Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft =

Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 45 (1991)

Heft: 1

Artikel: More on Parrthnumna: theses and syllogisms

Autor: Tillemans, Tom J.F.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146915

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 28.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

MORE ON PARĀRTHĀNUMĀNA, THESES AND SYLLOGISMS

Tom J.F. Tillemans, University of Lausanne

1. Introduction

In 1984 I published an article in this journal entitled "Sur le parārthānumāna en logique bouddhique", where I argued, amongst other things, that it is an important logico-philosophical point that an inference-for-others (parārthānumāna), taken along Dharmakīrtian lines, cannot state a conclusion or thesis (pakṣa; pratijñā).² I argued that this point — and others — fundamentally differentiate this version of parārthānumāna from Aristotelian syllogisms. Specifically, if we take a typical parārthānumāna such as, "Whatever is produced is impermanent, like a vase. Now, sound is produced", the point of this logical form is not to show an actual deduction of the conclusion, "Sound is impermanent", but rather to show only those elements which would prove such a deduction. In short a parārthānumāna only presents the "provers" (sādhana) of a conclusion or thesis, viz. the triply characterized reason (trirūpahetu; trirūpalinga), as it is only this which has the "power" to prove.³ It presents these

- 1 Asiatische Studien / Etudes Asiatiques XXXVIII, 2, 1984, pp. 73-99.
- Although the Naiyāyika's five-membered reasoning states the thesis (pratijñā) and conclusion (nigamana) as two separate members, for our purposes in talking about the Buddhist's two and three-membered parārthānumānas we shall use the English words "thesis" and "conclusion" interchangeably as referring to what is being proven this allows for an easier comparison with conclusions in Aristotelian syllogisms. So, it should be stressed that we are not using "conclusion" in the Naiyāyika's particular technical sense of nigamana, where it would be something different from pratijñā. That said, note, however, that Dharmakīrti's arguments against pakṣa / pratijñā do apply to the Naiyāyika's nigamana too.
- Cf. Dignaga's definition in PS III, 1: parārthānumānam tu svadṛṣṭārthaprakāśanam "Inference-for-others is what elucidates the object understood by oneself". The commentators are unanimous in taking svadṛṣṭartha as meaning the triply characterized reson. See p. 83ff. in Tillemans 1984. On artha in svadṛṣṭārtha see PV IV k. 13-14 translated on pp. 159-160 in Tillemans, "Pramāṇavārttika IV (1), WZKS 30, 1986. Cf. NB III.1: trirūpalingākhyānam parārthānumānam // "An inference-for-others is a statement of the triply characterized reason." On the triply characterized reason alone being sādhana and having the power to prove the thesis, cf. PV IV k. 16, 17ab and k. 20 translated and edited in Tillemans, "Pramāṇavārttika IV (2), WZKS 31, 1987.
 - K. 16: tat pakṣavacanam vaktur abhiprāyanivedane / pramāṇam saṃsayotpattes tataḥ sākṣān na sādhanam. "So the thesis-statement is a means of valid knowledge (prāmaṇa) for revealing the speaker's intention. [But] as doubt arises from it [as to whether the thesis is true or not], it is not directly (sāksāt) a sādhana."
 - K. 17ab: sādhyasyaivābhidhānena pāramparyena nāpy alam. "In stating merely the sadhya, [the thesis-statement] cannot, even indirectly, [establish it].

sādhana, however, in a very specific way: to take the above-mentioned case, the parārthānumāna shows that the reason "producthood" (kṛtakatva) is a valid prover in that the universal implication (vyāpti) holds as does the specific case at hand, the so-called pakṣadharmatva, or "fact that the reason is a quality of the subject".

In any case – so I argued in 1984 on the basis of Dharmakirti and his commentators – a thesis will never prove itself or even contribute in the slightest to its own proof, and thus cannot be considered a $s\bar{a}dhana$: it is therefore important that the thesis-statement (pakṣavacana) be absent from a well-formed $par\bar{a}rth\bar{a}num\bar{a}na$.

By contrast, in whichever way we analyse Aristotle's idea of a syllogism in the first book of the *Prior Analytics*; whether we see it as a *rule* along the lines of "P; Q; therefore R" or as a *proposition* like "If P and Q, then R", in any case, the syllogism must have a conclusion (R).

Such was my argument in 1984 against treating a *parārthānumāna* as a syllogism and so it remains in philosophical and logical discussions on the theme of *parārthānumāna* versus syllogisms. In such discussions, as we shall see below, we make a justifiable gain in simplicity by dealing with the final developed form of the *parārthānumāna*, i.e. the form to which Dignaga's and Dharmakīrti's earlier thought was tending.

The historical question as to when exactly the thesis-statement was definitively banned from parārthānumānas, however, is more complicated than I had thought in 1984. The present article will provide some evidence to show that the case for Dignāga in the Pramāṇasamuccaya (PS) and Dharmakīrti in his early works is probably somewhat different from what I, or the Dharmakīrtian commentators, made it out to be. Dharmakīrti himself seems to have changed his position from that of his earlier works, such as Pramāṇavārttika and Nyāyabindu, to that of his later Hetubindu and Vādanyāya. In fact, it is really in the Vādanyāya that the prohibition on thesis-statements is at its most clear and absolute – there he stresses that since the statement of a thesis (pratijñāvacana) is useless (vyartha), then presenting such a thesis or conclusion in the statement of a sādhana (sadhanavākya) is a "point of defeat", or nigrahasthāna, for the proponent.4

