* (i.e., combination of four major books of *Nyāya* system). And it would be said that *Nyāyakusumānjali* marked the boundary between *Prācīna* and *Navya* school of thought.

On the contrary, the period of NavyaNyāya begins from 14th century. It begins with the epoch-making *Tattvacintāmaṇi* of Gangeśa. All the books of *Nyāya* written between 14th to 17th centuries probably from Gangeśa to Gadādhara are included in *Navya-Nyāya*. Gangeśa was the inhabitant of Mithila and his teachings concluded in Mithilā up to Pakṣadhara Miśra during 15th century. Later, the teachings have been spread in Nadiyā. The name of another who first introduced *NavyaNyāya* in Nadiyā, he wrote a commentary on *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. From then *Navya Nyāya* became famous continuously in Nadiyā, and the group of Mithila became fade. Since then, the neo-logicians of Nadiyā maintain the progress which was admitted by the Indian scholars.

Raghunath Śiromani was contemporary of the famous Vaisnava reformer Caitanyadeva. Raghunath Śiromani, Mathurānāth Tarkavāgīśa, Jagadīśa Tarkālankāra, are the eminent logicians of this school. *NavyaNyāya* language is adopted in order to remove the inadequacy of natural language. This discipline has developed a systematic language through which a concept can be analysed non-ambiguously. By applying this sort of language, philosophical discussion can touch all the domain of human activities. The way of philosophizing has flourished in such new thinkers.

2) The language, *NavyaNaiyāyikas* have adopted after reforming Sanskrit language is widely accepted by other disciplines also like Advaitins, Grammarians etc. They define the nature of object of knowledge much more accurately, precisely than from old *Nyāya* thinkers. Neo-logicians have developed a kind of systematic language through which a concept can be analyzed non-ambiguously.

3) Philosopher tries to systematize the world in an order and classification in worldly entities is the way to explain phenomena. So, old *Nyāya* thinkers have classified whole world i.e., internal or external, in 16 categories. Gotama has admitted liberation (*mokṣa*) as an ultimate goal of human life. And until and unless we acquire right cognition of worldly objects, *niḥśreyasa* cannot be attained.

Tattvajñāna helps us to discover the real nature of an object; i.e. to explore 'x' as 'x' and 'y' as 'y'. So, through the development of *Tattvajñāna*, the effect of *mithyājñāna* can be taken out and finally an individual can achieve *apavarga*.

On the contrary, Neo-logicians have introduced innumerable entities in order to explain their world-view in their own different manner. Apart from *saṁyoga* and *samavāya*, they admit some of new categories like *avacchedaka* (*limitor*), self-linking relation (*svarūpa-sambandha*), *nirūpya–nirūpakasambandha* (*contextual properties*), *ādhāratā*, *ādheyatā*, *kāraṇatā*, *kāryatā*, *vyayadhikaraṇatā*, *viśeṣaṇatā–viśesa*, *tādātmya* etc. and hold that acceptance of these categories are necessary for developing the growth of philosophical discussion. These newly-introduced entities play a significant role in the region of logical thinking and help to attain valid cognition regarding an object.

4) The old *Naiyāyikas* have shown their equal interest both in epistemology (*pramāṇatattva*) and metaphysical (*prameyatattva*) discussion. So, the discussion based on four types of *pramāṇa* equally has been founded in the field of *ātmatattva*, mind (*manas*), space (*dik*), time (*kāla*) etc.

Comparatively neo-logicians have emphasized on epistemology. It can be further stated that, Gangeśa wrote four sections of *Tattvacintāmaṇi* which was based on four different kinds of *pramāṇa*. In this way, epistemological discussion became more analytic and the various smallest things which were overlooked in *PrācīnaNyāya* discipline have been elaborated in *NavyaNyāya* school of thought. As the Neo-logicians especially concentrate on epistemology, their assertion about metaphysics is restricted by limitation. In *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, only the concept of God has been discussed.

So, it is clear from the above discussion that *NavyaNaiyāyikas*, intellectual contribution to epistemology is more significant than *Prācīna Nyāya*.

5) In *PrācīnaNyāya*, the opponents mainly belong to Buddhist–logicians. But the position of opponents has been changed in *NavyaNyāya* Philosophy. Mainly, *Prābhākara Mīmāṃsakas* and *Prācīna Naiyāyikas* have been found as *Pūrvapakṣa*.

