

## CONTENTS

PUBLISHER'S NOTE
PREFACE
JAINA VIEW OF LIFE
JAINA AGAMAS AND INDIAN CULTURE
FROM NESCIENCE TO OMNISCIENCE
OMNISCIENCE : MISCONCEPTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS
SIX APPROACHES TO THE CONCEPT OF OMNISCIENCE
NON-ABSOLUTISM AND OMNISCIENCE
ADVAITA TRENDS IN JAINISM
NATURE OF UNCONDITIONALITY IN SYADVADA
AN EXAMINATION OF BRAHMA-SUTRA
KARMIC IDEALISM OF THE JAINAS
OMNISCIENCE : DETERMINISM AND FREEDOM
JAINA MOKSA IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY
PARA-PSYCHOLOGY AND JAINISM
NON-ABSOLUTISTIC HERITAGE OF BHAGAVANA MAHAVIRA
NON-ABSOLUTISM AND JAINA VIEW OF DARSANA
RELEVANCE OF ANEKANTA FOR MODERN TIMES
SYADVADA : A SOLUTION OF WORLD TENSION
CONTRIBUTION OF HARIBHADRA TO THE YOGA-VIDYA
AUTHOR INDEX
BOOK INDEX

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

We feel immense pleasure in bringing out this book 'A Perspective in Jaina Philosophy and Religion' by Prof. Ramjee Singh, vice-chancellor, Jaina Visvabharati, Ladhun, Rajasthan (Deemed to be University) in the hands of scholars, as 64th publication of Parsvanatha Sodhapitha. It is a collection of his valuable research papers and articles, written on various aspects of Jaina Philosophy and Religion, appeared in different journals, seminar proceedings, felicitation and commemoration volumes. These have been classified under sections - Jaina view of life, Jaina Epistemology, Jaina Metaphysics, Jaina Ethics, Jaina Psychology, Non-absolutism and its relevance to Jainism and Jaina-Yoga.

We are extremely grateful to Prof. Singh, who did us a favor by giving this work to the institute for publication. Prof. Singh, an eminent scholar of international fame on Gandhism and Non-violence, is also an authority on Jaina studies, and has made a significant contribution to it. A true Gandhivadi he follows its doctrine in word and spirit and practices in his life. We are grateful to Dr. Ramanbhai C. Shah and other members of Shree Bombay Jaina Yuvaka Sangh for providing grant of Rs. ten thousand for publication of this book.

We are thankful to Prof. Sagarmal Jain, Director of Parsvanatha Sodhapitha, who has been instrumental in obtaining this work for publication and seeing it through the press. Our thanks are also due to Dr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Research Officer, who has been associated with proof reading and publication of this book. We are also thankful to Mr. S.K. Upadhyaya of Naya Sansar Press for proof-reading and fine printing.

13-2-1993	Bhupendra Nath Jain
Nuchem Plastics Ltd.	Secretary
20/6 Mathura Road,	Pujya Sohanalala Smaraka
Faridabad.	Parsvanatha Sodhapitha

## PREFACE

The basic ideology of Jainism has been close to my heart for the following reasons - firstly, I have found an intellectual basis of the Gandhian principle of Ahimsa in the Jaina, theory of Anekantavada (Non-absolutism); secondly, I had, therefore started my initial research on Syavada-Anekanta-vada which was later changed into the "Jaina Concept of Omniscience" on the advice of my revered teacher late Dr. D.M. Datta, Thirdly, I have been greatly benefited in my life from the association of several Jaina scholars and saints, who have bestowed upon me their affection and kindness. Lastly, as a student of Indology, I thought that it is better to devote my attention to Jainology, which has been relatively a neglected discipline although it has immense potentiality.

Jainology is an amalgam of Jaina philosophy, Religion and Culture. The scope of the literature produced by Jaina masters and scholars are unlimited. However, a systematic research on Jaina philosophy, Religion and Culture has been very meager.

The present work is perhaps the first important contribution in this comprehensive field born out of deep study and analysis. It is undoubtedly a scholarly compendium of Jaina Epistemology, Metaphysics, Ethics, Psychology, Religion and Culture. However, unlike an introductory outline, it is marked by profundity and the typical synthetic approach to all problems. The book is neither sectarian nor unsympathetic in this treatment but fully balanced.

This book will enrich the small shelf of books on Jainism in English of every intelligent scholar and lover of Jainism.

My first work on The Jaina Concept of Omniscience was published by L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad in 1974. In the meantime, I have prepared several research papers on Jaina Philosophy, Religion and Culture, which were presented to various national and international conferences. However, they have been so arranged that the collection looks like a monograph.

My grateful thanks go to my friend and Director, Dr. Sagarmal Jain, of Parsvanatha Sodhapitha, Varanasi, who agreed to publish it from his Institute. Whatever deficiencies are there, they are mine, and whatever merit is found go to Dr. Jain and the management of his Institute without whose help this work would not have seen the light of the day.

15-8-1992	Ramjee Singh
Address	Vice-chancellor
Bhikhampur,	Jaina Visvabharati
Bhagalpur - 812 001.	( Deemed University )
	Ladnun ( Rajasthan )

## Jaina View of Life

## [ 1 ]

(1) Life is a struggle for perfection. Philosophy should serve as the light house in this struggle of life. Hence, true philosophy, must be a philosophy of life. Our attention has until now been mainly directed towards the problems of reality and knowledge, God and Soul etc., but we have culture have got significance only in relation to man. Hence, Vyasa correctly said : "There is nothing higher than man" (nahi sresthataram kincit manusat)". Chandidas perhaps went a little further : "Man is higher than everything and nothing is more important than him" (Sabar upare manusa satya, tahar pretation regarded "man as the measure of all" (Hamo men sura). The Jainas, even denied God, because they believed in the potential divinity of man. This reminds us of the famous Vedic saying : "Those who know Brahman in Man knows the Being who is Supreme" (Ye puruse Brahman Viduste Viduh Paramesthinam : Atharva Veda, X.VII. 17).

