

## Logical Structure of Dharmakīrti's Counter-argument against the proof of Ātman

Kyo Kano (Kobe)

It is well-known that logical proof in ancient India is formulated as “A is B, because C.” in many cases. The former part is called “*pratijñā*” (thesis) and the latter one is “*hetu*” (reason) and is normally presented as *C-tvāt*. However, in Uddyotakara's sixteen wheel of reasons, which is constructed by extending Dignāga's Hetucakra, we find one exception, the fifteenth case, which is presented as “A is not D, because E-*prasaṅgāt*.” This fact is supposed to be the result of introducing the style of argument called *Avīta* (indirect proof intended to refute opponent's view) which had come down to him from previous Indian logicians. The example of the fifteenth is contently known as the proof of Ātman, which is typically as follows: [Thesis] A living body in the world is not soul-less, (*neḍaṃ jīvaccharīraṃ nirātmakam*. [Reason] because (if it is so,) it would ensue that it is without life-breathing etc. (*aprāṇādimattvaprasaṅgāt*). After Uddyotakara Naiyāyikas and Buddhist logicians, even Jaina logicians sometimes cite this formulation as a typical proof of Ātman. In later texts, however, we find the normal style of the formulation, namely, “*idaṃ jīvaccharīraṃ sātmakam, prāṇādimattvāt*,” where double negation is replaced by affirmation and the reason is presented as a natural style. Then, who first remodeled the formulation and how logical equivalence of these two formulations is guaranteed?

My working hypothesis is that it is Dharmakīrti who regards both of these formulations as equivalent and insists that the original formulation can be transformed into normal one. He is supposed to be the first logician who presented both the original formulation and the revised one. If he is so, what kind of logical thinking made this transformation possible and guarantee their equivalence? He discusses these issues in PVSV, in the fourth chapter of PV, and elsewhere. The points of his logical idea therein are; 1) a correct understanding of “the law of contraposition”, 2) “double negation”, and 3) *paryudāsa* as their basis.