

METALOGICAL INCOMPATIBILITIES IN THE FORMAL  
 DESCRIPTION OF BUDDHIST LOGIC (NYĀYA)

DOUGLAS DUNSMORE DAYE

1 *Introduction and Background Sketch* In this paper\* I wish to consider two specific aspects of comparative logic. First, I wish to briefly sketch and comment upon the general post-war (rather Procrustean) methodological background regarding the Sanskrit ablative case (AC) in Buddhist logical texts and the use of the functor of material implication (MI, " $\supset$ ") to describe the AC. Secondly, I wish to demonstrate the incompatibility of MI and AC by contextually examining truth-functionality, and the incompatible concepts of Stephan Toulmin's full-warrant and the Buddhist proto-metalogical rule of the Three Forms of the Justification (trairūpyahetu). The technical literature of philosophy of logic is saturated with warnings against assuming the interchangeability of "if  $p$  then  $q$ ," " $q$  because of  $p$ " and " $p \supset q$ ." I do not wish to re-trace that ground again; rather I wish to suggest a new instance of incompatibility between " $\supset$ " and "because" (AC) based solely on the metalogical incompatibilities found in the works of Toulmin and the (supposed) author of the sixth century, the Indian Buddhist logician, Dignāga.

I have read somewhere that when the early Jesuit missionaries first arrived in China and began the study of the Chinese language in which to propagate the Christian Dharma (teachings), they began writing grammars of Chinese utilizing the non-isomorphic descriptive categories and terminology of Latin grammar. I would not wish blatantly to assert that such questionable methodological activities have been carried out in all logical studies of Buddhist Nyāya. However, I do wish to suggest that one can construct a weak analogy between such activities and the expectations and methodological projections of (first) scholars primarily trained in western 19th century syllogistic and 20th century mathematical logic, and (second)

---

\*This paper, in a slightly modified form, was read at the Institute for Asian Religions, The University of California at Berkeley, July 10, 1973. I wish to thank Professor A. Charlene S. McDermott for her comments at that time. This is not to suggest that she is in agreement with the contents of this paper.