



University of Sussex

A University of Sussex DPhil thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

**Generative Knowledge:
a pragmatist logic of inquiry articulated by
the classical Indian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Kumārila**

Jaspal Peter Sahota

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Philosophy

University of Sussex

January 2015

Declaration

I hereby declare that:

- this thesis has not been and will not be submitted, in whole or in part, to any other University for a degree
- where I have drawn on the research of others, this has always been clearly indicated

Signature:

Date:

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

JASPAL PETER SAHOTA

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**Generative Knowledge: a pragmatist logic of inquiry
articulated by the classical Indian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Kumāriila**

SUMMARY

This thesis investigates the svataḥ-prāmāṇyam doctrine of the 7th century Indian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Kumāriila, based on an analysis of this doctrine as presented in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā and in the Śloka-vārttika. The original contribution of this thesis consists in a novel interpretation of Kumāriila's claim which diverges from the interpretations of the classical Indian commentators as well as those of recent scholarship by John Taber and Dan Arnold.

Rather than a phenomenological or Reidean epistemology, this research argues that Kumāriila provides a normative epistemology. In contrast to the interpretation of Dan Arnold, which roots justification and truth in the phenomenological fact of mere awareness which is undefeated, it is argued here that Kumāriila articulates a normative process which mandates the believer to strengthen her beliefs through a purposive and goal-oriented process.

The thesis begins with a consideration of the notion of svabhāva, to which Kumāriila appeals, making a dispositional essentialist reading of this term, as a real causal power or disposition which is the essence of an entity conditional on

its existence. It is then argued that Kumāriila's claim concerns the manifestation of a competence. The operational dichotomy between pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa is compared to that between Good and Bad Cases in epistemological disjunctivism.

It is shown that Kumāriila articulates a belief protocol by analogy with normative processes in generative grammar and in legal and ritual interpretation. An anti-foundationalist defence of this protocol and its applicability to the case of beliefs formed from Vedic testimony is provided. It is suggested that Kumāriila's claim engages more closely with Sosa's notion of aptness than with any notion of justification.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Section 1: Acknowledgements and sources.....	1
Section 2: Introducing the research topic.....	3
Section 3: Intellectual and social context.....	5
Section 4: Situating the research.....	10
Section 5: Methodological approach.....	13
Section 6: Use of terminology.....	18
Section 7: Thesis Summary.....	21
Chapter 2: Kumāriila's dispositional essentialism.....	29
Section 1: Introduction.....	29
Section 2: Powers and properties in the classical Indian context.....	31
Subsection 1: Svabhāva as a property.....	32
Subsection 2: Svabhāva as a power.....	36
Subsection 3: Summary.....	38
Section 3: Powers and properties in the contemporary context.....	40
Section 4: A debate about natural necessity.....	46
Section 5: Reductionism about properties.....	55
Subsection 1: Reductionism and anti-realism.....	56

Subsection 2: Disposition as default nature.....	62
Section 6: Dharmakīrti and bare dispositions.....	66
Section 7: Kumāriila's notion of svabhāva.....	72
Chapter 3: Kumāriila's disjunctive epistemology.....	77
Section 1: Introduction.....	77
Section 2: Knowledge and its value.....	78
Section 3: Terminological issues in the existing literature.....	81
Subsection 1: Pramāṇa as instrument or outcome.....	85
Subsection 2: Prāmāṇyam as instrumentality or as outcome.....	89
Subsection 3: Svataḥ as intrinsic.....	93
Section 4: Kumāriila's disjunction between pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa.....	98
Subsection 1: Good and Bad Cases.....	99
Subsection 2: Reflective indiscriminability.....	106
Section 5: Kumāriila's notion of 'from itself'.....	112
Subsection 1: Kumāriila's four possible views.....	113
Subsection 2: Deliverances must possess a svabhāva.....	116
Subsection 3: An epistemic capacity must be restricted to deliverances	117
Subsection 4: Obstruction of capacity.....	125
Section 6: Kumāriila as Virtue Epistemologist.....	133
Chapter 4: Kumāriila's belief protocol.....	139
Section 1: Introduction.....	139
Section 2: Apparent truth or ascribed truth?.....	141
Subsection 1: The Pārthasārathi-Arnold line of interpretation.....	141

Subsection 2: Drawbacks of the Pārthasārathi-Arnold interpretation.....	148
Subsection 3: Towards a re-evaluation of the Pārthasārathi-Arnold interpretation.....	153
Section 3: The grammatical and ritual origins of Kumārila's terminology...	156
Subsection 1: 'General operation' and 'replacement operation'.....	159
Subsection 2: More on exceptions.....	164
Subsection 3: 'Exhortation'.....	165
Subsection 4: 'Conflict'.....	166
Section 4: Kumārila's logic of inquiry.....	171
Section 5: The instigating of inquiry.....	173
Section 6: The prolonging of inquiry.....	179
Section 7: Metarules for prolonging inquiry.....	198
Section 8: The terminating of inquiry.....	203
Chapter 5: Kumārila's anti-foundationalism.....	209
Section 1: Introduction.....	209
Section 2: Existing literature on Kumārila's anti-foundationalism.....	210
Section 3: Kumārila's argument against organon justification.....	215
Section 4: Kumārila's opposition to Buddhist foundationalism.....	226
Section 5: Kumārila's anti-foundationalist defence of the Veda.....	237
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	242
Section 1: Summary of findings.....	242
Section 2: Suggestions for future research.....	246
Abbreviations.....	247

Bibliography.....	249
Appendix 1: Transliterated Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā text extract.....	267
Appendix 2: Translated Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā text extract (with transliteration in brackets).....	273
Glossary of key terms.....	284
Index versorum.....	287

Chapter 1: Introduction

Section 1: Acknowledgements and sources

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Jonardon Ganeri for his skilful guidance through the course of writing this thesis and for his thoughtful advice as to the most effective ways to develop the themes and lines of inquiry for each chapter. I am deeply grateful to Prof. Kei Kataoka, who guided me through a very detailed study of the whole of Jayanta's discussion of the topic of *prāmāṇyam*, thereby introducing me to the conventions of philosophical Sanskrit and to the guiding themes of the debate about *prāmāṇyam*. I thank Mr. Suguru Ishimura, who worked closely with me on translating Jayanta's discussion, and who encouraged me to think about the relative significance of the terms *pramāṇatvam* and *prāmāṇyam*. I thank Prof. Piyushkant Dixit for reading through Jayanta's discussion of the topic of *khyāti-vāda* with me. I thank my Sanskrit teacher, Ms. Usha Mehta, for teaching me Sanskrit language and passing on her wide-ranging knowledge of Sanskrit literature, and for her encouragement to take my studies further.

The dependence of this research on existing scholarship will be evident from a reading of the thesis. The work of John Taber and Dan Arnold constitutes a sort of *pūrvapakṣa* which was helpful as a point of reference against which the distinctive features of this interpretation could be contrasted. This interpretation builds on the research of Kataoka (2011), and in particular picks up on the attention to philological details found in that work. Kataoka's translation of Kumārila's *Śloka-vārttika* presentation provided there was an indispensable foundation for this research. Further, the findings of Dunne

(2004) have been helpful as a basis for identifying some important philosophical suppositions and strategies shared by Kumāriḷa, and Dunne's translations of passages from Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi were used as a very helpful guide for examination of the Tibetan texts. Details of editions of other texts referenced can be found in the abbreviations and bibliography sections.

The textual basis of the research is two similar presentations by Kumāriḷa of the doctrine of svataḥ-prāmāṅyam in the Bṛhaḥ-ṭīkā and in the Śloka-vārttika. The Bṛhaḥ-ṭīkā presentation is preserved within the larger Tattva-saṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita. The 1968 edition of the Sanskrit text by Swami Dwarikadas Shastri has been used as a basis for translation and analysis of this presentation. That utilises photostat copies kept in the Nalanda Library, but also records variant readings elsewhere.¹ The 1926 Embar Krishnamacharya edition, which is based on a single manuscript preserved in the Wāḍi Pārśvanātha Bhaṅḍār in the ancient city of Pattan², was also consulted. Analysis of the Śloka-vārttika presentation is based on the 2011 critical edition of that presentation by Kei Kataoka, in preparing which Kataoka "consulted five manuscripts and seven published editions."³ Additionally, Kataoka has provided a felicitous translation, and it has not been possible to improve on this translation in any way in terms of cogency and accuracy. Accordingly, the translation provided here represents a derivative work, where modifications reflect the attempt at a greater degree of engagement with the technical vocabulary of contemporary philosophy.

¹ See Shastri (1968) 8

² See Krishnamacharya (1926) Vol.1 ix

³ Kataoka (2011) Part I, vii

Section 2: Introducing the research topic

Kahrs explains that a “model of substitution is certainly a well-developed methodological procedure in Pāṇinian grammar and in the ritual Sūtras”⁴. This thesis seeks firstly to extend Kahrs' finding by showing that Kumāriḷa employs such a substitutional model in his epistemology. This will be done through a study of Kumāriḷa's choice of terminology, and in particular, the terms 'utsarga', 'apavāda', and 'prāptā'. It will be shown that such terminology appeals to a substitutional model, and relevant precursors in grammatical and ritual interpretation literatures will be considered. Secondly, by employing this model, Kumāriḷa's epistemology will be shown to constitute a pragmatist logic of inquiry with affinities to that of Peirce. A pragmatics of inquiry will be identified in Kumāriḷa's presentation, involving the stages of instigating, prolonging and terminating inquiry. This reading of Kumāriḷa is an anti-foundationalist reading, on which inquiry is driven by pragmatic considerations and knowledge-claims do not rest on some secure foundation.

However, Kumāriḷa also separately characterizes deliverances from epistemic sources by reference to a paradigm of a Good Case deliverance, in which appropriately normal epistemic conditions ensure the truth of a belief. This element of Kumāriḷa's doctrine distinguishes his view from a more thorough or Rortian anti-foundationalism which would deny a metaphysical foundation for truth. Rather, Kumāriḷa's epistemological anti-foundationalism constitutes only a denial of the idea that any or all beliefs can be properly foundational in terms of justification, combined with a pragmatics of inquiry that involves attaining a sufficient threshold level of confidence in beliefs.

The case of beliefs formed via Vedic testimony is considered by Kumāriḷa to involve a special application of the general process of inquiry. Vedic injunctions are held to comprise an exclusive domain of judgments in the same way as

⁴ Kahrs (1998) 176

flavours do. As such, defeat based on non-Vedic epistemic sources is not possible.

Renou describes how “[l]a pensee indienne a pour substructure des raisonnements d'ordre grammatical. La Mīmāṃsā ... implique une masse de données philologique qui remontent en fin de compte à la grammaire”⁵. However, contemporary scholarship on Indian philosophy has only partially been guided by this insight.⁶ In particular, little research has been done into the use of grammatical forms of reasoning among philosophers of the Mīmāṃsā school in their purely philosophical work.⁷ Kumāṛila was one of these philosophers and a grammatical form of reasoning can be found throughout his own work.

Diverse practices of reasoning exist within contemporary society, covered by broad categorical terms such as legal reasoning, scientific reasoning, and informal reasoning. In the context of classical Indian intellectual traditions, we may expect to discover new forms of reasoning or applications of alternative forms of reasoning within otherwise familiar intellectual disciplines. Such discoveries may constitute conceptual resources which can be applied in the context of our own intellectual practices. This thesis builds on Renou's insight by identifying a grammatical model of reasoning which motivates Kumāṛila's model of an epistemic process and goal. Such a form of reasoning constitutes a defeasible, case-based reasoning or informal logic, and thus has an affinity with legal reasoning.

⁵ Renou (1941) 164

⁶ K. Bhattacharya's work on Nāgārjuna is an instance of following up on Renou's general insight. The discussion of the Indian epistemological framework as a relational model based on a grammatical case relations (strictly, *kāraka*-relations) has been discussed in Matilal (1986) and Taber (2005): these presentations will be drawn on in the next two chapters. By contrast, the distinctiveness of the grammatical terminology used by Kumāṛila in the doctrine currently under examination has not been examined.

⁷ Freschi (2012) discusses grammatical forms of reasoning in Mīmāṃsā in a more general context

Section 3: Intellectual and social context

Kumārila has been described as “the most important representative of classical Mīmāṃsā thought and apologetics”⁸. As Halbfass explains, “[a]ccording to Kumārila, the Mīmāṃsā is a “constellation of rules and arguments” (yuktikalāpa) that has been produced by a long tradition of human thought and teaching”⁹. Taber similarly explains that “Mīmāṃsā consists in a system of establishing rules and procedures, as objective as those of logic, for interpreting scriptural passages.”¹⁰ Taber also describes Mīmāṃsā in terms of a “science of exegesis”¹¹ and suggests that its methods “were not altogether unlike the “objective” methods employed by modern philologists today in interpreting Vedic texts.”¹² Verpoorten explains that the Mīmāṃsā school “is also called ... *Karma-mīmāṃsā* “Action-enquiry” or *Karma-kāṇḍa* “Action-chapter,” because it explores the way of (ritual) action (as distinct from the way of knowledge) towards “Liberation” (*mokṣa*).”¹³ The focus on rules and arguments will become manifest in the presentation of Kumārila's doctrine in terms of reasoning strategies in this thesis.

Kumārila's primary intellectual opponents are held to be Buddhist philosophers such as Dignāga and Dharmakīrti. Although fanciful stories about Kumārila and related authors are preserved in early works as well as in oral traditions¹⁴, fairly

⁸ Halbfass (1992) 32

⁹ Halbfass (1992) 30

¹⁰ Taber (2012) 146

¹¹ Taber (2012) 128

¹² Taber (2012) 146

¹³ Verpoorten (1987) 1

¹⁴ See the introduction to Sharma (1980) for a survey of some stories about the life of Kumārila and speculative remarks about the identity of Uṃveka. Early quasi-historical sources include for example the Śaṅkara-digvijaya by the 14th century author Vidyāraṇya (Mādhava) for Kumārila, and the Tibetan historians

little is known with certainty about their lives. As Taber explains:

“We know virtually nothing about Kumāriḷa's precise historical situation. We can guess, by the usual method of cross-referencing, that he lived in the seventh century. He seems to belong to the same period as Dharmakīrti, Maṇḍana, Śāṅkara, and Prabhākara. His familiarity with South Indian forms and customs suggests but does not prove that he lived in the South.”¹⁵

The Tibetan historian Tāranātha holds that the name 'Kumāriḷa' is a corruption of the name 'Kumāra-līla'.¹⁶ According to Sharma's survey of textual evidence, Kumāriḷa has been variously assigned to North India, South India and Bihar.¹⁷ According to Bu-ston, Kumāriḷa was in fact the uncle of Dharmakīrti, and other evidence also suggests South Indian origins.¹⁸ On the other hand, as Jha suggests, the uncertain reading 'procyāḥ' for the upholders of the doctrine of svataḥ-prāmāṇyam in Śāntarakṣita's text could be a corruption of 'prācyāḥ' or 'easterners', which would locate Kumāriḷa's intellectual community to the east of Nālandā.¹⁹ Also we read about how the 7th Buddhist philosopher Śāntideva “departed to the east, where he took part in a great dispute. By the force of his miraculous powers, he reconciled (those who were quarelling) and gave pleasure to all.”²⁰

for stories and some biographical details about the Indian Buddhist philosophers who travelled to Tibet

¹⁵ Taber (1997) 390

¹⁶ See Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya (1970) 230

¹⁷ Sharma (1980) 11: “[The Tibetan historian] Tāranātha says that [Kumāriḷa] was a native of Southern India. But it is also believed that he was a Brahman of Bihar who abjured Buddhism for Hinduism. The tradition associating Kumāriḷa with Northern India receives some support from the statement of Ānandagiri in his Śāṅkara Vijaya (Calcutta Edition, p.235) that Kumāriḷa came from the North (udagdeśāt) and persecuted the Buddhists and Jains in the South.”

¹⁸ See Arnold (2014): “It is sometimes surmised from his evident knowledge of Dravidian languages (his Tantravārttika includes some discussion of Tamil word forms) that Kumāriḷa may have been south Indian”

¹⁹ Jha (1939) 775

²⁰ Obermiller (1932) 163

Kataoka tells us:

“it is not yet clear what kind of relationship Kumāriḷa had with Dharmakīrti ... who severely criticizes Mīmāṃsā directly ... Kumāriḷa and Dharmakīrti do not explicitly refer to one another in their works ... Nevertheless, one finds theoretical parallels and allusions between the two ... it is likely that Mīmāṃsā, or a particular Mīmāṃsaka, played an important role ... at the time the young Dharmakīrti was developing his doctrines. And the most probable candidate is the Mīmāṃsaka Bhaṭṭa Kumāriḷa, as Frauwallner [1962] suggested.”²¹

Kataoka surveys textual evidence related to the question of the relationship between Kumāriḷa and his Buddhist opponent Dharmakīrti, who seem to have been close contemporaries.²² Eltschinger, Krasser and Taber similarly state that “Dharmakīrti's main opponent was Mīmāṃsā, quite probably in the person of its main brilliant classical exponent, Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa (Dharmakīrti's senior contemporary).”²³

Dharmakīrti “seems to have been born in South India and then to have moved to the great monastic university of Nālandā”²⁴. The account of the 14th century Tibetan writer Bu-ston discusses the activities of various Buddhist philosophers from India in Tibet, including those discussed here. According to this account, as Obermiller explains:

“[t]he pupil of Īcvarasena was Dharmakīrti. The latter was born in the southern kingdom of Cūḍāmaṇi in a heretical [i.e. non-Buddhist] Brāhmaṇic family ... Once, as he took from his uncle, the heretical

²¹ Kataoka (2011) 25-26

²² See Kataoka (2011) 47-59

²³ Eltschinger, Krasser and Taber (2011) 7

²⁴ Tillemans (2013)

teacher Kumāriḷa the garments of a Brāhmaṇic heretical ascetic, the uncle spoke abusively to him and drove him away. The teacher then made his resolve to vanquish all the heretics. Accordingly, he took orders in the Buddhist church ...".²⁵

Taber mentions that "the only item of significance [as to Kumāriḷa's dating is] his assignment to the reign of Srong-tsan-gam-po, 627-650, by the Tibetan historian Tāranātha."²⁶ Taber also considers that "[m]ost scholars have tended to consider [Kumāriḷa] an older contemporary of the great Buddhist logician Dharmakīrti, but recent evidence that the latter lived as early as 530-600 CE ... makes this approach problematic."²⁷ Thus, in recent research, Helmut Krasser explains:

"Dharmakīrti's dates as proposed in FRAUWALLNER's famous "Landmarks in the history of Indian Logic" are 600-660. These dates have been more or less accepted by the scholarly community, with the exception of Christian Lindtner and Toshihiko Kimura, who have proposed 530-600 and c. 550-620, respectively."²⁸

Krasser himself reconsiders the evidence and comes to a conclusion in which he "propose[s], as a working hypothesis, the time of activity of Kumāriḷa and Dharmakīrti to be the middle of the sixth century."²⁹ However, Frauwallner's dates seem to remain the scholarly consensus.

During the 7th and 8th centuries, the Buddhist institution of learning at Nālandā, in the Magadha region, was at the height of its fame and intellectual influence. Most of the prominent Buddhist philosophers of the times were based there.

²⁵ Obermiller (1932) 152

²⁶ Taber (2005) 163 note 2

²⁷ Taber (2005) 163 note 2

²⁸ Krasser, H. (2012b) 581

²⁹ Krasser, H. (2012b) 587

According to one apocryphal story, Kumābila disguised himself as a Buddhist in order to learn the doctrines of the Buddhists at first hand at Nālandā.³⁰ The Magadha region covered part of present-day Bihar and present-day Nepal.

As for the eight century Buddhist philosophers Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, according to Das, “[i]n the first quarter of the seventh century A.D., Buddhism was introduced into Tibet from Nepal ...”³¹ and subsequently both these philosophers, along with many of the prominent Buddhist philosophers of their times, visited Tibet and ultimately relocated there, and were “engaged in translating Sanskrit works into Tibetan”³². Śāntarakṣita was apparently “a native of Gaur [Bengal], who was the High Priest of the monastery of Nālandā”³³ and Kamalaśīla was a “great Buddhist philosopher of Magadha”³⁴.

The debate about the epistemic good that is the aim of inquiry takes place within a wider context of debate about the source of the authority of the Vedic textual corpus. Kumābila intended that his doctrine support the idea that the authority of Vedic texts is independent of any human author. This idea and its motivating theory were vehemently denied by Kumābila's Buddhist contemporaries and successors, who by contrast took the words of the Buddha as a source of authoritative testimony. As Kataoka explains:

“Xuanzang's travel accounts further depict the situation of intellectuals in those days. One took part in public debates in order to defeat representatives of other schools and sects, thereby gaining rewards and patronage from kings and ministers. Kumābila's criticism of omniscience

³⁰ See Aum Namah Shivaay (2011) for a popular dramatisation of this and one other episode from Kumābila's life

³¹ Das (1893) 49

³² Das (1893) 49. See also Blumenthal (2014): “He made two trips to Tibet and ultimately spent the last fifteen years of his life there. Śāntarakṣita was one of the most influential figures in the early dissemination of Buddhism in Tibet ...”

³³ Das (1893) 49

³⁴ Das (1893) 49

[of the Buddha] and his defense of the Veda and Vedic animal sacrifices can be regarded as a result of lively arguments with his opponents."³⁵

At the same time, the significance of philosophical interaction and polemical activity between different groups in driving forward philosophical research programmes should not be overstated. One aim of this research is to show how Kumāriḷa's epistemology can be read as a natural extension of his prior concerns with ritual interpretation and Vedic exegesis. In this way, the philosophical development of Mīmāṃsā was driven at least in part by an endogenous process.

Section 4: Situating the research

Kumāriḷa's theory has been discussed by classical Indian commentators including Uṃveka (also called Bhaṭṭoṃveka and Umbeka) and Pārthasārathi Miśra, and in recent work published by John Taber, Dan Arnold, and Kei Kataoka.³⁶ Arnold alludes to the importance of this topic by commenting that the "inattention to the epistemology of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā is regrettable".³⁷

Kataoka presents a translation of Kumāriḷa's discussion in the Śloka-vārttika and a comprehensive analysis of this, which represents a significant advance in understanding Kumāriḷa's view but does not provide a critical evaluation of the doctrine or site it in the landscape of contemporary philosophy. Taber and Arnold both examine two contrasting interpretations of Kumāriḷa's doctrine presented by the 8th century philosopher Uṃveka Bhaṭṭa and by the 11th century

³⁵ Kataoka (2011) 24

³⁶ See Taber (1992), Arnold (2001), Arnold (2005), Kataoka (2011); cf. also Arnold (2014)

³⁷ Arnold (2001) 591

philosopher Pārthasārathi Miśra, and both favour the interpretation of the latter.

A study by Taber “attempts to explain what ... Kumārilabhaṭṭa meant by *svataḥ prāmāṇya*, by discussing and evaluating the distinct interpretations of Kumārila's statements by his commentators Umbekabhaṭṭa and Pārthasārathimiśra.”³⁸ Arnold seeks to advance the work of Taber in two very similar publications, focusing on the interpretative differences between these two commentators.³⁹ These two presentations will be assumed here to present a single view.⁴⁰ Both Taber and Arnold focus almost exclusively on Kumārila's exposition in the Śloka-vārttika, on which the commentaries of Uṃveka and Pārthasārathi are based, and do not engage substantively with the separate presentation in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā, as this thesis will do. In doing so, they follow the lead of the classical Indian commentators, whose exclusive focus on the Śloka-vārttika is not easy to explain, except perhaps if this were a later text that were considered to supersede the earlier Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā. Thus, there are no extant commentaries on the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā apart from the antagonistic discussion by Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, and the text itself only survives in part, with the only substantive preservation in the larger Tattva-saṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita. Given that the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā constitutes a “more refined and sophisticated”⁴¹ discussion than that in the Śloka-vārttika, with “more detailed explanations”⁴², one might expect that a confident understanding of the doctrine would require a close study of this text.

Taber and Arnold not only explain the interpretative differences, but also express a firm preference for Pārthasārathi's interpretation. Taber believes that “Pārthasārathi offers a much more coherent reading of Kumārila's text than

³⁸ Taber (1992b) 204

³⁹ See Arnold (2001), esp. 592, and Arnold (2005)

⁴⁰ Cf. Arnold (2005) viii: “Chapters 3 and 4 represent revisions of my article ...”

⁴¹ Kataoka (2011) 46

⁴² Kataoka (2011) 42

Umbeka⁴³ and that Pārthasārathi's interpretation "represents a viable position in an important philosophical debate"⁴⁴, albeit "on no interpretation, neither Umbeka's nor Pārthasārathi's, can the notion of *svataḥ prāmāṇya* serve specifically as a basis for the defense of the authority of the Veda."⁴⁵ Arnold writes that "I hope to have shown that [Pārthasārathi's] interpretation represents not only the best exegesis of the tradition ... but also that it is a *philosophically cogent* account"⁴⁶ whereas "Uṃveka's interpretation compromises the major insight of Kumārila's doctrine of *svataḥ prāmāṇya*."⁴⁷

Although the scope of this study is restricted to understanding Kumārila's doctrine in its own right, and does not discuss the later commentarial developments of his doctrine, nevertheless some engagement with the discussions of Taber and Arnold is necessary, insofar as these concern the question of the proper interpretation of Kumārila's claim. The interpretation of Kumārila's doctrine presented here builds on the insights into the analytic nuances of Kumārila's terminology provided by Kataoka. However, it differs significantly from the interpretations of Arnold and Taber on a number of grounds. Firstly, Kumārila's doctrine is characterized as a Peircean form of anti-foundationalism rather than a Reidean form. Secondly, Kumārila's doctrine is characterized in terms of a culminating epistemic process constrained by a normative goal rather than by sole reference to the phenomenology of awareness. Thirdly, an ontological aspect of Kumārila's understanding of how deliverances function is distinguished from Kumārila's analysis of inquiry, thereby clarifying the sense in which Kumārila endorses a metaphysical foundation for the truth of beliefs. It is argued that the views of the two classical commentators correctly capture different aspects of Kumārila's claim.

⁴³ Taber (1992b) 211

⁴⁴ Taber (1992b) 218

⁴⁵ Taber (1992b) 217

⁴⁶ Arnold (2001) 642

⁴⁷ Arnold (2001) 593

Uṃveka's view has been characterized by Arnold as a causal account. It will be suggested that Uṃveka's account is adequate to capture the nature of the Good Case deliverances which form the paradigm case and which constitute the goal of inquiry. Pārthasārathi's view will not be considered separately, but only within the context of a general 'Pārthasārathi-Arnold' reading. The Pārthasārathi-Arnold reading of Kumārila's doctrine is non-normative and appeals instead to phenomenological content as the sole basis for justification and a robust conception of truth. It is suggested that such an account captures a regulative notion of justification present in Kumārila's doctrine. However, the reading developed here identifies a dynamic element to Kumārila's doctrine whereby it constitutes a normative and purposive protocol that reflects the logic of inquiry of a rational agent.

Section 5: Methodological approach

Classical Indian epistemological texts constitute a major intellectual resource and there is significant potential for bringing this resource into engagement with contemporary epistemology. Kumārila's presentation of the doctrine to be discussed is the earliest extant sophisticated discussion of an abstract epistemic goal, termed 'prāmāṇyam', common to all beliefs, rather than the description of particular information channels for forming beliefs.⁴⁸ For him, this goal is 'from itself' ('svataḥ'), rather than 'from something else' ('parataḥ').

Prominent features of the terrain of contemporary epistemology have developed in response to the Gettier counter-examples to the justified true belief analysis

⁴⁸ Uddyotakara discusses the topic of prāmāṇyam before Kumārila, but in a more rudimentary way and not in the context of an established debate: see Shida (2004) for details. Śabara uses the terms prāmāṇyam and non-prāmāṇyam before Kumārila. Dharmakīrti provides his views at the same time as Kumārila, but does not situate them in a wider polemical context.

of knowledge, including the purported need for modal conditions such as safety in an account of knowledge, and the distinction between internalist and externalist terminologies and positions. The historical evolution of classical Indian epistemology obviously does not parallel that of contemporary epistemology, and thus any claim of equivalence of analytic concepts between the two traditions must be treated with extreme caution. Nevertheless, in this thesis it is argued that, despite ostensibly different concerns, some notions in the classical Indian debate are allied to concepts in contemporary philosophy, and some of the same theoretical themes emerge in both contexts.

In describing his own methodological approach to classical Indian Buddhist epistemological texts, Christian Coseru explains his goal of “engaging the arguments of the Buddhist epistemologists in ways that make their thought relevant to contemporary debates”.⁴⁹ Accordingly, Coseru advises that “one engages Buddhist thinkers *philosophically*, that is, in the same way one reads Descartes or Kant as informers of contemporary philosophical debates.”⁵⁰ Although this approach may seem to raise interpretive concerns, Coseru quotes Gadamer in order to make the point that “the texts of the Buddhist epistemological tradition do not wish to draw attention to them as textual materials fit for exegesis but rather to mediate our understanding of various logical and epistemological arguments in relation to a specific topic.”⁵¹ The aim of this thesis is to engage with Kumāṛila in such a manner. In particular, a reading of Kumāṛila's doctrine that is philosophically coherent as well as appealing should be seen to speak in favour of the interpretative success of that reading. The thesis thus constitutes a reading of Kumāṛila which draws on the language and debates of contemporary philosophy as a tool or resource for transposing Kumāṛila's ideas into the space of contemporary philosophical concerns. Thus what Wiggins says about Peirce, that if his “ideas are to reach

⁴⁹ Coseru (2012) 22

⁵⁰ Coseru (2012) 35

⁵¹ Coseru (2012) 36 fn.62

again into the bloodstream of philosophy, then we need not only fresh studies of his texts but speculative transpositions of these ideas⁵² may also be said in regard to Kumāṛila.

This thesis provides a reconstruction of Kumāṛila's doctrine based on a close reading of the Sanskrit texts of both the Bṛhaṭṭīkā and the Śloka-vārttika. Kumāṛila's sets out his doctrine on two separate occasions in these two different texts. Their relative chronology and Kumāṛila's reasons for authoring two distinct works covering substantially the same ground are issues that are not fully settled among contemporary scholars.⁵³ Both presentations are in verse and are terse and succinct, presenting difficulties of interpretation which led to interpretative divergences arising during the following century. Thus Uṃveka considers four alternative interpretations of Kumāṛila's doctrine at some length before giving his own interpretation. Likewise Śāntarakṣita considers three and Kamalaśīla a further five versions of Kumāṛila's doctrine, one of which is Uṃveka's. This profusion of possible interpretations rather suggests that subsequent thinkers were in fact bewildered as to the actual significance of Kumāṛila's doctrine.

The presentation in the Śloka-vārttika involves a strategy of setting up a schema of four possible positions, and then fairly rapidly rejecting the three alternative views before advocating Kumāṛila's own view at greater length. The presentation in the Bṛhaṭṭīkā does not involve this strategy and argues in favour of Kumāṛila's own view in greater detail. This thesis freely draws from

⁵² Wiggins (2004) 89

⁵³ See Kataoka (2011) 27-47 for a survey of the history of modern scholarship on these two questions. See in particular p.47, where Kataoka concludes in accordance with Frauwallner that "the Bṛhaṭṭīkā is a later, revised version of the Śloka-vārttika." Similarly, Verpoorten (1987) 30 states that "[t]he Bṛhaṭṭīkā handles the same problems as the ŚV ... we feel K's thought in this work to be more synthetic and riper." By contrast, Taber (1992a) 179 argues against Frauwallner and in favour of "the traditional opinion [of K.S. Ramaswami Sastri] that the ŚV represents Kumāṛila's mature philosophy."

both texts in order to present a coherent and philosophically appealing view, without attempting to find any difference in the two presentations that may indicate a development in Kumāriila's own thinking.

The approach of this thesis aims to compensate for the terseness of Kumāriila's presentation by examining how Kumāriila selects technical terms with a pre-existing history of usage in theoretical contexts. This is not to claim that Kumāriila did not adapt the precise meaning of the terms to suit his own dialectic purpose, but rather that an understanding of the pre-existing roles of technical terms can provide a sound basis for understanding Kumāriila's own use of these terms.

This thesis seeks to reconstruct Kumāriila's own doctrine as far as possible independently of the concerns of later Indian philosophers who may have had varied motivations for discussing Kumāriila's work, and who were writing at a later time when the driving concerns of Indian epistemology would have changed to some extent. Given the terseness of Kumāriila's presentation, it has though been necessary to consult later authors who commented on or responded to these texts in more or less depth to strengthen the understanding of Kumāriila's epistemology. Later discussions of Kumāriila's work have therefore been drawn on to throw light on the technical terminology used by Kumāriila, but as far as possible without introducing any novel elements into the interpretation. However, given the controversy which arose over the proper interpretation of Kumāriila's doctrine among later authors, which seems to reflect an inherent ambiguity in Kumāriila's own presentations, it may not be possible fully to realize this ideal.

The main later sources drawn on in this thesis date from the seventh and eighth century, and are the earliest commentaries on this doctrine. As such,

they may be closer in spirit to Kumāriḷa's own way of thinking. The Tātparya-Ṭikā is a commentary on the Śloka-vārttika by Uṃveka Bhaṭṭa⁵⁴, who was also affiliated to the Mīmāṃsā school and as such defended (his own reading of) Kumāriḷa's doctrine. The Tattva-saṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita⁵⁵ and its own commentary Pañjikā by Kamalaśīla⁵⁶ excerpt Kumāriḷa's presentation from the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā and provide discussion of it. As Buddhist philosophers, these two authors disagree with Kumāriḷa's view, provide their own criticisms, and explain their own alternative view. These two philosophers are discussed briefly, and are treated here as speaking in a single voice against Kumāriḷa. As close contemporaries to Kumāriḷa, Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi have been drawn on to a limited extent, but a more detailed study of these two important Buddhist philosophers would be helpful in providing more insight into their contributions to the debate.

Unless otherwise stated, quotes from the Śloka-vārttika represent a modification of the translation in Kataoka (2011), and quotes from the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā and all other sources are translations made directly from published versions of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts referenced in the abbreviations and bibliography sections. Appendices are also provided with transliterated Sanskrit text and translations corresponding to extracts of the substantive part of

⁵⁴ Kataoka (2011) 21 gives the dates of Uṃveka as 730-790 AD. Mirashi (1966) 91 says that "Umbeka flourished in *circa* A.D. 775-800". Kane (1928) 292-3 says that "the literary activity ... of Umbeka [must be placed] between 700 and 730 AD". However, Mirashi (1966) 93 fn.209 argues forcefully that Dr Kane's reasons for this dating "are absolutely baseless". Taber (1992b) 209 says that "It indeed appears that the first Mīmāṃsā theory of *svataḥ prāmāṇya* discussed by Śāntarakṣita in his TS (2812-45) is Umbeka's interpretation of Kumāriḷa". Although this is not entirely implausible, the fact Kamalaśīla appends to this chapter a separate discussion of Uṃveka's views would suggest that the view discussed by Śāntarakṣita is not Umbeka's interpretation of Kumāriḷa, and that Umbeka wrote soon after Śāntarakṣita.

⁵⁵ Kataoka (2011) 21 follows Frauwallner in giving 725-788 AD as Śāntarakṣita's dates.

⁵⁶ Kataoka (2011) 21 follows Frauwallner in giving 740-795 AD as Kamalaśīla's dates.

Kumārila's discussion of this topic in the *Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā*. These appendices cover all the verses quoted from those two texts in this thesis, and are intended as a reference guide for the reader. No credit is taken for original research in respect of editing the Sanskrit text. Further, it has not been possible to make any significant improvement on the translation of the *Śloka-vārttika* made in Kataoka (2011), so the translation provided here represents a mere modification of that in line with the interpretation developed in this thesis. Accordingly, no credit is claimed in respect of translation of the *Śloka-vārttika* text extract either. The reader is directed to Kataoka (2011) for a full translation of the *Śloka-vārttika* text extract.

Section 6: Use of terminology

Terminology used in a philosophical discussion is of a technical character. The range of terms available and the semantic range of these terms reflects the contingent historical development of the subject. This is true for both contemporary Western philosophy and the classical Indian debate. Key terms of the vocabulary of contemporary epistemology, such as the framing of a debate between internalist and externalist positions, has been developed in the literature attempting to respond to the Gettier problem, and the meanings of pre-existing terms such as justification has also been made more complex and also problematic through this literature. Accordingly, this thesis will attempt to introduce whatever contemporary terminology is needed with a degree of self-awareness about the contingent historical character of contemporary terminology. The examination of wider usage of the Indian terminology in theoretical contexts mentioned above will also serve to introduce a degree of self-awareness about the contingent historical character of the terminology available to Kumārila. At the same time, terminology is wielded in distinctive

ways by individual philosophers, and the examination of general use of terminology constitutes only a preliminary exercise for understanding Kumāṛila's use of these terms.

Accordingly, this thesis will proceed to recover an understanding of Kumāṛila's doctrine through an examination of his use of a number of key theoretical terms. The question of how these terms should be rendered into the vocabulary of contemporary epistemology will be under examination throughout much of this thesis. As such, it will not be possible to begin this examination with a translation of these terms into English without presupposing what is ultimately to be discovered. In particular, the technical terms 'pramāṇa', 'non-pramāṇa', 'prāmāṇyam', 'non-prāmāṇyam', 'svabhāva', 'virodha', 'utsarga', 'apavāda' and 'prāptā' will be originally encountered in Sanskrit in this thesis. As well as developing novel formulations for translating these terms, existing translations such as 'validity' etc. will be used when engaging with the existing scholarship. A glossary of key technical terms is provided at the end.

Part of the argument of this thesis is that Kumāṛila does not make his terminology any more exact than it needs to be in order to do the philosophical work he requires of it. Thus there can be a variety of ways of filling out the details of Kumāṛila's position, but no such additional detail should be necessary in order to understand the structure of Kumāṛila's argument and its philosophical coherence. Thus Kumāṛila did not see the attainment of maximum granularity in analysis as the aim of philosophical endeavour, but instead chose to use philosophical terminology that is determined with a level of granularity appropriate to his specific philosophical goals. This can be compared to the way a tool is chosen that is appropriately coarse or fine to suit the purpose. A similar phenomenon can be seen in contemporary legal reasoning, where a good legal principle involves the idea that cases should be decided on narrower rather than broader grounds.

Kumāriila's approach contrasts with an analytic reductionist approach which is a prominent theme in at least some Buddhist philosophy. In particular, it will be seen how Kumāriila transfers paradigms of methodology and reasoning well-established in grammatical and ritual and legal interpretation literatures to this new context. It could also be that Kumāriila sought to make a philosophical intervention in support of his extra-philosophical beliefs, and thus was not concerned to engage with details that were not material to his strategic aims. A wide variety of interpretations of Kumāriila's doctrine formulated by later interpreters are preserved in the works of Uṃveka and Kamalaśīla. It will be suggested that these later interpretations reflect a failure to understand this strategic dimension to Kumāriila's use of terminology.

Given this approach, the challenge will be to find contemporary philosophical vocabulary which is sufficiently broad in its semantic range to convey the non-specific import of Kumāriila's use of the Sanskrit terms listed above. Thus it will be necessary to directly address the question of how key terms from contemporary philosophical vocabulary are being used at various stages in this thesis. The goal is to find a translation of each Sanskrit term which reflects the philosophical work being done by the term without introducing additional substantive claims which Kumāriila would not be concerned to defend.

Italics have been used for passages translated as block quotes from Sanskrit or Tibetan. Italics have not been used for transliterated Sanskrit terms, unless as part of a quotation, where the convention of the quoted author has been followed. Bold font has sometimes been used to emphasize a term within a translated quotation that is of particular relevance to the larger discussion. All page references to Kataoka (2011) are to Part II unless otherwise stated.

Section 7: Thesis Summary

A connection between Kumāriḷa's doctrine of svataḥprāmāṇyam and the ideas of fallibility and infallibility has been suggested by B.K. Matilal.⁵⁷ This thesis will clarify how notions of fallibilism and infallibilism are involved in Kumāriḷa's doctrine, and find an affinity with Peirce's rejection of skepticism and the Cartesian method of doubt in favour of a pragmatist method of inquiry.

Hookway distinguishes between two ways of characterizing fallibilism.⁵⁸ A first way is as a "distinctive 'attitude of mind'"⁵⁹, whereby "our acceptance of propositions should always have a detached or tentative character: the possibility of error must be real."⁶⁰ Hookway's interest however lies in a second characterization which he attributes to Peirce. Here, "lack of 'absolute certainty' is compatible with the sort of ordinary certainty that arises when the possibility of error cannot really be entertained or taken seriously."⁶¹ This second characterization involves "defining infallibility, and then characteriz[ing] fallibilism as the view that there are no propositions that are 'infallible' so understood."⁶² Hookway thus explains:

"When we describe a judgement or belief as 'infallible', we identify it as belonging to an epistemic kind of which, of necessity, all members are true ... This assignment to a kind identifies a metaphysical feature of the judgement or belief that guarantees its truth."⁶³

⁵⁷ See Matilal (1986) 32

⁵⁸ In Hookway (2007); the same material is also presented in Hookway (2008)

⁵⁹ Hookway (2007) 10

⁶⁰ Hookway (2007) 10

⁶¹ Hookway (2007) 10

⁶² Hookway (2007) 11

⁶³ Hookway (2007) 11

Kumārila's use of the notion of *svabhāva* will be investigated in order to show that Kumārila conceives of *pramāṇas* as epistemic kinds which have an essential disposition to correctly apprehend some object or rational truth under appropriately normal conditions. Kumārila is shown to endorse a disjunctive account of deliverances from epistemic sources, whereby deliverances based on *pramāṇas* are of necessity true, and deliverances not based on *pramāṇas* are characterized partly in terms of reflective indiscriminability from the first class of deliverances.

However, as Hookway goes on to explain, in such a case, "we may be unconfident of our judgement because we are unsure whether it is a judgement of perception or, perhaps, a member of a different epistemic kind, a report of illusion or hallucination, for example."⁶⁴ Kumārila's response to a first possible view raised in the *Śloka-vārttika* presentation makes this same point. Hookway suggests that a first possible solution is to "revise the characterization of infallibility to require that the belief *detectably* belongs to a kind which guarantees its truth."⁶⁵ Kumārila's discussion and a discussion by Uṃveka which rejects the notion of a distinguishing feature of correct awareness argue that no beliefs can meet such a characterization, and thus all beliefs are fallible in this sense.

However, Hookway alternately suggest that "we might accept that fallibilism does not extend to all our judgements, recognizing the infallibility of perceptual ones, while also insisting that our beliefs *about* whether a given judgement is a perceptual judgement are fallible."⁶⁶ Similarly, Kumārila asserts that, whereas perceptual and other judgments based on *pramāṇas* are infallible in the sense

⁶⁴ Hookway (2007) 11

⁶⁵ Hookway (2007) 11

⁶⁶ Hookway (2007) 11

that they belong to an epistemic kind that necessitates their truth, beliefs about whether a judgment is based on a *pramāṇa* are fallible. Accordingly, Kumārila's fallibilism concerns beliefs about whether a deliverance is of the right epistemic kind or not, and thus concerns something like the contemporary philosophical notion of judgments. Thus for Kumārila, just as much as for Peirce, "a commitment to fallibilism is compatible with great confidence and certainty in the adequacy of most of our opinions and methods."⁶⁷

Kumārila's fallibilism about judgments leads to his presentation of a method of inquiry which involves the transference of a pre-existing theoretical model rooted in ritual interpretation and already informing other disciplines such as legal interpretation and generative grammar. This is a model of general operation and replacement operation. Kumārila's model of inquiry is found to have an affinity with Peirce's understanding of abduction as a defeasible reasoning strategy that reflects the fallibility of human inquiry.

Kumārila's main claim is that "the *prāmāṇyam* of all *pramāṇas* is 'from itself'"⁶⁸. A full understanding of his claim will accordingly require a separate understanding of Kumārila's use of the three technical terms '*prāmāṇyam*', '*pramāṇa*' and '*svataḥ*' ('from itself'). Chapter Two argues for an understanding of the term 'from itself' as a form of nomic necessitation and Chapter Three argues for a rendering of the term '*pramāṇa*' as a deliverance which obtains in a 'Good Case', where the notion of 'Good Case' is borrowed from contemporary disjunctivism. A reading of the term '*prāmāṇyam*' as a capacity for epistemic success and as a manifestation of that competence in the form of accurate determination of an object or fact is also argued for in Chapter Three. As such, Kumārila's claim is that a capacity for epistemic success is nomically necessitated in Good Cases. One way to read this idea is provided by Sosa's

⁶⁷ Hookway (2007), 13

⁶⁸ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively. The language is almost identical in both texts.

idea that the disposition to trust our deliverances represents the manifestation of a competence where it is exercised in appropriate conditions. This means that epistemic success can be ascertained by the subject by ascertaining that conditions are appropriate, i.e. that a Good Case obtains. Kumārila's notion of 'non-pramāṇa' corresponds to the notion of a Bad Case as understood in disjunctivism.

Although Good Case deliverances represent the manifestation of a competence which is an essential disposition, nevertheless, as Hookway notes, the agent may be unsure whether any given deliverance belong to this epistemic kind. Accordingly, a method of inquiry is needed, and Chapter Four examines Kumārila's presentation of just such a method. Peirce is drawn on as an interlocutor for the understanding of Kumārila's protocol of inquiry, which is also rooted in the methodologies of ritual interpretation and generative grammar. Kumārila's method is set out in terms of three phases, which are labelled instigating, prolonging and terminating inquiry.

Chapter Five considers Kumārila's anti-foundationalism, which is based on a regress argument against a certain conception of justification. This regress argument targets *inter alia* the Buddhist position. Kumārila's opposition to the requirement for subsequent justification supports his own claim that the agent satisfies a normative burden by following a protocol for inquiry. That this protocol results in true belief is argued for via an explanatory induction.

The above discussion of Kumārila's doctrine has focused on the case of judgments that are not based on testimony from Vedic scripture, i.e. judgments derived from epistemic sources including perception, reasoning and ordinary testimony. In the case of Vedic judgments, Kumārila holds that the scope for error is eliminated because there is no other possible epistemic kind which

could give rise to a reflectively indiscriminable judgment.

In more detail, the chapter structure is as follows. Chapter Two begins with Kumāriḷa's gloss of 'from itself' as 'due to svabhāva' and argues that Kumāriḷa's use of the term 'svabhāva' captures a notion of nomic necessity. Primary and secondary literature on the term 'svabhāva' is surveyed to obtain a preliminary understanding of the term. However, previous research relating to this term outside of a Buddhist context is limited, so the research in this chapter contributes to a fuller understanding of the meaning of the term 'svabhāva'. The term 'svabhāva' is found to equate to some form of essential disposition, following the contemporary literature on dispositional essentialism. By endorsing the notion of a bare disposition, the chapter diverges from Arnold's rejection of *virtus dormativa* arguments such as Uṃveka's ontological reading of 'svataḥ' ('from itself').

The Mādhyamika Buddhist philosophers Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti rebut the interpretations of svabhāva as a permanent existent and as an invariably associated feature. This notion relates a property to an entity, and it is found to cover the semantic field of the terms 'nature' and 'essence', where these are understood as a real component explaining necessity and as a basis for the individuation of an entity.

The findings of Ramkrishna Bhattacharya that the notion of svabhāva among the svabhāva-advocates is ambiguous between a notion involving a minimal form of causality and a notion denying causality are then presented. The same ambiguity is shown to be inherent in Kumāriḷa's conception of an invariably associated feature. Uṃveka's interpretation disambiguates the meaning in favour of minimal causality. Kumāriḷa's use of the term 'svabhāva' is seen to capture a notion of nomic or natural necessity, congruent with the modality

implicit in Hookway's idea of "an epistemic kind of which, of necessity, all members are true."⁶⁹

Chapter Three begins by explicating Kumāriila's use of the term 'prāmāṇyam' as a capacity for epistemic success. As per its characterization by reference to svabhāva, this is nomically necessitated in the case of a pramāṇa. A pramāṇa is shown to be a deliverance which obtains in appropriately normal conditions, and thus represents the manifestation of a competence which determines the accuracy of the belief.

Through a careful reading of passages from Kumāriila's text, the dichotomy between pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa is shown to correspond to the dichotomy between a Good Case and a Bad Case advocated by epistemological disjunctivists. Further analysis of Kumāriila's terminology shows that Kumāriila's doctrine closely involves the disjunctivist idea that "Bad Cases [are] reflectively indiscriminable from Good ones"⁷⁰.

Chapter Four presents Kumāriila's claim as a belief protocol that captures the logic of inquiry of a rational agent. The normative reading of Kumāriila's doctrine developed here is contrasted with a phenomenological reading developed by Pārthasārathi and by Dan Arnold. The terms 'utsarga' and 'apavāda' are used by Kumāriila to capture the idea of hypothesis adoption and hypothesis replacement. The roots of this terminology in the grammatical and ritual literatures are described in order to show how Kumāriila models the process of generating true beliefs by analogy with how linguistic units are correctly formed through a generative grammar. Such a model constitutes a directive to the epistemic agent who aims at getting beliefs that are not merely

⁶⁹ Hookway (2007) 11

⁷⁰ Sturgeon (2006) 188

justified but are in fact true. The instigating, prolonging and terminating of inquiry are all separately investigated. Kumāriila's discussion of alternatives to his own view is seen to support the logic of inquiry he provides.

Chapter Five examines Kumāriila's anti-foundationalism. Kumāriila's presentation of an argument from infinite regress attacks forms of foundationalism including that of his Buddhist adversaries, which is accordingly described. Kumāriila is interpreted as an anti-foundationalist who rejects the idea that a secure foundation for judgments can be obtained. However, whereas the reading of Kumāriila's anti-foundationalism by Taber and Arnold means that all beliefs are equally justified or equally valid, the interpretation presented here is that a process of inquiry is necessary to strengthen the epistemic status of beliefs. Finally, the case of the Veda as an infallible epistemic source is considered.

Ultimately it is found that the term 'prāmāṇyam' constitutes the notion of a capacity for epistemic success, the term 'pramāṇa' constitutes a Good Case deliverance, which involves both possession and exercise of such a capacity, and 'svataḥ', or 'from itself', provides the idea that the exercise of such a capacity is in virtue of the intrinsic nature of the deliverance conditional on its identity as a Good Case deliverance, and hence not reliant on anything else. The notion of being 'in virtue of' represents an idea of metaphysical grounding. Thus Kumāriila's claim is that Good Case deliverances exercise a capacity for epistemic success which they possess as an intrinsic disposition.

By contrast, 'non-pramāṇa' constitutes a Bad Case deliverance. Such a deliverance is 'from something else' in the sense that its apprehension as of an object is due to sub-optimal epistemic conditions which are characterized as flaws of the belief process. Because Bad Case deliverances are so reliant, they

are vulnerable to defeat, unlike Good Case deliverances.

Chapter 2: Kumāriila's dispositional essentialism

Section 1: Introduction

This chapter provides an examination of rival notions of svabhāva in circulation at the time of Kumāriila, and defends the attribution to Kumāriila of a form of dispositional essentialism involving the notion of a real causal power of an entity which constitutes its essence conditional on the existence of that entity. Kumāriila's notion of svabhāva is shown to have a greater affinity with a notion promulgated by earlier groups of svabhāva-advocates that with the notion criticized by Mādhyamika Buddhists. In the existing secondary literature, 'svabhāva' has been translated by terms such as 'nature' and 'essence' which hint at a constraint on metaphysical possibility.

John Carroll remarks that “[t]he most interesting and perhaps the most perplexing feature of laws is their modal character.”¹ In contemporary philosophy, Humean or Regularity theories and natural or nomic necessitation theories form two competing strategies to account for this modal character. As Alexander Bird explains, “[t]he prevailing debates surrounding the nature of laws of nature have focused on the rivalry between the regularity conception of laws and recent nomic necessitation accounts.”² Classical Indian discussions of the lawlike behaviour of the natural world also exist, and this chapter will provide a survey of some of these discussions.

The term 'svabhāva' is employed by groups known as svabhāva-advocates (svabhāva-vādins), and this notion is understood by one of these groups as either an essential property or an intrinsic nature of a substance which determines its behavioural manifestations. This view has much in common with the thesis of dispositional essentialism in contemporary philosophy. Kumāriila appears to draw on just this idea of nomic necessitation in his epistemological

¹ Carroll (1990) 185

² Bird (2005) 353

claim, which is that beliefs have a real and irreducible disposition or causal power to provide epistemic success. A second group of svabhāva-advocates uphold a thesis of lawlessness which focuses on the denial of the essentialist thesis. Dharmakīrti is one of Kumāriila's Buddhist contemporaries who formulates a broadly similar notion of svabhāva as an explanatory principle, but within an ultimately reductionist and anti-realist framework. Arguments against a realist conception of svabhāva are provided by the Mādhyamika Buddhist philosophers Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti.

This chapter reviews these various conceptions of svabhāva as an explanatory posit for the lawlike behaviour of objects. Firstly, a quick overview of dispositional essentialism is provided as a contemporary theoretical framework for the presentation of the Indian material. Kumāriila's own claim is then presented in order to motivate the discussion of powers and properties in general. The views of the svabhāva-advocates are then considered by drawing on the work of Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya and Ramkrishna Bhattacharya. The view of Dharmakīrti is considered by reference to the work of John Dunne. The arguments against a realist notion are then considered with reference to Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti as well as relevant secondary literature. On the basis of this discussion, the notion of essential property is refined to provide a viable conception which evades the force of these arguments. The discussion then turns to Kumāriila's own notion of svabhāva. After briefly indicating the importance of this notion in his epistemological claim, an illustration involving a pot is examined. On this basis, it is argued that Kumāriila's notion of svabhāva amounts to that of an essential property.

This thesis as a whole provides a detailed examination of nomic necessitation as it figures in Kumāriila's doctrine and as such provides an additional textual resource on which to assess the viability of the concept of svabhāva. It can be seen as building on the research of Chattopadhyaya and Bhattacharya into the svabhāva-advocates, but with a focus on the outlying case of Kumāriila, who was affiliated to the Mīmāṃsā school rather than being a self-declared svabhāva-advocate. The purpose of this chapter is to use the existing primary

and secondary literature on svabhāva as a resource to flesh out the notion of svabhāva as it figures in Kumārila's claim.

Section 2: Powers and properties in the classical Indian context

Kumārila begins the presentation of his own view in both the *Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā* and the *Śloka-vārttika* with the claim that “the *prāmāṇyam* of all *pramāṇas* is 'from itself'”³. In order to understand this claim, the terms '*prāmāṇyam*', '*pramāṇa*' and 'from itself' will need to be separately understood. However, this opening statement already informs us that some kind of relation obtains between *pramāṇas* and *prāmāṇyam*.

Kumārila next explains that this means that “a capacity for accurate determination of an object belongs to them [*scil.* *pramāṇas*] due to their *svabhāva*”⁴. According to this clarification, *prāmāṇyam* is a capacity for accurate determination, and its relation to *pramāṇas* is 'due to *svabhāva*'. The term '*prāmāṇyam*' and Kumārila's notion of a capacity will be explored in more depth later, as well as the idea of a capacity for epistemic success. The central term in Kumārila's claim, 'from itself', has been immediately glossed as 'due to its *svabhāva*'. The investigation into Kumārila's claim will begin with an investigation of this expression 'due to *svabhāva*'. In order to understand this term, it will be helpful to examine the wider usage of the theoretical term '*svabhāva*' in the classical Indian context. This task will be undertaken in this chapter, before turning to the specific application to *prāmāṇyam* as a capacity for accurate determination of an object.

The meaning of the term '*svabhāva*' has been investigated in much recent

³ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

⁴ TS 2812ab

scholarship.⁵ This section will provide a high-level survey of how the notion of *svabhāva* has been treated in recent literature. Later sections of this chapter will provide a deeper engagement with selected pieces of primary and secondary literature. By comparison of the textual evidence with the relevant contemporary literature, it will be argued in this section that the term *svabhāva* incorporates two dimensions, firstly as a default nature, in a sense to be explicated, and secondly as a real dispositional property or causal power.

Subsection 1: Svabhāva as a property

The denial of the existence of *svabhāva* in entities is a key Mādhyamika Buddhist tenet, and arguments provided against *svabhāva* by the Mādhyamika philosophers Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti will be examined below. In the context of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma Buddhism, Collett Cox explains:

“Each such primary factor, or *dharma*, is determined or distinguished by an intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), or distinctive characteristic, that can be applied to that factor alone and to no other ... The term 'intrinsic nature' ... refers to its atemporal underlying and defining nature ... ”⁶

In the context of Buddhist Reductionism generally, Mark Siderits focuses his discussion on 'intrinsic nature' and 'genuine intrinsic property' in order to capture the ontological dimension of the term '*svabhāva*' as what is fundamentally real.⁷ Jan Westerhoff notes that the term is “often translated as “inherent existence” or “own-being””.⁸ Westerhoff himself draws a distinction

⁵ See for example Siderits (2003), Dunne (2004), Ronkin (2005) and Westerhoff (2011)

⁶ Cox (1995) 139

⁷ See Siderits (2003) 117

⁸ See Westerhoff (2011) 19

between this ontological dimension to the notion as what “exist[s] in a primary manner, unconstructed and independent of anything else”⁹ and a notion of essence as “something that an object cannot lose without ceasing to be that very object.”¹⁰ (A cognitive dimension and a notion of absolute-svabhāva are also discussed by Westerhoff, but will not be relevant to this study.) In the context of Abhidharma Buddhism, Ronkin notes that sabhāva (the Pāli equivalent of svabhāva in the Abhidharma texts) has been rendered in various ways, “the most paramount of which are 'particular nature', 'own-nature', 'self-existence' and 'individual essence'.”¹¹ Ronkin makes a distinction between senses of nature and essence similar to that of Westerhoff.

In the context of the affirmation of svabhāva by the non-Mādhyamika Buddhist philosopher Dharmakīrti, John Dunne carefully distinguishes between svabhāva as property and svabhāva as nature.¹² Dunne further explains although “Dharmakīrti's system does not allow *de re* predication”¹³, his notion of svabhāva does involve some notion of necessity, although this is not quite a notion of *de dicto* necessity either.¹⁴ Dunne further explains that the accidental/essential distinction “remains vague and undeveloped”¹⁵ in Dharmakīrti's philosophy.

The existence of svabhāva has also been affirmed by various non-Buddhist groups. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya and Ramkrishna Bhattacharya are two scholars who have examined the views of groups called svabhāva-advocates. In the context of one group of svabhāva-advocates, Bhattacharya quotes a view of Joseph Needham that svabhāva “could be translated “inherent nature”, “innate thus-ness”, or “the essential nature of things”.”¹⁶ Bhattacharya himself

⁹ Westerhoff (2011) 24

¹⁰ Westerhoff (2009) 22

¹¹ See Ronkin (2005) 86

¹² See Dunne (2004) 155-202

¹³ Dunne (2004) 187

¹⁴ See Dunne (2004) 187-190

¹⁵ Dunne (2004) 190

¹⁶ Bhattacharya (2012) 603

distinguishes between two types of svabhāva-advocacy. The first type is the idea that svabhāva is the cause of everything, which he labels svabhāva-as-causality, rigid causality, embodied cause and unchanging nature.¹⁷ The second type is the denial of causality and of svabhāva-as-causality, which he labels svabhāva-as-accident or chance.¹⁸

The Mādhyamika Buddhist critique focuses on a dimension of the notion of svabhāva which connects with the notion of essence or nature, as indicated by some of the common translations within this context. By contrast, the context of the svabhāva-advocates focuses a dimension which connects with some notion of disposition or causal power, as indicated by Bhattacharya's translations and discussion to be considered below. A preliminary understanding of this notion can be had from a quick look at some examples of it. Candrakīrti mentions the examples of heat in fire and the property that makes a ruby a ruby.¹⁹ Here, svabhāva refers to a property possessed by an entity. Nāgārjuna explains that "a svabhāva cannot be removed/ abandoned/ caused to cease, such as the heat of fire, fluidity in [liquid] water [and] extendedness of space"²⁰. These brief remarks, which can be taken as relatively neutral and unbiased²¹, indicate a property that is possessed with some form of necessity.

In the Nyāya Kośa, a Sanskrit reference work for philosophical terms, svabhāva is defined as "a particular property of an entity which is not dependent on another cause"²² and is said to be "difficult to overcome".²³ Examples given are

¹⁷ See Bhattacharya (2012) 599, 608 and *passim*. The term "embodied cause" is taken from a quote from Needham

¹⁸ See Bhattacharya (2012) 599, 608 and *passim*

¹⁹ PP 260: "agner auṣṇyaṃ jñātānāṃ padmarāgâdināṃ padmarāgâdi-svabhāvaś ca"

²⁰ Vīrahavyāvartanī Svavṛtti 82: 14-15, also quoted in Westerhoff (2009) 22: "na hi svabhāvaḥ śakyo vinivartayituṃ yathâgner uṣṇatvam apāṃ dravatvam ākāśasya nirāvarenaṭvatvam|"

²¹ The svabhāva-advocates also provide the examples of heat in fire and coolness in water, as described later

²² Jhalakīkar (1996) 971: hetv-antarānapekṣo vastu-dharma-viśeṣaḥ

²³ Jhalakīkar (1996) 971: duratikramaḥ

heat in fire, coolness in water, and cool sensation in breeze, and a late statement of the views of the Cārvākas is referred to, which Bhattacharya shows the views of the svabhāva-advocates to have been conflated with. The use of this expression 'difficult to overcome' to describe svabhāva is quite astute in that it can be construed to cover a range of cases, from the conceptual and metaphysical impossibility of unextended space (at least in a pre-modern paradigm) to the slight effort required to heat water.