- K. 20: antarangam tu sāmarthyam triṣu rūpeṣu saṃsthitam / tatra sṃrtisamādhānam tadvacasy eva saṃsthitam //. "The intrinsic capability [to prove the thesis], however, is in the three characteristics (rūpa). Only the statement of the [trirupalinga] can kindle the memory of that [viz. of the trirūpalinga's capacity to prove the sādhya]."
- 4 See 64,3-4 in Vādanyāya, ed. D. Shāstrī, Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi, 1972. tasmād vyartham eva sādhanavākye pratijnāvacanopādānam vādino nigrahasthānam. There are two sorts of nigrahasthāna spoken about in Vādanyāya: asādhanāngavacana and adoṣod-bhāvana ("not indicating the fault"). As M.T. Much points out on p. 134 of his article on

While I'm not a partisan of the current tendency to exaggerate the differences between Dignāga's and Dharmakīrti's philosophies – e.g. I don't believe that Dharmakīrti "washed away Dignāga's philosophical accomplishments" – I do think that here on the question of the members of a parārthānumāna, Dharmakīrti inherited an inelegant and overly complicated position from his master, one which did nonetheless contain a number of core ideas that Dharmakīrti, over time, struggled with and tried to unravel and simplify. Unfortunately, some of Dharmakīrti's own commentators, such as Prajñākaragupta and Śāntarakṣita, in true scholastic fashion, attempted to show that Dharmakīrti's (later) view was completely consonant with the textual evidence in Dignāga. In other words, Prajñākaragupta et al. wished to show that Dharmakīrti's view was unoriginal and already wholly present in PS. This, I think, was a mistake and blurred a rather complex historical development for Indo-Tibetan writers, and indeed also for the present author when he wrote his article on this subject in 1984.

2. Dignāga and Dharmakīrti on the absence of a thesis-statement in a parārthānumāna

Now, Dharmakirti himself finds only one source in Dignaga concerning the role of the thesis-statement. This is PS III k. 1cd:

tatrānumeyanirdeśo hetvarthavişayo matah. "In this regard, the presentation of the inferendum is held to concern the goal of the reason".

He invokes this passage in PV IV k. 18ab⁶, and interprets it quite correctly as showing that thesis-statement has no power to prove anything, i.e. that it is not

nigrahasthāna in Dharmakīrti, asādhanāngavacana is given a double interpretation depending upon where one places the negation, viz. "the non-statement of a member which is a means of proof" or "the statement of a member which is not a means of proof". The statement of a pratijñā falls into this latter category. See p. 135 in M.T. Much, "Dharmakirti's Definition of 'Points of Defeat' (nigrahasthāna)", in B.K. Matilal and R.D. Evans (eds.), Buddhist Logic and Epistemology. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1986, pp. 133-142. See also n. 11 below.

- See p. 310 in R. Hayes, Dignāga on the Interpretation of Signs. Studies of Classical India 9, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1988. One finds a similar position throughout the book of R. Herzberger, Bhartṛhari and the Buddhists: an essay in the development of fifth and sixth century Indian thought. Studies of Classical India 8. Dordrecht: D. Reidel (= Kluwer), 1986. I argue against both in Chapter I and Appendix I of my Materials for the Study of Āryadeva, Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Vienna, 1990.
- 6 hetvarthavişayatvena tadasaktoktir īritā/

a sādhana, an interpretation which, no doubt, fits well with what Dignāga himself says in the *Pramānasamuccayavrtti* (PSV(a)) ad PS III k. 1cd:

yan lag rnams nas gan rjes su dpag par bya ba bstan pa de ni kho bo cag gi sgrub byed nid du mi 'dod de | de nid the tshom skyed par byed pa'i phyir ro || (Kitagawa p. 471.5-7). "Amongst the members, the presentation of the inferendum is not held to be a sadhāna for us, for it engenders doubt."

Nonetheless, PV IV k. 18's interpretation of PS III k. 1cd is a far cry from justifying the later Dharmakīrtian view in *Vādanyāya* that the thesis-statement should not be in a parārthānumāna. In other words, it is clear that in PS Dignāga did not consider the thesis-statement as being a sādhana, but nevertheless he most likely allowed its presence in a parārthānumāna — we shall see more on this below. Dharmakīrti in the *Vādanyāya*, seems to have gone one step further on his own in saying that if the thesis-statement is not a sādhana, it should not be in a parārthānumāna. How much Dharmakīrti was conscious that this additional step was his own is difficult to say. At any rate, his discussion in PV of Dignāga's actual words can, with little difficulty, be taken as showing that he realized that Dignāga in PS only went so far as to deny that the thesis-statement is a sādhana. Indeed, I now think that there are good reasons for thinking that Dharmakīrti in PV held this same position.

- "The statement of that [viz. the sādhya] which is powerless is explained as having the goal of the reason as its object."
- Dharmakirti argues at length against the view that the thesis-statement provides some sort of indispensable orientation for a pararthanumana (see e.g. PV IV k. 21-22) and is thus indirectly a sādhana. See PV IV k. 21ab: akhyāpite hi visaye hetuvrtter asambhavāt / visayakhyāpanād eva siddhau cet tasya saktatā //. "[Objection:] If the aim (visaya) [of the reason] were not stated, then indeed the reason could not occur. Thus, as it does in fact make the aim known, the [thesis-statement] is [indirectly] capable of establishing [the sādhya]." Now, one can read PV IV k. 21 and the reply uktam atra ("This has already been answered") as no more than a rstatement of Dignaga's denial of sadhana-status to the thesis. The rest of k. 22 would then be Dharmakīrti's additional position that the thesis is understood by arthapatti. Indeed, it is probable that PV IV k. 21 is an opponent's interpretation of PS III 1cd's phrase hetvarthavisaya: PVBh 490.17-18, at least, takes it in this way and subsequently shows that what the opponent is saying is that because a statement of a thesis is a necessary condition for stating the reason, this thesis-statement also has probative power and is hence a sadhana. The indirect "power" to establish the sadhya by showing the aim (visaya) is rejected as leading to various already explained (see k. 19) absurd consequences, notably, that one would be forced to accept a bloated parārthānumāna of ten members, including the proposition which is doubted (samsaya), what we wished to know (jijnāsā), etc. etc. If the thesis-statement shows the aim (visaya) and is thus a sādhana for the parārthānumāna, the other indispensable conditions should also have membership and be sādhana.

