

UNITED WISDOM

Nyaya: The Means of Reliable Knowledge

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-21-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Nyaya: The Means of Reliable Knowledge

Imagine a hypothetical scene. A message appears in a work chat: an important partner is about to leave the project. One participant spoke to the partner directly. Another saw that they canceled a meeting. A third heard an account from an acquaintance. Within minutes, everyone is discussing the departure as an established fact. Yet their shared confidence rests on three different routes to a conclusion, none of which has been checked.

We can ask who is right. But another question is more useful first: how did each person acquire their knowledge? This organization of attention is close to the concerns of Nyaya, an Indian philosophical tradition that examines the means of reliable knowledge.

What this article explores. We will encounter Nyaya's four pramanas: perception, inference, comparison, and reliable testimony. We will consider why confidence is not yet knowledge, why trust need not oppose checking, and why an argument must remain open to an opponent's examination. Nyaya is not identical with modern empirical science: its epistemology exists alongside a realist metaphysics and the religious goal of liberation. The everyday examples below are our limited contemporary application, rather than illustrations found in the ancient text.

1. Knowing Is More Than Feeling Certain

Nyaya Sutras I.1.3 lists perception, inference, comparison, and verbal testimony as means of reliable knowledge. Pramana denotes a genuine source of correct cognition; a mistaken process may only resemble such a source. Stephen Phillips emphasizes this successful, factive grammar of the term: not every experience we call perception or testimony meets its technical meaning. Phillips, “Epistemology in Classical Indian Philosophy,” §1.1; Nyaya Sutras, I.1.3, translated by van Bijlert, p. 13.

Contemporary readers should not turn this into a circle: “Correct knowledge is correct, so there is nothing more to ask.” The central question remains: what enabled this assertion to arise, and are there grounds for suspecting a failure? Naming a source does not exempt us from examining how it actually works.

An imagined chat participant says, “I am completely certain the partner has left.” Certainty describes their attitude toward a thought. It does not yet show the path to the fact. Perhaps the person heard a direct statement. Perhaps they repeated an assumption so often that they no longer remember its origin. For the next decision, this is a substantial difference.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

We also need to distinguish a lucky guess from warranted knowledge. If someone predicted a departure without grounds and it really occurred, the coincidence does not make all that person's future conclusions reliable. We can acknowledge that they guessed correctly and still check how to act next. One successful prediction does not explain itself.

This distinction is sometimes experienced as distrust of a person. But “What grounds this assertion?” is a question about the assertion. It may also help the speaker understand the limits of their confidence. In a good conversation, checking a thought's origin need not sound accusatory. There is a calmer formulation: “Was that a direct statement, your inference, or someone else's account? Our next action depends on the answer.”

2. Perception: What Was Given and What Was Added

Nyaya Sutras I.1.4 describes perception through the connection of sense organs with an object and distinguishes it from error and doubt. Later discussions develop the role of concepts and the internal organ, manas. Historical Nyaya defends realism: cognition concerns objects that exist independently of our thoughts about them. Matthew Dasti, “Nyāya,” §1a.

Applying this theme to our imagined chat begins with a small change in language. “I saw that the partner was withdrawing” may mean that someone saw a cancellation notice and inferred a departure. The notice itself and its significance for the whole project are different matters. The cancellation was indeed observed. The intention to withdraw still needs to be established.

In ordinary speech, we often combine them without ill intent. “He looked angry” joins a facial expression with an interpretation of feeling; “She ignored me” joins the absence of a reply with a presumed intention; “Everyone agrees” may rest on nobody having objected. Such combinations are convenient until they become the sole grounds for an important action.

An imagined participant notices that a colleague was silent in a meeting. She can say, “I saw that he did not speak,” and separately, “I assumed he was opposed.” This formulation does not prohibit the assumption. It makes it available for checking. Perhaps the colleague really is opposed. Perhaps he had no opportunity, could not hear well, or thought the question settled. A check need not produce a pleasant answer; it should produce a more definite one.

