

The Compare and Contradiction of Nyaya and Aristotelian Logical Fallacies

J. DHILEBAN

Ph.D. Research Scholar
Department of Philosophy
Annamalai University
Annamalai Nagar

Dr. J. THIRUMAL

Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy
Annamalai University
Annamalai Nagar.

Abstract

The main objective of this paper is to determine the compare and contradiction of the Nyaya and Aristotelian logical fallacies. From the world most famous, two philosopher's logic are identical, first the great Indian philosopher's Aksapada Gautama (BCE 550) Nyaya logic and Nyaya Sutra, Anviksiki or Tarka or Science of logic its philosophy is called the philosophy of logical realism and the second western great Greek philosopher Aristotle (BCE 383-322). Traditional logic there, the inference of these two eminent is discussed Aristotle defines fallacy that "A logical fallacy is roughly an error of reasoning" kinds of the deductive fallacies are two parts immediate and mediate. Another Division of logic is inductive fallacy. By this the comparison and contradiction of the Hetvabhasa, the fallacy of Nyaya to the five kinds of material fallacy Naiyayikas are taken into account fundamental Nyaya (Anumana) inference of Hetvabhasa are described by Vyapti. The violation of rules of syllogism is treated as Fallacy thus the concept of syllogism also to be discussed here syllogism comprises three member major premise, minor premise, and conclusion Nyaya five members of syllogism are Pretijna, Hetu, Udaharana, Upanaya and Nigamana.

Key Words: Fallacy, immediate and mediate, Syllogism, Major premise, Minor premise, conclusion, Anumana, Paksa, Sadhya, Linga, Hetu, Vyapti, Hetvabhasa.

Introduction

The conclusions of the fallacy are described by the two premises of inference. If the conclusion does not accept the logical rules, then it is defined as fallacy logical consist of more rules that rules must be obeyed or else error has occurred that is known as 'fallacy'. The term fallacy in derived from the Latin name 'fallacia' which means 'fault' the fallacy of Nyaya inference defines by the anumana the complete conclusion can be achieved. These types of anumana have some rules if it is not involved with that rule the syllogism called as a 'fallacy'. The fallacy of Nyaya inference is called Hetvabhasa it is described by "A word

which literally means ‘hetu’ or ‘reason’. But the reason in the fallacies of Inference (Hetvabhasa) in terms as ‘Invalid reason’.

Generally a fallacy means an error or confusion in and argue. But in logic it has technical use logic formulates principles and conditions regulative of valid thinking and therefore the violation of any rule in an argument amounts to committing a fallacy. Therefore a fallacy consists in the violation of the rules or principles of valid reasoning in logic. The other way that an argument can fail to establish the truth of its conclusion is for its premises not to imply its conclusion. An argument whose premises do not support its conclusion is one whose conclusion could be false, even if all its premises were true. In cases of this kind the reasoning is wrong, and the argument is said to be fallacies. A fallacy is an error in reasoning. Each fallacy is a type of incorrect argument. There is no precisely determined number to fallacies.

The most common and deceptive categories of mistakes in reasoning are divided into two large groups. Viz. Fallacies of relevance and fallacies of ambiguity.

According to Naiyayikas all fallacies are material fallacies of hetvabhasa, it means that the middle term appears to be a reason, but is not a valid reason. There are five kinds of material fallacies in Nyaya, there are Savyabhicara, Viruddha, Satpratipaksa, Asiddha, and Badhita, savyabhicara is the fallacy of the irregular middle. It is of three kinds’ sadharana, asadharana, anupsanihari. The second kind of fallacy is viruddha which is the contradictory middle instead of proving the existence of the major term in the minor term. It proves its nonexistence there in the satpratipaksa hetvabhasa the middle term is contradicted by another middle term.

The reason is counterbalanced by some other reason. Asiddha or sadhyasama hetvabhasa is the fallacy of the unproved middle. It is of three kinds of asrayasiddha, svarupasiddha and vyapyatvasiddha. In badhita hetvabhasa the middle term is contradicted by some other pramana and not by inference. It cannot prove the major term which is disproved by another stronger source of valid knowledge.