(2) According to Jainism, man can attain divinity contained in the concept of Four-fold Infinities (anantachatushtaya). Thus, it shifted the emphasis from God to Man - an outcome of the development of inwardness. Hence, the interest of Jainism has been centered mainly around man, his morality and destiny. Of the seven fundamental categories of Jaina philosophy, only two, the 'self' and the 'Non-self' are dealt with from a metaphysical point of view, the other five are more corollaries. Asrava (inflow of karmic-matter) is the cause of mundane existence and Samvara is the cause of liberation. Everything else is only its amplification.

(3) Our conduct cannot be isolated from our way of life. Truth and valuation are inseparable. Samantabhadra in his Yuktyanusasanam (Verse 15) says : "Without knowing the real nature of things, all moral distinctions between bondage and liberation, merit and demerit, pleasure and pain will be blurred."

(4) For Plato, Samskara and Bradley, philosophy, broadly, is the 'knowledge of reality' for the logical positivist it is only 'linguistic analysis'. However philosophy, to be true, must be philosophy of life, where we do not have a part-view but the whole-view or world-view. "Idealism was unable to see the trees in the wood, while empiricism could not see the wood in the trees" said C.D. Broad (Contemporary British Philosophy, Ed. J.H. Muirhead, Vol.1, 1924). These are the two different ways of approaching the problem but they are not the only ways. Hence, we should see the world steadily and as a whole. If we do not look at the world synoptically, we shall have a very narrow view of it Purely critical philosophy is arid and rigid.

(5) The Jaina view of life known as anekanta (Non-absolutism) is nearer to such a synoptic view. To quote Whitehead, such a non-absolutistic approach is "an endeavor to frame a coherent, logical, necessary system of general ideas in terms of which every element of our experience can be interpreted" (A.N. Whitehead : Process and Reality, 1929, p.4). The function of philosophy is not merely academic pursuit of knowledge and reality, it also serves as a way of life. It has the dual purpose of revealing truth and increasing virtue so that it may provide a principle to live by and purposes to live for. Hence, C.E.M. Joad options that "We must achieve a synoptic view of the universe" (C.E.M. Joad : A Critique of Logical Positivism, 1950, p. 29).

## [ 2 ]

(1) The Jaina attitude of non-absolutism is rooted in its attitude towards life. Life is dear to all. To do harm to others is to do harm to oneself. The Acaranga Sutra ( 1. 5. 5) declares: "Thou art he whom thou intends to tyrannize over." Hence a feeling of immense respect and responsibility for human personality inspires Jainism. It has upheld the worth of life very much, hence its main emphasis is on Ahimsa or non-violence.

(2) However its concern for non-violence is more due to ideological consciousness than emotional compassion. Unlike Buddhism Jainism does not view life as a transient and illusory

phenomenon, nor it regards it as immutable like the Upanisad-Vedanta philosophers. In fact, both absolute permanence and absolute impermanence is absolute non-sense. Adhering to the common experience, Jainism regards the nature of reality as having the characteristics of origination, decay and continuance-giving a non-exclusivists view.

(3) Secondly, Jainism believes in the potential divinity of man. Given freedom of development, every individual can attain the supreme spiritual progress. Hence, any interference means spiritual degeneration. Violence is nothing but interference with life, hence it must be eschewed in thought, word and deed. In this context, Anekantavada (non-absolutism) is an extension of Ahimsa in the realm of thought and so is Syadvada a logical corollary in the field of speech. Anything should be viewed not from only one standpoint (ekanta) but from many, angles of vision. The real is a variable angles of vision, which will negate dogmatism and imperialism of thought. Ekanta, means the 'only' point of view, whereas Anekanta implies the principle of reciprocity and interaction among the reals of the universe.

(4) This Anekanta-ideology is the spirit of synthesis (Samanvaya-drsti) nurtured into the synthetic culture of India. In the Vedas and Upanisads, the ultimate reality is described neither as real (Sat) nor as unreal (Asat). Some described the reality is one, while others hold it as many. In fact, the ultimate reality as the same, though it is called by different names. Ajneyavada or Agnosticism of Sanjaya shows reconciliatory spirit through his Four-fold or Five-fold formula of denial, so the Vibhajyavada or the Critical method of Investigation of Buddha is contrasted with Madhyam-pratipada which included Buddha to "treat prevalent opinions with all due consideration." Nagarjuna's Dialectics of Four-fold Antinomies (chatuskoti) resembles Anekanta approach. The Bhedabheda system of Bharata Mimamsa and the Samkhya have an anekanta bias with respect to some of their ideas and methods. Therefore, Santaraksita attributes the concept of vaichitrya to the Mimamsa as well to the Samkhyas. Even the critique on the light doctrines of Gautama resemble the Anekantavada in its spirit an form although they are not as pervasive as they are in Jainism.

(5) Anekantavada is the heart of Jainism. It constitutes its moral original contribution to the philosophical speculation. However, Anekantavada-syadvada has been more maligned than understood even by the great Vedantic and Buddhist Avaryas. It is misfortune that system like Advaita which realizes the inadequacy of logic to appreciate the evidence of experience as well as the probabilistic interpretation of multi-valued logics, which can reconcile the apparent contradictions in the Anekantavada. Anekanta implies twin functions of analysis and synthesis known as conjunctive and disjunctive dialectics respectively or Nayavada and Syadvada.

(6) Viewed in the light of the doctrine of Anekanta, the reality reveals not merely as many (anantatmakam) but also as infinitely manifold (ananta-dharmatmakam). The reality is possessed of infinite number of attributes and human knowledge is limited until it attains omniscience. Hence we cannot have the complete grasp of the whole reality or an absolute affirmation or complete negation of a predicate. To know is to relate, therefore our knowledge is essentially relative and to relate, therefore our knowledge is essentially relative and limited in many ways. In the sphere of application of the means of knowledge or in the extent of the knowable our thought is relative. The whole reality in its completeness, cannot be grasped by this partial thought. The objectivity of the universe reveals that the universe is independent of the mind which implies principles of distinction leading to the recognition of non-absolutism.