By contrast, all of Nāgārjuna's three examples provide cases of determinable properties which are inalienable from their determinate entities and serve in part to individuate those entities. Kit Fine explains that the concept of essence "plays not only an external role, in helping to characterize the subject, but also an internal role, in helping to constitute it"²⁴ and characterizes the latter as a consequence of the former.²⁵ As such, the concept is of use "in the formulation of metaphysical claims [and] in the definition of metaphysical concepts"²⁶, including the concept of ontological dependence. As Fine explains, a modal account of essence posits that "an object [has] a property essentially just in case it is necessary that the object has the property."²⁷ The fact that Fine's two roles are being played by the properties with respect to their entities would seem to motivate a loose translation of svabhāva as essence.

There are also important differences in how the properties figure in their determinate entities in the examples given, and the resulting ambiguity will be exploited in the arguments provided by Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti against svabhāva, which will be discussed later. In the example of space and extendedness, extendedness constitutes space as a permanent given for experience (at least in a premodern paradigm). In contrast, heat may be lost when fire is extinguished, but not without the loss of fire also. And in the case of fluidity, water can lose this while continuing to exist, by turning to ice or to

²⁴ Fine (1994) 1

²⁵ See Fine (1994) 1

²⁶ Fine (1994) 2

²⁷ Fine (1994) 3

steam, but thereby loses its identity as water. Coolness in water represents a fourth case, where water may lose the coolness it possesses at normal environmental temperature without losing its identity, by heating up, but only dependent on external conditions to provide heat. The first three of these cases are reflected in a three-way distinction made by Fine concerning essence. Having characterized essence by the statement that “an object [has] a property essentially just in case it is necessary that the object has the property”²⁸, Fine labels this a categorical form and provides two variants on this categorical form – conditional on existence, i.e. if the object exists, and conditional upon identity, i.e. if the object is identical to that very object.²⁹ It can be seen that the case of extendedness in space satisfies the categorical form, the case of heat in fire satisfies the form conditional on existence, and the case of fluidity in water satisfies the form conditional on identity.

The fourth case, that of coolness in water, can be said to satisfy a third conditional form, conditional on the absence of extrinsic factors. As such, this fourth case of water temperature provides a notion of an intrinsic feature rather than that of an essence, where an intrinsic feature is “a feature of the thing itself”³⁰. Heat in water is an accidental property rather than an essential property, and one which is dependent on extrinsic conditions, where these are understood as “the stimuli to which it may be subject or the conditions which it finds itself in”³¹.

Subsection 2: Svabhāva as a power

The svabhāva-advocates provide a wide variety of examples of svabhāva, many of which have been collated by Bhattacharya, including the following verses:

²⁸ Fine (1994) 3

²⁹ See Fine (1994) 4

³⁰ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

³¹ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

"Heat in fire, coolness in water, the sweetness of tone in a cuckoo – these and other things of the same kind are [due to] svabhāva and not something else."³²

[One] thorn of a jujube tree is sharp, [one is] straight, and one is curved, and the fruit is spherical. Say, by what was this produced?³³

"What makes the sharpness of thorns, the various forms of birds and animals, the sweetness of sugarcane and the bitterness of lime? All this happens due to svabhāva."³⁴

Whereas the examples of heat and coolness are familiar from the above discussion, the other examples are more whimsical in character and suggest a slightly different conception of svabhāva to the four cases described above. Although all the examples can be construed as dispositional ascriptions, the example of the sweetness of a cuckoo's song stands out as a more paradigmatic example of a dispositional ascription, because it specifies a behaviour that the cuckoo is disposed to engage in. That is, on a dispositionalist reading the cuckoo's song is easily construed as a display of a real causal power in the cuckoo, whereas the idea of heat as a dispositional property needs to be filled out by saying the burning, cooking, warming, scalding etc. constitute its displays.

The examples considered so far involve dispositions of kinds, and arguably, of

³² SSS 2.2 quoted in Bhattacharya (2012) 602: agnair auṣṇyam apāṃ śāityaṃ kokile madhurasvaraḥ | ityādyekaparakāraḥ syāt svabhāvo nāparaḥ kvacit || The translation provided here follows Bhattacharya in supplying 'due to', which is syntactically necessary. Note also that the dropping of the ablative termination, which is probably done for metrical reasons, can easily mislead the interpreter into reading of the svabhāva doctrine in Mādhyamika fashion, which is precisely the danger highlighted in this chapter.

³³ Quoted in Bhattacharya (2012) 602 (my translation): badaryāḥ kaṅṭhakastikṣṇa ṛjurekaśca kuṃcitaḥ | phalaṃ ca vartulaṃ tasyā vada kena vinirmītam ||

³⁴ Quoted in Bhattacharya (2012) 602 (my translation): kaḥ kaṅṭakānāṃ prakaroti taikṣṇyaṃ vicitrabhāvaṃ mṛga-pakṣiṇāṃ ca | mādhuryaṃ ikṣoḥ kaṭutāṃ ca nimbe svabhāvataḥ sarvamidaṃ pravṛttam || (Strictly, the fruit mentioned is Nimb, or Azadirachta Indica, which is similar to lime.)

natural kinds or kinds that resemble natural kinds. That dispositions should be properties of natural kinds rather than of kinds generally or particulars is important to establishing the essentialist thesis. This is because the exercise of the causal power is explained by reference to the fact that it is the essence of a natural kind. A kind determined by social conventions would have no unified metaphysical essence and thus the notion of a dispositional property could do no explanatory work in relation to it.

By contrast, the examples of different types of thorns attribute dispositions to particulars. In Ellis's terminology, the degree of sharpness of a thorn cannot constitute a kind essence but only a particular essence. That is, the explanatory demand is for an explanation of intrinsic properties of thorns not constituted by their essential properties as a kind.

In this section it has been suggested that the properties seen in these examples can be construed as kind dispositions which are real causal powers. In section four below, it will be argued that such a construal is maintained by one of two groups of svabhāva-advocates.

Subsection 3: Summary

To summarize, the examples of svabhāva have been analysed in respect of essentialist and dispositionalist dimensions in turn. As a property, the notion of svabhāva has been shown to subsume a categorical notion of an essence which is an individuating principle and source of modal constraint, a notion of essence conditional on existence, a notion of essence conditional on identity, and a notion of intrinsic property conditional on normal extrinsic conditions. The notion of a nature as an ontologically real feature overlaps with at least the categorical form of the notion of essence, and provides a real basis for the lawlike behaviour of a determinate entity. This notion of a nature also forms one limb of a dichotomy between what is ontologically real and what is

conceptually constructed. The existence of such variety helps to explain the variety of translations in recent literature that were surveyed above.

What is common to all the senses of *svabhāva* as essence is the idea of a property of an entity which, in the words of the Nyāya Kośa quoted above, is 'difficult to overcome', where the difficulty ranges from the need for an intervening factor up to a conceptual and metaphysical impossibility. A notion which is loose enough to allow for such a range of possibilities is the notion of a default intrinsic property. This would be a property that is a feature of the thing itself, and a default in the sense that it is conditional on the absence of external factors which would interfere. The presence of coolness in water can be taken as an illustrative example of a default intrinsic nature which is not an essential property. Water is cool under what can be considered normal atmospheric conditions, but such coolness can be removed in the presence of an external source of heat. Such a notion subsumes the cases of an essential property discussed above as well as the case of an intrinsic property that is contingent on normal extrinsic conditions or the absence of an extrinsic stimulus.

As well as this essentialist dimension, a dispositionalist dimension to *svabhāva* was also identified in this section. Examples given by the *svabhāva*-advocates were used to flag the notion of a dispositional ascription and to distinguish a notion of kind essence in contrast to particular essence to which this may apply. The ability of cuckoos to sing can be taken as an illustrative example of a dispositional property which is the real essence of a natural kind, which may or may not manifest depending on circumstances that are extrinsic to the cuckoo. Although strictly speaking, cuckoo song does not individuate cuckoos as a natural kind, nevertheless this illustration has sufficient resemblance to a scientifically respectable natural kind to be illuminating. The idea that dispositional ascriptions could present *svabhāva* as a causal power, which is more prominent in the presentation by one group of *svabhāva*-advocates, was also noted, and this will be examined in more detail in section four below.

Section 3: Powers and properties in the contemporary context

Dispositional essentialism is a thesis in contemporary philosophy which is a conjunction of two separate claims, realism about dispositional properties and essentialism.³⁵ In the contemporary context, realism about dispositions arises through opposition to a Humean metaphysic³⁶ which holds that things in the world are passive entities which “behave as they are required to by the laws of nature”³⁷, these laws being “universal regularities imposed on things whose identities are independent of the laws”³⁸ and which “are contingent, not necessary”³⁹. According to a strong Humean view, such as that of David Lewis, laws supervene on particular matters of fact in some way. A weaker Humean view, such as that of David Armstrong, would be that laws are imposed on passive entities from without. Characterizing the Humean position as passivism, dispositionalists advocate an anti-passivism which holds that lawlike behaviour stems from the real causal powers or dispositional properties possessed by objects in the world.

The distinguishing feature of dispositionalism is the idea that “[p]roperties are powerful”⁴⁰ and that their powers “supply the world's necessity and possibility through being intrinsically modal: affording, grounding or instigating change”⁴¹. In a version of the doctrine first canvassed by Shoemaker and favoured by Mumford, properties of objects “are natural clusters of, and exhausted by, powers”⁴², so that “the powers fix the identity of the property.”⁴³ These causal powers are irreducible to analysis in terms of non-causal behaviour, that is,

³⁵ See Groff (2013) 211-217 for a discussion of these two elements within the context of Ellis's scientific essentialism.

³⁶ Whether the position commonly described in the literature as Humean does in fact reflect Hume's own view is a question which will not be discussed here.

³⁷ Ellis (2008) 76

³⁸ Ellis (2008) 77

³⁹ Ellis (2008) 77

⁴⁰ Mumford (2004) 170

⁴¹ Mumford (2004) 168

⁴² Mumford (2004) 170

⁴³ Mumford (2004) 171

they do not supervene on so-called categorical properties. The view that entities possess such causal powers can be traced back to Leibniz's notion of *vis viva* as a force that animates objects of nature from within. This provides the first element of dispositional essentialism, which is metaphysical realism about dispositional properties or causal powers.

Essentialism is the view that some properties of objects or natural kinds are metaphysically essential to it. Locke describes the real essence of a thing as “the very being of any thing, whereby it is, what it is”⁴⁴ and distinguishes it from nominal essence, which is a function of how we choose to categorize things. The Lockean real essence roughly corresponds to an Aristotelian notion of essence and is roughly the sense in play in contemporary essentialism.⁴⁵ Dispositional essentialism typically involves the idea that some or all properties of natural kinds are dispositional properties and are essential to their kinds.⁴⁶ Essentialism also provides an anti-Humean line of reasoning, in that it denies that lawlike behaviour is merely contingent. As Brian Ellis explains, essentialism is one form of what is called a natural necessitation theory, which asserts that laws are necessary in some sense.⁴⁷ Specifically, for essentialists, there is a real relation between natural kinds and essential properties which exerts a modal constraint on behaviour. This modal constraint is variously termed natural necessity, nomic necessity, *de re* necessity, or metaphysical necessity.⁴⁸ After briefly reviewing some of these terms, Ellis explains that he prefers the expression '*de re* necessity' “which might reasonably be translated as “real necessity”, for this indicates the kind of grounding that essentialists

⁴⁴ An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 3.3.15. See Jones (2013)

⁴⁵ See Ellis (2001) 55: “The scientific task is to discover what makes a thing the kind of thing it is and hence to explain why it behaves or has the properties it has. The scientific version of essentialism is therefore less concerned with questions of identity, and more with questions of explanation, than is the classical essentialism of Aristotle or the new essentialism of Kripke. Its closest historical predecessor is the kind of essentialism described by Locke.” However, see Leary (2009) for an alternative reading of Locke involving a trichotomy.

⁴⁶ See Groff (2013) 211-217 for a discussion of the views of Ellis, Mumford and Bird, all labelled dispositional essentialism.

⁴⁷ See Ellis (2002) 97

⁴⁸ See Ellis (2002) 110 and Ellis (2001) 43 for a brief explanation of how these terms target the same idea

believe natural necessities to have, namely, a grounding in reality."⁴⁹ Here, Ellis appeals to a notion of metaphysical grounding. Similarly, Mumford explains that "[d]e re necessity means necessity in nature: in things rather than in words or logical form."⁵⁰ Other similar terminology is used in a similar way by essentialist authors. Ellis suggests that "[t]he distinctions between causal powers, capacities, propensities, liabilities and so on, which appear to name different species of dispositions, are difficult to make, and of doubtful philosophical significance."⁵¹

Harré and Madden present an early theory that combines a doctrine of causal powers with the idea of natural necessity, wherein "natures of the operative powerful particulars, the constraining or stimulating effects of conditions and so on are offered as the grounds for judgement that a certain effect cannot but happen, or cannot but fail to happen"⁵² As such, there is a match between this natural necessity, which holds between dispositions and manifested properties, and a conceptual necessity, which holds between predicates descriptive of causes and predicates descriptive of effects.⁵³ Harré and Madden explain that "[t]he elements in a case of natural necessity, however, are independently describable even though conceptually related. It is perfectly possible to identify the weight and pressure of the atmosphere without reference to water rising in a pump ..."⁵⁴

Harré and Madden prefer the term 'power' or 'causal power' over other the alternative terminologies, explaining that "'[p]ower' is a notion particularly associated with agency, with the initiation of trains of events, with activity."⁵⁵ The proper analysis of a power ascription is that "'X has the power to A' means 'X (will/ can) do A, in the appropriate conditions, *in virtue of its intrinsic*

⁴⁹ Ellis (2002) 110

⁵⁰ Mumford (2004) 166

⁵¹ Ellis (2002) 65

⁵² Harré and Madden (1975) 20

⁵³ See Harré and Madden (1975) 8

⁵⁴ Harré and Madden (1975) 134

⁵⁵ Harré and Madden (1975) 88

nature."⁵⁶ Harré and Madden criticise earlier literature for an emphasis on liabilities, that is, the disposition to be causally affected, at the expense of powers, or the disposition to actively cause something. Thus "old favourites like 'solubility', 'inflammability', 'brittleness', etc. ... were the only dispositional properties that were ever mentioned. But these only have a role where the world is also full of things and materials with active powers. Nothing could be brittle in a world where nothing could smash, nothing could be inflammable in a world where nothing had the power to ignite and there could be no solutes where there were no solvents."⁵⁷ At the same time, "[t]he concepts of power and liability ... are the poles of a spectrum of concepts, distinguished by the degree to which we assign responsibility for particular behavioural manifestations between intrinsic conditions and extrinsic circumstances." Thus "[t]he chain saw cuts the tree and the tree dulls, to some extent, the teeth of the saw."⁵⁸

Harré and Madden explain that the notions of 'power', 'ability', 'nature' are explanatorily ineliminable and provide the most fundamental level of explanation⁵⁹ and that "power statements ... refer to genuine agencies which are explained but not eliminated by adverting to the general 'natures of things' form of explanation."⁶⁰ Thus in an example of the power and nature of a car, "explanations in terms of the nature of the car do not lead to the elimination of the notion of 'power' in the description of the car as a potent thing, since that power is specified in terms of an effect which is not part of the description of the nature in virtue of which the power is possessed."⁶¹

Thus "what the thing or material does ... is to be understood as brought about not just by the stimuli to which it may be subject or the conditions which it finds itself in, i.e. by extrinsic conditions, but in some measure by the nature or

⁵⁶ Harré and Madden (1975) 86

⁵⁷ Harré and Madden (1975) 89

⁵⁸ Harré and Madden (1975) 114

⁵⁹ Harré and Madden (1975) 11

⁶⁰ Harré and Madden (1975) 112-113

⁶¹ Harré and Madden (1975) 11

constitution of that thing or material, i.e. by intrinsic conditions."⁶² Intrinsic conditions are "a feature of the thing itself"⁶³ whereas extrinsic conditions are such that "changes in [conditions] are not properly to be considered to be changes in the thing or material *itself*"⁶⁴. This contrasts with the notions of internal and external, which concerns whether they "lie within the spatial envelope of the thing"⁶⁵. Thus a magnetic field is intrinsic to a magnet without being internal to it. Molnar's similar idea is that a power P is intrinsic to a bearer x "iff x's having P, and x's lacking P, are independent of the existence, and the non-existence, of any contingent object wholly distinct from x."⁶⁶

Harré and Madden set out four features of natural necessity which distinguish it from logical entailment. Firstly, "nature is explanatory of outcome whereas entailment *per se* is not".⁶⁷ Secondly, natural necessity involves conceptual separability of the causal power and the causal process which is related to it. They explain that "[t]he elements in a case of natural necessity, however, are independently describable even though conceptually related. It is perfectly possible to identify the weight and pressure of the atmosphere without reference to water rising in a pump ..."⁶⁸ Thirdly, natural necessity holds exclusively between natural kinds, constituted by "the concept of generative mechanisms and powerful particulars"⁶⁹ Fourthly, "[n]atural necessity involves causal directionality as an essential element, whereas entailment as a purely logical relation does not."⁷⁰

Ellis's scientific essentialism represents a robust form of dispositional essentialism in which anti-passivism and essentialism are intimately related. As Groff explains, for Ellis, anti-passivism performs three roles. Anti-passivism "motivates the claim that there are two different species of property kind, one

⁶² Harré and Madden (1975) 87

⁶³ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

⁶⁴ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

⁶⁵ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

⁶⁶ Molnar (2003) 102

⁶⁷ Harré and Madden (1975) 133

⁶⁸ Harré and Madden (1975) 134

⁶⁹ Harré and Madden (1975) 134

⁷⁰ Harré and Madden (1975) 134

dispositional, one not⁷¹, it “explains ... the existence of process kinds⁷², and it “accounts for the special relationship ... between process kinds and kinds of dispositional property.”⁷³

Ellis explains that “a causal power is a disposition to engage in a certain kind of process: a causal process.”⁷⁴ Ellis explains that this causal process relates causal events to effectual events. Both causal events and effectual events must belong to natural kinds so that their definition is independent of how we choose to classify things. The causal relationship between these two is explained by the exercise of causal power by the particular, rather than as mere regularity, as per the regularist account, or as due to subordination to external agency, as per the Categorical Realist account. In this way, for the essentialist, “inanimate objects of nature are genuine causal agents.”⁷⁵ As such, the essentialist account of the modal constraint on the relation between cause and effect differs from any conditional account, such as Ryle's dispositionalist account.

Other authors have affirmed causal realism while rejecting the essentialism that would necessitate that causal powers be displayed by entities in given situations.⁷⁶ As Mumford explains, the Humean argument against causal powers is that a causal process could fail to be followed by its characteristic effect in a given situation, thus refuting the necessary connection and supposedly the presence of the causal power too. However, if the causal power is understood as a probabilistic tendency, the Humean argument can be dismissed.⁷⁷

⁷¹ Groff (2013)213

⁷² Groff (2013)213

⁷³ Groff (2013)214

⁷⁴ Ellis (2002) 48

⁷⁵ Ellis (2002) 3

⁷⁶ See Mumford (2005), Chakravartty (2008) and Mumford (2013) for arguments for an anti-Humean position that involves realism about causal powers while rejecting essentialism.

⁷⁷ See Mumford (2013) 17-19

Section 4: A debate about natural necessity

The previous section has provided an account of dispositional essentialism as the conjunction of two claims, that dispositional ascriptions reflect real dispositional properties and that such dispositional properties are essential features of their objects which thus determine their lawlike behaviour with nomic necessity. The present section returns to the topic of svabhāva-advocacy, summarizing recent scholarship about two different types of svabhāva-advocacy. On this basis, the views of these two groups are characterized as dispositional essentialism and dispositional inessentialism respectively. This characterization entails two separate claims, about dispositions and essences. Firstly, the claim that svabhāvas are real dispositional properties rather than mere dispositional ascriptions is argued for. Secondly, it is argued that the debate between these two groups concerns whether such properties are essentially distributed over entities or inessentially distributed.

To recap, Kumāriḷa's claim is that "it is understood that the prāmāṇyam of all pramāṇas is 'from itself'"⁷⁸, and this is glossed as meaning that "a capacity for accurate determination of an object belongs to them [*scil.* pramāṇas] due to their svabhāva"⁷⁹. These formulations involve an ablative locution and an adverbial locution respectively. The ablative locution is also found in the presentation of the term 'svabhāva' by the groups known as svabhāva-advocates, who affirmed some concept of svabhāva. In the Śloka-vārttika presentation, Kumāriḷa presents a first view which Sucarita describes as being "svabhāva-advocacy about both [prāmāṇyam and its opposite]"⁸⁰, and which is very similar to his own view⁸¹. This would suggest that Kumāriḷa may have an affinity with svabhāva-advocacy. Chattopadhyaya explains that "early Sāṃkhya

⁷⁸ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

⁷⁹ TS 2812ab

⁸⁰ Sucarita refers to the advocates of this view as svābhāvīkôbhayavādināḥ at K84 under ŚV 2.36

⁸¹ At ŚV 2.34ab; This point is made in Kataoka (2011) 233-4 fn170 commenting on ŚV 2.34ab: "This view of *svataḥprāmāṇya* is the same as Kumāriḷa's own siddhānta in that it takes validity to be ontologically innate to itself."

was really maintaining the doctrine of natural law (svabhāva vāda)⁸² and Bhattacharya notes that although “svabhāva turned out to be, so to say, a lance free and readily available for use by anyone and everyone”⁸³, at the same time, “svabhāva has its own place in the Sāṃkhya tradition”.⁸⁴

By drawing on the scholarship of Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya and Ramkrishna Bhattacharya, the notion of svabhāva held by its advocates will be investigated in this section. Correspondence will be found between the conception of one group of svabhāva-advocates and the contemporary theses of causal realism and essentialism presented in the discussion above. This reading will be motivated on textual grounds, but the appeal of this reading in relation to Kumārila's epistemological claim will only be made evident in the next chapter.

Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya discusses the notion of svabhāva among those who advocate this notion, with a focus on its use in the ancient medical literature. Chattopadhyaya characterizes svabhāva in opposition to the idea of supernatural causation:

“the emphatic claim of the ancient doctors that the action of a substance is determined by the substance itself leaves no scope for any supernatural view of the efficacy of a substance being influenced in any way by *adr̥ṣṭa* [*scil.* a supernatural force] or god or any other factor like that ... the *svabhāva* or the inherent nature of a substance produces its specific result. In Indian terminology, this is known as svabhāva-vāda, literally “the doctrine of nature”, or according to the modern way of putting it, “the doctrine of the laws of nature”.⁸⁵

Chattopadhyaya explains that this doctrine involves a rejection of both accidentalism, the view that events happen at random without cause, as well as

⁸² Chattopadhyaya (2012) 394

⁸³ Bhattacharya (2012) 610

⁸⁴ Bhattacharya (2012) 610

⁸⁵ Chattopadhyaya (1977) 155; Chattopadhyaya uses the translation 'laws of nature' in many other works, as Bhattacharya also notes.

supernaturalism, especially the idea “that health and disease are determined ultimately by the actions performed by the patient in his past life”.⁸⁶ Thus the svabhāva principle is opposed to the law of karma as well as theistic causation. As Chattopadhyaya explains, the doctrine of svabhāva and the rejection of both supernatural action and lack of causal explanation which the doctrine entails “cannot but be a fundamental proposition for defending the intrinsic efficacy of medicine.”⁸⁷

In addition to this “medical view of svabhāva as “embodied cause” or unchanging nature”⁸⁸, Bhattacharya identifies a second meaning of svabhāva as accident or chance, which is precisely one of the views denied by the medical usage. Bhattacharya explains, “[d]enial of causality and free will then is the mark of one group of svabhāvavādins [in the 'ethical' domain] ... while acceptance of svabhāva as the cause of everything is the mark of the other [in the 'cosmological' domain]”⁸⁹ Bhattacharya explains that the group using svabhāva in the ethical domain advocated fatalism rather than free will. The 'cosmological' group use the notion of svabhāva in a similar way to its medical usage, as a dual rejection of both accidentalism and supernaturalism, but in regard to natural phenomena. This dual use of svabhāva led to confusion or conflation of the two ideas in some texts “from the fourth century CE to the fifteenth century”⁹⁰ and in subsequent scholarship. Indeed, Bhattacharya notes a similar ambiguity in the English word “nature” which “could mean both regularity and irregularity”⁹¹. For example, 'natural law' indicates regularity whereas 'natural' in other contexts could mean 'spontaneous' in the sense of being beyond the reach of lawlike explanation.

Bhattacharya has collated various examples of svabhāva from the svabhāva-advocates, including the following verse, which was also quoted above:

⁸⁶ Chattopadhyaya (1977) 186

⁸⁷ Chattopadhyaya (1977) 155

⁸⁸ Bhattacharya (2012) 608

⁸⁹ Bhattacharya (2012) 602

⁹⁰ Bhattacharya (2012) 610

⁹¹ Bhattacharya (2012) 598

*"What makes the sharpness of thorns, the varied nature of birds and animals, the sweetness of sugarcane and the bitterness of lime? All this happens due to svabhāva."*⁹²

Bhattacharya contrasts this verse with a variant version:

*"What produces the sharpness of thorns [and] the varied nature of birds and animals? All this happens due to svabhāva. It is not through desire [of an agent]. What is the point of effort?"*⁹³

Whereas this second formulation advocates fatalism, and presents the idea of svabhāva as accident, or lack of causal explanation, the first formulation above "stops at asserting the role of *svabhāva*, not of any other agency or creator as the *cause* of all varieties"⁹⁴ and thus presents svabhāva as causal explanation.

In sum, there are two contrasting conceptions of svabhāva, the neo-medical conception which Chattopadhyaya focuses on, and a second conception carefully distinguished from it by Bhattacharya. In both formulations, 'due to svabhāva' takes an ablative construction because it is the response to a question. As in other languages, the ablative construction includes not only the idea of 'from' but idea of 'due to' as per the translation used here. In response to a 'Why?' question, it is the idea of 'due to' which is the material sense of the construction.

This ablative notion of 'because', 'due to' or 'in virtue of' is also part of the vocabulary of metaphysical grounding. This metaphysical reading of the ablative formulation coheres with the neo-medical conception of svabhāva as

⁹² Quoted in Bhattacharya (2012) 602 (my translation): *kaḥ kaṅṭakānāṃ prakaroti taikṣṇyaṃ vicitrabhāvaṃ mṛga-pakṣiṇāṃ ca | mādhuryam ikṣoḥ kaṭutāṃ ca nimbe svabhāvataḥ sarvamidaṃ pravṛttam ||* (Strictly, the fruit mentioned is Nimb, or Azadirachta Indica, which is similar to lime.)

⁹³ Quoted in Bhattacharya (2012) 602 (my translation): *kaḥ kaṅṭakānāṃ prakaroti taikṣṇyaṃ vicitrabhāvaṃ mṛga-pakṣiṇāṃ ca | svabhāvataḥ sarvamidaṃ pravṛttam na kāmākāra 'sti kutaḥ prayatnaḥ ||*

⁹⁴ Bhattacharya (2012) 602

real essence or nature rather than the conception of *svabhāva* as chance. Metaphysical grounding appears in various philosophical theses, but the basic idea is to provide some metaphysically significant explanation. Thus Ellis explicates dispositional essentialism by appeal to this relation as per some quotes above. Specifically, for Ellis, “the natural dispositions [are] simply the real essences of the natural kinds of processes they ground”⁹⁵ and “[a] natural kind of process ... is a display of a dispositional property”⁹⁶.

The nature of metaphysical grounding is a topic of significant debate in the literature, but the dominant view is that the concept of grounding is primitive and not susceptible to analysis.⁹⁷ Fine considers that metaphysical grounding provides a distinct kind of explanation, “in which explanans and explanandum are connected, not through some sort of causal mechanism, but through some constitutive form of determination.”⁹⁸ Audi holds that grounding is a relation of noncausal explanation, involving a relation of essential connectedness between the natures of two properties, such that each instance of one property grounds an instance of the other.⁹⁹ Audi takes metaphysical grounding to be irreflexive, such that one distinct property grounds another distinct property.¹⁰⁰ So for Ellis, a real causal power which is the real essence of a natural kind of process grounds an instantiation of that process.

The neo-medical conception presents *svabhāva* as cause of its effect and as explanation of its effect, both in the context of drugs and their power to cure, as well as in the general context of objects and their power to behave in lawlike ways. Chattopadhyaya provides a quote from the medical text *Caraka-saṃhitā*, which he translates as “these laws are but the laws of nature (*svābhāvika*) – just like the laws because of which fire is hot and water liquid.”¹⁰¹ This translation of the notion of *svabhāva* as 'laws of nature' for this group of

⁹⁵ Ellis (2001) 125

⁹⁶ Ellis (2001) 124

⁹⁷ See Bliss and Trogdon (2014)

⁹⁸ Fine, K. (2012) 37

⁹⁹ See Audi (2012) 693-695

¹⁰⁰ See Audi (2012) 691-692

¹⁰¹ Chattopadhyaya (1977) 182

svabhāva-advocates seems to capture the notion of natural or nomic necessity which determines a constraint on behaviour. Indeed, the question of how the answer 'due to svabhāva' explains phenomena corresponds to the question of what kind of explanation is provided by laws of nature for the phenomena they purport to explain.

However, it fails to capture the characterization of svabhāva as a property of its entity which is metaphysically grounded in that entity. A better correspondence for the neo-medical view of svabhāva is with the idea of a real and metaphysically necessary causal power or essential dispositional property as per the dispositionalist literature surveyed above, which locates the source of natural necessity in the entity itself.¹⁰² Chattopadhyaya's own explanation that svabhāva is "the inherent nature of a substance [that] produces its specific result"¹⁰³ and that "the action of a substance is determined by the substance itself"¹⁰⁴ was quoted above. These two ideas correspond with the ideas that "the actions of things depend on their causal powers and other dispositional properties"¹⁰⁵ and that "dispositional properties are genuine properties, and intrinsic to the things that have them"¹⁰⁶, which constitute two planks of Ellis's scientific essentialism, involving realism and essentialism about causal powers.

This motivates a reading of this view as not only dispositionalist but also essentialist. That is, the essential natures of things determine the lawlike behaviour of those things due to a relation of natural or nomic necessity. The explanatory demand being made in the verses quoted is a demand to account for the lawlike behaviour of entities in nature, and the answer that is given is that such behaviour is necessarily the display of a real dispositional property. On this essentialist reading of svabhāva, the behaviour would be determined by a necessary connection between the existence of the property in the entity and its display under the right type of circumstances, corresponding to Ellis's

¹⁰² Cf. Ellis (2002) 97-102

¹⁰³ Chattopadhyaya (1977) 155

¹⁰⁴ Chattopadhyaya (1977) 155

¹⁰⁵ Ellis (2008) 76

¹⁰⁶ Ellis (2008) 76

statements that “the natural dispositions [are] simply the real essences of the natural kinds of processes they ground”¹⁰⁷ and that “[a] natural kind of process ... is a display of a dispositional property”¹⁰⁸ This idea of a display of an essential dispositional property would be consistent with the reading of svabhāva as kind essence described above but not with the notion of svabhāva as intrinsic nature.

Bhattacharya further explains that this group of svabhāva-advocates “believed in activism”¹⁰⁹ and that such “activism, or faith in human endeavour or resoluteness”¹¹⁰ could be seen as a logical corollary of this notion of svabhāva-as-causality.¹¹¹ This would make sense if it is understood that the participants in this debate see a robust connection between the causal power of entities and human agency. Interestingly, a connection between these two concepts is mooted by Ellis, who proposes that “human agency [may be] the exercising of our meta-powers to alter our own dispositions to act in one way rather than another”.¹¹² However, an even stronger connection may be needed for the claim of the svabhāva-advocates, and it may be that they in fact made a conceptual equation of human agency and the causal power of entities.

The affiliation between this group of svabhāva-advocates and contemporary dispositionalism is also evidenced by a shared commitment to the inherent dynamism of the natural world and an shared opposition to the 'dead world of mechanism'.¹¹³ Thus Harré and Madden explain that “[w]hen we think of causality and action we look to such images as a springtime plant forcing its way upwards towards the light, as the pulsing, surging movement of the protoplasm within an amoeba, of a flash of radiation as a positron and an electron meet, of the enormous flux of electromagnetic radiation from a star, of

¹⁰⁷ Ellis (2001) 125

¹⁰⁸ Ellis (2001) 124

¹⁰⁹ Bhattacharya (2012) 603

¹¹⁰ Bhattacharya (2012) 599

¹¹¹ See Bhattacharya (2012) 599

¹¹² Ellis (2002) 144; see also O'Connor (2009), Bird (2013), Ellis (2013) and Groff (2013) for more discussion of causal power and agency

¹¹³ 'The dead world of mechanism' is a phrase used by Ellis as a subheading in Ellis (2002) 60 and also referenced in Groff (2013) 210

the mobility and imaginative control of his own actions exercised by a human being, of the potent configuration of a magnetic field."¹¹⁴ Likewise for this group of svabhāva-advocates, there is a connection with human freedom as described above. A principle of natural dynamism also seems to inform the examples of the svabhāva-advocates above, but is even more vivid in examples attributed by Śaṅkara to the allied Sāṃkhya philosophers¹¹⁵, which include the images of milk flowing 'due to its svabhāva' from a mother to nourish her child, of water flowing 'due to its svabhāva' for the benefit of mankind, and of grass, herbs and water transforming themselves into milk.¹¹⁶ This last example seems to involve being digested by a cow, although it is argued that there is no instrumental cause, on the basis that we can neither perceive nor replicate this process.¹¹⁷ In fact, there is also a notion of teleological cause present in these last examples, which is not evident in the examples of the svabhāva-advocates given above and which is avoided in the contemporary discussion.¹¹⁸

That this group of svabhāva-advocates understand svabhāvas as properties which are no more than causal powers¹¹⁹ is suggested by a quote from Śaṅkarānanda translated as follows by Chattopadhyaya: "By *svabhāva* is meant the inherent nature of the respective material objects, i.e. their unique causal efficacy. For instance, burning in the case of fire and flowing downwards in the case of water."¹²⁰

The conception of the second group of svabhāva-advocates is that of svabhāva as accident or chance. This conception seems to be focused on a rejection of the essentialist thesis rather than on the rejection of real dispositional

¹¹⁴ Harré and Madden (1975) 7. A longer version of this quote is also given in Groff (2013) 210

¹¹⁵ The evidence for the affiliation between the Sāṃkhya philosophers and the svabhāva-advocates will be set out later in this chapter.

¹¹⁶ See Chattopadhyaya (1969) 67-68 and Chattopadhyaya (2012) 393-394; the examples are taken from Śaṅkara's Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya 2.2.3 and 2.2.5

¹¹⁷ See Chattopadhyaya (1969) 68 and Chattopadhyaya (2012) 395

¹¹⁸ Cf. Ellis (2002) 13: "Aristotle's concept of final cause – that is, that for the sake of which a thing exists – has no role in the new essentialism."

¹¹⁹ The view that properties just are powers or clusters of causal powers was proposed by Shoemaker: see Mumford (2004) 150 and Mumford (2011) 3

¹²⁰ Chattopadhyaya (1969) 59

properties. Perhaps the rejection of the essentialist thesis was thought sufficient to motivate the fatalism that they also advocated. Fatalism would then obtain regardless of whether there are real causal powers in the world, because there would be no necessity as to whether any causal power should manifest itself in any given situation.

Whereas the view of the first group was identified with dispositional essentialism, the view of this group of *svabhāva* can thus be tentatively labelled dispositional inessentialism. In the contemporary literature, this resonates with an aspect of a position set out by Anjan Chakravartty, that “causal powers are inessentially distributed”¹²¹ and that “[t]he behaviours of members of kinds may be a function of their causal powers, but only sometimes do powers constitute “essences”.”¹²² That is, Anjan Chakravartty maintains a position that falls short of full dispositional essentialism just as the first group maintain a position that similarly falls short of full dispositional essentialism.

The denial of natural necessity by this group is rhetorically strengthened by the focus on the variety of dispositional properties in nature, such as the example of different shapes of individual thorns, which are not easily susceptible to explanation in terms that reference kinds, given that every thorn is slightly differently constituted. In the examples given, the demand for an explanation of kind essence, such as heat in fire, which necessitarian theories purport to provide, is blurred together with the demand for an explanation of particular essence, such as the shapes of individual thorns, which necessitarian theories do not presume to address.¹²³ This sleight of hand lends a spurious credibility to the *svabhāva*-as-chance position. Bhattacharya also explains that 'inactivism' is a logical corollary of 'accidentalism'.¹²⁴ This again suggests that a robust connection between causal power and agency is being assumed in this debate.

¹²¹ Chakravartty (2008) 160

¹²² Chakravartty (2008) 161

¹²³ Cf. Ellis (2001) 239: “The identity of something as an individual seems to depend primarily on its temporal and causal history, and therefore on its extrinsic, not its intrinsic, properties.”

¹²⁴ See Bhattacharya (2012) 599

In summary, it has been argued that the two types of svabhāva-advocacy correspond to positions that can be located with respect to the contemporary debate. The neo-medical conception of svabhāva presents svabhāva as a causal power or real disposition which grounds a notion of natural necessity. Although the textual evidence is not sufficient to fill out the full details of this grounding, it is due to a feature of the entity and thus coheres with the essentialist thesis within dispositional essentialism. The chance conception of svabhāva denies natural necessity but seemingly without denying causal powers.

Section 5: Reductionism about properties

The Mādhyamika Buddhist philosophers Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti argue against the notion of svabhāva in what constitutes one of the most extended discussions of this notion in the primary literature. The notion that they argue against is that of the Buddhist Reductionists, whereby “ultimately intrinsic properties are essential to their bearers [and] all qualitative change is of extrinsic properties.”¹²⁵ Their discussion appears to form part of an intra-Buddhist debate, rather than a direct challenge to the views of the svabhāva-advocates discussed above. Further, the notion of svabhāva as a fundamental substance is more important in their debate than the notion of svabhāva as essence that is the focus here. Thus a full exegesis of any Buddhist notion of svabhāva is outside the scope of this research. The purpose of considering some Buddhist discussions is only to note some helpful affinities and contrasts with Kumāriila's notion.

In a first subsection, the Buddhist principle of reductionism, whereby svabhāvas are properties possessed by the most elementary constituent particles of the most complete scientific theory, is contrasted with the attribution of svabhāvas

¹²⁵ Siderits (2003) 119

by the svabhāva-advocates to kinds of everyday middle-sized objects. In a second subsection, a model of svabhāva and parabhāva affirmed by the Abhidharma Reductionist Buddhists and discussed by Candrakīrti is presented. Some examples are discussed in order to understand the notion of svabhāva involved. It is found that this model presents the notion of a real disposition which is an intrinsic nature in the presence of normal extrinsic conditions.

Subsection 1: Reductionism and anti-realism

Jan Westerhoff distinguishes between two conceptions of svabhāva in Nāgārjuna's work, substance-svabhāva and essence-svabhāva. Essence-svabhāva is a primarily epistemological notion, ranging from an earlier idea of a "specific characterizing property of an object"¹²⁶ which distinguish them from other objects to Candrakīrti's idea of an essential property which is "something that an object cannot lose without ceasing to be that very object."¹²⁷ This latter formulation, which coheres with Nāgārjuna's own view¹²⁸, conveys an idea of modal necessity, as Westerhoff also indicates¹²⁹. By contrast, what Westerhoff terms substance-svabhāva is "a primarily *ontological* notion. Rather than *svabhāva*'s being seen as the opposite of shared qualities (*sāmānyalakṣaṇa*), it is contrasted with conceptually constructed or secondary (*prajñaptisat*) existents and equated with the mark of the primary ones (*dravyasat*)."¹³⁰ Substance-svabhāva is thus a primary existent which is an irreducible constituent of the empirical world, as opposed to a secondary existent, which would be a linguistic and mental construction, and this notion "is most prominent in Nāgārjuna's arguments."¹³¹ Westerhoff explains that substance-svabhāva refers to putative "[p]rimary existents [which] constitute the irreducible constituents of the empirical world [and do not] depend on linguistic

¹²⁶ Westerhoff (2009) 21

¹²⁷ Westerhoff (2009) 22

¹²⁸ See Westerhoff (2009) 22

¹²⁹ See Westerhoff (2009) 22

¹³⁰ Westerhoff (2009) 23

¹³¹ Westerhoff (2009) 24

and mental construction for their existence."¹³²

The relevant notion in Kumāriḷa's discussion will be svabhāva as essence. By contrast, as Jan Westerhoff notes, the notion of substance-svabhāva "is of much greater importance in the Madhyamaka debate"¹³³, and Westerhoff's discussion correspondingly treats this aspect in greater depth. Siderits's discussion is likewise focused on the ontological dimension of svabhāva as 'substance-svabhāva' or 'intrinsic nature'.

As Jan Westerhoff notes, Candrakīrti highlights Nāgārjuna's statement "A svabhāva is not causally produced and is not dependent on something else" as a defining statement of svabhāva.¹³⁴ This dual negation suggests that svabhāva can be characterized within the framework of either of two dualities, contrasted with what is causally produced and with what is dependent. This dual framework also appears to be affirmed by the Abhidharma Buddhists discussed by Ronkin, who uphold the existence of svabhāva as nature and essence which they believe satisfies the conditions implied by both dichotomies.¹³⁵

In what appears to address the first dichotomy, between svabhāva and causal production, Candrakīrti's method is to start with a putative distinction between examples of svabhāva and examples which are not svabhāva. Candrakīrti explains that the heat artificially produced in water or quartz appearing as ruby are not generally taken to be svabhāvas.¹³⁶ The first example is in fact an intrinsic nature in the sense of Harré and Madden, and an accidental property. The second example involves an erroneous judgment, so can be characterized as a feature of extrinsic conditions. Candrakīrti explains that these cases are commonly acknowledged not to be svabhāvas because they are produced by

¹³² Westerhoff (2009) 24

¹³³ Westerhoff (2009) 23

¹³⁴ Westerhoff (2009) 24-25. The statement is "akṛtrimaḥ svabhāvo hi nirapekṣaḥ paratra ca"

¹³⁵ See Ronkin (2005) 99-100, 223

¹³⁶ PP 260: yaḥ kṛtakaḥ padārthaḥ sa loke naiva svabhāva iti vyapadiśyate tad yathā apām auṣṇyaḥ dhātu-piśāca-prayatna-niṣpāditaḥ karketanādīnām padmarāgādi-bhāvaś ca|

causes.¹³⁷ We can understand that both examples are explained by reference to extrinsic conditions, although they differ in whether those extrinsic conditions result in a change in the intrinsic nature of the entity.

By contrast, Candrakīrti tells us, the heat of fire and the property of being a ruby in a ruby which is (correctly) known are commonly taken to be svabhāvas.¹³⁸ These are two clear instances of essential properties, not so dependent on extrinsic conditions. Candrakīrti explains the reasoning for attributing the svabhāva of heat to fire as follows:

*Heat is said to be the svabhāva of fire as it is invariably associated with that in everyday experience ... then there is lack of change due to this invariable association, as fire is not [ever] cold.*¹³⁹

The key feature here seems to be inalienability or invariable association so the characterization of svabhāva is as essence conditional on existence. By contrast, as Candrakīrti explains:

*That same heat is not the svabhāva in water when it is found [there] because it is causally produced [and] because it arises from external conditions.*¹⁴⁰

This setup involves a dichotomy between an intrinsic nature in the presence of normal extrinsic conditions and an intrinsic nature in the presence of abnormal extrinsic conditions, as mentioned above.

Candrakīrti then notes that heat is causally dependent on the causes of fire

¹³⁷ PP 260: tad evam akṛtakaḥ svabhāva iti lokavyavahāre vyavasthite

¹³⁸ PP 260: yas tv akṛtakaḥ sa svabhāvas tad yathā agner auṣṇyaṃ jñātānāṃ padmarāgādināṃ padmarāgādi-svabhāvaś ca

¹³⁹ PP 241: agner auṣṇyaṃ hi loke tad-avyabhicāritvāt svabhāva iti ucyate ... tadāsyāvyabhicāritvād anyathābhāvaḥ syād abhāvaḥ| na hy agneḥ śaityaṃ pratipadyate|

¹⁴⁰ PP 241: tad evauṣṇyam apsūpalabhyamānaṃ para-pratyaya-sambhūtatvāt kṛtrimatvān na svabhāva iti|

also:

Not even the heat of fire is a svabhāva, because it is causally produced ... the dependence of fire on causes and conditions is found [to be] due to the conjunction of a jewel [acting as a lens], fuel and the sun, or due to rubbing sticks together, and so on. Heat does not arise without fire. So heat is also produced by causes and conditions. And so [heat] is causally produced. And because it is causally produced, it is not a svabhāva, like the heat of water ...¹⁴¹

This contrast with causal dependence is based on the idea that to be fundamentally real, an entity or property would have to be permanent and hence not causally produced, and hence reflects a notion of substance-svabhāva. Thus Candrakīrti says that causal production would be redundant if there were svabhāvas, as they would already exist.¹⁴²

Garfield explains similarly that Nāgārjuna “argues against the existence of causes and for the existence of a variety of kinds of conditions ... [which] must be thought of as empty of inherent existence ...”¹⁴³. Aside from the idea of emptiness of inherent existence, which appeals to a notion of svabhāva opposed to conceptual construction¹⁴⁴, there is also the idea that there can be no real dispositional property which is not reducible to a set of causal conditions.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ PP 260: *vayam idānīm brūmo yad etad auṣṇyaṃ tad apy agneḥ svabhāvo na bhavatīti gr̥hyatām kṛtakatvāt| iha mañindhanāditya-samāgamād araṇi-nirghaṣaṇādeś cāgner hetu-pratyaya-sāpekṣataivopalabhyate| na cāgni-vyatiriktaṃ auṣṇyaṃ saṃbhavati| tasmād auṣṇyaṃ api hetu-pratyaya-janitaṃ| tataśca kṛtakam| kṛtakatvāc cāpām auṣṇyavat svabhāvo na bhavatīti sphutam avasīyate|*

¹⁴² In chapter 15 (see Sprung 152); see also chapter 1, where the same argument is adduced against independence: Sprung 36-37

¹⁴³ Garfield (1995) 104-105

¹⁴⁴ For this dichotomy see e.g. MMK 502-503 verses 24.16-24.18, where it is also suggested that any conventional designation can preserve our commonsense understanding of causality

¹⁴⁵ Cf Lusthaus (2002) 170: Buddhists “do not accept the notion of 'cause', especially if by this one means a 'sufficient cause.' Buddhists instead propose a theory of conditionality, the precise definition of which varied from school to

The argument of Candrakīrti and Nāgārjuna thus amounts to the idea that a real dispositional property cannot be an essence conditional on existence and identity. By contrast, maintaining such a distinction between a disposition and a causal condition is central to contemporary dispositionalism. As Harré and Madden explain, in the claim that an entity has the power to do something in virtue of its intrinsic nature, the expression 'in virtue of' does not constitute an additional condition.¹⁴⁶ Rather, the potentiality or potency of an object is about "what would happen, as a matter of course, if interfering conditions were absent or taken away."¹⁴⁷

Why should a property that is produced by causes not be a *svabhāva*? Siderits attributes to the Buddhist Reductionist doctrine of intrinsic natures the claims that "all and ultimately real entities have intrinsic natures"¹⁴⁸ and that "every property that is intrinsic to an ultimately real entity is an essential property of that entity."¹⁴⁹ This entails a denial that ultimately real entities can have accidental properties. Thus Siderits explains:

"there is something deeply problematic about the idea that something might undergo change in any of its intrinsic properties ... For to call a property intrinsic is to say that it is part of its bearer's nature. And it sounds distinctly odd to say that a certain thing both has and lacks a certain nature."¹⁵⁰

Siderits goes on to explain that this rules out the idea that an entity can change its nature¹⁵¹, and reinforces this with a Humean suggestion that "'potentiality' looks like little more than a projection of our expectations given past

school." Also cf. Nagao (1989) 7 quoted in Garfield (1995) 110: "Dependent co-arising refers to a causal relationship wherein no essence is present at any time in either cause or result."

¹⁴⁶ See Harré and Madden (1975) 86-87

¹⁴⁷ Harré and Madden (1975) 12

¹⁴⁸ Siderits (2003) 117

¹⁴⁹ Siderits (2003) 117

¹⁵⁰ Siderits (2003) 119

¹⁵¹ See Siderits (2003) 119

experience"¹⁵².

That a thing may have different intrinsic properties at different times appears odd only given the reductionist principle, that is, 'findability under analysis', shared by the Abhidharma Buddhists and the Mādhyamika Buddhists. The resulting conception of svabhāva excludes by definition the possibility that dispositional properties could be intrinsic to things. The real world of the Abhidharma Buddhist Reductionists is one which resembles the 'dead world of mechanism', described by Ellis as one which is "hard, cold, colourless, silent, and dead; a world of quantity, a world of mathematically computable motions in mechanical regularity"¹⁵³. By contrast, in the paradigm of dispositional essentialism, Ellis characterizes dispositional properties as dynamic universals possessed by objects which necessitate the display of the causal processes that they define.¹⁵⁴ In short, "the world must have a dynamic as well as a substantive structure."¹⁵⁵

Siderits explains that the contrast with causal dependence is based on an argument that all varieties of causal relationship are "thoroughly intentional or conceptually constructed in nature"¹⁵⁶. Siderits considers and rejects various attempts to locate causal efficacy in an entity as a capacity or power¹⁵⁷, and concludes that "it appears impossible for the realist to give a satisfactory account of a causal relation that might be said to obtain among ultimately real entities."¹⁵⁸ So "if the fire atom is to count as ultimately real, then it cannot originate in dependence on causes and conditions. Thus ultimately real entities cannot come into existence; they must be eternal ... [which] will be taken as evidence that the notion of an ultimately real entity is incoherent."¹⁵⁹ However, a natural necessitation approach such as dispositional essentialism is able to

¹⁵² Siderits (2003) 119-120

¹⁵³ Ellis (2008) 77: the quote is taken from E.A. Burt (1932) *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science*

¹⁵⁴ See Ellis (2002) 67-68 and 78

¹⁵⁵ Ellis (2002) 32

¹⁵⁶ Siderits (2003) 126

¹⁵⁷ See Siderits (2003) 126-131

¹⁵⁸ Siderits (2003) 131

¹⁵⁹ Siderits (2003) 125

provide a more satisfying account of how there can be real change in the world that involves change in the observable properties of an entity than the counterfactual conditional account that Siderits focuses on.

This Buddhist demand that *svabhāva*, as what is ontologically fundamental, that is, Westerhoff's substance-*svabhāva*, be innately static is thus in striking contrast with the idea of an innately dynamic natural world advocated by contemporary essentialists and by the Indian *svabhāva*-advocates. The quotation from Harré and Madden given earlier involved such images as "a springtime plant forcing its way upwards towards the light, as the pulsing, surging movement of the protoplasm within an amoeba"¹⁶⁰. Likewise the view of the Sāṃkhya philosophers quoted above involved images of milk flowing 'due to its *svabhāva*' from a mother to nourish her child, of water flowing 'due to its *svabhāva*' for the benefit of mankind, and of grass, herbs and water transforming themselves into milk.¹⁶¹

Subsection 2: Disposition as default nature

The second part of the definition above contrasts *svabhāva* with dependence. This contrast forms a dichotomy of *svabhāva* (or 'own-nature') and *parabhāva* (or 'other-nature'), and is illustrated by Candrakīrti with the example of one's own money and money that is borrowed. This conception is treated only briefly by Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti, who argue that, because *svabhāva* as causelessness has already been refuted, *parabhāva* also stands refuted, "because *parabhāva* is the *svabhāva* of another thing"¹⁶².

Noa Ronkin provides a discussion of this distinction between *svabhāva* and *parabhāva* as was current among the Buddhist Abhidharma schools. As Ronkin

¹⁶⁰ Harré and Madden (1975) 7

¹⁶¹ See Chattopadhyaya (1969) 67-68

¹⁶² MMK 265-266 verse 15.3 *kutaḥ svabhāvasyābhāve parabhāvo bhaviṣyati| svabhāvaḥ parabhāvasya parabhāvo hi kathyate||*

explains:

“The own-nature is further explained as internal (*ajjhattiko*) to a stream of *dharmas*, as unshared or not held in common by them, and is likened to a producer (*nibbatiko*) and to a resident (*nevāsiko*). By contrast, the other-nature is said to be external (*bāhīro*) to a stream of consciousness, held in common (*sādhāraṇo*) by its constitutive *dharmas*, and is likened to a receiver (*paṭiggāhako*) and to a visitor (*āgantuko*) respectively.”¹⁶³

Ronkin also explains that the own-nature is equated with the notion of specific cause (*hetu*) and the other-nature with the notion of general causal condition (*paccaya/ pratyaya*) in the Buddhist text *Peṭakopadesa*.¹⁶⁴ Likewise Siderits describes this as a “contrast between the concepts of 'one's own' and 'borrowed from another'”¹⁶⁵ and attributes this model to the Buddhist Reductionists, or Abhidharma schools, where it was used to determine the ultimately real components of experience.¹⁶⁶

Candrakīrti's example of heat in water as representing its transfer from fire when it is heated up on the fire¹⁶⁷ and Candrakīrti's example of monies owned and borrowed both suggest a reading in terms of a real causal power that may be transferred from one entity to another. Mumford and Anjum similarly raise the idea that powers can be passed around, and they illustrate this with a similar example:

“You come in from the cold and sit by the fire. You sit by the fire because it is hot ... The fire being hot would mean nothing to you if it didn't mean that it had the power to heat. Causation occurs when powers exercise themselves ... Your body was cold and now it is hot. And, being hot, it now also has the power to warm some other thing,

¹⁶³ Ronkin (2005) 99

¹⁶⁴ However, note that Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti consider *svabhāva* to be opposed to both *hetu* and *pratyaya*. See e.g. MMK 502 verse 24.16

¹⁶⁵ Siderits (2003) 118

¹⁶⁶ See Siderits (2003) 118 and Siderits (2003) 14 note (a)

¹⁶⁷ See PP 260: “apām auṣṇyaṃ dhātu-piśāca-prayatna-niṣpāditaḥ”

such as the body of anyone who wants to come and cuddle. And, if they do, the power to warm something else will be passed on to their body, and so on."¹⁶⁸

In Candrakīrti's discussion, there is a dichotomy whereby *svabhāva* is an entity's own power and *parabhāva* is a power which is foreign to an entity in some way. Candrakīrti's examples illustrate forms of asymmetry in the possession of powers which is the basis for this dichotomy. By contrast with what is owned, Candrakīrti explains that what is borrowed are temporarily available.¹⁶⁹ The implicit contrast is with the permanent possession of one's own money. Presumably the availability of the monies are also contingent on the loan policy of the bank and on the credit-worthiness of the borrower.

The example of heat in water also works well as an illustration of borrowed nature, where again heat in water is contingent on being exposed to a power to heat, such as fire, and temporary, as water will gradually revert to cool temperature when the source of heat is removed. The analogy of resident and visitor is presumably intended to capture the contrast between permanent and temporary, on the basis that visitors may not overstay their welcome. Further, a visit is contingent on an explicit or implicit invitation by the homeowner, whereas staying at home is not contingent.

The analogy of producer and receiver also fits the examples of heat and of money, as fires and commercial banks are sources of heat and of money in a more robust sense than are heated water and indebted borrowers respectively. Specifically, the *svabhāva* is a potentiality or potency of an object in the strong sense of Harré and Madden, which concerns "what would happen, as a matter of course, if interfering conditions were absent or taken away."¹⁷⁰ Similarly, in the absence of any invitations, the default situation would involve everyone staying at home, and thus all individuals possess resident status as essence conditional on default location.

¹⁶⁸ Mumford and Anjum (2011) 5-6

¹⁶⁹ PP 262: "tad yathā tāvat-kālikā-yācitakam asvatantram"

¹⁷⁰ Harré and Madden (1975) 12

The examples of water temperature and creditor-debtor relation are formulated within the framework of own-nature and other-nature, and as such they provide a conception of svabhāva as default nature, conditional on the presence of normal external conditions and the absence of extrinsic interfering factors. Mirroring this conception of svabhāva as default nature, parabhāva is a borrowed power which is possessed not by default but contingently on extrinsic conditions and temporarily. Parabhāva may constitute either an intrinsic accidental feature, such as heat in water, or a feature of extrinsic conditions, such as being a visitor in one's location.

Nāgārjuna denies that the properties of an entity are caused either 'from itself' or 'from something else'.¹⁷¹ The first of these options appears to be that advocated by the Sāṃkhya philosophers.¹⁷² Nāgārjuna equates these options with causation by own-nature (svabhāva), that is, the nature of the entity itself, and causation by borrowed nature (parabhāva), which Nāgārjuna explains would be the own-nature of some other entity.¹⁷³ The dichotomy of 'due to own-nature' and 'due to other-nature' thus has an affinity to Kumāriila's own dichotomy of 'from itself' and 'from something else', which will be set out later.

The examples considered in this section suggest that, for Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti, svabhāva corresponds to the idea of an intrinsic nature in the presence of normal extrinsic conditions, and the contrasting notion of borrowed nature corresponds to the idea of a temporary and contingent change in intrinsic nature under abnormal extrinsic conditions, where these are defined with respect to "the stimuli to which it may be subject or the conditions which it finds itself in"¹⁷⁴.

¹⁷¹ See MMK 12 verse 1.1a: "na svato nāpi parato" Nāgārjuna also denies causation due to both and due to neither.

¹⁷² Cf. Garfield (1995) 105: "The first view – held prominently by Samkhya philosophers – is that all causation is really self-causation." Garfield adds in a footnote that this is "[at] least according to Tsong Khapa's commentary on this verse."

¹⁷³ See MMK 78 verse 1.3cd: avidyamāne svabhāve parabhāvo na vidyate

¹⁷⁴ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

Section 6: Dharmakīrti and bare dispositions

The Buddhist logician Dharmakīrti, who appears to have been a contemporary of Kumāriila, also uses the term 'svabhāva' to describe characteristics of an entity in virtue of which it exhibits law-like behaviour. Dharmakīrti's conception of svabhāva attempts to reconcile the ultimately reductionist analysis of other Buddhist groups with the dynamism seen in the examples of the svabhāva-advocates. John Dunne has provided a detailed analysis of Dharmakīrti's notion of svabhāva, and the presentation in this section will be based on Dunne's reading of Dharmakīrti rather than on a study of primary texts.

Drawing on the work of Ernst Steinkellner, John Dunne distinguishes between two related notions both subsumed by Dharmakīrti under the polysemous term svabhāva: nature-svabhāva as the single total nature of an entity and property-svabhāva as one of many properties that an entity could have. For Dharmakīrti, nature-svabhāva is "a predicate that refers to the totality of the causal characteristics of the subject to which that predicate is applied."¹⁷⁵ These causal characteristics include "the causes and conditions from which it must have arisen, and the corresponding effects that it is capable of producing."¹⁷⁶ However, these latter consist merely in potentials to engage in various causal complexes to produce various effects, such as the potential of a sesame seed to produce oil if crushed or to sprout if given appropriate nourishment, and not in actually being causes of products such as oil or a sprout.¹⁷⁷ Strictly speaking, although "some passages in Dharmakīrti's work suggest a relationship between an entity's nature-*svabhāva* and its participation in a present causal complex or its arising from a past causal complex"¹⁷⁸, nevertheless "an entity's nature-*svabhāva* should not be equated with a causal

¹⁷⁵ Dunne (2004) 198

¹⁷⁶ Dunne (2004) 161

¹⁷⁷ See Dunne (2004) 168

¹⁷⁸ Dunne (2004) 163

complex, whether it be a present causal complex in which it participates or the past causal complex from which it arose."¹⁷⁹

A similar contrast to that between nature-*svabhāva* and property-*svabhāva* is found in the notion of a causal power developed by O'Connor and Churchill. They explain that "a single property may contribute to a very wide array of effects, depending on the context in which it is instanced ... But in ordinary speech, again, there is a tendency to talk of a corresponding array of powers being exercised, 'each' of which is identified through the effect actually manifested ... [Instead] a basic power or disposition [should be understood] not in terms of this or that salient manifestation, but rather in terms of a unitary causal influence, something that is constant across circumstances while its manifestations will vary."¹⁸⁰

As Dunne explains, nature-*svabhāva* provides an explanatory basis for the causal powers of entities: "Veiled within Dharmakīrti's notion of *svabhāva* as nature is a strong rejection of random (*ākasmika*) causality and thus a strong commitment to the regularity of causality ... [Dharmakīrti] claims that an entity's causal potentials are restricted precisely because they have arisen from certain causes: it is impossible for an apple seed to produce certain types of effects because it is impossible for it to arise from certain types of causes. While these notions of restriction are negative in character, they amount to positive claims: an entity has the potentials to produce certain types of effects because it has arisen from certain types of causes."¹⁸¹

Dunne also explains that "the causal functionality implicit in both senses of *svabhāva* is actually reducible to the causal functionality of particulars."¹⁸²

Dharmakīrti's idea seems to be that causal powers of entities supervene on causal powers of their constituent elementary particles, rather than on non-

¹⁷⁹ Dunne (2004) 164

¹⁸⁰ O'Connor and Churchill (2010) 45; see also Corry (2009) 173 for discussion of Cartwright's similar distinctions between a capacity and a disposition and of Ellis and Lierse's notion of a multi-track disposition

¹⁸¹ Dunne (2004) 162

¹⁸² Dunne (2004) 155

causal categorical properties. Accordingly, it would not be correct to attribute to Dharmakīrti an affirmation of categorical properties. Rather, this claim appears to be Dharmakīrti's way of acknowledging the reductionist principle advocated by other Buddhist groups, whilst allowing for a dynamism to characterize reality at the microscopic and macroscopic levels.

