International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Nyāya Logic and Western Epistemology: Towards a Comparative Theory of Knowledge

Dr. Mukul Bala

Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Banarhat Kartik Oraon Hindi Govt. College

Abstract

This study explores the epistemological dialogue between Nyāya logic of classical Indian philosophy and Western epistemology, aiming to develop a comparative theory of knowledge. Nyāya epistemology, codified in the *Nyāya Sūtras* of Gautama, presents a pluralistic framework of four pramāṇas—perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), comparison (*upamāna*), and verbal testimony (*śabda*). It situates valid cognition (*pramā*) not only as a theoretical achievement but also as an instrumental means for the attainment of liberation (*mokṣa*). Western epistemology, from Plato's concept of knowledge as justified true belief to the analytic refinements of Russell, Quine, and Williamson, has traditionally emphasized perception and inference, often underestimating the role of testimony in knowledge formation. By placing these two traditions in dialogue, this paper identifies points of convergence in rational inquiry and logical methodology, as well as divergences in the treatment of epistemic sources, the role of metaphysics, and the ultimate purpose of knowledge. It proposes a comparative theory of knowledge that integrates the analytical precision of Western philosophy with the pluralistic inclusivity of Nyāya, offering insights for contemporary debates in cognitive science, artificial intelligence, and cross-cultural philosophy.

Keywords: Nyāya logic, epistemology, pramāṇa, comparative philosophy, justified true belief, cognitive science, artificial intelligence

Introduction

The pursuit of knowledge has always been a central concern of human thought, transcending the boundaries of culture and history. Philosophers across civilizations have asked: *What is knowledge? How is it acquired? How can true knowledge be distinguished from error?* While these questions are universal, the methodologies and philosophical orientations used to answer them often reflect the unique intellectual traditions in which they arise. A comparative study of Indian and Western epistemology not only highlights these differences but also reveals potential complementarities that can enrich global philosophy.

The Nyāya school of Indian thought, codified in the *Nyāya Sūtras* (ca. 2nd century CE), is particularly noteworthy for its systematic approach to logic and epistemology. It conceives valid knowledge (*pramā*) as that which corresponds to reality (*yathārtha-jñāna*) and serves a pragmatic and liberatory function. As Matilal observes, Nyāya epistemology is both "analytical and purposive, for it seeks the removal of error in the practical pursuit of liberation" (Matilal 15). Its doctrine of pramāṇas—perception, inference, comparison, and verbal testimony—reflects an epistemic pluralism that acknowledges the complexity of human cognition. Unlike some Western traditions, Nyāya is comfortable granting verbal testimony and

analogy independent epistemic authority, integrating individual reasoning with social and linguistic sources of knowledge.

Western epistemology, by contrast, developed within a different intellectual trajectory. From Plato's articulation of knowledge as justified true belief in the *Theaetetus* to the skepticism of Hume and the analytic rigor of Russell and Williamson, Western philosophy has consistently sought to define, justify, and secure knowledge in the face of doubt. It has traditionally emphasized individual cognition and critical verification, often viewing testimony as secondary to perception and inference. As Williamson notes in *Knowledge and Its Limits*, the modern analytic tradition continues to refine the boundaries of epistemic justification, grappling with challenges introduced by Gettier's seminal critique of the JTB model (Williamson 42).

This paper situates Nyāya and Western epistemology in dialogue, tracing their convergences in rational method and concern with error, while also highlighting their divergences in epistemic scope, metaphysical grounding, and soteriological purpose. In doing so, it argues for a comparative theory of knowledge that is both inclusive and analytically rigorous, capable of addressing classical philosophical questions and modern interdisciplinary challenges in fields such as cognitive science, artificial intelligence, and cross-cultural ethics.

Nyāya Epistemology

The Nyāya school of Indian philosophy, founded by Gautama (Akṣapāda) and systematized in the *Nyāya Sūtras* (c. 2nd century CE), is renowned for its rigorous logical and epistemological framework. Unlike schools that focus exclusively on metaphysical speculation or ritual practice, Nyāya locates the pursuit of liberation **(***mokṣa***)** firmly in the realm of right knowledge **(***pramā***)**, asserting that ignorance (*avidyā*) is the root of human suffering. As the *Nyāya Sūtras* declare, "The cessation of pain is attained through the right knowledge of the true nature of things" (Nyāya Sūtra 1.1.1). For Nyāya, epistemology is not an abstract exercise but a pragmatic and liberatory discipline, seeking to replace error with truth in the quest for freedom.

