

Preface

In the present thesis the subject matter of the discussion is the comparative study between the Naiyāyikas and the Buddhists regarding the nature of inference, its varieties and means for ascertaining vyapti etc. A general discussion about the *Pramāna* and *Anumāna* in general has made in this connection. There is a subtle distinction between the views of the Naiyāyikas and those of the Buddhists regarding *pramāna* and *anumāna*. The Naiyāyikas accepted four *pramāṇas*. On the other hand Buddhist accepted two *pramāṇas*, which are Pratyakṣa and anumāna, three characteristics of hetu. It has been shown that how the theories like momentariness, non-existence of a permanent soul etc. work behind the formulation of the nature of inference by the Buddhists.

It can be said that there is the long-lasting debate between the Naiyāyikas and the Buddhist Philosophers in the history of Indian Philosophy. Dignāga, the father of medieval Buddhist logic flourished in the fifth century A.D. and made a great effort to refute the Naiyāyika's views. The systematic Buddhist logic comes from Dignāga and there after follows Dharmakīrti, Śāntāraṣita, Vinītādeva, Kumalaśīla and other. The old Naiyāyikas presented many arguments against the attack of Dignāga and other Buddhist logicians to establish the Naiyāyika's views. Later Dharmakīrti also flourished as the opponent party of the Naiyāyikas. Among the Naiyāyikas who tried to refute the views of Dharmakīrti and other Buddhist logicians especially remarkable is Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in the tenth century A.D.

Uddyotakara and Vācaspati Mīśra in Nyāya mañjurī criticised the definition of *Anumāna* and *Pramāṇa* (valid knowledge) as given by Dharmakīrti and others. He also tried to refute the Buddhist's

acceptance of only two means of right knowledge. The old Naiyāyika Vācaspati Mīśra, the author of *Nyāya – Vārtika – tātparya-tikā* criticised Dharmakīrti in the middle of ninth Century A.D.

So it can be said that richness in Indian logic is a result of the long lasting debate among the philosophers like Naiyāyikas and Buddhists. In the present thesis there will be an effort to present how the Naiyāyikas have presented their views and how the Buddhist views may be refuted and what are their weak points. It is hoped that through investigation we will be able to provide much information which are not yet well known in the world of scholars. As the field of this research is very wide and I have to finish the work in a limited time, I have confined by investigation into the Naiyāyikas and the Buddhists especially Dharmakīrti about *Anumāna* and *Pramāṇa*.

Most of the Indian Philosophical texts are originally composed in Sanskrit. Many Sanskrit texts are not yet translated into English because of the lack of the understanding of its difficult terminology, such as *Nyāya-Vārtika tāt - parya tikā* of Vācaspati Mīśra is yet to be translated into English for its difficulty. My research work is mainly based on Sanskrit texts, for this reason I had to depend on Sanskrit teachers and I have tried to maintain the original meaning of text through the English translation with my little knowledge. I apologize for the fact that sometimes I had to overlook the proper way of English construction for keeping the original idea of the text. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāya mañjūrī* helped very much for my research work. I acknowledge hereby that I have taken help from the translation of *vārtika* by Ganganath Jhan.

Arati Bantik
8/6/12