Dunne describes another "principle of ontological reduction that appears to underlie Dharmakīrti's system. Properties can be reduced to the nature-*svabhāva* of the subject (*dharmīn*) that they qualify. This amounts to a reduction of the properties to the subject itself, since its nature-*svabhāva* is a marker for the totality of the causal characteristics that is that subject."¹⁸³ The idea that only causal properties are ultimately real is also reflected in Dharmakīrti's use of the notion of *arthakriyākāritvam*, or perceptible causal efficiency, as a criterion of what is real. As Dunne explains, for Dharmakīrti, "things that produce effects are particulars (or they are reducible to particulars), and since only particulars are ultimately real, anything that fails to produce an effect is not ultimately real."¹⁸⁴

With regard to the translation of the term *svabhāva*, Dunne cautions that "the notion of an "essential property" must not be allowed to introduce an unwarranted form of essentialism – and its attendant problems – into Dharmakīrti's system"¹⁸⁵ and that "Dharmakīrti's theory ... belies any such *de re* essentialism"¹⁸⁶. Specifically, "in a correct judgment immediately subsequent to a perception, the predications one makes of an individual are markedly conditioned by mind-dependent factors such as expectation, need, context, perceptual acuity, habituation and so on. Thus, when a child who studies under his father sees him coming from afar, he will first conceive of that person as "father" rather than "teacher."¹⁸⁷ This explanation makes it seem that Dharmakīrti's notion of *svabhāva* corresponds to Locke's notion of a nominal

¹⁸³ Dunne (2004) 199

¹⁸⁴ Dunne (2004) 83-84

¹⁸⁵ Dunne (2004) 182-183

¹⁸⁶ Dunne (2004) 184

¹⁸⁷ Dunne (2004) 184

essence, and, as such, Dharmakīrti would be labelled a conventionalist. As Ellis explains, conventionalists “do not think there are any real (that is, *de re* or metaphysical) necessities in the world. All necessities, they suppose, are *de dicto*, and hence derive from the conventions of language.”¹⁸⁸

In fact, however, no secure attribution of conventionalism can be made to Dharmakīrti. This is because, as Dunne explains, Dharmakīrti's notion of *svabhāva* cannot be easily equated with a notion of *de dicto* necessity either, because of a “relationship between psychologism and ontology in his system”¹⁸⁹ and because of “his failure to formulate and provide adequate terminology for a distinction between necessary and accidental properties”¹⁹⁰. The accidental/essential distinction “remains vague and undeveloped”¹⁹¹ in Dharmakīrti's philosophy.

The key feature of Dharmakīrti's notion of *svabhāva* is that it supervenes in some sense on the causal history and possible causal future of the entity. In this way Dharmakīrti provides a causal basis for dispositional properties. In the contemporary literature, dispositions that supervene on causal bases are contrasted with bare dispositions. Elizabeth Prior, Robert Pargetter and Frank Jackson define the causal basis of a disposition by means of an example of the fragility of a glass. They explain:

“[the] reason why a glass is fragile ... involves a causally relevant property (or property complex) of the glass, which we will call the *causal basis* of the disposition.”¹⁹²

Prior et al. go on to argue it is a necessary truth that dispositions have a causal basis, and that this be distinct from the disposition itself, and that it is the causal basis of the disposition rather than the disposition itself which is the

¹⁸⁸ Ellis (2001) 43

¹⁸⁹ Dunne (2004) 188

¹⁹⁰ Dunne (2004) 188

¹⁹¹ Dunne (2004) 190

¹⁹² Prior, Pargetter and Jackson (1982) 251

cause of the display of the disposition. That is, in the case of a glass, whatever causes the display of fragility in the glass is fixed by reference to the facts about the glass that constitute its fragility rather than being fixed by reference to the fact that those facts constitute fragility.

One objection to the notion of a bare disposition that is commonly canvassed is the *virtus dormitiva* objection. This objection is named from the example of providing 'dormative power' as an explanation of why opium causes sleep, which fails to provide an independent non-circular explanation of the power of opium to cause sleep. As Harré explains this objection:

"If the identifying criterion for a power of a certain kind is uniquely tied to the effect that it has when the corresponding disposition is activated, then there is a vicious circularity between powers and their manifestations. There would be a power for every disposition."¹⁹³

That this objection does not have force against the notion of a disposition that is not a bare disposition is made clear by Mumford as follows. Although the explanation of 'dormative power' is trivial in answer to the question 'why does opium cause sleep?', it is not trivial in answer to the question, 'why does sleep follow whenever opium is taken?' This is because the former question does and the latter question does not presuppose a causal relation between opium and sleep. As such, to respond to the latter question with the answer 'dormative power' serves to rule out alternative possibilities, such as correlation without causation. 'Dormative power' thus functions as a placeholder for a fuller or more scientific explanation rather than as an alternative to it. Harré and Madden similarly explain:

"The emptiness of the general regularity statement contrasts unfavourably with the promise of the power statement, which implies that the sleepiness is not fully explained by the fact of the ingestion of opium, but is to be looked for in the nature of opium. An attribution of a

¹⁹³ Harré (2013) 129

power opens up a certain direction of empirical investigation. It is not an attribution of an occult quality, because it is not a quality-attribution at all."¹⁹⁴

The view that there could be bare dispositions and that a disposition may have no distinct causal basis has been advocated by Jennifer McKittrick.¹⁹⁵ The notion of a bare disposition also gains support from the essentialist thesis in Ellis's dispositional essentialism, whereby the disposition constitutes the real essence of a natural kind and is a modal property defined by a way of acting. Crucially, Ellis holds that the causal process which serves to define the dispositional property is not itself defined by reference to that process, but is defined in terms of the causal kind and effectual kind events it involves.¹⁹⁶ Timothy O'Connor and John Ross Churchill similarly understand a causal power as "a power to produce or bring about some event, where this is assumed to be a real relation irreducible to more basic features of the world. Our favoured technical terms for this is 'causal oomph'. So understood, causation is not amenable to analysis in non-causal terms, but instead involves the exercise of ontologically primitive causal *powers* or *capacities* of particulars."¹⁹⁷ In sum, it can be said that there is no settled position in the literature about what dispositions consist in, and, specifically, it is not fully settled whether they are or are not reducible to causes or to other dispositional or categorical properties.¹⁹⁸

Based on the limited textual evidence available, it is not clear whether the neo-medical group of svabhāva-advocates also affirm bare dispositions or consider that dispositions supervene on other properties or facts. However, the lack of any available statement of how dispositions supervene on other factors make it plausible that they advocated bare dispositions. Also, as we shall see below, a form of supervenience concerning dispositions was advocated by the Buddhist

¹⁹⁴ Harré and Madden (1975) 85

¹⁹⁵ See McKittrick (2003) and McKittrick (2009)

¹⁹⁶ See Ellis (2002) 47-50

¹⁹⁷ O'Connor and Churchill (2010) 44

¹⁹⁸ See also the various papers in Kistler and Gnessounou (2007)

Dharmakīrti, so the opposition between Sāṃkhya philosophers aligned with this group and Buddhists may also suggest that this group advocated bare dispositions. If this were the case, it would also explain the confusion between this group and the second group of svabhāva-advocates, whose anti-necessitarian view would entail lack of such supervenience.

By contrast, the intellectual pessimism of one group of svabhāva-advocates in appealing to chance seems to entail the denial of distinct causal bases for distinct dispositions. The other group who affirmed a neo-medical conception of svabhāva also failed to specify any causal basis for dispositions, although their view is not technically inconsistent with the idea that dispositions should have a causal basis, based on the limited textual evidence available.

Section 7: Kumāriila's notion of svabhāva

The foregoing discussion has identified dispositionalist and essentialist dimensions to the notion of svabhāva. Dispositionally, svabhāva constitutes a real causal power which is an embodied cause. In terms of essence, three conceptions of particular interest have been identified. These include Fine's two notions of essence conditional on existence and essence conditional on identity. The third is the notion of a default intrinsic nature conditional on the absence of extrinsic factors. The notion of intrinsicity is that of Harré and Madden, which is that it is "a feature of the thing itself"¹⁹⁹, and the notion of a default refers to the presence of normal conditions and the absence of extrinsic factors. As such, an intrinsic feature is capable of metaphysically grounding some explanandum. In the next chapter, Kumāriila's claim that "it is understood that the prāmāṇyam of all pramāṇas is 'from itself'"²⁰⁰ will be investigated with respect to these conceptions. This section will provide a preliminary analysis of dispositionalism and essentialism in Kumāriila's notion of svabhāva by

¹⁹⁹ Harré and Madden (1975) 87

²⁰⁰ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

considering Kumāriḷa's analogy with the case of water being carried in a pot.

Kumāriḷa provides an example of his notion of svabhāva using the illustration of a disposition of a pot to carry water:

TS 2850: In being produced, a pot depends on a lump of clay, a [potter's] stick, a [potter's] wheel etc., ...

... but [the pot's] dependency on those things is not present in the extraction of water.

The translation of the term 'āharaṇa' as 'extraction' diverges from previous translations of this verse. Thus Jha provides the translation 'the action of containing water'. Taber, Arnold and Kataoka similarly translates this term as 'carrying water' or 'to carry water'.²⁰¹ However, 'containing' water does not really fit with the meaning of 'āharaṇa', and, although 'carrying' picks up on one set of meanings provided by Monier-Williams as "taking, seizing, bringing, fetching"²⁰², nevertheless it is the carrier and not the pot which plays the significant instrumental role when water is transferred from one place from another. Further, on this reading, it is not clear why the dynamic functioning of delivered content in bringing about beliefs that are true should be like the static functioning of a pot in holding water while it is carried.²⁰³

Monier-Williams provides the following additional meanings for this term: "taking away, robbing ... extracting, removing ..."²⁰⁴. The notion of extracting water seems to better capture the idea of a dynamic process. Specifically, in setting processes, such as when milk is set to make yoghurt, or hot liquidy ghee is set to make solid ghee, there is a dynamic process, where the porosity

²⁰¹ See Taber (1992b) 211, Arnold (2001) 655 fn.42, Arnold (2005) 242 fn.38, Kataoka (2011) 254 fn.210

²⁰² Monier-Williams (1956) 162

²⁰³ Jayanta also expresses some misgivings about this analogy: see NM 424

²⁰⁴ Monier-Williams (1956) 162

of an earthenware pot may be thought to play some role in this extraction process. Although this revision of previous translations brings the analogy to life in a way that previous translations do not, the discussion below could alternatively be read in terms of a pot containing water or somehow being involved when water is carried.

The behaviour of the pot in facilitating the extraction of water constitutes the display of a capacity which is a real dispositional property or causal power. Similarly, Kataoka explains that "Kumārila has his own well-defined notion of capacity and uses the term consistently."²⁰⁵ Kataoka observes:

"Ontologically, a capacity belongs to an entity ... It is ... "hypothetically" postulated from a seen result ... it exists objectively as a real entity."²⁰⁶

Kataoka's explanation highlights the affinity between Kumārila's notion of capacity and the notion of disposition discussed above. Specifically, the capacity is real and belongs to an entity, so corresponds to the general idea of a real property. The idea that a capacity is postulated from a seen result corresponds to Ellis's idea that a dispositional property which is the real essence of a natural kind is defined in terms of its display or manifestation.²⁰⁷

The capacity to facilitate extraction plays a real causal role which explains its manner of display in terms of the extraction of water. Thus the capacity is a real property of its entity which has a causal role in determining the behaviour of that entity. Kataoka similarly notes that 'due to svabhāva' is a paraphrase of 'from itself' with a specifically ontological connotation.²⁰⁸ This is also evident from the medical analogy, where the svabhāva of a drug was said to be responsible for its curative effect.

²⁰⁵ Kataoka (2011) 247

²⁰⁶ Kataoka (2011) 247-248

²⁰⁷ See Ellis (2001) 124 and Ellis (2002) 49

²⁰⁸ See Kataoka (2011) 84, 86

Kumārila also claims that the capacity does not supervene on the causal conditions that are responsible for the particular essence of the pot. This contrasts with Dharmakīrti's understanding of *svabhāva* described above. Kumārila's capacity is a property which is a kind essence rather than a particular essence. It is a dispositional property which does not supervene on any causal basis. The verse makes explicit that a capacity does not supervene on the causal history or material cause of its entity. Thus, although the conception of a bare disposition and debates about it in contemporary philosophy are in flux, Kumārila's notion of a capacity can be tentatively equated with the notion of a bare disposition. The notion of a bare disposition was also tentatively equated with the neo-medical use of *svabhāva* above.

In addition to this dispositionalist dimension to Kumārila's notion of *svabhāva*, there is also an essentialist dimension. It was described above how Dunne cautions that "Dharmakīrti's theory ... belies any such *de re* essentialism"²⁰⁹ and asserts that the accidental/ essential distinction "remains vague and undeveloped"²¹⁰ in Dharmakīrti's philosophy. Dunne's call for caution would *prima facie* apply in the case of Kumārila also. However, whereas Dharmakīrti emphasizes how correct judgments are "conditioned by mind-dependent factors such as expectation, need, context, perceptual acuity, habituation and so on"²¹¹, Kumārila's analogy with the case of a pot emphasizes rather the independence of the correct judgment from its causal factors, as bare disposition. As such, Fine's two conditional notions of essence, as conditional on existence and as conditional on identity, provide a sufficiently sophisticated notion of essence, which when properly applied does not "introduce an unwarranted form of essentialism"²¹² into Kumārila's doctrine. The notion of an intrinsic feature conditional on normal extrinsic conditions, i.e. the absence of external interference, is also relevant. The idea of disappearing together with its entity

²⁰⁹ Dunne (2004) 184

²¹⁰ Dunne (2004) 190

²¹¹ Dunne (2004) 184

²¹² Dunne (2004) 182-183

corresponds to Fine's idea of an essence conditional on existence. Kataoka similarly observes that a capacity "disappears if its locus is destroyed"²¹³

Relating this essentialist strand to the pot analogy, pots in general would be capable of facilitating extraction. However, this is conditional on normal conditions and the absence of extrinsic factors. For example, a person could smash or crack the pot, causing it to leak. As such, the ability to facilitate extraction is an intrinsic nature of the pot conditional on absence of interference.

There is now a disjunction between the case of an undamaged and a damaged pot. If something constitutes an undamaged pot, it will necessarily be able to facilitate extraction. As such, the ability to facilitate extraction is an essence conditional on identity as an undamaged pot, and is essentially distributed over undamaged pots. Specifically, it would be a kind essence, or essential property of a kind. That is, a pot is the type of thing that by its essential kind nature holds water. It would be possible for an individual pot to be destroyed along with its disposition to hold water, and also for a pot to be damaged, retaining its individual identity whilst losing its disposition to facilitate extraction. The lack of the ability to facilitate extraction in a pot is due to external interference. As some damaged pots may yet possess such ability, this ability is inessentially distributed over damaged pots. The significance of these observations will become clearer in the next chapter, where the notion of *svabhāva* is applied to the case of the relation between '*pramāṇa*' and '*prāmāṇyam*'.

²¹³ Kataoka (2011) 248

Chapter 3: Kumāriila's disjunctive epistemology

Section 1: Introduction

The claim under examination in this thesis is that "the *prāmāṇyam* of all *pramāṇas* is 'from itself'"¹. In the previous chapter, Kumāriila's terms 'from itself' and 'due to *svabhāva*' were explicated in terms of a metaphysic of causal powers, and the ramifications of such a metaphysic will be developed in this chapter. This requires an investigation of Kumāriila's use of the terms '*pramāṇa*' and '*prāmāṇyam*' in establishing his epistemological claim. Kumāriila's use of these two related terms is indebted to a general understanding of them common to a diverse selection of different Indian philosophers. As such, a certain amount of general discussion of these terms will be necessary. However, a comprehensive investigation of these two terms would require an examination of other thinkers in their own right, which is outside the scope of this thesis.

Sosa's virtue epistemology (VE) approach has itself been presented as a dispositional thesis consistent with a general metaphysics of causal powers. Sosa considers that human faculties such as eyesight are the intellectual virtues which are powers that bring about one's believing the truth under normal circumstances. It is suggested that Kumāriila's approach contributes to VE by demonstrating how Sosa's claim harmonizes with the metaphysical picture of dispositional essentialism.

This chapter begins with an examination of the key terms in Kumāriila's epistemic vocabulary, which are '*pramāṇa*' and '*prāmāṇyam*', based on existing secondary literature. The work of Dan Arnold and John Taber on the meaning of the claim "the *prāmāṇyam* of all *pramāṇas* is 'from itself'"² is then examined.

¹ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

² TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

Following this, the thesis argues for a reading of Kumāriila's claim as a metaphysical claim that deliverances have an essential disposition to make an accurate determination. Such a reading constitutes an ontological interpretation falling into a general type which is rejected by Arnold, and as such, the objections of Arnold to this type of reading are addressed.

This metaphysical interpretation is supported firstly by arguing for an initial understanding of Kumāriila's term 'pramāṇa' as a deliverance from an epistemic source. Such deliverances manifest their causal power when conditions are appropriately normal, and fail to do so when conditions are abnormal. As such, Kumāriila's distinction between pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa represents a distinction between a Good Case deliverance and a Bad Case deliverance respectively, where the Good Case deliverance is considered a paradigm case.

Section 2: Knowledge and its value

No single term in Kumāriila's discussion clearly corresponds to the term 'knowledge'. Kumāriila's expression meya-bodha more closely equates to the idea of veridical awareness, accurate determination, or true belief. The synonymous terms pramā and pramiti in classical Indian philosophy are terms with debated epistemic status, but are frequently used in the sense of true belief.³ Although they do not occur in this discussion, these terms would arguably denote some conception of knowledge for Kumāriila. This is because Kumāriila's notion of prāmāṇyam, which is etymologically related to these terms, involves the idea of a causal power and thereby does concern an epistemic performance and an epistemic achievement. It will be argued in this chapter that prāmāṇyam involves the idea of accuracy and the exercise of a competence, thereby establishing a clear contrast with accidentally true belief, which is not an epistemic achievement in a robust sense. In this way,

³ See for example MK Part 5 2772: pramātvaṃ ca yathārthānubhavatvam| See also Potter (1977) 155: "Pramā is a term designating a true judgment"

Kumārila's doctrine comes to engage with some conception of knowledge. More widely, the classical Indian debate recognizes an epistemic status which is more valuable than mere true belief because it invests the agent with confidence in that true belief. As such, there is a strong connection with discussions of knowledge and of the value of knowledge in Western philosophy generally.

Duncan Pritchard explains that recent work in epistemology has focused on questions about the value of knowledge.⁴ Pritchard describes the precedent for this discussion set by Plato's discussion in the *Meno* as to why knowledge is more valuable than true belief. Here, Plato suggests that knowledge is "tied down" to the truth, like the mythical tethered statues of Daedalus which were so lifelike that they were tied to the ground to ensure that they did not run away.⁵ Pritchard suggests that this amounts to the idea that "knowledge, unlike mere true belief, gives one a confidence that is not easily lost"⁶.

Pritchard suggests that mere true belief about the way to Larissa may be lost if the road seems to be going in the wrong direction, because one may lose confidence, whereas a person with knowledge "will in all likelihood press on regardless (and thereby have one's confidence rewarded by getting where one needs to go)."⁷

It is interesting to note that Plato's example of the traveller to Larissa focuses on the predicament of the individual knower, and specifically that the need for confidence suggests conditions that must be satisfied by the epistemic agent for herself. Such conditions would then themselves have to be accessible to the epistemic agent in some sense. Contemporary accounts in the analysis of knowledge seem to focus on a more abstract higher-level perspective from which a determination about the agent's epistemic status should be made according to a normative threshold for knowledge. Although subtle, this shift in perspective means that the confidence of the epistemic agent in acting on her beliefs is no longer centre stage, but is replaced with the confidence of the

⁴ Pritchard (2007)

⁵ Pritchard (2007) 86

⁶ Pritchard (2007) 86

⁷ Pritchard (2007) 86

philosopher in making a determination as to whether the traveller should be said to possess knowledge.

The motivation for considering the value of knowledge in the classical Indian context is illustrated by Jayanta in his discussion of this topic. Jayanta explains that Vedic rituals involve “labours including the giving of countless amounts of wealth”⁸. A prudent person would not take such action were the unseen benefits of such actions not ascertained.⁹ By contrast, Jayanta suggests, everyday actions can be motivated by empirical beliefs even if their truth has not been fully ascertained.¹⁰

Jayanta himself follows the lead of Buddhists such as Śāntarakṣita¹¹ in suggesting that the need for ascertainment represents a further separable condition for knowledge beyond the need for true belief.¹² By contrast, Kumārila denies that the need for ascertainment represents a separable condition. However, there is a general consensus that something beyond true belief is needed in order to give the agent confidence to act on her beliefs. There is thus a parallel with the idea that knowledge gives one the confidence to press on even in the face of initially unpromising results. The classical Indian debate thus shares with Plato's discussion a focus on the perspective of the knower, who is to gain sufficient confidence in the truth of her belief in order to act with conviction, thereby raising the epistemic status of the belief to a level that can aptly be termed knowledge. It could thus be said that knowledge requires true belief plus confidence, where this means that the epistemic agent must satisfy for herself certain conditions that would provide a type of confidence that is adequate in degree and in kind.

The alternative idea proposed by Kumārila is that the epistemic agent can gain

⁸ NM 436: “agaṇita-draviṇa-vitarāṇādi-kleśa-sādhyeṣu”

⁹ See NM 436: “prekṣāvātāṃ pravartanam anucitam”

¹⁰ See NM 436: “pratyakṣādiṣu dṛṣṭārtheṣu pramāṇeṣu prāmāṇya-niścayam antareṇaiva vyavahāra-siddheḥ ... tatra śreyān anirṇaya eva”

¹¹ See esp. TS 2974-2978

¹² See NM 436: “na tāvat svayam eva prāmāṇya-grahaṇam upapannam aprāmāṇikatvāt”

the needed confidence in her beliefs without such definitive ascertainment. His approach contrasts with the idea of a normative threshold or criterion to be met by a belief which is present among other classical Indian thinkers. Kumārila provides an alternative means for the epistemic agent to gain the required confidence in her beliefs. Kumārila provides a belief protocol for the agent to obtain beliefs in which she may justly place her confidence.

Accordingly, rather than a factorizable analysis of knowledge, Kumārila provides a modal metaphysics of beliefs together with a belief protocol addressed to the individual knower. The present chapter examines Kumārila's metaphysics of beliefs, whilst the next chapter examines Kumārila's belief protocol.

Section 3: Terminological issues in the existing literature

B.K. Matilal explains:

“In the Western tradition, epistemology is the name given to that branch of philosophy which concerns itself with the theory of knowledge ... The function of what is called the *pramāṇa-śāstra* in Indian philosophic tradition coincides to a great extent with this activity.”¹³

The terms *pramāṇa* and *prāmāṇyam* thus form part of a range of etymologically connected epistemic vocabulary. These two terms are central in Kumārila's main claim that “the *prāmāṇyam* of all *pramāṇas* is 'from itself'”¹⁴.

The term '*pramāṇa*' refers to a type of '*jñāna*'. In the similar context of Nyāya, J.N.Mohanty writes:

“*Jñāna* is not an activity but a product ... each person's ... *jñāna* is

¹³ Matilal (1986) 22

¹⁴ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

directly perceivable by himself and by none else ... it is an occurrent, i.e. to say, arises in time and is replaced by others ... epistemologically it refers beyond itself to its object ... if I am conscious of anything in whatsoever mode it may be, in the Nyāya terminology I may be said to have a *jñāna* of it"¹⁵.

The term 'thought' is sometimes used in the contemporary context to capture the similar notion of a propositional mental event.¹⁶

Kataoka explains that "in the Mīmāṃsā tradition, it is also well established that *jñāna* can be interpreted in two ways: cognition and a means of cognition (*jñāyate 'nena*)."¹⁷ The notion of a cognition in turn subsumes notions of an occurrent judgment and an occurrent awareness. A full analysis of this dimension of the term's meaning is outside the scope of this thesis, and the terms 'cognition', 'judgment', '(epistemic) deliverance', 'belief' and 'awareness' will alternately feature as translations depending on context. In particular, whilst being entirely consistent in his thinking, Kumāriḷa's perspective often shift between that of means and that of product, and the translation of the term '*jñāna*' as 'deliverance' and as 'judgment' will be used to capture these two perspectives.

The term 'deliverance' is used in Sosa's sense. Sosa explains:

"Traditionally our knowledge is said to have "sources" such as perception, memory, and inference. Epistemic sources issue

¹⁵ Mohanty (1989) 23-26

¹⁶ See Sawyer (1998) 523 fn.2: "The term 'thought' as I use it should not be understood as a Fregean thought. Rather, 'thought' should be understood as a synonym for 'propositional mental event'. Hence, two subjects cannot have the same thought, but can have thoughts with the same content. Similarly, a subject cannot be said to have the same thought at different times, but can have two thoughts with the same content at different times."

¹⁷ Kataoka (2011) 204 fn.113

“deliverances” that we may or may not accept ... Deliverances thus conceived make up a realm of the ostensible: ostensible perceptions, ostensible memories, ostensible intuitions, and the like ... Examples of deliverances are test results, indicator readings, eyewitness reports, media reports, perceptual reports, perceptual appearances, and even rational intuitions and ostensible conclusions. Contents are delivered by each such source.”¹⁸

The focus of Kumāriila's discussion will be on the potential of an accurate judgment to accurately determine an object as a result, and accordingly Kumāriila's use of the term 'jñāna' will be found to have an affinity with Sosa's notion of a deliverance. Interestingly, Sosa chooses to use a single term, deliverance, to refer to both the act of delivering by the epistemic source and the content that is delivered.¹⁹ These two senses of the term 'jñāna', act of delivering and delivered content, also correspond to the means and product perspectives.

The term 'jñāna' additionally subsumes both 'pramāṇa' and 'non-pramāṇa'. Accordingly, the same ambiguity is found at this sub-level. Thus Dan Arnold explains that pramāṇa “alternately refer[s] to a reliable means of knowing, and to an episode of veridical awareness such as results from the exercise thereof.”²⁰ It will be argued that the term 'pramāṇa' denotes an epistemic performance which achieves a particular outcome, which is accurate determination, and thus constitutes a successful deliverance. As an abstract property of such successful deliverances, the term 'prāmāṇyam' reflects a notion of epistemic success. These senses can be grammatically parsed as follows –

¹⁸ Sosa (2007) 101-103

¹⁹ See Sosa (2007) 103 fn.5

²⁰ Arnold (2001) 590

- pramāṇa = pramā-karaṇa²¹ = a successful act of deliverance
- pramāṇa = pramā = successfully delivered content

Corresponding to these are also two senses of prāmāṇyam.²² In some presentations, ambiguity is only attributed to this term, as the second sense of pramāṇa can be disambiguated by the term 'pramā'.²³ Based on the capacity reading of prāmāṇyam developed in the previous chapter, these will be understood as follows:

- prāmāṇyam = pramā-karaṇa-tvam = a capacity for epistemic success
- prāmāṇyam = pramā-tvam = epistemic success

Kumārila's notion of prāmāṇyam will be equated with the notion of pramā-karaṇa, or a capacity for epistemic success. However, it will also be found that most of Kumārila's claims can be formulated with respect to the epistemic success which results from the exercise of such a capacity. As such, the two notions of a capacity for epistemic success and epistemic success itself represent the two perspectives of means and product.

Ryle explains how success verbs, which signify achievements²⁴, are frequently used to refer to processes properly denoted by hunt verbs. Ryle writes, "we very often borrow achievement verbs to signify the performance of the corresponding task activities, where the hope of success is good. A runner may be described as winning his race from the start, despite the fact that he may

²¹ Cf. MK Part 5 2773: pramāṇatvaṃ pramākaraṇatvam|

²² Cf. Arnold (2001) 590: "Prāmāṇya then refers to that abstract quality in virtue of which a *pramāṇa* has whatever status it has."

²³ See Mohanty (1989) 2 quoted below; see also Potter (1977) 155: "Pramā is a term designating a true judgment; *pramātvā* is the universal property shared by all true judgments. Frequently this property is referred to by another word, *prāmāṇya*, which is, however, ambiguous, as Mohanty demonstrates. The truth of a judgment is grounded in what is called a *pramāṇa*, an instrument of (true) knowledge ... The property which all such instruments have in common is also called *prāmāṇya* – thus providing a source of confusion."

²⁴ See Ryle (1976) 125-126

not win it in the end; and a doctor may boast that he is curing his patient's pneumonia, when his treatment does not in fact result in the anticipated recovery."²⁵ A similar ambiguity sometimes obtains in the case of the Indian terminology. Thus Jayanta for example at one point uses the expression 'yathārthhêtara-pramiti' to denote correct or incorrect judgments.²⁶

Subsection 1: Pramāṇa as instrument or outcome

Regarding the former sense, Potter calls *pramāṇa* "an instrument of (true) knowledge"²⁷. Jha explains that it is a 'Means of Cognition', seemingly bracketing the question of epistemic status.²⁸ Matilal explains that *pramāṇa* "means simply various instrumental causes leading to true cognition."²⁹ and also writes, "What is a *pramāṇa*? Roughly the answer is: A *pramāṇa* is the means leading to a knowledge-episode (*pramā*) as its end."³⁰ Surendranath Dasgupta explains that *pramāṇa* "signifies the means and the movement by which knowledge is acquired"³¹ and, in the context of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika philosophy, writes that "[t]hat collocation (*sāmagrī*) which produced knowledge involved certain non-intelligent as well as intelligent elements ... this collocation is thus called *pramāṇa* or the determining cause of the origin of knowledge"³². Arnold quotes a definition from the Nyāyabhāṣya that "[a] *pramāṇa* is that by means of which one knows an object"³³ and states that "I prefer to render *pramāṇa* in this sense as "reliable warrant", though William Alston's term *doxastic practice* ... would also do nicely."³⁴ It is not clear from this if Arnold wishes to attribute

²⁵ Ryle (1976) 143

²⁶ See NM 431

²⁷ Potter (1977) 155

²⁸ See Jha (1939) 1271 unnumbered footnote: "The dual sense of the form 'Pramāṇa' as *Cognition* and *Means of Cognition* is brought out clearly in the Commentary on *Text* 2813 ..."

²⁹ Matilal (1985) 203

³⁰ Matilal (1986) 22

³¹ Dasgupta (1969) 406

³² Dasgupta (1969) 330

³³ Arnold (2001) 650-651; the quoted definition is "sa yenārthaṃ pramiṇoti tat pramāṇam"

³⁴ Arnold (2001) 651; cf. Arnold (2005) 60

a reliabilist aspect to Kumāriila's doctrine.

Kumāriila discusses the term 'pramāṇa' in the 'determination of perception' chapter of the Śloka-vārttika. John Taber has provided a translation of this chapter together with a detailed analytic commentary.³⁵ In his introduction to the text, Taber explains that pramāṇa has a general meaning of "*that which functions as the means or instrument in an act of cognition ... To ask, What is the pramāṇa perception? then, is to ask, What is the thing that functions instrumentally in the act of perception?*"³⁶ In this discussion, then, Kumāriila is considering the 'hunt' aspect of pramāṇa as act of delivering, without regard for the fact that that deliverance has positive epistemic status.

Taber explains that a variety of theories were discussed by Kumāriila's contemporaries. The following table quotes some options from Taber's enumeration³⁷ of interpretations of the idea that the pramāṇa is "the means of knowledge perception"³⁸ and its result is "the *cognition of an object*"³⁹.

Option	Pramāṇa (means of knowing⁴⁰)	Result
T1	the sense faculty	cognition of the object
T2	the connection of sense faculty and object	cognition of the object
T3	the connection between sense faculty and mind	cognition of the object
T4	all of these connections taken together	cognition of the object

³⁵ Taber (2005)

³⁶ Taber (2005) 18-19

³⁷ See Taber (2005) 19; T for Taber has been added to the option labels

³⁸ Taber (2005) 19

³⁹ Taber (2005) 19

⁴⁰ Cf. Taber (2006) 6: "Now the word *pramāṇa* ... literally means ... 'a means of knowing'."

The following table of options presents some options from Taber's enumeration⁴¹ of interpretations of the idea that the *pramāṇa* is "the *cognition* of the object"⁴² and its result is "some other kind of cognition"⁴³ –

Option	Pramāṇa	Result
T5	a cognition of a qualifying feature of an object, such as the colour blue	an awareness of that same object as qualified by that feature, for example, "The pot is blue"
T6	a nonconceptualized perception of the qualifying feature	a conceptualized awareness of it
T7	an awareness of the qualified object	an awareness of it as desirable, undesirable, or neither

These two broad styles of approach are also distinguished by Kamalāśīla⁴⁴ and by Jayanta.⁴⁵ Taber notes⁴⁶ that in the chapter on perception, Kumārila shows a preference for the latter family of views, whereby the *pramāṇa* is an awareness, yet is amenable to any view that characterizes the *pramāṇa* as something that makes contact with an external object, i.e. any view other than the view espoused by Buddhists like Dharmakīrti. Taber explains that "Kumārila, interestingly, proceeds [in the chapter on perception] to defend all of the theories that accept some kind of interaction between sense faculty and object as viable options – against the various criticisms raised by Diñnāga ... Even theories that hold the *cognition* of the object to be the means of knowledge,

⁴¹ See Taber (2005) 20; T for Taber has been added to the option labels

⁴² Taber (2005) 19

⁴³ Taber (2005) 19

⁴⁴ P on TS 2812

⁴⁵ Jayanta also discusses and rejects a third interpretation, that *pramāṇa* refers to one element in the causal aggregate which produces the cognition.

⁴⁶ See above footnote. See also ŚV 2.80, which provides a kind of definition of a *pramāṇa*, and which characterizes it as a type of cognition.

with which Kumārila's own is to be grouped, can be shown to be coherent."⁴⁷

As Taber explains, although Kumārila runs through all the possible views considering their various merits, the crucial point for Kumārila is simply that a distinction is made between *pramāṇa* and its effect. Whatever definition is chosen, "perception will still be something that occurs only when there is an existing connection of sense-faculty and object."⁴⁸ Kumārila's opposition to the Buddhist idea that *pramāṇa* and its effect are identical seems to be that to accept it would vitiate the explanatory model in which *pramāṇa* is on the side of the explanans and its effect is something with positive epistemic status which is the explanandum. As Taber explains, "It is a basic tenet of Mīmāṃsā (and all other realist schools of Indian philosophy) that means and end must always be distinct – an axe used to fell a tree is one thing, the felling of the tree another ..."⁴⁹

Taber also considers that "it appears that Kumārila favors the view that the cognition itself is the *pramāṇa*"⁵⁰. As for the effect of the *pramāṇa*, Taber notes:

"Kumārila's own view is that the result of knowing is, not another cognition, but the knownness (*jñātatā*) or manifestation (*prākāṣya*) of the object."⁵¹

This supposition is reinforced by Kumārila's presentation under discussion here,

⁴⁷ Taber (2005) 19-20

⁴⁸ Taber (2005) 70

⁴⁹ Taber (2005) 79

⁵⁰ Taber (2005) 71

⁵¹ Taber (2005) 169 fn.67

as the argument that a *pramāṇa* is a type of deliverance corresponds to Taber's equation of *pramāṇa* with the cognition itself. Further, Kumāriḷa's idea that "a capacity for accurate determination of an object belongs to them [*scil.* *pramāṇas*] due to their *svabhāva*"⁵² indicates that accurate determination, i.e. knownness or manifestation of a fact or object, is the effect of the exercise of a capacity. Also, in TS 2910, Kumāriḷa likens the way in which the eye can cognize to the way in which a *pramāṇa* can cognize, suggesting that the two are not equivalent.

The term '*pramāṇa*' can also refer to this effect or outcome of the deliverance. Arnold explains:

"In the present context [*viz.* Kumāriḷa's discussion] ... the word [*scil.* *pramāṇa*] very often has the latter sense, and thus I will generally translate it as veridical awareness."⁵³

Potter provides 'true judgement' for this latter '*pramā*' sense⁵⁴ and also notes that "[t]he Buddhists define truth as *avisaṃvāditva* – nondeviance ..."⁵⁵

Dasgupta explains that *pramā* is "the result of *pramāṇa* – right knowledge"⁵⁶. The Mīmāṃsā-kośa similarly provides the expression 'correct experience' as the meaning of '*pramā*'.⁵⁷

Subsection 2: Prāmāṇyam as instrumentality or as outcome

As abstract properties derived from the two senses of *pramāṇa* above, Mohanty explains that '*prāmāṇyam*' "may mean either the property of being instrumental in bringing about true knowledge (*pramākarāṇatva*), or simply the truth of a

⁵² TS 2812ab

⁵³ Arnold (2001) 590

⁵⁴ Potter (1977) 155: "*Prāmā* is a term designating a true judgment"

⁵⁵ Potter (1977) 156

⁵⁶ Dasgupta (1969) 406

⁵⁷ MK Part 5 2772: "*pramātvam ca yathārthhānubhavatvam*"

knowledge (*pramāṭva*). In the former sense, *prāmāṇya* belongs to the various instrumental causes of true knowledge. In the latter sense, it characterizes a knowledge [i.e. a veridical awareness] itself."⁵⁸

Mohanty translates *prāmāṇya* as truth, explaining that "[t]he theories of *prāmāṇya* ... are concerned with *prāmāṇya* in the second sense, i.e. with the truth of a knowledge."⁵⁹ Similarly, Matilal writes that "I shall often use 'truth' to translate the Sanskrit *pramāṭva*, which is one of the two senses of *prāmāṇya* and in this I shall follow J.N.Mohanty."⁶⁰

A translation as 'validity' for this latter sense is also frequently used, both in the context of Kumāṛila's doctrine and in general.⁶¹ It is difficult to find any positive argument for such a translation which references the meaning of this term, based either on a dictionary definition or on its use in any specialized philosophical context. Dan Arnold favours this term for what it does not imply, explaining that it is "important to render the word in such a way as to avoid prejudging the question of truth"⁶². However, John Dunne argues against a translation as validity, on the grounds that it wrongly "equates veridicality with *prāmāṇya*"⁶³ and that it creates confusion with the notion of validity as preservation of truth in argument structure.⁶⁴

Jha interestingly uses the terms 'authoritativeness', 'authority' and 'validity'⁶⁵, the first two of which seem to convey the idea of a normative claim being made on the agent. Dasgupta states that "[v]alidity (*prāmāṇya*) with Mīmāṃsā meant the capacity that knowledge has to goad us to practical action in

⁵⁸ Mohanty (1989) 2

⁵⁹ Mohanty (1989) 2

⁶⁰ Matilal (1985) 203

⁶¹ See Jha (1939), Taber (1992b), Arnold (2001), Arnold (2005) and Kataoka (2011) Part 2 for the translation as validity in the specific context of Kumāṛila's discussion; see for example Dasgupta (1969) for the translation as validity in a general context

⁶² Arnold (2005) 62; Arnold (2001) 592

⁶³ Dunne (2004) 227

⁶⁴ See Dunne (2004) 227

⁶⁵ See Jha (1907) 26 ff. and Jha (1939) 1270 ff.

accordance with it, but with Vedānta it meant correctness to facts and want of contradiction."⁶⁶ The second alternative captures a notion of accuracy, but Dasgupta's first option would introduce a novel element.

John Dunne provides a perspicacious discussion of the significance of the term 'prāmāṇyam', in which he coins the expression 'instrumentality' as his preferred translation, corresponding to the notion of a pramāṇa as "instrumental cognition."⁶⁷ Dunne argues that this would appropriately stress the connection with the grammatical instrumentality⁶⁸ and that the unfamiliarity of this term as compared with 'truth' or 'validity' allows "new possibilities for working through old problems"⁶⁹. Dunne also construes instrumentality in terms of purpose, writing that "part of what one means by instrumentality is that an instrument of knowledge must be "good for something""⁷⁰, and thus this notion of instrumentality is a feature of pramāṇas, here, deliverances, relative to some goal to be specified.

Given the current state of research, translation for the terms 'pramāṇa', 'prāmāṇatā' and 'prāmāṇyam' in this thesis will have a necessarily provisional status, both in general and in relation to Kumāṛila's conception. The term 'pramāṇa' will be understood as a successful deliverance in relation to a disjunction with the term 'non-pramāṇa' or unsuccessful deliverance. Kumāṛila's explication of the term 'prāmāṇyam' has already been shown to involve the notion of a capacity for accurate determination actually exercised under appropriately normal conditions which is also an essential disposition of those beliefs which are pramāṇas or successful deliverances.

Like Dharmakīrti, and perhaps in contrast with the later commentators, Kumāṛila's concern seems to be with prāmāṇyam as a feature of deliverances which Dunne conveys by the term 'instrumentality', rather than the feature of

⁶⁶ Dasgupta (1969) 485

⁶⁷ Dunne (2004) 255

⁶⁸ See Dunne (2004) 223-225

⁶⁹ Dunne (2004) 225

⁷⁰ Dunne (2004) 229-230

accuracy pertaining to the delivered content. The notion of instrumentality towards some epistemically successful end is substantially equivalent to the attainment of such an end. However, Dunne's term 'instrumentality' seems to place the leading emphasis on process, by constituting a 'hunt' term rather than a 'success' term. Thus, even if it were to be understood as instrumentality towards some epistemically successful end, the fact that an instrumentally successful outcome is not merely targeted but must in fact be achieved for the use of the term to be apt is obscured. An optimal expression would emphasize the requirement for success, without being too specific about the nature of the successful outcome. Accordingly, a notion of epistemic success will be employed. The advantage of this expression is that the notion of success conveys not merely a final state but that state construed in relation to a process of which it is an outcome. Further, as a means to such an outcome, *prāmāṇyam* will be understood as the exercise of a capacity for epistemic success. At the same time, Dunne's locution whereby a deliverance is said to be instrumental to an outcome will also be helpful in representing Kumāriila's views.

Kumāriila's main claim is that all *pramāṇas* have *prāmāṇyam* 'from itself'.⁷¹ Kumāriila glosses this main claim with the statement that a *pramāṇa* has a capacity for accurate determination of an object.⁷² This capacity is likewise glossed by Kamalaśīla as a capacity to accurately determine an object and as a capacity to produce a correct awareness.⁷³ Śāntarakṣita likewise understands that *prāmāṇyam* "has the defining characteristic of [involving] a capacity"⁷⁴ in his discussion of Kumāriila's verses. Kamalaśīla similarly provides his own separate explanation of *prāmāṇyam* as a capacity of an initial awareness to give rise to a later awareness of a further result in his commentary on Śāntarakṣita's accuracy-based definition above.⁷⁵ Accordingly, we must understand that the

⁷¹ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab

⁷² See TS 2812ab

⁷³ Kamalaśīla's gloss is as 'prameya-paricchede śaktiḥ' and as "yathārtha-jñāna-janane śaktiḥ", both at P 746 under TS 2812

⁷⁴ TS 2838: "śakti-lakṣaṇam ... idaṃ prāmāṇyam"

⁷⁵ P 771 under TS 2958-2961: "tasya tat-prāpaṇa-śaktiḥ." Kamalaśīla rather defines *pramāṇa* as correct awareness (see P 778: *avisamvādi-jñānam*)

term 'prāmāṇyam' also refers either directly to a capacity for accurate determination or something which is characterized by such a capacity.⁷⁶

Subsection 3: Svataḥ as intrinsic

Kumārila's claim that "the prāmāṇyam of all pramāṇas is 'from itself'"⁷⁷ states the doctrine of 'svataḥ-prāmāṇyam' or 'prāmāṇyam from itself'. The Sanskrit term 'svataḥ', which is here being translated literally as 'from itself',⁷⁸ is also frequently translated as 'intrinsic' in the secondary literature.⁷⁹ Dasgupta however talks of "[t]he doctrine of the self-validity of knowledge (*svataḥprāmāṇya*) ... Validity means the certitude of truth."⁸⁰ Monier Monier-Williams provides various meanings for 'svataḥ' including "'from one's own share' ... 'of one's own self', 'of one's own accord ... by nature ...'"⁸¹. Jha mainly uses the expression 'due to the conception itself' when translating the Śloka-vārttika⁸² and uses the terms 'inherent' and 'self-sufficient' when translating the Tattva-saṅgraha.⁸³ It is not clear whether Jha has a positive consideration in mind when choosing these terms.

Taber provides a purely negative consideration:

"I prefer to translate *svataḥ* ambiguously as 'intrinsic' or 'intrinsically' instead of literally as 'of itself', in order to allow for the possibility that it means something other than, strictly, 'of/from [the cognition] itself' ...

⁷⁶ Śāntarakṣita's term 'lakṣaṇam' at TS 2838 especially indicates the idea of an essential characteristic

⁷⁷ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab

⁷⁸ This is following the lead of Kataoka (2011); see also Taber (1992b) 207: "svataḥ literally means 'of itself' or 'from itself'."

⁷⁹ See for example Potter (1977) 156-160, Taber (1992b) 211 and *passim*, Arnold (2001) 597 and *passim*

⁸⁰ Dasgupta (1969) 372

⁸¹ Monier-Williams (1956) 1275

⁸² See Jha (1907) 26 ff.

⁸³ See Jha (1939) 1270 ff.

Umbeka interprets it in a nonliteral way."⁸⁴

Dan Arnold similarly writes: "I will render [svataḥ-prāmāṇyam as] "intrinsic validity."⁸⁵ Kataoka (2011) alternately uses both 'from itself' and 'intrinsic'.⁸⁶ This thesis will use the literal translation 'from itself' and also argue that this engages with ideas of essence and intrinsic nature in ways to be specified.

What is the philosophical significance of the term 'svataḥ'? Taber and Arnold both approach this question through a consideration of the two competing interpretations by Uṃveka and Pārthasārathi about what 'sva-' (itself) refer to. The views of Arnold and Taber will be considered in turn. As previously noted, however, discussion of the views of Uṃveka and Pārthasārathi are not within the scope of this research. On the basis of a cursory survey of the original works, the accuracy of Taber and Arnold in representing their views is accepted, and in particular, the position advocated by Arnold is taken to represent a homogenous Pārthasārathi-Arnold view.

Arnold explains that "the word *svataḥ* ... is often rendered adverbially ("intrinsically"), in which case, its reflexive sense is obscured."⁸⁷ Arnold focuses on Pārthasārathi's work *Nyāya-ratna-mālā*, where Pārthasārathi considers whether "sva- is reflexive only to all veridical awarenesses (i.e., only to *pramāṇas*)"⁸⁸ before arguing instead that "we must take the reflexive *sva-* ... as reflexive to all awarenesses – i.e., even those that turn out not to be veridical."⁸⁹ Strongly endorsing Pārthasārathi's interpretation, Arnold explains that we should "understand the *prāmāṇya* debate to concern nothing more than *prima facie* justification."⁹⁰ Thus "what is intrinsic is simply the fact that awareness confers *prima facie* justification."⁹¹

⁸⁴ Taber (1992b) 207 fn.21; square brackets are in the original

⁸⁵ Arnold (2001) 590; cf. Arnold (2005) 62, 74 and *passim*

⁸⁶ See Kataoka (2011) Part 2 63, 64 and *passim*

⁸⁷ Arnold (2005) 74; cf. Arnold (2001) 603

⁸⁸ Arnold (2001) 628

⁸⁹ Arnold (2001) 628; cf. Arnold (2005) 96

⁹⁰ Arnold (2001) 641

⁹¹ Arnold (2001) 592

Arnold also argues forcefully against the contrary idea that 'from itself' is reflexive to veridical awarenesses only and the allied reading of *prāmāṇyam* as truth. Kumārila's claim would then be read as the claim that only veridical awareness possess truth. Arnold writes that "in this case, we would seem to be faced with a truism; for "validity" intrinsically obtains with respect to all "valid awarenesses" simply by definition. On this account, then, the "intrinsic-ness" of validity obtains, as it were, simply *de dicto*."⁹² This rejected reading involves the idea that "the "capacity" for producing validity (the capacity which, if not already existent, can't be brought about by anything else) is something like an occult "power" or metaphysical property that is intrinsically *possessed* by *pramāṇas*, which therefore intrinsically and objectively "bear" the means of producing the state of affairs which makes them valid ... *svataḥ prāmāṇya* [is] something like the intrinsic truth of *pramāṇas*."⁹³ Arnold claims that this type of occult power would function like a *virtus dormitiva*, as it "is not an explanation, it is simply a restatement of what requires explanation."⁹⁴ Thus Arnold argues that ""truth" is a tendentious and misleading rendering of *prāmāṇya* which I think is much more appropriately rendered as validity."⁹⁵

Like Arnold, Taber also seems to endorse Pārthasārathi's reading, telling us that "Pārthasārathi appears to interpret the ŚV correctly"⁹⁶, that "the second theory, that championed by Pārthasārathi, affords a better interpretation [than Uṃveka's]"⁹⁷, and that "Pārthasārathi offers a much more coherent reading of Kumārila's text than Umbeka"⁹⁸. Taber explains that Pārthasārathi holds that:

"whenever a cognition occurs it *presents itself as true* ... This does not mean that it is known definitively to be true, but only that it "is manifest" as such. Even false cognitions manifest themselves as true. All

⁹² Arnold (2001) 604

⁹³ Arnold (2001) 605

⁹⁴ Arnold (2001) 605

⁹⁵ Arnold (2001) 591

⁹⁶ Taber (1992b) 212

⁹⁷ Taber (1992b) 208

⁹⁸ Taber (1992b) 211

cognitions, not just true cognitions, have intrinsic validity, according to Parthasarathi ... every cognition has a certain inherent force of conviction."⁹⁹

Thus "Kumārila never claims that intrinsic validity entails validity ... Pārthasārathi in particular stresses that intrinsic validity is common to true and false cognitions alike."¹⁰⁰ However, Taber's endorsement of Pārthasārathi's interpretation seems more nuanced than that of Arnold. Taber asks if Kumārila's position is "that since we can never establish the validity of cognition extrinsically, we must rest content with intrinsic validity, even though it is only subjective and may ultimately mislead us? that intrinsic validity, though not the same as real validity, is the best we can do?"¹⁰¹ Contrary to Arnold (and seemingly Pārthasārathi), Taber answers in the negative. Specifically, what Taber highlights is a process aspect to Kumārila's epistemology, the epistemological significance of which is downplayed in Arnold's exposition, as will be discussed later. Thus Taber writes:

"one becomes aware of the falsehood of a particular cognition only by ascertaining some other fact ... if no evidence of the falsehood of a cognition emerges ... we may suppose that the situation that would give rise to such evidence – an actual state of affairs that conflicts with its truth – does not exist, hence that the cognition really is true"¹⁰²

In this way, Taber finds in Kumārila's account the resources for something like a conventional analysis of knowledge. Specifically, the concern shown by Uṃveka that the subject be able to distinguish true beliefs from false beliefs is addressed in Taber's exposition. Taber writes:

"The difference between true and false cognitions is that the latter are always eventually overturned by other cognitions, whereas the former

⁹⁹ Taber (1992b) 210

¹⁰⁰ Taber (1992b) 214

¹⁰¹ Taber (1992b) 215

¹⁰² Taber (1992b) 215

retain their intrinsic validity indefinitely. In short, every cognition has a certain inherent force of conviction. We are inclined to believe that it represents matters as they really are, as soon as it occurs. True cognitions retain this force of conviction, but false ones eventually lose it."¹⁰³

In this way, one is justified in believing that one's cognitions are not just seemingly true, but actually true, and "[a]lthough that is not as good as *knowing* it is true extrinsically, via a *pramāṇa* – which however would be futile, since that would lead to a regress – it is almost as good."¹⁰⁴ Both Taber¹⁰⁵ and Arnold¹⁰⁶ also find evidence for a Pārthasārathi-type interpretation in Kumārila's verse ŚV 2.53. This verse and its proper interpretation will be discussed in the next chapter.

Kataoka systematically analyses how Kumārila uses verbs with three different viewpoints to talk about *pramāṇa* and *prāmāṇyam*, which Kataoka labels the ontological, epistemological and operational viewpoints.¹⁰⁷ The terminological distinction of ontological, operational and epistemological viewpoints employed in contemporary scholarship on Kumārila's doctrine seems to hark back to the description of four levels of structure presented by Gillon and Love as "underlying the subject-matter of the *Nyāyapraveśa*"¹⁰⁸ and maintained to be the structure "which underlies Indian logic, at least as it is expounded in the texts of Buddhism and *Nyāyavaiśeṣika*."¹⁰⁹ These four levels of structure are an ontic level, an epistemic level, a dialectic level and a forensic level. In a more recent article, Gillon distinguishes between four perspectives on reasoning, where "seek[ing] to distinguish good reasoning from bad" involves "seek[ing] to identify the general conditions under which what one concludes is true,

¹⁰³ Taber (1992b) 210

¹⁰⁴ Taber (1992b) 216

¹⁰⁵ See Taber (1992b) 212

¹⁰⁶ See Arnold (2001) 607, 622-624; Arnold (2005) 90-91

¹⁰⁷ Kataoka (2011) Part 2 64-76

¹⁰⁸ Gillon and Love (1980) 351

¹⁰⁹ Gillon and Love (1980) 351

having taken other things to be true.”¹¹⁰ These four perspectives are an ontic perspective, an epistemic perspective, a dialectic perspective and a forensic perspective.

Prāmāṇyam is said to arise, to exist, and to be cognized. It seems clear that the dominant aspect of prāmāṇyam in these roles is that of accurate determination, although it is consistent with the idea that such accurate determination has arisen etc. as a result of a disposition. This is particularly clear in the quasi-definitional statement that “an awareness which has arisen ... should be considered a pramāṇa”,¹¹¹ albeit that refers to pramāṇa and not prāmāṇyam.

Section 4: Kumārila's disjunction between pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa

Kumārila provides what Kataoka describes as an operational aspect in verses 2.48 to 2.51. In verse 2.48, Kumārila writes:

ŚV 2.48: To explain, entities would depend on causes in order to obtain their existence. But the functioning in performing their own activities of [entities which] have obtained their existence [is] just independent.

In verse 2.48 “Kumārila presupposes [that] “a valid cognition operates of itself” (*pramāṇam svataḥ pravartate*)”¹¹², and in verses 2.49-2.51, which will be discussed below, “Kumārila denies the opposite view, “a valid cognition operates through something else” (*pramāṇam svataḥ pravartate*), because it

¹¹⁰ Gillon (2011)

¹¹¹ ŚV 2.80

¹¹² See Kataoka (2011) Part 2 70

would lead to the fault of infinite regress (anavasthā).¹¹³ This operational aspect seems to capture what Ellis refers to as a natural kind of process. Pots engage in a natural kind of process to facilitate extraction on the basis of a real causal power to engage in such a process, which is the real essence of that process. Similarly, pramāṇas, as Good Case deliverances, engage in a natural kind of process to accurately judge, based on a real causal power to engage in such a process, which is the real essence of that process. Kataoka observes that this operational aspect features again in verse 2.83, which will also be examined below.¹¹⁴

Subsection 1: Good and Bad Cases

The theory of disjunctivism has been developed primarily in relation to perceptual awareness. As M.G.F. Martin explains:

“Disjunctivism about perceptual appearances, as I conceive of it, is a theory which seeks to preserve a naive realist conception of veridical perception in the light of the challenge from the argument from hallucination.”¹¹⁵

In particular, no conception of hallucination as relations to non-physical objects of awareness or as seeming relations to objects “challenges our conception of veridical perceptions as relations to mind-independent objects.”¹¹⁶ The view is disjunctive in the sense that it denies that veridical perceptions and hallucinations have some common property. As J.M. Hinton explains:

“the illusion of seeing a flash of light is the disjunction of Cases that are not, but to the subject are like, seeing a flash of light ... The reality of

¹¹³ See Kataoka (2011) Part 2 70-71

¹¹⁴ See Kataoka (2011) Part 2 71

¹¹⁵ Martin (2006) 354

¹¹⁶ Martin (2006) 354

seeing a flash of light is the disjunction of Cases of seeing a flash of light."¹¹⁷

Based on this general idea, a distinction between Good Cases and Bad Cases is standardly drawn in the literature. The terminology of Good and Bad Cases was developed by Timothy Williamson. Williamson writes, "A case is a possible total state of a system, the system consisting of an agent at a time paired with an external environment ..."¹¹⁸ Williamson further explains:

"In the good case, things appear generally as they ordinarily do, and are that way; one believes some proposition *p* (for example, that one has hands), and *p* is true ... In the bad case, things still appear generally as they ordinarily do, but are some other way; one still believes *p*, but *p* is false ... "¹¹⁹

Sturgeon explains:

"There are three types of visual experience: veridical perception, illusion and hallucination. They have portrayal and perceptual sides; and the former can be grounded in the latter to various degrees ... We shall simply speak—to simplify things—of Good and Bad experiences, Good and Bad episodes, Good and Bad cases."¹²⁰

The disjunctivist goes further by making the claim that the character of the experience is different in each of the two cases. As such, what justifies the experience is different in each case. As Hinton explains, in a case where you appear to see a flash, you do not know a proposition from which you infer that either a flash took place or you experienced the illusion of a flash. Rather, Hinton explains:

¹¹⁷ Hinton (1967) 218-219

¹¹⁸ Williamson (2000) 52

¹¹⁹ Williamson (2000) 165

¹²⁰ Sturgeon (2006) 186-187

“When what happens is that you see a photic flash, you are justified by this, irrespective of whether you know that this is what is happening; and when what happens is that you have an illusion of one, you are justified by this, irrespective of whether you know that this is what is happening.”¹²¹

In this way, the criterion of justification is pulled apart from the criterion of distinguishability or discrimination. This approach marks a radical break with the traditional internalist conception of justification, which holds that justification is solely a function of what is introspectively discriminable by the agent.¹²² The helpfulness of the disjunctive framework stems not from this particular claim that is being made being made but rather from the setup of a disjunction of awareness states through which this claim is motivated.

This general framework of disjunctivism has an affinity with the contrast set up by Kumāriila between the terms *prāmāṇyam* and *pramāṇa* and their opposite terms *non-prāmāṇyam* and *non-pramāṇa*. In a defining statement in the *Śloka-vārttika*, Kumāriila tells us:

ŚV 2.54: Non-prāmāṇyam is divided into three types according to [the three cases, i.e.] erroneous beliefs, non-awareness and doubt. Of these [three], [only] two [i.e. erroneous beliefs and doubts] are able [to arise] from a flawed cause, because they are real [whereas a non-awareness is not]

This statement constitutes an indirect response to a suggestion mooted earlier that *non-prāmāṇyam* is not a real entity.¹²³ The suggestion there is that the

¹²¹ Hinton (1967) 223

¹²² See Goldman (1976) 772: “a person is said to know that p just in case he distinguishes or discriminates the truth of p from relevant alternatives.”

¹²³ ŚV 2.39a

prefix 'non-' would denote a mere lack, so that non-prāmāṇyam would denote a simple lack of capacity. Instead, Kumārila wishes to assert here that non-prāmāṇyam involves some real basis, or at least, in two of the three cases it does, *viz.* doubt and error. Accordingly, we must understand that non-prāmāṇyam denotes some kind of real analogue of the capacity, which results in doubt or error.

The verse explains that non-prāmāṇyam results when the constitution of the deliverance is somehow defective. At another point, Kumārila likewise tells us that “being a non-pramāṇa [i.e. non-prāmāṇyam] is due to a flaw.”¹²⁴ This verse seems to be a direct answer to an opposed view canvassed earlier that “non-prāmāṇyam could not be due to a flaw in the cause.”¹²⁵ Kumārila provides the example of a visual perceptual belief formed in a dark environment¹²⁶ as a case where doubt may occur. Similarly, Uṃveka supplies the example “defective sense-faculties e.g. due to cataracts”¹²⁷ as a flaw. Jayanta also gives the example of cataracts as a flaw in regard to vision¹²⁸ and the example of clarity of vision as a putative good feature.¹²⁹

These putative good and bad features are properties of the causes of the deliverance, which correspond to the first set of items labelled T1 to T4 in the above table. Thus, rather than affecting the pramāṇa directly, i.e. the delivered content or the cognition, Kumārila's view is that bad features vitiate the cause to prevent the proper formation of a pramāṇa. What is formed instead is a non-pramāṇa. Kumārila himself uses such terms as “cause”¹³⁰ and “cause of

¹²⁴ ŚV 2.56ab; pramāṇatvam and non-pramāṇatvam can have the sense of prāmāṇyam and non-prāmāṇyam respectively

¹²⁵ ŚV 2.39ab

¹²⁶ See TS 2878a

¹²⁷ Uṃveka presents this in his discussion of the third view: see TṬ 46 under ŚV 2.42bcd (“duṣṭatvād indriyādīnām timirādi-doṣaiḥ”) and TṬ 47 under ŚV 2.43cd (“yadā timirādi-doṣa-duṣṭāni kāraṇāni bhavanti ...”). This example is also given by later authors including Jayanta: see NM 423 and NM 448, where it is given as part of a list of various sub-optimal epistemic conditions

¹²⁸ In presenting the Kumārila-type view: NM 423: “timirādeḥ”

¹²⁹ In presenting the Kumārila-type view: NM 423: “locanādeḥ nairmalya-vyapadeśaḥ”

¹³⁰ ŚV 2.39b: “kāraṇa” etc.

the capacity for epistemic success of a deliverance"¹³¹. Putative good or bad features are features not of the *pramāṇa* but of these causal factors. Such causes correspond to Sosa's idea of the human faculties which constitute sources for deliverances.

This can be understood in terms of the pot analogy, whereby flaws can affect the making of a pot, thereby preventing the production of a well-formed pot. Once a pot has been well-formed, however, its facilitating extraction is a natural kind of process which is metaphysically grounded in a real causal power or disposition to facilitate extraction. Similarly, epistemic success is an outcome of a natural kind of process to accurately determine a fact or object which is metaphysically grounded in a real causal power. As such, *pramāṇa* is constituted by an awareness conditional on the lack of bad features.