Nyaya Inference with Nature of Vyapti

According to Nyaya inference (Anumana) is classified into three stages. In first stages is there are two forms of Anumana namely svartha and paratha. This is a psychological classification which a has viewed the use (or) purpose which an inference serves. This svarthanumana for oneself and the pirate for others. While Aristotlian inference also divided into two kinds namely deduction and induction further the duction also divided into two types

which is immediate one mediates. A immediate inference it pass from a single given proposition to another proposition directly or immediately (immediate here does not mean quick) but means direct or without a mean (or) without a middle or (common term) if one premises (proposition) the process is called immediate inference in the immediate inference again divided into two kinds, namely opposition and eduction again the eduction also divided into parts observation and conversion these are all forms of immediate inference. But according to Nyaya inference immediate means svarthanumana or inference for oneself.

The pararthanumana is for otherself that mean and inference are parartha when in making it a man aims provoking or demonstrating the truth of the conclusion to the other man. At the same time Aristotelian mediate inference is a form of reasoning in which a conclusion is reached in directly or mediates that is called 'syllogism'. In a syllogism a conclusion is drawn or inferred from two premises, the conclusion is reached by comparing the two premises through a mediating terms. But the Nyaya inference (anumana) parartha is different form of reasoning that mean five structure forms of syllogism and Aristotelian form of syllogism are three structures of syllogism. Both of inference of different forms but conclusion are the same.

Vyapti in defining as spreaded all over, universal connection, described two meanings of Vyapti. In ancient Nyaya literature the word 'Abinaba' was joined the universality and invariability are depends upon each other, but are not same and the relation of Vyapti is only depends on this.

This concept is involved in the conclusive definition of 'Vyapti' offered by Gangesa (Siddhanta- Laksana) and is a necessary mark of recognition that in certain cases the 'sadhya' may be absent in the 'Paksa' and 'sapaksas' at a certain point of their space and time. This means that the conclusive general definition of Vyapti cannot be correctly applied to this particular "vyapti" without the established awareness an earthy substance does not possess smell at the times of its production. Vyapti is of two kinds, namely samavyapti and visamavyapti. A Vyapti between two terms of equal extension concomitance, so that we may infer either of them from the other e.g., whatever is nameable is knowable and vice-versa. Visamavyapti is a relation of non-equipollent concomitance between two terms, from one of which we may infer the other, but not vice-versa. We may infer fire from smoke but not smoke from fire.

Therefore Vyapti is an invariable the middle and the major term. The Naiyayikas agree with the vedantins in holdings that Vyapti is established by the uncontradict experience of the relation between two things and not on any a priory principle like causality or essential identity. They however go further than the vedantins and supplement uncontradicted experience of the relation between two facts by tarka or indirect proof and by samanyalaksana perception.

The Nyaya method of induction or generalization may be analyzed in five steps. These are anvaya vyatireka, vyabhicaragraha, upadhinirasa, tarka and samanyalaksana perception respectively. Anavaya is when a relation of agreement between two things is in presence, and vyatireka when this relation in absence. Vyabhicaragraha is when we do not observe any contrary instance in which one of them is present without the other. Upandhirasa is the elimination of upadhis or conditions on which the relation may possible be dependent. Tarka and samanyalaksana perceptions have their literal meaning about which we have discussed earlier.

Nyaya and Aristotle in forms and comparison of the syllogism

The structure of the Naiyayika that means Nyaya syllogism as five propositions is called, it avayayas or number these are pratijina, hetu, udahara, upanaya and nigamana. The five numbered syllogism may be thus illustrated.