In a recent study on the notion of paksābhāsa ("fallacies of the thesis") in pre-Dignāga logicians, Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, Masahiro Inami has shown that the use of the paksavacana can be profitably compared with the development of the closely related concept of paksābhāsa.8 Inami is of the opinion that the use of the paksavacana ("thesis-statement") can be profitably compared with the development of the closely related concept of paksābhāsa.8 Inami is of the opinion that Dharmakîrti in PV, the Pramānaviniścaya and the Nyāyabindu adhered to the same position as Dignāga in PS III, i.e. he permitted the presence of a thesis, all the while denying that it had any status as a sadhāna. In this phase Dharmakirti, like Dignaga before him, also still accepted paksābhāsa, as we see by the discussions in PV IV, Pramānaviniścaya III and Nyāyabindu III. The ban on thesis-statements comes later in the Hetubindu and Vādanyāya and coincides with his rejection of the theory of paksābhāsa. bhāsa and that of the thesis-statement. After all, it is incongruous to give an account of paksābhāsa in a chapter on parārthānumāna and yet maintain that the thesis-statement can under no circumstances be given in such a logical form! I might remark, though, that in practice, when Dharmakīrti gives actual parārthānumāna in texts such as PV IV k. 22, Nyāyabindu III, 8, 21, 23, etc., and Pramānaviniścaya III, he does not give theses, but only presents a twomembered form. The "permissibility" of thesis-statements, then, is at most a theoretical possibility for Dharmakirti at this stage, but one which he himself did not, to my knowledge, avail himself of in his own argumentation.

Now, Inami's account – to which I am heavily indebted – could be supplemented with one of the motivation behind Dharmakīrti's evolution. There seem to be two basic motivations. One is Dharmakīrti's view (from his early works on) that the thesis is known by arthāpatti ("presumption") and is hence unnecessary in the parārthānumāna. Whereas Dignāga in PS stresses that the thesis is not a sādhana, but that it may be stated to show the "goal of the reason", i.e. the proposition which the argument is about, Dharmakīrti goes one step further in suggesting that this proposition is at any rate indirectly known by means of the statement of the vyāpti and pakṣadharmatva in a parārthānumāna. Progressively he realizes that Dignāga's function for the thesis-statement in terms of hetvarthaviṣayatva is usurped by the indirect knowledge stemming from hearing the two other members. In fact, he gives various formulations explaining just how the conclusion can be known from the parārthānumāna: in PV IV k. 22 he uses the term arthāt ("by implication"); in the Nyāyabindu (NB) he speaks of sāmarthyāt and in Pramāṇavini-

⁸ See his article, "On pakṣābhāsa", forthcoming in the Proceedings of the Second International Dharmakīrti Conference, Vienna.

ścaya (PVin) III⁹ we find him using arthāpattyā (Tib. don gyis go bas). Indeed, what seems to be at stake is "presumption" (arthāpatti) – the conclusion is "presumed" from the two statements in the parārthānumāna in that these two statements could not both be true unless the conclusion were also. ¹⁰ But what is of interest for us here is that it seems that it was the fact that the thesis was known indirectly from the other two statements in a parārthānumāna which was one of the driving forces behind Dharmakīrti's own changes of position. In PV IV, PVin and NB Dharmakīrti probably takes the view that the thesis-statement is dispensable because known by implication, but that it can be used and can have pakṣābhāsa. Later, from the Hetubindu on, it is the same fact of sāmarthya which leads him to view thesis-statements as completely redundant and to abandon talk of them (and paksābhāsa) altogether. Hetubindu 5.23-24:

atra sāmarthyād eva pratijnārthasya pratīter na pratījnāyāh prayogah / "Here, because the thesis-proposition is known just simply by implication there is no need for the thesis."

The other driving force for abandoning the thesis-statement completely was the fact, already recognized by Dignāga, that the thesis-statement was not a $s\bar{a}dhana$. This is evident in the progression from the argumentation in PV IV to $V\bar{a}dany\bar{a}ya$ 59, 8-9, where it is argued that the thesis-statement is not a $s\bar{a}dhana$ and that its presence is a point of defeat in that it states something useless.¹¹

By way of a contrast with this evolutionary view of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti's development let us briefly look at some of Dharmakīrti's commentators. Their view on Dharmakīrti, which would become the received interpretation in later Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, was that Dharmakīrti's position did *not* evolve from PV to *Vadanyaya*: the thesis-statement was completely inadmiss-