The above verse also explains that the relevant cases of non-*pramāṇa* include not all false propositions, subsumed in cases of non-awareness, but only false beliefs which have actually arisen for some subject. This coheres with the disjunctivist idea of Bad Cases, which include perceptions and hallucinations rather than all false propositions, even though the cases of doubt and error provide a rather different emphasis.

Thus the earlier quote explains that doubt and error are forms of non-veridical awareness which are explained by a flaw, presumably because this flaw vitiates the operation of the capacity. Continuing the medical analogy of the last chapter, this can be compared to the situation where the capacity of a drug to heal is neutralized by some extraneous factor.

Pritchard draws a distinction between Good and Bad Cases as follows:

"A 'good' case ... is a case in which the agent's veridical perception takes place in epistemically advantageous conditions, and consequently results

¹³¹ ŚV 2.44b: "jñāna-prāmāṇya-kāraṇam"

in knowledge (and, thereby, justified belief). In contrast, the corresponding 'bad' case is a scenario which (i) is indiscriminable to the subject from the good case, (ii) is such that the subject's perception is non-veridical, and (iii) takes place in epistemically disadvantageous conditions."¹³²

The notion of non-pramāṇa presented by Kumāriila appears to cohere with conditions (ii) and (iii). The reflective indiscriminability of Good and Bad Cases that satisfies condition (i) will be discussed below. Satisfaction of condition (ii) is due to the specification of doubt and error. Satisfaction of condition (iii) is suggested by Kumāriila's example of darkness causing doubt in a visual perceptual case, and by the example of cataracts.

Kumāriila's notion of non-pramāṇa corresponds to the Bad Case, with two caveats. Firstly, it includes all cases of erroneous and doubtful perception, rather than only hallucinations, or only hallucinations and illusions, as is the case in much literature on disjunctivism. Secondly, the dichotomy of pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa is meant to apply to all belief processes and not merely perception. However, as with disjunctivism, which has also been extended beyond application to perception, the theory is easiest to grasp in relation to perceptual beliefs.¹³³

In the same way, pramāṇa represents the typical case of an epistemic performance that does result in a successful outcome consisting in an accurate determination, whereas non-pramāṇa represents the deviant case that will not. Whereas Ryle believes that achievement verbs are used to "describe people and, sometimes with qualms, animals",¹³⁴ Sosa extends such vocabulary to a wider sphere, explaining that "[a] heartbeat succeeds if it helps pump blood,

¹³² Pritchard (2011) 243. In Pritchard (2012), this is characterized as the distinction between an objectively epistemically Good Case and an objectively epistemically Bad Case.

¹³³ Cf. Taber (2006) 165 fn.27: "The question of what is the *means* of knowledge [i.e. the pramāṇa] becomes even more complicated in the case of inference."

¹³⁴ Ryle (1976) 125

even absent any intentional aim",¹³⁵ and also suggests that "[m]aybe all performances have an aim, even those superficially aimless, such as ostensibly aimless rambling."¹³⁶ Ryle explains that success verbs have corresponding verbs of failure. Ryle provides examples of such pairs including spell/ misspell and calculate/ miscalculate.¹³⁷ Ryle explains that the sense of 'can' in 'can spell' and 'can calculate' is quite different from its sense in 'can misspell' and 'can miscalculate'. The one is a competence, the other is not another competence but a liability.¹³⁸

Kumārila's claims that "the *prāmāṇyam* of all *pramāṇas* is 'from itself'"¹³⁹ and that "a capacity for accurate determination of an object belongs to them [*scil.* *pramāṇas*] due to their *svabhāva*"¹⁴⁰ both involve ablative formulations which the previous chapter linked with metaphysical explanation and metaphysical grounding. The epistemic success of a judgment which consists in accurate determination of an object or fact is metaphysically grounded in the judgment itself.

Accordingly, the term '*pramāṇa*' is used to denote a deliverance which would typically be a Good Case deliverance. Conversely, non-*prāmāṇyam* can be understood as a liability for an awareness to be either erroneous or doubtful, that is, non-veridical. Such liability terminology conveys the implication of a failure of an epistemic performance implied by Kumārila's success vocabulary and his presentation of non-*pramāṇa* as doubt and error owing to a flaw affecting the performance. The deliverance which suffers such a flaw would constitute a non-*pramāṇa*.

Similarly, Sosa presents a disjunctive account of reliably operating faculties and their erring equivalents. Sosa provides the example of memory and perception

¹³⁵ Sosa (2007) 23

¹³⁶ Sosa (2007) 23

¹³⁷ See Ryle (1976) 125

¹³⁸ Ryle (1976) 125-126

¹³⁹ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

¹⁴⁰ TS 2812ab

as follows:

“Possession of an excellent transmissive memory is yet compatible with frequent error in one's ostensible memories. Someone might have an excellent ability to retain beliefs once acquired, and yet suffer from a terrible propensity to believe new things out of the blue which come as apparent memories, as beliefs from the past.”¹⁴¹

“[Consider] someone with excellent sight subject besides to frequent hallucinations. His ostensible visual perceptions are thus highly error-prone but that should not cancel the virtue of his faculty of sight so long as both erring intuition and erring memory retain their status.”¹⁴²

As such, for both Kumārila and Sosa, the existence of real dispositions in the sources of deliverances such as perception etc. to make accurate determination is consistent with the fact of erroneous judgment.

Subsection 2: Reflective indiscriminability

One aspect of disjunctivism involves the idea that Bad Cases are reflectively indiscriminable from Good ones.¹⁴³ Kumārila's statement that “a non-pramāṇa also [is established] in its own form, just like a pramāṇa”¹⁴⁴ suggests that the agent would not be able to subjectively discriminate between Good and Bad Cases. Similarly, Uṃveka explains that awareness as such is common to both veridical and non-veridical awarenesses, so something further is needed in the

¹⁴¹ Sosa (1991) 226

¹⁴² Sosa (1991) 226-227

¹⁴³ See Sturgeon (2006) 188, where this is discussed within the context of reflective disjunctivism.

¹⁴⁴ TS 2911ab; cf. ŚV 2.85 which is discussed below

case of veridical awarenesses.¹⁴⁵

Does this indicate that Bad character is characterized by reflective indiscriminability from Good character? Kumārila's setup of the disjunction between an epistemic status and an opposed epistemic status which has a negative particle attached would suggest so. Thus Kumārila specifically considers whether negation implies absence or difference by contrasting his own understanding of non-pramāṇa with an alternative view. According to the alternative, non-prāmāṇyam is not a real entity¹⁴⁶, so epistemic failure is the mere absence of success. Kumārila's rejection of this idea involves arguing that negation of success would be mere lack of belief, whereas erroneous and doubtful beliefs are a negation which are not a mere lack in this way, but have some positive status.¹⁴⁷ Thus a positive account of these two types of non-prāmāṇyam is needed. That is, the opposition between prāmāṇyam and these types of non-prāmāṇyam follows a model of conflict between two incompatible properties such as blue and yellow. Thus, according to Kumārila's view, prāmāṇyam is a real entity, or 'vastu'.¹⁴⁸

These two possibilities cover some of the options discussed by the grammarian Koṇḍa-bhaṭṭa, who provides six meanings of negation in total: similarity (sādrśya), absence (abhāva), being different/ mutual absence (tadanyatvam), smallness (tadalpatā), impropriety or unfitness (aprāśastya), and contrariety (virodha).¹⁴⁹ Kumārila's own view opposes the notion of negation as absence, and instead posits a model of difference and contrariety. Kumārila's argument here complements his general understanding of negation. Kumārila thus states, following Jha's translation, that "[t]he negative particle, occurring in conjunction with a noun or a verbal root, does not possess the actual negating faculty. For the words "non-Brāhmaṇa" and "non-Virtue" only signify such other other *positive* entities as are contrary to those ... all negations

¹⁴⁵ See TĪ 45: "prāmāṇyaṃ tu svâlambanâvyabhicāritvam; na bodhakatvam, tasya pramāṇêtara-sâdhâraṇatvât"

¹⁴⁶ See ŚV 2.39a

¹⁴⁷ See ŚV 2.54

¹⁴⁸ See ŚV 2.54c

¹⁴⁹ See Joshi (1990) 288

(*Apoha*) would rest in positive entities.”¹⁵⁰ Here Kumāriila denies outright something like Koṇḍa-bhaṭṭa's conception of negation as absence. As Taber similarly explains, Kumāriila “held non-being (*abhāva*) to be a real thing (*vastu*), i.e., a real aspect (*aṃśa*) of that which is present.”¹⁵¹

In the *apohavāda* chapter of the *Śloka-vārttika*, Kumāriila considers how addition of a negative particle serves to modify the meaning of a term, taking up the example of the term 'Brahmin' and its negation 'non-Brahmin'. Indeed, this pair may have constituted something of a paradigm example in such discussions in early India, as it also appears in an interesting discussion of negation in the *Nyāyānusāra*¹⁵², as well as in the discussions by Patañjali and Bhartṛhari discussed below, and in grammarians such as Kaiyaṭa and Koṇḍa-bhaṭṭa.¹⁵³ Kumāriila denies that any negative term refers by reference to any extensional or intensional definition of that negative term. Thus Kumāriila rejects the idea that the term 'non-jar' refers to all things that are not jars, on the basis that we are not familiar with all the items included in that class.¹⁵⁴ Further, Kumāriila also rejects the idea that the term 'non-Brahmin' refers to some common feature of all such individuals.¹⁵⁵ Rather, the negative term gains its reference as a function of its connection with the non-negated equivalent. Following Jha's translation, in a first reading, “the Class “Manhood” common to all the four castes, is precluded by means of the negative particle (in the word “non-Brāhmaṇa”), from all non-Brāhmaṇas, - and as such, the class “non-Brāhmaṇahood (signifying *manhood precluded from Brāhmaṇas*) is cognized as a positive entity”¹⁵⁶. In a second alternative accepted by Kumāriila, following Jha's translation, “we may accept similarity alone as being the object of denotation. And this is based upon a similarity of parts. In fact, it is also in the absence of any such (similarity of parts) that the similarity is perceived.”¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁰ Jha (1907) 301

¹⁵¹ Taber (2001) 72

¹⁵² See Cox (1988) 56

¹⁵³ See Joshi (1990) 288-289

¹⁵⁴ See Jha (1907) 298

¹⁵⁵ See Jha (1907) 298

¹⁵⁶ Jha (1907) 298

¹⁵⁷ Jha (1907) 300-301

Whereas the first suggestion is of negation as difference, Kumāriḷa's second alternative ties in with Koṇḁa-bhaṭṭa's notion of negation as similarity. Similar usage of the negative particle can be observed in contemporary English, for example, in the advertising by various companies which offer non-paper destruction. It is understood by the client that the advertising company will destroy not any item whatsoever which is not comprised of paper, but only items that have a resemblance to paper in some respect or another, e.g. electronic media which contain information which would otherwise be kept on paper, office equipment such as printers which would typically be used alongside paper, etc. Returning to the Indian context, only the primary sense is strictly correct, and the secondary sense is explained with reference to the functioning of doubt or misinformation. However, that is not to say that the term non-Brahmin is used when the agent is in doubt or error, but rather that the term non-Brahmin gets its reference by appeal to those situations where an agent is in doubt based on similarity or error based on misinformation.

Kumāriḷa's understanding of negation as similarity seems to hark back to the linguistic investigations made by Patañjali in his commentary on Pāṇini's single-word aphorism 'negation'.¹⁵⁸ Patañjali's view is that the term Brahmin has two ranges of possible application, firstly on the basis of caste, and secondly to one who may superficially resemble a Brahmin in appearance, habits etc. or who one wrongly surmises to be a Brahmin based on what one has been informed.¹⁵⁹ However, the second range of application is said to be based on doubt or misinformation. The later commentator Kaiyaṭa terms these the primary and secondary senses respectively of the term 'Brahmin'. This secondary sense is based on similarity to the primary sense of Brahmin. The function of the negative particle according to Patañjali is not to positively identify the range subsuming every item which falls outside the class 'Brahmin'. Rather, it functions as an indicator that the secondary sense of the term

¹⁵⁸ 2.2.6: nañ. See Joshi and Roodbergen (1973) 70-117 for a translation and commentary on Patañjali's discussion.

¹⁵⁹ In fact, Patañjali also discusses a second model of negation, for situations such as where one who is quite clearly a non-Brahmin is being described. That model is not relevant to this discussion.

'Brahmin' is in play, which is similarity to an actual Brahmin.

Patañjali expresses the two possible views, that negation functions to identify a range and that negation functions merely as an indicator, as 'language-dependent' (vācanakī) and 'natural' (svābhāvika) respectively.¹⁶⁰ This terminological dichotomy is also seen elsewhere, such as in Patañjali's discussion of whether grammatical number and grammatical gender are 'language-dependent' or 'innate'.¹⁶¹

Bhartṛhari's development of this 'non-Brahmin' model of negation is discussed by Radhika Herzberger in her book, 'Bhartṛhari and the Buddhists'.¹⁶² For Bhartṛhari, the term 'non-Brahmin' contains its reference via analytic content from the term 'Brahmin', which analytically contains the notion of a learned person, and antonymic content from the term 'non-' which contains the notion of some other branch within the category 'learned person'. As Bhartṛhari explains, the term is thus appropriately applied not to anything that is not a Brahmin, such as a clod of earth, but rather to a learned person who happens not to be a Brahmin.¹⁶³ As Herzberger explains, whereas earlier thinkers had explained how terms gained their reference from qualities, such as learnedness etc. in the case of 'non-Brahmin', "the analytic content of names was organized by Bhartṛhari into a hierarchical structure"¹⁶⁴.

As a result, Bhartṛhari's account involves appeal to the analytic and antonymic content of names. As Herzberger explains, "The content defined by compatible co-inherence is the analytic content of a word; the content defined by incompatible co-inherence is the antonymic content. The former is given by the elements which lie along its ancestral lines; the latter is given by an element's siblings."¹⁶⁵ To adapt a stock example, a term such as 'oak' would analytically

¹⁶⁰ MB on P2.2.6: "yadā punaḥ asya padārthaḥ nivartate kim svābhāvikī nivṛttiḥ āhosvit vācanikī"

¹⁶¹ See Joshi and Roodbergen (1973) 84

¹⁶² Herzberger (1986)

¹⁶³ See Herzberger (1986) 39

¹⁶⁴ Herzberger (1986) 14

¹⁶⁵ Herzberger (1986) 36

contain the term 'tree' and antonymically contain the terms 'pine', 'birch' etc.¹⁶⁶

It is possible that Kumāriḷa sets up the problem of epistemic status in terms of success and its antonym in order to be able to similarly appeal to the analytic and antonymic content of the capacity for epistemic success. Just as the concept 'oak' analytically contains the concept 'tree' and antonymically contains the concepts 'pine' etc., or the concept 'Brahmin' analytically contains the concept 'learned person' and antonymically contains the concept 'other learned person' (at least in the presentation of writers like Bhartr̥hari), similarly the concept of a Good Case deliverance analytically contains the concept of a deliverance and antonymically contains the concept of a Bad Case deliverance.

	Analytic content	Antonymic content	Absence
Oak	Tree	Pine, birch etc.	Non-tree
Brahmin	Learned person	Other learned person	Unlearned person
Accurate determination	Determination	Doubtful and erroneous determinations	Lack of determination

Indeed, it seems that the example 'Brahmin' is a better fit than the example of oak, because it seems to take 'Brahmin' as a paradigm case of a learned person, which sets a normative standard which certain others are able to apparently meet dependent on their educational attainment. In the same way, an accurate determination constitutes a paradigm case of a determination and an inaccurate or doubtful determination can perhaps arise. In this way, Kumāriḷa's setup in terms of prāmāṇyam/ pramāṇa and non-prāmāṇyam/ non-pramāṇa seems to gain leverage from this pre-existing debate about negation.

¹⁶⁶ However, for reasons Herzberger discusses, Bhartr̥hari himself avoids addressing this example, and illustrates his theory using other examples, including the term 'non-Brahmin', which Herzberger focuses on.

Section 5: Kumāriila's notion of 'from itself'

The above section has argued that *pramāṇa* and non-*pramāṇa* form a metaphysical disjunction between Good Case deliverances, involving the manifestation of a disposition, and Bad Case deliverances, where the disposition is corrupted by a flaw, respectively. This section argues that the disjunction is also in part a modal disjunction. The Good Case deliverance not only has positive epistemic status but also accurately determines an object with necessity. Conversely, the Bad Case deliverance has a form of contingency, whereby it determines an object in a manner that is fortuitous or haphazard.

The above literature review indicated a common translation of '*svataḥ*' as 'intrinsic' and a more literal translation as 'from itself', meaning 'from the judgment itself'. Kataoka similarly explains that 'from itself' refers either to the cognition or to *prāmāṇyam*.¹⁶⁷ However, in this section, it will be argued that the idea of intrinsicity as reflexivity captures a peculiarly Buddhist understanding of this term, but is misleading as far as Kumāriila's use of this term is concerned.

Thus Taber is led to the view that "if a *cognition* were unable to determine its object itself, it could not receive such a capacity from something else ... [so] every cognition must involve an awareness of its own truth."¹⁶⁸ Similarly, Arnold urges that, following Pārthasārathi, we "understand *svataḥ* as reflexive to any awareness whose status as a *pramāṇa* is in question." Kumāriila's own verses will be examined in order to argue that, rather than a notion of reflexive awareness, Kumāriila's own conception of 'from itself' involves in part the notion

¹⁶⁷ See Kataoka (2011) 63-64: "It is also not clear what [Kumāriila] really means by "itself" (*sva*) and "something else" (*para*) ... Whether it is cognition (*jñāna*) or validity (*pramāṇatva*) that is considered "itself" ... All of the above seem possible in certain contexts."

¹⁶⁸ Taber (1992b) 211

of embodied cause. At an ontological level, 'from itself' indicates that epistemic success results from the exercise of a capacity for epistemic success which is an essential disposition and epistemic kind, thus 'due to svabhāva'. For the individual believer, 'from itself' indicates that epistemic success arises 'as a result of the process of inquiry'.

The previous chapter provided three essentialist notions that were relevant to a general understanding of svabhāva, and applied these to Kumāriila's example of a pot with a capacity to facilitate extraction of water in a setting process involving yoghurt, ghee etc. These were Fine's conceptions of essence conditional on existence and essence conditional on identity, and the notion of an intrinsic feature conditional on absence of extrinsic factors. Through a close reading of Kumāriila's canvassing of four possible views in the Śloka-vārttika presentation, it will now be argued that Kumāriila's understanding of 'from itself' appeals to these notions, and explained exactly how these notions feature in his discussion.

Subsection 1: Kumāriila's four possible views

Whereas the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā is focused on articulating and defending Kumāriila's own view, Kumāriila pursues a very different argumentative approach in the Śloka-vārttika presentation. Here, Kumāriila presents his own view as one of four possible views, and successively eliminates three of these before elaborating on and defending his own view in what amounts to either a concise or an underdeveloped version of the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā presentation. In the Śloka-vārttika presentation, the terms 'from itself' and its antonym 'from something else' are mapped onto a dichotomy of prāmāṇyam and non-prāmāṇyam, or pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa. Kumāriila thus introduces the topic by writing:

ŚV 2.33: First of all, with regard to the content of all judgments, this should be investigated: are the fact of being a pramāṇa and the fact of

being a non-pramāṇa 'from itself' or 'from something else'?

Understanding the fact of being a pramāṇa and the fact of being a non-pramāṇa in terms of Goodness of Case and Badness of Case, as per the above discussion of disjunctivism, this results in four combinations which can be presented as follows:

- view one: Goodness of Case is from itself and Badness of Case is from itself
- view two: Goodness of Case is from something else and Badness of Case is from something else
- view three: Goodness of Case is from something else and Badness of Case is from itself
- view four: Goodness of Case is from itself and Badness of Case is from something else

Later authors also list out these four possible views, but by glossing Kumāriḷa's expressions 'the fact of being a pramāṇa' ('pramāṇatvam') and 'the fact of being a non-pramāṇa' ('apramāṇatvam') as 'prāmāṇyam' and 'non-prāmāṇyam'.¹⁶⁹ Kumāriḷa himself also sometimes uses the expression 'svataḥ-prāmāṇyam' or 'epistemic success from itself'.

Kataoka explains that Kumāriḷa's presentation displays "a hierarchic sequence among the four views: the first and second views ... are refuted by the third view ... [which] is refuted by the final, fourth view"¹⁷⁰. Each of these four views agrees in part with two other views, so we may expect to find some common

¹⁶⁹ Kamalaśīla and Jayanta both set out this schema at P 745 under TS 2810 and at NM 420 respectively. Kumāriḷa himself discussed the first three of these possibilities before setting out his own view, which equates to the fourth view here.

¹⁷⁰ Kataoka (2011) 122

ground or argumentative overlap in the discussions. Schematically, the third and fourth views are fashioned by recombining the two halves of the first and second views, as follows:

	Badness of Case from itself	Badness of Case from something else
Goodness of Case from itself	First view	Fourth view
Goodness of Case from something else	Third view	Second view

The 14th century text *sarva-darśana-saṅgraha* attributes the four views to different groups of philosophers – the first to the Sāṃkhyas, the second to the Naiyāyikas, the third to the Buddhists and the fourth to the Mīmāṃsakas.¹⁷¹ Later texts including the 17th century text *Mānameyodaya*¹⁷² and the 20th century *Mīmāṃsā-kośa*¹⁷³ repeat this classification. However, Kumāriila himself does not specify the names of any groups who held these views, and there is little contemporaneous evidence for these attributions. Thus Kataoka instead suggests that “Kumāriila's classification is quite mechanical and looks highly hypothetical. It is unlikely that Kumāriila has a particular opponent in mind ...”.¹⁷⁴ Building on Kataoka's suggestion, consideration of the four views will be treated as an integral part of Kumāriila's methodology. In this chapter and again in the next chapter, the three alternative views will be discussed in terms of what they contribute to an understanding of Kumāriila's own doctrine, which features as the fourth view, and, as such, they will be introduced in an order relevant to the discussion here.

¹⁷¹ See Hattori (1997)

¹⁷² See Hattori (1997)

¹⁷³ Part 5 2856

¹⁷⁴ Kataoka (2011) 233 fn 169

Subsection 2: Deliverances must possess a svabhāva

The second view considered by Kumāriila is one in which neither prāmāṇyam nor non-prāmāṇyam is 'from itself'. Kumāriila presents the view as follows:

ŚV 2.34cd: Others [say that both Goodness of Case and Badness of Case are] dependent on the determination of good and bad features produced in the causes [of the deliverance].

According to the second view, deliverances would constitute Good or Bad Cases in virtue of real positive features which are separable from the belief itself. Good Cases would be due to the nature of the good feature and Bad Cases would be due to the nature of the bad feature. That Goodness and Badness of Case are due to these features and not the deliverance itself is indicated by Kumāriila's argument against the second view. Kumāriila writes:

ŚV 2.35cd: In that way, the deliverance per se would be without a svabhāva.

ŚV 2.36cd: And of what nature would that [deliverance] be without either svabhāva?

Although the second view does not deny that every deliverance does in fact possess either good or bad features, and thus is in fact successful or unsuccessful in correctly apprehending an object, nevertheless Kumāriila objects on grounds of lack of svabhāva. Kumāriila indicates again the connection of the expression 'from itself' with the idea of 'due to svabhāva'. This contrasts with a reflexive understanding of 'from itself' attributed above to Buddhist philosophers such as Śākyabuddhi.

Kumāriila's idea is that svabhāva must comprise a feature which is not merely accidental or contingent. As mentioned in the previous chapter, such putative

good and bad features would be things like clarity of vision and cataracts respectively in regard to visual perceptual beliefs. Kumāriila characterizes the contingency and separability of these features by the expression 'from something else'. As Kataoka notes, there is an ambiguity in this expression, such that it may refer to "good qualities (*guṇa*) and bad qualities (*doṣa*) of the causes of the cognition ... [or] their cognition ... [or] (a cognition of) agreement (*saṃgati*) or an invalidating cognition (*bādhaka*)".¹⁷⁵

Rather, epistemic acts of deliverance must play a role of metaphysically grounding either positive or negative epistemic status through an essential connectedness with that epistemic nature. Consideration of the first view will indicate that all deliverances must possess one or other epistemic status as a default intrinsic nature, in a sense to be explicated.

Subsection 3: An epistemic capacity must be restricted to deliverances

Kumāriila's first canvassed view is one in which both *prāmāṇyam* and non-*prāmāṇyam* are 'from itself'. As noted above, the first half of this claim is the same as the first half of Kumāriila's own claim. Kumāriila presents the first view as follows:

ŚV 2.34ab: Some say both [Goodness and Badness of Case] are 'from itself', because what is not 'from itself' cannot be established [by separable means].

This presentation involves a general form of argument applied to the specific case of Good and Bad Cases, which are concluded to be "both 'from itself'". Sucarita labels this first view as belonging to the *svabhāva*-advocates about both epistemic success and failure¹⁷⁶ and also attributes this view to the

¹⁷⁵ Kataoka (2011) 63

¹⁷⁶ Sucarita refers to the advocates of this view as *svābhāvikōbhayavādināḥ* (Kāśikā on ŚV 2.36: K 84)

satkāryavādins.¹⁷⁷ The most prominent advocates of the satkāryavāda doctrine during this period appear to have been the Sāṃkhya philosophers.¹⁷⁸ Although the development of Sāṃkhya philosophy during this period is not well-understood, we know that its ideas were taken seriously and vigorously debated by the thinkers of this period.¹⁷⁹ Sucarita's equation of 'due to svabhāva' and 'from itself' reinforces the reading of Kumārila's notion of 'from itself' in terms of 'due to svabhāva'. The first view, agreeing with Kumārila's objection to the second view, and, as will be seen, like Kumārila's own view, thus endorses the idea that epistemic status should be possessed as a svabhāva.

In his discussion of this first view, Sucarita explains that svabhāva is posited to explain the restriction on production by external causes in regard to properties of an entity: if what does not have existence could be produced, then anything, including fictional entities, could be produced from anything.¹⁸⁰ Were production of a given nature such as fragrance in flowers by external causes possible, then those same external causes should be capable of producing such a nature in any context, such as producing fragrance in fire or oil in sand. Instead, "there is a restriction"¹⁸¹ of entities to their own material causes, such that "a pot is only made of clay, a grass mat is made only from vetiver grass"¹⁸². The core elements of this reasoning already appear in the early Sāṃkhya literature¹⁸³, which demonstrates that this notion of a restrictive

¹⁷⁷ See Kāśikā on ŚV 2.34 and on ŚV 2.35 *passim*, and in particular:

"satkāryavādinō hi sarvaṃ eva kārya-jātaṃ sad utpadyata iti manyamānāḥ prāmāṇyāprāmāṇyātmakam api dvayaṃ svata evāsthiṣata" (K 80); "iti satkāryavādināṃ siddhāntaḥ" (K 82).

¹⁷⁸ See the extensive discussion of their satkāryavāda views in Ch 1 of TS

¹⁷⁹ See Larson and Bhattacharya (1987) 22-23: "it can be reasonably asserted that the commentarial tradition on the [Sāṃkhya] Kārikā extends from about the beginning of the sixth century ... through the ninth or tenth century ... We know that other systems of Indian philosophy ... were undergoing vigorous development, and one part of that development in each case involved polemical encounter with Sāṃkhya philosophy ..." . The authors tentatively ascribe the Yuktidīpikā and Jayamaṅgalā to the seventh and eighth centuries respectively.

¹⁸⁰ K80: "asattvāviśeṣeṇa hi sarvaṃ sarvasmāt utpadyeta"

¹⁸¹ K80: "niyamo dṛśyate"

¹⁸² K80: "mṛd eva ghaṭasya kaṭasya vīraṇam iti"

¹⁸³ See Sāṃkhya-kārikā verse 9: "because not everything can be produced (sarva-sambhavābhāvāt)". See also the SS commentary on that: "If (yadi) the effect

capacity long precedes its appearance in Kumāriila's debate.

Uṃveka similarly explains that "there is a restriction on which products can be produced"¹⁸⁴. Uṃveka provides the following illustrative examples: "For it is not possible to bring about [qualities like] fragrance etc. in fire or oil etc. in sand."¹⁸⁵ Uṃveka's second example is part of a stock example from the discussion of cause and effect. The full example contrasts sesame with sand: only the former can yield oil.¹⁸⁶ Uṃveka's choice of examples remind us of the discussions of svabhāva seen in the svabhāva advocates' doctrine¹⁸⁷, where it could mean explanation by reference to the nature of the entity, either as causal basis, e.g. a fire's heat is caused by the fire, or locational basis, e.g. oil's production from sesame is causally explained by its location in sesame.

The notion of svabhāva has been equated to a real causal power which is the real essence of a natural kind that metaphysically grounds a process or outcome. The physical examples provided by Sucarita and Uṃveka support this equation. Thus Audi explains that grounding is a form of determination, which, among other things, means for one thing "to *bring about* or *be responsible for*"¹⁸⁸ another thing. Further, grounding is closely related to explanation. Further, "[d]etermination is a *worldly*, as opposed to *conceptual*, affair. Whether two things stand in a relation of determination does not depend on how we conceive them."¹⁸⁹ Taber likewise notes that "[w]hat is meant by

(kāryam) does not exist (nāsti) in the cause (kāraṇe), then (tadā) anything (sarvam) would produce (utpādayet) anything (sarvam)."

¹⁸⁴ TṬ 48 under ŚV 2.47: "kāryôtpāda-niyamāt"; Uṃveka's discussion of a restriction is presented as an alternative interpretation of Kumāriila's own fourth view, which further emphasizes the similarity of Kumāriila's view with the first canvassed view.

¹⁸⁵ TṬ 43 under ŚV 2.34ab: "na hy agnau gandhādi sikatāsu vā tailādi śakyate sādhayitum iti"

¹⁸⁶ This example is given in numerous Sāṃkhya texts, such as the SS – commentary on SK verse 9. The example is also given by Jayanta in his discussion of satkāryavāda in NM Ch8.

¹⁸⁷ See Bhattacharya (2012) 602 where two examples of this doctrine are given, one from the SS

¹⁸⁸ Audi (2012) 691

¹⁸⁹ Audi (2012) 692

'potency', śakti, it seems, is a dynamic property that is characteristic of a thing and makes it what it is, like that of burning in the case of fire."¹⁹⁰

The examples above such as the ability of sesame but not sand to yield oil are similarly worldly rather than conceptual affairs. The nature of sesame is responsible for the fact that oil is produced through a grinding process. Audi provides the similar example that "the fact that my shirt is maroon grounds the fact that it is red."¹⁹¹ Another example provided by Audi is "[i]n virtue of being spherical, this ball is disposed to roll down inclined planes."¹⁹² Audi holds that grounding is a relation of noncausal explanation, involving a relation of essential connectedness between the natures of two properties, such that each instance of one property grounds an instance of the other.¹⁹³ Audi writes:

"some pairs of properties fail to be essentially connected in the required way ... It is metaphysically impossible that something be red in virtue of being loud, or morally wrong in virtue of being pointy, or prime in virtue of having a mass of 10kg. The properties in these pairs are simply too disparate."¹⁹⁴

Similarly, pairs such as (fire, fragrance) and (sand, oil) are too disparate for there to be a grounding relation between terms. This would indicate that the grounding for the restriction in the epistemic status of deliverances is also a worldly affair and a real feature of the deliverance. In the discussion of the pot analogy above, it was suggested that Kumārila's understands prāmāṇyam as a bare disposition of the deliverance. As such, there is a modal feature of Kumārila's claim, whereby it involves a *de re* rather than *de dicto* necessity. Specifically, it will be argued, it is a restrictive necessity, whereby certain features are restricted to certain entities. Such metaphysical necessity is a

¹⁹⁰ Taber (1992b) 211

¹⁹¹ Audi (2012) 693

¹⁹² Audi (2012) 687

¹⁹³ See Audi (2012) 693-695

¹⁹⁴ Audi (2012) 694

feature of grounding. Thus Uṃveka's claim is not that fragrance is necessarily produced in flowers or oil necessarily in sesame. This is because the production of these things could be somehow obstructed or prevented, e.g. if the flower or sesame seed is flawed in some way. Thus the necessity must be formulated negatively, whereby fragrance must not occur in entities such as fire or oil in substances such as sand. Similarly, the idea shared by Kumāriḷa's view and the first view is that the capacity for epistemic success is restricted to appear in deliverances. It may not appear outside deliverances.

By positing that both Good and Bad Cases are 'from itself', the first view can thus be understood as the view that both accurate and inaccurate determinations are due to capacities which are restricted to deliverances. However, this raises the question of how such capacities are distributed across deliverances. If all deliverances simultaneously possess both capacities, there would be conflict. Kumāriḷa expresses his objection to the first view with the following very terse formulations:

ŚV 2.35ab: Firstly, both [Goodness and Badness of Case] are not 'from itself', due to conflict ...

ŚV 2.36ab: To explain, how can [a deliverance] which does not depend on something else have conflicting natures?

The objection centres on the single term 'virodhāt', which has been translated as 'due to conflict'.¹⁹⁵ Bandyopadhyay explains that "[t]he Sanskrit term 'virodha' covers the two types of opposition, namely, contradiction and contrariety as they are defined and differentiated in Western logic ... What is common between contradiction and contrariety is that p and q cannot both be true at the same time and place ... in contradiction both p and q can neither be

¹⁹⁵ See ŚV 2.35b: virodhāt. Although Kumāriḷa sums up this criticism in this single word, Uṃveka explains that it refers to conflict in the case of a single cognition: "... ekasyāṃ tāvat nāsti, iti virodhād ity āha." Sucarita glosses this term as svabhāva-virodhāt, i.e. conflict in the svabhāvas of epistemic success and failure.

simultaneously true nor be false, while in contrariety, though both cannot be true, both can be false."¹⁹⁶

Kumārila's criticism appeals to Audi's notion of essential connectedness between natures. Specifically, an act of deliverance is a process which must have a nature which is essentially connected with some epistemic nature, and which metaphysically grounds that epistemic nature.

Specifically, conflict is an opposition between ontologically incompatible natures, and Kumārila thus seems to appeal to Fine's notion of essence conditional on the existence of a deliverance. The idea is that deliverances cannot have two conflicting essences conditional only on their existence. So the first view would construe 'from itself' as 'based on being the essence of deliverances as an epistemic kind'. This is the conception of svabhāva that is being rejected by Kumārila's criticism. This argument also supports the construal of good and bad features in terms of separability, despite their engagement with the cause of the deliverance.

According to Uṃveka, Kumārila's next remarks are directed against an alternative reading of the first view which may initially seem more attractive. Uṃveka explains that the above statement can be understood in either or two ways:

*Goodness of Case and Badness of Case would either be in each token judgment or due to the difference between token judgments.*¹⁹⁷

Thus a situation of conflict would only arise if both prāmāṇyam and its conflicting opposite were ascribed to every awareness. In what can be taken as a canvassing of Uṃveka's latter reading, and a rebuttal of that, Kumārila

¹⁹⁶ Bandyopadhyay (1988) 241-243 note 1

¹⁹⁷ TṬ 43 under ŚV 2.35ab: "tarhy ekasyāṃ vā vijñāna-vyaktāu syāt vijñāna-vyakti-bhedena vā?"

introduces the alternative reading as follows:

ŚV 2.37ab: "If it is said that there is no conflict because the token judgments are different, ..."

As support for the idea of both being 'from itself', this indicates that certain token deliverances have Goodness of Case 'from itself' and certain token deliverances have Badness of Case 'from itself'. There are thus two epistemic categories of deliverance with two opposed epistemic statuses. As such, this strategy appeals to a notion of essence conditional on the identity of a deliverance as a Good Case or a Bad Case deliverance. So 'from itself' alternately indicates 'based on being the essence of Good Cases as an epistemic kind' and 'based on being the essence of Bad Cases as an epistemic kind'.

Kumārila's rebuttal of the modification is as follows:

ŚV 2.37cd: "... [then] even so, it cannot be determined which [of Goodness of Case and Badness of Case] is where [i.e. in which deliverance], because they do not depend on any other thing."

Kumārila's criticism parallels the remarks of Hookway above, that even given that Good Case deliverances do constitute an epistemic kind, "we may be unconfident of our judgement because we are unsure whether it is a judgement of perception or, perhaps, a member of a different epistemic kind, a report of illusion or hallucination, for example."¹⁹⁸ Thus it is of no help to be informed merely that Good and Bad Cases do constitute epistemic kinds. The problematic is that, as described above, Bad Case deliverances are reflectively indiscriminable from Good Case deliverances. This reflective indiscriminability presents the epistemic agent with a problem of belief formation. What is additionally required is an independent definition of epistemic success against which Cases can be assessed as Good or Bad.

¹⁹⁸ Hookway (2007) 11

The upshot of this discussion is that *svabhāva* cannot be located in deliverances at the level of Good Case or Bad Case deliverances, owing to the 'which is where?' critique of the revised first view. Yet, as indicated by the critique of the second view, *svabhāva* must be possessed by deliverances in general. However, the 'conflict' critique indicates that capacities cannot be possessed by deliverances as an inalienable essence. Capacities must be restricted to deliverances, yet their manifestation in deliverances is not guaranteed. Kumāriila also holds that although there are two epistemic outcomes, only one epistemic capacity may be posited of all deliverances. As such, the other epistemic outcome must be construed as a failure of exercise of the epistemic capacity.

This reasoning leads to the formulation of the third and fourth views. According to Kumāriila's own view, which comprises the fourth view in this schema, all deliverances constitute Good Cases as a default nature, yet this nature is vitiated by the aforementioned bad features. The term 'vitiating' is chosen to indicate an erosion of an ordinarily functional state. Alternatively, according to the third view canvassed, all deliverances constitute Bad Cases as a default nature, and this nature is revamped by the aforementioned good features. The term 'revamping' is chosen to indicate the overcoming of an ordinarily impotent state. The dichotomy between the exercise of the deliverance as default outcome and the vitiation or revamping as extrinsically caused outcome taps into the *Abhidharma* conception of own nature and other nature discussed in the previous chapter, where the examples of credit and debit, and of cool and hot water were described.

Thus in explaining the rejection of these first two views, Sucarita brings up the example of coolness in water which was discussed above in the context of *Abhidharma* Buddhism. Sucarita writes, "one *svabhāva* is overcome due to the juxtaposed presence of a different superimposed form, like coldness in water [is overcome] in contact with fire [i.e. when heated] ..." ¹⁹⁹ This analogy seems to

¹⁹⁹ See K84 on ŚV 2.36ab: "ekas tu *svabhāva* upādhy-antara-sannidhānād

confirm the understanding of svabhāva as a default state which may be overcome by external factors. Sucarita likens erroneous perceptions in Kumārila's own view to hot water, in that they occur due to vitiation by extrinsic factors.²⁰⁰ Just as water has a default state of coolness, so deliverances yield accurate determination as a default outcome. Just as heat in water is due to the effect of fire, which has an intrinsic nature of heat, so Badness in deliverances is due to bad features, which has an innate nature of Badness. The third view would be the reverse of this as regards the role of the effect of fire.

These views can be presented as follows:

Sucarita's analogy	Water	Fire	Heat	Coolness
Third view	Deliverance	Goodness	Goodness	Badness
Kumārila's (fourth) view	Deliverance	Badness	Badness	Goodness

Subsection 4: Obstruction of capacity

Kumārila's discussion of the pot example involved the idea that the disposition to facilitate extraction is a bare disposition in the sense that it does not causally supervene on the causes of the pot, but functions independently once the pot comes into being. Similarly, the capacity for epistemic success requires no positive feature over and above the properly formed deliverance. The pot analogy thus supports Kumārila's claim:

abhibhūto bhavati, apsv ivâgni-saṃyoge śaityam"

²⁰⁰ See K84 under ŚV 2.36ab: "tad-apekṣaś ca tāsṅ auṣṇya-bhramah"

ŚV 2.48ab: [Entities which] have obtained their existence function in their own activities just independently²⁰¹.

In this way, though constituting a real causal power, the capacity for epistemic success is not due to any separable feature of the deliverance.

As such, all deliverances possess the capacity for epistemic success by default, in the sense that this occurs by virtue of the fact of judgment absent any bad feature. However, Kumārila indicates that a Bad Case deliverance is due to “the judgment that there is a bad feature in the cause.”²⁰² As such, the capacity may be vitiated by a bad feature, such as cataracts, insufficient light etc. in the case of visual perceptual beliefs. Absent such bad features, the deliverance constitutes a Good Case deliverance. Sosa similarly holds that intellectual virtues are powers or abilities which “make one such that, normally at least, in one's ordinary habitat, or at least in one's ordinary circumstances when making judgments, one would believe what is true and *not* believe what is false, concerning matters in that field.”²⁰³ Sosa explains that “[t]he perceptual faculty of sight, for example, generates beliefs about the colours and shapes of surfaces seen fully, within a range, and in adequate light.”²⁰⁴

Accordingly, Kumārila's own view is one in which deliverances have a capacity to make nothing other than an accurate determination when not obstructed, i.e. under appropriately normal epistemic conditions. By analytically categorizing those deliverances which are not obstructed as *pramāṇas*, or Good Case deliverances, this class of deliverances involves the necessity that they do in fact make an accurate determination. However, this is not an analytic

²⁰¹ TS 2847cd and ŚV 2.48

²⁰² ŚV 2.53cd; cf. similar statements at 2.43 and 2.45 (against this view), 2.52, 2.55, 2.56, 2.59, 2.60, 2.62, 2.63

²⁰³ Sosa (1991) 274

²⁰⁴ Sosa (1991) 227

necessity, as it is based on the fact that they possess an epistemic capacity as a real causal power, which is not obstructed. As such, an independent ground is provided for identifying deliverances as Good Cases.

Accordingly, Kumāriila's argument is read as one in which the capacity for epistemic success is a restrictive capacity which precludes the failure of Good Case deliverances. As such, the capacity for epistemic success is a real causal power which is a kind essence of a Good Case deliverance conditional on its identity as a Good Case deliverance. Such identity is contingent on non-vitiation in the process of judgment formation. This is analogous to the way in which a pot in good nick has a real causal power to facilitate extraction conditional on good nick. By contrast, by lacking any equivalent capacity, Bad Case deliverance are not precluded from being epistemically successful. Further, such lack is due to a positive act of vitiation by a bad feature. Based on the example of cataracts etc. provided by Kumāriila, such bad feature consists in some sub-optimal feature of the situation of judgment formation. This parallels the way in which a pot in bad nick may yet facilitate extraction.

This reading is supported by consideration of the remarkable parallel between Kumāriila's notion of *prāmāṇyam* and that developed by the Buddhist philosophers Dharmakīrti and Devendrabuddhi, who would have been working at around the same time as Kumāriila. Dunne explains that Dharmakīrti's "Brahminical counterparts [including Kumāriila] consider [a successful deliverance] to be instrumental relative primarily to the act of knowing"²⁰⁵. By contrast, Dharmakīrti himself considers a successful deliverance instrumental to "another resulting action, namely, the perceiver's activity"²⁰⁶. However, within two differing frameworks, both Kumāriila and the Buddhist authors make a strikingly similar appeal to the notion of a capacity. By drawing on recent scholarship by John Dunne, some details of the Buddhist theoretical work will now be investigated in order to support the above reading of Kumāriila's view.

²⁰⁵ Dunne (2004) 262-263

²⁰⁶ Dunne (2004) 263

Dunne explains that Devendrabuddhi “find[s] himself in such a muddle”²⁰⁷ by articulating two different conceptions of the 'trustworthiness' of an awareness. Initially, Devendrabuddhi adheres closely to Dharmakīrti's text in presenting a confirmation-model, as described above, whereby “the trustworthiness of [an] instrumental cognition consists of the fact that it leads to another instrumental cognition whose content is the desired telic function, i.e., the achievement of one's goal.”²⁰⁸

Later, however, Devendrabuddhi goes on to redefine an instrumental cognition “in terms just of the *capacity* to result in the achievement of one's goal”²⁰⁹. This redefinition occurs in response to an objection based on obstructed action. Specifically, a correct judgment may not lead to successful activity if subsequent action is obstructed. Thus, Dunne provides an example where “if I have correctly identified fresh water from a distance and yet my attempt to reach it fails”²¹⁰. Devendrabuddhi accordingly makes “a tactical retreat”²¹¹ from the position that a correct judgment necessarily leads to successful result to the position that a correct judgment cannot lead to an unsuccessful result.

As Dunne explains, “Devendrabuddhi's above-cited answer is to place the restriction not upon the obtainment, but upon the object.”²¹² This strategy involves a modal idea, whereby an instrumental cognition necessarily leads to no other result. This can be expressed in terms of the idea that there cannot be a false positive. By contrast, both true positive and false positive are possible in the case of doubt. As Dunne explains, “a doubtful perception might lead me to water, but in other cases I will find only the hot sand of a mirage.”²¹³ Devendrabuddhi utilises the notion of a capacity to convey the idea of necessity of restriction rather than necessity of result, whereby “what distinguishes an instrumental cognition is not that it necessarily leads one to the result, but

²⁰⁷ Dunne (2004) 287

²⁰⁸ Dunne (2004) 287

²⁰⁹ Dunne (2004) 286

²¹⁰ Dunne (2004) 287

²¹¹ Dunne (2004) 287

²¹² Dunne (2004) 286

²¹³ Dunne (2004) 286-287

rather that it has the *capacity* to lead one to that result if all other conditions are in place."²¹⁴ In Dunne's example of perceiving water at a distance, what distinguishes a successful deliverance from an unsuccessful one is thus that the former will lead to "attain[ing] an object with the desired or expected telic function"²¹⁵ if one has the chance to move towards the perceived water without hindrance.

Similarly, as the examples of Sucarita and Uṃveka indicate, Kumāriḷa's capacity is restricted to deliverances and this capacity is necessarily exercised in cases where it is not obstructed. Dharmakīrti's notion of a goal-oriented activity such as heading for water corresponds to Kumāriḷa's notion of epistemic deliverances as a goal-oriented process. Dharmakīrti's conception of an awareness of telic function as goal corresponds to Kumāriḷa's conception of accurate determination as result. Further, Dharmakīrti's notion of hindrance corresponds to Kumāriḷa's notion of a bad feature. Extending the analogy to consider how the views canvassed by Kumāriḷa correspond to the process of seeking water can yield some insight into the nature of Kumāriḷa's reasoning. There must be some fact of the matter as to whether a given route does or does not lead to water. As such, the route itself is ascribed some capacity as an intrinsic feature. Kumāriḷa's own supposition is that this is a capacity to lead to water. However, individual deliverances correspond in this analogy to attempts to pursue this path and ultimately reach water. Certain attempts succeed and others fail.

The second view is equivalent to the idea that whether or not an attempt succeeds or fails is entirely due to assistance or obstruction. However, this overlooks the role of the route itself in leading to water. The first view denies the roles of both assistance and obstruction. However, without either such notion, there is no account of why some attempts are successful in reaching water and other are unsuccessful. As such, Kumāriḷa's position is equivalent to maintaining that the route itself is responsible for successful outcomes, whereas obstruction of the route is responsible for unsuccessful outcomes. As

²¹⁴ Dunne (2004) 287

²¹⁵ Dunne (2004) 289

such, it is necessary that attempts to follow the route lead to water when not obstructed. This has been expressed technically as the idea that the capacity for success is both the intrinsic nature of attempts to follow the route, as well as the essence of unobstructed attempts to follow the route conditional on their identity as unobstructed attempts to follow the route.

Kumārila distinguishes between Good Case deliverances and Bad Case deliverances as follows²¹⁶:

*ŚV 2.83: A pramāṇa which is independent in its functioning, enduring **only** (eva) by its own nature before being apprehended [as being a pramāṇa rather than a non-pramāṇa], is apprehended by means of another awareness.*

*ŚV 2.85: However, **it could be** (syāt) that a non-pramāṇa apprehends its own object due to its own nature. It would not cease until falsity is apprehended by a further [awareness].*

A pramāṇa is a natural kind of process which results in accurate determination, and metaphysically grounds this outcome. By contrast, a non-pramāṇa is dependent on bad features in functioning to apprehend its object, and thus it would cease operating when the bad features on which it depends are removed, in a sense that will be explicated in the next chapter. This provides a metaphysically disjunctive conception of pramāṇa and non-pramāṇa. Pramāṇa is a process which is metaphysically grounded in a real causal power which is a real disposition and real nature of the kind of process of forming an accurate judgment. By contrast, non-pramāṇa is a process of erring in judgment which is metaphysically grounded in a bad feature of the cause.

Kumārila's idea was clarified by Uṃveka. As Kataoka explains:

²¹⁶ In the Śloka-vārttika; see TS 2909 and TS 2912 for the equivalent verses in the Brhaṭ-ṭikā.

“Umbeka ... clarifies Kumāriila's intention that even an erroneous cognition seems to have correctly grasped its own object, just as a valid cognition does. An invalid cognition, though it is erroneous, is nonetheless “the agent of grasping” with regard to its object, just as a valid one is ... ”²¹⁷

This explanation captures the way in which non-pramāṇas are reflectively indiscriminable from pramāṇas. Successful deliverances must not accurately determine something other than their object, whereas doubts, classified as unsuccessful deliverances, may or may not yield an accurate determination. This is equivalent to the idea that only successful deliverances produce no false positives. However, in order to constitute a successful deliverance, thus being guaranteed to produce a true positive, other conditions must be satisfied, which in Devendrabuddhi's case consists in a 'no obstruction' condition and in Kumāriila's case requires appropriately normal epistemic conditions, as described above. By contrast, unsuccessful deliverances may produce a false positive. This corresponds to the idea that an unsuccessful attempt to reach water may at first seem as though it will be successful.

Both Devendrabuddhi and Kumāriila utilise the notion of capacity to convey these ideas. Kataoka explains that for Kumāriila a capacity “is made manifest by a *vyañjaka* and enables its substratum-entity to bring about a particular result (*kārya*).”²¹⁸ However, does this mean that the capacity exists in all deliverances and is only exercised in Good Case deliverances? It is true that all deliverances are in principle capable of succeeding if not vitiated by bad features. However, such bad features, consisting in cataracts etc., affect the constitution of the cause itself. As such, only Good Case deliverances possess the capacity in fact. The possession of the capacity by a deliverance entails its exercise, and no separate stimulus is required.

²¹⁷ Kataoka (2011) Part 2 295-296 fn.293

²¹⁸ Kataoka (2011) 248

This is consistent with the notion of a bare disposition discussed above, where the possession of a disposition to facilitate extraction automatically results in the process of extraction, and a severely damaged pot possesses no such disposition. In the contemporary dispositionalist literature, Mumford and Anjum similarly reject the idea that a separate stimulus is needed for the manifestation of a power, instead allowing that powers necessitate their own manifestation. No ontological distinction can be made between powers and stimuli.²¹⁹ They provide the example of radioactive decay as a 'lonely' power which manifests itself spontaneously.²²⁰ Cases where powers fail to manifest are analysed as cases where there is "an unknown, hidden, or just taken-for-granted countervailing power"²²¹ or "an obstacle in the way of the manifestation"²²² of the power. Mumford and Anjum explain that a power that needs a mutual manifestation partner "needs its partner in order to operate. It is not exercising otherwise."²²³ Kumāriila's notion of independence seems to liken the case of epistemic deliverances to the case of radioactive decay, where no mutual manifestation partner is required. Although possession of the deliverance by an agent is necessary for the exercise of the capacity, the pot analogy suggests that this is a background fact about the deliverance rather than a stimulus for its exercise.

Epistemic reflexivity to the individual judgment better reflects the Buddhist doctrine than Kumāriila's view. As Kataoka explains:

"the lack of ... [the formulation] "validity is cognized through itself" ... cannot be explained without assuming that Kumāriila does not favour the idea. And in fact Kumāriila confirms this assumption ... from the epistemological viewpoint it is supposed that a capacity is grasped from

²¹⁹ See Mumford (2013) 16

²²⁰ See Mumford and Anjum (2011) 34-38

²²¹ Mumford and Anjum (2011) 36

²²² Mumford and Anjum (2011) 37

²²³ Mumford and Anjum (2011) 38

its result ... Therefore it is theoretically consistent for Kumāṛila to say that validity is cognized "by something else" and not "through itself".²²⁴

By contrast, Śākyabuddhi endorses just such an epistemological conception of 'from itself' as reflexive awareness for a certain class of perceptions which are those involving telic function, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Śākyabuddhi writes:

*"Therefore, because a perception whose content has the capacity for telic function is without the causes of error, it is determined **by reflexive awareness** as being nothing other than a pramāṇa just due to svabhāva."²²⁵*

The notion of reflexive awareness ('rang rig' or 'svasaṃvedana') is a distinctly Buddhistic notion²²⁶, and by adopting Śākyabuddhi's conception, Pārthasārathi is forced into the unenviable situation of having to explain that awareness provides reflexive awareness of its own epistemic goodness but not of itself!²²⁷ It thus seems that Pārthasārathi may have adopted a reflexive conception of 'from itself' from Śākyabuddhi.

Section 6: Kumāṛila as Virtue Epistemologist

The term 'virtue epistemology' (VE) is used to label a diverse range of different approaches in a fast-developing field of epistemology, including so-called reliabilist and responsibilist approaches. Linda Zagzebski and Abrol Fairweather explain that, in the aftermath of the Gettier literature, Sosa "introduced the

²²⁴ Kataoka (2011) 72-73

²²⁵ PVṬ nye 75A: "de'i phyir don byed par nus pa'i yul can gyi mngon sum ni 'khrul pa'i rgyu mtshan med pa'i phyir tshad ma nyid kyi bdag nyid du gyur pas rang rig pas yongs su bcad pa yin no|"; cf. Dunne (2004) 292-293

²²⁶ Cf. Yao (2005) 18 ff.

²²⁷ See Taber (1992b) 213-214

term "intellectual virtue" into the contemporary epistemological literature. What Sosa meant by an intellectual virtue was a reliable belief-forming faculty, and so virtue epistemology (VE) began as a species of reliabilism."²²⁸ By contrast, responsibilist approaches model virtue as conscientiousness or responsibility as a parallel to virtue ethics.²²⁹ Greco contrasts the Aristotelian, responsibilist form of VE with the reliabilist approach as follows:

"If we do not make Aristotle's account of moral virtue definitional of the concept of virtue in general, then we can see that Sosa, Goldman and Zagzebski are members of an important camp; one appropriately labeled "virtue epistemology." The defining characteristic of virtue epistemology, in this sense, is that it makes the normative properties of persons conceptually prior to the normative properties of beliefs."²³⁰

Fairweather similarly explains:

"The Aristotelian conception of virtue as an excellence of character has dominated work in virtue ethics ... There are other plausible accounts available; virtue can be defined as a skill or a mere power ..."²³¹

Ernest Sosa's VE presents a dispositional understanding of epistemic virtues, as causal powers of agents. Sosa writes:

"Epistemic virtues or competences are abilities. These are a special sort of dispositions, familiar examples of which are fragility and solubility."²³²

As Jesper Kallestrup and Duncan Pritchard explain, Sosa's virtue epistemology:

"explicitly understands epistemic virtue in terms of the manifestation of a

²²⁸ Zagzebski and Fairweather (2001) 3

²²⁹ See Zagzebski and Fairweather (2001) 3

²³⁰ Greco (2000) 181

²³¹ Fairweather (2001) 63

²³² Sosa (2011) 80-81

cognitive disposition, or power, where these cognitive dispositions have a physical basis resident in [the] cognitive subject ... Sosa's virtue epistemology thus trades on a broader metaphysical picture of dispositions and powers, where the manifestation of a cognitive power mirrors the manifestation of dispositions and powers more generally."²³³.

John Greco similarly states that "[a]ccording to Sosa, an intellectual virtue is a reliable cognitive ability or power."²³⁴ For Sosa, virtues are "powers or abilities [which] enable a subject to achieve knowledge or at least epistemic justification"²³⁵. It is this notion of virtue as skill or power which has an affinity with Kumārila's notion of *prāmāṇyam* as a capacity or real causal power. Kallestrup and Pritchard explain that Sosa's account contrasts with Greco's presentation of an otherwise similar form of VE, which involves "think[ing] of the "because of" relation in play here precisely in terms of the kind of causal explanatory lines that Sosa rejects."²³⁶ In light of the discussion of dispositions in the previous chapter, we may liken Sosa's position to the idea of a bare disposition which is causally irreducible, in contrast to Greco's causally reducible position. Sosa's VE thus represents one way in which the causal power metaphysic can be transferred into the domain of epistemology, whereby "the accuracy [of a belief] manifests a cognitive power on the part of the subject."²³⁷

Sosa holds in particular that human faculties are themselves intellectual virtues. Sosa writes:

"it may be one's faculty of sight operating in good light that generates one's belief in the whiteness and roundness of a facing snowball. Is possession of such a faculty a "virtue"? Not in the narrow Aristotelian sense, of course, since it is no disposition to make deliberate choices. But there is a broader sense of "virtue," still Greek, in which anything

²³³ Kallestrup and Pritchard (2013) 250

²³⁴ Greco (2002) 293

²³⁵ Sosa (1991) 274

²³⁶ Kallestrup and Pritchard (2013) 265 fn.4

²³⁷ Kallestrup and Pritchard (2013) 250

with a function – natural or artificial – does have virtues. The eye does, after all, have its virtues, and so does a knife. And if we include grasping the truth about one's environment among the proper ends of a human being, then the faculty of sight would seem in a broad sense a virtue in human beings ...”

Sosa's claim that faculties such as reason, memory and perception are themselves the intellectual virtues which “enable a subject to achieve knowledge or at least epistemic justification”²³⁸ has an affinity with Kumāriila's claim that *prāmāṇyam* is 'from itself'. The review of Kumāriila's canvassed alternative views indicated that this claim amounted to the rejection of the idea that accurate determination is due to separable good features. Rather, the unflawed causes of the deliverance, which are the pure faculties, is responsible for accurate determination, and thus these unflawed causes constitute intellectual virtues in Sosa's sense.

Sosa's characterisation of human faculties as intellectual virtues has been disputed by Zagzebski, and defended by Greco.²³⁹ Zagzebski writes that “it is quite obvious that sight, hearing, and memory are faculties ... the Greeks identified virtues, not with faculties themselves, but with the excellence of faculties.”²⁴⁰ This disagreement concerns the question of whether virtues are eyesight etc. or separable good features of deliverances. As such, Kumāriila is allied with Sosa, because of their common rejection of good features over and above the normal exercise of the sense-faculties etc. By contrast, Zagzebski's understanding of excellences as faculties is allied with the third view canvassed by Kumāriila, according to which the capacity for accurate determination is due to contingent good features of the cause, such as clarity of vision, which is a property of sight.

Sosa separately considers both generative faculties, such as external perception and intuitive reason, and transmissive faculties, such as memory and deductive

²³⁸ Sosa (1991) 274

²³⁹ See Greco (2000)

²⁴⁰ Zagzebski, *Virtues of the Mind*: 10, quoted in Greco (2000) 180

reason. Considering an example of the latter, Sosa writes:

“The perceptual faculty of sight, for example, generates beliefs about the colours and shapes of surfaces seen fully, within a range, and in adequate light. Such beliefs issue from visual impressions derived in turn from the seen objects.”

Sosa considers that the case of a subject whose “ostensible visual perceptions are ... highly error-prone”²⁴¹, holding that “that should not cancel the virtue of his faculty of sight so long as both erring intuition and erring memory retain their status.”²⁴² This presents a disjunctive analysis of types of perception, contrasting with the idea that “what makes a belief perceptual is its basis in experience as if P, leaving it open whether or not the belief derives from a perceptual process originating in a fact corresponding to the object of the belief, namely, P.”²⁴³

In the case of external perception, because this is understood in terms of an experience-belief mechanism, fallibility is due to “the occasional failure of an experience to reflect what experience of that sort normally reflects.” In the case of faculties such as introspection, memory, intuition and deduction, it is not clear what can play an analogous role to experience, as a “belief-guiding pre-belief appearance in [their] operation.”²⁴⁴ In the case of memory, “how then do we understand the lineage required for legitimacy as memory while still allowing for the possibility of error due to the misoperation of *memory* (and not to flaws in the original inputs)?” As such, Sosa suggests, “[w]hy *not* conceive of such faculties as infallible?”²⁴⁵ Although it is outside the scope of this thesis to defend this claim, similar reasoning seems to be behind the claim of the Buddhist philosophers that inferential reasoning is always ‘from itself’.

²⁴¹ Sosa (1991) 227

²⁴² Sosa (1991) 227

²⁴³ Sosa (1991) 227

²⁴⁴ Sosa (1991) 230

²⁴⁵ Sosa (1991) 231

A metaphysical claim seems to be suggested by Sosa's VE. Kallestrup and Pritchard explain:

“Sosa's virtue epistemology thus trades on a broader metaphysical picture of dispositions and powers, where the manifestation of a cognitive power mirrors the manifestation of dispositions and powers more generally.”²⁴⁶

Kumārila's characterisation of *prāmāṇyam* as a real causal power or disposition seems to contribute to filling out this idea of VE as a metaphysical thesis. Kumārila's use of the expression 'from itself' (*svataḥ*) seems to cohere with a notion of 'due to *svabhāva*' (*svabhāvataḥ*) that is of more general applicability in metaphysical speculation.

²⁴⁶ Kallestrup and Pritchard (2013) 250

Chapter 4: Kumāriila's belief protocol

Section 1: Introduction

This chapter presents Kumāriila's claim as a protocol for belief adoption and revision with normative force for the epistemic agent. The chapter begins by surveying some existing secondary literature, and in particular the reading of Dan Arnold, based on the commentary by Pārthasārathi. The chapter then develops an alternative reading of Kumāriila's doctrine as a normative protocol which captures the logic of inquiry of the rational agent. This reading is motivated by examining the origins of some of Kumāriila's terminology in the existing grammatical and ritual material. Kumāriila's epistemology is presented as generative in the sense in which Pāṇini's grammar is generative: it provides a procedure which can be followed to generate true beliefs about the world. Kumāriila's belief protocol is then presented in some detail, considering the beginning, middle and end of the process of inquiry. The ramifications of three alternative views in the Śloka-vārttika for a viable logic of inquiry are considered.