6) Old-logicians have cited different examples from *Śruti*, in order to substantiate the existence of God, soul etc. But Neo-logicians always have a tendency to resist them from mentioning such examples of *Śruti*. They present metaphysical doctrine through proper reasoning. Arguments for the existence of God as stated by Gangeśa can be shown here. He has mentioned the causal argument as a proof for the existence of God which is as follows.

“*KṣityankurādikaṃKartṛjanyamKāryatvātghaṭavat*” -- The earth and its dyadic compound are created by an agent, as it is an effect, just as a jar. Finally, he quoted a sentence from *Śruti* which he did not explain. He stated that God, having created heaven and earth, has become the agent of the world and

protector of the world (*“dyāvābhumījanayan devo viśvasyakartābhuvanasyagoptā”*).

Indian Philosophers have undertaken some methods of debate regarding the determination of the truth of an object. These methods are neither biased nor dogmatic, but based on some ethical and argumentative values. Logic developed in Indian soil is called *vāda*, a discipline dealing with the categories of debate over various religious, philosophical, moral and doctrinal issues. They are introduced in order to train the students who wanted to learn how to conduct debates successfully, what tricks to learn, how to find out loopholes of the opponent’s position etc. Debate, according to the *Naiyāyikas*, can be of three types: a) an honest debate called *vāda* where both sides, proponents and opponents, are seeking the truth, i.e., **desirous** to establish the right view, b) a tricky debate called *jalpa* where the goal is to win by fair means or foul and c) destructive debate called *vitanḍā* where the goal is to defeat or demolish the opponents. The first kind favors the employment of logical arguments, and use of rational means and proper evidence to establish a thesis. It is said that the participants in this kind of debate were the teacher and the student or students themselves belonging to the same school. In honest debate *the desire for knowing truth (tattvabhūtsu)* is the fundamental basis.

In the *Nyāya* system of Indian Philosophy the right cognition of categories leads us to the attainment of the mundane and transcendental values which are called *dr̥ṣṭa* (seen) and *adr̥ṣṭa* (unseen) well-being (*niḥśreyasa*). The ethics of propagating such view lies in the fact that the right cognition of the categories can associate us with mundane well-being which has got some

pragmatic value in our life. At the same time, the import of the transcendental value like emancipation etc has not been ignored. The right cognition of the categories like '*pramāṇa*' ('means of knowing') '*vāda*' ('debate to arrive at truth without any desire to get victory over the opponent'), '*jalpa*' (argumentation for achieving victory, but not truth), '*vitandā*' (argument only to refute others views without substantiating one's own), '*chala*' ('adopting tricks in argumentation'), '*hetvābhāsa*' (fallacy of arguments') etc leads to the former while the right cognition of the 'objects to be known' ('*prameya*') leads to the latter. In a debate between an opponent and a proponent the determination of truth which is called technically *vāda* is the main objective of the *Naiyāyikas* leaving the question of victory aside. In the *vāda* type of debate there should be the adoption of one of the two opposing sides (*pakṣa-pratipakṣa-parigraha*), which is defended by *pramāṇa* and *tarka* (*pramāṇa-tarka-sādhanopalambha*) and which is not opposed to the established tenets (*siddhāntābirudhha*) 6.

If the desire of victory prevails in debate, and determination of truth is by passed, it is called *jalpa*, which is not taken as an ideal pattern of forwarding argument in a philosophical debate. If someone refutes the opponent's view only without forwarding his own, it is called *vitandā*, which is not honored as a better philosophical method. Hence each and every theory based on philosophical doctrine is called *vāda*, e.g., *nirvikalpakavāda*, *apohavāda*, *īśvaravāda* etc.

We may recall Udayana in this connection. To him if there is mistrust among the family--members, social-beings etc, our empirical doubt will not be possible. If, on the other hand, there is no doubt, there does not arise any philosophical enquiry. (*Śamkācedanumāstyevanacecchankātatastarām /*

vyāghātāvadhīrāsankātarkahśamkāvadhīrmatah.//) If there is doubt, there is inferential cognition or an inferential procedure is to be resorted to with a view to resolving doubt. If not, inference is established easily. Such doubt is permissible so long there does not arise self-contradiction (*vyāghāta*). Sometime the method of Tarka (reductio-ad-absurdum) is taken into account. From this it is proved that doubt has got a positive role in philosophical methodology if it is taken as a category 7.

