

The monkey on the tree and other dilemmas

R. Ramanujam

The Institute of Mathematical Sciences
Chennai - 600 113
email: jam@imsc.res.in

Colloquium, Hangzhou, May 27, 2019

First words . . .

- ▶ Thanks to Wang Yi for this opportunity and to Zhejiang University for the wonderful atmosphere.
- ▶ Please feel free to interrupt any time to comment or question.
- ▶ **Statutory Warning:** I am not a Sanskrit scholar or expert on the ancient Indian systems of logic, am only sharing what I have learned from secondary sources.

Acknowledgements: 1



Bimal Krishna Matilal

- ▶ Bimal Krishna Matilal (1935 — 1991): an influential Indian philosopher who wrote extensively on the Indian philosophical tradition in logic.
- ▶ From 1977 to 1991 he was the Spalding Professor of Philosophy at University of Oxford.

Acknowledgements: 2



Jonardon Ganeri

- ▶ Jonardon Ganeri is a philosopher whose work spans the philosophy of mind, metaphysics and epistemology. He is the editor of the Oxford Handbook of Indian Philosophy (2017).
- ▶ The Open Minds magazine named him one of its 50 global open minds for 2016. He is currently in New York.
- ▶ Almost everything I am talking of here is from Ganeri's writing, and the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.

Perspectives on logic

What is reasoning ? Four classical perspectives.

- ▶ **Ontic**: Under what conditions, can one conclude that a statement is true, having taken other statements to be true.

Perspectives on logic

What is reasoning ? Four classical perspectives.

- ▶ **Ontic**: Under what conditions, can one conclude that a statement is true, having taken other statements to be true.
- ▶ **Epistemic**: Under what conditions does *knowledge* of some facts permit knowledge of another fact.

Perspectives on logic

What is reasoning ? Four classical perspectives.

- ▶ **Ontic**: Under what conditions, can one conclude that a statement is true, having taken other statements to be true.
- ▶ **Epistemic**: Under what conditions does *knowledge* of some facts permit knowledge of another fact.
- ▶ **Dialectic**: Under what conditions does the acceptance by someone of some facts require him or her to accept some other fact.

Perspectives on logic

What is reasoning ? Four classical perspectives.

- ▶ **Ontic**: Under what conditions, can one conclude that a statement is true, having taken other statements to be true.
- ▶ **Epistemic**: Under what conditions does *knowledge* of some facts permit knowledge of another fact.
- ▶ **Dialectic**: Under what conditions does the acceptance by someone of some facts require him or her to accept some other fact.
- ▶ **Linguistic**: Use the forms of linguistic expressions to identify forms of inferences and arguments. This is the modern method.

Indian philosophers seem to have been mostly preoccupied with the first three.

Pre Classical Period

Thanks: [The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy](#).

The last five hundred years before the Common Era.

- ▶ Public debates were common in pre-classical India, frequently alluded to in various Upanishads and in the early Buddhist literature. (But all books on these are from later.)

Pre Classical Period

Thanks: [The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy](#).

The last five hundred years before the Common Era.

- ▶ Public debates were common in pre-classical India, frequently alluded to in various Upanishads and in the early Buddhist literature. (But all books on these are from later.)
- ▶ Many treatises by the fifth century BCE: Krshi-shastra (agriculture), Shilpa-shastra (architecture), Jyotisha-shastra (astronomy), Dharma-shastra (law), Caraka-samhita (Carakas collection): a treatise on medicine, and Artha-shastra (wealth), a treatise on politics.

Pre Classical Period

Thanks: [The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy](#).

The last five hundred years before the Common Era.

- ▶ Public debates were common in pre-classical India, frequently alluded to in various Upanishads and in the early Buddhist literature. (But all books on these are from later.)
- ▶ Many treatises by the fifth century BCE: Krshi-shastra (agriculture), Shilpa-shastra (architecture), Jyotisha-shastra (astronomy), Dharma-shastra (law), Caraka-samhita (Carakas collection): a treatise on medicine, and Artha-shastra (wealth), a treatise on politics.
- ▶ Panini's Ashtadhyayee: the worlds earliest extant grammar.

Early Classical Period

The first five hundred years of the Common Era.

- ▶ Intense interest in argumentation during this period.

Early Classical Period

The first five hundred years of the Common Era.

- ▶ Intense interest in argumentation during this period.
- ▶ Arguments which correspond to well-known forms of logical argument.