Kumāriila writes that "a capacity to cognize something etc. belongs to them as a svabhāva."¹ On the basis of a consideration of the meaning of the term svabhāva and Kumāriila's use of it, the argument of the previous chapters is that the claim that epistemic success is 'from itself' amounts to the idea that deliverances under appropriately normal conditions constitute Good Case deliverances, and they are true because they are the manifestation of an essential disposition.

The chapter begins by considering the arguments by Taber and Arnold in favour

¹ TS 2812ab

of a reading of *prāmāṇyam* in terms of '*prima facie* justification'² or 'force of conviction'³, which build on the interpretation of the philosopher Pārthasārathi, as well as the findings of Kataoka in regard to this. It is argued that what is missing from the Pārthasārathi-Arnold interpretation is the idea that Kumāriila considers the attribution of *prāmāṇyam* as a stage in a normative process. Kumāriila's own thinking thus involves the notion of a hypothesis. That the logic of inquiry is distinct from the psychology of belief formation is a point emphasized by Charles Peirce, and Peirce will accordingly be treated as an interlocutor for understanding Kumāriila's claim. Whereas Arnold's account allows no scope for an understanding of Kumāriila's doctrine as a normative account, it will be argued that normativity plays a key role in Kumāriila's account. Some points of agreement between this interpretation and that of Arnold will be noted.

This chapter will accordingly provide an interpretation of Kumāriila's doctrine as goal-oriented and purposive. On this basis, the more straightforward reading of Kumāriila's verse ŚV 2.47 , whereby only *pramāṇas* have the feature of 'intrinsic validity', is supported. In order to substantiate this claim about Kumāriila's normative thinking, the origins of some of the vocabulary used by Kumāriila in the grammatical and ritual literatures will be examined. The purposive and goal-orientated theoretical framework of the original context of these terms will be highlighted in order to motivate the claim that Kumāriila deployed just such a purposive and goal-orientated model in the new context of epistemology. After that, a reading of Kumāriila's verses TS 2861 and ŚV 2.53 as providing a protocol for belief formation and revision will be set out. It is argued that this protocol is rooted in the ritual interpretation literature and in the Indian grammatical literature. Specifically, it will be argued that Kumāriila's epistemology involves a rule or procedure analogous to these rules of ritual interpretation and the rules of Pāṇini's generative grammar. Such an approach contrasts with the specification of necessary and sufficient conditions in some post-Gettier epistemology, in that it is process-orientated. This idea will be

² See e.g. Arnold (2001) 641; Arnold (2005) 61

³ See e.g. Taber (1992b) 210

further developed by characterizing Kumāṛila's description of an epistemic process as a logic of inquiry. The beginning, middle and end of inquiry will be considered in turn. Inquiry is begun through instigation by means of adoption of a working hypothesis. Inquiry is prolonged through search for defeaters, motivated by a genuine doubt. Inquiry is terminated when defeaters fail to appear, on partly epistemic grounds and partly pragmatic grounds. These stages of inquiry will be investigated in successive sections.

Section 2: Apparent truth or ascribed truth?

Kumāṛila's verse ŚV 2.53 has been taken by John Taber and Dan Arnold as definitive support for Pārthasārathi's interpretation of Kumāṛila's doctrine, whereby *prāmāṇyam* "concern[s] nothing more than *prima facie* justification"⁴ and "is common to true and false cognitions alike."⁵ This section presents an alternative reading of Kumāṛila's verse ŚV 2.53 and its analogue TS 2861 in the *Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā* in order to argue that *prāmāṇyam* constitutes a notion of truth. Specifically, it is argued that the verse specifies a two-part procedure, of truth-ascription and 'erasing the excess'. This procedure is executed by the agent through the single operational instruction to exercise repeatedly his default competence to host and accept dispositions.

Subsection 1: The Pārthasārathi-Arnold line of interpretation

Taber identifies a distinction between two competing interpretations of Kumāṛila's claim, '*svataḥ sarva-pramāṇānaṃ prāmāṇyam*', which emerges to full clarity in later literature. These two interpretations are 'from *utpatti*' and 'from *jñapti*'. Taber explains that "[t]he positions of Umbeka and Pārthasārathi

⁴ Arnold (2001) 641; cf. Arnold (2005) 61

⁵ Taber (1992b) 214

came to be known in subsequent literature as *svataḥ prāmāṇyam utpattitaḥ* and *svataḥ prāmāṇyam jñaptitaḥ*, respectively ... They themselves do not use these expressions."⁶ However, the beginnings of such a distinction between utpatti-prāmāṇyam and niścaya-prāmāṇyam seems to be present already in the work of Buddhist philosophers working around the time of Kumāriḥa. Indeed, this distinction is particularly relevant to the Buddhist position, which provides accounts of the two which diverge in respect of unfamiliar awarenesses, though not of other types of awareness. Thus expressions such as 'tshad ma 'jug pa' and 'tshad ma nges pa' are found in the Tibetan translations of the discussion of this topic by Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi. Further research would be needed to trace the evolution of this distinction in detail.

Translating the above claim as "[t]he validity of all *pramāṇas* should be accepted as intrinsic"⁷, Arnold finds that "there are some interpretative difficulties in [this passage]". These difficulties are resolved by Pārthasārathi by reinterpreting this statement to be reflexive to all awarenesses, so that it is read as the claim that "whenever a cognition occurs it *presents itself as true*."⁸ Taber and Arnold both prefer this revised interpretation, where all true or false awarenesses are 'intrinsically valid'.

Taber claims that "[i]f intrinsic validity were an actual correspondence between cognition and object that arose in a cognition from its causes, then it certainly would not belong to false cognitions; yet Kumāriḥa clearly says that it does."⁹ Taber seems to base this on Kumāriḥa's half-verse ŚV 2.53ab, which Taber translates:

ŚV 2.53ab: Thus, the validity of a cognition, due to its having the nature of knowledge, ...¹⁰.

⁶ Taber (1992b) 208 fn.24

⁷ Arnold (2005) 70

⁸ Taber (1992b) 210

⁹ Taber (1992b) 214

¹⁰ Taber (1992b) 212

Taber states that this “says that a cognition is intrinsically valid by virtue of being a *bodha*, that is, a *knowledge* of its object ... [which] is to say that it is intrinsically valid insofar as it presents itself as true.”¹¹ Taber bases his endorsement of Pārthasārathi on this point, and also on the next half-verse ŚV 2.53cd, which “says that the intrinsic validity of false cognitions is annulled upon disconfirming the cognition.”¹² If ‘intrinsic validity’ amounted to truth, Taber explains, it could not “initially belong to a cognition and then be removed.”¹³

Arnold likewise bases his support for Pārthasārathi largely on a reading of Kumāriḷa's half-verse ŚV 2.53ab. Arnold translates the same line as:

ŚV 2.53ab: the validity of awareness obtains simply by virtue of the fact that it is awareness (*bodhātmakatvena*)¹⁴

Arnold suggests that this verse provides “something like a definitive statement regarding *prāmāṇya*”¹⁵. Arnold also sets out and endorses Pārthasārathi's own argument in the Nyāya-ratna-mālā against an Uṃveka-type approach. There, Pārthasārathi explains that the view would be that “the *prāmāṇyam* of a cognition produced from itself is later exceptionally cancelled”¹⁶ and argues that “that is not right, because it is already a non-*pramāṇa* when it arises.”¹⁷ That is, if *prāmāṇyam* is truth, then belief revision cannot alter the truth-status of a belief. As Arnold paraphrases this, for the Uṃveka-type approach, belief revision would have to “consist in the actual transformation of the initial cognitive event ... the subsequent, overriding awareness actually renders *untrue* what had (really, ontologically) been *true*.”¹⁸

¹¹ Taber (1992b) 212

¹² Taber (1992b) 212

¹³ Taber (1992b) 212

¹⁴ Arnold (2001) 622; essentially the same translation is also given at Arnold (2005) 91

¹⁵ Arnold (2001) 607

¹⁶ NRM 46: “buddheḥ svato jātaṃ prāmāṇyaṃ paścād apodyata iti”

¹⁷ NRM 46: “tac cāyuktam| utpattāv evāpramāṇatvāt|”

¹⁸ Arnold (2001) 623

Taber concludes rather pessimistically that, despite offering “a much more coherent reading of Kumārila's text than Umbeka”¹⁹, nevertheless Pārthasārathi's interpretation “appears to provide no better defense of the authority of the Veda than Umbeka's ... *svataḥ prāmāṇya* is something essentially subjective for Pārthasārathi; it is a cognition's initial appearance or manifestation of validity.”²⁰ By contrast, Arnold finds Pārthasārathi's interpretation more philosophically appealing. Finding an affinity with “the argument that William Alston develops in *Perceiving God*”²¹, Arnold develops an understanding of Kumārila's epistemology as having a largely phenomenological significance. Thus “Alston's procedure is to show that the subjects of religious experience are *prima facie* justified in thinking that their experience is the experience it seems, phenomenologically, to be; and, if one is thus justified, then the experience can, *ipso facto*, be taken as genuinely an experience of what seems to be experienced.”²²

It is not really clear that the notion of justification can be used in a way which divorces it from meta-level concerns about the correctness of one's beliefs. As Velleman explains:

“Something is subject to justification only if it is subject to a *jus*, or norm of correctness ... a belief can be justified only because it can be correct or incorrect by virtue of being true or false.”²³

Similarly, Sosa writes:

“According to my dictionary, to justify is “to prove or show to be just, right, or reasonable,” in a way that implies “appeal to a standard or precedent.””²⁴

¹⁹ Taber (1992b) 211

²⁰ Taber (1992b) 212

²¹ Arnold (2005) 61; Arnold (2005) 81

²² Arnold (2005) 87

²³ Velleman (2000) 15

²⁴ Sosa (1991) 253

However, Arnold introduces an epistemic notion of truth, whereby “truth consists in the means of justification”²⁵. Thus, quoting Alston, Arnold explains:

“the truth of a truth bearer consists not in its relation to some 'transcendent' state of affairs, but in the epistemic virtues the former displays *within* our thought, experience, and discourse. Truth value is a matter of whether, or the extent to which, a belief is justified, warranted, rational, well-grounded, or the like ...”²⁶

This contrasts with a realist notion of truth, which is “a conception of “truth” as obtaining independently of what any knowing subjects believe to be the case.”²⁷ Arnold contrasts the interpretations of Uṃveka and Pārthasārathi in terms of their notion of truth. Whereas Pārthasārathi's account “involves a realist conception of truth”²⁸, “Uṃveka ends up supporting an ultimately epistemic notion of truth”²⁹. Specifically, Pārthasārathi “thinks of the justification defended by his account as conducive to the realization of truth, understood in realist terms – here, in terms of something like correspondence ... The point is simply that we are justified in finding such correspondence to obtain whenever “the validity of cognition that obtains simply by virtue of the fact that it is cognition” is not falsified by any subsequent overriding cognition.”³⁰

Arnold notes that Buddhist philosophers including Dignāga and Dharmakīrti “espoused a fundamentally *causal* epistemology”³¹ whereby “a subject's awarenesses are simply among the effects produced by that object (together, of course, with the proper conditions in the subject)”³². Arnold argues that it is precisely this causal epistemology which is disputed by Pārthasārathi, who

²⁵ Arnold (2005) 50

²⁶ Arnold (2005) 51

²⁷ Arnold (2005) 78

²⁸ Arnold (2005) 94

²⁹ Arnold (2005) 81

³⁰ Arnold (2005) 95

³¹ Arnold (2001) 632; cf. Arnold (2001) 636

³² Arnold (2001) 633

instead formulates a doxastic epistemology³³, which “starts from the presumption of justification, takes us as entitled to consider ourselves justified in thinking ourselves to experience, in fact, what we seem to ourselves to experience. Such justification is, on this view, all that is required for us to be justified in claiming to hold true beliefs.”³⁴ Nevertheless, it is “not incompatible with strong truth-claims.”³⁵ Arnold characterizes Uṃveka's reading of Kumāriila as a causal account³⁶ whereby:

“validity, on this causal account, is the resultant effect of the causes that are veridical awarenenses, and the real task is simply to determine, by appeal to causes, which are and which are not veridical awarenenses. This is why Uṃveka can take it as an unwanted consequence of Kumāriila's interpretation that validity ends up being predicated of awarenenses that are not *prāmāṇas* ... “truth” turns out, in fact, to be a plausible rendering of *prāmāṇya* – and it would indeed sound absurd to speak of something's being *prima facie* true.”³⁷

Arnold contrasts two different understandings of how *prāmāṇyam* figures in the epistemic process: “Pārthasārathi disagrees with Uṃveka regarding whether validity is found at the *outcome* of the epistemic process, or at the beginning”³⁸. Uṃveka construes *prāmāṇyam* as the outcome of the epistemic process, so that ““truth” turns out ... to be a plausible rendering of *prāmāṇya*”³⁹ By contrast, the Pārthasārathi-Arnold view renders *prāmāṇyam* in terms of subjective justification⁴⁰, *prima facie* justification⁴¹, *prima facie* validity⁴² etc. and refers to “awarenenses that are *prima facie* credited with validity”.⁴³ This “*prima facie* judgment of validity merely begins the process, which is subject to revision

³³ See in particular Arnold (2001) 615, 626-630, 644-645; cf. Arnold (2005) 89 ff.

³⁴ Arnold (2001) 644

³⁵ Arnold (2001) 644

³⁶ See Arnold (2001) 607-612

³⁷ Arnold (2001) 612

³⁸ Arnold (2001) 625

³⁹ See Arnold (2001) 612

⁴⁰ See Arnold (2001) 608

⁴¹ See Arnold (2001) 619

⁴² See Arnold (2001) 619

⁴³ Arnold (2001) 625

(subject, that is, to falsification) in light of subsequent, overriding awarenesses."⁴⁴ In this way, Arnold is able to find an affinity with William Alston's discussion in *Perceiving God*, which "defend[s] the claim that putative experiences of God are significantly akin to perceptual experiences ... Alston here eschews a normative-explanatory approach in favor of a strictly phenomenological characterization."⁴⁵ Arnold thus construes *prāmāṇyam* "not as *truth* (not as the *outcome* of the epistemic process), but as *prima facie justification* (hence, as the *basis* for the epistemic process)"⁴⁶.

Arnold goes on to assimilate the accounts of Kumārila's doctrine given by both B.K. Matilal and J.N. Mohanty to the same type of causal epistemology he attributes to Uṃveka. Arnold writes:

"Matilal's presupposition of a causal epistemology has led him to see *prāmāṇya* precisely as this kind of "effect," such that its resulting from causes can be likened to a mango's resulting from conditions of growth. It is, I suggest, fundamentally this notion of *prāmāṇya* as the culmination of the epistemic process that has Matilal render it as "truth."⁴⁷

Likewise, Arnold writes:

"Mohanty, in thinking that the *svataḥ prāmāṇya* of *all* awarenesses absurdly entails the "truth" of erroneous awarenesses, assumes that *prāmāṇya* must be the end result of the epistemic process, the "effect" that is caused by *pramāṇas*."⁴⁸

In sum, for Arnold, "Matilal and Mohanty are guilty of misrepresenting the

⁴⁴ Arnold (2001) 625

⁴⁵ Arnold (2001) 612-613

⁴⁶ Arnold (2001) 626

⁴⁷ See Arnold (2001) 641

⁴⁸ See Arnold (2001) 642

position"⁴⁹ and "are on shaky philosophical ground"⁵⁰ because "the target of the whole Mīmāṃsaka project ... [is] the idea that some particular *pramāṇas* (some special *kinds* of awareness) have privileged access to the world."⁵¹

Subsection 2: Drawbacks of the Pārthasārathi-Arnold interpretation

Taber considers that Pārthasārathi's interpretation appears theoretically unsatisfying. Taber writes:

"Clearly, the appearance or idea of truth is not the same as truth. Pārthasārathi himself admits, even emphasizes, that cognitions that are in fact false have intrinsic validity, that is, they initially manifest themselves as true. This ... is the problem that most of those outside Mīmāṃsā have seen in the doctrine of *svataḥ prāmāṇya*."⁵²

By contrast, Arnold's adducing of Alston is intended to demonstrate that Pārthasārathi's notion of subjective justification or prima facie validity is in fact compatible with a robust or realist conception of truth.⁵³

In either case, it seems that no scope is allowed for Kumārila's account of the epistemic process to be purposive or goal-orientated in any sense. This characterization of *prāmāṇyam* leads to its disconnection from the process of inquiry. What is missing is the idea that our beliefs are susceptible to normative assessment. Arnold in fact considers it a virtue that Alston "eschews a normative-explanatory approach in favor of a strictly phenomenological

⁴⁹ See Arnold (2001) 642

⁵⁰ See Arnold (2001) 642

⁵¹ See Arnold (2001) 643

⁵² Taber (1992b) 212

⁵³ See Arnold (2001) 620; Arnold (2005) 94-97

characterization"⁵⁴. However, this way the process of belief revision amounts to simply one disconnected belief after another, rather than constituting any kind of epistemic ascent. By denying that one can entertain doubts about what is phenomenologically secure, the agent seems to be denied any motivation to undertake inquiry starting from a position of settled belief. Further, even if external forces compel belief revision, such belief revision would not constitute an epistemic advantage. Rather, change in belief would be no more epistemically noteworthy than the entertaining of one thought followed by a different one. Indeed, the endorsement by Arnold of an epistemic process without epistemic culmination seems rather to acquiesce in a Buddhist notion of process devoid of normativity.

This interpretation seems particularly odd given that the intensity of inquiry of Mīmāṃsā authors including Kumārila in their interpretative enterprise seems to be the diametric opposite of the type of intellectual apathy that would follow from the view that finds no intrinsic epistemic value in inquiry. Further, as Lingat explains, "[t]he Mīmāṃsā has as its primary object the study of the injunction. It determined and examined the different forms under which it could present itself in the Vedic texts and undertook to define their respective scope of application."⁵⁵ Specifically, Lingat explains that "[t]he Mīmāṃsā ('investigation') is a method of exegesis which was originally confined to the Vedic texts."⁵⁶ However, "one of the essential tasks of interpretation distinguishes it completely from literary exegesis. It is the search from amongst the rules of *smṛti*, for that which ought to be held for an obligatory rule of conduct."⁵⁷ Thus "the Mīmāṃsā propounds rules which enable the scholar to recognise a true injunction and to determine its sense and significance."⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Arnold (2005) 82

⁵⁵ Lingat (1973) 153; cf. also Verpoorten (1987) 37, where 'vidhi' or 'injunction' is described as "the chief *mīmāṃsaka* concept"

⁵⁶ Lingat (1973) 148-149

⁵⁷ Lingat (1973) 148

⁵⁸ Lingat (1973) 149

That the Mīmāṃsā approach to philosophy emerged from this tradition of exegesis of normative statements is a point made by Halbfass, who describes how “[a] genuinely and originally exegetic and text-oriented tradition [i.e. Mīmāṃsā] opens itself increasingly to epistemology and logic”⁵⁹ leading to a “concurrent amalgamation of philosophy and exegesis.”⁶⁰ Thus “[s]uch concepts as *bhāvanā*, *vidhi*, and *niyoga* all deal primarily with the causal and motivating power of the Vedic word ... but they also refer to problems concerning ethics, the causality of human actions, and the motivating power of language in a far more general sense.”⁶¹ Ganeri likewise tells us that “[a]lthough it has its origins in a particular context, the Mīmāṃsā theory is clearly a theory of practical reason, a method for deciding what properly is to be done.”⁶² Such a notion of what is to be done can be adapted from the ritual domain not only to the ethical domain but also to the epistemological domain. If in the context of ritual, action leads to liberation, then in the epistemic context, Mīmāṃsā thinkers might be expected to specify actions leading to some ultimate epistemic good such as knowledge or true belief. That this is in fact precisely Kumārila's strategy will be argued in this chapter.

As Francavilla explains, “[t]he Mīmāṃsā's peculiarity may be found in the context of Vedic ritualism and in the capacity of diffusion of ritual thought.”⁶³ Thus a robust notion of justification as conforming to an external standard of correctness may be expected in the context of Mīmāṃsā. McClymond explains that “[t]he ability to identify ritual errors assumes that general standards for correct and incorrect ritual action exist, grounded in some authority beyond the realm of the ritual arena itself.”⁶⁴ McClymond discusses the large body of *prāyaścitta* material in the Vedic corpus, which describes expiatory rites which are to be performed as corrective activity for mistakes made in the performance of rituals.⁶⁵ Such material may have formed the background for

⁵⁹ Halbfass (1992) 29

⁶⁰ Halbfass (1992) 30

⁶¹ Halbfass (1992) 32

⁶² Ganeri (2004) 211

⁶³ Francavilla (2006) 13

⁶⁴ McClymond (2012) 203

⁶⁵ McClymond (2012)

Kumārila's epistemological theorizing, whereby belief correction is a process aiming at a standard of correctness external to the belief formation process itself. Indeed, the idea of an external norm would be expected in other intellectual disciplines involving a rule-governed system, such as generative grammar and legal hermeneutics. Thus Francavilla describes how “the Mīmāṃsā ... has many connections with the grammarians' schools ... it is remarkable that key Mīmāṃsā terms are key terms in grammatical science also.”⁶⁶ Further, Mīmāṃsā is connected with Dharmaśāstra, which Francavilla describes as “a kind of jurisprudential system”⁶⁷ the texts of which have “an interpretative character”.⁶⁸ Francavilla further explains:

“[t]he *mīmāṃsā* is strictly linked to the *dharmaśāstra* and their origins should be searched for in the same context of learning ... while *dharmaśāstra* is meant to teach about dharma, the Mīmāṃsā, as a more theoretical science, is concerned with the epistemological investigation into the nature of *dharma* and the ways to know it.”⁶⁹

Such normative concerns were seemingly not shared by contemporaneous and subsequent Buddhist philosophers, who were not rooted in the traditions of Vedic exegesis. As such, it may be that the contextual framework of Mīmāṃsā hermeneutics from within which Kumārila's thinking arose would over time have become obscured by the more analytic-reductionist framework within which Buddhist philosophers formulated their own views. Thus later commentators on Kumārila may also have read Kumārila without sufficient attention to Kumārila's own notion of process, but in a context shaped by the need to respond to Buddhism. Thus, discussing the same stretch of history, Herzberger explains:

“Texts fell into obscurity rapidly. When Vācaspati Miśra, who wrote not much more than two hundred years after Uddyotakara, compared his

⁶⁶ Francavilla (2006) 12-13

⁶⁷ Francavilla (2006) 7

⁶⁸ Francavilla (2006) 7

⁶⁹ Francavilla (2006) 8

work of commenting on Uddyotakara's *Nyāyāvārttika* to the efforts involved in rescuing an old cow deeply sunk in mire, what he was expressing was a lack of communication."⁷⁰

Arnold has reduced the interpretative question to the question of whether the right interpretation is that of Uṃveka or that of Pārthasārathi, and thus moves too quickly in assimilating the views of Matilal and Mohanty to that of Uṃveka. The notion of an epistemic process that culminates in an epistemically advantageous situation certainly does involve an analogy with causal process such as a mango ripening, in the sense that *prāmāṇyam* is an outcome, but it need not be a causal epistemology in any sense that requires the agent to determine the sufficiency of the causal conditions from which the awareness has arisen. Indeed, it will be argued that Kumārila considers and rejects just such a possibility.

Rather, the epistemic process may be a purposive and goal-orientated process in the same way as is a mango's ripening. This is not to deny that awareness "becomes true or false depending upon the causal conditions from which it arises"⁷¹, if this is understood as a statement relating to the goal at which the process aims. The reading developed here allows for a provisional attribution of *prāmāṇyam* to a belief that serves as "the *basis* for the epistemic process"⁷² and also the idea that this epistemic process is a culminating process which ends in one's beliefs coinciding with the truth, as per its translation by Matilal and by Mohanty. That there is an idea of directive action or goal-orientation, so that the actions of the agent constitute a process that moves towards and ultimately results in believing propositions that are in fact objectively true, is argued here.

Thus Kumārila's epistemology is seen to involve also a normative directive to the epistemic agent. Without such normativity, it would be difficult to articulate any systematic logic of inquiry, that is, to explain what drives the process of

⁷⁰ Herzberger (1986) 4

⁷¹ Arnold (2001) 642 quoting Matilal

⁷² Arnold (2001) 626

inquiry forward not merely from a psychological perspective but from a rational perspective. Key terms used by Kumāriḷa to convey this sense of directionality are *prāptā*, *utsarga* and *apavāda*, which will be discussed in the next section.

Subsection 3: Towards a re-evaluation of the Pārthasārathi-Arnold interpretation

The reading of Kataoka differs somewhat from Arnold in that the term 'prāptā' is understood as 'ascribed' or 'presupposed', rather than as 'obtained'. Contrasting an 'ontological' reading with an 'epistemological' reading, Kataoka explains:

“*prāptā* must be understood in an epistemological sense ... it should mean “be wrongly ascribed” so that the validity of an erroneous cognition will be epistemologically cancelled. And *prāptā* is often used in the sense “has resulted”, “is [tentatively and often wrongly] concluded”⁷³.

Kataoka contrasts this term 'prāptā' with another of Kumāriḷa's terms, 'āttah', as “was unconsciously presupposed wrongly”⁷⁴ and “was unconsciously presupposed correctly”⁷⁵ respectively. Kataoka considers that “Pārthasārathi ... does not fail to incorporate his own view into this passage ... which, with a subtle, clever modification, then supports his view”⁷⁶ and that “Pārthasārathi's interpretation is not acceptable in taking ... *prāptā* as *avagatā*”⁷⁷.

Kataoka translates the Śloka-vārttika verse discussed above as follows:

⁷³ Kataoka (2011) 75

⁷⁴ Kataoka (2011) 76

⁷⁵ Kataoka (2011) 76

⁷⁶ Kataoka (2011) 257 fn217

⁷⁷ Kataoka (2011) 257 fn217

ŚV 2.53: Therefore the validity of a cognition which has **resulted** from its being a cognition is **exceptionally cancelled** [only] when [one] finds that the object [of the cognition] is otherwise [than the way it was cognized] or that there are bad qualities in [its] cause.⁷⁸ (bold font not in original)

The interpretation of Kataoka differs from that of Arnold in that, whereas Arnold reads the claim that 'prāmāṇyam' is 'prāptā' as 'justification obtains', Kataoka understands that an 'ontological' feature of the belief which Kataoka terms 'validity' is '[wrongly] ascribed' or '[wrongly] presupposed'. Thus what is at issue is not an ontological transformation but rather a revision of attributed ontological status. The contrast between these two readings lies in the fact that the Kataoka-type ascription reading allows that the agent's propositional attitude can be assessed as 'right' or 'wrong', and thus that Kumārila's epistemology involves a normative dimension. However, Kataoka does not build on this by finding in Kumārila's discussion any account of normativity or normative process. Kataoka only observes that "Kumārila's use of the word *bodhātmakatvena* as if he refers to a condition or reason of validity (*pramāṇatā*) is problematic. However, he probably intends neither a causal nor a logical relationship in a rigid sense ..."⁷⁹

The criticism made by Pārthasārathi and Arnold was that Uṃveka's ontological understanding of prāmāṇyam as truth would lead to belief revision being characterized as an ontological transformation. This was premised on the idea that prāmāṇyam is obtained in the case of every awareness, whether true or false. On the revised understanding that prāptā denotes ascription, it can be comprehended how the ascription of a real ontological feature such as truth to a belief ascribed by an agent can be revised without any transformation in the ontology of the belief.

Although this then allows that ascription can be normatively assessed, and that

⁷⁸ See Kataoka (2011) 257-259; bold font not in original

⁷⁹ Kataoka (2011) 259

inquiry can aim at the normative goal of true belief, Uṃveka himself does not go on to give any account of this, leaving a rather impoverished account of Kumārila's doctrine. Thus while identifying a real weakness in Uṃveka's analysis, the Pārthasārathi-Arnold interpretation goes too far in reducing the basis of prāmāṇyam to a phenomenological claim. Arnold tells us that "on Pārthasārathi's account ... we are justified in forming beliefs about whatever appears in that cognition ... this epistemological claim thus turns on a basically phenomenological point about how cognitions appear"⁸⁰. At the same time, Arnold holds that this "is nevertheless compatible with a realist conception of truth"⁸¹. Arnold's characterization of prāmāṇyam as *prima facie* justification is thus intended to support a doxastic account of justification.

The 'ascription' reading of verse ŚV 2.53 allows the possibility of the more natural construal of ŚV 2.47, according to which prāmāṇyam is a feature of all pramāṇas, i.e. that only accurate determinations are in fact predicated with a feature which necessitates their being true, although at intermediate stages of inquiry, the epistemic agent may falsely ascribe such a feature to determinations which are not in fact accurate. As such, what is ascribed constitutes a hypothesis.

Previous chapters have examined aspects of the ontology of beliefs as true or false, by discussing the idea of a capacity for accurate determination which features as an essential disposition in the case of pramāṇas, and setting out an ontological disjunction between pramāṇas and non-pramāṇas. It may be surmised that Uṃveka would be in agreement with much of this discussion. However, in this chapter and the next, it is argued that Kumārila's primary concern in setting out this topic is not to provide a 'comprehensive epistemology', as Arnold suggests⁸², but rather to uncover a normative logic of inquiry of the individual epistemic agent. Thus a procedural aspect to the belief

⁸⁰ See Arnold (2001) 620; Arnold (2005) 94-97

⁸¹ See Arnold (2001) 620; Arnold (2005) 94-97

⁸² See Arnold (2005) 66: "It is therefore to be expected that Kumārila found in Śabara's discussion of codanā the need for better elaborating and defending a comprehensive epistemological doctrine."

process will be identified in Kumāriila's presentation, which is missing in the discussions of Uṃveka and Pārthasārathi.

Section 3: The grammatical and ritual origins of Kumāriila's terminology

The previous section discussed existing scholarship on a key verse in the Śloka-vārttika, which can now be translated as follows:

*ŚV 2.53: Therefore [the hypothesis] that a judgment [is based on] a Good Case deliverance, which has been **ascribed** (prāptā) from the fact of its being a judgment, is **replaced** (apodyate) [only] by a deliverance that the object [of the judgment] is otherwise [than the way it was originally judged] or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed.*

The equivalent verse in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā is as follows:

*TS 2861: So Goodness of Case [being] the essence of an epistemic kind remains the **general operation** (autsargikam) in all cases, [and] it is **replaced** (apodyate) either by a defeating deliverance or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed.⁸³*

Before making a full examination of what the substance of this verse amounts to, it will be helpful to examine the sources of the technical terminology used by Kumāriila in the grammatical and ritual literatures, and thereby to understand the explanatory models that he draws on. Louis Renou was perhaps the first modern scholar to describe how "Indian philosophy follows the grammatical method and makes a massive use of grammatical concepts"⁸⁴. More specifically, Elisa Freschi writes that "[l]inguistic analysis and

⁸³ TS 2861; the reading of Kataoka (2011) 259 as 'apodyate' has been followed

⁸⁴ K.Bhattacharya (1985) 7

epistemology are always closely linked in Mīmāṃsā.⁸⁵

Doniger explains:

“Concepts that seem at first to be mutually contradictory often turn out, on closer examination, merely to constitute a general principle and a series of exceptions to it. This is ... a method whose most extreme form was already achieved in the grammatical treatise of Pāṇini, which set the paradigm for all kinds of scientific inquiry in India: state one general rule, to which the whole of the subsequent treatise constitutes nothing but a series of increasingly specific exceptions. Ritual texts have archetypes and ectypes, rules and exceptions, just like Pāṇini.”⁸⁶

Doniger here presents a model of general principle and exceptions as an organizational methodology present in Pāṇini's grammar and also used in ritual interpretation and legal codification. This thesis will find that this methodology was also used by Kumāṛila in the specification of a protocol for belief. Doniger also presents this methodology as a solution to a problem of apparent contradiction. It will be found that Kumāṛila makes the same move in motivating his model of inquiry by a problem of apparent conflict.

Through a consideration of Kumāṛila's use of technical vocabulary, it will be argued that Kumāṛila's strategy involves an appeal to a generative paradigm that was developed in the earlier grammatical and linguistics literature. This paradigm involves firstly the identification of a natural relation, which is natural in the sense allied to the notion of natural necessity, and secondly, a stage of 'erasing the excess', whereby an initial over-extension of the relation of natural necessity is reversed. This results in a normative protocol for believing constituted by the instruction to host and accept deliverances as per the agent's default competence.

⁸⁵ Freschi (2012) 60

⁸⁶ Doniger (1991) liv-lv; also quoted in part in Francavilla (2006) 187

The Śloka-vārttika verse provides a pairing of the terms 'ascribed' (prāptā) and 'replaced' (apodyate), which Kataoka translates as 'ascribed' and 'exceptionally cancelled' respectively, and which are flagged in bold font above. The Bṛhaṭṭīkā verse provides a similar pairing of 'general operation' (utsarga)⁸⁷ and 'replaced' (apodyate)⁸⁸, also flagged in bold font. Similarly, at ŚV 2.65, Kumārila talks about a 'general operation' (utsarga) which is not subsequently replaced (anapodita). All of these terms are technical terms borrowed from the grammatical literature to describe the operation of a grammatical rule. Kumārila's use of these terms indicate that he is seeking to understand the nature of epistemic success in part through the interpretative framework of general and specific rules. In particular, this suggests that his account of epistemic status involves in part a protocol for belief adoption analogous to Pāṇini's protocol for word formation. An investigation of the origins of the terms 'defeat' (bādha), 'ascribed' (prāptā), 'general operation' (utsarga) and 'replacement operation' (apavāda), from which 'replaced' (apodyate) is derived, in the grammatical and ritual interpretation literatures will thus illuminate Kumārila's intention in the present epistemological context.

⁸⁷ See also TS 2861, Kamalaśīla's commentary below TS 2862, TS 2865 and TS 2869 where a similar term 'apoh-' is used. This term may be a wrong reading for 'apod-'.

⁸⁸ There is some confusion between the terms 'replaced' (apodyate) and 'excluded' (apohyate). In devanāgarī script, it would be difficult to see the difference so there is potential for scribal error. Both editions of TS uses the terminology of apoh- ('exclusion') at TS 2861 and throughout the texts of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla. By contrast, Kataoka (2011) 259 quotes 'apodyate' for TS 2862. Accordingly, 'replacement' rather than 'exclusion' has been assumed throughout, as this also makes more sense. A wrong reading as 'apohyate' could have been introduced by later copyists, who were conflating Kumārila's ideas with the Buddhist apoha-theory. The substantive issue addressed here is strengthened by the 'replacement' reading but does not absolutely depend on it. In any case, the terminology of defeat and exclusion is used rather loosely, at least in the edited texts. Kamalaśīla glosses 'dependence on a replacement operation' as 'dependence on a defeater' at TS 2866.

Subsection 1: 'General operation' and 'replacement operation'

Referring to a rule given in Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 6.5.54, Renou explains, “il s'agit de l'application d'un principe grammatical bien connu, aux termes duquel la règle générale (*utsarga, nyāya, sāmānya*) cède le pas à la règle particulière (*apavāda, viśeṣa*)”⁸⁹. Kahrs similarly describes a substitution model which is “a well-developed methodological procedure in Pāṇinian grammar and in the ritual Sūtras”⁹⁰. In the grammatical context, “the linguistic derivational process are accounted for by saying 'Y occurs in the place of X' as opposed to 'X becomes Y'.”⁹¹ Kahrs explains that the substitution model was extended from its use in ritual interpretation to the new use in grammar. Kahrs writes:

“In other words, something automatically applies (*prāpnoti*) unless there is some specific instruction, *ādeśa*, to overrule it. In practice this comes down to 'substitute', and the usage of the term *ādeśa* in grammar is accordingly nothing more than a special application of its liturgical use.”⁹²

In the above Śloka-vārttika verse, Kumāṛila's uses the term 'prāptā' to signify that a truth-ascription is automatic, and uses the term apodyate instead of *ādeśa* to indicate a special instruction. Likewise in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā verse, *utsarga* has the sense of a general operation which automatically applies.

Herzberger also discusses the transference of a ritual model into grammatical analysis. In the original ritual context, Herzberger surmises that its motivation may have been as follows:

“The problem of finding substitutes for materials prescribed in the context of certain rituals must have become acute as the Indo-European tribes migrated east. The problem was two-fold: to find substitutes and to justify their substitution, ensuring that the Vedic injunction prescribing

⁸⁹ Renou (1941) 118

⁹⁰ Kahrs (1998) 176

⁹¹ Kahrs (1998) 176

⁹² Kahrs (1998) 182

the ritual is not violated."⁹³

Herzberger notes the teleological nature of this model, such that "rituals were conceived of teleologically; they were performed in order to bring about certain ends ... Grammarians found an analogy between this description of ritual and, within the context of sentences, the roles of nouns and the principal verb." Kumāriḷa's further transference of this model into epistemology suggests that he conceived of the process of inquiry as normatively constrained by the pursuit of an externally defined goal, constituted by some positive epistemic status.

In the context of grammar, the linguist Pāṇini provides a system of rules which constitute a generative grammar of the Sanskrit language. Correctly forming a word from its verbal root and obtaining the correct inflection requires performing a sequence of grammatical operations on the verbal root in the stipulated order. Thus generative grammar involves a normative aspect in that it specifies the rules to be followed in order to achieve a correct description of language.⁹⁴ In this context, too, Renou explains:

On sait que Pāṇini a disséminé dans l'Aṣṭhādhyāyī, et surtout dans le premier *pāda*, des *sūtra* qui constituent des axiomes à valeur générale, "illuminant comme une lampe la grammaire entière" (Pradīpa ad M. I 49 vt. 4) et que la tradition appelle des paribhāṣāsūtra.⁹⁵

Cardona describes a particular linguistic debate about how negative particles function within Pāṇini's rules, which are understood as grammatical operations.⁹⁶ In order to simplify the presentation, instead of taking an example from Pāṇini's rules, the example 'i before e but not after c' can be used. This is a rule that concerns the spelling of words. The first part of this rule stipulates the operation of placing the letter i before the letter e. The

⁹³ Herzberger (1986) 18-19

⁹⁴ cf. Staal (1962) 70 fn.1: "Though modern linguistics aims at being descriptive and not prescriptive, it is possible to formulate general rules prescribing how to arrive at a set of rules which together constitute a description of a language."

⁹⁵ Renou (1941) 116

⁹⁶ See Cardona (1967)

second part tells us that in restricted cases 'i before e' is not done. The two possible interpretations of the negative injunction in this second rule involve interpreting the negative particle in either of two ways, which Cardona terms 'limitation(al negation)' and 'negation (subsequent to tentatively applying)'.⁹⁷

On the first interpretation, the formulation 'not after c' restricts the scope of the 'i before e' to the remaining 25 letters. The whole rule is thus a more economical way of saying 'i before e after a, after b, after d, after e, etc.' Specifying what falls outside the scope of the rule serves to indicate what falls within its scope. On the second interpretation, the formulation 'not after c' constitutes a second operation to be performed subsequent to the first part, which backs out the effect of the first part, so that i is moved before e to yield a tentative result then moved back to its previous place after e to yield the final result.⁹⁸ The grammatical end result is the same in either case, so it is a theoretical debate between rival linguistic models.⁹⁹ On the first interpretation, negation serves to exclude a positive operation from acting in a domain, whereas on the second interpretation, negation fails to restrict the positive operation but involves subsequent cancellation of that positive operation and replacement by a different operation within a more limited domain.¹⁰⁰

If we look at the operation element of each part of the rule in isolation from context, there is an apparent conflict between 'place i before e' and 'place e before i'. This conflict is merely apparent, however, either because the rules are restricted to mutually exclusive domains on the first interpretation, or because they are to be considered serially on the second interpretation. In either case, the restriction in scope involves distinguishing between generally applicable and specifically applicable rules. As Cardona tells us, "[a] rule providing a general operation is called an *utsarga(vākya)*, one which provides a

⁹⁷ See Cardona (1967) 34

⁹⁸ The analogy is slightly imperfect at this point, because the example rule is not part of a larger system of operations in the way that Pāṇini's rules are, so the notion of a previous place is rather shaky.

⁹⁹ See Joshi and Roodbergen (1981) 44-45 for a discussion of this debate

¹⁰⁰ Strictly speaking, it involves cancellation and replacement by a different positive operation. Mere cancellation is modelled by a similar dichotomy between *vidhi* and *pratiṣedha*.

specific operation is called an *apavāda(vākya)*¹⁰¹ A very similar dichotomy is between *vidhi*, or positive operation, which operates in an unrestricted domain, and *pratiṣedha*, or cancellation, which operates in a restricted domain. As Cardona explains, "The essential difference between *pratiṣedha* and *apavāda* is that while the latter counters an *utsarga* by providing another positive operation ... a *pratiṣedha* counters a *vidhi* by providing its absence."¹⁰² It is on this basis that the term 'replacement operation' has been chosen here.

These same considerations about the distinction between negation as exclusion from a domain and as replacement are also found in the literature on ritual interpretation, which is developed by a series of thinkers which includes Kumāṛila. This is a specifically normative context, so the interpretation of the negation becomes a normative question. Staal discusses the differing analyses of negation of both verbs and nouns as either a positive injunction through exclusion (*paryudāsa*) or a negative injunction through prohibition (*pratiṣedha*).¹⁰³ Staal contrasts the ritual injunctions 'he shall not look' and 'he shall not eat'. As instructions within the contexts of particular rituals, the former "positively enjoins something opposed to looking"¹⁰⁴, thus involves exclusion, whereas the latter "does not enjoin ... any definite action different from eating, but it prohibits eating"¹⁰⁵, thus involves prohibition. A similar distinction obtains in the case of nouns also. Staal provides the single example of the instruction 'not at the after-sacrifices does he say ye-yajamahe', where "the context shows that ... it means ... 'at sacrifices other than the after-sacrifices he shall say ye-yajamahe'."¹⁰⁶ Here, negation applies to the term 'after-sacrifices', and the type of negation is exclusion, as it results in a positive injunction.

The notion of 'apoha' or 'exclusion' may also be related to the notion of 'apavāda' or replacement operation. Thus variant readings as 'apohyate' and

¹⁰¹ Cardona (1967) 35

¹⁰² Cardona (1967) 40

¹⁰³ See Staal (1962)

¹⁰⁴ Staal (1962) 59

¹⁰⁵ Staal (1962) 57

¹⁰⁶ Staal (1962) 59

'apodyate' are seen in different edited texts.¹⁰⁷ In any case, there is an affinity between the way these two terms denote very similar ideas of an operation that negates and replaces a procedure. In her discussion of the debate between the philosophers Bhartṛhari and Dignāga, Herzberger explains that Dignāga "was forced to concede the consequences that Bhartṛhari had drawn from this view: that the occasioning ground for names is in excess of the spatio-temporal bearers."¹⁰⁸ However, Dignāga provided an account of *apoha* as an operation "to erase this excess ... and to reconstitute the rights of Kātyāyana's aphorism on names."¹⁰⁹ Although there are various negational aspects to Dignāga's *apoha* operation, the key feature is that "[t]he *apoha*-operation is restricted to that part of the name-giving sentence which designates its object indirectly through universals ... those elements ... alone are subject to the *apoha*-operation which are in excess of their spatio-temporal bearers ..."¹¹⁰

In Chapter Two above, it was seen how Bhattacharya explains that "svabhāva turned out to be, so to say, a lance free and readily available for use by anyone and everyone"¹¹¹. The use of the terms *apoha* and *apavāda* by different writers for different purposes suggests that they similarly constitute another terminological resource which could be flexibly employed. Indeed, just as this research notes the parallels in the grammatical literature in regard to the notion of *apavāda*, Herzberger also suggests, "[m]odels for Dignāga's *apoha* operation, I think, are to be found in the deleting procedures used by grammarians, in Bhartṛhari's view that universals abandon their number when they become associated with individuals ... and in Bhartṛhari's idea of *apoha*."¹¹²

¹⁰⁷ Both editions of TS use the terminology of *apoh-* ('exclusion') at TS 2862 and throughout the texts of Śāntarākṣita and Kamalaśīla. By contrast, Kataoka (2011) 259 quotes 'apodyate' for TS 2862.

¹⁰⁸ Herzberger (1986) 124

¹⁰⁹ Herzberger (1986) 125

¹¹⁰ Herzberger (1986) 124-125

¹¹¹ Bhattacharya (2012) 610

¹¹² Herzberger (1986) 125

Subsection 2: More on exceptions

Tantra-yuktis are interpretative devices employed in various Indian intellectual disciplines. As Helmut Scharfe explains in relation to the early political text *Artha-śāstra*, "Among the tantra-yukti-s listed in XV 1,3 there are logical (*upamāna, arthâpatti, saṃśaya, vikalpa, ūhya*) and interpretative (*uddeśa, nirdeśa, upadeśa, apadeśa, atideśa, etc.*) terms that are also known from the *Mahābhāṣya* ..."113 Such devices can be seen to constitute a meta-level set of terminology in which the logic of the underlying arguments can be classified or analysed.

Scharfe tells us that "[t]he elaboration of the thirty-two *tantra-yukti-s* "text-fittings" is the only topic in the last book of the *Arthaśāstra* (book XV) ... the relation of this book with the text is found only in the illustrations; the list of terms and their definitions are absolutely neutral and might as well be taken from another source, e.g. a philosophical text. There are, in fact, indications that the tantra-yuktis have an extraneous source."114 Scharfe goes on to discuss the presence of similar final *tantra-yukti* sections in the medical texts *Caraka-saṃhitā* and *Suśruta-saṃhitā*, and similar *tantra-yukti* listings or discussions in the Tamil grammar *Tolkāppiyam*, the Tamil grammar *Nannūl* and in the Sāṃkhya text *Yuktidīpikā*.115 Scharfe suggests that several of these texts "can be dated in the first few centuries A.D."116 As a "system of establishing rules and procedures"117, it might be expected that *Mīmāṃsā* would contain just such tantra-yuktis, even if not explicitly documented.

One of the technical devices listed in the *Artha-śāstra* is *apavarga*, which is substantially equivalent to the notion of an exception also captured by the term 'apavāda'. As Scharfe explains, "[t]he interplay of the general rule and its exception is an essential feature of Pāṇini's grammar; the *Mahābhāṣya* uses the

¹¹³ Scharfe (1993) 265-266

¹¹⁴ Scharfe (1993) 265-266

¹¹⁵ See Scharfe (1993) 268-270

¹¹⁶ Scharfe (1993) 271

¹¹⁷ Taber (2012) 146

terms *utsarga* and *apavāda* for these two classes of rules. In the Arthaśāstra the relation of general rule and exception turns up frequently in the presentation of legal facts.¹¹⁸ Scharfe refers to a rule providing for divorce, where this is possible under given circumstances, but then a final caveat 'But not when they have begotten children' constitutes "a clearly marked exception to the general rule."¹¹⁹ Scharfe's second example involves a fine on a breadwinner who refuses to provide for his familial dependents.¹²⁰ In this example, "we find not only an exception to the rule, but also an exception to the exception"¹²¹. That those familial dependents who have been cast out of society due to wrongdoing need not be provided for constitutes a first exception; that one must provide for one's own mother constitutes an exception to that exception.¹²²

Subsection 3: 'Exhortation'

The term 'vidhi' is translated as 'injunction' or as 'prescription'. As Freschi explains, "*vidhi* denotes both a prescriptive sentence and its exhortative core ... I distinguish the two aspects by calling the former "prescription" and the latter "prescriptive force"."¹²³ Above the notion of *vidhi* was compared to the notion of *utsarga* or general operation. Freschi also explains that prescriptive force is connected with use of the optative grammatical ending by the Mīmāṃsā theorists.¹²⁴

Although Kumārila does not use the term 'vidhi' in this discussion, the general notion of exhortation to inquiry appears to be in the background of his discussion. Thus Kumārila's discussion of this topic is provided as part of a

¹¹⁸ Scharfe (1993) 271

¹¹⁹ Scharfe (1993) 272

¹²⁰ See Scharfe (1993) 272

¹²¹ Scharfe (1993) 272

¹²² See Scharfe (1993) 272

¹²³ Freschi (2012) 19

¹²⁴ Freschi (2012) 20

commentary on a Mīmāṃsā Sūtra that concerns codanā or Vedic injunction.¹²⁵ In the rules of exegesis, vidhi is a positive injunction which contrasts with niṣedha/ pratiṣedha or prohibition.¹²⁶ Lingat describes a range of injunctions defined in the Mīmāṃsā literature, including “the primary injunction pure and simple (*utpatti-vidhi*) ... the injunction of employment (*prayoga-vidhi*) which fixes the order in which the different parts of the rite should be performed ... and the injunction of exclusive specification (*parisaṃkhyā-vidhi*, which operates as a prohibition) ...”¹²⁷

Similarly, Francavilla explains that “[g]enerally, the term “*vidhi*” denotes a positive prescription, while the terms *niṣedha* and *pratiṣedha* make reference to a prescription having a negative content ... The terms *codanā* and *vidhi* are equivalent in many contexts.”¹²⁸

Subsection 4: 'Conflict'

Conflict (*virodha*) is also one of various forms of negation that have been identified in the grammatical literature¹²⁹ and it constitutes a technical term in that literature. Patañjali explains that a 'general operation' is 'defeated' by a 'replacement operation'.¹³⁰ However, the later linguist Kaiyaṭa describes an interesting divergence of opinion between Kātyāyana and Patañjali on the circumstances under which this happens. Kātyāyana holds that defeat can only happen when there is conflict between the operations, whereas Patañjali holds that defeat can occur even when there is no such conflict.¹³¹ As Joshi and Roodbergen explain, for the grammarians, the term 'defeat' is used as

¹²⁵ Cf. Kataoka (2011) 160-161

¹²⁶ See Kataoka (2011) 159-160

¹²⁷ Lingat (1973) 153

¹²⁸ Francavilla (2006) 101

¹²⁹ See for example the discussion by Koṇḍa-bhaṭṭa at Joshi (1990) 288 and referenced below

¹³⁰ See e.g. MB 2.1.24: “apavādaiḥ utsargāḥ bādhyante”. See also Joshi (1969) 158

¹³¹ See Joshi and Roodbergen (1973) 18-19 and Joshi and Roodbergen (1976) 15

something that holds between two grammatical operations, whereas conflict (*virodha*) and sameness of result (*ekaphalatva*) are terms applied to the outcomes of applying the rules.¹³² Joshi and Roodbergen also explain that defeat cannot hold between two general operations, but only between a general operation and a replacement operation and that conflict (*vipratishedha*) "is assumed to occur between two rules, if both are of equal force; if both are applicable to the same example, and if they cannot be applied together."¹³³

Renou explains:

"Le terme *vipratishedha* apparaît aussi dans le rituel en concurrence avec *virodha* (qui le glose chez M.) et, isolement, avec *vibādhāmāna* ... qui montre un cas ... de la racine *bādh-* dite de regles qui s'entravent"¹³⁴.

Renou describes the rule 'in case of conflict, the later [operation] ought to be performed'¹³⁵ as one of the most significant general operations of Pāṇini's grammar. Renou also explains:

"Les philosophes du rituel ont emprunté cette *paribhāṣā* ; les Mī. XII 4 37 donnent la formule *vipratishedhe param*, infléchie d'ailleurs vers une valeur différente "lorsqu'il y a prohibition mutuelle (entre ce qui est en vue du rite et ce qui est en vue de l'homme), c'est l'autre (i.e. ce qui est en vue du rite) qui est à effectuer".¹³⁶

If the Mīmāṃsā philosophers were able to adapt the meaning of this rule in the context of ritual, one may expect also a further adaptation to the context of epistemology.

A key discussion in the Mīmāṃsā-sūtra involves various aspects of meaning

¹³² Joshi and Roodbergen (1973) 19 fn.68

¹³³ Joshi and Roodbergen (1969) 159

¹³⁴ Renou (1941) 117 fn.1

¹³⁵ Aṣṭhādhyāyī 1.4.2: '*vipratishedhe param kāryam*'

¹³⁶ Renou (1941) 117

roughly corresponding to the ideas of denotation, connotation, contextual meaning etc. The discussion of this by Śabara and Kumāriḷa begins by considering whether a statement should be taken according to its denotation or its connotation. In the chosen example, "The Gārhapatyā [fire] should be worshipped with the [verse] to Indra"¹³⁷, the denotation is that the fire is to be worshipped whereas the connotation is that Indra is to be worshipped. There are in fact four possible meanings of the verse, because it is additionally possible to suppose that both should be jointly worshipped or that either one could be freely selected for worship. Here denotation is the general rule (utsarga) and connotation is the exception (apavāda).¹³⁸

A later sūtra presents six aspects of meaning in order from strongest to weakest. The structure of the discussion by both Śabara and Kumāriḷa is then to examine each of the five adjacent pairs to confirm that they do indeed stand in the relation of stronger to weaker. As such, the structure of this discussion very closely resembles that used by Kauṭilya in the Arthasāstra to assess the relative gravity of various different types of political crisis that can occur.

In their discussions of how the various elements of meaning play a role, both Śabara and Kumāriḷa himself begin by confirming that there is indeed conflict (virodha) between such elements, which means that there are numerous possible interpretations of any one statement.¹³⁹

Interestingly, the literature on conflict was still in continuing development by Buddhist philosophers of Kumāriḷa's time and later. Dharmakīrti distinguishes between two varieties of conflict, which I shall translate as 'mutually scope-restricting' and 'mutually displacing'.¹⁴⁰ This distinction has been discussed in recent scholarship, sometimes using the translations 'conceptual

¹³⁷ Aindryā gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhate

¹³⁸ cf. Tantra Vārttika 755 ad 3.2.5: ataḥ param etad vicāryate ka utsargasya viṣayaḥ ko 'pavādasyēti

¹³⁹ See their commentaries ad Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 3.2.3, 3.2.5 and 3.3.14

¹⁴⁰ That is, these terms can be used to translate Dharmakīrti's terms saḥānavasthāna-virodha and paraspara-sthiti-lakṣaṇa-virodha/ paraspara-parihāra-sthita-lakṣaṇa-virodha respectively

incompatibility' and 'factual incompatibility'¹⁴¹.

Dharmakīrti's former case, 'mutually scope-restricting', holds between a property and its negation, as illustrated by the conflict between blue and not-blue. As Kyuma discusses¹⁴², the later Buddhist philosopher Jñānaśrīmitra explains that blue and not-blue are a case of mere difference when in separate loci, but become a case of conflict when ascribed to the same locus. It is on this basis that they are termed 'mutually scope-restricting'. Further, Dharmottara argues that cases such as blue and yellow, which do not feature excluded middle, are a variant of this general case of 'mutually scope-restricting'. As Woo explains, "*parasparasthīlakṣaṇavirodha* ['mutually scope-restricting'] ... can be understood as a kind of identical relation between properties in the logical world."¹⁴³ The absence of one property is invariably associated with the presence of the other. Whether this invariable association is founded in either logical or metaphysical necessity, or is merely an empirical correlation is a question which I will not address.

Mutually scope-restricting properties are thus those such as colour that are inalienable from their loci, as they are held to be partly constitutive of their loci, and, due to the concomitant causal restriction, serve to define their entities. We should perhaps imagine different types of flowers such as bluebells and buttercups, or different types of minerals, such as lapis lazuli and gold, whose colour may be taken as innate to their classification as such. This type of conflict is between properties which are in part constitutive of the entity.

By contrast, Dharmakīrti's latter case, 'mutually displacing' "occurs between two opposed facts (*vastu, dños pa*), such as light and darkness (*ālokāndhakāra*) or the sensation of heat and that of coldness (*sītoṣṇasparśa*).” These are states of affairs which can exist in a single locus at different times, because they are not constitutive properties of their loci.¹⁴⁴ These examples are presumably

¹⁴¹ See Bandyopadhyay (1988), Kyuma (1997), Woo (2001)

¹⁴² Kyuma (1997) 26

¹⁴³ Woo (2001) 424

¹⁴⁴ Woo (2001) 423

chosen because changes of a single entity or location in temperature and brightness are commonplace phenomena. This model allows properties to be alienable from their substratum, so that a single locus can non-concurrently possess two contradictory properties such as light and dark or heat and cold. Similarly, a thought can non-concurrently possess both *prāmāṇyam* and non-*prāmāṇyam*. As Woo explains:

“When two facts in *sahānavasthānavirodha* ['mutually displacing'] contact each other in a place, the following three progressions occur: 1) They are ready to impede each other's existence in that place; 2) The one with strong causal effectiveness (*arthakriyākāritva*) nullifies the other with less effectiveness; and 3) Only the former can exist while the latter ceases to exist in that place. So, the two facts described in this 'incompatibility' are in a relationship of the impeded and the impeder (*nivartyanivartakabhāva*).”¹⁴⁵

Specifically, two mutually exclusive or opposite properties are merely different when in different loci but in conflict when in the same locus.¹⁴⁶ As Sucarita elaborates, “So, just as a single fire cannot be both cold and hot, in the same way a single thought cannot be both *pramāṇa* and non-*pramāṇa*.”¹⁴⁷ Kyuma's explanation, “While S [mutual displacement] occurs between two opposed facts, e.g., the sensation of heat and that of coldness, P [mutual scope-restriction] stands between a property and its negation, e.g. 'blue' and 'non-blue’”¹⁴⁸ seems to resonate with Sucarita's example.

¹⁴⁵ Woo (2001) 424

¹⁴⁶ See Kyuma (1997) 26

¹⁴⁷ *ataḥ yathā naīkasyâgnehī na śītôṣṇatvam evam jñānasya na pramāṇâpramāṇam iti*

¹⁴⁸ Kyuma (1997) 1019

Section 4: Kumāṛila's logic of inquiry

The above section has provided some resources that can usefully be employed in understanding Kumāṛila's doctrine. A large part of Kumāṛila's discussion in both the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā and the Śloka-vārttika concerns the case of beliefs formed via non-Vedic sources, including beliefs formed on the basis of perception, reasoning and non-Vedic testimony. The following sections will identify a normative protocol for belief adoption and revision that captures the logic of inquiry, initially through a careful examination of Kumāṛila's verse ŚV 2.53 in the Śloka-vārttika. This protocol is especially relevant in the case of non-Vedic beliefs.

Kumāṛila's verse ŚV 2.53 has now been translated as follows:

*ŚV 2.53: Therefore [the hypothesis] that a judgment [is based on] a Good Case deliverance, which has been **ascribed** (prāptā) from the fact of its being a judgment, ...*

*... is **replaced** (apodyate) [only] by a deliverance that the object [of the judgment] is otherwise [than the way it was originally judged] or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed.*

The equivalent verse in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā has been translated as follows:

*TS 2861: So Goodness of Case [being] the essence of an epistemic kind remains the **general operation** (autsargikam) in all cases, [and] it is **replaced** (apodyate) either by a defeating deliverance or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed.*

Each of these two verses presents a two-step procedure, explained either in terms of 'being ascribed' and 'being replaced' or in terms of 'general operation' and 'replacement'. The terminology used in these statements is the normative

terminology associated with generative grammar or exegesis of ritual instructions described above. The ascription is of a capacity for accurate determination which is the essential disposition of an epistemic kind, as discussed in previous chapters.

Kumārila's logic of inquiry will accordingly now be examined in terms of stages of a normative protocol followed by a rational epistemic agent. These stages are the instigating of inquiry, the prolonging of inquiry, and the termination of inquiry.

Kumārila's protocol can be likened, first of all, to Goldman's notion of a doxastic decision principle, or DDP. Goldman explains, "We may represent a DDP as a function whose *inputs* are certain conditions of a cognizer -e.g., his beliefs, perceptual field, and ostensible memories-and whose *outputs* are prescriptions to adopt (or retain) this or that doxastic attitude-e.g., believing *p*, suspending judgment with respect to *p*, or having a particular subjective probability vis-à-vis *p*."¹⁴⁹ Goldman notes that whether a subject is justified in believing depends partly on some unique DDP being correct, but assuming that this is the case, "Then *S* is justified in believing *p* at *t* if and only if the right DDP, when applied to the relevant conditions that characterize *S* at *t*, yields as output the prescription "believe *p*."¹⁵⁰ This notion of a DDP captures a regulative function of justification principles, which Goldman distinguishes from theoretical functions of justification principles.¹⁵¹ Goldman writes, "It may well be suggested that a cognizer is justified in believing something just in case the rules of proper epistemic procedure prescribe that belief. Principles that make such doxastic prescriptions might thereby "double as principles of justification."¹⁵² This would perform a regulative function. By contrast, a theoretical function is served by a theory which "considers an *already formed* belief of a cognizer and says what features are necessary and sufficient for that

¹⁴⁹ Goldman (1980) 29

¹⁵⁰ Goldman (1980) 30

¹⁵¹ Goldman (1980)

¹⁵² Goldman (1980) 27

belief to count as justified."¹⁵³

A pragmatics of inquiry involving three conceptual stages in the process of inquiry will now be identified in Kumāriila's discussion. This stagewise process constitutes a pragmatics of inquiry in the Peircean sense of a belief-habit. As Burks explains, "As a pragmatist Peirce held that a belief is a conscious habit of action ... Peirce calls the activity of resolving genuine doubt and arriving at stable belief-habits inquiry ... Peirce conceived of the three kinds of reasoning (abduction, deduction, and induction) as three stages of inquiry."¹⁵⁴ Kumāriila's belief protocol can similarly be understood in terms of a belief-habit of the agent who seeks to arrive at stable beliefs. Like that of Peirce, Kumāriila's protocol would "lead to the avoidance of all surprise and to the establishment of a habit of positive expectation that shall not be disappointed"¹⁵⁵.