Apart from the above-mentioned arguments we can supply some from common sense point of view. Any discovery, scientific or philosophical, presupposes doubt about something. Newton had discovered the law of gravitation as he had some doubt regarding the falling of an apple downwards. His doubt was why it cannot go up. Before this inducement many times apple had fallen down, but no question was raised about it due to the absence of doubt. That is why; doubt is taken as the key of discovery or invention. Doubt prompts an individual to question regarding something. If there is questioning, it is to be presupposed that there prevails a kind of doubt. Our *Upaniṣadas* start with a question from an innocent disciple 8. The *Kenopaniṣada* has started with a question which runs as follows: '*keneṣītāmpatatiṣṣitammanah, kenaprānahprathamapraitīyuktah/ keneṣītāmvācamimāmvadanticakṣuhśrotram ka u devo yunakti//*'. That is, by whose desire does our mind direct towards an object? By whom our vital organ has received first prominence? Why whose desire our speaking organ functions? And by whom our eye and hearing organs are engaged in revealing the objects. Again, in *Kathopaniṣada* Naciketā asks the question of knowing self to great teacher *Yama*, which is very much appreciated as '*barāṇameṣobarastṛtīyaḥ*' (i.e., among the three boons third was the most

desired one as it involves doubt regarding self). Following the same line Maitreyī in *BṛhadāranyakaUpaniṣada* asks the question to Yājñavalkya- ‘*yenāhamnāmṛtamsyāmtenāhamkimkuryāma*’ (What can do with that which cannot provide me Immortality?). Even Narendranath who was known as Swami Vivekananda afterwards went to Ramakrishna with a question- ‘Have you seen God?’ All these questions are prompted by some doubt regarding a particular object. Keeping this in view *Śrīmadbhagavad-gītā* has taken *paripraśna* or repeatedly questioning as a method of learning (*pranipātenaparipraśnenasevayā*). In fact there are three methods of learning- repeatedly questioning (*paripraśna*), deep regards towards teachers (*pranipāta*) and service to the teachers (*sevā*). All these activities are backed by certain doubt to know the truth. In ancient time when a student used to feel tension being disturbed by some doubt regarding some incident, he tried to dispel his /her doubt through questioning about this again and again. Sometimes the teacher is given service to get some enlightenment from him, which is also prompted by doubt in mind on certain subject. It is already known to us that a student having profound regards to his preceptor can attain knowledge alone (*śraddhāvānlabhatejñānam*). One who has regards can attain education from the preceptor and in this way doubt in the form of darkness is dispelled. If we seriously think about it, the proper education is meant for removing doubt from the mind.

Those who are engaged in laboratory for scientific discovery try to dispel some sort of doubt. Had there been no doubt, no discovery is possible. That is why, we get discovery of so many scientific discoveries. There are two types of doubt- positive and negative. The positive doubts are called non-pathological

doubts which are otherwise called epistemological or metaphysical doubts. These doubts are virtuous in nature as they lead us to phenomenon of philosophical analysis. At the same time there is another type of doubt called pathological doubts which have no importance in our philosophical enterprise. It has been said in the *Bhagavad-gītā*—‘*saṁśayātmāvinaśyati*’. Those who are possessing doubt are on the way of destruction. For smooth running of our empirical and spiritual life we must have a sense of reliance towards our Vedic and secular codes that are called *vidhi*-s. If we do not have reliability towards our laws formulated by the state machinery, our society would be turned into an anarchic state, which is not desirable. That is why; we must maintain the laws and orders in the society. If we nourish doubt always regarding the efficacy of such laws, we shall refrain from obeying it, which ultimately leads to the world of chaosness technically called *mātsyanyāya*. Just as big fishes can swallow the smaller ones due to having greater physical power, the powerful persons would have killed the weaker section (*śūlematsyānivāpakṣyandūvalānbalavattarāh*). If we want to live in a society, we have to maintain civic laws without any doubt on them. We always depend our near and dear relatives and hence some sort of reliability lies on them. Had there been doubt, our life would not have been smooth and steady. In habitual cases we cannot doubt about the efficacy of an object as told earlier. Depending on our past experience we take food when hungry, drink water when thirsty, when sick, take medicines, when tired take rest. These are habitual behaviors grown after repeated experience. If somebody expresses doubt even in these cases, this leads to contradiction. A question may be ask to a person entertaining doubt- if doubt pertains whether water will quench thirst or not then why does he ask for water? Even after this if he on doubts about the efficacy of