- Rama is Mortal (Pratijna) → (Proposition)
- Because he is a Man (hetu) → (Reason)
- All men are Mortal (Udaharana) → (Example) Rama, Madhva, Ramanuja
- Rama also is a Man (Upanaya) → (Application)
- Therefore mortal (Nigamana) → (Conclusion)

The structure of Aristotle this syllogism may be said to express a single comprehensive act of the thought. An Aristotelian form of mediate inference syllogism broadly classified into pure and mixed, depending upon the nature of the proposition, if all the three propositions are of the same kind, it is a pure syllogism. If the entire three propositions are of different kinds, that syllogism is called a mixed one. There are three kinds, pure syllogism namely categorical, hypothetical and disjunctive and there are three kinds of mixed syllogism, hypothetical, disjunctive and dilemma. Etymologically syllogism means 'thinking together' a syllogism appeal to reason and compels assent. It may define the reasoning expressed in a syllogism as judgment so expended as to exhibit the reason by which it is supported in the reasoning

- The geranium has five pointed sepals (Major Premises)
- The plant has not five pointed sepals (Minor Premises)
- Therefore, it is not a geranium (Conclusion)

From these two examples, the proposition and syllogism are different, but it is concluded same. Usually Gautama Five members of syllogism are very complicating then Aristotle's three members of syllogism so Aristotle three members are used nowadays. The pratijna is the first proposition of Nyaya five member of syllogism and pratijna is as conclusion. The third proposition in udaharana is added. But Aristotle syllogism has three members of syllogism.

Nyaya and Aristotle are different in structure but both give same conclusion. From this the various proposition and syllogism are very important as well as the team there two syllogism has three terms, according to Nyaya five members of syllogism. Sadhya -major term, Paksa - minor term and Hetu - middle terms. Likewise Nyaya and Aristotle three member of syllogism has contain three terms in it, they are major term-P, minor term-S, and middle term-m.

The three terms of Nyaya and Aristotle are included in various proposition of it particularly Nyaya five members of syllogism in this from first two proposition me get conclusion in this proposition. Then from the third and fourth proposition the next fifth one is derived as the conclusion. In this term are considered in three propositions. The First proposition of pratjna is included with Sadhya-S, the second proposition of included with Paksa, thence by the third, fourth and fifth terms the third proposition Udaharana in included also Sadhya the major term in included.

The fourth proposition of Upanaya, the minor term Paksa are include finally the common terms in third and fourth proposition are called as hetu. Generally the Father of logical in Aristotelian these three members of syllogism contains three terms. They are major terminated, minor term and middle term.

The major term contains predicate is the first proposition. Minor term denotes the subject in the second proposition middle term denote the common term from first and second terms generally the Nyaya and Aristotle syllogism are different in structure gets gives same conclusion with three terms. But Vyapti in very important in Nyaya logic in the invariableness between major term (Sadhya) and middle term (hetu) are called Vyapti. This is the fundamental for Anumana logic, in this manner each Anumana based on the knowledge of Vyapti.

Normally Fallacy are also occurring in the conclusion of Nyaya and Aristotle inference these types of Fallacies formed by proposition of terms the Fallacy in the Nyaya tarka sutra are called as hetvabhasa.

Nyaya and Aristotle Fallacies in Comparison

Nyaya and Aristotle syllogism which in derived from inference, contains certain rules by the violation of this rule fallacy occurred. Fallacies are formed by premises and terms the fallacy derived from Nyaya Tarka logic Anumana is called Hetvabhasa the Aristotelian logic is called as the fallacy of syllogism. Nyaya logic are all material fallacy, there are five kinds of fallacies. In this primary is called Savyabhicara or Anaikantika this is the fallacy of the irregular material. It is about three kinds of Sadharana, Asadharana, Anupasamhari.

In Aristotelian fallacies the fallacy of undistributed middle in taking from categorical syllogism by the middle term we compare major and minor terms conclusion are integrated. For this the middle term must be completed at once. If two parts are completed the parts of major and minor terms are taken into account, but major premises and minor premises are not connected. This error is known as fallacies undistributed middle. By this the Nyaya of Hetvabhasa is compared with savyabhicara it's depend only by middle term like the fallacy of undistributed the savyabhicara's middle term not matched so it is compared in this topic.