Early Classical Period

The first five hundred years of the Common Era.

- ▶ Intense interest in argumentation during this period.
- ▶ Arguments which correspond to well-known forms of logical argument.
- ▶ Logical principles of reasoning such as the principle of non-contradiction, the principle of excluded middle and the principle of double negation.

Early Classical Period

The first five hundred years of the Common Era.

- ▶ Intense interest in argumentation during this period.
- ▶ Arguments which correspond to well-known forms of logical argument.
- ▶ Logical principles of reasoning such as the principle of non-contradiction, the principle of excluded middle and the principle of double negation.
- ▶ Some authors isolated canonical forms of argument.

Early logicians

The Buddhist philosopher Nagarjuna (2nd century CE), one of the most influential early logicians.

- ▶ He used reductio ad absurdum so often (called prasanga), his later followers were often called prasangikas, or absurdists !

Early logicians

The Buddhist philosopher Nagarjuna (2nd century CE), one of the most influential early logicians.

- ▶ He used reductio ad absurdum so often (called prasanga), his later followers were often called prasangikas, or absurdists !
- ▶ Vatsyayana (5th CE), Nyaya-bhashya (Commentary on logic).

Early logicians

The Buddhist philosopher Nagarjuna (2nd century CE), one of the most influential early logicians.

- ▶ He used *reductio ad absurdum* so often (called *prasanga*), his later followers were often called *prasangikas*, or absurdists !
- ▶ Vatsyayana (5th CE), *Nyaya-bhashya* (Commentary on logic).
- ▶ Bhartrhari (6th CE), eminent grammarian and philosopher of language, *Vakyapadeeya* (On sentences and words): elaborate discussion on the excluded middle.

Arguments with form

Argument in debate than for inference: classify public discussions, qualities which either enhance or detract from a discussant's performance.

- ▶ Gautama, (c. 2nd CE): Nyaya-sutra (Aphorisms on logic).

Arguments with form

Argument in debate than for inference: classify public discussions, qualities which either enhance or detract from a discussant's performance.

- ▶ Gautama, (c. 2nd CE): Nyaya-sutra (Aphorisms on logic).
- ▶ The Buddhist idealist Asanga (c. 4th century CE): Vada-vinishcaya (Settling on what debate is).

Arguments with form

Argument in debate than for inference: classify public discussions, qualities which either enhance or detract from a discussant's performance.

- ▶ Gautama, (c. 2nd CE): Nyaya-sutra (Aphorisms on logic).
- ▶ The Buddhist idealist Asanga (c. 4th century CE): Vada-vinishcaya (Settling on what debate is).
- ▶ Two of his works have survived **only in Chinese!**

Arguments with form

Argument in debate than for inference: classify public discussions, qualities which either enhance or detract from a discussant's performance.

- ▶ Gautama, (c. 2nd CE): Nyaya-sutra (Aphorisms on logic).
- ▶ The Buddhist idealist Asanga (c. 4th century CE): Vada-vinishcaya (Settling on what debate is).
- ▶ Two of his works have survived **only in Chinese!**
- ▶ Xian chang sheng jiao lun (Treatise which reveals and disseminates the wise teachings), and Shun zhong lun (Treatise on following the middle way).

Central concepts

Canonical arguments by similarity (supaksha) or dissimilarity (vipaksha).

- ▶ Proposition (pratijna), **the ground** (hetu), corroboration (drshtanta), application (upanaya), conclusion (nigamana).

Central concepts

Canonical arguments by similarity (supaksha) or dissimilarity (vipaksha).

- ▶ Proposition (pratijna), **the ground** (hetu), corroboration (drshtanta), application (upanaya), conclusion (nigamana).
- ▶ Vatsyayana: sound canonical arguments are underpinned by the causation relation.

Central concepts

Canonical arguments by similarity (supaksha) or dissimilarity (vipaksha).

- ▶ Proposition (pratijna), **the ground** (hetu), corroboration (drshtanta), application (upanaya), conclusion (nigamana).
- ▶ Vatsyayana: sound canonical arguments are underpinned by the causation relation.
- ▶ Vasubandhu: recasting of the argument form from an analogical argument to a deductive one. (Fang bian xin lun (Upaya-hridaya)).

Central concepts

Canonical arguments by similarity (supaksha) or dissimilarity (vipaksha).