(7) In absolute sense, a thing is neither real nor unreal, neither permanent nor evanescent but both. This dual nature of things is proved by a reductio-ad-absurdum of absolutism. Further, this is also the basis of the Law of Causation, because an 'absolute real' can neither be cause nor an effect. However, an 'absolute flax' cannot be the basis of operation for the Law of Causation. Similarly, the controversy between unity and plurality can be easily solved by the Anekanta logic, which affirms attributes in a unitary entity. A thing is neither an absolute unity nor an irreconcilable multiplicity. In fact, it is both multiplicity-in-unity. Similarly, both absolute existence and non-existence are metaphysical abstractions.

### [ 3 ]

(1) To say that a thing is neither real nor unreal, neither eternal nor non-eternal, neither static nor mobile but partakes of the dual nature perhaps is an affront to the beliefs in the traditional Laws of Thought. No body rejects them but these abstract formulations are not suited to dynamic character of the universe. Our own observation and experience reveals that the two-valued logic seems to be unreal. So far that abstract formulation of the Laws of Thought A is A (Identity), A is A (Contradiction), A is either A or not A (Excluded Middle), they may be right. But their concrete formulations (A Radio is a Radio) admits of change. A real radio is constantly undergoing change, hence there is change according to space and time. Similarly, even change is meaningless without the idea of persistence. Hence the contradiction (A Skylab cannot both be and not be) is only nominal because 'A Skylab' is a Skylab so long it works as a laboratory in the Sky but when it takes as a debris after degeneration, it is not the same sky-lab in the same condition. Hence, a Skylab can be both a Skylab and not a Skylab. There is no difficulty to accept this in actual experience.

(2) The denial of pre-non-existence and post-non-existence as part of a real leads to the impossibility of all theoretical and practical activity. Similarly, the denial of non-existence of mutual identity (numerical differences) and absolute non-existence is also impossible. If there is no difference, there will be no distinction, hence no independence between subject and object. If there is negation of identity, there is worse confusion. Hence the nature of reality can neither be exclusively identity nor multiplicity. As regards relations, no relation is meaningful if there is pure identity and no relation is possible between the two absolutely independent and different terms. Similarly regarding causal efficiency, the real cannot be either 'absolute constant' nor can it be an 'absolute variant' but a 'variable constant'.

### [ 4 ]

(1) It is asked, whether this kind of non-absolutism is itself absolute or not. If it is former, there is at least one real which is absolute; if it is not, it is not absolute and universal fact. Whether non-absolutism is itself absolute or relative depends upon the nature of proposition which is either complete (Sakaladesa) or incomplete (Vikaladesa). The former being the object of valid knowledge (Pramana) and the latter, two object of aspectal knowledge (naya). This means that the directive of non-absolutism is not absolute unconditionally. However, to avoid the fallacy of infinite regress, the Jainas distinguished between the true non-absolutism (Samyak-Anekanta) and the false non-absolutism (Mithya-Anekanta). To be valid, therefore, non-absolutism must not be absolute but always relative. When one attributes is stated as constitution the whole nature of the real and thus implies the of the 'false absolute'. But Naya is not false though it is partial or knowledge from a particular standpoint.

(2) The nature of unconditionality in the statement "All statements are conditional" is quite different from the normal meaning of unconditionality. This is like the idea contained in the passage "I do not know myself" where there is no contradiction between knowledge and ignorance, or in the statement 'I am undecided', where there is at least one decision : "I am undecided" the unconditionality is not at the level of existence, while at the level of essence (thought) anything is alternative. We do not live in the realm of thought or reason above. Behind reason, there is always the watershed of unreason or faith. The Jainas too have faith in their scriptures as anybody else has in his or her. Her is unconditionally. In each community, there is a special absolute. The absolutes themselves are alternation so far as they are possible (till we are on thought level), but I have chosen one and stick to it, it is more than possible, it is existence or actual. At this point, there may be a reconciliation between conditionality and unconditionality. On thought level, the statement "Everything is conditional", holds good but when we adopt the point of view of existence, we are led to rest with unconditionality.

## [ 5 ]

(1) Ideologically, we cannot make one-sided exposition. But in actual usage, whenever we make any particular statement (S is P or S is not P), it takes the form of a categorical proposition. Even a Hypothetical (If S then P) or a Disjunctive (Either S or P) is said to have a categoric basis and therefore, they can be converted into categorical propositions. But since our thought is relative, so must be our expression.

(2) There is another problem also - how to synthesize the different angles of vision or internal harmony of the opposed predications (S is P, S is not P, S is both P and not P, S is neither P nor not P). It is, therefore, the Jainas prefix Syat (Somehow, in some respect) as a corrective against any absolutist way of thought and evaluation of reality. This is a linguistic tool for the practical application of non-absolutism in words. Because of this prefix Syat and the relative nature of proposition, it is called Syadvada. But words are only expressive or suggestive (Vachaka or Jnapaka) rather than productive (Karaka). Thus the meaning is, however, eventually rooted in nature of things in reality and we have, therefore, to explore a scheme of linguistic symbols (Vachanavinyasa) for model judgments representing alternate standpoints. (Nayas), or a way of approach or a particular opinion (abhipraya) or view-point (apeksa).

(3) This philosophy of standpoints bears the same relation to philosophy as logic does to thought or grammar to language. We cannot affirm or deny anything absolutely of any object owing to the endless complexity of things. Every statement of a thing, therefore, is bound to be one-sided and incomplete. Hence the doctrine of seven-fold predication (Saptabhanga) in the logical consumption of the doctrine of relative standpoints (Syadvada). If we insist on absolute predication without conditions (Syat), the only cause open is to dismiss either the diversity or the identity as a mere metaphysical fiction. Every single standpoint designated in every statements has a partial truth. Different aspects of reality can be considered from different perspectives (Niksepa). This Naya is the analytic and Saptabhanga is the synthetic method of studying ontological problems.

If this form of statements, this doctrine insists on the correlation of affirmation and negation. All judgments are double-edged in character-existent and non-existence. The predicate of inexpressibility stands for the unique synthesis of existence and non-existence and is therefore 'unspeakable' (avaktavya). Thus three predicates - 'existence', 'non-existence' and 'inexpressibility' make seven exhaustive and unique modes of expression of truth.

## [ 6 ]

(1) We are aware of various criticisms against Anekantavada-Syadvada that they involve the fallacies of self-contradiction (Virodha), Absence of Common Abodi (Vaiyadhikaranya), Infinite-Regress (Anavastha), Confusion (Sanka), Exchange of Natures (Vyatikara), Doubt (Samsaya), Non-apprehension (Apratipatti), Both sides (Ubhaya) etc. However, we do not want to go into details.

(2) We have considered the most formidable criticism that how far non-absolutism of Syadvada is not absolute but relative. However, it is wrong to confuse the Pragmatic and Pluralistic realistic attitude of Syadvada with either Pragmatism of James-Dewey either or with the objective relativism of the sophists or even with the relative absolutism of Whitehead or Bodies or with Einsteinian relativity except in the most general attitude. Pyrrho's prefixing every judgment with a 'may be' must not be identical Jaina 'Syat'. The former degenerates into Agnosticism or Skepticism means in the minimum, absence of any assertion, whereas Syadvadins always assert, thought what they assert are alternatives - each being valid in its own Universe of Discourse, which controls the interpretation of every word. This is the logic of Relatives.

(3) Perhaps on account of its catholicity of outlook Syadvada is branded as a form 'eclecticism' or a 'philosophy of compromise'. "Since an eclectic system is a loose piece of mosaic work,



rather than an organized body of original thought, the term has come to be one of reproach." However, this is unjust to brand it as a 'loose piece of mosaic work' or 'odd collection of arbitrary half-truths'. In fact the truths presented are alternative truths which are true in their own aspects. Of course, Syadvada rejects the 'dispotic absolute truth' or the 'block universe' or a 'seamless coat'. Even in the synthesis achieved through the dynamics of Syadvada, there is 'discriminative unity' rather than 'secondless unit'. In short, absolutism in thought is rejected to avoid arbitrariness in action.

(4) To brand Syadvada as agnosticism or Skepticism like that of Sanjaya or of Pyrrho is again another injustice. The prefix 'Syat' does not mean 'perhaps' but 'in respect of' a particular context. Each model truth is valid from its own standpoint. It is not a doctrine of 'know nothingness' or 'unknowability'. Each standpoint of the saptabhangi is definite in its own place. Syadvada statements are not 'indefinite' (Belvalkar), but 'indeterminate' (Hiriyana) which means that it cannot be defined absolutely. No single mode of expression is adequate to express the nature of reality. The various modes of truths are not merely many truths, but alternative truths, each being as definite as anything.

(5) Regarding the charge of 'Self-contradiction' against Syadvada by the great Vedantic and Buddhist Acaryas, I feel that the motive behind it must be extra-logical. How one can believe that Dharmakirti will call Anekantavada as mere non-sensical talk (Pralapamatra) in view of Jain theory of dual character of universal and particular of a thing. He asks of all realities are sat, there would be no difference between cow and camel. Prajnakara Gupta and Arcaya point out that the triple character nature of reality having origination, destruction and permanence cannot exist together and hence is self contradictory. Sammtarakṣita thinks that there would be a commingling (Sankarya) and a confusion (Sandeḥa) in the dual nature of reality, the result of which would not be helpful to decide which is general and which particular.

Karnakagomin also refutes the dual characteristic theory of the Jainas in his own way. In this famous treatise Refutation of Anekantavada (Anekantavada Nirasa), Jitari says that one cannot have identity as well as difference by the same nature.

Sankara and Ramanuja also point out to the violation of the law of contradiction.

However, all these thinkers forget that the laws of thoughts should be considered by the testimony of experience and not be pre-conception. Experience shows that a thing is real in own respect but not so in other respect.

The triple character theory is supported through anvasthanupapannatva hetu. From the realistic standpoint there is so much difference which could indicate the separation between identity and difference. The reality is synthism of identity-in-difference and each synthesis is a Jatyantara (sui genesis). Akalanka points out that the Buddhists philosophers ignore the formula Sarvobhavastudatasvabhāti and tries to establish equality between curd and camel.

In fact, Syadvada is against the formulations of formal two valued logic. It avoids vicious intellectualism and the fallacy of exclusive particularity. Thus Syadvada is a new dynamics of thinking which is based on Catholicism and regard for truth seen from different angles.

## JAINA AGAMAS AND INDIAN CULTURE

### The Place of the Agamas in Cultural History of India

Language and Literature apart from art and architecture constitute the most important records of the cultural history of a country. Hence, the study of the Agamas is bound to reveal the most important observations of Jainism and its contribution to Indian culture.

As we all know, the collective term given by the Jainas to their Sacred literature is called Agamas written in Prakrt just as the Buddhist Pitakas in Pali and the Brahmanical Vedas in

Sanskrit. The Jaina Agamas like the Buddhist Pitakas contain the sermons of their founders. They were later on codified by their trusted disciples into the languages of the people just for the larger benefit of the masses. Thus the original Sacred Books of both the Jainas and the Buddhist were written in Prakrt, i.e., Ardhamagadhi and Pali respectively. Being missionaries, their mission was to interest not only the intellectuals but the common people and hence they used the language of the common man. The Jaina Agamas accord a very respectable position to Ardhamagadhi by calling it not only the language of the Aryans but also of the celestial gods. The Buddhist Trpitakas enjoin upon their followers to use the local dialect of the people for the propagation of their sacred teachings. This was nothing but a legitimate protest against the touch-me-not attitude of the Vedic scholars who would never descend down from their ivory tower of Sanskrit language and on the other hand they would look down upon the use of these languages of the people for imparting religious instructions. Prakrt and Pali were declared to be the languages of the outcasts or Mlechchhas. This shows their regard for maintaining the so-called cultural purity by the priestly order to ensure their monopoly for ever. To be impartial, we cannot deny that there was some amount of animosity among the Jainas and the Buddhist scholars against the use of Sanskrit language at least at the critical stages which is amply reflected in the painful sight of some of Pali and Prakrt scholars maintaining linguistic isolationism as a result of which they remained unaware of the Indian heritage as depicted in Sanskrit language and literature. The Bhikkhus of the Hinayana cults of Buddhism in Burma and Ceylon are examples of such isolationism. Similarly, many eminent scholars of Sanskrit of that age remained unaware of the growth and development of ideas in the field of Pali and Prakrt languages. The cause of this linguistic animosity was also unhealthy religious rivalries which are demonstrated into the literature of the 7th and 8th centuries A.D. All these factors went to retard the growth of cultural synthesis in India at least for some time.

In this respect, the Jaina tradition has been rather liberal. Down from the days of Arya Raksit (2nd Century of Vikram Samvat) and Uma Swami (3rd Century of V.S. ), there has been equal interest in Prakrt and Sanskrit so much so that both these languages became the common and combined treasures of the Jaina. Naya, the Jainas have adopted other regional languages also like Kannada and Tamil in South India, Gujarati and Marathi in Western India and even Hindi in Central India for the propagation of their religious teachings or literary pursuits.

Pt. Sukhalaji has divided the entire extent of Jaina philosophical literature broadly into four periods beginning with the Agamic period. Notwithstanding the differences in the two tradition of Digambaras and Svetambaras, the Jainas generally agree that the Agamas constitute the inspired wisdom of Lord Mahavir, when he attained perfection and Omniscience. The sermons were later on codified by his chief disciples called Ganadharas. According to the Jaina tradition, there are only two types of persons, who are qualified to know the secrets of religion - the Omniscient (Kevalin) who directly perceive everything of all places and of all times. Then lectures of sermons by the Kevalins themselves. They are called Sruta Kevalins. Acarya Yati Vrsabha has given the chronological account of the Missionary (Acarya) tradition of 683 years after the Nirvana of Lord Mahavir having 3 Kevalins, 5 Sruta Kevalins, 20 different orders of Acaryas.

According to the Svetambara tradition, the last compilation of the Agamas had been done at Valabhi after 980 years of the death of Lord Mahavir at the time of Devardhi, however the compilations of some of the Agamas were done at Pataliputra also which was after 250 years of Lord Mahavir's death. The Agamic literature is vast and stupendous, comprising of 12 Angas, 12 Upangas, 4 Mulas, 2 Chulikas Sutras, 6 Cheda Sutras, 10 Prakirnakas etc. The commentation on these Agamas are called Niryuktis and Bhasyas, which are in poetry style and those in prose style are called Curnis. Available Niryuktis, are said to be compositions of Bhadrabahu, the Second, which contain subtle philosophical discussion on the problems of existence of soul, analysis of knowledge and meaning etc. The Bhasyas contain the fuller accounts of all subjects. Sanghadas Gani and Jinabhadra are the two famous Bhasyakaras. Jinabhadra was a versatile genius, who has written practically on all subject under the sun. Sanghadas Gani has limited himself to the task of dealing with the problems of epistemology and the ethics of the Jain Sadhus. Among the Curnikaras, Jinadasa Mahattara is a notable figure. Curnis are shorter



commentaries in prose on the pattern of Jatakas. In Sanskrit, the oldest commentaries of the Agamas is of Acarya Haribhadra (757-857 V.S.) next to whom are Silanka Suri (8th Cent. V.S.) and Sandhacarya, Abhayadeva and Malladhari Hemacandra and last but not the least Malayagiri. All these scholars wrote their commentaries in Sanskrit and Prakrt but they were so vast and deep that shorter commentaries in the languages of the people was considered essential. Hence, we find the composition of many primers and Beginner in regional languages like Taba in Gujarati. Acarya Dharma Singh is said to be an important author of such Beginners and Primers.

According to the Digambara tradition, all the old Agamas are said to have lost except the 12th called Drstivada. They regard Bhadrabahu as the last Sruta Kevali, with him out of 14 Purvas, 4 were lost. After Bhadrabahu, the different Acaryas became the teachers of 11 Angas and 10 Purvas and the process of disintegration continued up till 683 years after Mahavir's Nirvana. An important Acarya named Dharasena initiated his two most, able disciples, named Puspadanta and Bhutabali into the Agamas, who later on compiled the Sermons in the form of a monumental epics of religion called, Sat-khanda-gama in Prakrt. A contemporary of Acarya Gunabhadra compiled Kasayas-Pahuda upon which Yati Brsabha wrote a commentary in Prakrt after he learnt it from Arya Mansku and Nagahasti. There are quite a few commentaries on these two monumental treasures-Satkhandagama and Kasaya-pahuda. The last of the commentaries on Satkhandagama called Dhavala is by Virasena, which comprises 72 thousand verses. The commentary on Kasaya-pahuda, called Jayadhavala is equally monumental having 20 thousand verses written by Virasena and 40 thousand added by his disciple Jinasena. The final portion of the Satkhandagama is called Mahabandha which has 41 thousand verses. This has been composed by Bhutabali himself. Fortunately, all those three monumental Agamas are treasured at Mudabidri's temple library. Acarya Nemichand Siddhanta Sastri Chakravarti of the 10th century was supposed to be an authority on these three Agamas. He had composed Gommatasara and Labdhisara to give the essences of these Agamas. Todaramala has written commentaries upon Gommatasara and Labdhisara in Bhasa. Acarya Kunda-kunda's Samayasara, Pravacanasara, Niyamasara and Pancastikaya-sara are in acknowledged Prakrt works which are regarded as good as the Agamas by the Jainas. Jainacarya Umaswati wrote Tattvartha-Sutra, which is regarded as the Veritable Bible of the Jainas by both the sects. The legend of the propagation of Jaina religion rests with the Tirthanakars and their disciples called eleven Ganadharas, who are said to have converted a community of 4411 Sramanas from whom the entire Jaina community has grown.