- 9 Peking 288a.
- For a definition of arthāpatti see p. 42 in K. Mimaki, La Réfutation bouddhique de la permanence des choses (sthirasiddhidūṣaṇa) et la preuve de la momentanéité des choses (kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi), Paris, 1976: "...[L]a présomption est la façon dont le fait 'B' est déduit à partir de l'expérience réelle du fait 'A' et du jugement que le fait 'A' n'est pas possible autrement (anyathānupapatti) qu'en présumant un fait tel que 'B'." Compare Dharmottara's gloss on NB's sāmarthyāt (NBT 175, 2-3): yadi ca sādhyadharmas tatra sādhyadharmiṇi na bhavet sādhanadharmo na bhavet | sādhyaniyatatvāt tasya sādhanadharmasyeti sāmarthyam ||. "If the property to be proved did not exist there in the subject of what is to be proved, then the property which is the prover [i.e. the reason] would not exist [either], since this property which is the prover is connected to that which is to be proved. We thus speak of 'implication'." The existence of the state of affairs corresponding to the conclusion can be presumed from the fact that the reason exists, i.e. possesses the three characters. For a translation of PV IV k. 22, see Tillemans, "Pramānavārttika IV (2)" WZKS 31, 1987.
- 11 atha vā tasyaiva sādhanasya yan nāngam pratijnopanayanigamanādi tasyāsādhanāngasya sādhanavākye upādānam vādino nigrahasthānam vyarthābhidhānāt /

able. Not only that, but they maintained that Dignāga in PS had no role at all for the thesis-statement either. Let us for convenience term Prajñākaragupta's and Śāntarakṣita's interpretation of Dignāga, the "Dharmakīrtian commentators' interpretation." This interpretation where one seeks to impose the Vādanyāya-Hetubindu position on Dignāga is, I now think, untenable. As it is worth our while to try to see some of its shortcomings in some detail, we shall take up the problems which the Dharmakīrtian commentators had with PS IV k. 6.

3. Dharmakirtian commentators' interpretations

Prajñākaragupta, in his *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya* (PVBh 487.30 - 488.1), presents the commentators' problem in his introduction to PV IV k. 18:

nanv ācāryasya pakṣavacanam abhimatam eva / yad āha / svaniścayavad anyeṣām niścayotpādanecchayā / pakṣadharmatvasambandhasādhyokter anyavarjanam //. "[Objection: But did not the Master [Dignāga] in fact admit the thesis-statement when he said [in PS IV k. 6] 'As one wishes to generate certainty for others just like one's own certainty, then anything other than the statements of the pakṣadharmatva, necessary connection (sambandha) and sādhya is excluded."

He then argues that in fact when Dignāga spoke of the $s\bar{a}dhya$ in this verse, he meant only the $s\bar{a}dhyadharma$, i.e. the property to be proved which occurs in the pervasion $(vy\bar{a}pti)$ of a two-membered $par\bar{a}rth\bar{a}num\bar{a}na$ — in short, there are not three members, but only the usual two. PVBh 488.8-11:

yat kṛtakam tad anityam iti vyāptyantargatā sādhyoktir na pratijnārūpeṇa / avasyam hi sādhane vyāpakatvam sādhyasyopadarśanīyam / ato 'vayavadvayam eva darśanīyam / sambandhena rūpadvayāksepād eva trirūpatā hetoh / tasmād anityah śabda iti nādāv ante vā darśanīyam / rūpadvayamātrakād eva sādhyasya siddheḥ /. "The statement of the sādhya is included in the vyāpti, 'Whatever is produced is impermanent', but is not in the form of a thesis. For indeed, one does definitely have to show that the sādhya is a pervader (vyāpaka) of the sādhana. Hence, one should present only two members [in a parārthānumāna]. By means of the necessary connection two characters [of the reason] are in fact implied, and thus the reason has the three characters. Therefore, neither at the beginning nor at the end should one present [the thesis] 'Sound is impermanent', for the sādhya is established simply by the two characters [i.e. pakṣadharmatva and vyāpti] alone."

Note that Prajñākaragupta's explanation is also what one frequently finds adopted by Tibetan commentators – it figures plainly in rGyal tshab Dar ma rin chen's rNam 'grel thar lam gsal byed. 12

12 See p. 247 in Vol. II, Sarnath ed. 1975: slob dpon phyogs tshig sgrub byed du bźed pa ma yin na / phyogs chos 'brel ba bsgrub bya dag / brjod pa las gzan span bar bya / zes pa ji

Sāntarakṣita, in his $V\bar{a}dany\bar{a}yavṛtti$ $Vipañcit\bar{a}rth\bar{a}$, also cites PS IV k. 6 as a potential inconsistency, but seems to "resolve" the problem by saying that the statement of the $s\bar{a}dhya$ (i.e. the proposition to be proved) is implied $(\bar{a}kṣepa)$ by the pakṣadharmatva and sambandha, and that therefore the thesis (pakṣa), application (upanaya) and such members of a traditional five-membered reasoning are banished from use. 13

Now, to get an idea of the fragility of the Dharmakirtian commentators' interpretation that Dignāga did not allow that the thesis-statement at all, consider the following points:

- (a) Nowhere does Dignāga say clearly and unambiguously in PS that he rejects the thesis-statement as being a member of a parārthānumāna.
- (b) In the Nyāyamukha (NM) Dignāga definitely did accept the thesis-statement as a member of a parārthānumāna.
- (c) PS IV k. 6 and PSV ad k. 6 provide good evidence that Dignāga did allow the thesis-statement.
- (d) PS IV k. 6 = NM k. 13 (ed. Katsura 1981, 5.5; Tucci p. 44) and Dignāga's PSV on PS IV k. 6 is identical with NM's own explanation of NM k. 13.