- ▶ Proposition (pratijna), **the ground** (hetu), corroboration (drshtanta), application (upanaya), conclusion (nigamana).
- ▶ Vatsyayana: sound canonical arguments are underpinned by the causation relation.
- ▶ Vasubandhu: recasting of the argument form from an analogical argument to a deductive one. (Fang bian xin lun (Upaya-hridaya)).
- ▶ Alongwith corroboration by illustration, include an explicit step for generalization.

Classical period

- ▶ Dignaga (c. 5th 6th century CE): Nyaya-mukha (Introduction to logic).

Classical period

- ▶ Dignaga (c. 5th 6th century CE): Nyaya-mukha (Introduction to logic).
- ▶ Explicit recognition that inference, the cognitive process of acquiring knowledge, and argument, the device of persuasion, are but two sides of the same coin.

Classical period

- ▶ Dignaga (c. 5th 6th century CE): Nyaya-mukha (Introduction to logic).
- ▶ Explicit recognition that inference, the cognitive process of acquiring knowledge, and argument, the device of persuasion, are but two sides of the same coin.
- ▶ The wheel of grounds (hetu-cakra): a 3×3 matrix, for deciding whether a ground is proper.

Classical period

- ▶ Dignaga (c. 5th 6th century CE): Nyaya-mukha (Introduction to logic).
- ▶ Explicit recognition that inference, the cognitive process of acquiring knowledge, and argument, the device of persuasion, are but two sides of the same coin.
- ▶ The wheel of grounds (hetu-cakra): a 3×3 matrix, for deciding whether a ground is proper.
- ▶ Sankarasvamin (c. 6th century CE): Nyaya-pravesha (Beginning logic).

The epistemic shift

What knowledge is needed for inference ?

- ▶ Dharmakirti (c. 7th century CE): epistemology in general and on reason and argument in particular — a watershed in classical Indian philosophy.

The epistemic shift

What knowledge is needed for inference ?

- ▶ Dharmakirti (c. 7th century CE): epistemology in general and on reason and argument in particular — a watershed in classical Indian philosophy.
- ▶ Jain thinker, Jinabhadra (6th CE): relation to deduction.

The epistemic shift

What knowledge is needed for inference ?

- ▶ Dharmakirti (c. 7th century CE): epistemology in general and on reason and argument in particular — a watershed in classical Indian philosophy.
- ▶ Jain thinker, Jinabhadra (6th CE): relation to deduction.
- ▶ Mimasa thinker, Kumarila Bhatta (c. early 7th century CE): application to deontic reasoning.

The epistemic shift

What knowledge is needed for inference ?

- ▶ Dharmakirti (c. 7th century CE): epistemology in general and on reason and argument in particular — a watershed in classical Indian philosophy.
- ▶ Jain thinker, Jinabhadra (6th CE): relation to deduction.
- ▶ Mimasa thinker, Kumarila Bhatta (c. early 7th century CE): application to deontic reasoning.
- ▶ Central structure of argument: the universal and the particular; which properties are inherited, and how; limits to knowledge.

Navya Nyaya

Two traditions, the Nyaya (grounded in Gautama's Nyaya-sutra, c. 100 C.E., dealing with logic, epistemology, and debate), and Vaisheshika (grounded in Kanada's Vaisheshika-sutra, c. 100 B.C.E., dealing with ontology), developed in parallel.

- ▶ In the 11th or 12th century, they merged to form a new school, called Navya-Nyaya, the new Nyaya, developed mostly by Jaina thinkers.

Navya Nyaya

Two traditions, the Nyaya (grounded in Gautama's Nyaya-sutra, c. 100 C.E., dealing with logic, epistemology, and debate), and Vaisheshika (grounded in Kanada's Vaisheshika-sutra, c. 100 B.C.E., dealing with ontology), developed in parallel.

- ▶ In the 11th or 12th century, they merged to form a new school, called Navya-Nyaya, the new Nyaya, developed mostly by Jaina thinkers.
- ▶ Foundational text: Gangesha's brilliant *Jewel of Reflection on the Truth* (Tattvacintamani), 12th century.

Navya Nyaya

Two traditions, the Nyaya (grounded in Gautama's Nyaya-sutra, c. 100 C.E., dealing with logic, epistemology, and debate), and Vaisheshika (grounded in Kanada's Vaisheshika-sutra, c. 100 B.C.E., dealing with ontology), developed in parallel.

