

Rationality in Indian Philosophy

Arindam Chakrabarti

From Companion to World Philosophy, Blackwell, Oxford. Ed by Deutsch and Bontekoe, 1997.

Introductory Remarks

You cannot say "thank you" in Sanskrit. It would be ridiculous to deduce from this (as William Ward, a British Orientalist, did in 1822) that gratefulness as a sentiment was unknown to the ancient Indian people. It is no less ridiculous to argue that *rationality* as a concept is absent from or marginal to the entire panoply of classical Indian philosophical traditions on the basis of the fact that there is no exact Sanskrit equivalent of that word.

For one thing, there *are* several words for the science or art of reasoning: for example, "*anviksiki* *," "*tarkasastra**," "*nyaya**." (And one of these — namely, "*anviksiki*," and its role in the Indian metatheory of branches of learning or knowledge — will occupy us in a separate section of this article). There are also very ancient words for the institutions of rational debate and public problem-solving contests (for example, a "*brahmodya*"), like the famous one reported in the Brhadaranyaka* Upanisad* (third book) in which Yajñavalkya* steals the show in the court of the philosopher-king Janaka. There are also words for the special form of reflecting by means of anticipated "pro" and "contra" arguments ("*uhapoha**," "*manana*," "*yukti-vicara**"), which one is urged to cultivate as part of a contemplative culture.

Second, even if there were no such closely cognate words, that would hardly license the conjecture that the concept is foreign to the Vedic people. Of course, identity-criteria for concepts are hard to formulate. But, as the following discussion would demonstrate, articulated concepts of what makes a belief, an action, an interpretation, a preference, a choice of means or an end *reasonable* could be detected everywhere in classical Indian thought. Those concepts may not be easily recognizable as concepts of *rationality*, since unlike the standard Western concepts of rationality, the typically Indian notions of rationality are, on an average, non-hedonistic, non-individualistic, non-positivistic, and aim at surrendering the personal ego to an impersonal tradition or to some universal consciousness.

In this article, I shall first try to diagnose four major worries that can make even unprejudiced surveyors of Indian thought wonder whether the concept of rationality, with its positive value-overtone, is at all compatible with the general tenor of classical Indian philosophies. Although it is advisable to be suspicious of any talk of the "general tenor" of *all* Indian philosophies (except Buddhism, because I have avoided discussing it here), these deep worries are well grounded. By trying to face them, I think, we can get a better grip on the special contribution that Indian ways of thinking — in their inexhaustible variety of in-house disagreements and their passion for intra-traditional polemics — made to the multivalent concept of rationality.

After responding to these four major worries, I take up specific aspects of the Indian theoretical engagement with logical, epistemic, hermeneutic, ethical, aesthetic, and soteriological

rationality. Besides demonstrating the diversity and enormity of this field, I hope my account will suggest the way in which the tensions between scriptural testimony and reason, mysticism and logic, poetry and analysis, action and theory were celebrated, partially resolved and partially allowed to remain unresolved by the ancient and medieval Indian thinkers, and how some contemporary Indian interpreters are coming to terms with these inner tensions within their own pluralistic cultural legacy.

How Are Humans Special?

One important way in which the adjective "rational" has been understood in the West is as standing for the differentiating feature distinguishing human beings from other animals. It must have been part of popular thinking even in ancient India that cognitive and ratiocinative powers distinguish humans from beasts because a very important Hindu religious text (*Durga * Saptasati**, a part of *Markandeya* Purana**) warns *against* this idea and says in no uncertain terms: "True, humans are knowledgeable, but they are not the only ones; for even birds and beasts all have knowledge of some sort." Then it goes on to give examples of apparently self-sacrificing behavior on the part of bird-mothers feeding their young *knowing*, as it were, that they are totally dependent at that stage. Because of the continuity across species underlying the reincarnation theory (which enabled the wise, rational, morally sensitive Buddha to be born in many sub-human bodies or even Vishnu the god to assume the form of a fish or a pig), on the one hand, and the orthodox Vedic society positing caste divisions within human society as a natural given, on the other, the divide between humans and sub-humans was never such a major theme among the traditional Indians.

One can, however, point out three very striking ways in which the privilege of man has been thematized in the tradition. First, in the *Aitareya Aranyaka** (which is a part of the Vedic corpus) man (*purusa**, gender-neutral) is said to be privileged because in him the self (*atman**) is more manifest; he alone discerns what he perceives and can liberate his understanding and speech from the immediate needs of hunger and thirst. Saying that beasts and birds are unable to foresee and plan, this text comments beautifully: "Man knows tomorrow . . . and by the mortal aspires after the immortal."

Second, Sabara* in his commentary to the *Mimamsa* Sutra** (VI, 1,5) remarks on this typically human capacity to wait and (as the *Rgveda** X.117 says, warning the short-sighted ungiving amasser of wealth) "look down the longer path." Rising above the proximate (*asanna**) self-interest, a human being can perform "sacrifices" both in the literal and the ritualistic sense for the sake of "unseen" results in a remote future. A sacrifice (*yajña*) is therefore taken by the *Bhagavad Gita** (4.28 33) as the human rational activity *par excellence*, so much so that even "trying to ascertain the meaning of Vedic sentences by logical arguments" is called "knowledge-sacrifice" (*nyayena* vedartha* niscayah* jnanayajnah**). At the very end of *Nirukta*, Yaska* (400 BCE) personifies Reasoning as a wise seer (*rsi**), one "*tarka-rsi**" who would guide the interpretation of obscure Vedic texts by humans.

Thus while both animals and humans are conscious pleasure-seekers, only humans are capable of *dharma* considerations of piety and morality, right or wrong conduct. Hence the popular Sanskrit adage, found in some versions of the *Hitopadesa**: "Without *dharma*, a man eating,

sleeping, and engaging in sex is no different from a beast." The link between the ethico-ritualistic concept of *dharma* and rationality is very clear in texts like *Yogavasistha* Ramayana**, which devotes an entire chapter (II, 14) to the nature and importance of *vicara** (reflective analysis) without which human life is pointless. This is how the chapter starts: "With an intellect purified by understanding of the scriptures, the person who is aware of what causes what (*karana*-jñā*), must constantly examine and analyze himself." The chapter ends after 45 verses explaining the indispensability of reasoned reflection for moral, spiritual as well as worldly life with this echo of Socrates: "It is better to be born as a mud-frog or as a slime-worm or as a snake in a cave than to be an unreflective unexamining human being."