While the Dharmakīrtian commentators' view that the thesis-statement must be excluded finds no hard evidence in Dignāga, there is, by contrast, considerable hard textual evidence to show that Dignāga in the *Nyāyamukha* and *Pramāṇasamuccaya* did allow a place for the thesis-statement in a parārthānumāna. The degree of obligatoriness is, however, different. Concern-

ltar ze na / slob dpon phyogs glan phyogs tshig sgrub nag gi yan lag tu bzed pa ma yin par thal / rjes dpag bya der bstan pa ni / gtan tshigs don gyi yul du 'dod / ces pa'i tshig de ñid hyis / phyogs tshig des phyogs sgrub pa'i nus pa med pa'i phyogs de ni brjod par bśad pa'i phyir / 'o na tshig sna ma'i don ji lta bu ze na / de ni bsgrub bya'i chos la / bsgrub bya'i min gis btags pa yin gyi bsgrub bya mtshan nid pa min no //. "[Objection:] If the Master [Dignaga] did not accept that the thesis-statement is a sādhana, then how could he say [in PS IV k. 6], 'Anything other than the statements of the pakṣadharmatva, necessary connection and sādhya is excluded.' [Reply:] It follows that the Master, Dignaga, did not hold that the thesis-statement is a member of a proof [i.e. parārthānumāna] because by means of the phrase, tatrānumeyanirdeśo hetvarthavisayo matah, he asserted that the thesis-statement states a thesis which [itself] has no power to prove a thesis. [Objection:] Well then, how [are we to understand] the meaning of the previous phrase [in PS IV k. 6]? [Reply:] It [i.e. the sādhya spoken about in k. 6] is the sādhyadharma. It has been metaphorically termed sādhya, but it is not the real sādhya."

13 Ed. D. Shāstrī p. 64,22-24: katham tarhy uktam pakṣadharmatvasambandhasādhyokter anyavarjanam iti / nāsti virodhaḥ (/) pakṣadharmatvasambandhābhyam sādhyasyokti-prakāśanam ākṣepaḥ / tasmād anyeṣām pakṣopanayavacanādīnām upādeyatvena sādhana-vākyavarjanam iti vyākhyānāt.

ing the Nyāyamukha, there is no question that at this stage Dignāga held that the thesis should be a member of a parārthānumana, for it was a sādhana which, if left out, would bring about the fallacy of the sādhana known as "incompleteness" (nyūnatā). 14 In PS and PSV it is clear, as we saw above, that Dignaga no longer considers the thesis-statement a sādhana and that he has redefined nyūnatā to concern only the statement of the characteristics of the reason. 15 The result is that to avoid nyūnatā, there is now no obligation to present a thesis. However, while this much is different from NM, there are important passages, such as PS IV k. 6 and PSV ad k. 6, which do give evidence that the thesis, while not a sādhana, could be present. PS IV k. 6 has already been given above, but now consider Dignāga's own commentary to this verse in PSV(a):

'di ltar phyogs kyi chos ñid bstan pa'i don du gtan tshigs kyi tshig yin no // de rjes su dpag par bya ba dan med na mi 'byun ba ñid du bstan pa'i don du dpe'i tshig yin no // rjes su dpag par bya ba bstan pa'i don du phyogs kyi tshig brjod do //. "Thus, the statement of the reason is for the purpose of showing the pakṣadharmatva. The statement of the example is to show the necessary connection with the inferendum (anumeya). One states the thesis-statement in order to show the inferendum [itself]."16

Dharmakīrti's commentators on his PV IV k. 18 were obviously troubled by the fact that k. 18 seemed in contradiction with Dignāga's PS IV k. 6, and they devised various tortuous explanations to resolve the apparent contradiction so that they could continue to maintain that Dignāga completely rejected the thesis-statement. These types of explanations might have been possible for PS IV k. 6 taken in isolation, but they become extremely problematic in the light of PSV. The *coup de grâce*, however, comes from the fact that PS IV k. 6 along with the quoted passage (and more) from the PSV also figure in Dignāga's earlier work, the *Nyāyamukha*¹⁷, and that in NM's system the thesis-statement *does* indeed figure in a *parārthānumāna*. Now, we cannot reasonably interpret NM k. 13ff. along the lines of Dharmakīrti's commentators, but have to take it as showing that the thesis is stated. Hence, either the same pas-

- 14 See NM 1 and 1.1. in Katsura 1977: zōng děng duō yán shuō néng lì "The thesis (pakṣa) and other terms are called sādhana"; yóu cǐ ying zhī suí yǒu suǒ quē míng néng lì quò "Thus it should be understood that lack [of any of these terms] is called a fault of the sādhana" (Taishō XXXI, 1628 i 1a 7 & 10). Cf. Nyāyapraveśa 2 (in Tachikawa ed.): tatra pakṣādivacanāni sādhanam.
- 15 See PSV(a) Kitagawa p. 470.7-8: 'dir yan tshul gan yan run ba ciq ma smras na yan ma tshan ba brjod par 'gyur ro //. "Here, we will term [the parārthānumāna] 'incomplete' if any of the characters (tshul = rupa) are not stated." Cf. PV IV k. 23 in Tillemans, Pramānavārttika IV (2), p. 151.
- 16 PSV(a) Kitagawa ed. p. 521.18-522.4.
- 17 This equivalence was already noted by Tucci in his n. 79, 80, 81 on pp. 44-45.

sages would have to mean two radically different things in two different texts of $Dign\overline{a}ga - an$ unlikely prospect – or $Praj\overline{n}akaragupta$'s and Santaraksita's approaches are impossible.