- ▶ In the 11th or 12th century, they merged to form a new school, called Navya-Nyaya, the new Nyaya, developed mostly by Jaina thinkers.
- ▶ Foundational text: Gangesha's brilliant *Jewel of Reflection on the Truth* (Tattvacintamani), 12th century.
- ▶ Development for about four centuries, the works of Raghunatha, Jagadisha and Gadadhara.

Navya Nyaya

Two traditions, the Nyaya (grounded in Gautama's Nyaya-sutra, c. 100 C.E., dealing with logic, epistemology, and debate), and Vaisheshika (grounded in Kanada's Vaisheshika-sutra, c. 100 B.C.E., dealing with ontology), developed in parallel.

- ▶ In the 11th or 12th century, they merged to form a new school, called Navya-Nyaya, the new Nyaya, developed mostly by Jaina thinkers.
- ▶ Foundational text: Gangesha's brilliant *Jewel of Reflection on the Truth* (Tattvacintamani), 12th century.
- ▶ Development for about four centuries, the works of Raghunatha, Jagadisha and Gadadhara.
- ▶ Several manuals or compendia in the 17th and 18th centuries: Annambhatta's *The Manual of Reason* (Tarkasamgraha).

Ontology

I will talk principally about the epistemological aspects of Navya Nyaya, but ontology was also important for them.

- ▶ Vaisesika theory of 5 primary substances: earth, water, air, fire and 'akasa' (sky).

Ontology

I will talk principally about the epistemological aspects of Navya Nyaya, but ontology was also important for them.

- ▶ Vaisesika theory of 5 primary substances: earth, water, air, fire and 'akasa' (sky).
- ▶ An elaborate theory of motion.

Ontology

I will talk principally about the epistemological aspects of Navya Nyaya, but ontology was also important for them.

- ▶ Vaisesika theory of 5 primary substances: earth, water, air, fire and 'akasa' (sky).
- ▶ An elaborate theory of motion.
- ▶ These are important because the propositions Nyaya philosophers were interested in were statements about the physical world, and contradictions reside only in perceptions of the world.

Ontology

I will talk principally about the epistemological aspects of Navya Nyaya, but ontology was also important for them.

- ▶ Vaishesika theory of 5 primary substances: earth, water, air, fire and 'akasa' (sky).
- ▶ An elaborate theory of motion.
- ▶ These are important because the propositions Nyaya philosophers were interested in were statements about the physical world, and contradictions reside only in perceptions of the world.
- ▶ Metaphysical truth is somehow to be derived from these.

Number

Matilal considers the Navya Nyaya concept of number akin to Frege's in content and sophistication.

- ▶ Old Vaisesika theory: numbers are not qualities. (Table has four legs and wooden legs.)

Number

Matilal considers the Navya Nyaya concept of number akin to Frege's in content and sophistication.

- ▶ Old Vaisesika theory: numbers are not qualities. (Table has four legs and wooden legs.)
- ▶ New solution: a notion of completion (paryapti): “four-hood” resides in the four legs jointly but not individually.

Number

Matilal considers the Navya Nyaya concept of number akin to Frege's in content and sophistication.

- ▶ Old Vaisesika theory: numbers are not qualities. (Table has four legs and wooden legs.)
- ▶ New solution: a notion of completion (paryapti): “four-hood” resides in the four legs jointly but not individually.
- ▶ So numbers are qualities. (That which is common to four horses and four chair legs.)

Number

Matilal considers the Navya Nyaya concept of number akin to Frege's in content and sophistication.

- ▶ Old Vaisesika theory: numbers are not qualities. (Table has four legs and wooden legs.)
- ▶ New solution: a notion of completion (paryapti): “four-hood” resides in the four legs jointly but not individually.
- ▶ So numbers are qualities. (That which is common to four horses and four chair legs.)
- ▶ This gets more sophisticated, moving to n -place relations. (Mars and Venus are two planets; hence they are in a binary relation.)

Space, time and motion

All these are shown to be problematic already in the pre-classical period.

- ▶ Nyaya has an elaborate argument to 'demonstrate' that space has no finite dimension; some commentators call it a special dimension (paramadirgha) of "maximal length".

Space, time and motion

All these are shown to be problematic already in the pre-classical period.

- ▶ Nyaya has an elaborate argument to 'demonstrate' that space has no finite dimension; some commentators call it a special dimension (paramadirgha) of "maximal length".
- ▶ Much debate on whether the present is an imaginary point boundary between the past and the future, or a real one.

Space, time and motion

All these are shown to be problematic already in the pre-classical period.