### **The Contribution of the Agamas**

The Validity of Scriptural Knowledge - Except the Carvakas, all systems of Indian Philosophy admit the validity of scriptural knowledge. In the Vedic tradition, the Vedas which are regarded as impersonal, constitute the highest authority of religion. In the tradition of the Sramanic culture of Buddhism and Jainism, the authority of scriptures rests with their prophets, who are supposed to be Omniscient as well above all desires and aversions. In the Jaina tradition, the validity of the scripture is accorded at par with direct perception since the scriptural knowledge is knowledge gained by the Omniscient being, who has directly perceived the reality. Thus scriptural knowledge is also definite and indubious like the omniscient knowledge. This is admitted by Samantabhadra in his Apta-Mimamsa. It should also be noted that the knowledge and practice of Scriptures (Agamas) also leads to the attainment of Kevala-jnana, so as to the knower of the Srutas are called Sruta-kevalin. Anybody and everybody cannot be Sruta. In order to be a Sruta, he must fulfill the conditions of becoming desireless (Vitaraga) and he must destroy the Karmas which obscure the real nature of Sruta. Only then, such a Scriptural knowledge serves like the bliss.

According to the Vedic tradition, the Vedas manifest their own validity. Words used by us, according to them, denote things that can be cognised by other means of knowledge, and, if we cannot know them through other means, then those who utter them must be of unquestionable

authority. So non-Vedic utterances cannot possess any inherent validity. According to Prabhakara, such non-Verbal knowledge is of the nature of inference because only the verbal cognition of the Vedas is strictly verbal. The Vedic thinkers adopt the doctrine of impersonate authorship perhaps to maintain its infallibility, because a person is liable to many defects. However, in order to prove the impersonal authorship of the Vedas, the Vedic thinkers; especially the Mimamsakas introduce a mystical theory of the eternality of the Vedas. They hold that the relationship between the word and its meaning is natural and not created by convention. The purpose of the Mimamsakas in rejecting the authorship of the Vedas to Gods is because God, who is incorporeal, has no organs of speech and hence he cannot utter words, and if He assumes the human form, then He is subject to all the limitations of material existence and hence his utterances will not be authoritative. Then there is no tradition of divine or human authorship of the Vedas. If it is said that the Vedas are human compositions because names of saints and seers occur, it may be said that the hymns deal with the eternal phenomena of nature and the names of persons have only symbolical significance and not any historical significance.

In tracing their Agamas to the utterances of Lord Mahavir, the Jainas have a more secured position. Firstly, since Mahavir is Omniscient (Kevalin) what he says must be true. Since, he is above desires (Vitaraga), what he says is free from any subjective prejudices. Lastly, since he is compassionate, what he says is for the benefits of the people. Thus the Jaina theory of scriptures as the sermons of Lord Mahavir is more intelligible and rational. The adherence of one's faith in the personality of Lord Mahavir gives a religious color. Lastly, such a theory of scriptures having its source in the personality of a realized man raises the dignity and status of man to the status of God. Omniscience is not divine but human. It requires a Sadhana. Thus the Jaina doctrine of Agamas sets up everything in real and historical context, while the explanation of the impersonality of the Vedas is rather vague and ambiguous. However, it loses at one place by treating the Vedic authorship as impersonal, it implies that it is perhaps very-very old and ancient because a person is after all a historical event. Here the Jaina reply is that since the truth contained in the Agamas is one, eternal and permanent, it is as old as anything. The objects of the knowledge are the one and the same for all. Hence their cognition is neither new nor old. Hence, there is an argument in the teaching of all Arhats. In this sense, the teachings are eternal and universal and hence impersonal. Thus, the line of demarcation between personal and impersonal authorship of the scripture gives way to a reconciliation. A prophetic utterance, in the sense, it is eternal and universal, is impersonal; however, since it comes from the mouth of a historical person, it is personal.

**Agama and its Interpretation** - The statement of a trust-worthy person is said to be Agama. Otherwise, words themselves are inert, lifeless and even ambiguous. Hence, the validity of Sabda rests with the person who uses them. Hence the interpretation of the Agamas depends both upon the Speaker and also upon the Audience. So far, the speakership of the Agamas is concerned, it is held to be the direct sermons of the Omniscient Lord, which have been compiled and codified by their chief disciples called Ganadhara. So far the interpretation of the Agamas from the point of view of the audience is concerned, it should be clearly noted that a certain amount of intellectual ability and moral preparation is needed for the appropriate grasp of the subject matter. In absence of such a preparation, the same Agama admits of different and even conflicting interpretations about one and the same subject, like the different interpretations of the Brahma-Sutra and the Bhagavad-Gita. The Jaina Agamas are the sermons of the Tirthankaras which have been correctly reported by the Sruta-kevalin and the Ganadhara, who are also supposed to be Sruta-kevalin and the Ganadhara, who are also supposed to be omniscient and also above all desires of love and hate, hence the validity of the Jaina Agamas is doubly raised because both the Source as well as the Course of the Agamas are pure.

**The Place of Samayika** - There are three distinctive contributions of Jainism to Indian Culture - Equality (Sama), Self-control (Sama) and Dignity of labor (Srama). Equality or Samayika is said to be the heart of Jainism. In the Jaina religious scripture, Dvadasang or in the 14th Purva, the place of Samayika is the first and foremost among the six daily duties. Without the practice of Samayika or equality, there is no hope for any religious or spiritual realization. When a householder accepts the Jaina religion, he solemnly pledges to abide by the principle of equality.

The whole of Visvasavyaka-bhasya of Jinabhadra Gani is an exposition of this principle of Samayika. The three jewels of Jainism, i.e. Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct depend upon the principle of equality. The Gita calls it the inner poise or the evenness of mind (Samatvam), or equal mindedness (Sama Cittatvam or Samata) and such a man who attains this is called seer with an equal eye (Samadarsinah or Sarvatra-sama-darsana). This principle of equality must be reflected both in thought and action. In thought it is the principle of Anekanta, in action it is the principle of Ahimsa.