In short, as not in frequently happens in Indian philosophy, commentators are reluctant to admit that there was an evolution and an historical development of certain notions. If, however, we take a more evolutionary view, we should get the following result: True, Dignaga did make a change in his positions in NM and PS on the questions of the thesis-statement being a sādhana and the fallacy of nyūnatā being incurred if it is absent, but in PS he still kept some holdovers from his earlier views. Specifically, the lack of a thesis-statement ceases to be a criticizable fallacy in PS, but nonetheless, there is still a theoretical justification for stating a thesis in a parārthānumāna. Dharmakirti initially inherited this view (although in his actual practice of parārthānumāna he never actually stated theses), but then moved gradually to simplify Dignāga's inelegant theoretical stance.

4. Syllogisms

Now, what implications does this revised version of the history of pakṣava-cana have for our philosophical comparison between parārthānumāna and syllogisms? A catalyst for the present reflections is a recent book by V.A. van Bijlert, who makes three basic criticisms of my 1984 article: (a) Dignāga did accord some place for the thesis-statement in a parārthānumāna; (b) hence, my anti-syllogism polemic is unfounded or too strong; (c) there are significant similarities between the Buddhist parārthānumāna and Aristotelian syllogisms.¹⁸

Van Bijlert's book is a very valuable contribution and raises some interesting questions concerning the specific problem of *parārthānumāna*. In effect, I think that the above discussion and Inami's paper shows that van Bijlert is basically right on the first point¹⁹. The errors in his second and third points should become clearer below.

- 18 See p. 70ff. and n. 15 on pp. 88-90 in Vittorio A. van Bijlert. Epistemology and Spiritual Authority: The development of epistemology and logic in the old Nyāya and the Buddhist school of epistemology with an annotated translation of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika II (Pramāṇasiddhi) vv. 1-7. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 20. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1989.
- 19 Oddly enough, the actual reasons he gives are perhaps somewhat inaccurate. He says on p. 90:
 - "... I think he [i.e. Tillemans] is not quite right in saying that the absence of a thesis (on which his interpretation of the pararthanumana as not being a syllogism seems to rest)

To take up (b), the revised historical account of pakṣavacana in parārthānumāna does not change my earlier point that the thesis-expression, contrary to the conclusion in a syllogism, is fundamentally irrelevant in an inference-for-others. In fact, the basic metalogical views in PS and PV concerning what is and is not a sādhana already implied that the thesis-statement was a more or less useless appendage, although it took Dharmakīrti some reflection to actually arrive at the explicit position that it was thoroughly useless and should be banned. In making a logical comparison between parārthānu-

is a fundamental logical and philosophical characteristic of the parārthānumāna. As we will see in my description of the parārthānumāna [on van Bijlert's p. 72], Dignāga discusses some sort of enunciation of what is to be proved (sādhyanirdeśa) in PS III.1cd-2, although he makes it clear that this is not a separate step in syllogistic reasoning as his predecessors thought."

Now, the unique use, in Kanakavarman's translation of the Pramāṇasamuccayavrtti (See Kitagawa p. 472.7), of the definition of the thesis (pratijñā), viz. sādhyanirdeśa, found in Nyāyasūtra 1.1.33 is in itself nothing extraordinary and proves little about Dignāga's view on the thesis. After all, later in PS III k. 3 Dignāga goes on to discuss this Naiyāyika definition's shortcomings and to reject it in favour of his own definition of the thesis given just previously in PS III k. 2, viz. svarūpeṇaiva nirdesyah svayam isto 'nirākrtah / pratyak-ṣārthānumānāptaprasiddhena svadharnini //. For k. 3, see Kitagawa's ed. of Kanakavarman's translation of PS III k. 3, p. 473: bsgrub bya bstan pa zes bya 'dir // grub pa med la don byas ñid // de lta na yan dpe dan rtags // ma grub brjod pa thal bar 'gyur // "In this [Naiyāyika definition], sādhyanirdeśa, the meaning [of sādhya] is taken to be 'what is not established' (asiddha). In that case, it would follow absurdly that statements of unestablished examples and reasons [must be theses]."

The fact that Dignaga may have preferred sādhyanirdeśa once according to one version of PSV is thus not of much consequence for our purposes. The scholastic problem of the differences between the Naiyāyika definition and Dignāga's own definition of the thesis were also taken up by Dharmakīrti in PV IV k. 24-26, as well as in k. 164-168 and 171-172, but while the argumentation is complex and not without interest, it is not relevant for our purposes of deciding what role a thesis plays in a parārthānumāna for Dignāga. The real question is "Why does he speak of theses at all immediately after giving a definition of parārthānumāna which supposedly excludes them from being sādhana?" Presumably, PS III k 2's definition of the thesis meant that Dignāga saw some role for a thesis in a parārthānumāna.

Concerning Dharmakīrti's account of the reasons for PS III k. 2, PV IV k. 28ab states: gamyārthatve 'pi sādhyokter asammohāya lakṣaṇam / "Although the sādhya-statement is to be understood [by implication from a parārthānumāna], the definition [of the thesis in PS III k. 2] is [given] in order to avoid confusion." In brief, following Dharmakīrti and his commentators, the point of the thesis-definition (pakṣalakṣana) in PS III is to refute various wrong views on what theses are, some being the views which the Sāmkhyas and Cārvākas exploited to prove various sophistical conclusions turning on ambiguity, and others being the views on pratijñā which Naiyāyikas would use to say that properties of the subject (dharmin) which are merely specified in the proponent's treatises also count as part of the thesis. The more than one hundred verses which follow in PV IV treating of PS III k. 2's pakṣalakṣana have to be seen in this light.

māna and syllogisms, then, I would maintain that we can profitably disregard the tortuous historical process that it took for the Buddhist writers to work out the implications of their own key ideas. If we wish to speak of a parārthānumāna as a logical form and make philosophical analyses about what is and is not crucial to it, we do better to speak about the fully developed form where the extraneous elements, such as the useless pakṣavacana, have been consciously eliminated. In discussions on comparative logic there is a certain justifiable simplicity in relegating the Buddhists' actual discovery of their own implicit notions to the domain of an extremely long footnote.