Kumāriila's canvassing of three alternatives to his own view was discussed above. It will be suggested that Kumāriila's critique of the second view serves to buttress his conception of how inquiry is instigated, Kumāriila's critique of the first view serves to buttress his conception of how inquiry is prolonged, and Kumāriila's critique of the third view serves to buttress Kumāriila's conception of how inquiry is terminated.

Section 5: The instigating of inquiry

By rebutting the second view, discussed above, according to which neither epistemic success nor epistemic failure constitute the default intrinsic nature of deliverances, Kumāriila is able to set up a presumption that one or the other is in fact the default intrinsic nature of deliverances. As such, the epistemic agent must also default to accepting one or other status for his judgments.

Kumāriila's own view was that epistemic success must be ascribed to judgments

¹⁵³ Goldman (1980) 29

¹⁵⁴ Burks (1946) 303

¹⁵⁵ CP 5.197 quoted in Burks (1946) 303

by default. As a result, the agent must affirm or deny the propositional content of an awareness, but may not suspend belief as to the truth of a judgment in the way that Śāntarakṣita will advocate. Thus Kumāriila's universe of propositional attitudes for inquiry includes belief, denial, and, as we shall see, genuine doubt, but not suspension of belief. Kumāriila's claim is that the process of inquiry begins with acceptance of propositional content as true, mirroring the psychological fact that we are willing to believe on first impressions.

This claim is supported by employing terminology from the normative disciplines as described above. The notion of a general operation involves the idea of an initial prescription which is rationally justified by its role in instigating a normative process, here the process of inquiry. Similarly, the notion of 'ascription' indicates a first stage in the process of inquiry, subject to later revision.

The first part of the verses under examination, as set out above, run as follows, in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā and the Śloka-vārttika respectively:

*TS 2861ab: So Goodness of Case [being] the essence of an epistemic kind remains the **general operation** (autsargikam) in all cases, ...*

*ŚV 2.53ab: Therefore [the hypothesis] that a judgment [is based on] a Good Case deliverance, which has been **ascribed** (prāptā) from the fact of its being a judgment, ...*

In the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā presentation, Kumāriila clarifies the procedure of a defeasible general operation potentially followed by replacement operation. Kumāriila's use of the term 'ascribed' in the Śloka-vārttika presentation similarly serves to introduce the feature of prāmāṇyam into the epistemic process through an initial operation. As per the discussion of the previous chapter, what is ascribed is a capacity for epistemic success which is a real dispositional property, and by extension epistemic success itself. This attribution involves a transition from

the fact that an awareness has been produced to the fact that this awareness is veridical, i.e. that a belief has been formed which accurately determines its object. Thus the term 'ascribed' introduces a truth-claim which is provisionally attributed on the basis that it would account for the awareness that has arisen.

Such a notion accords well with Charles Peirce's notion of a hypothesis and its role in abductive inference. Peirce tells us:

"By a *hypothesis*, I mean ... any ... supposed truth from which would result such facts as have been observed"¹⁵⁶

Kumārila's term 'prāptā' or 'ascribed' can thus be seen as a way of introducing a claim that functions in the same way as a hypothesis functions for Peirce. Specifically, the fact that p constitutes a hypothesis that would account for the awareness as of p. In the terms of Kumārila's gloss, the fact that a capacity to accurately determine an object has operated constitutes a hypothesis that would account for the awareness as of an accurately determined object.

Further, the structure of Kumārila's argument in the first half of each of the above verses parallels the structure of Peirce's abductive inference. There are numerous interpretative difficulties concerning Peirce's views on abduction, but affinities can be found at a high level. As Fann explains, already in his earlier papers, Peirce considers abduction as an evidencing process, whereby:

"we pass from the observation of certain facts to the supposition of a general principle to account for the facts ... abduction is an inference from a body of data to an explaining hypothesis, or from effect to cause ..."¹⁵⁷

In Kumārila's argument, the idea that an accurate determination has been made and the awareness as of an accurately determined object likewise stand

¹⁵⁶ CP 6.525 quoted in Frankfurt (1958) 596

¹⁵⁷ Fann (1970) 10

in the relation of explaining hypothesis to data and in the relation of effect to cause.

Like Peirce, Kumāriila's use of inference is to move from the explanatory value of the proposition to attributing truth to the proposition. However, Peirce treats abductive inference within the context of scientific discovery, with its multiplicity of observation about each of which many hypotheses can be made. By contrast, Kumāriila applies a similar form of reasoning to the single question of the epistemic status of an occurrent judgment, where only two possible hypotheses are available, that it is accurate or erroneous. In this way, the question of hypothesis construction does not feature. Only the question of hypothesis selection is a live question. At this stage, Kumāriila's discussion is focused on the case on ordinary beliefs rather than beliefs formed on the basis of Vedic scripture.

Frankfurt contrasts the way in which "abduction leads us to adopt hypotheses *as working hypotheses*, as worthy of investigation and verification"¹⁵⁸ with induction, which "leads us to adopt hypotheses *as true* or *as verified*"¹⁵⁹. Abduction thus leads us to hypotheses which, in the expression used by Fann, are adopted 'on probation'. Similarly, Kumāriila's presentation involves assuming the accuracy of any given perceptual, rational or testimonial awareness as a working hypothesis or hypothesis on probation.

Fann adds that abduction is an ampliative form of inference, where the conclusion amplifies rather than explicates what is stated in the premises, and so does not follow from the premises with necessity.¹⁶⁰ As such, it is "the only kind of reasoning that introduces new ideas into our store of reasoning."¹⁶¹ There is an affinity with the way in which "being a source of new information is an important characteristic of *pramāṇa* ... for Kumāriila"¹⁶².

¹⁵⁸ Frankfurt (1958) 595

¹⁵⁹ Frankfurt (1958) 595

¹⁶⁰ See Fann (1970) 7-8

¹⁶¹ Fann (1970) 7-8

¹⁶² Kataoka (2003) 89

Kumārila's idea is thus that the application of the general operation results in rational belief in its propositional content rather than just suspension of belief in that propositional content pending some further determination. As Kataoka notes, such dependence on some further determination is one reading of the 'from something else' position opposed to Kumārila's own 'from itself' position.¹⁶³

In the Śloka-vārttika, Kumārila begins to set out his own view as follows –

ŚV 2.47: It should be understood that the validity of all pramāṇas is independent, for a capacity not existing by itself cannot be produced by something else.

Kumārila's argument for independent validity appears *prima facie* to be the same as the argument of the 'both independent' advocate for the first view of independent validity discussed above¹⁶⁴. That is, both Kumārila's own view and the first view reason from the fact of awareness (bodhakatvam) to prāmāṇyam. However, as described above, the advocate of the first view engaged in forward reasoning from the fact of awareness to a deductively valid conclusion. By contrast, Kumārila's 'ascription' terminology suggests that Kumārila engages in backward reasoning from the fact of awareness to a hypothetical explanation which locates prāmāṇyam as a feature in the awareness, i.e. posits that an accurate determination has been made.

In order to get the process of inquiry started, then, a general rule must be applied, which is to attribute truth to a belief on a basis that purports to be modally necessary due to the metaphysical nature of beliefs. That is, the belief is individuated as a true belief on the assumption that all relevant facts that could compromise the truth of the belief are known. This step can be

¹⁶³ See Kataoka (2011) 63

¹⁶⁴ This point is made in Kataoka (2011) 233-4 fn170 commenting on ŚV 2.34ab: "This view of *svataḥprāmāṇya* is the same as Kumārila's own *siddhānta* in that it takes validity to be ontologically innate to itself."

considered quasi-analytic in nature because truth is analytically entailed when conditions are appropriately normal, i.e. by Good Case deliverances. That is, when the subject's cognitive faculties and the environmental conditions are sufficiently good, then the belief that is formed is guaranteed to be true due to the possession of a causal power which manifests itself under such circumstances. Similarly, Fann explains that abduction "is the only logical operation which introduces any new ideas; for induction does nothing but determine a value, and deduction merely evolves the necessary consequences of a pure hypothesis"¹⁶⁵.

This step yields an intermediate result. The terms 'utsarga' and 'prāptā' in the above verses thus build on their significance in the earlier contexts by suggesting that an apparent awareness should be treated as a working hypothesis. Prakken similarly explains that "a general rational principle people employ is: assume as much as possible that things are normal; under this assumption conclusions can be drawn which have to be retracted only in unusual circumstances."¹⁶⁶

It can now be seen that the strength of Pārthasārathi's interpretation is that it captures how the process of inquiry gets going. We must act as though validity is in fact produced in the case of all awarenesses, whether true or false. As Arnold explains, Pārthasārathi's interpretation is based on "what Uṃveka saw as an unwanted consequence: that all cognitions must be assumed intrinsically to confer prima facie justification."¹⁶⁷ However, whereas for the Pārthasārathi-Arnold reading, this idea is "the whole doctrine of intrinsic validity"¹⁶⁸, in the present interpretation this is considered merely an instigating stage within a larger normative process of inquiry, with further stages to be described next.

¹⁶⁵ CP 5.171, quoted in Fann (1970) 10

¹⁶⁶ Prakken (1997) 67

¹⁶⁷ Arnold (2005) 92

¹⁶⁸ Arnold (2005) 92

Section 6: The prolonging of inquiry

It has been argued in the previous section that Kumāriila's line ŚV 2.53ab involves a Peircean abductive inference to the truth of the belief, that is, to the hypothesis that the occurrent awareness has made an accurate determination. It will now be argued that the second half of the above verse, line ŚV 2.53cd, presents a subsequent stage of inquiry whereby the hypotheses can be replaced by a contrary hypothesis under certain circumstances. Together, the two parts of the verse constitute the protocol for the epistemic agent which capture the logic of belief adoption and revision.

The second part of the verses under examination, as set out above, run as follows, in the Śloka-vārttika and the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā respectively:

*ŚV 2.53cd: [the hypothesis] ... is **replaced** (apodyate) [only] by a deliverance that the object [of the judgment] is otherwise [than the way it was originally judged] or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed.*

*TS 2861cd: [the hypothesis] ... is **replaced** (apodyate) either by a defeating deliverance or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed.*

The Śloka-vārttika verse above explains that replacement is based on (an awareness of) either the object being other than what was originally believed, or the belief forming process having gone wrong in some way. The second possibility is expressed in terms of the causal factors of awareness being defective. The Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā verse similarly explains that replacement is based on a defeater or on the belief forming process having gone wrong in some way. The Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā verse appears to draw a distinction between a defeater and a faulty belief-forming process. However, the Śloka-vārttika clarifies that both are cases involving defeat, as the latter case is one where 'defeat has been

indirectly ascribed¹⁶⁹, and Kamalaśīla also makes the same point.¹⁷⁰

In these verses, Kumāriila presents a process of defeat as causing belief revision, thereby moving forward the process of inquiry. By focusing on the role of the defeating awareness, Kumāriila's protocol involves a notion of mental state defeater. Indeed, Kumāriila provides no independent discussion of propositional defeaters, indicating that his sole concern is to provide a protocol executable from the perspective of the individual knower. Goldman likewise explains that the inputs to a DDP should be current cognitive states rather than states of the world such as truth and falsity. This is because:

“If a DDP is to be actually usable for making deliberate decisions, the conditions that serve as inputs must be accessible or available to the decision-maker at the time of decision.”¹⁷¹

The notion of 'bādha' or 'defeat' is also seen in the ritual interpretation literature. Francavilla explains:

“in case of conflict [between various types of sources] ... the preceding source prevails on the following. This is seen as a case of *bādha*, that is to say, exclusion, which is a general way to organise normative complexity that applies also, for instance, to methods of interpretation.”¹⁷²

Kahrs' identification of a model of substitution as “a well-developed methodological procedure in Pāṇinian grammar and in the ritual Sūtras”¹⁷³ was discussed above. In her discussion of Kahrs' findings, Candotti tentatively concludes that “a substitution model was, by the time of Pāṇini, at the disposal

¹⁶⁹ See ŚV 2.58

¹⁷⁰ See P under TS 2862: “bādhāḥ – arthānyathātvāvadhāraṇaṃ kāraṇa-duṣṭa-jñānaṃ ca”

¹⁷¹ Goldman (1980) 30

¹⁷² Francavilla (2006) 189

¹⁷³ Kahrs (1998) 176

of all schools with an hermeneutic background and aim.”¹⁷⁴ Kumāriila's notion of defeat likewise seems to tie into this idea of substitution derived from the ritual context. Thus Kumāriila writes:

ŚV 2.58: On the other hand, in the case of an awareness that the cause is defective, although a different object is established, defeat is ascribed indirectly, having the same object, like the milk-pail etc.

Jayanta explains this example more fully, as follows:

*'[Water] should be carried [towards the east] using a milk-pail [for the sake] of one who desires cattle' - here, because of the reference to cattle as the desired object, the milk-pail is for the sake of humans, so, even though [they] thus deal with different [things] due to [their being used] for the sake of ritual and for the sake of humans, there is a single effect of the wooden bowl and milk-pail called 'carrying', so when that [carrying water] by the milk-pail is being accomplished, the wooden bowl ceases [to be applicable].*¹⁷⁵

The example concerns a situation where the general form of the ritual is modified by substituting a milk-pail for a wooden bowl. This modification is made to reflect the fact that the patron of the ritual acts from a desire for cattle, i.e. a human purpose, rather than out of a duty to maintain the performance of the ritual, i.e. a ritual purpose. By raising this example, Kumāriila is suggesting that a defeater acts to replace a belief. That an overriding defeater conforms to such a model, by pushing out the old belief, might be evident, but Kumāriila here emphasizes that an undercutting defeater acts in this way, because the original belief is replaced by a belief in the opposite proposition.

¹⁷⁴ Candotti (2012) 35

¹⁷⁵ NM 432: “godohanena paśu-kāmasya praṇayed iti kāmyamāna-paśu-nirdeśāt puruṣārthaṃ godohanam ity evaṃ krtvartha-puruṣārthatayā bhinna-ṣayatve 'pi camasa-godohanayoḥ praṇayanākyaṃ kāryam ekam iti godohanena nirvṛtte tasmimś camaso nivartate|”

As Kahrs explains, one mode of substitution is 'ceasing', as for example, "when one says 'Bitter herb medicine in the case of phlegm', one means that the phlegm is removed when the medicine is taken"¹⁷⁶. In a similar way, for Kumāriila, defeat of a belief involves ceasing to ascribe a positive epistemic status to a belief not through mere cancellation of that status, but by substituting an opposed status. In terms of the feature-placing model discussed above, whereby conflicting features may alternately be posited of a single substratum, Kumāriila's conception seems to be that defeat can only occur when one feature is substituted for another at a later point in time. Kumāriila's term 'defeat' (bādh-) thus constitutes something like an antonym for his term 'ascribe' (prāp-). In Kahrs' description of the substitution model in grammar, "stages in the linguistic derivational process are accounted for by saying 'Y occurs in the place of X' as opposed to 'X becomes Y'."¹⁷⁷ Similarly, in Kumāriila's epistemology, an ascription of positive epistemic status can be overturned not by mere cancellation but only by a positive act of substitution for an alternative epistemic status. This again connects with Kumāriila's endorsement of negation as difference and conflict rather than absence.

In the modern context, Claudia Blöser traces the notion of defeasibility back to an article, 'The Ascription of Responsibility and Rights' by H.L.A Hart. There Hart notes that "it is usually not possible to define a legal concept such as "trespass" or "contract" by specifying the necessary and sufficient conditions for its application."¹⁷⁸ For such legal concepts, the word 'unless' is indispensable, as it indicates how a contract, for example, can be defeated, even when the ordinarily sufficient conditions have been satisfied.¹⁷⁹ Hart explains that he will "borrow and extend"¹⁸⁰ the word 'defeasible', which was previously being "used of a legal interest in property which is subject to termination or 'defeat' in a number of different contingencies but remains intact if no such contingencies

¹⁷⁶ Kahrs (1998) 249

¹⁷⁷ Kahrs (1998) 176

¹⁷⁸ Hart (1949) 174

¹⁷⁹ See Hart (1949) 174-175

¹⁸⁰ Hart (1949) 175

mature.”¹⁸¹ Hart thus identifies such concepts as both ascriptive, such that they “ascribe responsibility for actions”¹⁸² and defeasible. Fascinatingly, as Blöser explains, Hart “identifies a defeasible structure ... also for concepts traditionally designated as “mental elements” in criminal law, such as *mens rea*, intentionality or voluntariness”¹⁸³. Hart explains that, although jurists have striven to identify some positive definition of such concepts, nevertheless, their content is in fact given by the absence of any defeater. Hart writes:

“the word “voluntary” in fact serves to exclude a heterogeneous range of cases such as physical compulsion, coercion by threats, accidents, mistakes, etc., and not to designate a mental element or state ; nor does “involuntary” signify the absence of this mental element or state.”¹⁸⁴

Hart's notion of ascription seems to parallel that of Kumāriḷa, in as much as to ascribe *prāmāṇyam* is to make a normative judgment that appropriately normal causal conditions are responsible for the arising of a belief. Further, Hart's defeasible structure parallels that of Kumāriḷa, inasmuch as Kumāriḷa's stipulation involves the idea that the end of inquiry results in *prāmāṇyam* being ascribed not on the basis of some positive definition. Rather, what Hart says about certain legal concepts, that “in order to determine ... how their presence and absence are established it is necessary to refer back to the various defences [i.e. possible defeaters]”¹⁸⁵ can also be said about Kumāriḷa's notion of *prāmāṇyam*.

This also ties in with a pattern of ritual structure where an action is to be performed in cases where no stated exception holds. Kahrs analyses passage 24.8 from the *paribhāṣā* section of the pre-common era text the Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra as an example of general case and exceptions and summarizes its structure and purport as follows:

¹⁸¹ Hart (1949) 175, also quoted in Blöser (2013) 131

¹⁸² Hart (1949) 171

¹⁸³ Blöser (2013) 132

¹⁸⁴ Hart (1949) 180, also quoted in Blöser (2013) 132

¹⁸⁵ Hart (1949) 181

“the default case is that one sacrifices on the Āhavanīya fire;
 unless there is a specific instruction, the sacrifice must be made by the
 Adhvaryu priest;
 unless there is a specific instruction, the sacrifice must be made by
 means of a Sruc ladle;
 unless there is a specific instruction, the sacrifice must be made only
 after the fire has received the kindling.
 Otherwise a specific instruction (*ādeśa*) would tell you to substitute that
 for the general instruction.”¹⁸⁶

In this passage, there is no positive specification of sufficient conditions for sacrificing on the Āhavanīya fire. Rather, such an instruction obtains in the absence of a specific exclusion. Similarly *mens rea* in Hart's analysis, and *prāmāṇyam* in Kumārila's analysis, are both ascribed, to the defendant and to the judgment respectively, in the absence of a contrary instruction.

From this beginning, defeasibility has come to feature in epistemology and other areas of philosophy. Similarly in the Indian context, it appears that Kumārila makes a parallel move by transferring a notion from the context of legal and ritual interpretation and generative grammar into epistemology. Indeed, this should be unsurprising given the position of Mīmāṃsā as a theoretical resource for legal reasoning in classical India.¹⁸⁷ Thus both Mīmāṃsā reasoning functioning in the context of legal and ritual interpretation in classical India, as well as contemporary legal reasoning, involve forms of defeasible, case-based reasoning or informal logic. As such, it should not be a surprise that Kumārila here presents a reasoning strategy which does not conform to a deductively valid schema but rather to a defeasible, informal logic which has much in common with contemporary legal reasoning.

In contemporary epistemology, the notion of a defeater seems to have been

¹⁸⁶ Kahrs (1998) 183; the quoted sentence has been broken out onto separate lines for clarity

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Sarkar (1909), Lingat (1973), Francavilla (2006)

developed in the context of literature on “defeasibility conditions”, which represented one response to the Gettier problem, according to which knowledge was analysed as undefeated justified true belief.¹⁸⁸ As Shope explains, “Certain modifications of a standard analysis of knowing involve what are commonly called “defeasibility conditions,” but there is no agreement about the definition of that technical label.”¹⁸⁹ In the literature, defeat is considered to apply to the justification for a belief or to the reason for holding the belief, rather than to the belief itself. Michael Bergmann distinguishes between “propositional’ defeaters (which are propositions) and ‘mental state’ defeaters (which are either propositional attitudes or experiences or combinations thereof).”¹⁹⁰ According to Bergmann, in a defeasibility account of knowledge, “the mere truth of [a defeater for a belief] prevents [that belief] from counting as knowledge.”¹⁹¹ By contrast, a mental state defeater is internal to the believer and is constituted by whatever would cause a belief to be justified.¹⁹² Moving between the two notions of defeat corresponding to these two types of defeater, Goldman explains that “an indefeasibility theory would say that S’s justification j for believing that p is defeated if and only if there is some true proposition q such that the conjunction of q and j does not justify S in believing that p. In slightly different terms, S’s justification j is defeated just in case p would no longer be evident for S if q were evident for S.”¹⁹³

Arnold importantly observes that defeat is just by another cognition and not by some special falsifying cognition.¹⁹⁴ The conclusion drawn from this by Arnold is that there is no more to the process of one cognition overriding another than what is phenomenologically given. Characterizing defeat in terms of overriding rather than undercutting, Arnold writes: “a cognition can present itself as falsifying a previous one just insofar as it is the subsequent one that seems more credible. And if that is not how it seems, then it will not appear,

¹⁸⁸ See Shope (1983) 45-74 for a survey of the literature on defeasibility in the context of additions to the JTB analysis of knowledge.

¹⁸⁹ Shope (1983) 45

¹⁹⁰ Bergmann (2005) 422; see also Bergmann (2006) 154-159

¹⁹¹ Bergmann (2005) 422

¹⁹² See Bergmann (2005) 422

¹⁹³ Goldman (1976) 774

¹⁹⁴ See Arnold (2005) 73

phenomenologically, as an overriding cognition!"¹⁹⁵

The above verse links the objective fact that the belief formation process was flawed with the psychological fact that the belief is destabilized. Kumāriila's notion of flaw again suggests that the belief process and thus the epistemic status of the belief produced can be normatively evaluated. Further, this normatively evaluable status is linked with the psychological process of destabilization of beliefs in a way that allows the subject to move away from a normatively sub-optimal situation. Specifically, Kumāriila's account involves two bases for belief revision. Firstly, further inspection may show the nature of a distal object to be something other than what was initially believed. Here, Kumāriila recognizes the Peircean point that beliefs can be revised based on a "return to the *object* of their disquiet, namely the particular thing not known."¹⁹⁶ Secondly, Kumāriila provides an alternative non-Peircean method of belief revision, whereby instead of returning to the distal object, one re-considers the circumstances of belief formation. If these are sub-optimal, this fact will destabilize the settled belief which was formed under such circumstances.

This distinction between two types of defeaters roughly corresponds to the distinction between overriding and undercutting defeaters in contemporary epistemology. As Janvid explains, "[a]n overriding defeater to a knowledge-claim P provides justification for non-P, while an undermining defeater to P defeats the justification provided for P. In the latter case, no justification has thereby been provided for non-P."¹⁹⁷ Janvid provides the example of a printed flight itinerary, where an overriding defeater may be contrary information on the airport departure board, and an undermining defeater might be the discovery of a misprint in the itinerary.¹⁹⁸ However, whereas Janvid clarifies that defeat occurs only when "the evidence for non-P is stronger than the evidence for P"¹⁹⁹, so, in the airport example, presumably the departure board

¹⁹⁵ Arnold (2005) 73

¹⁹⁶ Wiggins (2004) 94

¹⁹⁷ Janvid (2008) 47

¹⁹⁸ See Janvid (2008) 47

¹⁹⁹ See Janvid (2008) 47

information is presumed to have greater authority than a printed itinerary, Kumāriila does not make this feature of defeat explicit.

The previous chapter presented an operational disjunction between *pramāṇa* and non-*pramāṇa*, whereby the former functions independently whereas the latter functions dependently and thereby ceases. It can now be seen that non-*pramāṇa* ceases when undercutting and overriding defeaters effect the removal of bad features. The undercutting defeater removes the bad feature by identifying its presence in the process of belief formation, whereas the overriding defeater removes the bad feature despite not specifically identifying it in the cause. In one case, the vitiating is apprehended, and in the other case, the vitiating is supplanted. By contrast, the functioning of a *pramāṇa* in apprehending a distal object does not depend on any separable feature, but is simply due to the nature of awareness itself. As such, nothing can cause the apprehension of a distal object by a *pramāṇa* to cease.

In order to understand better the significance of the defeat process, Kumāriila's discussion in the *Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā* will now be examined. This constitutes a "more refined and sophisticated"²⁰⁰ discussion than that in the *Śloka-vārttika*, and a close reading of a core section of this text will illuminate the role of defeat in this belief protocol. Kumāriila starts by linking replacement with the arising of a mental state defeater in the ordinary process of belief formation as indicated. Kumāriila writes:

TS 2865: The mental state defeater is just the determination that the object is different [from how it was originally cognized]. It excludes the earlier deliverance because it has a success of deliverances that is independent.

Kumāriila next considers the status of the revised belief that has replaced an original belief:

²⁰⁰ Kataoka (2011) 46

TS 2866: Although in respect of those [defeaters] there may again be dependence on replacement operation, in some cases, nevertheless, for a person who has developed a genuine doubt due to the earlier awareness, that [dependence] however will easily come to an end.

The first part of this verse characterizes the possibility of repeated defeat in terms of dependence on replacement operation.

The second part of this verse allows for the entertainment of doubt, so that the universe of propositional attitudes includes scope for doubting one's occurrent awarenesses and determinations. Kumāriila is here considering the case of an either/ or situation, where defeat of one possibility has nevertheless caused some element of residual doubt, as clarified in the next verse. Kumāriila recognizes that a believer may entertain a legitimate doubt even when her current phenomenological awareness is unproblematic, as in this case when she wonders if she was right to revise her belief. The acknowledgement that the believer can exercise such doubt, so that the possibility of defeat can be entertained in respect of an awareness that is as yet phenomenologically secure, seems to tell against Arnold's reading, whereby phenomenological security is the entire basis for epistemic justification and for Arnold's conception of truth. Rather, what is provided by the belief is not theoretical justification but Goldman's regulatory justification, merely justifying the holding of that belief at the relevant stage of inquiry.

Kumāriila's paradigm inquirer in the above verse is the person who has a genuine doubt. By linking the process of inquiry with the possession of genuine doubt, Kumāriila endorses a belief-doubt model of a general type found by Isaac Levi in the work of the great American pragmatists, Charles Peirce, John Dewey and William James. In his book, 'Pragmatism and Inquiry', Levi discusses how these thinkers characterized epistemology in terms of problem-solving inquiry. Levi explains:

“Inquiry according to Peirce is a struggle to replace doubt by true belief. As such, inquiry calls for a transformation of one state of belief (a state of suspense or doubt in some respect) to a state where the doubt is alleviated.”²⁰¹

A similar transformation is discernible in the above verse, where the doubter is able to allay her doubt. Kumāriila also links such doubt with the idea that replacement is dependent, thereby accepting that the first stage of belief revision cannot be guaranteed to bring the process of inquiry to an end. Thus Kumāriila next explains how a misleading defeater can in turn be defeated if and when the subject comes to form further beliefs, leaving her original belief intact:

*TS 2867: If another defeater of this [second belief], being further sought for, is produced, then by the defeat of the middle [second] belief, the first alone has prāmāṇyam.*²⁰²

Thus, as described above, the process of inquiry may continue to toggle between two opposed beliefs, each supplanting the other through replacement, acting as a mental state defeater of the other. We can again compare with the grammatical context, where some exceptions themselves have exceptions which restore the original rule.²⁰³ The case of a fine on a breadwinner in a legal context was also discussed above as involving an exception to an exception. Kumāriila's protocol for belief change can be depicted as follows, where token deliverances from epistemic sources are represented on the left hand side. In the case of an overriding defeater:

$$\begin{array}{l} p \rightarrow B(p) \\ \neg p \rightarrow B(\neg p) \\ p \rightarrow B(p) \\ \neg p \rightarrow B(\neg p) \text{ etc.} \end{array}$$

²⁰¹ Levi (2012) 1

²⁰² See ŚV 2.59 for the equivalent verse in the Śloka-vārttika

²⁰³ See Joshi and Roodbergen (1969) 26-27

This schema is based on a toggle model, as per verse TS 2867 above, in which the difference between not believing p and believing that not- p is disregarded. Successive lines show temporally successive changes in belief in response to successive changes in deliverances. In the case of an undercutting defeater, the dependence on appropriately normal epistemic conditions, which can be represented as $p|q$, becomes explicit, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p|q &\rightarrow B(p) \\ \neg q &\rightarrow \neg B(p) \end{aligned}$$

However, in the continued absence of a defeater, we have no motive to disbelieve the proposition. Kumāriila writes:

TS 2868: And if, when it has been correctly sought by appropriate effort, a defeater of the defeater would not be known as it has no basis, ...

*TS 2869: ... then due to [the defeater's] **greater strength** (balīyasā), because it has not been cancelled, the first [belief] will be blocked by [the defeater], [and] the prāmāṇyam of that [first belief] will be cancelled.*

Kumāriila here clarifies that seeking for a potential defeater plays a role in allaying doubt, and mandates the agent to seek out a defeater, in this case one that might defeat the first defeater. This notion of defeat has roots in the interpretative techniques of Mīmāṃsā²⁰⁴, and it was discussed in great detail by Jayanta.²⁰⁵ As Sarkar explains, in one type of defeat, “where two contradictory texts or contradictory matters are both of equal force, there only is contradiction proper (Virodha). But if one of them possesses greater force than the other, then the former supersedes the latter, and this is called Bâdha.”²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴ See Sarkar (1909) 213-220 for details

²⁰⁵ See NM 452 ff.

²⁰⁶ Sarkar (1909) 219

Arnold's description of *prima facie* justification presented the mere fact of awareness as sufficient for a robust truth-claim. Arnold rightly observes that "justification regarding the truth of beliefs is all that we get here in this sublunary world"²⁰⁷ and goes on to say that "[i]t is precisely the point of Pārthasārathi's interpretation ... that one cannot know anything more about the truth of one's belief than one already knows in being justified."²⁰⁸ Whilst the Pārthasārathi-Arnold reading eloquently acknowledges that justification is the only means to approach truth, by holding that Kumārila's "epistemological claim thus turns on a basically phenomenological point about how cognitions appear"²⁰⁹, it fails to capitalize on the additional resources in Kumārila's presentation, which demonstrate that justification is not an all-or-nothing matter. Rather, justification can be strengthened over time, and indeed Kumārila advises that appropriate effort must be made in order to achieve such strengthening. Thus acquiring sufficient justification is a purposive and goal-oriented activity by the agent.

Further, Kumārila here also claims that defeat is due to the greater strength of the defeater. The notion of relative strength is again one with roots in ritual and grammar, where the rule 'the replacement operation is stronger than the default case'²¹⁰ occurs in the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra. Discussing this, Renou writes that "la maxime ... reparaît dans la grammaire et indirectement dans les Mī. Sū."²¹¹

This terminology implies that the agent moves from a weaker epistemic position to a stronger one. Kumārila presents us with a hierarchy of justification, whereby stronger awarenesses replaces weaker ones. Kumārila also allies the sensation of doubt with the idea that one's level of justification can be appraised as strong or weak, and the idea that this can provide a motive to continue with inquiry. This indicates that mere phenomenal appearance is

²⁰⁷ Arnold (2005) 97

²⁰⁸ Arnold (2005) 107

²⁰⁹ Arnold (2005) 96

²¹⁰ 'prasaṅgād apavādo balīyan'

²¹¹ Renou (1941) 121

not sufficient for the removal of genuine doubt. Rather, Kumāriila's process of inquiry is a hysteresis process, whereby the present epistemic state of the agent is a function of his past history of inquiry. Thus, the fact that it appears to the agent as if x is the case does not by itself indicate whether or not the agent is justified in that judgment. Rather, this turns on whether this judgment does or does not represent the (pragmatically determined) end of inquiry.

Kumāriila's notion of strengthening justification has an affinity with a discussion about strengthening justification in contemporary epistemology. Janvid describes how epistemic contextualism is associated with a "rising standards of justification model"²¹² which involves the idea "that challenging a knowledge-claim always raises the original standards of justification"²¹³. Janvid makes a similar point about how the notion of strengthening involves an external standard, writing that "the metric of strength itself, where the marks of correctness are placed, constitutes an invariant feature of the dialectic of justification. (The standards could not be classified as higher or lower otherwise)."²¹⁴

As we have seen, even a belief that has been revised may be susceptible to future revision. Thus Kumāriila seeks to bring the process of doubting and also the possibility of defeat to an end by distinguishing between genuine doubt and spurious conjecture. Kumāriila writes:

TS 2870: Thus the inquirer does not go beyond the third judgment, and so a further defeater is not suspected as no defeater has arisen.

Kumāriila here affirms a link between the psychological sensation of 'suspecting a defeater', i.e. having doubt about one's current beliefs, and the process of inquiry which involves the search for a defeater. By telling us that at a certain stage of inquiry, a defeater is no longer suspected, Kumāriila again implies that one may entertain doubts about one's currently phenomenologically secure

²¹² Janvid (2008) 46

²¹³ Janvid (2008) 45

²¹⁴ Janvid (2008) 46

beliefs up to a point.

Kumārila here articulates another element of what was characterized above as a belief-doubt model, whereby one only needs to change one's belief if there are grounds for suspicion of a possible defeater. Thus Levi explains, "Peirce, as I understand and admire him, was a fan of the principle of *doxastic inertia* according to which there is no need to justify current beliefs (i.e. doxastic commitments) but only *changes* in belief (doxastic commitments)"²¹⁵

Kumārila next writes:

TS 2871: For he who, having a doubting nature in all his everyday activities, conjectures [a defeater] through delusion even when no defeater has arisen will perish.

*TS 2872: And so being a compulsive doubter is censured by Vāsudeva – "O, Kaunteya, neither this world nor the next is for a compulsive doubter."*²¹⁶

In contrast to the paradigm inquirer discussed above, the person who has developed a genuine doubt ('jātāśaṅka'), Kumārila now depicts the case of a compulsive doubter ('saṁśayātmā') whose doubt amounts to mere conjecture ('utprekṣā'). This contrast also has an equivalent in the pragmatist literature. As Levi explains, for the American pragmatists, "justification for changes in belief ought to be grounded in the methods and information currently free of living doubt."²¹⁷ Burks explains that Peirce:

"held that genuine doubt comes about when an actually functioning habit is interrupted ... Once a belief-habit is interrupted the aim is to arrive at a new belief-habit which will prove to be stable, that is, one that would
"lead to the avoidance of all surprise and to the establishment of a habit

²¹⁵ Levi (2012) 32

²¹⁶ Here Kumārila quotes a variant on line 4.40cd from the Bhagavad Gītā

²¹⁷ Levi (2012) 5

of positive expectation that shall not be disappointed" (5.197). Peirce calls the activity of resolving genuine doubt and arriving at stable belief-habits inquiry."²¹⁸

Kumārila expresses a similar thought in the Śloka-vārttika as follows:

ŚV 2.60cd: But when awareness of a bad feature has not arisen, [there can be] no doubt which is not based on some successful deliverance.

Kumārila's distinction between doubt which is and is not based on a successful deliverance corresponds to the distinction between a living doubt and a mere paper doubt, and this distinction plays a similar role in determining the extent of legitimate inquiry.

A consideration of uberty is also discernible in these verses. As Fann explains, the term 'uberty' is used by Peirce to denote the 'value in productiveness' of adopting a hypothesis.²¹⁹ That is, uberty refers to something like fruitfulness in generating new ideas or new content. Uberty contrasts with security, which is the 'approach to certainty' made by the hypothesis. Fann explains that "from deduction to induction and to abduction the security decreases greatly, while the uberty increases greatly."²²⁰ Kumārila's stark warnings against excessive doubt seem likewise to advert to the fact that failure to invest sufficient confidence in one's beliefs would not be a productive attitude.

Kumārila next presents a series of verses which, according to Kamalaśīla, answer the question 'how much replacement is possible and where?'.²²¹ Kamalaśīla's introduction indicates that a replacement operation can only occur in limited situations, conforming to the model of 'erasing the excess' described above. Kamalaśīla's use of such terminology also suggests that Kamalaśīla may

²¹⁸ Burks (1946) 303

²¹⁹ See Fann (1970) 8; see CP 8.384 for Peirce's original presentation

²²⁰ Fann (1970) 8

²²¹ See P above TS 2875: "kutra kiyān apavādaḥ sambhāvya ity etad darśayann āha"

be alive to the operational aspect of Kumāriila's epistemology in a way that much later thinkers such as Pārthasārathi may not be.

Kumāriila begins by stating:

TS 2875: Due to meeting with variations in place, time, person, [and] state, the seeker of defeaters determines those [beliefs] which are dependent in whichever respect.

Kumāriila here again acknowledges a requirement to seek for defeaters, but restricts this requirement by indexing it to these four parameters. The process of inquiry thus displays a tendency to return to a stable trajectory which is a feature of a homeorhetic mechanism. Specifically, the stable trajectory to which the agent aims as an ideal is the continual formation of correct judgments, and the agent veers away from this trajectory through the formation of erroneous judgments. However, by the very fact of forming erroneous judgments, the agent strengthens the tendency for those beliefs to be defeated by subsequent judgments, thus returning her to the stable trajectory of true judgments.

An example is now provided of something seen far away, which may be suspected to be something other than what it is, "just until one has come close."²²² It appears Kumāriila intends this as a case of 'time', where error is resolved with passage of time. Kumāriila here connects the disquiet produced by doubt with a perceived need to return to the distal object. Kumāriila next states:

TS 2877: [Entertaining the possibility of] replacement operation (apavāda) terminates in respect of time, man and state, and the possibility [of replacement] is not entertained other than in regard to

²²² TS 2876d

[those things], like an awareness of a mirage etc.

Kumārila here restates the three cases, time, man and state, but now adds that doubt terminates in each of the three cases.²²³ Kumārila goes on to illustrate each of these cases and its termination in the next three verses. In the first case:

TS 2878: Where there is error or ascertainment such as a doubt about being a cow or a horse at a time of great darkness, in that case, [inquiry] terminates when [the object] is manifested.

The idea seems to be that error is here caused by a lack of appropriately normal conditions for belief formation, such as insufficient light. This constitutes a case of time in that the error is 'terminated' when epistemic conditions revert to normal, e.g. more light is provided, the agent moves closer to the object etc. By indexing error to conditions which are transient, the scope for error is restricted in time, and the case is termed one of 'time'.

Secondly:

TS 2879: In cases of confusion about the moon [or about] direction, the letters and accents of the Vedas etc., [there is] a determination to the contrary due to asking another person.

Here, error is indexed to conditions which are localized to a single individual, and the case is termed one of 'person'. Error is here terminated by deferring to the testimony of another person. This example also seems to indicate that what is at stake is objective truth rather than subjective certitude. However, deferring to the judgment of another is preferred over a return to the object itself.

Finally, Kumārila writes:

²²³ The case of 'place' is perhaps unintentionally missed

TS 2880: In the case of a bad judgment due to senses impaired by passion, aversion, intoxication, madness, hunger, thirst etc., [then] in the absence of those, there is awareness of an object to the contrary.

Kumārila here recognizes that error can be indexed to features of the agent's internal state. Error terminates when such features are not present. However, it is not clear why termination of states such as hunger and thirst would not constitute a case of 'time', and it is also not clear that states such as madness need terminate at all. Kumārila's expression 'in the absence of those' may indicate that beliefs must be formed by an agent with an optimal state, and that we should simply give up on mad agents.

Sosa similarly considers the difference between Mr. Magoo, who is "extremely nearsighted but totally unaware of his condition"²²⁴ and an ordinary myopic, who is "well aware of his limits"²²⁵. Sosa writes:

"The big difference between Magoo and the ordinary myopic is a difference in self-knowledge with a corresponding difference in self-imposed limits for the use of one's eyes. The ordinary myopic and Magoo are equally deficient beyond arm's length, but the former knows his limits and proceeds accordingly."²²⁶

Kumārila's discussion suggests that error arises when the agent acts like Mr. Magoo, not imposing appropriate limits for making judgements. However, importantly, Kumārila's solution is not to hold the agent epistemically blameworthy for his beliefs. Rather, acting like Mr. Magoo can be consistent with Kumārila's protocol, as improperly formed beliefs will in due course be defeated. In this way, like Mr. Magoo, Kumārila's agent will find that every problematic situation ultimately rights itself.

²²⁴ Sosa (1991) 286

²²⁵ Sosa (1991) 286

²²⁶ Sosa (1991) 286

Section 7: Metarules for prolonging inquiry

Kumārila's doctrine has been characterized above as a logic of inquiry, based on a multi-stage process. This suggestion is supported by consideration of Kumārila's critique of the first view, discussed above. Kumārila's objection 'due to conflict' seems to understand the first view in terms of a dual exhortation addressed to the believer to ascribe both *prāmāṇyam* and non-*prāmāṇyam* to beliefs. The surface contradiction is analogous to that between conflicting Vedic normative statements, and Kumārila brings the pre-existing interpretative apparatus to bear on this problem. Francavilla describes a variety of interpretative techniques devised to resolve contradiction, including the following technique described by Kumārila in his *Tantra-Vārttika*:

“it is just possible that the suspected contradiction could be explained and set aside ... even when they do treat of the same subject, as there would be no contradiction, if one could be explained as a General Injunction, and the other as the prohibition of a particular phase of it”²²⁷

Francavilla distinguishes between two well-known types of negation, *paryudāsa*, which is “a restricted or qualified prohibition that must be considered an exception”²²⁸ and *pratiṣedha*, which is “a general prohibition of what is first prescribed”.²²⁹ These were also discussed above with reference to the ritual injunctions 'he shall not look' and 'he shall not eat'. Francavilla explains that the above type of resolution “occurs when there is a conflict between a positive injunction and a negative one ... interpreters could solve apparent conflict by showing that the negative injunction is a *paryudāsa*.”²³⁰ Kumārila thus seems to set up the first view in order to present his own view as emerging from a

²²⁷ *Tantra Vārttika* 1.3.2, quoted in translation from Francavilla (2006) 185-186

²²⁸ Francavilla (2006) 186

²²⁹ Francavilla (2006) 186

²³⁰ Francavilla (2006) 186

resolution of the apparent conflict between exhortations concerning what to believe. This resolution is effected by organizing our belief process in terms of a general rule to form beliefs followed by specific exceptions constituted by cases of subsequent defeat.

Similarly, Francavilla explains that “[t]he Sanskrit term for conflict is *virodha*. This term has a wide semantic scope and is suitable to denote any kind of conflict ... the conflict between normative sentences is connected to the conflict between the actions they lay down as dutiful.”²³¹ Francavilla describes how the mass of apparent contradictions between different Vedic statements led the Mīmāṃsā thinkers to develop principles of interpretation to resolve such conflict.²³² A similar motivation is evident in the contemporary development of similar legal principles. As Prakken explains:

“Regulations come into being and cease to exist in complex ways ... all this can easily give rise to inconsistencies, involving different authorities at different times in different places ... lawyers have developed ways of anticipating such conflicts based on the same structural features of legal systems by which the conflicts are caused.”²³³

The problem faced by both versions of the first view described above is that they provide no basis on which the agent can prolong inquiry. It is not coherent to entertain both belief and disbelief with respect to a single proposition, and it is not helpful to know that some propositions are true and others false if there is no further instruction as to which epistemic status is where. Consideration of this view helps to motivate Kumāriila's idea that the logic of inquiry requires specification in terms of a multi-stage process rather than a single instruction. This is because no feature of the awareness itself which is accessible to the subject is sufficient to identify it as accurate.

Uṃveka makes this point very clear in a separate discussion of another

²³¹ Francavilla (2006) 181

²³² See Francavilla (2006) 177-204

²³³ Prakken (1997) 67

proposed view. Uṃveka describes this view as follows:

*"Prāmāṇyam is not merely the nature of awareness; that deviates; rather, a pramāṇa has a cognitive distinguishing feature which [provides] the absence of doubt – 'this is a hand'."*²³⁴

This view acknowledges the difficulty of forming accurate beliefs, but attempts to find some special accessible feature by which one would know it as accurate. However, Uṃveka considers and rejects various candidate features that would satisfy such a condition, viz. clarity, lacking shakiness, or lack of invalidating cognition.²³⁵

Kumārila's protocol also displays an affinity with the contemporary legal principle of '*Lex Specialis Derogat Legi Generali*'. Prakken describes this as a type of legal collision rule, provided to deal with "conflicts between norms"²³⁶. Prakken explains that "[t]he general idea is, instead of introducing a new operator into the language of a logical system, to augment an existing logical system with a metaprinciple to restore consistency if a contradiction has been derived."²³⁷ Kumārila's rule that a stronger belief defeats a weaker belief constitutes a collision rule which acts as a metarule to the rule to form beliefs.

Kumārila's protocol thus seems to constitute a metarule exhorting the agent to form beliefs, together with a metarule on that metarule to the effect that a replacement operation is stronger than the general operation. In this way, the problem of epistemic fallibility becomes a short-term problem. The individuating role of svabhāva is compromised by the existence of bad beliefs

²³⁴ TṬ 50: "nanu na bodhâtmakatva-mâtraṃ prāmāṇyam; tad vyabharati; nirvicikitsas tu bodha-viśeṣaḥ pramāṇam – hasto 'yam iti"

²³⁵ Jayanta also provides a discussion which is very similar to that of Uṃveka. However, note that Kumārila also claims that there is a distinguishing feature present in waking awarenesses that distinguishes them from dream-state awarenesses in Sloka-varttika 5.28ab: "jāgra-jñāne viśeṣo 'yaṃ supariniścayaḥ". This claim occurs in the Nirālambanavāda discussion and requires further investigation.

²³⁶ Prakken (1997) 204

²³⁷ Prakken (1997) 44

which are subjectively indiscriminable. However, this compromised status proves to be a temporary phenomenon, because further information is available at a later time which will defeat these beliefs. In this way, the postulated correct apprehension is able to play the role of individuating beliefs, and subsequent lack of defeat confirms the correctness of the apprehension.

Doniger similarly explains in the context of a general Indian theoretical model:

"A metarule on metarules states that the distinctiveness of the particular overrides the general application of the metarule. Thus, 'A specific injunction is stronger than a general one.' Manu, like the Vedic texts it so faithfully follows in this, posits a few general principles and then a host of exceptions."²³⁸

Kumārila's protocol can be expressed in the single operational instruction "Believe beliefs!" although it falls into two theoretical stages. The first stage involves postulation of the capacity in a belief in virtue of which it would be a good belief.²³⁹ That is, when forming a belief, we should assume that the belief has apprehended its object. The second stage involves forming further beliefs. In cases where the belief was incorrectly postulated, the belief will be defeated.

There is again a parallel with the case of ritual, where as McClymond explains, "if certain life difficulties arise, a householder may suspect that his sacrificial fires have become ritually useless ... In response he can reestablish the ritual fires, starting afresh to correct the problem."²⁴⁰ McClymond explains that problems can also occur when sacrificial utensils are manipulated improperly²⁴¹, mirroring the case where the epistemic faculties are manipulated improperly in receiving a deliverance.

Does the agent thus exercise his epistemic duty simply by continuing to form

²³⁸ Doniger (1991) iv; also quoted in part in Francavilla (2006) 187

²³⁹ See TS 2839

²⁴⁰ McClymond (2012) 197

²⁴¹ See McClymond (2012) 197

beliefs, or is there any specific epistemic responsibility for the avoidance of error? Does the agent fall short in his duty given that in some cases the general operation will yield to a subsequent replacement operation, and thus some beliefs will turn out to be false? The semantic connection between the term *apavāda* and the term '*āpaddharma*' may suggest so. In the *Mahābhārata*, the term *apavāda* is used in the context of describing *āpaddharma* or deviation from ethical norms in times of difficulty. In circumstances of distress, a suspension of ethical norms is mandated which is to be rectified at a later time when conditions become normal. In the story of Viśvamitra and the dog cooker, Viśvamitra chooses to steal and eat dog meat in order to avoid starvation, thereby transgressing ethical norms ordinarily applicable to him as a Brahmin.²⁴² Similarly, forming incorrect judgments would constitute an *āpaddharma*, that is, a sanctioned activity in epistemically sub-optimal conditions.

Nevertheless, that the agent remains epistemically blameless is suggested by a *Mīmāṃsā* discussion which considers an individual who follows the general rule without specific regard to the problem of exceptions. As Sarkar explains, "is a violation of an exception also to be visited with a penance? Some [*Mīmāṃsā* writers] answer, no. Because to observe an exception is by itself no duty."²⁴³ Sarkar provides the example of a man who performs a mandated ritual, but during the night, contrary to a stipulated time restriction. "The effect is that he gets no benefit from the performance of the *Srādh* [ritual]. But he commits no positive sin."²⁴⁴ One can extrapolate from this the idea that to form an erroneous belief, by initially failing to observe the exception mandated by the replacement operation, involves neither epistemic praise nor blame.

²⁴² See the *āpaddharma-parvan* in *Mahābhārata* Book 12 (*Śānti-Parvan*)

²⁴³ See Sarkar (1909) 333

²⁴⁴ See Sarkar (1909) 333-334 (page 334 is misnumbered as 234)

Section 8: The terminating of inquiry

In the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā, Kumāriḷa argues for a 'limit' or 'termination' (avadhi) to entertaining the possibility of defeat, i.e. to further inquiry concerning the truth of any existing belief.²⁴⁵ Kumāriḷa indexes error to specific circumstances, so that entertaining this possibility comes to an end when the specified conditions are found not to obtain. Kumāriḷa also places this limit within the context of the process of inquiry, where it constitutes an end of inquiry, or an end to the epistemic process. In the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā, as described above, Kumāriḷa writes:

TS 2870: Thus the inquirer does not go beyond the third judgment, and so a further defeater is not suspected as no defeater has arisen.

Similarly, in the Śloka-vārttika, Kumāriḷa tells us:

ŚV 2.61: "In this way, when three or four judgments have been produced, no more judgments are required. Just in this case one [judgment] enjoys prāmāṇyam from itself."

In the Śloka-vārttika verse, Kumāriḷa asserts that a judgment which remains undefeated will enjoy prāmāṇyam. Whereas the initial judgment was ascribed with prāmāṇyam as a hypothesis, the belief held after a period of inquiry has gained in strength due either to defeating an earlier belief or itself becoming stronger by resisting defeat. That the belief held at this mature stage of inquiry accordingly enjoys greater security in its epistemic status seems to be the implication of Kumāriḷa's notion of enjoying prāmāṇyam.

The specification of either three or 'three or four' judgments appears somewhat arbitrary, but the general idea is clear. Kumāriḷa appears here to make broadly the same claim as Peirce, and accordingly to face broadly the same difficulty. Peirce holds that inquiry "is bound in the long run to iron out every error".²⁴⁶

²⁴⁵ See TS 2877

²⁴⁶ Wiggins (2004) 89

Kumārila is rather more ambitious in allowing only three (or four) tokens of checking or revision, presumably intended to happen within a very limited timespan. Kumārila's setting of such an arbitrary limit to inquiry appears questionable at first. However, Kumārila also makes an analogy with court proceedings, where judgment is given on the basis of a strictly limited number of statements taken, two from the plaintiff and one from the defendant.²⁴⁷ This analogy might suggest that termination of the epistemic process is a feature of the pragmatics of inquiry and not of the epistemology of inquiry.

Kumārila's epistemological model of a process of individual acts of inquiry thus seems also to be rooted in a paradigm of ritual action, the analysis of which is focused on the combinatorics of individual ritual acts. Thus Kumārila seems to construe occurrent judgments as acts of the agent.²⁴⁸ As Govardhan Bhatt explains, "all commentators and independent writers of [Kumārila's] Bhāṭṭa school are unanimous in holding that cognition is an act"²⁴⁹, although Kumārila's own statements on this are somewhat ambiguous. Bhatt also criticizes Kumārila and his commentators for holding that "cognition ... is essentially an activity of the subject in relation to some object."²⁵⁰ Bhatt suggests that these thinkers "were misled by the word 'activity' which in common usage is predicated of 'knowing' as well as of such physical activities as 'cooking' etc."²⁵¹ However, an alternative understanding has been developed in this thesis, whereby an epistemology informed by the theory of ritual interpretation is able to illuminate the logic of inquiry in terms of purposive and normative acts by the epistemic agent.

By thinking again in terms of an informal logic of operations, Kumārila's strategy here seems to owe something to the style of reasoning in the maxims (nyāyas) of Mīmāṃsā. Thus as Sarkar explains, "[b]y the Apaccheda (losing hold) maxim when two different effects are respectively attached to two events

²⁴⁷ TS 2881-2882

²⁴⁸ I would like to thank Dr Shalini Sinha for drawing my attention to this connection

²⁴⁹ Bhatt (1989) 17

²⁵⁰ Bhatt (1989) 65

²⁵¹ Bhatt (1989) 66

alternately, if both happen simultaneously, either effect may be attached optionally; but, if one event follows the other, the result will be in accordance with the event that happens last."²⁵² Sarkar illustrates this rule with an example commented on by Śabara, involving a potential mishap in a ritual when a priest holding the tail-end of the robe of the preceding happens to lose his grip.²⁵³ The compensatory burden on the sacrificer, i.e. the patron of the ritual, is different dependent on which type of priest loses his grip. Sarkar first asks: "If both the priests ... lose hold simultaneously, what is to be done?"²⁵⁴ The answer is that "the case becomes one of direct conflict, and therefore, option results."²⁵⁵ But if one priest should lose hold successively, "the result will be in accordance with what happens last."²⁵⁶ Sarkar's quoting of Jimutvahana's example of Apaccheda is even more pertinent:

"in respect of the precepts enjoining the votary to bestow his wealth as a gratuity in one instance and no gratuity in the other ... [those instances being] if either the priest doing the functions of Udgatri or the one performing the office of Pratistotri, singly stumble ... but, if both these priests stumble at the same time, neither injunction would be applicable; for that would be a variableness in the precept."²⁵⁷

From this angle, the first view appears to be such a case where conflict would result in neither the injunction to attribute *prāmāṇyam* nor the injunction to attribute non-*prāmāṇyam* being applicable. Kumārila's own view is one where the defeat functions as overrider or replacement operation due to its occurring later.

The use of terms from Pāṇini's generative grammar motivates the idea that a general operation yields a hypothesis which has provisional status at first, but

²⁵² Sarkar (1909) 334 (the page is misnumbered as 234)

²⁵³ See Sarkar (1909) 334-335 (page 334 is misnumbered as 234)

²⁵⁴ Sarkar (1909) 334 (the page is misnumbered as 234)

²⁵⁵ Sarkar (1909) 335

²⁵⁶ Sarkar (1909) 335

²⁵⁷ Sarkar (1909) 402

the failure to be defeated leaves it with definitive status. However, in the Pāṇinian case, this is because the grammar has been explicitly constructed to include all necessary exceptions within the scope of a finite number of rules. Accordingly, it may be considered that the generative model of reasoning found in grammar is an inappropriate model to capture the logic of generating beliefs from a world of open-ended possibilities. Whilst it is outside the scope of this thesis to actually defend Kumāṛila's epistemology, it may be noted in his favour that both contexts share some noteworthy common features. Specifically, Pāṇini's generative grammar is intended to systematize the logic of word-formation rather than to reflect the psychology of language learning. Similarly, Kumāṛila aims to present the logical aspect of belief formation rather than its psychology. Further, whereas the extension of a language such as Sanskrit is potentially unlimited, Pāṇini's generative grammar indicates that its underlying logic can be captured in terms of a finite normative protocol. Similarly, the case of belief formation presents us with a situation where there is a potentially unlimited number of truths to be known, but the articulation of a logic of inquiry requires that there be a finite procedure in which this can be captured.

Hookway explains that the epistemology of Peirce and James:

“rejected the Cartesian focus upon the importance of defeating skepticism while endorsing the fallibilist view that any of our beliefs and methods could, in principle, turn out to be flawed. This was tied to the study of the normative standards we should adopt when carrying out inquiries, when trying to find things out.”²⁵⁸

The above presentation of Kumāṛila's three stages of inquiry displays these same elements of a pragmatist epistemology. Kumāṛila's admonishment of the compulsive doubter reflects a rejection of the Cartesian method of doubt, whereby existing beliefs need to be justified against skeptical challenges. Rather, as Levi explains, “the concern ought to be focused on justifying *changes*

²⁵⁸ Hookway (2013)

in belief"²⁵⁹ and "[t]he burden is on the skeptic to justify why one should cease being certain"²⁶⁰. At the same time, Kumārila's backing for the person with a genuine doubt indicates the recognition that the believer is situated at an intermediate stage in an epistemic process which may lead to defeat or to strengthening of her belief. Kumārila's recommendation to end inquiry after three or four checks may at first be considered a somewhat dogmatic and anti-Peircean block to inquiry, but should ultimately be seen in terms of the pragmatics of inquiry, warning against excessive questioning rather than against maintaining openness to new evidence.

There is also some uncertainty about the nature of Peirce's fallibilism. It was previously explained how Hookway understands Peirce's view in terms of the denial of an epistemic kind which necessitates truth, rather than the denial of everyday claims to certainty, thereby leaving such claims unaffected.

Levi similarly presents Peirce's view in terms of preservation of everyday certainty, but by characterizing Peirce as a corrigibilist rather than a fallibilist. Levi explains that "[a] fallibilist denies that inquirers should be absolutely certain of any current extralogical beliefs."²⁶¹ By contrast, corrigibilism is a "vulnerability to being modified"²⁶² which allows me to maintain absolute certainty in my beliefs due to the absence of any living doubt, whilst allowing me to acknowledge that in the future new considerations may cause such a doubt to arise or cause my belief to be defeated.²⁶³ Thus corrigibilists "can coherently acknowledge a distinction between conjectures or potential answers that might be true or false and settled assumptions, free from doubt." Whereas "settled assumptions are ... all maximally certain"²⁶⁴, "[o]ne may coherently distinguish between conjectures with respect to probability."²⁶⁵ By contrast, fallibilists "must think of the distinction between conjectures and settled

²⁵⁹ Levi (2012) 5

²⁶⁰ Levi (2012) 31

²⁶¹ Levi (2012) 4

²⁶² Levi (2012) 184

²⁶³ See Levi (2012) 4

²⁶⁴ Levi (2012) 192

²⁶⁵ Levi (2012) 191

assumptions as matters of degree."²⁶⁶ Levi considers that Peirce's belief-doubt model combines epistemological infallibilism with corrigibilism, indicating by this something like what Hookway means by his second characterization of fallibilism.

Kumārila acknowledges that the believer should exercise a degree of effort to question her beliefs, and that any genuine doubt that arises from a new deliverance should be treated with appropriate gravity as regards the resulting need for revision of existing beliefs. However, Kumārila's stipulation that "the self-concerned investigator should establish [his perception as accurate] by not continuing to conjecture"²⁶⁷ scenarios for defeat and that "one [judgment] enjoys epistemic success 'from itself'"²⁶⁸ indicate that the believer is right to invest those beliefs which have resisted a certain degree of challenge with certainty, and that this is the final meaning of *prāmāṇyam* 'from itself'. As such, Kumārila's protocol for inquiry similarly combines vulnerability to being modified with certainty in one's settled beliefs which is the mark of corrigibilism. As indicated above, the basis of Kumārila's corrigibilism is the fact that epistemic success in the form of accurate judgment is essentially distributed over the epistemic kind consisting in *pramāṇas* or successful deliverances.

²⁶⁶ Levi (2012) 192

²⁶⁷ TS 2874cd

²⁶⁸ ŚV 2.61cd

Chapter 5: Kumāriila's anti-foundationalism

Section 1: Introduction

This chapter will present Kumāriila's doctrine as a form of anti-foundationalism which has much in common with that of pragmatism. Levi explains that “[f]oundationalism in epistemology imposes two demands on the beliefs of intelligent inquirers: (1) that *current* beliefs be justified and (2) that there be foundational premises and principles of reasoning that are self-certifying on the basis of which the merits of other current beliefs and principles may be derived. Many antifoundationalists give up (2) but not (1) ... Pragmatists belong among those who give up *both* (2) and (1).”¹ In this chapter, it will be argued that Kumāriila's presentation indicates the rejection of both the demands above. As such, Kumāriila is an anti-foundationalism in the same vein as the pragmatists.

The chapter begins by reviewing existing literature which seems to suggest a Reidean form of anti-foundationalism. An argument from infinite regress which motivates Kumāriila's anti-foundationalism is then examined. It is shown that this argument targets what Sosa terms an organon conception of justification, whereby one thing serves as rule or instrument for acquiring justification for another thing. Sosa accordingly suggests that aptness is a more promising notion than justification, and a loose affinity is found between Kumāriila's doctrine and Sosa's Virtue Epistemology. As Arnold explains, Kumāriila's consideration of the argument from infinite regress serves to reject the notion of foundational beliefs in Levi's first demand, such a view being explicitly set up as a third alternative view in the Śloka-vārttika. However, it will be argued here that Kumāriila's doctrine involves a rejection of Levi's demand (1) in what amounts to a parallel move to Peirce.

¹ Levi (2007) 30; a similar formulation can be found in Sosa (1991) 178

In the following section, a Buddhist epistemology is sketched out, and it is shown how the Buddhist position is under threat from this infinite regress argument. Finally, it is shown how Kumāriḷa's anti-foundationalism comes to bear on the case of knowledge derived from the testimony of the Vedas. In this case, knowledge from other epistemic sources does not bear on the epistemic status of testimony from Vedic texts.