water, food, medicine etc., and this doubt is to be taken a pathological one having no importance in philosophical activities.

This type of doubt is taken as *bhayāvaha* or frightening. Because, the phenomenon of doubting may be treated as psychological disorder.

The *Sāmkhyakārikā* begins with enquiry being hurt by the suffering of three types (*dukhattrayābhighātādbhavatijijñāsā*)⁹. When an individual suffers from sorrow, he will have doubt whether such suffering can be removed or not. This doubt gives rise to innovation of a way for it. In *Tattvakumudī* it has been explained that a sufferer has got doubt about its removal, because such suffering cannot be dispelled through an ordinary means (*laukikaupāya*). The suffering related to body (*ādhyātmika dukkha*) and suffering caused by external factors like animal etc. (*ādhibhautika dukkha*) can somehow be managed if an individual takes prior precaution. But doubt regarding its removal is more prominent when we see our helplessness in case of suffering arising out of Divine will (*ādhidāivika dukkha*). The calamities caused by earth-quake, draught, flood etc. are not under the control of human being and hence it under Divine will. So the prior precaution cannot help us to remove such suffering. Doubt becomes stronger in such cases regarding the impossibility of its removal. To the *Sāmkhya* system the absolute cessation of suffering is not possible even through the super-normal means (*alaukikaupāya*). Doubt is clear when Īśvarakṛṣṇa has prescribed a path of its removal. Most of the systems of Indian Philosophy are found to be worried about suffering and its removal. Hence Indian systems are not free from doubt giving rise to philosophical exercise.

Again, a question may be raised that sometimes over reliance on some authority; person or institution makes no room for doubt which sometimes leads to a chaotic life. Just like over confidence overreliance is harmful and hence the doubt on some principles of the authority or person or institution makes them self-critical and self-assessing. Others doubt or critical points help them to rectify themselves. This is true in case of philosophical or any type of writing. Had there been doubt giving rise to critical analysis, the writer would cautious is self-assessment leading to their self-rectification. All these cases are the results of positive or constructive or virtuous or non-pathological doubt and hence its methodological value can never be ignored.

References:

1. Rabindra Nath Tagore, *Śāntiniketana*, Viswabharati, 6, Acarya Jagadisha Basu Road, Kolkata, 1404(BC). Pp 64-66, 128-132.
2. Rabindra Nath Tagore, *Swaravitan 12(TāśerDeśa)*, Viswabharati, 6, Acarya Jagadisha Basu Road, Kolkata, 1416(BC). Pp 2-44.
3. Satish Chandra Vidyabhusana *Nyāyasūtra-1.2*, pp42-44 *Vātsyāyanabhāṣya* on them. *Nyāyadarśana* of Gotama, Edited by Raghunath Ghosh, New Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, 2003
4. Ibid, 1.2.42.with Vātsyāyanabhāṣya
5. Sri Rajendranath Ghosh, *NavyaNyāya*, Sahitya Accademy, New Delhi, 1962. Pp 73-90.
6. Sri Fanibhusan Tarkavagish, *Nyāya Darśan (Goutam Sūtra) Vātsāyan bhāṣya (vol.1)*, Paschimbanga Rajya Pustak Parsad, Kolkata, 2006, pp46-50.
7. Ibid, pp194-196
8. Swami Gambhirananda, *Upaniṣada Granthāvalī* Udvodhan Karyalaya, Kolkata, 1962, pp 20-21
9. Swami Virupakshananda, *Sāṃkhya Kārikā of Tīswara Kṛṣṇa (with the Tattva Kaumadī of Śrī Vācaspati Miśra)*, Sri Ramkrishna Math, Madras, 1995, pp 1-10.