(a) Anekanta - Anekanta is the application of the principle of equality in the sphere of thought. Thus it is not a philosophy but a philosophical standpoint just as there is the Advaitic standpoint of Sankara and the standpoint of the Middle path of the Buddhists. Anekanta literally means non-absolution. Though the Anekanta Period in Jaina philosophical literature comes after the end of the Agamic period, the genesis of the Anekantic idea is already present in the Agamic literature. The famous Bhagavati Sutra refers to the important and interesting dreams that Lord Mahavira had just before attained Keval-jnana. In one of the dreams, there is reference to 'multi-faced' or 'multi-colored' (citra-vicitra) wings of Pansakholi which symbolizes the multi-faced reality.

The Buddhist also have their doctrine of Vibhajyavada or 'conditional expressions', which means that they discard one-sided view (ekantavada). However, the Buddhists believed in Vibhajyavada to a limited extent, whereas the Jainas believe it to the full extent, so that it was finally developed into the Theory of Non-absolutism (Anekantavada). In Buddhism, Vibhajya means division and Vibhajya Vyakarniya means answering a question by diving. While the Buddhists attribute the divergent attributes at the same time with regard to two different things, the genius of the Jainas is reflected in attributing the different attributes in the one and the same subject, of course, the contexts are different. This leads to the organon of Sapta-bhangi and the multi-valued logic of Syadvada. Even in the Vedas and Upanisads, the description of the reality is in terms of contradictory attributes, like real and unreal, mobile and immobile. Nasadiya Sukta, therefore, avoids to describe the reality either as real or unreal. Thus Anekanta seems to be a dynamic of thought-reconciliation, through which we find an attempt at synthesis between apparently contradictory attributes of eternity and non-eternity of the world or finiteness or infiniteness of the Jiva or difference or non-difference between the body and the soul. Anekanta however, should not be understood to mean that reality is contradictory. It simply means that it has innumerable number of aspects and attributes which can be thoroughly comprehended only when we can put all of them together. This is ideal of perfection, which can be attained only when we become an omniscient. However, we can have the knowledge of one or other aspect if we are free from prejudice and bias. Thus, on the one hand it has its ideal of finality of knowledge, in reality it aims at aspectal knowledge or naya. As a corollary, we have to be cautious in our speech. Lord Mahavira explained every problem with the help of Siyavaya or Syadvada. Absolutism in speech and language is as bad as absolutism in thought. The Agamic stress on Anekanta and Syadvada is due to its great adherence to Ahimsa. Anekantavada or Syadvada is extension of the principle of Ahimsa on intellectual level. Jainas think that without non-violence in thought, non-violence in practice is impossible.

(b) Ahimsa - Ahimsa follows as a logical corollary from the principle of Equality (Samya) of souls. The inequalities of physical and mental abilities are only accidental and they are due to the Karmas. How, since 'life is dear to all and since everything has hot life', we have to accept the principle of Ahimsa as an important means of spiritual realization. To the Sramanic cult of Jainism, the means are as important as the ends. Our end is no doubt self-realization or Moksha. Now, this self-realization is impossible without the love of self and this love of self is nothing other than Ahimsa, since self resides in everything. Jainism looks upon the whole world as filled with life. Nothing is fallow or sterile, nothing is dead and inert. What to speak of living beings, even plants and every portion of matter have got life. Hence, respect for life is a spiritual act, it is a law of our being. If we forget it, life becomes well nigh impossible. 'As we feel our pain, so we must feel the pain of others', says the Acaranga. The same truth is stated in Dasvaikalika where it is clearly said that 'all beings desire to live, none want to die'. All our religions accept Ahimsa as a virtue but Jainas have worked out a complete philosophy of non-violence, hence here

Ahimsa is more due to rational consideration than emotional as we find in Buddhism and Christianity. The Jaina Ahimsa, embraced the whole universe and is not restricted to humanity. There we can find that Advaita Vedanta and others admit oneness of soul and practically removes the ground of mistrust and violence, which are the result of duality.

Nivarttaka Dharma - Ahimsa together with Aparigraha constitute the ethical wholeness of self-control or self-restraint in social relationship, self-control is the foundation of a higher moral life as in individual life, it is the basis of higher spiritual life. Except for the Mimamsakas, who believe in heaven etc. all the Vedic and non-Vedic systems adopt Moksha as the Summum Bonum of life, which is a state of cessation of the wheels of existence. It is happiness (Sreya) rather than pleasure (Preya) which is the goal of life. Thus self-purification (Atma-suddhi) and not the acquisition of any earthly or heavenly pleasures, which is the aim of life. The obstacles in the forms of delusion, ignorance and craving must be rooted out by practicing the different vows or Vratas, throughout life. Hence, the agency is emphasized. In short, all these constitute the Nivarttaka Dharma or world-withdrawing religion, which is said to be the heart of Jainism. It is bound to be individualistic, world-withdrawing and self-negating. Emphasis on renunciation, asceticism, penances etc. in the account of Sadhana given in the Acaranga is literally soul-stirring. Like Buddha, Mahavira also presented a gloomy picture of the world. 'The living world is afflicted, miserable' - thus begins the second lecture of the first book of Acaranga.