Section 2: Existing literature on Kumāriḷa's anti-foundationalism

Taber explains that:

“Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsā is not a form of epistemological foundationalism, which conceives of human knowledge as hierarchically structured, with the mass of what we know resting upon a few cognitions of special status.”²

This statement attributes a rejection of Levi's second demand above to Kumāriḷa. Taber also holds that Kumāriḷa's doctrine is:

“closer to the common sense empiricism of the eighteenth-century Scottish philosopher Thomas Reid, which stresses that *almost all* our perceptions have initial authority.”

Thus:

“we find at the basis of both the foundationalist and the Mīmāṃsā (Reidean) proposals the same insight: there must occur cognitions which present themselves as true ... The search for evidence must come to an end – either at the very start, or after a finite process – in a kind of

² Taber (1992b) 217

knowledge for which the concern for evidence does not arise.”³

Taber thus seems to commit Kumāriḷa to Levi's first demand above. Specifically, current beliefs are justified by their initial appearance of authority. Taber thus explains:

“Given that a cognition initially appears as true, one remains justified in believing that it is true until concrete evidence of its falsehood presents itself.”⁴

Taber also tells us that:

“Opposed to this [foundationalist] answer would be any form of coherentism which says that truth is merely a matter of corroboration by further evidence that is not, in turn, ultimately anchored in some self-validating form of awareness. It is interesting that although such theories have been extensively developed in Western thought – e.g., in pragmatism – Indian philosophers have shied away from them.”⁵

Taber's statement above is somewhat ambiguous between a coherence theory of truth, which concerns the truth of propositions, and a coherence theory of justification, which concerns what it is for a belief to be justified, and is typically understood in terms of corroboration by further evidence.

Arnold similarly explains that “the Mīmāṃsaka doctrine of *svataḥ prāmāṇya* represents a compelling critique of foundationalist epistemologies”⁶. However, according to Arnold:

“many philosophers (both traditional and modern) persist in understanding the doctrine in terms of the foundationalist

³ Taber (1992b) 218

⁴ Taber (1992b) 207

⁵ Taber (1992b) 218

⁶ Arnold (2001) 591

presuppositions that are precisely what this doctrine means to call into question.”⁷

Arnold includes B.K. Matilal among such philosophers⁸ and considers that only Pārthasārathi has correctly understood Kumāriila's anti-foundationalism. Arnold explains that foundationalist approaches are “intended ... to indicate the uniquely indubitable sorts of knowledge that ... are suitably regarded as foundational for the rest of our beliefs.”⁹ Thus Arnold similarly presents foundationalists as rejecting Levi's demand (2) above.

Arnold's preferred reading of Kumāriila involves:

“a phenomenological sort of epistemology – where “phenomenological” here characterizes a basically descriptive approach, the “bracketing” of normative commitments ... A project in phenomenological epistemology might thus aim to describe, for example, what must be the case ... in order that there can develop such knowledge as we generally believe ourselves already to be justified in claiming”¹⁰.

Arnold here presents Kumāriila's doctrine in terms of a bracketing of Levi's demand (1). However, elsewhere Arnold renders Kumāriila's doctrine using the expression 'prima facie justification', which would seem to indicate an acceptance of Levi's thesis (1). Further, it is not clear how, on Arnold's construal, Kumāriila's doctrine could substantively engage with any research programme in philosophy.

Arnold contrasts Pārthasārathi's approach with:

“a foundationalist approach, which would seek to ground justification in a causal story that takes the perceived object indubitably to have *caused*

⁷ Arnold (2001) 591

⁸ See Arnold (2001) 591

⁹ Arnold (2005) 123

¹⁰ Arnold (2005) 123-124

the perception – which, that is, withholds the judgment that one “knows” something until it has first been ascertained that the “something” in question is in fact present as the cause of the cognition under review. But the problem, of course, is that the latter can only be ascertained by adducing “other things one knows or justifiably believes,” which we can, in turn, only be justified in knowing based on the very same epistemic instruments now available to us as we seek to ascertain the presence of a cause.”¹¹

Arnold here sets out the foundationalist position and alludes to the argument from infinite regress which features in contemporary articulations of the foundationalist position.¹² However, whereas the threat of such regress is often presented as an argument for some beliefs to be properly foundational, Arnold's argument is that there is no properly basic class of beliefs which would not be vulnerable to further regress. Arnold's use of the regress argument here corresponds rather to the way it features in an argument presented by Kumāriila both in the *Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā*, and in the *Śloka-vārttika*, where it functions as Kumāriila's objection to a third canvassed view.

Arnold immediately goes on to assert:

“this is, finally, Uṃveka’s problem, too. For Uṃveka wants an account of *svataḥ prāmāṇya* according to which we can be certain that, for example, we will only ever credit with *prāmāṇya* an awareness of silver that was really caused by silver.”¹³

However, Uṃveka’s problem is only a problem of inquiry. As Arnold agrees, Uṃveka’s notion of *prāmāṇya* constitutes a notion of truth, which we can certainly “ground ... in a causal story that takes the perceived object indubitably

¹¹ Arnold (2001) 619

¹² See e.g. Steup (2014) and Fumerton and Hasan (2010) for the contemporary argument in the context of foundationalism

¹³ Arnold (2001) 619

to have *caused* the perception".¹⁴ Indeed, such a story was developed in the earlier chapters of this thesis. Uṃveka's problem thus concerns not acquiring true beliefs but rather acquiring justification for them, i.e. being able to credit them with truth. Arnold's hope is that Pārthasārathi's reading can provide a non-foundationalist theory of justification by rooting a robust conception of truth in the *prima facie* justification which is provided phenomenologically by the mere fact of awareness.

Arnold frequently uses the notion of 'crediting' an awareness with validity.¹⁵ Although such a notion seems at first similar to the notion of ascription driving the present interpretation, whereby a process of inquiry may be built on correcting an ascription, Arnold quickly shuts down this construal, by insisting that we are always 'justified' or 'entitled' to credit our initial awarenesses with such validity. Although, as mentioned above, there seems to be some tension between use of such notions as justification and entitlement and Arnold's claim that normative concerns have been bracketed, nevertheless Arnold ends up in a similar place to Taber, whereby all beliefs are justified by the phenomenological fact of mere awareness, thus answering to Levi's demand (1) above. So both Arnold and Taber read Kumāriḷa as setting up the initial awareness as a complete phenomenological basis for some form of justification, and, in Arnold's case, also for truth.

Notwithstanding this, Kumāriḷa's view is well taken by both Arnold and Taber as what amounts to a rejection of Levi's demand (2). The idea seems to be that inquiry is needed to discriminate correct judgments from incorrect judgments, yet the process of inquiry must be one that can be brought to an end. One strategy would be to bring this to an end in some foundational class of beliefs. However, the privileging of any particular class of beliefs would be arbitrary, so the process of inquiry should be stopped through the ascription of epistemic success to the initial belief. As per the above discussion, this is a defeasible assumption made on pragmatic grounds.

¹⁴ Arnold (2001) 619

¹⁵ See e.g. Arnold (2001) 619, 625; Arnold (2005) 69, 101

Section 3: Kumāṛila's argument against organon justification

Kumāṛila presents an argument from infinite regress in favour of his own view, in both the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā and the Śloka-vārttika. Whereas it is a free-standing argument in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā, in the Śloka-vārttika it targets a third view canvassed in opposition to Kumāṛila's own. It was described above how the third canvassed view is structurally the reverse of Kumāṛila's own view. Whereas Kumāṛila's claim is that prāmāṇyam is 'from itself' and non-prāmāṇyam is 'from something else', the third view holds that prāmāṇyam is 'from something else' and non-prāmāṇyam is 'from itself'. Kumāṛila's own claim has been construed as the claim that all deliverances constitute Good Cases as a default nature, yet this nature is vitiated by bad features. Conversely, according to the third view, all deliverances constitute Bad Cases as a default nature, and this nature is revamped by the aforementioned good features. Kumāṛila presents the third canvassed view as follows:

ŚV 2.38abc: Therefore the Badness of Case of those [Bad Case deliverances] (apramāṇatvam) should be accepted as being due to svabhāva (svābhāvīkam), and the capacity for epistemic success [of Good Case deliverances] (prāmāṇyam) [as being] dependent on something else.

Whereas Bad Cases are 'due to svabhāva', epistemic success is 'dependent on something else'. Kumāṛila tells us that, in this view, this something else is a good feature. Kumāṛila writes:

ŚV 2.39cd: A capacity for epistemic success (prāmāṇyam) is produced by the good features of those [causal factors of the deliverance],

because it is a real entity.

By contrast:

ŚV 2.39ab: Epistemic failure (aprāmāṇyam) could not be due to a bad feature of the cause [of the deliverance], because it is not a real entity.

The role of the bad feature in this argument supports the reading of the second view discussed in Chapter Three above, whereby putative good and bad features would be responsible for deliverances constituting Good and Bad Cases respectively. In this argument, epistemic failure is characterised by a mere lack or absence of Goodness, and thus not due to a positive vitiating nature of a positive feature. The argument is that epistemic failure is not a real property or nature of a process, so cannot be metaphysically grounded in a separable (bad) feature. By contrast, accurate judgment is real, so can be metaphysically grounded in a separable (good) feature, which revamps erroneous judgment. This argument thus supports the third view.

Kumārila later provides a rebuttal of that argument. Kumārila writes:

ŚV 2.54: "Epistemic failure (aprāmāṇyam) is divided into three types according to [the three cases, i.e.] erroneous judgment, lack of judgment and doubtful judgments. Of these [three], [only] two [i.e. erroneous judgments and doubtful judgments] are able [to arise] from a bad cause, because they are real [whereas lack of judgment is not]."

Here, Kumārila observes that there are various types of Bad deliverances in order to assert that Bad Cases constitute some real nature which is metaphysically grounded in some separable feature of deliverances, which is a

positive vitiating feature. Kumāriila however must clarify that this argument applies only to two of the three types of Bad Case. Kumāriila writes:

ŚV 2.55: "As for lack of judgment, the operation of bad qualities [in that case] is not postulated. According to us, however, it [viz. lack of judgment] takes place only through the absence of causes as you have said yourself [in verse 2.41]."

In Kumāriila's own view, epistemic failure is a real nature which arises from bad features of the cause, such as cataracts etc. and thus the agent is mandated to seek out an undercutting or rebutting defeater. Epistemic success is also a real nature, but one which is metaphysically grounded in the intrinsic nature of deliverances when unvitiating. This provides a point of asymmetry between Kumāriila's own view and his third canvassed view.

In the third view, epistemic success arises from good features of the cause, seemingly such as clarity of vision etc. It is not clear if the agent would be required to ascertain the presence of such features in the belief formation process, in which case, justification would be dependent on such corroborating factors. Thus Kataoka notes that it is not clear whether 'something else' refers to "good qualities (*guṇa*) and bad qualities (*doṣa*) of the causes of the cognition ... [or] their cognition ... [or] (a cognition of) agreement (*saṃgati*) or an invalidating cognition (*bādhaka*)".¹⁶ As the third view amounts to a form of foundationalism, whereby justification is dependent on some externalist foundation, which constitute the good features, or some internalist foundation, comprising awareness of some factors. However, as noted in Chapter Four above, Uṃveka considers and rejects various candidate features that would provide such a foundation, such as clarity and lacking shakiness, on the basis that these are consistent with erroneous judgment.¹⁷

¹⁶ Kataoka (2011) 63

¹⁷ Jayanta also provides a discussion which is very similar to that of Uṃveka. However, note that Kumāriila also claims that there is a distinguishing feature

Kumārila himself provides a regress argument against this third view. Kumārila writes:

ŚV 2.49: If an object is not determined even when a judgment has been made, as long as purity of cause is not apprehended from a different successful deliverance, ...

ŚV 2.50: ... then it would be necessary to make another judgment based on a different cause, because the purity [of the cause of the first judgment] is effectively non-existent as long as [that purity is] not correctly ascertained.

ŚV 2.51: When there is purity of the cause of that [second judgment] too, the judgment of that [first purity] would be a Good Case deliverance. And this would also be so of that [third judgment] also, so in this way, there is no foundation.

Kumārila here appeals to an asymmetry between affirmation and denial in order to advantage his own view over the inverted alternative. In terms of the Peircean reading of the previous chapter, denial is capable of eliminating an abductive hypothesis that has been affirmed, whereas affirmation is not capable of introducing a hypothesis that has not first been introduced in some way.

Arnold characterizes this argument in terms of an infinite regress of justification, whereby “the subsequent, justifying cognition would, as itself a cognition, similarly require justification, and so on.”¹⁸ Thus on the Pārthasārathi-Arnold reading, the idea that no corroborating awareness is needed is because phenomenological content provides sufficient justification.

present in waking awarenesses that distinguishes them from dream-state awarenesses in Sloka-varttika 5.28ab: “jāgra-jñāne viśeṣo 'yaṃ supariniścayaḥ”. This claim occurs in the Nirālambanavāda discussion and requires further investigation.

¹⁸ Arnold (2005) 69

Arnold thus considers that “it is an essentially phenomenological point being made ... that is, doesn't Kumāriila effectively credit overriding cognitions with a capacity for stopping the epistemic process such as he does not allow for the initial cognitions thus overridden ...?”¹⁹ Arnold contrasts Kumāriila's doctrine with Popper on the grounds that Kumāriila allows for epistemic termination, which is provided for through the fact that an awareness phenomenologically appears to provide termination. By contrast, the argument of the above chapter was that such termination is made on pragmatic rather than epistemic grounds.

Sosa again provides an illuminating parallel to Kumāriila's discussion. Sosa describes an how an organon account of justification leads to an infinite regress. Sosa describes an organon as a “manual of practical methodology”²⁰ or “an instrument for acquiring knowledge”²¹. Sosa writes:

“According to methodism the only way one could acquire such justification is through a further appropriate application of an adequate organon. But that application in turn requires the appropriate following of rules, which in turn requires that one justifiedly consider oneself to be in the conditions required for the application of *these* rules. And so on.”²²

Sosa proposes that we abandon this organon conception of justification, and, with it, the term 'justification' itself. Sosa suggests we replace a requirement for justified belief with a requirement for apt belief, where justification may be one way to achieve aptness. In general, Sosa explains:

“The “aptness” of a belief B relative to an environment E requires that B derive from what relative to E is an intellectual virtue, i.e. a way of arriving at belief that yields an appropriate preponderance of truth over

¹⁹ Arnold (2005) 72

²⁰ Sosa (1991) 245

²¹ Sosa (1991) 245

²² Sosa (1991) 249

error ..."²³

In Chapter Three, Kumārila's claim that *prāmāṇyam* or epistemic success is due to the unflawed faculties themselves as causes of awareness was equated with Sosa's idea that the human faculties such as perception are themselves the intellectual virtues. As such, Sosa's conception of aptness as resulting from intellectual virtues would seem to have a close affinity with Kumārila's conception of epistemic success. Kumārila motivates the idea that epistemic success is 'from itself' by arguing that this avoids an infinite regress of justification. Sosa similarly motivates a notion of aptness as a criterion for knowledge by rejecting various conceptions of justification focused around the notion of an organon, and thus the term 'justification' itself. Thus part of Kumārila's main claim is to reject the notion of justification as the application of a methodological rule for determining true belief. However, whereas Sosa equates the organon conception of justification with the idea that epistemology is founded on a methodology,²⁴ Kumārila distinguishes between these ideas, retaining some aspect of methodology for arriving at the truth. Specifically, Kumārila rejects the idea that the method of epistemology involves applying a rule for justifying beliefs, in favour of the idea of a culminating process, as described in Chapter Four.

Following Pārthasārathi, Arnold considers that this argument leads Kumārila to the idea, "why not simply allow this [*viz.* justification] with respect to the initial moment?"²⁵ Arnold thus arrives at his notion of *prima facie* justification. However, as Sosa notes, "to justify is "to prove or show to be just, right, or reasonable," in a way that implies "appeal to a standard or precedent."²⁶ As such, it is not clear that the term 'justification' can be retained by Arnold and Alston, whose usage he follows.

More generally, Arnold is correct to take Kumārila's discussion as a rejection of

²³ Sosa (1991) 289

²⁴ See Sosa (1991) 250

²⁵ Arnold (2005) 70

²⁶ Sosa (1991) 253

an organon conception of justification. The previous chapters have argued that Kumāriḷa does nevertheless endorse the idea of an external standard or norm against which beliefs must be assessed. However, this argument from infinite regress stands opposed to what Sosa terms an organon conception of justification. As such, Kumāriḷa has rejected the idea that beliefs can be justified by following a rule, on pain of infinite regress, without rejecting the idea that there is a normative burden on the agent to attain only true beliefs. The regress argument has established that the normative burden cannot be discharged by measuring the beliefs against some external standard in the manner of the third canvassed view. Rather, the protocol for inquiry set out in the previous chapter discharges the normative burden as it represents a culminating process resulting in true beliefs, despite not providing direct justification.

That protocol involved the strengthening of the epistemic status of beliefs through what was characterized as an appropriate level of investigation. It was claimed that the beliefs which are not defeated through a certain amount of checking activity will as a result provide the agent with a sufficient level of epistemic confidence. However, all beliefs are fallible in the sense that the evidence for them is consistent with their falsity, given the possibility of more or less radical sceptical scenarios. As such, why should Kumāriḷa's protocol lead to actual true beliefs rather than merely beliefs held with a high degree of confidence?

Śāntarakṣita notes that Kumāriḷa's view is that the existence of a capacity is established through arthāpatti, or postulation. Śāntarakṣita refers back to an earlier statement by Kumāriḷa as follows:

"The capacities of all things are established through postulating [them] based on their effects."²⁷

²⁷ TS 1588ab quoted again at TS 2839ab: "śaktayaḥ sarva-bhāvānāṃ kāryārthāpatti-sādhanāḥ"

Referring to the abductive logic of Charles Peirce, Shida makes a general observation that “in the Indian philosophical context, the valid means of cognition referred to as *arthāpatti* is similar to abduction.”²⁸ In abduction, Fann explains, “we pass from the observation of certain facts to the supposition of a general principle to account for the facts ... abduction is an inference from a body of data to an explaining hypothesis, or from effect to cause”²⁹. This contrasts with induction, which is “an inference from a sample to a whole, or from particulars to a general law”³⁰. Kumāriila's explanation is thus that the existence of a capacity for accurate determination and its exercise constitutes an explaining hypothesis for the arising of undefeated awareness. This account of how beliefs are justified agrees with Sosa's idea of an explanatory inference. Sosa writes:

“the deeper, reflective justification of the beliefs ostensibly yielded by a certain faculty derives from an explanatory inference that attributes those beliefs to the faculties from which they ostensibly derive.”³¹

Considering the case of memory, where “sometimes the ostensible memory is *merely* ostensible”³², Sosa elaborates as follows:

“What justifies accepting one's ostensible memory *m* in such cases is, I suggest, a meta-belief in the virtue of one's memory which delivers *m*. One's justification hence derives from an explanatory induction applied to oneself and one's pertinent faculties.”³³

²⁸ Shida (2011) 514

²⁹ Fann (1970) 10

³⁰ Fann (1970) 10

³¹ Sosa (1991) 280

³² Sosa (1991) 280

³³ Sosa (1991) 280

Sosa describes meta-epistemic foundationalism as follows:

“Meta-epistemic foundationalism is the view that there must be foundational epistemic beliefs: beliefs *about* epistemic justification that do not derive *all* of their justification from coherence or some other relation to other beliefs of the subject, but rather derive some of their justification from intrinsic plausibility or from factors external to the system of belief.”³⁴

Kumārila's idea that the capacity is postulated thus seems to be equivalent to Sosa's idea of an explanatory inference that attributes the deliverance to faculties that operate correctly. This explanatory inference plays a meta-level role in justifying beliefs. As such, a meta-epistemic foundationalism in Sosa's sense can be attributed to Kumārila.

The previous chapter presented an operational disjunction between *pramāṇa* and non-*pramāṇa*, whereby the former functions independently whereas the latter functions dependently and thereby ceases. It can now be seen that non-*pramāṇa* ceases when undercutting and rebutting defeaters effect the removal of bad features. The undercutting defeater removes the bad feature by identifying its presence in the process of belief formation, whereas the rebutting defeater removes the bad feature despite not specifically identifying it in the cause. In one case, the vitiation is apprehended, and in the other case, the vitiation is supplanted.

By contrast, the functioning of a *pramāṇa* in apprehending a distal object does not depend on any separable feature, but is simply due to the nature of awareness itself. As such, nothing can cause the apprehension of a distal object by a *pramāṇa* to cease. This asymmetry between the way in which *pramāṇa* and non-*pramāṇa* function leads to an asymmetrical significance to

³⁴ Sosa (1991) 157-158

the findings of subsequent investigation. In the case of non-pramāṇa, as described above, subsequent disconfirmation has an instrumental role in regard to the functioning of the non-pramāṇa, inasmuch as it terminates the functioning by removing the enabling support. By contrast, the findings of subsequent investigation do not play any instrumental role in respect of a pramāṇa. Thus Kumāriila explains:

ŚV 2.84: So the fact that [the pramāṇa itself] is known does not contribute to [its] epistemic success. To explain, the experience of the object is obtained only from the earlier [deliverance].

This feature of Kumāriila's view, that subsequent investigation plays no role in respect of the functioning of the pramāṇa in making an accurate determination, is perhaps taken by Pārthasārathi and Arnold as support for the idea that subsequent investigation plays no role in strengthening the justification of the agent. On that reading, in every instance of crediting a belief with prāmāṇyam, the agent is fully 'entitled' or 'justified', and thus that such prāmāṇyam amounts to a notion of 'validity' or '*prima facie* justification', which provides a basis for an epistemic process involving possible belief revision. This would suggest a Reidean interpretation of Kumāriila of the type explicitly endorsed by Taber. However, other remarks by Arnold about a bracketing of normative commitments suggest this may not be the case.

The present discussion argues that this is not the case. Rather, following Hookway, we can distinguish between the idea that a judgment "belong[s] to an epistemic kind of which, of necessity, all members are true"³⁵ and the idea that "we may be unconfident of our judgement because we are unsure whether it is a judgement of perception or, perhaps, a member of a different epistemic kind, a report of illusion or hallucination, for example."³⁶ Kumāriila's discussion of an operational aspect concerns the idea that the capacity of Good Case

³⁵ Hookway (2007) 11

³⁶ Hookway (2007) 11

deliverances to accurately determine objects is a real causal power which is not dependent on some extrinsic feature. It does not concern the ability of the agent to determine that a judgment constitutes a Good Case deliverance. In order to determine that, the agent must exercise appropriate doubt. Such a determination also rests on the meta-belief that one's undefeated judgments arise from the exercise of a real causal power of Good Case deliverances to make an accurate determination.

However, Kumārila allows that accuracy of judgment must be postulated at the outset of investigation. Kumārila writes:

TS 2859: So having considered for a long time, it certainly has to be postulated that the epistemic success of some [deliverance] is 'from itself'. This being the case it is best established in the first [cognition].

Here, Kumārila uses the term 'postulated'. This term has an affinity with the term 'prāptā' or 'ascribed' which was previously discussed, inasmuch as both terms allow that the question of whether prāmāṇyam is present in the belief is separable from the question of whether it has been postulated or ascribed at a particular stage of inquiry, and thus allow for the possibility that the agent can normatively assess her own ascription or postulation through additional inquiry. What is postulated is that the deliverance has arisen from causes that are not flawed.

Accordingly, although the agent is justified in the sense of possessing regulatory justification, viz. a level of justification appropriate to the stage of inquiry, the agent is also allowed scope for genuine doubt about a phenomenologically secure belief, and mandated to exercise appropriate effort in corroborating the belief. Accordingly, the agent is able to strengthen her level of regulatory justification through inquiry by aiming at an ultimate goal of inquiry which is possessing beliefs that are objectively true. Kumārila rejects Levi's first demand in the same way that Peirce does, by focusing on

justification for belief change rather than on justification for belief *per se*.

Accuracy of judgment can only be postulated with a sufficient degree of epistemic confidence at the end of investigation. Kumābila thus provides the following statements:

TS 2851ab: Epistemic success 'from itself' is like that [pot analogy], and it is certainly just in the final [judgment]

Kamalaśila clarifies that the word 'final' refers to 'the last judgment of all'.³⁷ Similarly in the Śloka-vārttika presentation, Kumābila writes:

ŚV 2.61: In this way, when three or four deliverances have been produced, no more deliverances are required. Just in this case one [deliverance] enjoys epistemic success 'from itself'.

Thus Kumābila's account involves an increase in epistemic confidence by the agent to a final outcome of inquiry involving a situation where the believer possesses only beliefs that are true in virtue of their arising from a successful deliverance.

Section 4: Kumābila's opposition to Buddhist foundationalism

Kumābila's strategy is also opposed to the foundationalist strategy of the Buddhist thinkers referenced in Chapter Three above. Śākyabuddhi characterizes 'familiar'³⁸ perceptual judgments, judgments of telic function, and inferential judgments as 'from itself' and 'unfamiliar' perceptual judgments as 'from something else'. Regarding perceptual judgments, Śākyabuddhi writes:

³⁷ See P under TS 2852: anta iti sarva-pāścime jñāna ity arthaḥ

³⁸ Dunne (2004) translates this term as 'habituated'

"Activity based on perception is said to be of two types, viz. 'unfamiliar' and 'familiar'. Of those, because a very familiar and clear perception is produced as that which possesses familiarity, involving the elimination of cause of error, its production is accurately determined in accordance with the familiar type, and therefore an ascertainment is produced involving the later manifestation of what exists, so a person acts on the basis of that."³⁹

About judgments of telic function, Śākyabuddhi appeals to the notion of svabhāva as a guarantee of error-freedom. Śākyabuddhi writes:

"Therefore, because a perception whose content has the capacity for telic function is without the causes of error, it is determined by reflexive awareness as being nothing other than a pramāṇa just due to svabhāva."⁴⁰

According to this Buddhist picture, entities are defined in terms of their telic function, so that fire just is what has the effect of burning and cooking etc. As such, a familiar case is one where one accurately determines the object in the context of a familiar process. An unfamiliar case is one where one gains confidence in one's judgment only when the awareness of telic function is attained. Devendrabuddhi thus explains that the later awareness of telic function enables the agent to discriminate accurate judgments from their reflectively indiscriminable counterparts. Devendrabuddhi appeals to what Dunne terms a confirmation-model, in order to discriminate correct from incorrect judgments. Dunne explains:

³⁹ PVṬ nye 72A: "brjod pa mngon sum gyi rten can gyi 'jug pa ni rnam pa gnyis te dang po nyid dang goms pa can no| de la goms pa dang ldan pa gang yin pa de la shin tu goms pa gsal ba can gyi mngon sum skyes pa na ji lta ba bzhin tu goms pa'i rnam par 'khrul pa'i rgyu mtshan spangs pa can nyid kyis yongs su bcad nas skye ba dang| de lta bur gyur pa'i phyis 'byung ba'i nges pa skyed par byed pa'i phyir de la skyes bu 'jug par byed do|"

⁴⁰ PVṬ nye 75A: "de'i phyir don byed par nus pa'i yul can gyi mngon sum ni 'khrul pa'i rgyu mtshan med pa'i phyir tshad ma nyid kyi bdag nyid du gyur pas rang rig pas yongs su bcad pa yin no|"; cf. Dunne (2004) 292-293

“On this model, the trustworthiness of that instrumental cognition consists of the fact that it leads to another instrumental cognition whose content is the desired telic function, i.e., the achievement of one's goal.”⁴¹

This research will adopt Dunne's translation of the term 'arthakriyā' or 'don byed pa' as 'telic function'. Interestingly, the notion of arthakriyā, which Dunne translates as 'telic function', also engages with a pragmatist maxim, that which holds that only what can make a practical difference can normatively regulate our beliefs. This seems to explain a common alternative translation of arthakriyā as 'pragmatic efficacy'.⁴² As Śākyabuddhi explains, “a perception whose content has the capacity for telic function is without the causes of error”.⁴³ This represents a strategy of epistemological foundationalism, whereby certain classes of beliefs are foundational of the remainder. However, this foundationalist label should be caveated by the remark that it does not fully reflect the mind-dependent aspect of the Buddhist theory. As Dunne explains, Dharmakīrti's “relentless pursuit of certainty (niścaya) suggests an intriguing form of foundationalism that is nevertheless relativist.”⁴⁴ Thus, although Dharmakīrti's “thought appears to rest on a kind of internalist foundationalism, where knowledge is ultimately rooted in the indubitability of habituated perceptions”,⁴⁵ nevertheless “the “nature” of the object in question is in significant ways reflective of the mind in which that object is being perceived.” It may seem that “Dharmakīrti is resorting to an internalist foundationalism rooted in irrefragable and private sense data, but in fact, Dharmakīrti clearly rejects the ultimate reliability of such data.”⁴⁶

However, in terms of the everyday level of activity, a two-tier foundationalist model does reflect the Buddhist theory. For Śākyabuddhi, as for Kamalaśīla,

⁴¹ Dunne (2004) 287

⁴² Cf. Arnold (2005) 99

⁴³ PVṬ nye 75A: “don byed par nus pa'i yul can gyi mngon sum ni 'khrul pa'i rgyu mtshan med pa”; cf. Dunne (2004) 292-293

⁴⁴ Dunne (2004) 3 fn.6

⁴⁵ Dunne (2004) 323

⁴⁶ Dunne (2004) 323-324

inferential judgments and habitual perceptual judgments are considered to be foundational, thus 'from itself', whereas novel perceptual judgments are not, and thus 'from something else', in the sense that their justification is based on subsequent confirmation. This Buddhist theory thus constitutes a confirmation model in which beliefs are justified either immediately because they are telic function judgments, or involve familiar processes leading to telic function judgments, or are justified at a later point when they involve unfamiliar processes when those processes do in fact yield successful outcomes. In this way, awareness of telic function is foundational for judgments involving previously unfamiliar processes.

This Buddhist epistemology has much in common with what Sosa terms super-radical skepticism. About this, Sosa writes:

“such skepticism does allow that one is reasonable in believing at least what is present to one's mind as intrinsically obvious *per se* ... Justification in that case need not derive from any process of justifying that one or anyone need have carried out, but rather derives from one's satisfaction of certain conditions ...”⁴⁷

For the Buddhist philosophers, judgments concerning familiar processes and telic function judgments represent awarenesses present to the agent's mind as intrinsically obvious, and on this basis are considered to be justified.

Due to the foundationalism of telic function and familiar judgments, the Buddhist theory answers to Levi's second demand above. Due to the need to justify unfamiliar perceptions, Levi's first demand above is acknowledged, though in a qualified way. Specifically, unfamiliar judgements need not be immediately justified, but can be acted on without justification, and justification will be achieved later through confirmation by a telic function judgement. This qualified acknowledgement of Levi's first demand leads to a delay model which

⁴⁷ Sosa (1991) 248

was further developed by the later Buddhist philosopher Śāntarakṣita.⁴⁸

Śāntarakṣita defends the Dharmakīrti-inspired model of epistemic success against that of Kumāriila. Thus Śāntarakṣita begins by accepting Kumāriila's claim that the fact that the source is trustworthy guarantees the truth of a token belief. Śāntarakṣita writes:

"And as for [the reading of Kumāriila's proposal whereby] a capacity is produced from the pramāṇas' own causes, rather than being added by other things after they [viz. the valid cognitions] have been produced from their own causes, then in this case we have no disagreement."⁴⁹

In this verse, Śāntarakṣita agrees that the capacity for accurate determination is not separable from the pramāṇas' own causes, i.e. from the appropriateness of the epistemic conditions of belief formation, and thus agrees that truth is achievable based on an essential disposition of beliefs. However, this does not mean that Śāntarakṣita is fully in agreement with Kumāriila. In order to clarify their difference, Kamalaśīla asks:

"It could be [objected:] if you do not disagree, then why do you adopt [the view of] prāmāṇyam 'from something else'?"⁵⁰

This question introduces Śāntarakṣita's statement:

"although this [capacity] is present in a belief, it cannot be ascertained independently in some cases."⁵¹

Śāntarakṣita here distinguishes between the fact that a belief is true and the

⁴⁸ See esp. TS & P 2836-2841 and TS & P 2958-2962

⁴⁹ TS 2826 – 2827a: "atha śaktiḥ svahetubhyaḥ pramāṇānāṃ prajāyate | jātānāṃ tu svahetubhyaḥ nānyair ādhīyate punaḥ || tad atra na vivādo naḥ ko hy anaṃśasya vastunaḥ |"

⁵⁰ P 750 immediately above TS 2832: "syād etat – yadī bhavatāṃ na vivādo kathaṃ tarhi parataḥ-prāmāṇyam abhyupagatam iti"

⁵¹ TS 2832cd: "jñāne kvacit sthitā 'py eṣā na boddhum śakyate svataḥ |"

fact that the truth of the belief has been ascertained in some sense by the agent. Śāntarakṣita alludes to Śākyabuddhi's distinction between unfamiliar perceptual judgments and other kinds of judgments, as Kamalaśīla later clarifies.⁵² Śāntarakṣita's critique challenges Kumāriila's epistemology on the grounds that it would account for mere true belief rather than some greater epistemic good which allows the agent some degree of epistemic confidence and which could appropriately be termed knowledge.

Śāntarakṣita thus agrees with Kumāriila that, ontologically, successful judgments determine their object, but argues that the agent is left with no confidence as to whether any given token judgment has in fact been successful.⁵³ This also seems to be the understanding of Taber, who observes in rejecting Uṃveka's view that "[v]alidity may always arise intrinsically, but it will have to *be determined* extrinsically."⁵⁴ This Buddhist position thus addresses the challenge presented by Hookway, referred to above, such that we can "recogniz[e] the infallibility of perceptual ones, while also insisting that our beliefs *about* whether a given judgement is a perceptual judgement are fallible."⁵⁵ It does so by presenting a factorizable analysis of the epistemic goal.

The introduction of a further ascertainment requirement engages with the third of the perspectives identified by Kataoka, the 'epistemological' or 'cognizing' perspective. Indeed, Jayanta discusses this perspective specifically in terms of 'ascertainment' (niścaya). Reflecting the fact that Śāntarakṣita's critique of Kumāriila involves only a concern with the subject's ascertaining the truth and not with the subject's possessing the truth, Shida explains that Śāntarakṣita's "theory is argued mainly at the epistemological level"⁵⁶ and that "Śāntarakṣita mainly shows the third theory [*i.e.* endorses the idea that prāmāṇyam is not 'from itself'] regarding the epistemological aspect."⁵⁷

⁵² See P 775 under TS 2844

⁵³ See TS & P 2826-2827 and TS & P 2832-2835

⁵⁴ Taber (1992b) 209

⁵⁵ Hookway (2007) 11

⁵⁶ Shida (2007) 1060

⁵⁷ Shida (2007) 1059

Śāntarakṣita writes:

So [the capacity] depends on an awareness of telic function or other judgment just for [its] ascertainment, but does not [depend on those types of judgment] to separately provide this [i.e. the capacity in the awareness], like poison etc.⁵⁸

In this verse, Śāntarakṣita does several things. Firstly, he reaffirms that the truth of a belief is not dependent on any further judgment. Rather, the agent requires a further judgment in order to ascertain that truth. Secondly, Śāntarakṣita reiterates Devendrabuddhi's view that the ascertainment requirement is satisfied by an awareness of telic function. Similarly, Dunne explains:

“according to Devendrabuddhi ... when one acts ... and one then attains an object with the desired or expected telic function, that initial perception was instrumental; one was simply unable to determined the instrumentality of that perception at the time of the perception. Devendrabuddhi proposes that instrumentality in this context be confirmed by a subsequent instrumental cognition ... in which the desired telic function appears.”⁵⁹

Thirdly, Śāntarakṣita's verse above makes a novel point about how ascertainment is achieved by the agent by analogy with poison and with wine. Śāntarakṣita goes on to explain the significance of this analogy as follows:

To explain, because poison, wine etc. are observed to be similar to other things [in having some effect] and [yet] because the results do not present themselves immediately, the ascertainment of the nature of these [viz. poison, wine etc. happens only] when there is ascertainment that the results of those things has been produced [such as] fainting,

⁵⁸ TS 2835: tasmād arthakriyā-jñānam anyad vā samapekṣyate| niścayāyâiva na tv asyā ādhānāya viṣādivat||

⁵⁹ Dunne (2004) 289

*sweating, slurring speech etc. In this same way too, it is ascertained that the deliverance does possess the capacity.*⁶⁰

This analogy with poison and wine presents a delay-model of confirmation, in which Levi's first demand must be ultimately satisfied. The lack of justification for one's beliefs regarding unfamiliar processes at the outset is no bar to being able to act on those beliefs. Thus a process of inquiry is established which involves a search for a judgment with epistemically foundational status. This contrasts with Kumāriila's process of inquiry described in the previous chapter, which involves a search for a threshold level of epistemic confidence.

Śāntarakṣita replies to an objection that it would not be possible to act if one doubts one's judgment as follows:

*The intelligent person acts on the basis of doubt alone, and by doing this, his intelligence is not diminished.*⁶¹

Śākyabuddhi likewise explains:

*"But regarding that cause [of awareness] which operates due to an initial perception, when there is no apprehension [of it] as accurate, one acts on the basis of nothing other than doubt."*⁶²

Similarly Jayanta writes:

*"So we consider that prāmāṇyam is not ascertained (na niścitam) at that time; we take action on the basis of nothing other than doubt."*⁶³

⁶⁰ TS 2836-2837: "yathā hi viṣa-madyādes tad-anya-samatêkṣaṇāt| phalānantarābhāvāc caītat ātmā-viniścayaḥ|| mūrccā-sveda-pralāpādi-tat-phalōtpatti-niścaye| tādātmyam gamyate 'py evam jñāne tac-chakti-niścayaḥ||"

⁶¹ TS 2974: "ucyate saṃśayaṇaīva varttate 'sau vicakṣaṇaḥ| vaicakṣaṇya-kṣitis tasya na caīvam anuṣajyate||"

⁶² PVṠ nye 72A: "dang po nyid kyis 'jug pa gang yin pa de la yang rgyu mtshan nges par gzung ba med pa na the tshom nyid kyī sgo nas 'jug par byed do|" cf. Dunne (2004) 291

⁶³ NM 439: tena manyāmahe na niścitaṃ tadā prāmāṇyaṃ, saṃśayād eva

As such, whereas Kumāṛila's presentation concerns a regulative notion of degree of confidence, as per Goldman's characterisation above, the Buddhist discussions concern what Sosa terms an ideal level of confidence, i.e. the degree of confidence "given the subject's epistemic position, including his total relevant evidence."⁶⁴ When an agent acts on the basis of a doubtful judgment, Kumāṛila's analysis is that she posits accuracy of judgment as a working hypothesis. By contrast, the Buddhist analysis is that a theoretically insufficient level of epistemic confidence can be sufficient to motivate action.

However, Kumāṛila alleges that the Buddhist confirmation model is vulnerable to the problem of infinite regress, which was examined earlier in this chapter. In the *Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā* presentation, Kumāṛila presents the argument from infinite regress as follows:

TS 2852: If you claim that the success of the deliverance in the case of the first [deliverance] is established by a different successful deliverance, [then] in that case, seeking in this way, we would not find a foundation.

TS 2853: Just as the first deliverance depends on a deliverance which agrees with it, in the same way, an agreeing deliverance should again be sought for that agreeing deliverance also.

TS 2854: But if you accept the success of deliverances of some [deliverance] to be just 'from itself', [then] for what reason is there aversion to [saying] the same thing [i.e. it is 'from itself'] about the first [deliverance]?

The argument of the last verse is that no subsequent judgment can play a foundational role for an earlier one, on pain of infinite regress. That this

⁶⁴ *vyavaharāma iti*
Sosa (2011) 36

criticism is particularly aimed at the Buddhist confirmation model is suggested by the fact that Śākyabuddhi and Śāntarakṣita⁶⁵ both explicitly address it. Śākyabuddhi directly quotes these verses TS 2853 and TS 2854 and considers how the Buddhist can respond.⁶⁶ Devendrabuddhi has explained that the accuracy of judgments is confirmed by reference to the later awareness of telic function. However, Śākyabuddhi is forced to admit that even the awareness of telic function, which is supposed to play a foundational role, is subject to error, and thus stands in need of further justification. Devendrabuddhi has founded a disjunction between Good Case and Bad Case deliverances on the outcome in the form of an awareness involving telic function, so that they can be discriminated on this basis. Devendrabuddhi writes:

"Both would not occur when there is no real thing. When there is activity based on apprehending fire with respect to what is not fire, there is no arising of a later awareness having content involving the functions of burning and cooking etc., because that [later awareness] could only be based on a real thing."⁶⁷

However, Śākyabuddhi realizes that this does not correctly deal with the case of dreams. Śākyabuddhi considers the objection:

"According to [your] explanation, in a dream too, there would be non-deviation regarding the goal ... [so] the deliverances of dreams would have prāmāṇyam."⁶⁸

Śākyabuddhi replies:

⁶⁵ Krasser (1992) 154 explains that "Kamalaśīla comments that this verse *bhrantihetor* etc. [TS 2972] is a response to ... a verse from Kumāṛila's *Bṛhaṭṭikā*", viz. TS 2855 above.

⁶⁶ PVT *nye* 74B; cf. Dunne (2004) 377 fn.13

⁶⁷ PVP 2B: "gnyis ka dngos po med par me 'jug pa'i phyir ro| me med pa la mi 'dzin pa can gyi 'jug par byed pa las| 'jug pa'i sreg pa dang 'tshad pa la sogs pa'i yul can gyi phyis kyi shes pa skye ba yod pa ma yin te| de ni dngos po'i rten can nyid yin pa'i phyir ro|"

⁶⁸ PVT *nye* 75A: "gal te rmi lam la yang ji skad du bshad pa'i don la mi slu ba yod do zhe na| ... gal te rmi lam gyi shes pa tshad mar 'gyur ro zhe na ..."

*"This is no fault because we accept this."*⁶⁹

Śākyabuddhi next considers:

*"In that case, how do [you] explain the lack of prāmāṇyam [in dreams]?"*⁷⁰

Śākyabuddhi's reply is:

*"Because [one] thinks the thought 'it is an error'"*⁷¹

Although Śākyabuddhi's way of dealing with the case of dreams is far from adequate, by admitting that there is no other basis for positing something as real than the phenomenology of awareness which is given equally in dreams and waking state, Śākyabuddhi seems to provide his support to a phenomenological interpretation of prāmāṇyam 'from itself' of just the type later advocated by Pārthasārathi and Arnold. Although Śākyabuddhi maintains that one can later correct one's beliefs, such correction consists in nothing over and above the fact of belief change, just as Arnold explains that "a cognition can present itself as falsifying a previous one just insofar as it is the subsequent one that seems more credible. And if that is not how it seems, then it will not appear, phenomenologically, as an overriding cognition!"⁷² This also reflects a more general Buddhist notion of process without culmination or normativity.

This problem of infinite regress should also be distinguished from its equivalent in the context of self-awareness. Whereas this argument involves an infinite regress of ascertaining prāmāṇyam, that context involves an infinite regress of being aware of awareness. As Zhihua Yao explains, the Sautrāntikas establish the reflexivity of awareness on the basis that "[i]f a consciousness is not known

⁶⁹ PVṬ nye 75A: "'dod pa nyid kyi phyir skyon med do|"

⁷⁰ PVṬ nye 75A: "gal te 'o na ji ltar na tshad ma ma yin par bshad ce na|"

⁷¹ PVṬ nye 75A: "'khrul pa yin no snyam pa'i bsam pas so|"

⁷² Arnold (2005) 73

by itself, but by a separate consciousness, ... there will be a fault of infinite regress."⁷³ Kumāriila is aware of the threat of infinite regress to a non-reflexive philosophical position, but chooses to block it on pragmatic grounds rather than by admitting either of Levi's two foundationalist demands. Interestingly, the rendering of Kumāriila's verse TS 2853ab by Śākyabuddhi or his translators, Subhutiśrī and Dge ba'i blo gros, discussed above, involves a subtle but significant change, so that it reads:

*"Just as the cognizedness of the first [awareness] depends on [an awareness] which does not deceive ..."*⁷⁴

By changing Kumāriila's idea that the prāmāṅyam of the awareness depends on a subsequent awareness, the two infinite regress arguments seem to be either conflated or equated. Further, Śākyabuddhi's discussion seems to confirm that the earlier and later awarenesses specifically refer to the initial and telic function awarenesses of the Buddhist position. By construing 'not deviating from that' as 'not deceiving', this formulation also seems to sharpen the criticism of the idea of that privileged class of awarenesses, such as the awarenesses of telic function, can be identified as non-deceptive.

Section 5: Kumāriila's anti-foundationalist defence of the Veda

The upshot of the above discussion is that deliverances have an intrinsic epistemic capacity to make an accurate determination under appropriately normal epistemic conditions. As such, in order to gain the requisite confidence in her beliefs, the agent is only required to ascertain the fact of appropriately normal epistemic conditions, which consists in the lack of separable bad features. In the case of testimony, bad features would consist in properties of the informant, such as ignorance, intention to deceive etc. As self-revealing

⁷³ Yao (2005) 117

⁷⁴ PVṬ nye 74B: "ji ltar dang po'i shes pa nyid| de mi slu la ltos 'gyur na|"

scripture, however, the Veda has no author as such. As Davis explains, “[t]he denial of any author for the Vedas liberates it from having to seek out the author's intentions. Like all texts subjected to hermeneutic practice, therefore, the Vedas possess a “semantic autonomy.””⁷⁵ Thus Kumāṛila writes:

*ŚV 2.63cd: Bad features, lacking any basis, could not exist, because there is no author.*⁷⁶

The general protocol for belief formation described in the previous chapter involves a general operation of affirming one's judgments, followed by the search for a defeater which may result in a replacement operation. Regarding beliefs based on Vedic testimony, Kumāṛila writes:

ŚV 2.68: As concerns the [Veda], being free of replacement [of the general operation] is easier, because there is no author. Therefore, it does not even come to be suspected that the Veda is a non-pramāṇa.

*ŚV 2.65bcd: The absence of both kinds of epistemic failure is due to the lack of those [bad features]. So the general operation is not replaced.*⁷⁷

Here, Kumāṛila tells us that the tenet that the Veda has no author means that no prolonging of inquiry is needed, that the believer easily gains sufficient confidence in her beliefs. In this way, it would seem that the instigating and terminating of inquiry thus coincide. Whereas replacement is possible in the case of ordinary beliefs, in the case of beliefs derived from Vedic testimony, Kumāṛila tells us that the stage of replacement is not even possible.

Kumāṛila's strategy may appear *prima facie* to be an odd and weak manner of defending the accuracy of Vedic testimony. Specifically, it may seem that Kumāṛila conflates absence of evidence for the falsity of Vedic injunctions with evidence of such absence. As such, the proposition that the Vedic statements

⁷⁵ Davis (2010) 48

⁷⁶ ŚV 2.63cd: “vaktur abhāvena na syur doṣāḥ nirāśrayāḥ”

⁷⁷ ŚV 2.65d: “tad-abhāvataḥ| aprāmāṇya-dvayāśattvam tenōtsargô 'napoditaḥ|”

are true does not appear to meet the Peircean requirement that a hypothesis “must be capable of being subjected to experimental testing”⁷⁸. However, Kumārila clarifies his intention through an illuminating analogy with gustatory judgments. Kumārila writes:

*ŚV 2.91: Nor, as in the case of flavour etc., would an object be absent if it is not apprehended by some other [sense]. For they [i.e. taste and so on] are indeed restricted to being grasped [only] by gustation etc.*⁷⁹

*ŚV 2.92ab: If it is objected: [there is another] awareness of the object in the case of [taste], [Reply:] it will be likewise with respect to dharma.*⁸⁰

Judgments about the flavour of a food are obtained exclusively through the faculty of gustation. Indeed, following the ideas of Śākyabuddhi about telic function, sweetness can be defined as the power to affect the tastebuds in certain ways, and so on. As such, corroboration of a judgment of sweetness by audioperception and the other senses is neither possible nor necessary. However, Kumārila notes that a further awareness of the judgment of sweetness can be acquired, presumably in cases such as successive gustatory episodes involving a single bite of cake. Kumārila does not clarify how this second judgment would bear on the original judgment, but one construal is that corroboration is provided through further tasting. In this way, Kumārila would allow that corroboration is one way in which a judgment can gain positive epistemic status.

Alternatively, it could be understood that the judgment gains epistemic strength simply through not being defeated by subsequent judgments. Defeat could occur in cases such as illness. A second slice of cake eaten when one has recovered would also serve to rebut the initial judgment that the cake is sour. It could be objected that Kumārila overlooks the way in which gustatory

⁷⁸ Fann (1970) 43

⁷⁹ ŚV 2.91: “na cānyair agrāhe 'rthasya syād abhāvo rasādivat| teṣāṃ jihvādibhir yasmān niyamo grahaṇe 'sti hi||”

⁸⁰ ŚV 2.92ab: “tad dhiyāivārthabodhas cet tādṛg dharme bhaviṣyati|”

judgments can be defeated by non-gustatory deliverances. Thus a doctor's testimony that illness has affected one's tastebuds constitutes an undercutting defeater for a previous judgment of flavour. However, in Kumāriila's defence, it can be said that this deliverance does not undercut the phenomenology of the awareness as of sourness.

Kumāriila's idea is that Vedic testimony provides awareness of phenomena within an exclusive domain in the same way as the sense of taste does. This exclusive domain concerns beliefs which broadly concern moral, legal and ritualistic affairs, thus normative rather than factual matters. As Halbfass explains, "[a]ll knowledge about dharma, the ritual norms and duties, is ultimately obtained from the Veda."⁸¹

As such, it seems that the lack of replacement operation and the lack of bad features described above refer to judgements based on non-Vedic sources. Just as a judgment of sourness can only be overturned by a later judgment of sweetness, so too a judgment based on a Vedic injunction can only be replaced by a contrary judgment based on a different Vedic injunction. The previous chapter provided examples of overturning such as the ritual injunctions 'he shall not look' and 'he shall not eat', carrying water in a milk-pail instead of a wooden bowl, and sacrificing on the Āhavanīya fire as a general case.⁸²

As such, within the sphere of Vedic judgments, it would seem that defeat of judgments formed on the basis of Vedic testimony is possible, and that the process of inquiry described in the previous chapter is applicable. This feature of Kumāriila's position has been recognized by Arnold, who explains that "Vedic practices (practices represented as executing what is enjoined by the Vedic texts) are subject to being overridden [but are] susceptible only to the outputs

⁸¹ Halbfass (1992) 30

⁸² It may be objected that these examples are not drawn from the core saṃhitā texts of the Vedas. However, this is typical of the type of injunctions of interest to the Mīmāṃsā philosophers. As Taber (1989) note 7 explains, "Śabara sometimes cites the Śrautasūtras as if they were śruti ... The paradigm of a Vedic injunction for Śabara, *svargakāmo yajeta*, is probably not a citation at all but a purely artificial model."

of the Veda itself."⁸³ In this statement, Arnold comes close to acknowledging the procedural aspect of Kumārila's thinking, albeit only in relation to the Vedas.

However, Arnold nevertheless maintains that the Mīmāṃsakas hold that "the Vedas are in principle unfalsifiable"⁸⁴ and that "the Vedas cannot possibly be the source of any error"⁸⁵. Rather, falsification "tak[es] the form of essentially hermeneutical debates about, what, precisely, is enjoined by the Vedas in any case."⁸⁶ As a result, "significant authority attaches to those charged with interpreting the Veda – that is, the Mīmāṃsakas."⁸⁷ Arnold's analysis roots the process of falsification in the hermeneutical practices of the Mīmāṃsakas. By contrast, this research has argued that such hermeneutical practices reflect an underlying logic to the presentation of injunctions in the Veda, involving a model of general rule and exceptional cases. As such, the hermeneutic process reflects the general method of inquiry described in the previous chapter, whereby the agent is advised to begin inquiry by introducing a new idea, to continue inquiry by searching for a defeater, and to terminate inquiry when a sufficient level of confidence has been obtained. In the case of knowledge acquired from Vedic texts, the very fact of hearing the statements and of comprehending their exhortative significance is sufficient to introduce these statements as ideas and so begin the process of inquiry.

⁸³ Arnold (2005) 113

⁸⁴ Arnold (2005) 112

⁸⁵ Arnold (2005) 112-113

⁸⁶ Arnold (2005) 113

⁸⁷ Arnold (2005) 113

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Section 1: Summary of findings

By drawing out the procedural aspect of Kumāriila's doctrine, an interpretation has been developed which diverges from the interpretations by Kumāriila's classical commentators as well as modern scholars, whilst acknowledging that those interpretations capture important features of Kumāriila's doctrine. Specifically, whilst existing interpretations present notions of justification and truth relevant to the process of inquiry, what is lacking is attention to the dynamic aspect of Kumāriila's epistemology, whereby the inquirer is mandated to engage in an epistemic process regulated by a notion of justification but culminating in a state where the inquirer can have sufficient confidence that her beliefs coincide with the truth. This epistemic process involves Peircean considerations about how to instigate, prolong and terminate inquiry, and as such has been characterized as a pragmatics of inquiry.

Kumāriila's statement that the *prāmāṅyam* of all *pramāṅas* is 'from itself'¹ was identified as his central claim. The term *pramāṅa* was shown to identify a deliverance from an epistemic source or human faculty such as perception, following Sosa's terminology. This is strictly the act of delivering, which is a natural kind of process to produce accurate determination, but can also be taken to refer to the accuracy of the delivered content.

A disjunction between *pramāṅa* and non-*pramāṅa* was characterized in terms of the disjunction between Good Case deliverances and Bad Case deliverances, on the grounds that they are reflectively indiscriminable yet arise from different belief processes or sets of causal conditions. Specifically, a *pramāṅa* is a Good Case deliverance because it arises from epistemic sources not vitiated by flaws.

¹ TS 2811ab and ŚV 2.47ab respectively.

Such flaws consist in features such as cataracts, which make epistemic conditions sub-optimal.

The notion of *prāmāṇyam* was analyzed as a capacity for epistemic success, based on the idea of an epistemic goal implicit in this terminology. Based on Kumārila's expression '*meva-bodha-śakti*', epistemic success consists in accurate determination of an object or fact.

The construction 'from itself' (*svataḥ*) was found to appeal to a dispositionalist essentialist notion of capacity as metaphysical ground for the process of accurate determination. A capacity is a real causal power which is a real essence and natural disposition of a natural kind of process. This capacity metaphysically grounds the process of accurate judgment, which results in an accurate judgment as an outcome. The contrast between 'from itself' and 'from something else' indicates a sense of non-reliance. A non-*pramāṇa* or Bad Case deliverance is reliant on some vitiating feature of the belief process to cause the apprehension as of a particular object. By contrast, a *pramāṇa* or Good Case deliverance is not reliant on anything external to itself.

Accordingly, Kumārila's claim above is that a Good Case deliverance, which arises from epistemic sources that are not vitiated by flaws, exercises a capacity to determine an object due to that capacity being a real causal power which is an essence conditional on its identity as a Good Case deliverance. All deliverances possess such a capacity as an intrinsic nature contingent on lack of vitiation, but the vitiation in the case of Bad Case deliverances means that their intrinsic nature is overpowered, in the same way that the intrinsic nature of water to be cool is held to be overpowered by the proximity of fire.

Thus a Good Case deliverance is one which arises from a human faculty which constitutes an intellectual virtue in the sense that it is "a way of arriving at belief that yields an appropriate preponderance of truth over error"². This Good Case deliverance has positive epistemic status by virtue of being an apt belief,

² Sosa (1991) 289

i.e. by virtue of deriving from that intellectual virtue. In this way, the reflexive sense of 'itself' is construed as reflexivity to the intellectual virtue that the deliverance amounts to. The interpretation of this thesis thus contrasts with that of Pārthasārathi, Arnold and Taber, whereby *prāmāṇyam* is a property of both veridical and non-veridical awarenesses.

However, given the reflective indiscriminability of Bad Case deliverances, it still remains to be explained how the agent can have sufficient confidence that her beliefs arise from Good Case deliverances. This problem cannot be solved by appeal to some external standard of justification, on pain of infinite regress. Rather, Kumāriḷa lays out a protocol for inquiry based on the asymmetry between Good Case and Bad Case deliverances. Bad Case deliverances rely on some vitiating feature whereby they are vulnerable to subsequent defeat, either by undercutting or overriding defeaters. By contrast, a Good Case deliverance lacks any such reliance and so display no such vulnerability to defeat. As such, a process of checking one's beliefs will result in the defeat of Bad Case deliverances and the withstanding of defeat by Good Case deliverances.

Although such a checking process could potentially be continued indefinitely, it should be brought to an end on pragmatic grounds, just as a judge brings the potentially open-ended process of hearing evidence in a trial to an end. Although reflective indiscriminability means that judgments that withstand defeat are logically not incompatible with their falsity, nevertheless Kumāriḷa considers that the agent attains not merely a high degree of epistemic confidence but actual possession of only true beliefs. This is based on an explanatory induction to the view that beliefs that withstand defeat do so because they are due to a real causal power which is a capacity to determine an object.

This dynamic conception contrasts with the static conception of Arnold, whereby the initial appearance provides a 'validity' which constitutes an epistemically complete outcome. This reading is defended through consideration of Kumāriḷa's use of the notion of *svabhāva*, the negative particle, and ritual and

grammatical terminology. On this basis, affinities are found with Peirce's pragmatics of inquiry and with Sosa's Virtue Epistemology.

Kumārila's presentation of an argument from infinite regress is shown to target a conception of organon justification, whereby one belief is justified by some further instrument or rule. As such, Kumārila is an anti-foundationalist who rejects the idea that a secure foundation for judgments can be obtained. However, whereas the reading of Kumārila's anti-foundationalism by Taber and Arnold means that all beliefs are equally justified or equally valid, the interpretation presented here is that a process of inquiry is necessary to strengthen the epistemic status of beliefs. It is thus tentatively suggested that Kumārila's doctrine be understood with reference to Sosa's more general notion of aptness, rather than the narrower notion of justification.

The title of this thesis, 'Generative Knowledge', is intended to resonate with the idea of theory-generating methods in general, including Peirce's conception of abduction, but also has particular reference to the example of Pāṇini's generative grammar. A reading has been made in line with what Ganeri identifies as a Mīmāṃsā model of ritual reason involving processes of substitution and adaptation which is also a general model for practical deliberation.³ Kumārila's protocol has an affinity with legal reasoning, which is similarly adaptive. As Prakken explains, legal reasoning has a "rule-guided rather than rule-governed nature"⁴ whereby "legal rules are ... often subject to exceptions which are not explicitly stated in legislation, and this calls for ways of representing the provisional or 'defeasible' character of legal rules."⁵ Kumārila's doctrine of inquiry represents a similarly pragmatic response to "the open, unpredictable nature of the world"⁶ faced by jurists, ritualists and epistemologists.

³ See Ganeri (2004) 207

⁴ Prakken (1997) 33

⁵ Prakken (1997) 33

⁶ Prakken (1997) 33

Section 2: Suggestions for future research

This research has suggested connections with various themes in contemporary philosophy. These are the literature on metaphysical grounding, the thesis of dispositional essentialism, the pragmatism of Charles Peirce, and the Virtue Reliabilism of Ernest Sosa. However, the development of these connections has only been partial. Further research may strengthen the claim of Kumāriila's affinity with these themes. In particular, it is likely that the general notion of *pramāṇa* can be helpfully illuminated with regard to aspects of Virtue Epistemology including anti-luck conditions for knowledge such as Sosa's modal notions of tracking and safety, as well as ability conditions for knowledge such as Sosa's notion of aptness, which Sosa has continued to develop in recent work. Further, the notion of a metaphysical ground is a topic of renewed philosophical interest, and research into the notion of *svabhāva* could contribute to the articulation of the concept of grounding.

This research has also set out Kumāriila's own view with tangential reference to the rival accounts of Buddhist thinkers. However, given the substantial discursive engagement with Kumāriila's view by Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi very shortly after Kumāriila's own activity, and by Dharmottara as well as Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla in the following century, it would seem that research into the engagement with this topic by these thinkers would be very valuable in illuminating Kumāriila's own understanding of his claim, as well as in indicating the immediate impact of Kumāriila's work. As close contemporaries of Kumāriila, Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi may share Kumāriila's own philosophical concerns more closely than Kumāriila's own later commentators.

As discussed above, Mīmāṃsā authors have specialized in the analysis of normative statements, and as such, the methodologies they have developed can be brought into further engagement with similar normative concerns in contemporary thought, such as epistemological and ethical normativity.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in the thesis are explained here. A reference to the bibliography below is given in those cases where citations have been made with reference to page numbers.