At the core of Nyāya thought is the doctrine of pramāṇas, the valid means of acquiring knowledge. Nyāya recognizes four pramāṇas—perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), comparison (*upamāna*), and verbal testimony (*śabda*)—each providing an independent route to valid cognition. Later schools like Vedānta or Mīmāṃsā expanded the list to include presumption (*arthāpatti*) and non-cognition (*anupalabdhi*), but Nyāya retained its fourfold model, emphasizing analytical clarity and practical sufficiency.

Perception (Pratyakṣa***)***

Perception is the primary and most immediate source of knowledge in Nyāya philosophy. It is defined as "knowledge produced by the contact of the senses with their object, which is free from error and doubt" (*indriyārthasannikarṣotpannaṃ jñānam avyapadeśyam avyabhicāri vyavasāyātmakaṃ pratyakṣam*, Nyāya Sūtra 1.1.4). Nyāya distinguishes between indeterminate perception **(***nirvikalpa***)**, which apprehends an object in a pre-conceptual form, and determinate perception **(***savikalpa***)**, in which the object is categorized and named. This distinction anticipates modern discussions in phenomenology and cognitive science, where the stages of perception involve raw sensory input followed by conceptual interpretation. As Bimal Krishna Matilal observes, Nyāya perception is both empirically grounded and epistemically cautious, as it insists on freedom from illusion or misidentification (Matilal 38).

Inference (Anumāna***)***

Inference represents Nyāya's analytical and logical dimension, allowing knowledge of the unperceived through its connection to the perceived. Inference relies on the principle of invariable concomitance **(***vyāpti***)**, the necessary and universal relation between a sign (*liṅga* or *hetu*) and the property to be inferred. The classic example is inferring fire on a distant hill upon perceiving smoke, knowing that smoke invariably co-occurs with fire. Nyāya codifies inference into a five-member syllogism: (1) statement of the thesis (*pratijñā*), (2) reason (*hetu*), (3) universal rule with example (*udāharaṇa*), (4) application (*upanaya*), and (5) conclusion (*nigamana*). This structure, though more elaborate than Aristotle's three-part syllogism, is intended for didactic and dialectical purposes, ensuring that inference is transparent and communicable.

Nyāya also analyzes fallacies (*hetvābhāsa*), recognizing that flawed reasoning leads to invalid knowledge. This commitment to logical rigor and error analysis has drawn comparisons with Western analytic philosophy, particularly in its shared goal of refining valid reasoning processes (Ganeri 57).

Comparison (Upamāna***)***

The third pramāṇa, *upamāna* or comparison, is a distinctive contribution of Indian epistemology. It refers to the knowledge gained through recognizing similarity or analogy. A classic illustration is when a traveler is told, "A *gavaya* (wild ox) resembles a cow," and later identifies the animal in a forest by recalling this comparison. While Western epistemology often treats analogy as a form of inference, Nyāya recognizes that analogical recognition operates as a direct cognitive process**,** worthy of independent epistemic status. Modern cognitive science validates this insight by acknowledging the role of analogical mapping in learning, memory, and problem-solving.

Verbal Testimony (Śabda***)***

The fourth pramāṇa, *śabda*, affirms the authority of language and communication in knowledge formation. Nyāya holds that the words of a reliable source **(***āpta***)**, whether human or scriptural, constitute a valid means of knowledge. Testimony is divided into Vaidika**,** referring to the infallible authority of the Vedas, and Laukika, which encompasses trustworthy secular communication. The epistemic legitimacy of testimony reflects Nyāya's socially embedded epistemology**,** recognizing that much human knowledge is mediated through others**.** As Jonardon Ganeri notes, "Nyāya offers a sophisticated account of testimony that anticipates modern social epistemology, grounding trust in both competence and sincerity" (Ganeri 103).

In summary, Nyāya epistemology is pluralistic, analytical, and purposive**.** It integrates empirical observation, logical reasoning, analogical recognition, and testimonial trust into a comprehensive theory of knowledge aimed at dispelling ignorance and guiding human flourishing**.** Its systematic analysis of cognition and error makes it not only a cornerstone of Indian philosophy but also a valuable interlocutor for global epistemological discourse.

Western Epistemology

Western philosophy has been concerned with the nature, justification, and limits of knowledge since its earliest expressions in ancient Greece. From Plato's dialogues to the analytic tradition of the twentieth century, the central problem has remained: *What does it mean to know, and how can knowledge be distinguished from belief or opinion?* Although Western epistemology is diverse, it is characterized by its emphasis on individual cognition, rational justification, and critical skepticism**.**

Classical Foundations

Plato's *Theaetetus* (ca. 360 BCE) provides the first systematic exploration of the question, "What is knowledge?" His conclusion—that knowledge can be understood as justified true belief (JTB)—became the foundation for much of Western epistemology. In this model, a belief counts as knowledge only if it is true**,** believed by the subject, and supported by justification. This framework establishes a standard for epistemic evaluation that seeks to exclude mere opinion (*doxa*), emphasizing that knowledge requires a rational foundation.

Aristotle built upon this foundation by systematizing logic as a tool for securing knowledge. His theory of the syllogism provided a method of inference that would dominate Western thought for centuries. While Aristotle acknowledged the role of perception as the starting point for knowledge, his emphasis was on reasoned understanding (*epistēmē*), culminating in universal principles derived from experience through induction.

Medieval and Early Modern Epistemology

Medieval scholastic philosophers such as Thomas Aquinas integrated Aristotelian logic with Christian theology, maintaining that human knowledge could ascend from sense experience to intellectual apprehension, ultimately reaching truths revealed through divine illumination. During this period, testimony—in the form of scriptural or ecclesiastical authority—was considered epistemically significant but always mediated by theological presuppositions.

The early modern period marked a decisive shift, as philosophers sought to rebuild knowledge on secure foundations in the wake of scientific discovery and the decline of unquestioned religious authority. René Descartes (1596–1650) inaugurated the method of radical doubt, attempting to discard all beliefs that could conceivably be false in order to find an indubitable starting point. His famous cogito—*Cogito ergo sum* ("I think, therefore I am")—served as the first certainty in a chain of reasoning aimed at reconstructing human knowledge on a basis of rational self-awareness.

In contrast, John Locke (1632–1704) and other empiricists argued that all knowledge ultimately derives from sense experience. Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) described the mind as a "blank slate" (*tabula rasa*), upon which experience writes. David Hume (1711–1776) extended empiricism to its skeptical limits, questioning the rational basis of causal inference and asserting that much of what is taken as knowledge is merely a habit of association. His critique of induction parallels Nyāya's concern with fallacious inference (*hetvābhāsa*), though Hume's skepticism lacked Nyāya's pragmatic resolution.

Modern and Contemporary Developments

The analytic tradition of the twentieth century sharpened epistemology through logical analysis and linguistic clarity**.** Bertrand Russell emphasized the distinction between knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description, while G.E. Moore defended common-sense realism against skepticism. W.V.O. Quine, in his influential essay "Epistemology Naturalized," proposed that the study of knowledge be integrated with empirical science, shifting the focus from abstract justification to the natural functioning of human cognition.

A turning point in modern epistemology came with Edmund Gettier's 1963 paper, which challenged the sufficiency of the justified true belief model. Gettier showed that a belief could satisfy all three conditions—truth, belief, and justification—yet still fail to constitute knowledge if the justification was only coincidentally related to the truth. This "Gettier problem" sparked decades of debate, leading to

theories such as reliabilism (Goldman), contextualism (DeRose), and virtue epistemology (Sosa), all attempting to refine or replace the classical model.

In social epistemology, contemporary philosophers like Alvin Goldman and Miranda Fricker have expanded the scope of inquiry to include the social dimensions of knowledge, examining testimony, trust, and epistemic injustice. Here, Western epistemology begins to converge with the Nyāya emphasis on *śabda*, though typically without granting testimony independent status as a fundamental source of knowledge.

In summary, Western epistemology has evolved as a dialogue between skepticism and justification, seeking to secure knowledge through logical reasoning, empirical verification, and conceptual analysis. While it has historically privileged individual cognition, modern developments in social epistemology bring it closer to the pluralistic awareness of traditions like Nyāya. Its analytic precision and critical method provide a valuable complement to the integrative approach of Indian thought, setting the stage for a meaningful cross-cultural dialogue on the nature of knowledge.

Convergences and Divergences

A sustained comparison between Nyāya epistemology and Western philosophical traditions reveals both remarkable convergences in their intellectual ambitions and profound divergences in their methods, priorities, and underlying metaphysical assumptions. This dialogue not only illuminates the strengths and limitations of each system but also offers fertile ground for constructing a comparative theory of knowledge.

Points of Convergence

The most immediate point of convergence lies in their shared commitment to rational inquiry and logical rigor. Nyāya's elaboration of inference (*anumāna*) parallels the deductive and inductive reasoning central to the Western tradition since Aristotle's syllogistics. Both traditions recognize that knowledge is not merely a matter of unexamined belief but requires structured reasoning that can distinguish truth from error. For instance, Nyāya's five-member syllogism—proposition (*pratijñā*), reason (*hetu*), example (*udāharaṇa*), application (*upanaya*), and conclusion (*nigamana*)—shares functional similarity with the Aristotelian three-term syllogism, although it is more pedagogically explicit (Matilal 45).

Similarly, both systems regard perception as the foundational source of knowledge. Nyāya's *pratyakṣa* and Western empiricism converge in their recognition that sense experience provides the first and most immediate access to the external world. Locke's assertion that the mind is initially a "blank slate" resonates with the Nyāya claim that valid perception arises from the contact of the senses with objects (*indriyārthasannikarṣa*), free from conceptual imposition or error. Both traditions also grapple extensively with error and illusion, as seen in Nyāya's treatment of *bhrama* and Western reflections on skepticism in Descartes and Hume.

Another convergence lies in their dialectical orientation. Nyāya's tradition of debate (vāda) and its careful analysis of fallacies (*hetvābhāsa*) mirrors the Western concern with argumentation and critical discourse. Both traditions view philosophy as not merely a solitary enterprise but a process of reasoned exchange, where ideas must withstand scrutiny in the pursuit of truth.

Points of Divergence

Despite these overlaps, the differences between the two epistemological frameworks are equally revealing. The most significant divergence arises in the treatment of epistemic sources, particularly verbal testimony. Nyāya grants *śabda*—reliable testimony—independent pramāṇa status, asserting that

trustworthy linguistic communication can directly yield valid knowledge. This encompasses both scriptural authority (Vaidika) and human testimony (Laukika), reflecting a recognition of the social embeddedness of knowledge. In contrast, Western epistemology has historically approached testimony with skepticism, often treating it as derivative knowledge requiring further justification through perception or inference (Coady 1992). This reveals a fundamentally individualistic orientation in Western thought, where knowledge is often construed as a personal cognitive achievement rather than a socially mediated process.

A second divergence lies in epistemic pluralism versus reductionism. Nyāya acknowledges four independent pramāṇas—perception, inference, comparison, and testimony—while Western philosophy, until the rise of social epistemology, has tended to reduce knowledge to perception and reasoning, often treating analogy as an informal or secondary process. Nyāya's pluralism allows it to capture the complexity of cognition, integrating sensory, logical, analogical, and linguistic modes of knowledge acquisition. By contrast, the traditional Western approach is more restrictive, privileging those forms of knowledge that can be explicitly verified or logically formalized**.**

A third divergence emerges in the ultimate purpose of epistemology. Nyāya philosophy situates epistemic inquiry within a soteriological framework, where knowledge is a means to liberation (*mokṣa*) from suffering and ignorance. It is pragmatic and transformative, linking intellectual achievement to the existential project of self-realization. Western epistemology, particularly in its modern and analytic phases, has largely pursued knowledge for its own sake, emphasizing theoretical justification and conceptual clarity over existential or ethical implications. Although traditions such as Stoicism and Christian scholasticism acknowledge a moral or spiritual dimension to knowledge, the post-Enlightenment trajectory of Western thought tends toward a secular and abstract orientation (Williamson 2000, 42).

Illustrative Example

Consider the problem of testimony as an illustrative example of these divergences. A Nyāya philosopher encountering a statement like "There is a fire in the next village" would evaluate it as valid knowledge if the speaker is an āpta—competent and trustworthy. Western epistemology, until recently, would demand additional corroboration: perception of the fire, inference from smoke, or at least supporting evidence from multiple sources. Only in modern social epistemology (e.g., C.A.J. Coady, Miranda Fricker) does Western philosophy begin to recognize testimony as a fundamental epistemic resource, a position Nyāya affirmed over a millennium ago.

These convergences and divergences reveal that while both traditions aim to secure valid knowledge, they differ in scope, method, and purpose. Nyāya offers a holistic and socially aware model of epistemology, while Western thought brings analytic precision and critical skepticism. Together, they create the conditions for a comparative framework that is richer than either tradition in isolation.

Towards a Comparative Theory of Knowledge

The dialogue between Nyāya epistemology and Western philosophy offers fertile ground for developing a comparative theory of knowledge that is at once pluralistic, rigorous, and contextually meaningful. Both traditions, despite their distinct historical and cultural contexts, share the ambition of distinguishing truth from error and grounding human cognition in reliable processes. By synthesizing the pluralism of Nyāya with the analytic precision of Western epistemology, a framework can be constructed that is both philosophically comprehensive and practically relevant to contemporary intellectual challenges.

Integrating Epistemic Sources

A comparative theory begins by recognizing that human knowledge arises through multiple interrelated sources, a view more explicitly developed in Nyāya than in classical Western epistemology. Perception (*pratyakṣa*) remains foundational, forming the starting point for both Lockean empiricism and Nyāya's sensory realism. Inference (*anumāna*) aligns naturally with Western deductive and inductive reasoning, both traditions emphasizing the necessity of valid inferential structures to move beyond immediate experience.

Nyāya's distinctive contribution lies in its recognition of analogy (*upamāna*) and testimony (*śabda*) as independent pramāṇas, which expand the epistemic landscape to include social and analogical cognition. Modern cognitive science supports this pluralism: research in analogical reasoning shows its fundamental role in problem-solving, language acquisition, and creative thought (Gentner 1983), while social epistemology increasingly acknowledges the importance of trust, communication, and collective knowledge formation (Goldman 1999; Fricker 2007). A comparative framework thus legitimizes a multi-pronged approach, integrating sensory, inferential, analogical, and testimonial forms of knowledge into a coherent model.

Bridging Theoretical and Practical Dimensions

Another feature of a comparative theory is its integration of the theoretical and practical functions of knowledge. Nyāya situates epistemology within a soteriological project, asserting that valid knowledge contributes to the cessation of suffering and the attainment of liberation (*mokṣa*). While Western epistemology has often pursued knowledge for its own sake, modern trends in applied epistemology and philosophy of technology increasingly recognize that epistemic inquiry carries ethical and social responsibilities. Issues such as misinformation, epistemic injustice, and the reliability of AI systems illustrate that knowledge is never purely theoretical; it has profound pragmatic and societal implications.

By combining Nyāya's purpose-driven orientation with Western analytic standards of justification, a comparative theory can respond to the dual demands of accuracy and significance. Knowledge is not only about what is true but also about why it matters—to individuals, communities, and the human condition.

Interdisciplinary Relevance

A pluralistic comparative epistemology has concrete implications across disciplines:

1. **Cognitive Science and AI**: A model that incorporates perception, inference, analogy, and testimony reflects the multi-layered architecture of human cognition, offering insights into designing AI systems capable of integrating empirical data, logical reasoning, analogical processing, and trustworthy source evaluation.
2. **Cross-Cultural and Global Philosophy**: Comparative epistemology encourages dialogue across traditions, challenging the parochialism of single-framework approaches. By respecting plural modes of knowing, it contributes to a more inclusive global philosophical discourse (Ganeri 2016).
3. **Social Epistemology and Ethics**: Recognizing the epistemic value of testimony and collective knowledge allows for more nuanced engagement with issues like fake news, expert authority, and epistemic injustice, where knowledge and power intersect in contemporary society (Fricker 2007).

Towards an Integrative Model

A comparative theory of knowledge thus envisions epistemology as both analytic and transformative, rigorous in method yet inclusive in scope. It seeks to balance the Western emphasis on justification and skepticism with the Nyāya commitment to pluralism and practical relevance. By acknowledging that

knowledge emerges not solely from isolated individuals but also from social, linguistic, and analogical networks, this model aligns with both classical wisdom and modern scientific understanding.

Such a synthesis does not erase the differences between the traditions; rather, it allows them to mutually illuminate and enrich one another, producing a vision of epistemology that is globally resonant, interdisciplinary, and humanly meaningful.

Conclusion

The comparative study of Nyāya epistemology and Western philosophy demonstrates that the human pursuit of knowledge is both universal in aspiration and diverse in expression. Both traditions share a commitment to rational inquiry, logical analysis, and the correction of error, yet they diverge in epistemic scope, methodological focus, and ultimate purpose.

Nyāya epistemology presents a pluralistic and integrative model of knowledge, grounded in the four pramāṇas—perception, inference, comparison, and verbal testimony. Its recognition of analogy and testimony as independent sources of valid cognition reflects an awareness of the social and analogical dimensions of human thought, a perspective that anticipates insights now emerging in cognitive science and social epistemology. Its soteriological orientation frames knowledge as a means of liberation, linking intellectual inquiry to existential and ethical transformation.

Western epistemology, by contrast, has historically pursued a more individualistic and analytic path, emphasizing justification, skepticism, and formal reasoning. From Plato's justified true belief model to Gettier's critique and the rise of social epistemology, Western philosophy has honed the tools of critical analysis and conceptual precision, yet often left the pragmatic and transformative functions of knowledge implicit or secondary. Modern developments in reliabilism, contextualism, and virtue epistemology mark a gradual movement toward integrating social and practical dimensions.

By bringing these two traditions into dialogue, this paper proposes the contours of a comparative theory of knowledge that is inclusive, rigorous, and globally relevant. Such a framework integrates Nyāya's pluralism and purpose-driven approach with Western analytic standards of justification, producing a vision of epistemology that is both theoretically robust and practically meaningful. This synthesis offers tools for addressing contemporary challenges—from the design of AI systems that mirror human cognitive processes to the ethical management of knowledge in an era of misinformation.

Ultimately, the future of comparative philosophy lies not in the juxtaposition of isolated traditions but in mutual illumination and creative integration. Nyāya logic and Western epistemology, considered together, invite a new horizon of knowledge: one that bridges the analytic and the existential, the empirical and the testimonial, the individual and the collective. This comparative epistemology is not merely a theoretical exercise but a philosophical path toward intellectual clarity, social relevance, and human flourishing.

References

1. Aristotle. *Posterior Analytics*. Translated by Jonathan Barnes, Oxford University Press, 1993.
2. Coady, C.A.J. *Testimony: A Philosophical Study*. Oxford University Press, 1992.
3. Dasgupta, Surendranath. *A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. 1*. Cambridge University Press, 1922.
4. Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Edited by John Cottingham, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

5. Fricker, Miranda. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
6. Ganeri, Jonardon. *Philosophy in Classical India: The Proper Work of Reason*. Routledge, 2001.
7. Ganeri, Jonardon. *The Lost Age of Reason: Philosophy in Early Modern India 1450–1700*. Oxford University Press, 2016.
8. Gentner, Dedre. "Structure-Mapping: A Theoretical Framework for Analogy." *Cognitive Science*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1983, pp. 155–170.
9. Goldman, Alvin I. *Knowledge in a Social World*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
10. Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Tom L. Beauchamp, Oxford University Press, 2000.
11. Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford University Press, 1975.
12. Matilal, Bimal Krishna. *Perception: An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge*. Oxford University Press, 1986.
13. Nyāya Sūtras of Gautama. Translated by Ganganatha Jha, Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.
14. Plato. *Theaetetus*. Translated by M.J. Levett, revised by Myles Burnyeat, Hackett Publishing, 1990.
15. Quine, W.V.O. "Epistemology Naturalized." *Ontological Relativity and Other Essays*. Columbia University Press, 1969, pp. 69–90.
16. Russell, Bertrand. *The Problems of Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, 1912.
17. Sinha, Jadunath. *Indian Epistemology: The Nyāya School*. Central Book Agency, 1971.
18. Williamson, Timothy. *Knowledge and Its Limits*. Oxford University Press, 2000.