

Cont'd :

In the first case we just have an inferential judgement; in the second case a judgement of concomitance.

The judgement 'there is a fiery hill' contains three terms, however, they are not necessarily interrelated. But the judgement 'there is here a fire, because there is smoke ' or 'there is no smoke without a fire' are inferential since smoke is represented as necessarily connected with its cause, the fire.

The three terms : the logical subject (Paksa or minor term), the logical predicate (sadhya, consequence, major term), and, between them, the 'reason' or mark which unites them.

Dignaga says that all inferential relation is based upon a substance to quality relation; it is constructed by our understanding; it doesn't represent the ultimate reality. According to Dharmottara, inference has an imagined object, e.g., an imagined fire, as its own object.

Two varieties:

Inference for oneself/ Svartha Anumana, is an internal process of cognition. When we cognize something internally, for ourselves, the inference is an internal process of cognition. Its formulation in speech is a case of ' inference for others'/ Parartha Anumana ; it is a method of communicating knowledge to others.

Parathanumana or Syllogism consists in communicating the three aspects of the hetu to others. The 3 aspects are :

- I. Direct concomitance (Anvaya vyapti): for example, Wherever there is smoke, there is fire.
2. The same premise expressed negatively : Vyatireka vyapti : for example, Wherever there is absence of fire, there is absence of smoke,
3. Paksa dharmata i.e., the subject of inference (Paksa, eg, hill) is characterised by the logical mark/ hetu, e.g., smoke.

Three examples of Svartha Anumana:

1. The sounds of speech are impermanent entities
Because they are produced at will, just as jars etc.
This is an Inference based on Identical Reference of two concepts, ' impermanence' and 'production'.
2. There is fire on the hill
Because there is smoke, just as in the kitchen etc.
This is an Inference based on a causal relation between two facts.
3. There is no jar on the floor.
Because we do not perceive any, just as we perceive no flower growing in the sky.
This is an Inference based on Negation.