BṬ = Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā of Bhaṭṭa Kumāṛila – see Shastri (1968)

CP = Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce

K = Kāśīkā of Sucarita Miśra – see Sâmbaśiva Śāstrī (1926)

MB = Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali

MK = Mīmāṃsā Kośa – see Kevalānandasaraswatī (1960)

MMK = Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā of Nāgārjuna – see Poussin (1903-1913)

NM = Nyāya-mañjarī of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta – the text reflects an unpublished critical edition of the text prepared by Prof. Kei Kataoka; see Varadācārya (1969) for page references

NRM = Nyāya-ratna-mālā of Pārthasārathi Miśra – see Shastri (1982)

P = Tattva-saṅgraha-pañjikā of Kamalaśīla – see Shastri (1926)

PP = Prasanna-padā of Candrakīrti – see Poussin (1903-1913)

PVP = Tshad ma rnam 'grel kyi 'grel pa (= Pramāṇa-vārttika-pañjikā) of Devendrabuddhi – see Devendrabuddhi (1991)

PVṬ = Tshad ma rnam 'grel kyi 'grel bshad (= Pramāṇa-vārttika-ṭīkā) of Śākyabuddhi – see Śākyabuddhi (1991)

ŚV = Śloka-vārttika of Bhaṭṭa Kumāriḷa – see Kataoka (2011) Part 1

TS = Tattva-saṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita – see Shastri (1968)

TṬ = Tātparya-tīkā of Bhaṭṭaṃveka – see Ramanatha Sastri (1940)

Bibliography

- Arnold, D. (2001) 'Intrinsic validity reconsidered: a sympathetic study of the Mīmāṃsaka inversion of Buddhist epistemology', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 29: 589-675
- Arnold, D. (2005) *Buddhists, Brahmins and Belief: Epistemology in South Asian Philosophy of Religion*, Columbia University Press
- Arnold, D. (2011) 'Mīmāṃsā', in Garfield, J.L. and W. Edelglass (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of World Philosophy*, Oxford University Press: 138-146
- Arnold, D. (2014) 'Kumārila', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/kumaarila/>](http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/kumaarila/)
- Audi, P. (2012) 'Grounding: Toward a Theory of the *In-Virtue-Of* Relation', *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 109, No.12: 685-711
- Aum Namah Shivaay (2011) *Kumaril Bhatt, The Great Vedic Pandit* [video online], available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-bRnufbAK7g> [Accessed 30 October 2014].
- Bandyopadhyay, N. (1988) 'The concept of contradiction in Indian logic and epistemology', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 16: 225-246
- Barber, A.W. (1991) (ed.) *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Taipei Edition*, Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc.
- Bergmann, M. (2005) 'Defeaters and Higher-Level Requirements', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 220: 419-436

- Bergmann, M. (2006) *Justification without Awareness*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Bhatt, G. (1989) *The basic ways of knowing: An In-depth Study of Kumāriila's Contribution to Indian Epistemology* (Second Revised Edition), Motilal Banarsidass
- Bhattacharya, R. (2012) 'Svabhāvavāda and the Cārvaka/ Lokāyata: A Historical Overview', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 40: 593-614
- Bird, A. (2005) 'The dispositionalist conception of laws', *Foundations of Science* 10: 353-370
- Bird, A. (2013) 'Limitations of Power', in Groff, R. and J. Greco (eds.) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy: The New Aristotelianism*: 186-206
- Bliss, R. and K. Trogdon (2014) 'Metaphysical Grounding', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/grounding/>>
- Blöser, C. (2013) 'The Defeasible Structure of Ascriptions of Responsibility', in Blöser, C., Mikael Janvid, Hannes Ole Matthiessen, and Marcus Willaschek (eds.) *Defeasibility in Philosophy: Knowledge, Agency, Responsibility, and the Law*, Rodopi
- Blumenthal, J. (2014) 'Śāntarakṣita', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/saantarak-sita/>>
- Burks, A.W. (1946) 'Peirce's Theory of Abduction', *Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Oct., 1946): 301-306
- Candotti, M. P. (2012) 'Naming-Procedure and Substitution in Early Sanskrit Grammarians', in Voegeli et al., *Devadattiyam: Johannes Bronkhorst*

Felicitations Volume, Peter Lang

Cardona, G. (1967) 'Negations in Pāṇinian Rules', *Language*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (March 1967): 34-56

Carroll, J. (1990) 'The Humean Tradition', *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 99, No. 2 (Apr., 1990): 185-219

Chakravartty, A. (2008) 'Inessential Aristotle: Powers without essences', in Groff, R. (ed.) *Revitalizing Causality: Realism about causality in philosophy and social science*, Routledge Studies in Critical Realism: 152-162

Chattopadhyaya, D. (1969) *Indian atheism: a Marxist analysis*, Manisha Granthalaya P. Ltd.

Chattopadhyaya, D. (1978) *Science and Society in Ancient India*, Philosophical Currents, Vol. 22, B.R. Grüner B.V., Amsterdam

Chattopadhyaya, D. (2012) *Lokāyata: A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism* (Sixth Reprint), People's Publishing House (P) Ltd

Chimpa, Lama and A. Chattopadhyaya (1970) *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India* (ed. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya), Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study

Corry, R. (2009) 'How is Scientific Analysis Possible?', in T. Handfield (ed.) *Dispositions and Causes*, Clarendon Press, Oxford: 158-188

Coseru, C. (2012) *Perceiving Reality: Consciousness, Intentionality and Cognition in Buddhist Philosophy*, OUP

Cox, C. (1988) 'On the Possibility of a Nonexistent Object of Consciousness: Sarvāstivādin and Dārṣṭāntika Theories', *Journal of the International*

Association of Buddhist Studies, Vol. 11, No.1: 31-87

Cox, C. (1995) *Disputed Dharmas: Early Buddhist Theories on Existence* (Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series XI), The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, Tokyo

Das, S.S.C. (1893) *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*, ed. by N.C. Das, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press

Dasgupta, S. (1969) *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Volume One, Cambridge at the University Press (Original work published 1922)

Davis, D., Jr. (2010) *The Spirit of Hindu Law*, Cambridge University Press

Devendrabuddhi (1991) *Tshad ma rnam 'grel kyi 'grel pa* (= Pramāṇa-vārttika-pañjikā), translated by Subhutiśrī and Dge ba'i blo gros, *Bstan 'gyur*, *Sde dge* edition, *Tshad ma*, Vol. Che, 1a-326b, in Barber (1991) Vol. 46

Doniger, W. (1991) *The Laws of Manu*, Penguin Books

Dunne, J. (2004) *Foundations of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy*, Boston: Wisdom Publications (Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism)

Edgerton, F. (1929) *The Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa or Āpadevī: A treatise on the Mīmāṃsā system by Āpadeva translated into English, with an introduction, transliterated Sanskrit text, and Glossorial Index*, New Haven: Yale University Press

Ellis, B. (2001) *Scientific Essentialism*, Cambridge University Press

Ellis, B. (2002) *The Philosophy of Nature: A Guide to the New Essentialism*, Acumen Publishing Limited

- Ellis, B. (2005) 'Universals, the essential problem and categorical properties', *Ratio (new series)* XVIII 4, December 2005: 462-472
- Ellis, B. (2008) 'Powers and Dispositions', in Groff, R. (ed.) *Revitalizing Causality: Realism about causality in philosophy and social science*, Routledge Studies in Critical Realism: 76-92
- Ellis, B. (2013) 'The Power of Agency', in Groff, R. and J. Greco (eds.) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy: The New Aristotelianism*: 186-206
- Eltschinger, V., H. Krasser and J. Taber (2012) *Can the Veda speak? Dharmakīrti against Mīmāṃsā exegetics and Vedic authority. An annotated translation of PVSV 164,24-176,16*, Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- Fairweather, A. (2001), 'Epistemic Motivation', in Fairweather, A. and L. Zagzebski (eds.) *Virtue Epistemology*, Oxford University Press
- Fann, K.T. (1970) *Peirce's Theory of Abduction*, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague
- Fine, K. (1994) 'Essence and Modality', *Philosophical Perspectives 8: Logic and Language*, 1994, ed. James E. Tomberlin, Ridgeview Publishing Company
- Fine, K. (2012) 'Guide to Ground,' in F. Correia and B. Schnieder (eds.) *Metaphysical Grounding: Understanding the Structure of Reality*, Cambridge University Press: 37–80
- Francavilla, D. (2006) *The Roots of Hindu Jurisprudence: Sources of Dharma in Mīmāṃsā and Dharmasāstra*, Torino: Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum
- Frankfurt, H.G. (1958) 'Peirce's Notion of Abduction', *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 55, No. 14: 593-597

- Freschi, E. (2012) *Duty, Language and Exegesis in Prābhākara Mīmāṃsā*, Brill
- Fumerton, R. and A. Hasan (2010) 'Foundationalist Theories of Epistemic Justification', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2010 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/justep-foundational/>>
- Ganeri, J. (2004) 'The ritual roots of moral reason: Lessons from Mīmāṃsā', in Schilbrack, K. (ed.) *Thinking Through Rituals: Philosophical Perspectives*, Routledge: 207-223
- Garfield, J. (1995) *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way*, OUP
- Gillon, B. (2011) 'Logic in Classical Indian Philosophy', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/logic-india/>>
- Gillon, B. and M.L. Love (1980) 'Indian Logic Revisited: Nyāyapraveśa reviewed', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol.8: 349–384
- Goldman, A. (1976) 'Discrimination and Perceptual Knowledge', *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 73, No. 20 (Nov. 18, 1976), 771-791
- Goldman, A. (1980) 'The Internalist Conception of Justification', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, Volume 5: Studies in Epistemology, 27-51
- Gonda, J. (1977) *A History of Indian Literature: the Ritual Sūtras*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden
- Greco, J. (2000) 'Two Kinds of Intellectual Virtue', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 60, No. 1: 179-184
- Greco, J. (2002) 'Virtues in Epistemology', in Moser, P. (ed.) *The Oxford*

Handbook of Epistemology, Oxford University Press: 287-315

- Groff, R. (2013) 'Whose Powers? Which Agency?', in Groff, R. and J. Greco (eds.) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy: The New Aristotelianism*: 207-227
- Haddock, A. and F. Macpherson (eds.) (2008) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, OUP
- Halbfass, W. (1992) *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought*, Sri Satguru Publications (First Indian Edition)
- Harré, R. (2013) Powerful Particulars Revisited, in Groff, R. and J. Greco (eds.) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy: The New Aristotelianism*: 128-142
- Harré, R. and T. Madden (1975) *Causal Powers: A theory of Natural Necessity*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford
- Hart, H.L.A. (1949) 'The Ascription of Responsibility and Rights', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series*, Vol. 49: 171-194
- Hattori, M. (1997) 'The Buddhist Theory Concerning the Truth and Falsity of Cognition' in Bilimoria, P. and J.N. Mohanty (eds.) *Relativism, Suffering and Beyond: Essays in Memory of Bimal K. Matilal*, Oxford University Press
- Hayes, R. (1988) *Dignāga on the Interpretation of Signs*, Kluwer Academic Publishers
- Herzberger, R. (1986) *Bhartr̥hari and the Buddhists: An Essay in the Development of Fifth and Sixth Century Indian Thought*, D. Reidel Publishing Company (Studies of Classical India, Vol.8)
- Hinton, J.M. (1967) 'Visual Experiences', *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 76, No. 302:

217-227

Hookway, C. (2007) 'Fallibilism and the Aim of Inquiry', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume*, Vol. 81: 1-22

Hookway, C. (2008) 'Peirce and Skepticism', in J. Greco (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Skepticism*, Oxford University Press: 310–329

Hookway, C. (2013) 'Pragmatism', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2013/entries/pragmatism/>

Janvid, M. (2008) 'Defeaters and Rising Standards of Justification', *Acta Analytica*, 23: 45-54

Jha, G. (1907) *Çlokavārttika, translated from the original Sanskrit with extracts from the commentaries of Sucarita Miśra (the Kāśikā) and Pārtha Sārathi Miśra (the Nyāyaratnākara)*, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press

Jha, G. (1939) *The Tattvasaṃgraha of Śāntarākṣita with the commentary of Kamalaśīla, translated into English by Ganganatha Jha in two volumes, Vol.2*, Baroda: Oriental Institute (Gaekwad's Oriental Series)

Jhalakīkar, B. (1996) *Nyāyakośa, or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy* (revised and edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar), Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Jones, J. (2013) 'Locke on Real Essence', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/real-essence/>

Joshi, S.D. (1968) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Samarthāhnika*

(P.2.1.1): *Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes*, University of Poona, Poona

Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen (1969) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnikā (P.2.2.2-2.2.23): Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes*, University of Poona, Poona

Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen (1973) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Tatpuruṣāhnikā (P.2.2.2-2.2.23): Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes*, University of Poona, Poona

Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen (1975) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Kāraṅgāhnikā (P.1.4.23-1.4.55): Introduction, Translation and Notes*, University of Poona, Poona

Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen (1976) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Anabhihitāhnikā (P.2.3.1-2.3.17): Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*, University of Poona, Poona

Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen (1981) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Prātipadikārthāśeṣāhnikā (P.2.3.1-2.3.17): Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*, University of Poona, Poona

Joshi, S.D. (1990) 'Koṇḍa (or Kauṇḍa) Bhaṭṭa', *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Vol.5: The Philosophy of the Grammarians*, Motilal Banarsidass: 255-308

Kahrs, E. (1998) *The Nirvacana Tradition*, Cambridge University Press

Kallestrup, J. and D. Pritchard (2013) 'The Power, and Limitations, of Virtue Epistemology', in Groff, R. and J. Greco (eds.) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy: The New Aristotelianism*: 248-269

- Kane, P.V. (1928) 'The chronological position of Mandana, Umbeka, Bhavabhuti, Suresvara' in *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, New Series* Vol.3 (1928)
- Kataoka, K. (2003) 'The Mīmāṃsā definition of pramāṇa as a source of new information', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 31: 89–103
- Kataoka, K. (2011) *Kumārila on Truth, Omniscience, and Killing, Part 1: A Critical Edition of Mīmāṃsā Ślokavārttika ad 1.1.2 (Codanāsūtra). Part 2: An Annotated Translation of Mīmāṃsā Ślokavārttika ad 1.1.2 (Codanāsūtra)*, Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- Kevalānandasaraswatī (ed.) (1960) *Mīmāṃsākośaḥ, Part V, Prājña Pāṭhashālā Maṇḍala Grantha Mālā*
- Kistler, M. and B. Gnessounou (eds.) (2007) *Dispositions and Causal Powers*, Ashgate Publishing Limited
- Krasser, H. (1992) 'On the relationship between Dharmottara, Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla', in *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Naritasa Shinshoji, Vol.1: 151-158
- Krasser, H. (2003) 'On the ascertainment of validity in the Buddhist epistemological tradition', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 31: 161-184
- Krasser, H. (2012a) 'Logic in a religious context: Dharmakīrti in Defence of āgama', in Eltschinger, V., H. Krasser and J. Taber (2012)
- Krasser, H. (2012b) 'Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumārila', in Voegeli *et al.*, *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*, Peter Lang
- Krishnamacharya, E. (1926) *Tattvasaṃgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the*

commentary of Kamalaśīla, Vol.2, Baroda: Central Library (Gaekwad's Oriental Series)

- Kyuma, T. (1997) 'Incompatibility and Difference – virodha and anyonyābhāvāvvyabhicāritva', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 2, March 1997, 1019-1016
- Larson, G. and S. Bhattacharya (1987) *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. IV, Motilal Banarsidass
- Leary, N. (2009) 'How Essentialists Misunderstand Locke', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (July 2009): 273-292
- Levi, I. (2012) *Pragmatism and Inquiry: Selected Essays*, Oxford University Press
- Lingat, R. (1973) *The Classical Law of India*, University of California Press
- Lusthaus, Dan (2002) *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogacara Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun*, Curzon Critical Studies in Buddhism Series
- Martin, M.G.F. (2006) 'On Being Alienated' in Gendler, T.S. and J. Hawthorne (eds.), *Perceptual Experience*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 354-410
- Matilal, B.K. (1985) *Logic, Language and Reality: An Introduction to Indian Philosophical Studies*, Motilal Banarsidass
- Matilal, B.K. (1986) *Perception: An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge*, Clarendon Press, Oxford
- McClymond, K. (2012) 'Negotiating Ritual Repair: The prāyaścitta Material in the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra', in *Negotiating Rites*, Ute Hūsken and Frank

Neubert (eds.), OUP: 191-211

McKittrick, J. (2003) 'The Bare Metaphysical Possibility of Bare Dispositions',
Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, Vol. LXVI, No. 2 (March 2003)

McKittrick, J. (2009) 'Dispositions, Causes, and Reduction', in T. Handfield (ed.)
Dispositions and Causes, Clarendon Press, Oxford: 31-64

Mohanty, J.N. (1989) *Gaṅgeśa's Theory of Truth* (Second Revised Edition),
Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi

Monier-Williams, M. (1956) *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, etymologically and
philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European
languages: New Edition greatly enlarged and improved by E. Leumann; C.
Cappeller and other scholars*, Oxford University Press (Original work
published 1899)

Mirashi, V.V. (1966) 'Dr Kane on Bhavabhuti and Umbeka', in Neog and
Barpujari (eds.) *Professor Suryya Kumar Bhuyan Commemoration Volume*,
Gauhati, Assam

Molnar, G. (2003) *Powers: A Study in Metaphysics*, ed. S. Mumford, Oxford
University Press

Mumford, S. (2003) *Dispositions*, Oxford University Press

Mumford, S. (2004) *Laws in Nature*, Routledge

Mumford, S. (2005) 'Kinds, Essences, Powers', *Ratio (new series)* XVIII 4,
December 2005: 420-436

Mumford, S. and R.L. Anjum (2011) *Getting Causes from Powers*, Oxford
University Press

- Mumford, S. (2013) 'The Power of Power', in Groff, R. and J. Greco (eds.) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy: The New Aristotelianism*: 9-24
- Musalgaonkar, G. S. (1979) *Mīmāṃsā-darśana, Ślokavārttika of Kumārilabhaṭṭa with Śābarabhāṣya, the Comn. Nyāyaratnākara and Notes, Vol. I*, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan
- Obermiller, E. (1932) (trans.) *History of Buddhism by Bu-ston, II. Part: The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet, Translated from Tibetan*, Heidelberg (O. Harrassowitz)
- O'Connor, T. (2009) 'Agent-Causal Power' in T. Handfield (ed.) *Dispositions and Causes*, Clarendon Press, Oxford: 189-214
- O'Connor, T. and J.R. Churchill (2010) 'Is Non-Reductive Physicalism Viable within a Causal Powers Metaphysic', in MacDonald, C. and G. MacDonald (eds.) *Emergence in Mind*, Oxford University Press: 43-60
- Peirce, C. (1995) 'The Fixation of Belief' (Original work published 1877), in Anderson, D.R. *Strands of System: The Philosophy of Charles Peirce*, Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiana: 68-82
- Potter, K. (ed.) (1977) *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. II, Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*, Motilal Banarsidass
- Poussin, Louis de la Vallée (1903-1913) *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, Imprimerie de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences, St. Pétersbourg
- Prakken, H. (1997) *Logical Tools for Modelling Legal Argument: A Study of*

Defeasible Reasoning in Law, Kluwer Academic Publishers

Prior, E.W., R. Pargetter and F. Jackson (1982) 'Three Theses about Dispositions', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol.19, No.3 (July 1982)

Pritchard, D. (2007) 'Recent Work on Epistemic Value', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 2: 85-110

Pritchard, D. (2011) 'Evidentialism, Internalism, Disjunctivism', in Dougherty, T. (ed.) *Evidentialism and its Discontents*, OUP: 235-253

Pritchard, D. (2012) *Epistemological Disjunctivism*, OUP

Ramanatha Sastri, S.K. (1940) *Śloka-vārttika-vyākhyā (Tātparyaṭīkā) of Bhaṭṭombeka*, University of Madras

Renou, L. (1941) 'Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire', *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 233: 105-165

Ronkin, N. (2005) *Early Buddhist Metaphysics: The making of a philosophical tradition*, RoutledgeCurzon

Ryle, G. (1976) *The Concept of Mind*, Penguin Books (Original work published 1949)

Śākyabuddhi (1955-61) *Tshad ma rnam 'grel kyi 'grel bshad* [= Pramāṇa-vārttika-ṭīkā], translated by Subhutiśrī and Dge ba'i blo gros, *Bstan 'gyur*, Sde dge edition, *Tshad ma*, Vols. Je 1-328a and Nye, 1-282a, in Barber (1991) Vol. 47

Sâmbaśiva Śāstrî, K. (ed.) (1926) *The Mîmâmsâ Ślokavârtika with the commentary Kâśîkâ of Sucaritamîśra, Part I*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. XC, Trivandrum: Government Press

- Sarkar, K.L. (1909) *The Mimamsa (sic.) Rules of Interpretation as applied to Hindu Law*, Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co.
- Sawyer, S. (1989) 'Privileged access to the world', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 76:4, 523-533
- Schaffer, J. (2008) 'Truthmaker commitments', *Philosophical Studies* (2008) 141:7-19
- Scharfe, H. (1993) *Investigations in Kauṭalya's Manual of Political Science: Second, revised edition of „Untersuchungen zur Staatsrechtslehre des Kauṭalya“*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden
- Sharma, P.S. (1980) *Anthology of Kumārilabhaṭṭa's works*, Motilal Banarsidass
- Shastri, Swami D. (ed.) (1968) *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Shāntarakṣita with the commentary Pañjikā of Shri Kamalaśīla*, Vol.2, Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati
- Shastri, A.S. (ed.) (1982) *Nyāyaratnamālā of Pārthasārathi Miśra With the Commentary Nāyakarātna by Śrī Rāmānujācārya*, Varanasi: Sarasvati Bhavana Library
- Shida, T. (2004) 'The theory of Truth in the Classical Nyāya System: On the conditions of pravṛtti and the means of justification', *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* 24, 2004
- Shida, T. (2006) 'On the Causal Factor for Validity at the Origination of Cognition: What are the guṇa and the general cause of cognition in Naiyāyikas' parataḥprāmāṇyavāda?', *Journal of Indological Studies*, No.18, 2006
- Shida, T. (2007) 'Udayana's Critique of the Intrinsic Theory of Validity: With

- Respect to the Origination of the Validity', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol.55, No.3, March 2007
- Shida, T. (2011) 'Hypothesis-Generating Logic in Udayana's Rational Theology', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 39: 503-520
- Shope, R. (1983) *The Analysis of Knowing: A Decade of Research*, Princeton University Press
- Siderits, M. (2003) *Personal Identity and Buddhist Philosophy*, Ashgate
- Sosa, E. (1991) *Knowledge in Perspective*, Cambridge University Press
- Sosa, E. (2007) *A Virtue Epistemology: Apt Belief and Reflective Knowledge, Volume I*, Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Sosa, E. (2011) *Knowing Full Well*, Princeton University Press
- Sprung, M. (1979) *Lucid Exposition of the Middle Way: The Essential Chapters from the Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti*, Boulder: Prajñā Press
- Staal, F. (1962) 'Negation and the Law of Contradiction in Indian Thought: A Comparative Study', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 25, No.1-3, 52-71
- Steup, M. (2014) 'Epistemology', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/epistemology/>
- Sturgeon, S. (2006) 'Reflective Disjunctivism', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society: Supplementary Volume* 80, 185-216
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. (1969) *Bhartṛhari: A study of the Vākyapadīya in the*

light of the Ancient Commentaries, Deccan College, Poona

- Taber, J. (1989) 'Are Mantras Speech Acts?', in *Understanding Mantras*, Harvey Alper (ed.), State University of New York Press
- Taber, J. (1992a) 'Further Observations on Kumāriḷa's Bṛhaṭṭikā', *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*, 179-189
- Taber, J. (1992b) 'What Did Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa Mean by Svataḥ Prāmāṇya?', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 112, No. 2, 204-221
- Taber, J. (1994) 'Kumāriḷa's Refutation of the Dreaming Argument: The Nirāḷambanavāda-adhikaraṇa' in *Studies in Mīmāṃsā: Dr. Mandan Mishra Felicitation Volume* (ed. R.C. Dwivedi), Motilal Banarsidass Publishers: 27-52
- Taber, J. (1997) 'The significance of Kumāriḷa's philosophy', in Franco, E. and K. Preisendanz (eds.) *Beyond Orientalism: The Work of Wilhelm Halbfass and its Impact on Indian and Cross-cultural Studies*: 373-393
- Taber, J. (2001) 'Much Ado about Nothing: Kumāriḷa, Śāntarakṣita, and Dharmakīrti on the Cognition of Non-Being', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 121, No. 1: 72-88
- Taber, J. (2005) *A Hindu Critique of Buddhist Epistemology: Kumāriḷa on perception*, RoutledgeCurzon Hindu Studies Series
- Taber, J. (2012) 'Dharmakīrti and the Mīmāṃsakas in Conflict', in Eltschinger, V., H. Krasser, and J. Taber (2012)
- Tillemans, T. (2013) 'Dharmakīrti', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/dharmakiirti/>

- Varadācārya, K.S. (ed.) (1969) *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa with Ṭippaṇi – Nyāyasaurabha by the Editor*, Vol.1, Mysore: Oriental Research Institute
- Velleman, J.D. (2000) *The Possibility of Practical Reason*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Verpoorten, J-M (1987) *Mīmāṃsā literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden
- Westerhoff, J. (2009) *Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka: A Philosophical Introduction*, OUP
- Wiggins, D. (2004) 'Reflections on Inquiry and Truth Arising from Peirce's Method for the Fixation of Belief', in Misak, C. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Peirce*, Cambridge University Press
- Williamson, T. (2000) *Knowledge and its Limits*, Oxford University Press
- Woo, J. (2001) 'Incompatibility And The Proof Of The Buddhist Theory Of Momentariness', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 29: 423-434
- Yao, Zhihua (2005) *The Buddhist Theory of Self-Cognition*, Routledge
- Zagzebski, L. and Fairweather, A. (2001) 'Introduction', in Fairweather, A. and L. Zagzebski (eds.) *Virtue Epistemology*, Oxford University Press

Appendix 1: Transliterated Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā text extract

This appendix contains a transliteration of the svataḥ-prāmāṇyam presentation in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā. That presentation is preserved as a long quotation within Śāntarakṣita's Tattva-saṅgraha. The transliteration below closely follows the Shastri (1968) (Bauddha Bharati) edition [BB], which does not constitute a genuinely critical edition. Accordingly, no credit is taken for original research in respect of the material in this appendix. Emendations were made based on the Krishnamacharya (1926) (Gaekwad's Oriental Series) edition [GOS]. The Tattva-saṅgraha verses quoting the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā are 2811ab, 2812 to 2815 and 2846 to 2918. However, Kataoka notes that there is slight uncertainty as to whether verse 2846 is extracted from the Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā or is by Śāntarakṣita.¹ See Kataoka (2011) 283 footnote 274 for a comparison of Bṛhaṭ-ṭikā and Śloka-vārttika verses. This extract covers 2811 to 2815, 2846 to 2884, and 2908 to 2916, which concern the general case. Verses 2885 to 2907 and 2917 to 2918, concerning the application to the case of the Veda, are omitted.

2811ab: svataḥ sarva-pramāṇānāṃ prāmāṇyam iti gr̥hyatām|
[2811cd: ity etasya ca vākyasya bhavadbhiḥ ko 'rtha iṣyate||]

2812ab: meya-bodhādike śaktis teṣāṃ svābhāvīkī sthitā|
2812cd: na hi svato 'satī śaktiḥ kartum anyena pāryate||²

2813ab: anapekṣatvam evaīkaṃ prāmāṇyasya nibandhanam|
2813cd: tad eva hi vināśyeta sāpekṣatve samāśrite||

2814ab: ko hi mūlaharam paḥṣaṃ nyāyavādy adhyavasyati|
2814cd: yena tat-siddhy-upāyo 'pi svōktyaivāsya vinaśyati||

¹ See Kataoka (2011) 251

² **2812cd** pāryate] BB; śakyate GOS

2815ab: sāpekṣaṃ hi pramāṇatvaṃ na vyavasthāpyate kvacit|³

2815cd: anavasthita-hetuś ca kaḥ sādhyam sādhaiṣyati||

2846ab: svatas tv asya pramāṇānām prāmāṇyasyôpavarṇanāt|

2846cd: svakārye vṛttir jātānām athāpy abhimatā svataḥ||

2847ab: ātmaḥ hi bhāvānām kāraṇāpekṣitēṣyate|

2847cd: labdhātmanaḥ svakāryeṣu vartante svayam eva tu||

2848ab: utpāda-mātra evāto vyapekṣāsti svahetuḥ|

2848cd: jñānānām svaguṇeṣv eṣā na tu niścaya-janmani||

2849ab: janane hi svatantrānām prāmāṇyārtha-viniściteḥ|

2849cd: svahetu-nirapekṣānām teṣām vṛttir ghaṭādivat||

2850ab: mṛtpiṇḍa-daṇḍa-cakrādi ghaṭo janmany apekṣate|

2850cd: udakāharaṇe tv asya tad-apekṣā na vidyate||

2851ab: evaṃ svataḥ-pramāṇatvam ante cāvaśyam eva tat|

2851cd: parādhīne pramāṇatve hy anavasthā prasajyate||

2852ab: maulike cet pramāṇatve pramāṇāntara-sādhyatā|⁴

2852cd: tava tatraīvam icchanto na vyavasthām labhemahi||

2853ab: yathāiva prathamam jñānam tat-saṃvādam apekṣate|

2853cd: saṃvādenāpi saṃvādaḥ punar mṛgyas tathāiva hi||

2854ab: kasyacit tu yadīṣyeta svata eva pramāṇatā|

2854cd: prathamasya tathābhāve pradveṣaḥ kena hetunā||

2855ab: evaṃ yadi guṇādhīnā pratyakṣādi-pramāṇatā|

³ **2815ab** vyavasthāpyate] vyavasthāpyata GOS; vyasthāpyate BB

⁴ **2852ab** cet] GOS; ca BB

2855cd: guṇās ca na pramāṇena vinā santi kadācana||

2856ab: tato guṇa-paricchedi-pramāṇāntaram icchataḥ|

2856cd: tasyâpy anya-paricchinna-guṇâyattā pramāṇatā||

2857ab: yathâdye ca tathā 'anyatrêty anavasthaîva pūrvavat|⁵

2857cd: tatra tatraîvam icchanto na vyavasthāṃ labhemahi|

2858ab: guṇa-jñānaṃ guṇâyatta-prāmāṇyam atha nêṣyate|

2858cd: ādyam apy artha-vijñānaṃ nâpekṣeta guṇa-pramām||

2859ab: ato dūram api dhyātvā prāmāṇyaṃ yat svataḥ kvacit|

2859cd: avaśyâbhyupagantavyam tatraîvâdau varam sthitam||

2860ab: saṃvāda-guṇa-vijñāne kena vā 'bhyadhike mate|⁶

2860cd: ādyasya tad-adhīnatvam yad-balena bhaviṣyati||

2861ab: tasmāt svataḥ-pramāṇatvaṃ sarvatrautsargikaṃ sthitam|

2861cd: bādha-kāraṇa-duṣṭatva-jñānābhyām tad apohyate⁷||

2862ab: parâyatte 'pi caîtasmin nānavasthā prasajyate|

2862cd: pramāṇādhiṇam etad dhi svatas tac ca pratiṣṭhitam||

2863ab: pramāṇaṃ hi pramāṇena yathā nānyena sādhyate|

2863cd: na sidhyaty apramāṇatvam apramāṇāt tathaîva hi||

2864ab: tulya-jātâśrayatve hi pratiṣṭhā nôpapadyate|

2864cd: vijātes tv anya-hetutvād dṛḍha-mūla-pratiṣṭhitā||

2865ab: bādha-pratyayas tāvad arthānyatvâvadhāraṇam|

⁵ **2857ab** yathâdye ca tathā 'anyatrêty] GOS; yathaîvâdye tataś caîvam BB

⁶ 'bhyadhike mate] GOS; printing is bad in BB

⁷ Kataoka reads this term as 'apodyate'

2865cd: so 'napekṣa-pramāṇatvāt pūrva-jñānam apohate⁸||

2866ab: tatrāpi tv apavādasya syād apekṣā punaḥ kvacit|

2866cd: jātāsankasya pūrveṇa sā 'py alpena nivartate||

2867ab: bādhakāntaram utpannaṃ yady asyānviṣyato 'param|

2867cd: tato madhyama-bādhena pūrvasyaīva pramāṇatā||

2868ab: athānurūpa-yatnena samyag-anveṣaṇe kṛte|

2868cd: mūlābhāvān na vijñānaṃ bhavet bādhaka-bādhakam||⁹

2869ab: tato nirapavādatvāt tenaīvādyaṃ balīyasā|

2869cd: bādhyate tena tasyaīva pramāṇatvam apohyate¹⁰||

2870ab: evaṃ parīkṣaka-jñāna-tritayaṃ nātivartate|

2870cd: tataś cājāta-bādhena nāśaṅkyaṃ bādhakaṃ punaḥ||

2871ab: utprekṣeta hi yo mohād ajātam api bādhakam||¹¹

2871cd: sa sarva-vyavahāreṣu saṃśayātmā kṣayaṃ vrajet||

2872ab: tathā ca vāsudevena ninditā saṃśayātmā|

2872cd: nāyaṃ loko 'sti kaunteya na paraḥ saṃśayātmanaḥ||¹²

2873ab: yavān evāpavādo 'to yatra sambhāvyate matau|

2873cd: anviṣṭe 'nupajāte ca tāvaty eva tad-ātmani||

2874ab: kadācit syād apīty evaṃ na bhūyas tatra vastuni|

2874cd: utprekṣamāṇaiḥ sthātavyam ātmakāmaiḥ pramāṭṛbhiḥ||¹³

⁸ This term should perhaps be some form of 'apod-'

⁹ **2868cd** vijñātaṃ] GOS; vijñānaṃ BB

¹⁰ This term should perhaps be 'apodyate'

¹¹ **2871ab** utprekṣyate] GOS; utprekṣeta BB

¹² **2872cd** loko] BB; loke GOS

¹³ **2874cd** ātmakāmaiḥ] BB; nātmakāmaiḥ GOS

2875ab: deśa-kāla-narāvasthā-bhedāḥ saṃvyavahārataḥ|
 2875cd: siddhā eva hi ye yasmiṃs te 'pekṣyā bādhakārthinā||

2876ab: dūra-deśa-vyavasthānād asamyag-darśane bhavet|
 2876cd: anyāśaṅkā kvacit tatra samīpa-gati-mātrakam||

2877ab: apavādāvadhiḥ kāla-narāvasthāntare na tu|
 2877cd: vyapekṣā vidyate tasmin mṛga-trṣṇādi-buddhivat||

2878ab: evaṃ santamase kāle yo gavāśvādi-saṃsayāḥ|
 2878cd: bhrānter vā nirṇayas tatra prakāśī-bhavanāvadhiḥ||

2879ab: tathā hi candra-dig-moha-veda-varṇa-svarādiṣu|
 2879cd: puruṣāntara-saṃpraśnād anyathātvāvadhāraṇam||¹⁴

2880ab: rāga-dveṣa-madōnmāda-kṣut-trṣṇādi-kṣatēndriyaiḥ|
 2880cd: durjñāne jñāyamāne 'rthe tad-abhāvād viparyayaḥ||

2881ab: ṛṇādi-vyavahāre 'pi dvayor vivadamānayoḥ|
 2881cd: ekaṃ pratyarthino vākyaṃ dve vākye pūrva-vādinah||

2882ab: anavasthā-bhayād eva na vākyaṃ dve likhyate 'dhikam|
 2882cd: tatas tu nirṇayaṃ brūyuh svāmi-sākṣi-sabhāsadaḥ||

2883ab: evaṃ jñāna-trayasyaīva sarvatra vikriyêṣyate|¹⁵
 2883cd: trisatyatā 'pi devānām ata evābhidhīyate||

2884ab: tena svataḥ-pramāṇatve nānavasthōbhayor api|
 2884cd: pramāṇatvāpramāṇatve yathā-yogam ataḥ sthite||

2908ab: nanu pramāṇam ity evaṃ pratyakṣādi na gṛhyate|

¹⁴ **2879cd** anyathātvāvadhāraṇam] GOS; anyathātvēvadhāraṇam BB

¹⁵ **2883ab** sarvārthādhikriyêṣyate] BB; sarvatra vikriyêṣyate GOS

2908cd: na cêttam agrhîtena vyavahāro 'vakalpyate||¹⁶

2909ab: pramāṇam grahaṇāt pūrvam svarūpeṇa pratiṣṭhitam|

2909cd: nirapekṣam ca tat-svārthe pramite mīyate paraiḥ||

2910ab: yathā cāviditair eva cakṣur-ādibhir indriyaiḥ|

2910cd: grhyante viṣayāḥ sarve pramāṇair api te tathā||

2911ab: tenātra jñāyamānatvam prāmāṇye nōpayujyate|

2911cd: viṣayānubhavo py asmād ajñātād eva labhyate||

2912ab: apramāṇam punaḥ svārthe pramāṇam iva hi sthitam|

2912cd: mithyātvam tasya grhyeta na pramāṇāntarād ṛte||

2913ab: na hy arthasyānyathābhāvaḥ pūrveṇāttas tathātvavat|

2913cd: tad atrāpy anyathābhāve dhīr yad vā duṣṭa-kāraṇe||

2914ab: tāvatā caīva mithyātvam grhyate nānya-hetukam|

2914cd: utpatty-avastham caīvēdam pramāṇam iti mīyate||¹⁷

2915ab: ato yatrāpi mithyātvam parebhyaḥ pratipādyate|

2915cd: tatrāpy etad dvayam vācyam na tu sādharma-mātrakam||

2916ab: tatrāpramāṇa-sādharma-mātram yat-kiñcid āśritāḥ|

2916cd: sarvam pramāṇa-mithyātvam sādhayanty avipaścitaḥ||

¹⁶ **2908cd** 'vakalpyate] BB; 'vakalpate GOS

¹⁷ **2914cd** caīvēdam] BB; evēdam GOS

Appendix 2: Translated Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā text extract (with transliteration in brackets)

This appendix contains a translation of the svataḥ-prāmāṇyam presentation in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā in accordance with the final understanding developed in this thesis. That presentation is preserved as a long quotation within Śāntarakṣita's Tattva-saṅgraha. The transliterated text below is based on the Krishnamacharya (1926) and Shastri (1968) (Bauddha Bharati) editions, so no credit is taken for original research in respect of editing the Sanskrit text. Those editions do not constitute genuinely critical editions, and some errors in translation may arise from underlying errors in the text. The English translation Jha (1939) of that edition and parallel verses in Kataoka (2011) were consulted. The Tattva-saṅgraha verses quoting the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā are 2811ab, 2812 to 2815 and 2846 to 2918. However, Kataoka notes that there is slight uncertainty as to whether verse 2846 is extracted from the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā or is by Śāntarakṣita.¹ See Kataoka (2011) 283 footnote 274 for a comparison of Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā and Śloka-vārttika verses. This translation covers 2811 to 2815, 2846 to 2884, and 2908 to 2916, which concern the general case. Verses 2885 to 2907 and 2917 to 2918, concerning the application to the case of the Veda, are omitted. In some cases, verses are split to make clear the flow of the argument.

2811ab: The capacity for epistemic success (prāmāṇyam) of all Good Case deliverances (sarva-pramāṇānām) is apprehended (iti grhyatām) as being an intrinsic nature (svataḥ).

[2811cd: And (ca) what meaning (ko 'rthaḥ) of this statement (ity etasya ... vākyasya) is accepted (iṣyate) by you (bhavadbhiḥ)?]

2812: A capacity to cognize something etc. (meya-bodhādike śaktiḥ) belongs to them [viz. Good Case deliverances] (teṣām ... sthitā) due to an intrinsic causal

¹ See Kataoka (2011) 251

power (svābhāvīkī). To explain (hi), a capacity (śaktiḥ) which is not due to being an intrinsic nature (svato 'satī) cannot be produced (na ... kartum ... pāryate) by something else (anyena).

2813: A capacity for epistemic success is solely due to non-dependence (anapekṣatvam evaīkaṃ prāmāṇyasya nibandhanam). For (hi) just that [i.e. the capacity for epistemic success] (tad eva) would be destroyed (vināśyeta) if dependence were accepted (sāpekṣatve samāśrite).

2814: To explain (hi), what philosopher (kaḥ ... nyāyavādi) accepts (adhyavasyati) a view that destroys the central topic (mūlaharaṃ pakṣam), by which (yena) even (api) the means of establishing that [view] (tat-siddhy-upāyaḥ) is destroyed (vinaśyati) by his (asya) very words (svôktyaīva).

2815: To explain (hi), dependence (sāpekṣam) never (na ... kvacit) establishes (vyavasthāpyate) the Goodness of Case (pramāṇatvam), and (ca) what (kaḥ) reason which has no foundation (anavasthita-hetuḥ) will cause to be proved (sādhayiṣyati) what is to be proved (sādhyam)?

2846ab: Rather (tu), due to the description (upavarṇanāt) of this capacity for epistemic success (asya ... prāmāṇyasya) of the Good Case deliverances (pramāṇānām) [as] being due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ), ...

2846cd: ... therefore (athāpi) the activity (vṛttiḥ) in operating (svakārye) of [the Good Case deliverances which] have arisen (jātānām) is considered (abhimatā) [to be] due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ).

2847: "To explain (hi), it is accepted that (iṣyate) entities (bhāvānām) depend on causes (kāraṇāpekṣitā) in order to obtain their existence (ātmalābhe). But (tu) [entities which] have obtained their existence (labdhātmanaḥ) function (vartante) in their own activities (svakāryeṣu) just independently (svayam eva).

2848: So (ataḥ) there is dependency (vyapekṣāsti) of deliverances (jñānānām)

on their own causes (svahetuṣu) simply in being produced (utpāda-mātr[e]) only (eva), but (tu) there is not (na) this [dependency] (eṣā) [of deliverances] in producing (-janmani) ascertainment (niścaya-) in respect of their good features (svaguṇeṣu).

2849: To explain (hi), when the ascertainment of the object [and] of the capacity for epistemic success (prāmāṇyârtha-viniściteḥ) is being produced (janane), the functioning (vṛttiḥ) of those [viz. Good Case deliverances] (teṣām) which are independent (svatantrāṇām) and not reliant on their own causes (svahetu-nirapekṣāṇām) is like [the functioning of] a pot etc. (ghaṭḍivat).

2850: In being produced (janmani), a pot (ghaṭaḥ) depends on (apekṣate) a lump of clay, a [potter's] stick, a [potter's] wheel etc. (mṛtpinḍa-daṇḍa-cakrâdi), but (tu) its (asya) [i.e. the pot's] dependency on those things (tad-apekṣā) is not present (na vidyate) when water is being extracted [in a setting process] (udakâharणे).

2851: Goodness of Case [being] due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ-pramāṇatvam) is like that (evam), and (ca) that [Goodness] (tat) is certainly just (avaśyam eva) in the final [deliverance] (ante), for (hi) if Goodness of Case were dependent on something else (parâdhîne pramāṇatve), there would be infinite regress (anavasthā prasajyate).

2852: If it is said (cet) by you (tava) that the Goodness of Case of the first [deliverance] (maulike ... pramāṇatve) is established (-sâdhyatâ) by a different Good Case deliverance (pramāṇântara-), [then] in that case (tatra), seeking (icchantâḥ) in this way (evam), we would not find a foundation (na vyavasthâṃ labhemahi).

2853: Just as (yathâiva) the first deliverance (prathamam jñānam) depends on a deliverance which agrees with it (tat-saṃvâdam apekṣate), in the same way (tathâiva hi), an agreeing deliverance (saṃvâdah) should again be sought (punar mṛgyâḥ) for that agreeing deliverance (saṃvâdena) also (api).

2854: But (tu) if (yadi) you accept (iṣyeta) the Goodness of Case (pramāṇatā) of some [deliverance] (kasyacit) to be just due to an intrinsic nature (svata eva), [then] why (kena hetunā) are you averse (pradveṣaḥ) to [admitting that] the actual presence (tathābhāve) [of Goodness] is in the first [deliverance] (prathamasya)?

2855: If (yadi) the Goodness of Case of perceptual deliverances etc. (pratyakṣādi-pramāṇatā) is dependent on good features (guṇādhīnā) in this way (evam), and (ca) good features (guṇāḥ) do not exist (na ... santi) other than in a Good Case deliverance (pramāṇena vinā) at any time (kadācana), ...

2856: ... then (tataḥ), when seeking (icchataḥ) another Good Case deliverance (-pramāṇāntaram) which manifests the good feature (guṇa-paricchedi-), the Goodness of Case (pramāṇatā) of that (tasya) too (api) would be dependent on a good feature manifested by another [valid cognition] (anya-paricchinna-guṇāyattā).

2857: And (ca) just as (yathā) in the case of the first (ādye), so (tathā) [in the case] of the next (anyatra), like before (pūrvavat) so (iti) [there would] just (eva) be infinite regress (anavasthā). In this way (evam), seeking (icchantaḥ) in the case of one and another (tatra tatra), we would not find a foundation (na vyavasthāṃ labhemahi).

2858: And if (atha) it is not accepted (nēṣyate) that cognition of the good feature (guṇa-jñānam) has a capacity for epistemic success (-prāmāṇyam) that is dependent on a [further] good feature (guṇāyatta-), [then] the first [deliverance] (ādyam) too (api) would not depend (nāpekṣeta) on the deliverance of the object (artha-vijñānam) which is the knowledge of the good feature (guṇa-pramām).

2859: So (ataḥ) having considered (dhyātvā) for a long time (dūram api), it certainly has to be postulated (avaśyābhyupagantavyam) that the capacity for

epistemic success (prāmāṇyam) of some [deliverance] (yat ... kvacit) is due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ). This being the case (tatraiva) it is best (varam) established (sthitam) in the first [deliverance] (ādau).

2860: Or (vā) due to what (kena) are the deliverances of agreement and the deliverance of a good feature (saṃvāda-guṇa-vijñāne) considered (mate) superior (abhyadhike), due to the strength of which (yad-balena) the first [cognition] (ādyasya) will be (bhaviṣyati) dependent on that (tad-adhīnatvam)?

2861: So (tasmāt) Goodness of Case [being] due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ-pramāṇatvam) remains (sthitam) the general operation (autsargikam) in all cases (sarvatra), [and] it (tat) is replaced (apohyate²) either by a defeating deliverance or by the deliverance that there is a flaw in how the belief was formed (bādha-kāraṇa-duṣṭatva-jñānābhyām).

2862: And even though this [defeating deliverance or by the deliverance that there is a flaw] would be dependent on something else (parāyatte 'pi caītasmin), there would be no infinite regress (nānavasthā prasajyate), for (hi) that [Goodness] (etat) would be dependent on a Good Case deliverance (pramāṇādīnam), and that (tac ca) is established (pratiṣṭhitam) [as being] due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ).

2863: To explain (hi), just as (yathā) a Good Case deliverance (pramāṇam) is not (na) established (sādhyate) by another (anyena) Good Case deliverance (pramāṇena), in the same way (tathaiva hi), Badness of deliverance (apramāṇatvam) is not (na) established (sidhyati) by [another] Bad Case deliverance (apramāṇāt).

2864: For (hi) when one thing is based on something else of the same kind (tulya-jātāśrayatve), a [final] foundation (pratiṣṭhā) is not possible (nōpapadyate), whereas (tu) [something] of a different kind (vijāteḥ) is securely established (drḍha-mūla-pratiṣṭhitā), because [in that Case] it has a

² Kataoka reads this term as 'apodyate'

cause that is something else (anya-hetutvāt).

2865: The mental state defeater (bādhaka-pratyayaḥ) is just (tāvat) the determination (-avadhāraṇam) that the object is different [from how it was originally cognized] (arthānyatva-). It (saḥ) excludes (apohate³) the earlier deliverance (pūrva-jñānam) because it has Goodness of Case that is independent (anapekṣa-pramāṇatvāt).

2866: Although (api tu) in respect of those [defeaters] (tatra) there may be (syāt) dependence (apekṣā) on replacement operation (apavādasya) again (punaḥ) in some cases (kvacit), nevertheless (api) for a person who has developed a genuine doubt (jātāśaṅkasya) due to the earlier [deliverance] (pūrveṇa), that [dependence] (sā) will easily (alpena) come to an end (nivartate).

2867: If (yadi) another actual defeater (bādhakāntaram utpannam) of this [second deliverance] (asya) is additionally (aparam) sought (anviṣyataḥ), then (tataḥ) by the defeat of the middle [second] deliverance (madhyama-bādhena), just the first is a Good Case (pūrvasyaiva pramāṇatā).

2868: And if (atha), when it has been correctly sought (samyag-anveṣaṇe kṛte) with appropriate effort (anurūpa-yatnena), a defeater of the defeater (bādhaka-bādhakam) should not be known (na vijñātaṃ bhavet) as it has no basis (mūlābhāvāt) ...

2869: ... then (tataḥ) due to its greater strength (tenaiva ... balīyasā) [of the defeater] due to not being replaced (nirapavādatvāt), the first [deliverance] (ādyam) will be defeated (bādhyate tena), [and] the Goodness of Case (pramāṇatvam) of that [first deliverance] (tasyaiva) will be excluded (apohyate⁴).

³ Variant reading may be some form of 'apod-'

⁴ Variant reading may be 'apodyate'

2870: Thus (evam) the inquirer does not go beyond the third deliverance (parīkṣaka-jñāna-tritayaṃ nâtivartate), and so (tataś ca) a further defeater (bādhakaṃ punaḥ) is not suspected (nâśaṅkyam) as no defeater has arisen (ajāta-bādhena).

2871: To explain (hi), he (saḥ) who (yaḥ), having a doubting nature (saṃśayâtmā) in all his everyday activities (sarva-vyavahāreṣu), conjectures (utprekṣyate) [a defeater] through delusion (mohāt) even when no defeater has arisen (ajātam api bādhakam) will perish (kṣayaṃ vrajet).

2872: And so (tathā ca) being a compulsive doubter (saṃśayâtmā) is censured (ninditā) by Vāsudeva (vāsudevena) – “O, Kaunteya (kaunteya), neither this world (nāyaṃ lokaḥ) nor the next (na paraḥ) is (asti) for a compulsive doubter (saṃśayâtmanah).”

2873: So (ataḥ) whenever (yavān eva) a replacement operation (apavāda[ḥ]) is possible (sambhāvyate) for a deliverance (matau) and (ca) which (yatra) does not arise when sought (anviṣṭe 'nupajāte), just in that Case (tāvaty eva) it has that nature (tad-ātmani).

2874: In regard to that object (tatra vastuni), the self-concerned (ātmakāmaiḥ) investigator (pramātr̥bhiḥ) should establish [its perception as correct] (sthātavyam), by not continuing (na bhūyaḥ) to conjecture (utprekṣamāṇaiḥ) that (ity evam) “[defeat] is possible at some [later] time” (kadācit syād api).

2875: To explain (hi), due to meeting with (saṃvyavahārataḥ) differences (-bhedāḥ) in place (deśa-), time (-kāla-), man (-nara-), circumstance (-avasthā-), for (hi) it is established that (siddhā) [error] only (eva) [is in those] which (ye) [are listed above, so it is] in regard to (apekṣyā) those (te) in which (yasmin) [error is sought] by the seeker of defeaters (bādhakārthinā).

2876: When something is wrongly seen (asamyag-darśane) due to being situated at a faraway place (dūra-deśa-vyavasthānāt), there would be (bhavet)

suspicion that it is something else (anyâśaṅkā) in some cases (kvacit) just until one has come close (tatra samīpa-gati-mātrakam).

2877: [Then there is] termination of [the possibility of] replacement operation (apavādâvadhiḥ) in respect of time (kāla-), man (-nara-) and circumstance (-avasthântare), and there is no expectation (na tu vyapekṣā vidyate) in regard to that (tasmin), like the cognition of mirage etc. (mrga-trṣṇâdi-buddhivat).

2878: In this way (evam), when it is very dark (santamase kâle), a doubt such as about being a cow or a horse (gavâśvâdi-saṃśayaḥ) which [takes the form] (yaḥ) 'is [the belief formed] through error or [is it] an accurate determination?' (bhrânter vā nirṇayaḥ); in those cases (tatra) termination [occurs] in [the object] being manifested (prakâśī-bhavanâvadhiḥ).

2879: In the same way (tathā hi), in the cases of [misperceiving] the moon (candra-), confusion about direction (-dig-moha-), the phonemes and accents of the Veda (-veda-varṇa-svarādiṣu), etc., a determination that [the true facts are] otherwise (anyathâtvâvadhāraṇam) [occurs] by asking another person (puruṣântara-saṃpraśnāt).

2880: In regard to the deliverance of objects which are being badly delivered (durjñāne jñāyamāne 'rthe), due to senses which have been impaired by (-kṣatêndriyaiḥ) passion (rāga-), anger (-dveṣa-), intoxication (-mada-), madness (-unmāda-), hunger (-kṣut-), thirst etc. (-trṣṇâdi-), the opposite [i.e. good cognition] (viparyayaḥ) [occurs] when those things do not obtain (tad-abhāvād).

2881: Even (apī) in lawsuits relating to debts etc. (ṛṇâdi-vyavahāre), of the two litigants (dvayor vivadamānayoḥ), one statement [is taken] from the defendant (ekaṃ pratyarthino vākyaṃ) [and] two statements [are taken] from the claimant (dve vākyaḥ pūrva-vādinah).

2882: Precisely (eva) because of the fear of infinite regress (anavasthā-

bhayāt), no further statements (na vākyaṃ ... adhikam) are recorded (likhyate). Rather (tu), the judge (svāmi-), witnesses (-sākṣi-) [and] assessors (-sabhāsadaḥ) should pronounce (brūyuh) a decision (nirṇayam) based on that [number of statements] (tataḥ).

2883: In this way (evam), in all cases (sarvatra), production (vikriyā) of only three judgments (jñāna-trayaśyaiva) is needed (iṣyate). For this reason (ata eva) the deities (devānām) too (api) are called (abhidhīyate) 'triple-truth' (trisatyatā).

2884: So (tena) when Goodness of Case is due to an intrinsic nature (svataḥ-pramāṇatve), [there is] no infinite regress (nānavasthā) of either [Goodness or Badness of Case] (ubhayor api). So (ataḥ) Goodness and Badness of Case (pramāṇatvāpramāṇatve) are established (sthite) as per usual practice (yathāyogam).

2908ab: Objection (nanu): Perceptual and other [cognitions] (pratyakṣādi) are not apprehended (na gr̥hyate) in the manner (evam): '[this is] a Good Case deliverance' (pramāṇam ity).

2908cd: And (ca) human activity (vyavahāraḥ) could not take place (na ... avakalpyate) while they are not grasped (agr̥hītena) in this way (ittham)

2909: A Good Case deliverance (pramāṇam) is established (pratiṣṭhitam) due to its own nature (svarūpeṇa) even before being apprehended (grahaṇāt pūrvam), independently (nirapekṣam) and (ca) in its own form (tat-svārthe); having apprehended [something] (pramite), it is [in turn] apprehended by another ['pramāṇa'] (mīyate paraiḥ)

2910: And (ca) just as (yathā) objects (viśayāḥ) are apprehended (gr̥hyante) by the senses, vision etc. (cakṣur-ādibhir indriyaiḥ) which are themselves not cognized (aviditair eva), all those [things] (sarve ... te) are likewise (tathā) [cognized] due to Good Case deliverances (pramāṇaiḥ).

2911ab: So (tena) the fact that [the deliverance] is [itself] apprehended (asya jñāyamānatvam) does not contribute (nôpayujyate) to epistemic success (prāmāṇye).

2911cd: The experience of the object (viṣayānubhavaḥ) is obtained (labhyate) even (api) when there is no [separate] awareness of the deliverance [itself] (ajñātād eva).

2912ab: To explain (hi), by contrast (punaḥ), a Bad Case deliverance (apramāṇam) is established (sthitam) in its own object (svārthe) like a Good Case deliverance (pramāṇam iva)

2912cd: The falsity of that [deliverance] (mithyātvam tasya) is not apprehended without another Good Case deliverance (gṛhyeta na pramāṇāntarād ṛte).

2913ab: To explain (hi) that an object is different [from how it is apprehended] (arthasyānyathābhāvaḥ) is not discerned (na ... āttaḥ) from the earlier [deliverance] (pūrveṇa), [whereas] the fact that it is the same [does come from from the earlier deliverance] (tathātvavat).

2913cd: Here too (atrāpi), [there will be] an awareness (dhīḥ) that the object is different (arthānyathā-bhāve) from that (tat) or that the cause is faulty (yad vā duṣṭakāraṇe).

2914ab: And just in this way (tāvataiva ca) falsity (mithyātvam), which has no other cause (nānyahetukam) is apprehended (gṛhyate).

2914cd: And (ca) just (eva) in the state of being produced (utpatty-avastham), it is determined that "this is a Good Case deliverance" (idam pramāṇam iti mīyate).

2915ab: Therefore (ataḥ) when (yatrâpi) [you opponents try to] inform others of (parebhyaḥ pratipādyate) the falsity (mithyātvam) [of a cognition which arises from a Vedic injunction], ...

2915cd: ... in that case, too (tatrâpi), [one of] these two [conditions] (etad dvayaṃ) should be stated (vācyam), but [you should] not [appeal to] a mere similarity (na tu sādharma-mātrakam) [to worldly statements, which might be true or false].

2916: Regarding that (tatra), undiscerning people (avipaścitaḥ) establish (sādhayanti) the falsity of all Good Case deliverances (sarvaṃ pramāṇa-mithyātvam) merely through [their] resemblance to Bad Case deliverances (apramāṇa-sādharma-mātram) are inadequately supported (yat-kiñcid āśritāḥ).

Glossary of key terms

apavāda: Replacement operation; this is connected with the verbal form 'apodyate', which means 'is replaced'; cf. **utsarga**

bādhaka: Mental state defeater; this term is connected with the noun **bādha**, which means 'defeat'.

essence: the term is used in Fine's sense whereby "an object [has] a property essentially just in case it is necessary that the object has the property."¹ Fine distinguishes this categorical form from two conditional forms, conditional on the existence of that object, and conditional on that object being identical with what it is.

intrinsic: the term is used in the sense of Harré and Madden, whereby an intrinsic feature is "a feature of the thing itself"². Such an intrinsic feature may be overcome by external stimuli.

jñāna: Deliverance; this translation has been borrowed from Sosa, and displays a similar ambiguity to the original term, between act of delivering and delivered content. Depending on context, this term has also been translated as (occurrent) judgment. It also can correspond to the notions of (occurrent) belief and (occurrent) awareness. This term has been translated as 'cognition' and 'awareness' by some contemporary scholars.

non-pramāṇa: Bad Case deliverance; this is an incorrect awareness or judgment as of an object which arises from a vitiated use of human faculties such as perception; cf. **pramāṇa**

¹ Fine (1994) 3

² Harré and Madden (1975) 87

non-pramāṇatvam: The fact of being a Bad Case deliverance; cf. **pramāṇatvam**

non-prāmāṇyam: Epistemic failure; cf. **prāmāṇyam**

parataḥ: 'From something else'; This term has been translated as **extrinsic** by some contemporary scholars; cf. **svataḥ**

paryudāsa: A form of negation which positively excludes an injunction by prescribing an alternative injunction, rather than mere prohibition; cf. **pratiṣedha**

pramāṇa: Good Case deliverance; an awareness or judgment which arises from the unvitiated use of human faculties such as perception; cf. **jñāna**

pramāṇatvam: The fact of being a Good Case deliverance; cf. **pramāṇa**

prāmāṇyam: A capacity for epistemic success; epistemic success consists in a capacity for veridical awareness, that is, a capacity for accurate determination of an object or fact. Depending on context, a statement about this capacity may be equivalent to a statement about epistemic success itself. This term has been translated as 'validity' by some contemporary scholars. John Dunne understands this term as 'instrumentality' towards some end such as a resultant act of knowing.

prāptā: 'Is ascribed'; this term describes the provisional attribution of a hypothesis.

pratiṣedha: A form of negation which merely prohibits rather than positively excludes by means of an alternative injunction; cf. **paryudāsa**

svabhāva: A causal power or disposition which is the essence of an entity conditional on its existence

svataḥ: 'From itself'; this term is used by Kumāriḷa to convey the idea of a default intrinsic nature of deliverances *per se* as an epistemic kind conditional on normal conditions and the idea of a kind essence of Good Case deliverances conditional on their identity as Good case deliverances. This term has been translated as 'intrinsic' by some contemporary scholars; cf. **parataḥ**

utsarga: General operation; Kumāriḷa transfers this term from ritual and grammatical theoretical contexts; cf. **apavāda**

virodha: Conflict; this term subsumes contradiction and contrariety; exegetical techniques were developed in the ritual interpretation literature to resolve such conflict; Kumāriḷa discusses the ascription of two conflicting epistemic statuses to a single belief and resolution through a model of general operation and positive exclusion.

Index versorum

This index contains references to all significant quotations of verses in the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā and in the Śloka-vārttika in the main body of the thesis.

Bṛhaṭṭīkā	
TS 2850.....	73
TS 2851ab.....	226
TS 2852.....	234
TS 2853.....	234
TS 2854.....	234
TS 2859.....	225
TS 2861.....	156, 171
TS 2861ab.....	174
TS 2861cd.....	179
TS 2865.....	187
TS 2866.....	188
TS 2867.....	189
TS 2868.....	190
TS 2869.....	190
TS 2870.....	192, 203
TS 2871.....	193
TS 2872.....	193
TS 2875.....	195
TS 2877.....	195
TS 2878.....	196
TS 2879.....	196
TS 2880.....	197

Śloka-vārttika.....	
ŚV 2.33.....	113
ŚV 2.34ab.....	117
ŚV 2.34cd.....	116
ŚV 2.35ab.....	121
ŚV 2.35cd.....	116
ŚV 2.36ab.....	121
ŚV 2.36cd.....	116
ŚV 2.37ab.....	123
ŚV 2.37cd.....	123
ŚV 2.38abc.....	215
ŚV 2.39ab.....	216
ŚV 2.39cd.....	215
ŚV 2.47.....	177
ŚV 2.48.....	98
ŚV 2.48ab.....	126
ŚV 2.49.....	218
ŚV 2.50.....	218
ŚV 2.51.....	218
ŚV 2.53.....	154, 156, 171
ŚV 2.53ab.....	142, 143, 174
ŚV 2.53cd.....	179
ŚV 2.54.....	101, 216
ŚV 2.55.....	217
ŚV 2.58.....	181
ŚV 2.60cd.....	194
ŚV 2.61.....	203, 226
ŚV 2.63cd.....	238
ŚV 2.65bcd.....	238
ŚV 2.68.....	238
ŚV 2.83.....	130
ŚV 2.84.....	224
ŚV 2.85.....	130

ŠV 2.91.....	239
ŠV 2.92ab.....	239