- ▶ Nyaya has an elaborate argument to 'demonstrate' that space has no finite dimension; some commentators call it a special dimension (paramadirgha) of "maximal length".
- ▶ Much debate on whether the present is an imaginary point boundary between the past and the future, or a real one.
- ▶ **Motion**: Long discussions on motion and causation.

Space, time and motion

All these are shown to be problematic already in the pre-classical period.

- ▶ Nyaya has an elaborate argument to ‘demonstrate’ that space has no finite dimension; some commentators call it a special dimension (paramadirgha) of “maximal length”.
- ▶ Much debate on whether the present is an imaginary point boundary between the past and the future, or a real one.
- ▶ **Motion**: Long discussions on motion and causation.
- ▶ Notions like rest, impetus, elasticity, fluidity, etc. Discussions on ‘special’ types of motion such as “the movement of an iron needle towards a magnet, the upward motion of flames, the movement of air, and the initial motion of the atoms at the beginning of creation”.

Causation

Four sources of knowledge: perception (pratyaksha), inference (anumana), analogical identification or comparison (upamana) and testimony (shabda).

- ▶ The potter-pot example: what caused the pot ?

Causation

Four sources of knowledge: perception (pratyaksha), inference (anumana), analogical identification or comparison (upamana) and testimony (shabda).

- ▶ The potter-pot example: what caused the pot ?
- ▶ The thread-cloth example: the threads from which it is woven, the weaver, the shuttle, the loom, etc.

Causation

Four sources of knowledge: perception (pratyaksha), inference (anumana), analogical identification or comparison (upamana) and testimony (shabda).

- ▶ The potter-pot example: what caused the pot ?
- ▶ The thread-cloth example: the threads from which it is woven, the weaver, the shuttle, the loom, etc.
- ▶ The axe-tree example: the felling of the tree is caused by the axe, its contact with the tree, the axeman, etc.

Types of cause

Three distinguishable types of cause:

- ▶ Substrate or inherence causes: of a cloth, the threads.

Types of cause

Three distinguishable types of cause:

- ▶ Substrate or inherence causes: of a cloth, the threads.
- ▶ Non-substrate or non-inherence causes: conjunction of threads, a non-substrate cause of a piece of cloth.

Types of cause

Three distinguishable types of cause:

- ▶ Substrate or inherence causes: of a cloth, the threads.
- ▶ Non-substrate or non-inherence causes: conjunction of threads, a non-substrate cause of a piece of cloth.
- ▶ Instrumental cause: the weaver's shuttle or the weaver herself.

Model of causation

A formal distinction is made between causes and non-causes.

- ▶ c is a causal factor for e iff
 1. c exists before e ,
 2. c exists 'regularly' (niyata) with e , and
 3. c is 'relevant' (ananyathasiddha) to e .

Model of causation

A formal distinction is made between causes and non-causes.

- ▶ c is a causal factor for e iff
 1. c exists before e ,
 2. c exists 'regularly' (niyata) with e , and
 3. c is 'relevant' (ananyathasiddha) to e .
- ▶ Extensive discussion distinguishing the threadcolour-cloth regularity and the thread-cloth regularity.

Perceptual acts

What is common to all the perceptions below ?

- ▶ Looking out of the window, I see that the sky is blue.
- ▶ I sense that the air is cold.
- ▶ I see too that there is nobody on the street.
- ▶ In the corner of the room, I notice something coiled up, which I perceive to be a piece of rope.

Qualificative Perception

When do perceptions qualify as knowledge-episodes ?

- ▶ To see that the passing animal is a horse, one must first possess the concept horse, by means of previous acquaintance with the type.

Qualificative Perception

When do perceptions qualify as knowledge-episodes ?

- ▶ To see that the passing animal is a horse, one must first possess the concept horse, by means of previous acquaintance with the type.
- ▶ What happens when I see a new shade of blue on a vase ?

Qualificative Perception

When do perceptions qualify as knowledge-episodes ?

- ▶ To see that the passing animal is a horse, one must first possess the concept horse, by means of previous acquaintance with the type.
- ▶ What happens when I see a new shade of blue on a vase ?
- ▶ Perceptual illusions are explained as cases in which a wrong feature is recalled from memory.

Memory

Memory is considered in the western tradition to be an important means by which an individual can justify her beliefs about the past.

- ▶ Nyaya separates memory states from knowledge-yielding beliefs.

Memory

Memory is considered in the western tradition to be an important means by which an individual can justify her beliefs about the past.