But all this praise for intellectual and moral superiority is qualified by a most interesting twist given by the *Mahabharata** to its explanation of why "there is nothing nobler than humanity" in the story of a poor scholarly Brahmin (Mbh XII, 174). Knocked over by a rich man's carriage, he wants to die on the street out of utter frustration. Indra, the King of Gods takes the form of a jackal and tells him that he should make the best of his life as a human being because he is far better off than beasts who cannot even scratch themselves properly with their tails. For several verses this story goes on to explain why humans are great because they have a *pair of hands* with ten pliable fingers with which they can take out thorns, and make tools and shelters and clothing. Thus not so much as *homo sapiens* but as *homo faber* do humans rule over other creatures. What does this have to do with rationality?

Foreshadowing what I say, in the next paragraph, about rationality and the use of hand gestures to communicate (for example, in the Indian but not exclusively Indian ways of greeting with folded hands, giving reassurance, and so on), let us compare this "manual" view of man with the following remark by Kant:

The characterization of man as a rational animal is already present in the form and organization of the human *hand*, partly by the structure and partly by the sensitive feeling of the *fingers* and *finger-tips*. (*Anthropology*, p. 323, italics Kant's)

The point that the *Mahabharata* makes about the hands making humans "free" to clean or protect themselves or to dominate or torture others is exactly the point that Kant also makes in the remark: "By this, nature has made him fit for manipulating things not in one particular way but in any way whatsoever, and so for using reasons" (ibid.).

A dimension of these wonderful possibilities that the hands open up for us which Kant did not speak of (and perhaps would *not* have considered part of rationality) is the endlessly expressive and creative use of the hands, palms and fingers in dance and drama that Bharata, in the fourth chapter of his magnum opus *Natya * Sastra**, lists as 140 different "poses" forming the basic postural alphabet (*karanas** and *angaharas**). That would be a typically Indian extension of the "reason of the hands."

It is by systematic reflection and debate about every aspect of life that the classical Indian learned traditions self-consciously tried to display the distinctiveness of human existence without making too much of a fuss about just the *cognitive* specialty of humans. An extreme example of the use of definition and dialectic in every sphere of rational thought from etymology to erotica can be given from the *Kamasutra** (VI, 2,27 8) where Vatsyayana* considers the view of those

who "argue that massage is a form of embrace because it is a tactile contact." He observes that "there are three reasons why it is not so, because [in love-practice] they occur at different times, because they serve different purposes, and unlike an embrace which is ideally reciprocal a massage is non-mutual." The commentator adds a little *reductio* to the effect that "if any tactile contact were an embrace, then even a kiss would be so." When the zeal to theorize and support every theory with a reason was carried to this extreme in ancient Indian thought, one cannot but be surprised at the fact that "lack of theoretical orientation" is usually the first charge that is brought against the Indian mind.

Four Worries Dissipated

Of the four features of Indian thought that could be pointed out as reasons for skepticism about the very idea of an Indian conception of Rationality the first that draws our attention is the alleged practical or goal-oriented character of Indian philosophy. Not only are pleasure (*kama**), power/wealth (*artha*), piety/righteousness (*dharma*), and final liberation from suffering (*moksa**) distinguished as the four and only four alternative and actually pursued goals of life, but even branches of knowledge or subjects of study are divided accordingly.

Thus we have *kamasastra**, *arthasastra**, *dharmasastra**, and a specially prestigious *moksasastra** dealing with these four goals respectively. Philosophy is often identified with the last of these, so that there remains no room for the pure theories of logic, mathematics, knowledge, reality, or morality, undertaken simply for the sake of intellectual satisfaction. Along with this ancient overarching theory of the fourfold "ends of man" (*purusartha**), philosophical treatises followed the general pattern of opening with a statement of "purpose" or "use" (*prayojana*) for "why should an intelligent person undertake a study or an action until he is told what purpose it serves?" (Kumarila* Bhatta*, *Sloka* vartika**, 1.1.12)

How can the out-and-out theoretical notion of reason and rational inquiry develop in an intellectual atmosphere so obsessed with practical concerns or with the goal of the end of suffering? There are several ways in which this worry can be allayed.

As early as the fourth century BCE, Kautilya *, in his *Arthasastra**, divides disciplines (*vidya**) into four: scripture (the three Vedas, *trayi**), agriculture and commerce (*varta**), politics and public administration (*danda*-niti**), and finally "the light of all other disciplines, the methodology of all other practice, and the foundation of all moral virtues" *anviksiki**, the investigative reflective science which examines beliefs acquired through observation and testimony by the means of correct knowledge (*pramanaih* arthapariksanam**). The very recognition of a metascience (*anviksiki*) which would examine what is moral and what is immoral in the Vedas (*dharma* dharmau trayyam**), what is efficient and what is inefficient in the sciences of material acquisition, and good and bad policies in the science of government weighing their strength of evidence by arguments and the identification of this metascience with philosophy (examples given by Kautilya include *samkaya**, *yoga*, and the *lokayata** materialistic philosophy) unquestionably proves that even the recognition of the purposefulness of rational inquiry or action was part of a *theoretical* orientation of these ancient Indian thinkers. The practical purpose of a study itself became a theoretical topic of discussion. Indeed, Jayanta (c. 950 CE) begins his book *Nyayamanjari** (*Logic Blossoms*) by constructing a paradox of

inquiry (rather like the Platonic "Meno's Paradox") based on this requirement that one know the use of every study that one begins.

If you insist on first knowing its use and then being interested in a subject, then you are involved in a circularity. After mastering the subject alone you know exactly what purpose it can really serve; but you are not even interested to start learning the subject unless you first know what its use is. So the required knowledge of use cannot be a thorough critical knowledge on pain of this circularity.

One of the reasons why the tension between theory and practice never became important in classical Indian thought is that practice, as it was laid out in the arts (of dancing, building, medicine and poetry), never was blind, and the theories themselves claimed to be somehow livable in practice. The distinction, however, between action (*karma*) and knowledge (*jñāna**) has been recognized since the Upanisadic* times. A healthy competition between the ritualists, on the one hand, who took sacred descriptive speech to be subservient to Vedic injunctions concerning what is to be done, and the followers of the path of pure knowledge, on the other, who took prescriptions to be subservient to metaphysical parts of sacred speech, continued for at least a thousand years. Both the ritualists and the metaphysicians, nevertheless, had their own *aviksikis** or analytical methodologies. So, to quote J. N. Mohanty, "the Hindu mind was constantly engaged in theorizing about practice" and also committed to the idea that "a purely *theoretical* cognition will lead to the satisfaction of the highest *practical* interest" (Mohanty, 1995).

The scheme of the four ends of life (*purusarthas**) to which we alluded above is itself a rational theorization about what humans live for. Recent (that is, late twentieth-century) Indian philosophers have taken up this fourfold scheme for thorough critical examination. Daya Krishna, for instance, has provocatively asked, "What is the *purusartha** of intellect (*buddhi*)," given that the intellect just wants to raise questions and get the answers right, not desiring sensual pleasure or political or economic power, not trying to be virtuous, and not always aiming at freedom from suffering? We should not be too far from the mainstream of Indian thought if we answer this question by positing knowledge of the self or understanding of texts to be the *purusartha** of intellect. Alternatively, we could develop K. C. Bhattacharya's (*Studies in Philosophy*, p. 142) idea that rational reflection is primarily reflection on *pain* and is "a freeing process" thus linking it up with liberation. The link between an intellectual discipline, such as *aviksiki**, and self-knowledge or textual interpretation will become clear as we deal with the second and third "worries" concerning rationality in India.

The second major worry is this: how could autonomous rationality have developed in Indian thought given that most philosophizing was done with an allegiance to the unquestioned authority of the Vedas or some other root-text the truth of which was taken for granted? Where the forces of tradition and verbal testimony are so dominant, how could *reason* in the Western sense of the term flourish?

Three lines of response, of varying degrees of power, and by no means mutually exclusive, can be adopted in the face of this second worry. First, while it is correct that mere or "dry" reasoning (*suska** *tarka*) has been belittled by great Indian thinkers like Samkara* because it is groundless, unstable and conflict-generating (*Brahmasutrabhasya**, II.1.11), or because, as Bhartrhari* noted before him, "what expert reasoners have concluded with great logical acumen and effort is

disproved by yet other more expert logicians," not *all* Indian thought is blindly supportive of scriptural authority. Having abused the authors of the three Vedas as impostors and cheats, the materialist-skeptical Carvaka* philosophers from very ancient times rejected all trust in religious texts as irrational. Of course, in their case, even inferences, and especially inductive generalizations, are epistemically unjustified, and insofar as testimony is reduced to a form of inference, our reliance on testimony too loses all rational respectability. Right from the Buddha's own sermons up to the sophistication of Buddhist epistemology in the Yogacara-Sautrantika* school, the Buddhist mind shows opposition to unexamined "say so" as evidence. The Buddha urges his disciples not to believe his own words upon the basis of his personal authority, but to test them by reasoning and individual experience. Accordingly, only perception and inference are admitted as sources of knowledge in Buddhist epistemology, and testimony is either rejected or reduced away. Similarly, in what has been called the "Tradition of Rationalist Medicine" (Chattopadhyaya, 1980, pp. 85-115), appealing to religious or scriptural authorities in the context of clinical practice has been regarded by Caraka (from the very early Christian era) as committing the fallacy of irrelevance. We shall see, in a subsequent section on ancient Indian medical reasoning, how "medical integrity" was supposed to consist in reliance on empirical data, inductive probability, practical efficacy, and *not* on religious authority.

Within the mainstream orthodox schools, Samkhya* in spite of its lip-service to the Vedas and the "word of the expert" as sources of knowledge very clearly relied on its own variety of reflective reasoning as the sole means of attaining such knowledge as would lead to the pure and permanent cessation of suffering. In the two opening couplets of *Samkhya * Karika**, observed worldly means of removing pain and scripture-prescribed ritualistic means of removing pain are both rejected as unsatisfactory, because even the heavenly pleasures (after death) promised as rewards for the performance of Vedic rituals are exhaustible, mixed with pain and surpassable in degree. The only method of attaining an inexhaustible, unmixed and unsurpassable state of freedom from pain is rational reflection on the distinction between the manifest (effects), unmanifest (cause) and consciousness (which is neither effect nor cause). Samkhya, therefore, is at heart an out-and-out reason-based system of thought with its own basic presuppositions, such as the three fundamental *gunas** and the doctrine of the pre-existence of effect in the material cause, defended by a series of internally coherent arguments.

Second, even Vedanta* and Mimamsa* the two pillars of Vedic orthodoxy assign a crucial role to reasoning and critical argumentation in extracting the correct meaning from sacred sentences of the "heard" revelation (*sruti**). Far from being antagonistic, reason and scripture coexist peacefully together in coupling compounds strewn all over Vedanta literature (for example, *sruti-yukti*, *tarkagama**, *sastranyaya**). What is this assisting role that reason plays in Vedic hermeneutics? In the Upanisads* the philosophical cream of the Vedas one finds statements like "you are that (*Brahman*)". In order to make sense of such identity claims, the reader must first "distill" the meaning of "you," which is coreferential with the reader's (ideally, listener's) use of "I." Causal links are established by what in Vedanta is called the method of presence in presence and absence in absence (*anvayavyatireka*). Now, signification or designation is taken as a special case of a causal link, because there is a lawlike connection between the utterance of a word and the consequent grasp, by the hearer, of a meaning. The Upanisads start from a proto-materialistic conception of the self (the referent of "I") as the food-constituted body. Samkara* the commentator uses this method of presence and absence to reject,

one after another, these "object"-nature candidates for selfhood the body, the life-breath, the inner sense, the intellect because the self seems to be present even in the absence or non-functioning of these elements (in death, dreams, deep sleep, and so on). This method of elimination leaves only a pure non-individuated subjective consciousness as the possible meaning of "I." A similar isolation of relevant signification is performed on the word "that" (which directly stands for God and the totality of physical and mental entities of the universe). When the direct or primary referents of these two terms are seen to be in partial conflict, because the individual embodied "I" is not *prima facie* identical with "that" world or all that there is, the method of rational exegesis is employed. Secondary significance of words is generally derived from the literal sense by extension (for example, "crying over spilt milk" comes to include a whole lot of spilt other things) and elimination (for example, in "the opinion of the house," "house" does not signify house at all). Thus through "retaining a part and rejecting a part" of their literal sense, the words "I" and "that" are taken in their secondary significance. That part of their distinct literal meaning where they intersect: namely, pure subjective consciousness, is taken as the emerging oblique meaning of the scriptural identity statement. What can never be spoken of the *Atman* *-*Brahman* could thus be got at indirectly by its only testimony, the sentences of an authorless revelation. This is an oversimplified summary of the intricate interpretive technique through which reasoning is used to distill the indirect meaning of the "great sentences" of the Veda. Thus the text is trusted as the sole proof of the *Atman-Brahman* (the Self which is All) but it is subjected first to a tradition-tested method of critical scrutiny. It is only relentless reasoning which can help us hold on to the distinction between the self (reality) and the not-self (appearance), and without such reasoned discrimination, no blind parroting of the scriptures would get us anywhere. As far as the role of testimony is concerned, even scripture is a ladder to be kicked away after the saving knowledge of non-duality dawns. Thus Samkara*'s faith in the "truth" of Vedic text is also ontologically *provisional*. *Tarka* (reasoning) may be baseless by itself (*apratistha**), but even *sruti** (scripture) is, in the final analysis, ignorance that helps cure ignorance. While discussing the "instability" of autonomous reasoning, Samkara, interestingly, considers and dismisses an objection which it is worthwhile to mention. "This alleged refutability and non-decisiveness of reason," the objection goes, "should be recognized as a good feature rather than a weakness, insofar as it keeps room for correction and improvement." After all, if you have conflicting Vedic texts, reasoning is your only basis for adjudication!

Third, we could question the very assumption that relying primarily on an impersonal unquestionable tradition is necessarily irrational. There are two ways in which not only the compatibility between reason and testimony but the essentiality of commitment to the tradition as a necessary condition for rationality can be brought out. The first way can be called the Nyaya* Dummett way and the second the Mimamsa* Gadamer way.

By emphasizing the irreducible role of knowledge from words (*sabda** *pramana**) in the acquisition and use of language, Nyaya epistemology exposes a fundamental error of Lockean individualistic epistemology. As Michael Dummett remarks,

It is not a rule of etiquette, or a device for saving time, that we should accept what others tell us: It is fundamental to the entire institution of language. (*Motilal and Chakrabarti*, p. 266)

There is no rationality without social interaction, because as Wittgenstein showed us, no one can be a private rule-follower. But there is no social interaction without understanding of others' speech. And, as Dummett and Davidson, in spite of other major differences, both insist there is no understanding of others' speech without a basic presumptive trust in their testimony. It follows, therefore, that there is no rationality without a basic trust in the veracity of competent speakers "be that a sage, a lay Aryan or a *mleccha* foreigner" (to quote Vatsyayana*, the fifth-century Nyaya commentator) unless there is reason to suspect ignorance or deceit or lack of commitment. While this way of putting testimony back into the heart of rationality proceeds through the inescapable *trustworthiness* of fellow-speakers of a language, the other way, adopted by Kumarila* Bhatta* and recently articulated by John Taber using insights from Gadamer, turns on an underlying *distrust* of individual speakers and treats a speaker-less body of received tradition to be the only possible source of moral knowledge. Perception or empirically grounded inference never gives us any knowledge of what ought to be done. The verdict of our conscience or moral emotions is highly unreliable. The only ineluctable source of knowledge of right and wrong action, under the Mimamsa * view, which is firmly rooted in the epistemological doctrine of the intrinsic validity of all knowledge, is the impersonal objective (beginningless) prescriptive sentences handed down by one's own cultural tradition. The only way meaningful speech could be unreliable is by being spoken by fallible individuals. If it is not spoken by anyone as Mimamsa takes the Vedas to be then it is intrinsically knowledge-yielding. The knowledge it yields is also unique, because from no other source of knowledge can you have any rational insight into morality. To quote Gadamer, "The real force of morals . . . is based on tradition. They are freely taken over but by no means created by a free insight grounded on reasons." (*Truth and Method*, p. 281) Of course, neither Gadamer nor any modern person can swallow the orthodoxy of Kumarila* that the Vedic tradition *alone* is the source of *all* moral knowledge. But it may be necessary to rectify the Enlightenment idea that a fully autonomous external critique of tradition is possible or desirable purely on the basis of personal rationality. A creative but sympathetic understanding of the traditionalist ethics of Mimamsa may enable us to appreciate why it is perfectly rational for a Veda-rooted Indian to assert "I ought to feed the guest first because the Veda says so" and then claim, like Wittgenstein, that he has hit the rock-bottom of reason-giving and that is where his spade turns.

But by over-emphasizing discursive knowledge whether derived from reasoning or from the word of the reliable authority am I not falsifying the very spirit of Indian intellectual traditions, which eventually aspire after non-discursive, ineffable, direct mystical insight into a reality that transcends reason? How could *any* conception of rationality have developed in a philosophical milieu so deeply devoted to some kind of ecstatic vision where "the subject and the object are . . . eternally and absolutely lost in unity, and the din of phenomenal existence is forever hushed in the calm of sweet repose?" This is the third "worry" that I wish to address.

Mahamahopadhyaya Gopinath Kaviraj, whom I have just quoted, compiled, in his classic 1924 paper "The Doctrine of *Pratibha** in Indian Philosophy," all the references to such supra-rational supra-sensuous intuitive awareness of "all things past, present and future in a simple flash" which was called "*pratibha**." Even from that pro-mystical survey of Sanskrit sources, two things become clear: first, not all schools of philosophy believed in the possibility or centrality of such supramental experience; second, even the schools that relied heavily on *pratibha*, like the Grammarians, did not understand by it anything which goes against or beyond reason.

Before discussing the anti-mystical position of Mimamsa, let us take a quick look at the role of the so-called "immediate spiritual experience" (*aparoksa* anubhuti**) in Advaita Vedanta*. Contrary to the claims of Neo-Hindu writers like Radhakrishnan, Samkara* nowhere claims that non-dualism is based on direct mystical experience. To quote Halbfass:

that experience which the Veda itself teaches as a transcendent soteriological goal, the sheer undisguised presence of Brahman, should not be confused with "personal experiences". . . . Instead of being a documentation of subjective experience, the Veda is an objective structure which guides, controls and gives room to legitimate experience, as well as legitimate argumentation. . . . It is an objective, transpersonal epiphany, an authorless, yet didactically well-organized body of soteriological instruction. (Halbfass, 1988, p. 388)

Ramanuja *, the most prominent rival-Vedantist*, is even more unequivocal in asserting that no yogic trance can give knowledge of *Brahman*. Such Yogic visions, according to him, are, after all, results of intense imagination and vivid reproduction of previous sense-experiences. Such transient experiential states cannot be depended upon as a source of *knowledge*.

The most orthodox traditionalists are the harshest critics of mystical intuition or even divine omniscience. Kumarila* ridicules the possibility that "all things could be *experienced* directly at once in a synoptic vision" as on a par with the possibility that we could "hear colors." Kaviraj, who is pained by this "bitter opposition," finds the following rationale behind it. As we have already noted above, the impersonal and exclusive authority of the Veda is the corner-stone of Mimamsa*. Personalities, however elevated or divine, even of an alleged Deity, are taken as sources of fallible and limited experiences. As Kaviraj insightfully remarks, "The very fact of being a subject involves the inevitable relativity of consciousness fatal to omniscience." So "omniscient person" is an oxymoron. Also, given the presence of the Vedic corpus as the ineluctable source of impersonal and hence intrinsically valid knowledge, any all-knowing person divine or human is strictly redundant.

Finally, if we look at the favorable accounts of intuitive knowledge in Patañjali's Yoga or Bhartrhari*'s word-non-dualism (*sabdadvaita**), we come to realize that it is a deepened or sophisticated form of a reflective rationality which in Yoga takes the form of discrimination (*viveka-khyati**), and in the hands of the Grammarian takes the form of innate or instinctive capacity for synoptic grasp for example, of the sentence-meaning as a whole. Both of these contexts are, interestingly, deeply linguistic. A yoga-practitioner's *prajña** (insight) becomes clearer and clearer, according to the *Yoga-sutra** (1.42-43), first by reflecting upon the distinctness of a word, the concept, and the object, all three of which are confused inextricably in our ordinary consciousness. As one recognizes the conventional character of the word-object relation and the memory-mediated character of the concept associated with the word, the pure object in its individuality is supposed to shine more and more distinctly in isolation from its linguistic and cognitive cloaks. The last step of this stripping the pure object of words and imaginations through which the non-discursive "dropping out of the mind" is achieved is indeed hard to explain. But Kaviraj makes an excellent attempt:

It sounds absurd to say that the object alone remains without the *citta* or *jñana** to take cognizance of it, but what is meant seems to be that the *citta* through extreme purity, becomes at this stage so tenuous as to be in fact a luminous void; it does not exist.

Notice that this elimination of thought and language is achieved through a very careful rational reflection on the distinction between the sound "cow," the idea of a cow, and the particular animal cow in its uniqueness.

Although Bhartrhari * emphasizes the indescribability of *pratibha**, he also finds its presence in birds and beasts and describes it as "testified to by the inner experience of every man." It is nothing esoteric. In a latent form it is innately present in every creature that can follow a rule. It is that instinctive flash of understanding through which, in practical situations, people come to decide what to do. *Pratibha** is, indeed, a multifaceted concept. In its specially cultivated extraordinary forms, it can amount to clairvoyance or yogic powers of remembering one's own previous birth, and so on. But its central significance in Bhartrhari's philosophy is more that of tacit knowledge of the total sentence-meaning which arises in a spontaneous way after individual word-meanings and their syntactical connections are separately grasped, so that the final flash of understanding remains inexplicable even to the understander. Such meaning-grasping tacit knowledge lies at the heart of all interpretive rationality, rather than going beyond or against it.

The fourth and final worry is of a different nature. Unlike the general anxiety regarding the alleged practical orientation, respect for authority and "mystical empiricism" of Indian philosophical systems, which were supposed to make the emergence of the idea of autonomous positivistic theoretical rationality unlikely, this has to do with a specific absence that India's intellectual traditions suffer from. The concept of deductive or logical necessity which is paradigmatically illustrated by proofs in mathematics and formal logic and the allied notion of *a priori* knowledge seem to be simply missing from the entire arena of Indian philosophical disciplines. Truths, even eternal truths, are recognized always as truths of fact, and never as truths of reason. Inferences have always been formulated as involving an inductive general premise (the *vyapti** or rule of pervasion, about which more later) and never as demonstrative proofs. This absence of the notions of formal validity and logical necessity is linked at bottom with the failure to appreciate the idea of possible but non-actual worlds and, in a roundabout way, also with the tendency to define knowledge as "true presentative awareness" without any further "justification" clause! These are serious allegations which have bothered contemporary Indian logicians and epistemologists like B. K. Matilal, J. N. Mohanty, and Sibajiban Bhattacharya.

Broadly, two different sorts of response have been made to this crucial complaint. First, that in recognizing very clearly the law of non-contradiction *nyaya-vaishesika** logicians do display adequate sensitivity to the concept of logical truths or necessity; and that in Buddhist logic deductive inferences find a place; and finally that the role of hypothetical reasoning (*tarka*) as buttressing evidence for universal generalizations shows that Indian logic has room for the modal notions of necessary connections between non-actualized possibilities. This is the line adopted by Matilal (1982) in "Necessity and Indian Logic" (chapter 7 of *Logical and Ethical Issues of Religious Belief*). Second, that Nyaya*, at least, is not even trying to do logic in the Frege Russell sense, but is doing a phenomenological epistemic logic in which eidetic rules are discovered not concerning compatibility or incompatibility between *propositions* but concerning compatibility and incompatibility of episodes of awareness (*jñana* *) in virtue of their contents. This is the line taken by Mohanty (1992) in his "The Nature of Indian Logic" (chapter 4 of

Reason and Tradition in Indian Thought). The second approach is more challenging and opens up newer notions of *logicality*, which of course are not all that new in Asia.

But let us discuss briefly Matilal's approach first. Formulations of the law of non-contradiction are very easy to find in ancient and medieval Sanskrit writings. Udayana famously formulates the law of excluded middle as his *a priori* justification for a dichotomous division producing the sevenfold taxonomy of the Vaisesika* categories. Just as a classificatory rationality is operative in the division of all things first into presences and absences, and then the presences into non-relations and relations, the non-relations into independent and dependent, and so forth, so too purely analytic inferences are accommodated when definitions are taken as inference-tickets, albeit for "inferences with merely differentiating marks" for example, "Earth differs from all non-earth because it has odor," when having odor is taken as the defining mark of earth. Unlike other inferences, which require as supporting examples a series of cases where the mark (whatever property is mentioned in the "because"-clause displaying the sign, probans or ground) coexists with the property to be inferred, "in [these] inference[s] we do not need certification from a positive example. . . . Naiyayikas* . . . would insist that this inference (or its conclusion) is necessarily true, for the opposite situation would be impossible or a logical contradiction" (Matilal 1982, p. 142).

The Buddhist logicians talk about a universal concomitance which is not based on causal connection but issues simply from conceptually guaranteed class inclusions for example, all elms are trees. From this they develop a theory of "inner connection" or "necessary pervasion" (*antarvyapti**) which the fallibilist Nyaya* school did not support. The most important evidence for an Indian sensitivity to logical necessity comes from their use of "*tarka*," which has been translated as hypothetical or subjunctive reasoning. Ancient Indian atheists would strengthen their position by arguing:

If God were the maker, then he would possess a body, make strenuous efforts etc; But God cannot have a body or make efforts to overcome obstacles. Hence God is not the maker.

For the inherent *modus tollens* to work, one must have a clear conception of connection between two false sentences or two unmaterialized possibilities. There is a vast literature on the role of *tarka* starting with Bagchi's (1953) pioneering *Inductive Reasoning* and proceeding to K. Chakrabarti's (1992) *Definition & Induction*. In spite of the acceptance of its probative value for generalizations, it remains puzzling why a sentence like "If *p* then *q*," in which both *p* and *q* are known to be false, is treated as expressing non-knowledge (*aprama**).