Let us now look at van Bijlert's remarks on (c), the so-called similarities which make it appropriate for us to use the term "syllogism" for parārthānumāna. He first gives a paraphrase of Aristotle's definition of the syllogism — "a discourse in which from certain propositions that are laid down something other than what is stated follows of necessity". For the rest of the argument let me cite the relevant passage from van Bijlert's pp. 89-90:

"What is important here [in Aristotle's definition of the syllogism in the *Prior Analytics*] is that from general true propositions another proposition generally follows. If this general notion is kept in mind, we are able to see the correspondence of this with the *parārthānumāna*, for in the latter the *drṣṭānta* functions as a proposition enunciating a general *fact* while the *hetu* enunciates a particular *fact*. The thing that was announced for proof follows from both propositions."

Van Bijlert, in brief, is emphasizing that in a *parārthānumāna* too, "the thing that was announced for proof follows from both propositions". Indeed it does. But that is comparatively trivial and was certainly not the point I was driving at. What's important for us – as I insisted in 1984 – is the way in which syllogisms and *parārthānumāna* are evaluated. Let us take this up again from a slightly different angle.

First of all, most of Aristotle's key discussion of syllogisms in the *Prior Analytics* and in particular that concerning the syllogistic figures is comprehensible only if we include the conclusion and premises in a syllogism. We get sentences like "If A [is predicated] of no B, and B of all C, it is necessary that A will belong to no C" where syllogism is said to occur, and other cases where syllogism is said to fail to occur. We cannot understand these occurrences of syllogisms or non-occurrences, or "syllogistic necessity" (to use Lukasiewicz's gloss on the word $\partial u \partial u \partial u \partial u$ figuring in syllogisms), without taking into account the conclusion. Take the syllogism's three figures, which William and Martha Kneale simplify as:

20 Aristotle himself defines it as "discourse in which, certain things being stated, something other than what is stated follows of necessity from their being so" (24b18).

(I)	(II)	(III9
A-B	M-N	T-S
B-C	<u>M-O</u>	<u>P-S</u>
A-C	N-O	T-P

(Here letters show the skeleton of general statements which can be affirmative or negative, universal or particular in accordance with the Square of Opposition. The variables are term variables. 21) Again it makes no sense to evaluate figures in terms of syllogistic necessity unless we specify which conclusion we are speaking about. Now, I realize that some writers like Lukasiewicz and Bochenski have preferred to take syllogisms as material implications along the lines of "if P and Q then R." In other words, we are not speaking about validity, as in inferences, but rather of the truth or falsity of a sentence. Dr. T.J. Smiley once proposed the interesting solution that the syllogism be seen as a type of formal deduction, viz. a finite series of well-formed formulae satisfying certain specific conditions. Thus the syllogism would have to be the ordered triple P,Q,R>. At any rate, whatever be the analysis which we adopt, the conclusion is obviously an integral part of the syllogism. This, then was my point in saying on p. 87: "un syllogisme, quelle que soit notre manière de l'analyser, doit avoir une conclusion."

Now, I can imagine that at this point someone schooled in traditional logic might argue that all this only serves to show that actually it is the enthymeme (viz. a syllogism-like form where one member is missing) which is a better candidate for a parallel with parārthānumāna. Specifically, it might be argued that a parārthānumāna is like what older logic textbooks²³ would call "an enthymeme of the third order" – those in which the conclusion is the omitted member. This is typically used in cases of innuendo. E.g.

"Cowardice is always contemptible, and this was clearly a case of cowardice."24

- 21 See p. 68 in William and Martha Kneale, *The Development of Logic*, Oxford, revised edition, 1975.
- 22 For J. Lukasiewicz see Chapter I of his Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic, second edition, Oxford, 1957. See also his "Zur Geschichte der Aussagenlogik", Erkenntnis 5 (1935), pp. 111-131 for a comparison of the Stoic and Aristotelian syllogisms, the former being inference-schemata involving propositional variables, while the latter are logical theses of the form "if... then ..." containing term variables. On the notions of "necessity" in Aristotle, see also Chapter II in Günther Patzig, Die Aristotelische Syllogistik, third and revised edition, Göttingen, 1969. My information on Dr. Smiley's views is based on notes of his lectures of Lent term 1970.
- 23 See e.g. pp. 154-155 in R.J. McCall, Basic Logic. New York: Barnes and Noble. Reprinted in 1961.
- 24 McCall op. cit. p. 155.

Actually shifting to enthymemes changes virtually nothing, for they are simply truncated syllogisms whose necessity is to be judged by that of a corresponding elaborated form. The usual textbook explanation is that we must first determine which member has been ommitted, restore it, and then evaluate things in the usual syllogistic fashion: "if the syllogism thereby constructed is formally valid, the original enthymeme is valid, if the syllogism is formally invalid, the original enthymeme is invalid." So, to be blunt, enthymemes are a red herring for this discussion and can best be disregarded.