- ▶ Nyaya separates memory states from knowledge-yielding beliefs.
- ▶ Memories lack 'independence'; we must go via the originating experience.

Memory

Memory is considered in the western tradition to be an important means by which an individual can justify her beliefs about the past.

- ▶ Nyaya separates memory states from knowledge-yielding beliefs.
- ▶ Memories lack 'independence'; we must go via the originating experience.
- ▶ An exact reproduction of a Picasso does not count as a Picasso.

Memory

Memory is considered in the western tradition to be an important means by which an individual can justify her beliefs about the past.

- ▶ Nyaya separates memory states from knowledge-yielding beliefs.
- ▶ Memories lack 'independence'; we must go via the originating experience.
- ▶ An exact reproduction of a Picasso does not count as a Picasso.
- ▶ Much discussion on 'false memory'.

Doubt

The concept of doubt has an important theoretical role in Nyaya.

- ▶ A state of doubt is claimed to be a necessary precondition for any philosophical enquiry.

Doubt

The concept of doubt has an important theoretical role in Nyaya.

- ▶ A state of doubt is claimed to be a necessary precondition for any philosophical enquiry.
- ▶ Consider any proposition P . We must start with “Does P hold, or not ?”

Doubt

The concept of doubt has an important theoretical role in Nyaya.

- ▶ A state of doubt is claimed to be a necessary precondition for any philosophical enquiry.
- ▶ Consider any proposition P . We must start with “Does P hold, or not ?”
- ▶ A doubt can never be a true or false cognition; there are no beliefs with the same content as doubts.

Doubt

The concept of doubt has an important theoretical role in Nyaya.

- ▶ A state of doubt is claimed to be a necessary precondition for any philosophical enquiry.
- ▶ Consider any proposition P . We must start with “Does P hold, or not ?”
- ▶ A doubt can never be a true or false cognition; there are no beliefs with the same content as doubts.
- ▶ Related notion: ‘tarka’ or ”Suppositional Thinking” .

Inferential Warrant

The most studied notion of Navya Nyaya is Gangesha's relation between inferential sign and property-to-be-inferred, which is called the **vyapti**, 'pervasion' or 'inference-warranting'.

- ▶ Roughly speaking, vyapti is like entailment.

Inferential Warrant

The most studied notion of Navya Nyaya is Gangesha's relation between inferential sign and property-to-be-inferred, which is called the **vyapti**, 'pervasion' or 'inference-warranting'.

- ▶ Roughly speaking, vyapti is like entailment.
- ▶ Vyapti or pervasion, is that relation between the inferential sign (hetu) and the inferred property (sadhya), which legitimises the inference.

Inferential Warrant

The most studied notion of Navya Nyaya is Gangesha's relation between inferential sign and property-to-be-inferred, which is called the **vyapti**, 'pervasion' or 'inference-warranting'.

- ▶ Roughly speaking, vyapti is like entailment.
- ▶ Vyapti or pervasion, is that relation between the inferential sign (hetu) and the inferred property (sadhya), which legitimises the inference.
- ▶ Typical example: wherever there is smoke there is fire.

Inferential Warrant

The most studied notion of Navya Nyaya is Gangesha's relation between inferential sign and property-to-be-inferred, which is called the **vyapti**, 'pervasion' or 'inference-warranting'.

- ▶ Roughly speaking, vyapti is like entailment.
- ▶ Vyapti or pervasion, is that relation between the inferential sign (hetu) and the inferred property (sadhya), which legitimises the inference.
- ▶ Typical example: wherever there is smoke there is fire.
- ▶ Knowledge of this relation is the instrumental cause in the inferential process.

Defining pervasion

Gangesha considers and rejects 21 definitions of vyapti before offering one of his own !

- ▶ The 'No Counter-Example' Definition:

$$Pervades(S, H) \text{ iff } \neg(\exists x)(Hx \wedge \neg Sx)$$

Defining pervasion

Gangesha considers and rejects 21 definitions of vyapti before offering one of his own !

- ▶ The 'No Counter-Example' Definition:

$$Pervades(S, H) \text{ iff } \neg(\exists x)(Hx \wedge \neg Sx)$$

- ▶ Rejected because of Partially Locatable Properties.

Defining pervasion

Gangesha considers and rejects 21 definitions of vyapti before offering one of his own !

