Among the four special sources of valid knowledge accepted by the Logicians (i.e., Perception, Inference, Comparison and Verbal testimony), Perception has got a vital role in the cases of other sources of valid knowledge. It has been proved that the Inference has got much utility in our everyday life. Though Perception and Inference are considered as most important sources of valid knowledge, the importance of comparison and verbal testimony cannot be ignored, as they also help us in their own ways in many phases of our everyday life.

It has already been mentioned that our life will completely be impractical without the help of an inference. Though the definition of an inference is given by different scholars of the different schools of philosophy, all the philosophers (except the Cārvākas) offer the same view...
regarding the utility of Inference. There may have diversity of opinion among the scholars of the different schools in respect of the definition of Inference, but all of them admit the utility of it. Though the definitions given by other systems of philosophy are different from each other, most of the systems of philosophy accept the knowledge of the invariable concomitance as a special cause of the inferential knowledge. The Buddhists describe Inference as consisting in the perception of some object which is known to be inseparably connected with another object. Such inseparable condition between two objects is caused either by the law of causality (tadutpatti) or identity of nature (tadātmya). (1) The Jaina philosophers also are of the view that Inference is a process
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(1) "Kāryakārāt vā dhāvāvā
svabhāvāvānīyāmaṇi.
Avinābhāvāvāniyo
āyō darsanānā nā darsanātāt."
Buddha-darsana of Sarvedhārājasamgraha, Page-5
(Satyajyoti Chakraborty Edition).
of knowing an object which is not perceived through the perception of sign (linga) and the recollection of its invariable concomitance with that object. (1) That Sākhyas and Yoga, the Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta systems too define Inference as knowledge of one object (of the relation) which is not perceived through the knowledge of other object which is perceived and which is known as having invariable relation to the first object. (2)

According to the Neo logicians, the knowledge of the coexistence of the probans and the probandum along with the

(1) "Drṣṭādunapaidistādvā sadhanāt yat sādhyasya vijnānam samyo-gārthanirnayatmakam tadanausīyate'nneti anumānam lingagrahanasambandhasamaranayah pasučat paricchedanam." commentary on Sūtra 1/2/7 of Pramāṇa-mīmāṃsā. Singdhi Jaina Series No. 9. Page no. 39.
(2) "Pratibandhadrahalah pratibaddhajñānamanumāpakaṃ." Sākmhya Sūtra 1/100.
"Vyāpyadaraśanādasannikṛṣṭarthaḥjñānamanumānām." Mānimeyodaya - Page no. 25. C.Kunhan Raja and S.S.S. Sāstrī Edition,
absence of the knowledge of deviation of the probans in the cause of ascertaining Vyāpti. (1) This process of ascertaining Vyāpti has been accepted by the Vedantists also. (2)

According to the Neo logicians, the doubt of deviation (vyabhicāra) which may arise in some cases from the doubt of an extraneous adjunct can be removed by Tarka. (3)

The importance has been laid on Tarka in respect of ascertaining Vyāpti by the philosophers of other systems also. According to Vijnānabhikṣu, Vyāpti can be ascertained by applying the favourable Tarka. (4) Same opinion has also been forwarded by

(1) "Vyabhicārajñānā vibrasahasahakṛtam sahacāradarsanam vyāptigrāhakam." - Tattvācintāmani (Vyāptigrāhopāya Chapter).
(2) "Sā ca vyabhicāraṇāne sati sahacāradarsanena grhyate." Vedenāparībhāṣā (Inference Chapter).
(3) "Tadbhirasāca vipakṣaḥ sahakatarkat." - Tattvācintāmani (vyāptigrāhopāya Chapter).
the Mīmāṃsakas. But the Jaina-Philosophers have laid much more importance on it. According to them, the only means for ascertaining Vyāpti is Tarka.

The definitions of Vyāpti and the means of ascertaining it given by different systems of philosophy are of different types. Though the view (regarding Vyāpti and the means of its knowledge) offered by the Neo-logicians appears to us to be most accurate, as it is based on the hairsplitting analysis and strict logical principles, other views (regarding those) given by other systems of philosophy can not be ignored. Their views are also to be supported from the standpoint of their philosophy. Every system has got its own principle and

---


standpoint. If the definitions of Vyāpti and the means of ascertaining it are considered through the light of argument and principle of a particular system, it can not be said that their views are groundless. That is to say, these definitions and means of ascertaining it should also to be reviewed from their own viewpoint if we want to know the cause of forwarding different views in respect of those.