We need not turn this into a demand to speak only in sterile descriptions. Interpretations are inevitable and useful in ordinary life. The question concerns the cost of error and the possibility of correction. The more consequential the conclusion, the more useful it is to see which part of its content came from the observed episode and which we contributed ourselves. This is our contemporary practical formulation, rather than a complete definition of Nyaya perception.

3. Inference: The Bridge Must Support the Crossing

Inference, anumana, allows us to know what is unobserved through a sign connected with it. The classic example is fire inferred from smoke. Inference requires not merely the sign's presence but a warranted relation between it and the conclusion, vyapti. G. Vedaparayana's educational account presents this example and distinguishes inference for oneself from an argument for someone else. Vedaparayana, “The nyāya system,” §4.

Our imagined inference, “The meeting is canceled, so the project is over,” moves too quickly from sign to outcome. Cancellation may accompany withdrawal, but also rescheduling, illness, or a technical problem. To consider it a sufficient sign, we would need to exclude significant alternatives or obtain further information. One recognizable connection is not enough.

It helps to distinguish a connection from the exclusivity of that connection. An imagined employee often replies late when busy. It does not follow that every late reply proves they are busy. Still less does it follow that another person's late reply has the same cause. A similar situation does not guarantee an identical source.

An objection: we cannot check every alternative or we will never act. That is true. Contemporary decisions are often made with incomplete information. But they then need a corresponding description: “We consider withdrawal likely and are preparing a backup,” rather than “Withdrawal is established.” The difference allows us to retain reversibility and update the decision when a new message arrives.

An imagined team can ask the partner for clarification while preparing a contingency plan. Such action does not require pretending that an assumption has become knowledge. It is serious enough to prepare for and insufficiently definite to announce as fact to every participant.

Checking an inference therefore need not end in paralysis. It relates the strength of a conclusion to the strength of its grounds. If the transition is still weak, we can narrow the assertion, gather information, or choose an action that remains reasonable under several possible answers.

The direction of the connection matters. Even if we accept “Where there is smoke, there is fire,” the converse has not been obtained: the absence of visible smoke does not exclude every fire. Exchanging the sign and the property to be proved is a separate transition. In a contemporary hypothetical example, a successful project may have a prepared budget, but having a budget does not guarantee success. Forgetting the direction quietly turns a necessary condition into a sufficient one.

There is also a difference between an error in the rule and an error in establishing the sign. Someone sees a white cloud above a building and mistakes it for smoke. Even a good rule

cannot correct a mistaken initial classification. Another person really sees smoke but assigns it to a particular room, although the source is nearby. The failure then concerns the sign's location. A third correctly establishes both smoke and location but adds an unwarranted conclusion about the fire's cause. Each case requires its own check.

This distinction is not a contemporary experiment testing the ancient example. It reveals the logical work required by the transition from observed to unobserved. A strong argument consists not of one recognizable sign but of a precisely identified subject, a justified relation, and an admissible conclusion. When one part changes, the others cannot automatically be retained.

4. Comparison: Recognition Has Its Own Limits

Upamana in Nyaya is a particular route connected, among other things, with recognizing an object through a similarity previously described and learning the relation between a word and its referent. Phillips shows that this technical concept is not equivalent to any argument of the form “They look alike, so they are the same.” Phillips, “Epistemology in Classical Indian Philosophy,” §7.1.

A contemporary analogy is useful precisely when its task is clear. An imagined newcomer is shown two documents and told that the new one resembles a familiar one in the arrangement of sections. They recognize the format and find the relevant field faster. Yet similar sections do not prove identical contractual terms. To learn the terms, the text must be read.

Another hypothetical example: someone describes their state as “like constantly taking an exam.” The image helps another person approach the meaning of the experience. But it does not establish that the situation is literally the same as a student's before an assessment. We can ask what exactly is similar: anticipating judgment, fear of error, or a lack of clear criteria? Comparison becomes more useful through clarification, rather than expansion to every detail.

This applies to the philosophical article itself. We use a chat, a letter, and a work meeting to make questions about knowledge intelligible. Such scenes do not prove Nyaya. They show where a contemporary reader recognizes the problem of moving from grounds to a conclusion. If this limit is forgotten, analogy replaces argument.

You can voluntarily examine a favored comparison by noting one significant shared feature and one significant difference. An organization really may resemble an organism in the interdependence of its functions, for instance, but its participants possess independent rights that bodily organs do not. The difference does not destroy every use of the image. It ends the image's operation at the point where it tries to settle a question outside its scope.

A good comparison need not encompass everything. It need only clarify one relation and leave the others open.

To see upamana's technical task more clearly, it helps to return to Phillips's example. Someone hears from an expert that a gavaya resembles a cow. Later, they encounter the corresponding animal and connect the object seen with the word previously known only through a description. Phillips, §7.1. The acquired knowledge concerns the word's meaning and use, rather than every property of the animal.

Why is this case not merely a free poetic analogy? Because its result is definite: a new word acquires a connection with an object. The remembered description and recognized similarity work together. If the name was learned incorrectly, subsequent confidence does not automatically correct the error. If someone was told only “It resembles a cow,” the similarity must still be related to a particular class, rather than making every similar animal qualify.

Our document example is much looser and broader than the historical task. It recalls a limit of analogy but does not exactly reproduce upamana. This difference gives the classification substance: the means of knowledge are distinguished by the work they perform. If any familiar similarity is called comparison, the four pramanas become a list of general mental habits and lose their philosophical meaning.

5. Testimony: Knowing Through Another Is a Normal Possibility

Shabda, reliable testimony, is not a weak substitute for personal experience in Nyaya. It has significance of its own. Nyaya Sutras I.1.7 concerns the communication of a competent, trustworthy speaker; Vatsyayana connects such reliability with knowledge of the subject and an intention to convey it without distortion. Dasti, “Nyāya,” §1d.

Contemporary people cannot personally observe everything on which their lives depend. We learn a timetable from a carrier, hear the circumstances of a meeting from a participant, and use researchers' work. Total distrust of testimony does not make us more independent: it removes access to knowledge acquired through others by its very nature.

Trust, however, is sensitive to domain. An imagined good friend may honestly describe what they saw and poorly assess a document's legal significance. Sincerity does not turn an opinion into an expert finding. An imagined expert may know the subject and disclose only some information because of a personal interest. Competence and good faith require separate questions.

In our chat, someone heard a direct conversation with the partner. It matters to establish not only “Whom do you trust?” but “What exactly was said?” Perhaps the message stated a condition: “If the deadline does not change, we will not be able to continue.” In transmission,

the condition disappeared and only a final refusal remained. The source did not necessarily lie; the failure arose in the retelling.

There is also a question of time. A reliable message about yesterday's decision does not always describe today's situation. We can retain respect for the witness and request an update. Changing circumstances do not make an earlier account dishonest, but they alter its applicability.

It is therefore useful to trust specifically: who is communicating, how do they know, what exactly are they conveying, and to which moment does the message refer? This language does not require suspecting everyone. It helps us understand the work a particular testimony performs and where another source is needed.

6. Doubt Needs a Reason and a Next Step

Nyaya does not propose beginning with total distrust of everything. Doubt arises on substantive grounds and initiates inquiry. Dasti's account emphasizes the difference between ordinary trust in a functioning source and the need for checking when an objection, conflicting information, or a failure appears. Dasti, “Nyāya,” §§1f.ii, 1f.iv.

This allows us to distinguish caution from endless postponement. An imagined manager says, “We cannot know anything definitively.” The phrase formally leaves room for error but does not clarify which information is missing now. Sometimes it evades a decision, although enough evidence exists for a limited, reversible action.

Another manager names a particular doubt: “We know the meeting is canceled; we do not know whether participation is canceled. Let us clarify that before sending a notification.” Such a question has a subject, a deadline, and a possible result. Every answer changes the subsequent action. If withdrawal is confirmed, a contingency plan is needed. If the meeting is being postponed, a time must be agreed. If there is no answer, the team decides while explicitly retaining uncertainty.

We may ask whether this view is too practical. Philosophical doubt sometimes concerns the very structure of knowledge. Yes, it can be more radical than a chat's task. But our example concerns an idea's use in life and does not exhaust the philosophical dispute. It shows why “doubt” should not conceal the absence of a definite question.

Everyone has the right not to answer immediately. We should simply distinguish a pause for understanding from the claim that every decision is forever impossible. In a particular task, we can say “I need to check one message,” “I do not yet understand the criterion,” or “This information will not change the choice.” Doubt then becomes part of the work, rather than an endless state against which no outcome can be assessed.

7. An Argument for Another Must Let Them Check It

Nyaya uses the familiar five-part form of a public argument: thesis, reason, a rule with an example, application, and conclusion. Vedaparayana's educational account presents it through fire and smoke. The form explains the connection, rather than decorating speech with Sanskrit terms. Vedaparayana, “The nyāya system,” §4.

In a contemporary conversation, every request need not become five lines. But seeing which parts are hidden is useful. “This decision is mistaken” is a thesis. “Because the deadline is unattainable with the current workload” is a reason. We still need to show what grounds the workload estimate and why this particular deadline fails the calculation. If all that remains in the speaker's head, the other person struggles to check the argument.

An imagined person responds irritably to a question about grounds: “It is obvious.” The connection may indeed be familiar to them. But familiarity for one participant does not make it visible to another. A good explanation provides a bridge the other person can cross independently and notice if it is broken.

There is an ethical dimension here, which we formulate as contemporary application. If I want another's agreement, it matters not only to sound persuasive but to let them refuse for a substantive reason. An argument that cannot be checked without complete trust in my status differs from one with open grounds.

Not every disagreement indicates bad faith. An interlocutor may accept the observation and reject the general rule, accept the rule and doubt its application, or point out that a new fact changes the outcome. These responses require different clarifications. If we call them all “resistance,” we stop understanding where we diverged.

The public form of an argument is useful because it makes disagreement more definite, rather than guaranteeing agreement. The dispute then works with a thought that can be changed, rather than only with the participants' personalities.

Another way to test a thought is to accept it temporarily and examine its consequences. In Nyaya, tarka assists the pramanas but is not considered a separate, independent source of definite knowledge. Dasti, §1b.iv. The distinction between eliminating a weak answer and establishing a strong one is particularly important here. Refuting one explanation does not prove just any other.

In an imagined dispute over deadlines, one participant maintains, “Any task of this size can be completed in a day.” Another proposes accepting the rule and considering whether it is compatible with known constraints. If two sequential stages each require a day, the rule conflicts with acknowledged conditions and needs qualification. Yet this does not yield a precise deadline for the entire project: information about the other stages is still needed.

This move is useful precisely because it is limited. It can show where a claim requires an impossible combination of conditions, or why doubt rests on an excessively strong assumption. But if the initial constraints are disputed, the interlocutor may challenge them too. The strength of the check depends on genuinely shared grounds, rather than the speaker's ability to construct an impressive paradox. The possibility of objection returns us to the sources of knowledge.

8. Nyaya and Modern Science: Connection Is Not Identity

Nyaya values justification, discusses error, and defends the reality of the knowable world. But it cannot retroactively be declared modern experimental science. It considers an immaterial Self, liberation, and arguments about Ishvara. Phillips connects Indian theories of knowledge with their schools' metaphysical commitments; Dasti shows Nyaya's religious horizon. Phillips, introduction and §1.3; Dasti, §3.

We need to distinguish three questions. Does the tradition use arguments? Yes; this is visible in the texts. Do its arguments coincide with contemporary research procedures? A particular comparison is required to answer that. Are its metaphysical conclusions confirmed by modern data? An appeal to the tradition's fondness for reasoning cannot settle this question.

Contemporary sciences do not constitute a single simple list of actions either: experiment, observation, modeling, and historical research have different conditions. They nevertheless need their own methods of checking, which an ancient classification cannot replace. To assess a medical claim, it is not enough to call it an inference or testimony. Data and a research procedure suited to that claim are required.

The opposite distortion is to see a religious horizon and conclude that the text contains no rational content at all. A philosophical argument can be analyzed independently of whether we accept the author's ultimate goal. We can recognize a strong distinction between testimony and personal observation without agreeing with the entire metaphysics.

This reading preserves both sides of the historical tradition. We neither award it a modern scientific license for resonant words nor deprive it of its argument because it speaks of a religious goal. The question becomes more precise: what intellectual work does this passage perform, and how far do its grounds permit us to go?

9. What This Means in Practice

You can voluntarily take one meaningful assertion that is safe to discuss: “This person does not want to cooperate,” “This option does not work,” or “Everyone supports the decision.” Beside it, note your route to it: I observed, inferred, learned through comparison, or received a message. This is a contemporary editorial scheme inspired by the four means, rather than Nyaya's full practice.

If the grounds are mixed, it helps not to force them into one category. For example: “I saw two meetings canceled and heard a direct statement about a lack of time; leaving the project remains my inference.” Such a record is more definite than simply “I know.” It shows what is available and what is still absent.

The next question is which new information would actually change the conclusion. If someone will consider the partner dishonest under any possible answer, perhaps the clarification serves another task: obtaining confirmation of a judgment already made. This is not a diagnosis, but a reason to examine the structure of one's own question.

Finally, we can choose an action proportionate to the knowledge. With an established refusal, change the plan. With a serious assumption, prepare a backup and clarify. With a weak rumor, do not circulate it as fact. Actions need not await absolute certainty, but it is useful to relate their scope and reversibility to the information's limits.

If the exercise turns into an interrogation of yourself or others, it can be stopped. Not every friendly account needs a protocol. It is especially important to respect the interlocutor's right not to disclose details. An inaccessible piece of information remains unknown; it does not prove the answer convenient to us.

10. More Precise Knowledge Retains the Possibility of Updating

Our imagined chat might reveal withdrawal, postponement, or uncertainty. Any of these results is better than the initial shared confidence if its grounds are now understood. Nyaya asks us to take seriously the path by which cognition arises and the difference between a genuine source and its appearance.

For contemporary readers, this means the right to formulations of different strengths: “I saw,” “I was told,” “I assume,” “The information conflicts,” and “It is not yet known.” These do not express intellectual weakness. They let the next message correct the picture without requiring us to defend earlier confidence at any cost.

We can be mistaken after a conscientious check. But such an error leaves a path to correction: finding a source's failure, an inference's limit, or a lost condition. Bare confidence hides that

path. This is why a calm question about the origin of knowledge is sometimes more useful than another forceful assertion.

We need not become followers of Nyaya to respect the problem it posed. Knowledge arrives through different routes, and each has conditions. Attention to those conditions helps us speak more precisely, trust more specifically, and leave our own thought able to encounter a new fact.

Sources Used

1. Matthew R. Dasti. Nyāya. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. §§1a, b, d, f and §3: pramanas, testimony, doubt, realism, and religious goals. Includes the primary passages read from Nyaya Sutras I.1.4–7 and Vatsyayana; these were read through academic exposition.

2. Stephen Phillips. Epistemology in Classical Indian Philosophy. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2024 revision. Introduction, §§1.1, 1.3, 6, 7.1: the origin of knowledge, the technical meaning of pramana, and differences between schools.

3. G. Vedaparayana. The nyāya system. INFLIBNET, Indian religion and philosophy, chapter 9. §4: vyapti and the five-part public argument.

4. Victor A. van Bijlert. *Nyāya Sūtra — on Philosophical Method: Sanskrit Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Routledge, 2024, p. 13, sutra I.1.3. Publisher's preview PDF. The list of four pramanas was checked directly; the modern translation is not quoted.