- ▶ The 'No Counter-Example' Definition:

$$Pervades(S, H) \text{ iff } \neg(\exists x)(Hx \wedge \neg Sx)$$

- ▶ Rejected because of Partially Locatable Properties.
- ▶ The monkey on the tree example.

Contradiction and partial relations

Is Nyaya a para-consistent theory then ?

- ▶ No, they are very particular that there is no contradiction when a property and its negation both occur due to 'partial location'.

Contradiction and partial relations

Is Nyaya a para-consistent theory then ?

- ▶ No, they are very particular that there is no contradiction when a property and its negation both occur due to 'partial location'.
- ▶ A property may have both a "presence range" and an "absence range", and the two may overlap.

Contradiction and partial relations

Is Nyaya a para-consistent theory then ?

- ▶ No, they are very particular that there is no contradiction when a property and its negation both occur due to 'partial location'.
- ▶ A property may have both a "presence range" and an "absence range", and the two may overlap.
- ▶ Suppose we find a place where smoke is present, and fire is both absent and also present, e.g. the kitchen. Is the inference faulty ?

Contradiction and partial relations

Is Nyaya a para-consistent theory then ?

- ▶ No, they are very particular that there is no contradiction when a property and its negation both occur due to 'partial location'.
- ▶ A property may have both a "presence range" and an "absence range", and the two may overlap.
- ▶ Suppose we find a place where smoke is present, and fire is both absent and also present, e.g. the kitchen. Is the inference faulty ?
- ▶ A sophisticated theory of partial relations.

The 'siddhanta-lakshana'

Gangesha's definition of vyapti:

- ▶ $Pervades(S, H)$ iff
- ▶ $\neg \exists x(Hx \wedge \neg Sx)$ and
- ▶ $\forall P.(\exists x(Hx \wedge \neg Px \wedge P'x)) \rightarrow (P \neq S).$

The 'siddhanta-lakshana'

Gangesha's definition of vyapti:

- ▶ $Pervades(S, H)$ iff
- ▶ $\neg \exists x(Hx \wedge \neg Sx)$ and
- ▶ $\forall P.(\exists x(Hx \wedge \neg Px \wedge P'x)) \rightarrow (P \neq S)$.
- ▶ Note the second order quantification.

Semantic fitness

The Nyaya philosophers also discuss language-based knowledge at length.

- ▶ 'Semantic fitness' (yogyata), an intriguing concept.

Semantic fitness

The Nyaya philosophers also discuss language-based knowledge at length.

- ▶ ‘Semantic fitness’ (yogyata), an intriguing concept.
- ▶ Example: contrast the sentence “He sprinkles the field with water” and “He sprinkles the field with fire” .

Semantic fitness

The Nyaya philosophers also discuss language-based knowledge at length.

- ▶ ‘Semantic fitness’ (yogyata), an intriguing concept.
- ▶ Example: contrast the sentence “He sprinkles the field with water” and “He sprinkles the field with fire” .
- ▶ Such sentences, though grammatically correct, do not make sense.

Semantic fitness

The Nyaya philosophers also discuss language-based knowledge at length.

- ▶ ‘Semantic fitness’ (yogyata), an intriguing concept.
- ▶ Example: contrast the sentence “He sprinkles the field with water” and “He sprinkles the field with fire” .
- ▶ Such sentences, though grammatically correct, do not make sense.
- ▶ An utterance is intelligible only if the proposition expressed is ontologically possible.

Debate with other schools

There were interesting debates between the different schools.

- ▶ The Mimamsa scholars argued that the relationship between signifier and signified was intrinsic.

Debate with other schools

There were interesting debates between the different schools.

- ▶ The Mimamsa scholars argued that the relationship between signifier and signified was intrinsic.
- ▶ The Nyaya philosophers insisted that language was empirical, and a product of convention.

Debate with other schools

There were interesting debates between the different schools.

- ▶ The Mimamsa scholars argued that the relationship between signifier and signified was intrinsic.
- ▶ The Nyaya philosophers insisted that language was empirical, and a product of convention.
- ▶ Grammarians like Prabhakara claimed that on hearing a sentence, we grasp a unified proposition and not just a list of entities.

Debate with other schools

There were interesting debates between the different schools.

- ▶ The Mimamsa scholars argued that the relationship between signifier and signified was intrinsic.
- ▶ The Nyaya philosophers insisted that language was empirical, and a product of convention.
- ▶ Grammarians like Prabhakara claimed that on hearing a sentence, we grasp a unified proposition and not just a list of entities.
- ▶ The Naiyayikas offer a fascinating account of language acquisition by children to argue that general features of the sentence are enough to connect the meaning-relations.

Are there unique objects?

If they did, how would we know them ?

- ▶ The Nyaya claim: no two objects, including atoms, can be intrinsically identical.

Are there unique objects?

If they did, how would we know them ?

- ▶ The Nyaya claim: no two objects, including atoms, can be intrinsically identical.
- ▶ **Wittgenstein**: the logical impossibility of a universe containing two identical spheres.

Are there unique objects?

If they did, how would we know them ?

- ▶ The Nyaya claim: no two objects, including atoms, can be intrinsically identical.
- ▶ **Wittgenstein**: the logical impossibility of a universe containing two identical spheres.
- ▶ **Leibnitz**: Two drops of water, or milk, viewed with a microscope, will appear distinguishable from each other. That does not mean they are the same.

Are there unique objects?

If they did, how would we know them ?

- ▶ The Nyaya claim: no two objects, including atoms, can be intrinsically identical.
- ▶ **Wittgenstein**: the logical impossibility of a universe containing two identical spheres.
- ▶ **Leibnitz**: Two drops of water, or milk, viewed with a microscope, will appear distinguishable from each other. That does not mean they are the same.
- ▶ Discussion on identity and equality.

Other themes

I have skipped a whole lot of other themes in Navya Nyaya.

- ▶ There is much discussion on the role of **testimony**.

Other themes

I have skipped a whole lot of other themes in Navya Nyaya.

- ▶ There is much discussion on the role of **testimony**.
- ▶ Universals, universal properties, ...

Other themes

I have skipped a whole lot of other themes in Navya Nyaya.

- ▶ There is much discussion on the role of **testimony**.
- ▶ Universals, universal properties, ...
- ▶ Inherence and acquired properties.

Other themes

I have skipped a whole lot of other themes in Navya Nyaya.

- ▶ There is much discussion on the role of **testimony**.
- ▶ Universals, universal properties, ...
- ▶ Inherence and acquired properties.
- ▶ Semantics of negation, absence and non-existence.

Closing remarks

Nyaya is considered a living tradition, with some scholars still working on them.

- ▶ Indexical reasoning in Nyaya has relevance to modern modal logics.

Closing remarks

Nyaya is considered a living tradition, with some scholars still working on them.

- ▶ Indexical reasoning in Nyaya has relevance to modern modal logics.
- ▶ Interesting connections to argumentation theories.

Closing remarks

Nyaya is considered a living tradition, with some scholars still working on them.

- ▶ Indexical reasoning in Nyaya has relevance to modern modal logics.
- ▶ Interesting connections to argumentation theories.
- ▶ Emphasis on everyday reasoning and empirical structure may have some relevance for logics in artificial intelligence.

Closing remarks

Nyaya is considered a living tradition, with some scholars still working on them.

- ▶ Indexical reasoning in Nyaya has relevance to modern modal logics.
- ▶ Interesting connections to argumentation theories.
- ▶ Emphasis on everyday reasoning and empirical structure may have some relevance for logics in artificial intelligence.
- ▶ A surprising lack of connection with the development of mathematics in India (which was led mostly by astronomy).

Discussion time

Thank you.

Questions, comments, suggestions welcome; also, please write to jam@imsc.res.in.

Welcome to ICLA / ISLA

We have an Association for Logic in India (www.cmi.ac.in/~ali) which organizes:

- ▶ *Odd years*: (ICLA) Indian Conference on Logic and Applications. Last one at IIT-Delhi, March 3–5, 2019.

Welcome to ICLA / ISLA

We have an Association for Logic in India (www.cmi.ac.in/~ali) which organizes:

- ▶ *Odd years*: (ICLA) Indian Conference on Logic and Applications. Last one at IIT-Delhi, March 3–5, 2019.
- ▶ *Even years*: (ISLA) Indian School on Logic and Applications. next one at IISER-Bhopal, February 2020.

Welcome to ICLA / ISLA

We have an Association for Logic in India (www.cmi.ac.in/~ali) which organizes:

- ▶ *Odd years*: (ICLA) Indian Conference on Logic and Applications. Last one at IIT-Delhi, March 3–5, 2019.
- ▶ *Even years*: (ISLA) Indian School on Logic and Applications. next one at IISER-Bhopal, February 2020.
- ▶ ICLA 2021 will be at IIT-Goa, co-located with WOLLIC.

Welcome to Chennai!

