

2007

PHILOSOPHY

PAPER—II

Full Marks : 100

Time : 4 hours

The figures in the right-hand margin indicate full marks.

Candidates are required to give their answers in their own words as far as practicable.

Write the answer to questions of each Half in separate books.

Answer any six questions taking any three from each half.

First Half

1. Bring out the issue between *svataḥ-prāmāṇyavāda* and *parataḥ-prāmāṇyavāda* in respect of ascertainment (*jñāpti*) of *pramā* as discussed in *Bhāṣāpariccheda*. 16
2. Discuss elaborately the Buddhist's view of *Pramā* as explained by *Dharmakīrti*. 16
3. (a) Define *jñāna* or *buddhi* after *Tarkaśaṅgraha*.
(b) Why does the author of *Tarkaśaṅgraha* offer a different definition in *Dīpika*. 10+6

(Turn Over)

4. Explain and examine the Buddhist theory of *asatkhyāti*.
10+6

5. (a) State whether the following are the cases of *pramā* or *saṁsaya* or *viparjyaya* :

- (i) 'ime rajate' when uttered by a person having seen a silver and a tinsel.
- (ii) 'Sukla ahaṁ' when uttered by a person of fair complexion.
- (iii) *pītaḥ gaganah*.
- (iv) *ayaṁ sthānu puruṣo vā*.

(b) Answer the following questions in the light of *Bhāṣāpariccheda*.

- (i) Why has the word 'ekadharmika' been introduced in the definition of *saṁsaya*?
- (ii) Explain any two causes of doubt.
- (iii) Can *pramātvā* be regarded as the *svarūpa* of *Pramā*?

(2×4)+2+(2+2)+2

6. (a) Distinguish between *pramāṇa saṁplava* and *pramāṇa vyavasthā*.

(b) Give examples of *Pramāṇa vyavasthā* and *Pramāṇa saṁplava* in *alaukika kṣetra*.

(c) Discuss whether the following are the cases of *pramāṇa saṁplava* or *pramāṇa vyavasthā*.

- (i) Enemies are destroyed by *śyeṇa yāga*.
- (ii) The hill has fire.
- (iii) God exists.
- (iv) Aeroplanes can fly.

4+(2+2)+(2×4)

General impression — 2

Second Half

1. What is philosophical scepticism? Explain the following statement after Chisholm :
“Such philosophers—we may call them ‘philosophical sceptics’—may thus seem to present a challenge to traditional epistemology.”
4+12
2. How does E. L. Gettier show that the tripartite definition of knowledge is not enough? Explain Gettier’s view with suitable examples. 16
3. State and explain the theory of ‘classical foundationalism’ in epistemology. Is this theory acceptable? Justify your answer. 10+6

4. Briefly discuss the causal theory of justification.
5. Can synthetic truths be known a-priori? Discuss the problem after J. Dancy.
6. Write short notes on any *two* of the following :
 - (a) Epistemologists' faith in themselves.
 - (b) Reliability as a response to Gettier Counter examples.
 - (c) Coherentism (regarding justification).
 - (d) A priori knowledge and Universal Truth.

General impression — 2