Now, contrast all this with the Buddhist parārthānumāna as we find it already in Dignāga's PS, all of Dharmakīrti and certainly in post-Dharmakīrti logicians, where the validity of the reason and of the pararthanumana which exhibits that reason is not a matter of whether or not the conclusion follows, but whether the vyāpti and paksadharmatva hold. If we want to judge a parārthānumāna's merits, the main question is whether the reason possesses the triple characterization (trairupya): we can and do judge a parārthānumāna without even examining the "necessity" of its "conclusion" at all. Granted in PS and the earlier works of Dharmakirti the thesis may be present, with the result that a parārthānumāna can be judged faulty if there are paksābhāsa. But this was little more than an inelegance in the system. The gradual elimination of the notion of paksābhāsa and the growing realization of the redundancy of thesis-statements indicate just how little logical role they played. The streamlined version of the pararthanumana captures all the essential features which Buddhist logic demanded of it. Nor does the arthapatti-version of the way in which a conclusion "follows" from the pararthanumana in any way contradict my fundamental point: we can come to know the truth of the conclusion by arthāpatti, but in order to evaluate a parārthānumāna, the conclusion plays no indispensable logical role.

So, looking deeper at the respective ways to evaluate syllogisms and Dharmakīrtian parārthānumānas we see that the conclusion has a completely different importance in the two sorts of logical forms. This is, in turn, connected with the fact that syllogisms and parārthānumāna serve very different roles in widely differing accounts of argumentation, the former providing a type of derivation (à la T.J. Smiley), the latter merely giving a perspicuous presentation of the triply characterized reason, nothing more than a preliminary step to the opponent inferring a conclusion in his own svārthānumāna ("inference-for-oneself").

In short, the whole PS, Dharmakīrtian and post-Dharmakīrtian account of parārthānumāna is principally governed by their peculiar account of sādhana – something totally foreign to Aristotle – and it is in that sense that we could

²⁵ Ibid. p. 151.

say that the fundamental incommensurability between syllogisms and parārthānumāna stems from two different philosophies of logic, or metalogics. The supposed similarity between Aristotelian syllogisms and the Dharmakirtian parārthānumāna is only correct, then, in a trivial sense. No doubt, conclusions do follow from parārthānumānas: they are forbidden in the statement of the parārthānumāna itself not because they are non-sequiturs, but for metalogical considerations about sādhana, i.e. about how logic works.

In my 1984 article I insisted upon this incommensurability between syllogisms and parārthānumāna not out of nitpicking compulsion for detail, but rather because if we satisfy ourselves with superficial similarities we blur the philosophically interesting point that Buddhist logic is sui generis. Thus we preclude meaningful, informed attempts at comparative philosophy. Naturally, if someone wishes to use the word "syllogism" in a new sense and is conscious that the pararthanumana is very different from an Aristotelian syllogism, I'll give him the word. There's clearly no harm here in adhering to Humpty Dumpty's philosophy of language and letting a word mean "just what we choose it to mean - neither more nor less."26 Far be it from me to prevent writers on Buddhist logic from using "syllogism" in their own way, just as they use "epistemology" to categorize what Dharmakīrti and co. did, even though that use of the term bears little resemblance to Western notions of "epistemology" or "Erkenntnistheorie", terms which were developed by neo-Kantians in the 19th Century.²⁷ But unfortunately, our secondary literature from Vidyabhusana to Stcherbatsky and onward to van Bijlert is full of evidence that people did indeed see pararthanumana as being a kind of quasi-Aristotelian syllogism. And that, I maintain, is a bad misunderstanding.

²⁶ See p. 274 et seq. in Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking Glass, Penguin, 1974:
'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less.'

^{&#}x27;The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.' The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master – that's all.'

²⁷ On the development of the Western notion of epistemology, see e.g. Chapter III in R. Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, Princeton, 1980.

Abbreviations

k $k\bar{a}rik\bar{a}(s)$.

Kitagawa, Indokoten ronrigaku no kenkyū: Jinna no taikei, re-

vised edition, Tokyo, 1973. Including a partial edition and trans-

lation of PS and PSV.

NB Nyāyabindu of Dharmakīrti. Ed. by D. Malvania, along with

Dharmottara's Nyāyabindutīkā and Durveka Miśra's Dharmot-

tarapradīpa. Patna, 1955, reprint. 1971.

NBT Nyāyabindutīkā of Dharmottara.

NM Nyāyamukha of Dignāga. Ed. and Japanese transl. by S. Katsura,

Inmyō shōrimonron kenkyū. Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters of Hiroshima University, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1984, 1987. English transl. G. Tucci, The Nyāyamukha of Dignāga, Heidel-

berg, 1930, reprint. Chinese Materials Center, Taiwan, 1976.

P Peking edition of the Tibetan canon.

PS Pramāṇasamuccaya of Dignāga. P. 5700.

PSV Pramāṇasamuccayavrtti of Dignāga. PSV(a) transl. by Vasu-

dhararaksita and Sen rgyal, P. 5701; PSV(b) transl. by Kanakavarman and Dad pa ses rab, P. 5702. See Kitagawa for

partial edition and Japanese translation.

PV Pramāṇavārttika of Dharmakīrti (PV I = Svārthānumāna; PV II =

Pramānasiddhi; PV III = Pratyaksa; PV IV = Parārthānumāna),

ed. Y. Miyasaka, Acta Indologica, Narita, 1972.

PVBh Pramānavārttikabhāsya or Vārttikālamkāra of Prajñākaragupta,

ed. R. Sāṅkrtyāyana, Patna 1953.

PVin *Pramānaviniścaya* of Dharmakīrti. P. 5710.

Tucci See NM.

WZKS Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens.