Prāmāṇyavāda In Indian Epistemology: A Study of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Validity of Knowledge

Soubhagini Swain

Ph.D Research Scholar

Department of Philosophy

Utkal University, Vanibihar, Bhubaneswar, Odisha

Abstract

Indian philosophy places significant emphasis on knowledge *(jñāna)* as the cornerstone of human understanding and intentional action. Philosophical systems markedly differ regarding the validation of knowledge and the determination of its truth. This issue is examined through the theory of *Prāmāṇyavāda,* which explores the nature and conditions of the validity *(prāmāṇya)* of knowledge. The ancient discourse on *Prāmāṇyavāda* centers on two contrasting theories: *Svataḥprāmāṇyavāda,* asserting that knowledge is inherently legitimate, and *Parataḥprāmāṇyavāda,* positing that validity is contingent upon external conditions. The former perspective is primarily supported by the *Mīmāṃsā* and Advaita *Vedānta* traditions, whilst the latter is methodically articulated by the Nyāya school. This work conducts a critical and comparative analysis of these two theories, scrutinizing their epistemological assumptions, logical foundations, and philosophical ramifications. This analysis aims to elucidate the Indian understanding of truth and to underscore the unique contribution of Indian epistemology to the world philosophical dialogue.

Keywords: *Prāmāṇyavāda, Indian Epistemology, Pramā, Pramāṇa, Svataḥprāmāṇya, Parataḥprāmāṇya, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā*

1. Introduction: Knowledge in Indian Epistemology

Epistemology, a philosophical discipline, examines the nature, origin, extent, and boundaries of human knowledge. In general terms, knowledge is defined as awareness, information, or comprehension of facts and circumstances. Philosophically, knowledge transcends mere information; it constitutes a cognitive state that elucidates reality and facilitates effective practical interaction with the universe.

In Indian philosophy, the term *jñāna* signifies knowledge, encompassing the notion of cognition. Nevertheless, not all cognition is considered legitimate. Accurate cognition is referred to as *pramā (yathārthajñāna),* whereas inaccurate or erroneous cognition is designated as *aprāmā (ayathārthajñāna).* Indian philosophical systems together assert that knowledge is fundamental to metaphysical exploration, ethical existence, and spiritual emancipation. Simultaneously, they underscore the necessity of critically evaluating knowledge, as not all cognition aligns with reality.

The Indian epistemological tradition poses a fundamental inquiry: What is the validity of knowledge? The systematic investigation of this subject is referred to as *Prāmāṇyavāda,* the theory of the validity of knowledge.

2. *Pramā and Pramāṇa:* Conceptual Foundations

In Indian philosophy, knowledge is significant solely when it unveils an object. The subject of knowledge can be either an actual or hypothetical thing, a substance or a characteristic; yet, cognition inherently requires an object that is disclosed. Knowledge reveals both its subject and itself, thereby rendering cognition self-evident.

Knowledge is typically classified into two categories: valid and invalid. Valid cognition *(pramā)* accurately perceives its object as it exists, but invalid cognition *(aprāmā)* does not align with reality. The methods by which legitimate knowledge is obtained are referred to as pramāṇas. The ancient definition asserts:

"Yathārtha anubhavaḥ pramā, tat-sādhanaṃ ca pramāṇam."

True cognition is *pramā,* and the instruments that yield it are *pramāṇas.*

Therefore, pramāṇa denotes not knowledge itself, but rather the source or instrument through which authentic knowledge is generated. Knowledge would be unattainable in the absence of pramāṇas.

3. The Problem of Prāmāṇya

The primary issue of *Prāmāṇyavāda* pertains to the legitimacy of knowledge. When knowledge is acquired by a specific pramāṇa, a significant philosophical inquiry arises: Is knowledge inherently legitimate, or does it necessitate additional validation? Is the veracity of knowledge inherent, or is it contingent upon external conditions?

This discourse centres on two essential inquiries:

1. What conditions produce truth in knowledge?

2. What is the method for ascertaining the veracity of knowledge?

Indian philosophy provides varied responses to these inquiries, especially through the teachings established by the *Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya* schools. The former asserts the inherent validity of knowledge, while the latter demands its external validation.

4. *Svataḥprāmāṇyavāda:* The Doctrine of Intrinsic Validity

4.1 Definition and Fundamental Principles

The word *svataḥ* signifies "from itself," whereas *prāmāṇya* denotes validity. *Svataḥprāmāṇyavāda* is the concept asserting that knowledge is inherently valid. This viewpoint is chiefly endorsed by the Mīmāṃsā school and subsequently upheld by Advaita Vedānta.
This perspective asserts that knowledge is independent of external authority, inference, or verification for its legitimacy. Upon the emergence of knowledge, it manifests as truth.

4.2 Mīmāṃsā Perspective on Valid Cognition

Mīmāṃsā philosophers characterize genuine knowledge as cognition that:

1. Comprehends an unfamiliar concept (novelty),

2. Is not refuted by subsequent knowledge,

3. Emerges from unblemished causes, accurately depicts its subject. Consequently, truth is characterized by novelty, non-contradiction, causal integrity, and alignment with reality. Knowledge is fundamentally reliable unless subsequently contradicted.

4.3 Error and Its Elucidation

Error, as per Mīmāṃsā, originates from deficiencies *(doṣa)* in the epistemic instruments. A person may erroneously view a shell as silver due to impaired sensory circumstances. This erroneous thought is subsequently refuted by a corrective cognition *(bādhaka-pratyaya)*. The inaccuracy of knowledge is seen only in hindsight.

4.4 Comprehension of Veracity

Mīmāṃsā posits that both the genesis *(utpatti)* and determination *(jñapti)* of validity are inherent. All cognitions, with the exception of memory *(smṛti),* are initially legitimate. The conviction in the veracity of knowledge emerges concurrently with the knowledge itself and does not necessitate separate validation. Therefore, truth is self-evident, while doubt or falsehood is derivative.

5. *Parataḥprāmāṇyavāda*: Nyāya Theory of External Validity

5.1 Nyāya Theory of Knowledge

The *Nyāya* school offers a distinctly alternative perspective on knowledge and its legitimacy. According to Nyāya, knowledge is the comprehension that discloses the object in its true form. Similar to previous systems, Nyāya differentiates between valid knowledge *(pramā)* and invalid knowledge *(aprāmā)*. Valid knowledge is described as *yathārthānubhava—* cognition that aligns with reality.

5.2 Veracity as Correspondence and Pragmatic Achievement

According to Nyāya philosophers, truth is not inherent to knowing. Knowledge, at the point of its inception, is neither true nor untrue. The validity is subsequently established through external verification, such as effective practical application or corroboration by another knowledge. A cognition is valid if it results in productive action.

5.3 External Conditions of Validity

Nyāya asserts that both the creation and determination of validity rely on external conditions. The fundamental requirement for perception is the interaction between the sense and the object; nonetheless, its validity necessitates specific conditions, including adequate illumination, proximity, and the optimal functioning of sensory organs. Conversely, errors occur when thesecircumstances are inadequate.
Truth and falsity are therefore extrinsic attributes placed on knowledge by external influences. Knowledge is deemed valid not solely by the lack of flaws but by the affirmative efficacy of its causal circumstances.

6. Comparative Assessment of the Two Theories

The discourse between *Svataḥprāmāṇyavāda and Parataḥprāmāṇyavāda* exemplifies a fundamental contention in Indian epistemology. Mīmāṃsā philosophers contend that "neutral" knowledge is unattainable, as every cognition is perceived as either true or untrue. Nyāya philosophers assert that validity is a subsequent conclusion reliant on verification. Mīmāṃsā prioritizes reliance on cognition and the Vedas' authority, whereas Nyāya highlights logical analysis, correspondence, and empirical validation. Each system embodies a unique epistemic perspective and philosophical emphasis.

7. Conclusion

Prāmāṇyavāda is pivotal in Indian epistemology. The discourse on intrinsic vs extrinsic validity underscores essential divergences about the essence of truth, cognition, and justification. *Svataḥprāmāṇyavāda* asserts the self-evident nature of knowledge, whereas *Parataḥprāmāṇyavāda* underscores the importance of verification and practical efficacy. Collectively, these theories illustrate the profundity, rigor, and originality of Indian philosophical inquiries into knowing. The ongoing significance of this discourse demonstrates that Indian epistemology provides important perspectives on modern concerns over truth and justification.

References

Bhatta, K. (1985). *Ślokavārttika* (G. Jha, Trans.). Motilal Banarsidass.

Chatterjee, S. C. (1950). *The Nyāya theory of knowledge*. University of Calcutta.

Chatterjee, S. C., & Datta, D. M. (1984). *An introduction to Indian philosophy* (8th ed.). University of Calcutta.

Dasgupta, S. (1932). *A history of Indian philosophy* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Dasti, M., & Phillips, S. H. (2017). *The Nyāya-sūtra: Selections with early commentaries*. Hackett Publishing.

Ganganatha Jha, G. (1999). *Prabhākara Mīmāṃsā*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Jha, G. (1986). *The Prabhākara school of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Matilal, B. K. (1986). *Perception: An essay on classical Indian theories of knowledge*. Oxford University Press.

Matilal, B. K. (1998). *The character of logic in India*. SUNY Press.

Mohanty, J. N. (1992). *Reason and tradition in Indian thought: An essay on the nature of Indian philosophical thinking*. Oxford University Press.

Phillips, S. H. (2012). *Epistemology in classical India: The knowledge sources of the Nyāya school*. Routledge.

Potter, K. H. (1977). *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies: Epistemology (Pramāṇa)* (Vol. 2). Princeton University Press.

Potter, K. H. (1984). *Presuppositions of India's philosophies*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Radhakrishnan, S., & Moore, C. A. (1957). *A sourcebook in Indian philosophy*. Princeton University Press.

Sharma, C. D. (2000). *A critical survey of Indian philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Taber, J. A. (2005). *A Hindu critique of Buddhist epistemology: Kumārila on perception*. Routledge.

Upadhyaya, K. N. (1989). *Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā*. Motilal Banarsidass.