Notwithstanding extremely sophisticated distinctions made between self-contradictions (such as the liar-sentence) and pragmatic self-refutations (like "I am not aware of this"), the Naiyayikas* use "barren woman's son" and "horn of a rabbit" as empty terms without discrimination. Here is Matilal's explanatory conjecture:

Suppose my car is red. This fact, a contingent fact, has already defeated (excluded) the possibility of its being non-red. Does this "excluded" possibility then join the group of impossibilities? No clear and explicit answers emerge from the Indian philosophers except in their discussion (Udayana) of citing a nonexistent entity as an example. In any case, consideration of the excluded possibilities have somehow been thought idle in the Indian context. (Matilal, 1982, pp. 150 1)

Mohanty, on the other hand, is not baffled by this apparent lack of interest in purely formal necessity/possibility on the part of the Indian logicians. Since Indian logic arose out of two different contexts – namely, as a science of adjudication of actually happening debates and disputations, and as part of a general epistemology in which inferential cognition as a form of veridical awareness had to be normatively thematized – it was natural that component sentences of a valid argument were usually confined to those which were materially true. Soundness was more important than mere validity. This epistemic and causal character of Indian logic becomes clear when we look at its definition of a fallacy or defect of a mark. (As a reminder, in the inference "a has f, because it has g," g is the mark.)

A defective mark or the defect of a mark is defined as "the object of such a true cognition as acts to prevent an inferential cognition." The idea is this: consider the fallacy of locuslessness (*asrayasiddhi**). "Sherlock Holmes must have been a psychopath because he took drugs." The veridical awareness that Sherlock Homes never existed would, according to Nyaya*, *prevent* the serious inference that he actually was a psychopath, because the property of drug-addiction as a putative mark would find no real locus. We surely have a different conception of logic (Mohanty calls it "Logic 2") here, not only because the fallacy above would not count as a formal fallacy in Western logic but because the rejection or cancellation of a proposed inference that the discovery of the defect is supposed to lead to is conceptualized as "preventing." In later Neo-Nyaya* schools, the relation of preventor-and-prevented cognitions became a hot topic of discussion. My perception that the sun has risen *prevents* any immediately succeeding inference that it is still night-time. But is this just a psychological generalization? Once we discover the fault in the mark, the inferential cognition is blocked or prevented. Is that just a causal law? Insofar as these rules are formulated in terms of the content-structures of the cognition and not in terms of any other mentalistic features of cognition, they must be structurally grounded. Logicians in the Indian context were partly evolving an ethics of belief and partly discovering naturalistic laws of compatible and incompatible cognitive acts (in the same subject) in virtue of their intentional content (*visayata**) which is further broken down into the roles of qualificand (*visesyata**), qualifier (*prakarata**), relation (*samsargata**), and so on. The logic of awareness gets fascinatingly complex and the philosophical logic involved in trying to decide the ontological status of these cognition-conferred intentional roles of actual items which figure as objects, qualifiers and relational links becomes awfully subtle. But it is neither a formal logic that studies relations between sentence meanings or Fregean thoughts belonging to a non-mental non-material third realm, nor a psychologistic logic that studies merely how the mind functions with regard to cognitive acts. It is a logic of universal intentional structures interrelated in a normative way. Thus fallacies are called "apparent marks" (*hetu-abhasa* *) a correct knowledge of which *prevents* inference because, Mohanty remarks, "as rational beings we cannot make a fallacious inference: we only appear to be doing so" (Mohanty, 1992, p. 113).

As far as the justification-clause in the definition of knowledge is concerned, Sibajiban Bhattacharya has made a virtue out of the common complaint that the Indian concept of *prama** never developed beyond the second rejected definition of Plato's *Theaetetus* – namely, knowledge as true belief. By using simple principles of epistemic logic, he proves (see, "Epistemology of Testimony and Authority" in *Knowing from Words*) the following: "If knowledge is something more than mere true belief, then I should be able to know when I have knowledge and when I have mere true belief. Theorem 1 suggests, however, that no one is able to make that

discrimination in his own case." This is a pretty strong stand to take, because Western epistemology starts from the distinction between knowledge and true belief – the space between the two being precisely the *space of reason*. Perhaps all that Bhattacharya has proved is that that distinction has no role to play in self-ascriptions or claims of knowledge. The rich skeptical literature in Sanskrit (see, Jayarasi* and Sriharsa*) clearly demands a stricter notion of knowledge, because it is never tired of pointing out that accidentally slipping into a true belief by a route which could equally well have produced error is no knowledge (and that is all we can do!, hence the skeptical pessimism). But Bhattacharya's attempt cautions us against taking the usual Western account of knowledge as justified true belief plus something else (which the Gettier-industry has been hard at work on) as gospel truth. A more realistic rationality may require that we be happy with true beliefs achieved through epistemically virtuous means.

Axiomatic Grammar

"To adhere to Indian thought," remarks L. Renou, "means first of all to think like a grammarian." The model of theoretical knowledge that appealed most to the Vedic mind was, as we find in the hymn to knowledge (Rg* Veda X.71), that of "the seers fashioning speech by their mind, sifting as with sieves corn-flour is sifted." Patañjali, who quotes this at the beginning of his "great commentary" on Panini*'s grammar, makes it clear that words are not "fashioned" by the grammarian like pots are made by the potter. Panini was trying to come up with an adequate description of already existent ordinary and Vedic Sanskrit usage while remaining faithful to the criteria of simplicity and brevity. The method of this fourth century BCE grammarian has been compared to that of Euclid insofar as Panini's rules or aphorisms (*sutras**) are divided into three kinds:

- a) the defining *sutras* * which introduce technical terms,
- b) the theorems which normatively describe linguistic facts while demonstrating their legitimacy through formation and transformation rules, and
- c) the metatheorems (*paribhasa-sutra**) explaining how rules have to be applied in particular cases (see, "Euclid and Panini*" in Staal 1988).

There are obvious differences between Euclid's subject matter, which demands a higher degree of generality and *a priori* validity of the axioms, and Panini's subject-matter, namely, well formed words and sentences, to accommodate the contingent variety of which, rules have to be formed *ad hoc*. But Panini's rigorous standards of consistency, completeness, and the avoidance of redundancy (amounting to independence) among his basic rules make the comparison illuminating. This grammatical model of generating all correct speech-units by sifting them through the parsimonious "sieve" of a set of systematically arranged *sutras* (memorable strings of words) became the paradigm for philosophers in the early Common Era in India. Thus we have the *Yoga-sutras**, the *Mimamsa**-*sutras*, the *Vaisesika**-*sutras* and, from the point of view of the study of epistemic and dialogical rationality, the all-important *Nyaya-sutras**.

Rationality in Medical Practice

Physicians in ancient India must have regularly held meetings for co-operative as well as combative debates in the presence of some expert judges. The Nyaya* list of "tricks of reasoning" and "sophistical rejoinders" is thought to have emerged out of this older tradition of the science and art of diagnostic and therapeutic debates. The enormous medical text *Caraka Samhita**, which reports on this tradition, divides the entire practice of medicine into four factors: (1) the physician; (2) the substances (drugs and diet); (3) the nurse; and (4) the patient. The four essential qualifications of the physician are: (1a) a clear grasp of the science learnt; (1b) a wide range of experience; (1c) general skillfulness; and (1d) cleanliness. The four key factors concerning drugs and diet are: (2a) abundance of supply; (2b) applicability; (2c) their many imaginable uses or multifacetedness, which is now called the "broad-spectrum" nature; and (2d) richness. The four qualifications of the nurse are: (3a) a knowledge of attending techniques; (3b) skill; (3c) caring involvement with the patient; and (3d) cleanliness. The most interesting quartet of desiderata is that concerning the rational patient, who must have: (4a) a good memory (so as not to forget her own case-history!); (4b) obedience to the doctor's instructions; (4c) courage; and (4d) the verbal ability to describe the symptoms.

Interestingly enough, in spite of the presence of *karma*-theory in popular as well as theoretical consciousness, the text does not list "accumulated good *karma*" as a condition of the curable patient. As long as the patient is cooperative and courageous and articulate, his chances of getting well are good!

In the tenth chapter of *Caraka Samhita* we find the most fascinating argumentation about the efficacy of medical practice, where cases of cures without doctors, drugs or nursing as well as the death of a well attended and medically treated patient are discussed as counterexamples to the alleged necessity and sufficiency of medicine. We do not have space here to go into the details of this discussion. But what emerges out of this context is a clear sense of the need to defend the probabilistic workability/truth of a scientific practice/theory in the face of reasonable doubts arising from empirical data. (See Chattopadhyaya, 1980, pp. 107-13.)

Logical Form and Confirmation of Universal Concomitance

The center-piece of the Nyaya-theory * of reasoning has been the problem of formulating and justifying the relation of invariable co-location or pervasion (*vyapti**) between the mark (typically illustrated by smoke) and the property to be inferred (typically, fire). In this quick survey we shall first look at the way the universality of such a relation was captured, without resorting to extensional quantification theory, in terms of property, location and absence. Then we shall summarize the ways in which skeptical attacks against the possibility of the non-circular empirical confirmation of such universal concomitance were resisted.

Gangesa*, the father of Neo-Nyaya* (thirteenth century CE) discusses 29 different formulations of the definition of pervasion, rejecting 21 of them as flawed. Pervasion has been defined as "non-deviation," "natural connection," "relation of effect to its efficient cause," "accompaniment of all cases of one term with the other term," "unconditional relation," and as "not being located in any place where the property to be inferred is absent," to mention just a few of its definitions. The last of these – that is, pervasion's definition in terms of non-co-location with the absence of

the major term (loosely identifiable with the property to be inferred, for example, fire) has been rejected because it fails to cover cases where the major term is an unnegatable property which is located everywhere for example, existence or nameability. Interestingly, "This cup is nameable because it is knowable" is regarded as a sound inference even though the mark and the property to be inferred are both unnegatable.

The final definition of pervasion, somewhat simplified, could be translated as follows: "Pervasion is the mark's property of being co-located with such an inferable property as is not the absentee of any absolute absence which is co-located with the mark." The subtleties of these definitions are brought out by at least five centuries (that is, until the eighteenth century CE) of scholastic creativity, which continued to invent counterexamples, adding further qualifications to avoid under-coverage, overcoverage and inapplicability. A very small part of this literature is available in English now in F. Staal's (1988) *Universals* ("Means of Formalisation in Indian and Western Logic" and "Contraposition in Indian Logic"), in Matilal's (1985) *Logic, Language and Reality*, and in C. Goekoop's (1967) *The Logic of Invariable Concomitance*.

Coming to the issue of inductive justification of pervasion (*vyapti-graha**), the Nyaya philosophers conceded Hume's point that there are no *a priori* necessities in nature. Against Samkhya*, which believes in inherent substantial identity between cause and effect, Nyaya believes that fire is one thing and smoke is another. But their account of contingent causal connection is realistic rather than psychologistic. Unlike Hume, Nyaya * does not regard demonstrative *a priori* knowledge and irrational animal faith as the only options. Boldly affirming that it is perfectly rational to embrace fallible certitude after one has taken all possible empirical precautions to eliminate doubt (especially when asking for deductive necessity is irrational), Nyaya bases its knowledge claims of invariable concomitance on: (1) multiplication of instances; (2) subjunctive supporting arguments showing the material absurdity of the negation of the universal generalization to be established; (3) direct perceptual acquaintance with all cases of the inferable property through the experienced universal inherent in the observed cases (this is a controversial doctrine of seeing-all-through-seeing-the-class-character-in-one); and (4) showing how skeptical doubt concerning induction lands one in practical paralysis insofar as one cannot help believing that food will always nourish, fire will always burn, and words will often be understood. "Doubt reaches its limits in pragmatic self-refutation." (The clearest account of this is to be found in K. Chakrabarti's *Definition and Induction*.)

Dharma-rationality and Self-other Comparison

I have said earlier that Vedic orthodoxy regarded tradition as the sole spring of moral knowledge. Such rigidity was naturally called into question by the tradition itself, and in the *Mahabharata** and the *Dharmasastras** we see an obsessive attempt to arrive at contextualized as well as universal criteria for determining the right way to live. Some parts of practical rationality were explained in terms of means end adaptations, so that a command like "You must perform fire-rituals since you wish to attain heaven" would be understood in terms of three pieces of belief: (1) that such performance is do-able by the command-receiver; (2) that it would promote a desirable result, in this case, heaven; and (3) that it does not involve undesirable results which are counterbalancing for example, the sin of killing animals. But there were other parts of

practical reason which were deontological, and the *Mahabharata* tries to come up with criteria for such universal *dharmas* (duties). The briefest statement of such a criterion is:

Do not inflict upon others what is intolerable to yourself. This, in short, is *dharma* and it is other than what one naturally desires. (*Mbh.* XIII, 113, 8)

Probing deeper into the source of this morality, the next verse says,

In refusals, generosity, pleasure, pain, approval, and disapproval a human being finds a decisive source of knowledge (*pramana**) by comparison with oneself.

This coheres perfectly with the symbolic narrative of a just businessman who teaches *dharma* even to higher-caste brahmins because he has achieved "equal attitude towards all living beings." As he puts it, "My weighing scale remains balanced equally for everybody" (*Mbh.* XII, 262, 10).

But what does one do when there is a conflict of duties? The *Mahabharata* * is full of such moral dilemmas. Traditions and texts cannot solve them because they themselves are often in conflict with one another. That is why one needs intelligence (*buddhi*) and learning (*vidya**), a special training in the *pramanas** (means of knowledge), to purify the moral knowledge derived from handed-down tradition. *Dharma* cannot afford to be intellectually blind or uncritical. Matilal quotes the following advice from Manu Samhita*:

What is to be done? If such a doubt arises with regard to a conflict of *dharmas* an assembly of not less than ten persons should deliberate and reach a decision this assembly will be constituted by three Vedic scholars, one logician, one dialectician or debater, one expert in semantics, etymology, and three laymen from three different age-groups a student, a householder, and a retired person. (Matilal in *Rationality in Question*, p. 203)

One sees the beginnings of a discourse-model of practical rationality quite clearly here!