The contradictory of Nyaya and Aristotle Fallacies

The third kinds of fallacy Hetvabhasa is called satpraktipaksa or the inferentially contradicted middle and in the Nyaya sutras 'satpratipaksa' is tenned 'prakaranasama' which

has been defined as “yasmat prakaranacita sanimayartham apadistah prakaramasamah the term ‘prakarana’ has been defined by vatsyayana”. The satpraktipaksa Hetvabhasa contradictory of major premises and minor premises and middle terms of this of the logic of Aristotle’s fallacy of illicit major and the fallacy of illicit minor the conclusion are set by the premises, so it does not exceed the premises.

The level of completion of terms in the premises is must be equal to the level of conclusion terms completion. If an incomplete term in premises leads error when the completion of the term at the conclusion. This rule depends upon two terms the violation of rules is given two types of fallacy. It is called the fallacy of illicit major and the fallacy of illicit minor. The Fallacy of illicit major it is completed in major premises and not in the conclusion. Whereas fallacy of illicit minor in not completed in minor premises and completed in conclusion from this the satpratipaksa Hetvabhasa contradictory with Aristotelian fallacy.

Conclusion

These research articles mainly focus on the comparison and contradictory of the relation between Nyaya and Aristotelian Logical Fallacies, mainly Indian and Western Philosopher the most eminent Aksapada Gautama (Nyaya Philosophy) and Aristotelian logic or tarka most famous even though they are in different ages their philosophical logic are identical. In this article the inference (anumana) the violation in the syllogism is fallacy are taken.

Nyaya inference (anumana) logic is called as five numbed syllogisms or naturahstic syllogism. They are Pratijna. Hetu, Udaharana, Upanaya and Nigamana. The Nyaya Hetvabhasa is five kinds material fallacy and the specialty at this topic in the discussed the main part at Vyapti.

Aristotle syllogism in comparison of three members of syllogism major premises, minor premises and conclusion, this syllogism of Nyaya and Aristotle are same in structure and not in conclusion so this it is focused mainly in of from Indian and Western Logic in Fallacies which in violating focus the rules and comparison and contradictory are discussed. Finally, this research is compare with Nyaya and Aristotelian syllogism of structures and its fallacies, the structure of syllogism, rules and its fallacies are different forms and the end of the reason that means the conclusion is the common for both Nyaya and Aristotelian logic.

Reference

1. Satischandea Chatterjee and Dhirendramohan data, "An Introduction to Indian Philosophy", University of Calcutta, 1996.
2. Vidhyabhushan, Satish Chandra, "A history of Indian logic, Ancient, Medieval and Modem Schools" Motilal Banasidass Publishers, Delhi, 1971.
3. H.N. Randle, "Indian logic in the early school", oriental book reprints Corporation, New Delhi, 1976.
4. Chandradhar Sharam, "A critical survey of Indian Philosophy", Motilal Banarsidass publishers Private Limited, Delhi 2003.
5. Bodas, Rajaram Mahadev, "A history study of Indian logic"
6. John, T., Kearna, "Deductive Logic", New Century Education Division, Manedith Corporation, New York, 1965.
7. Mahadevan, T.M.P., "An Invitation to Logic", K.C.S. Desikan & Co. Press. Madras, 1973.
8. James Edwin Creighton and Harold R. Smart, "An Introductory Logic", New York the Macmillan Company, 1986.
9. A.B. Shab "Scientific method" Allied Publisher private LTD, New York, 1964
10. Arthur N. Prior "Logic and the basis of Ethics", Oxford at the calendar Press, 1949.
11. A.K. Monga "A Selective course in Deductive logic", Sterling publishers private limited, New Delhi-1981.
12. Ronald Jager "Essay in Logic from Aristotle to Russel", Printed in the United States of America, 1963.