Reason in Emotions:

The Rasa Theory of Aesthetic Relish

A similar process of universalization (*sadharanikarana**) or depersonalization, which has been called detached enjoyment through the "heart-universals," lies at the center of mainstream Indian aesthetic theory, which runs from Bharata's treatise on drama through Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta up to K. C. Bhattacharya's early twentieth-century reflections on aesthetic rapture.

Bharata (first or second century CE) provides almost a functionalist logic of emotion in his classic sixth chapter, where he gives the cryptic formulation: "*rasa* (aesthetic rapture) comes from a combined functioning of the determinants (*vibhava**) and the consequent expressions (*anubhava**) and the passing states." The basic idea, somewhat shrouded by a millennium's worth of commentators' controversies, seems to be this: a certain depersonalized enjoyment (for example, at the representation of fury) is a function of the stable latent emotional disposition (for example, anger) and is achieved through the input of some determinants (for example, insult, vengefulness, threat, jealousy, assault) and the output of some consequent outer expressions (for example, red eyes, frowning, the biting of lips, the grabbing of one hand with another, and so on)

via the passing sentiments (for example, energy, restlessness, obstinacy, perspiration, trembling, and so on).

Abhinava Gupta, who comes after a long tradition of commentators and thinkers on poetics and aesthetics, takes this obscure theory and develops an exceedingly complex epistemology of artistic enjoyment out of it. What is relevant for our purpose is to realize the importance of the process of the impersonalization of an emotional situation through which even the pain of actual or possible, real or imaginary others can become objects of aesthetic rapture by becoming, as it were, one's own. The same mechanism of self other comparison, in two radically different ways, yields both moral imagination as well as aesthetic enjoyment. Without the viewer's loss of ego, emotional identification with a tragic hero should lead to pain rather than pleasure. K. C. Bhattacharya describes this beautifully in his 1930s essay "The Concept of *Rasa*." "When I imagine, with delight, an old man affectionately watching his grandchild play with a toy, my sympathy with the grandfather's sympathetic feeling for the child goes through the grandfather's heart-universal. The beauty of a child at play appears to me through a kind of knowledge-by-identification. My personality is as it were dissolved and yet I am not caught in the object like the child. I freely become impersonal." K. C. Bhattacharya's theory of aesthetic appreciation as "sympathy with sympathy" becomes rather obscure and contentious and he admits that this idea of the "heart-universal" is "semi-mythological." Yet there is a certain right-mindedness in his interpretation of the phenomenon of de-individuation through which even the humdrum or the ugly or the ludicrous become beautiful, and because of which, in spite of total empathy with the tortured heroine on the stage, one does not feel the need to go and attack the actor playing the villain, because while one enjoys "suffering" with the felt-heroine-in-general one cannot hit a villain-in-general.

Conclusion:

The Logical Way to Liberation

We started this survey of the ideas of rationality by mentioning the term "*anviksiki* *," which is usually taken as synonymous with logic, Nyaya* or the philosophical systems in general. What is profoundly interesting is that this metascience or logic of all other disciplines is said to be identical with the liberating science of the spirit (*atmavidya**). Through medicine and healthy diet, ethically correct behavior, intelligent and legally constrained utility-maximization and aesthetic enjoyment, we constantly engage in the most basic reasonable activity of all that is, the avoidance of suffering. But as long as we are unclear about the nature of our selves, we continue to make errors which lead to recurring pains. Different philosophical systems, in consonance with, but not solely depending upon, one's own received tradition, try to give us knowledge of the self. This is as much a rational project as it is a practical, moral and spiritual one. As far as the major classical Indian philosophies such as Nyaya, Samkhya*, Vedanta*, and the Kashmir* Saiva* schools are concerned, rationality is theoretically studied and practically used so that the thinking agent can ultimately lose her individual ego, the object-directed outward mind or intellect which pretends to be the self, the pleasure-seeking wish-generating cognitions which make one other-dependent, and hence unfree. The practice of *Dharma* which forces you to compare yourself to others, the performance of duties without desire for reward, the distillation of emotions through aesthetic universalization, a healthy dose of reasoned skepticism about reason's ability to yield stable knowledge all of these lead to that saving self-

knowledge which brings freedom from suffering. According to Aksapada* Gautama (first century CE), in order to achieve such liberation you must have accurate knowledge of the means of knowledge, the objects of knowledge, doubt, purpose, example, tenet, the components of a syllogism, hypothetical reasoning, the determination of a conclusion truth-finding discourse, defensive debate, polemics, fallacies, tricks, retorts, and the conditions of defeat. Thus in Indian thought spirituality and rationality merge into one discipline called *aviksiki* *.

Bibliography

Bagchi, Sitansusekhar 1953: *Inductive Reasoning: a Study of "Tarka" and its Role in Indian Logic* (Calcutta).

Bhattacharya, K. C. 1983: *Studies in Philosophy* (Delhi: Motilal Banarassidas).

Biderman, Shlomo and Scharfstein, Ben-Ami (eds) 1989: *Rationality in Question* (Leiden: E. J. Brill).

Chakrabarti, Kisor K. 1995: *Definition and Induction* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad 1980: "Tradition of Rationalist Medicine in Ancient India," in *Philosophy: Theory and Action* (Poona).

Goekoop, C. 1967: *The Logic of Invariable Concomitance* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

Halbfass, Wilhelm 1988: *India and Europe* (Albany: State University of New York Press)
1991: *Tradition and Reflection*. (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Kant, Immanuel 1974: *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, trans. Mary J. Gregor (Holland: Mertinus Nijhoff).

Kaviraj, Gopinath 1990: *Selected Writings of M. M. Gopinath Kaviraj* (Varanasi: Centenary Celebration Committee).

Masson, J. L. and Patwardhan, M. V. 1970: *Aesthetic Rapture* (Poona: Deccan College).

Matilal, B. K. 1977: *Logical Illumination of Indian Mysticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

1982: *Logical and Ethical Issues of Religious Belief* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta).

1985: *Logic, Language, and Reality* (Delhi: Motilal Banarssidas).

Matilal, B. K. and Chakrabarti, Arindam (eds) 1994: *Knowing from Words* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

Mohanty, J. N. 1992: *Reason and Tradition in Indian Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

1995: "Theory and Practice in Indian Philosophy," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, March.

Saha, Sukharanjan 1987: *Perspectives on Nyaya Logic and Epistemology* (Calcutta: K. P. Bagchi).

Solomon, Esther A. 1978: *Indian Dialectics*, Vols 1 and 2 (Ahmedabad).

Staal, Frits 1988: *Universals: Studies in Indian Logic and Linguistics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).