## FROM NESCIENCE TO OMNISCIENCE

### Soul : The Basis of Science, Nescience & Omniscience

By overthrowing rational psychology in his 'Critique of Pure Reason', Kant has disproved the very existence of the soul and thereby the doctrines of the immortality and simplicity of it. But what he lost in the 'Critique of Pure Reason', he regained them in the 'Critique of Practical Reason'. Lord Mahavira presenting the Purva-paksa in the Visvasavyaka bhasya comes to the conclusion that the soul does not exist, but in the Uttar-paksa, refutes all the arguments of the opponents and successfully establishes the existence of the soul. Eminent psychologists of today have been finding themselves helpless to do away with the hypothesis of the soul. "Modern man (is also) in the search of a soul." "The reality of self is obvious to the Introspectionist as the reality of the organism is to the Behaviorists." James supports it and his pupils, Calkins comes out strongly for a 'psychology of selves'. Stern, Dilthey, Spranger and Allport have been endeavoring to build up a 'science of personality'. The theory of soul holds that the principle of consciousness must be a substantial entity, psychic phenomena are activities and the activity is possible unless there exists an agent. Therefore William James regards its admittance 'to be the line of least logical resistance'. Calkins holds that the self, far from being a metaphysical concept, is an ever present fact of immediate experience and fully worthy to be made the central fact in a scientific psychology. Huxley, Spencer and even Darwin have likewise admitted that the materialistic hypothesis involves grave philosophical errors.

In fact, nothing would be simpler than to start with sensation, which is as simple as simplicity, hence it is bound to be indivisible affection which does not imply a reflection even. Naturally, the subject of such sensations must then be a simple substances. "The ancients employed the term 'should' to indicate their conceptions of a knowing substance that was partless and indestructible and therefore immortal." Words abound with references to the arguments for the existence of soul. It is due to the soul that a body appears to be living, the soul itself being the principle of consciousness. Udyotkara, the famous author of Nyaya-Varttika, therefore observes that there is practically no un-unanimity regarding the existence of soul.

### Soul : Its Characteristics

Indian philosophers are agreed about the nature of the soul as possessing consciousness. Even the Carvakas regard Atman as Consciousness, which is a byproduct of the material body. The Buddhists also accept this position, with little difference. However, Jainism is very emphatic about the characteristic of soul as consciousness, which consists of jnana and darsana (knowledge and intuition). In the Tattvartha-Sutra, the term for Cetana is given as Upayoga which includes bliss and power besides cognition and intuition. So very Jiva, in its natural condition possesses 'four-infinities'.

### **Karma : The Material Basis of Bondage**

So infinite cognition, intuition, bliss and power belong to the soul in state of perfection. But the mundane souls are infected by something foreign, which obscures their natural faculties. This foreign elements is known as Karman. The Jaina conception of Karman is not 'action' or 'deed' as it etymologically means; it is an aggregate of very fine imperceptible material particles. This Doctrine of the Material Nature of Karman is singular to Jainism alone; with others karma is formless. The Jainas regard karma as the crystallized effect of the past activities or energies. But they argue that "in order to act and react and thereby to produce changes in things on which they work, the energies must have to be metamorphosed into forms or centers of forces." Like begets like. The cause is like the effect. "The effect (i.e. body) is physical, hence the cause (i.e. Karma) has indeed a physical form." But unless Karma is associated with the soul, it cannot produce any effect, because karma is only the instrumental cause and it is the soul which is the essential cause of all experiences. Hence the Jainas believe in the Doctrine of Soul as the Possessor of Material Karma. But why the conscious soul should be associated with the unconscious matter ? It is owing to the karma, which is a substantive force or matter in a subtle form, which fills all cosmic space. "The soul by its commerce with the outer world becomes literally penetrated with the particles of subtle-matter." Moreover, the mundane soul is not absolutely formless, because the Jainas believe in the Doctrine of Extended consciousness, like the Doctrine of Pudgala in Buddhism and the Upanisads and also to some extent in Plato and Alexander. While the Samkhya-Yoga, Vedanta, Nyaya-Vaisesikas and the Buddhists kept consciousness quite aloof from matter, the Jainas could easily conceive of the inter-influencing of the soul and the Karmic-matter, hence the relation between the soul and Karma became very easy. The Karmic matter mixes with the soul as milk mixes with the water or fire with iron. Thus the amurta karma is affected by murta karma as consciousness is affected by drink and medicine. This is the relation of concrete identity between the soul and the Karma.

Without the Karma Phenomenology, the diversity of the variegated nature and apparent inequalities among human beings and their capacities remain unexplained. Kalavada (Temporalism), Svabhavavada (Naturalism), Niyativada (Determinism), Yadrachavada (Fortuism), Ajnanavada and Samsaya-vada (Agnosticism and Scepticism), Bhautikavada (Materialism) and Maya-vada (Illusionism) fail to satisfy us. Karma is the basis of Jaina psychology and the key-stone supporting edifice of the Jaina ethics.

### **The Concept of Nescience**

The link between the spirit and the matter is found in the Doctrine of the Subtle Body (Karma-Sarira or Linga-Sarira), a resultant of the unseen potency and caused by a Principle of Susceptibility due to Passions and Vibrations. The Doctrines of Constitutional Freedom of the soul and its Potential Four-fold Infinities means that the Soul is intrinsically pure and innately perfect. It is due to Karma that it acquires the conditions of nescience. Nescience is opposite to science or knowledge, i.e., deluded and misguided. This Ignorance or Nescience is the "force which prevents wisdom shining from within, that is that which holds it in latency." The relation between the soul and the non-soul is beginningless and is due to nescience or avidya, otherwise



called Mithyatva, Ajnana, Mithya-Jnana, Viparyaya, Moha, Darsana-moha, Aviveka, Mala and Pasa etc. in different schools of Indian Philosophy. They are responsible for the worldly existence, or bondage, which is determined by the nature (Prakrti), duration (Sthiti), intensity (Anubhava) and quantity (Pradesa) of karmas. Jivas take matter in accordance with their own karmas because of self-possession (Kasaya). This is known as bondages, the cause of which are Delusion (Mithya-drsti). Lack of Control (Avirati), Inadvertence (Pramada), Passions (Kasaya) and Vibrational-activities (Yoga).

The Jaina term for avidya is mithyatva, which is divided into categories and sub-categories differently. According to Umaswami, it may be divided into abhigrahitva and anabhigrahitva; according to Pujyapada Devanandi it may be divided into Naisargika and Paropadesapurvaka, the last again sub-divided into four sub-classes. According to Kunda-Kunda delusion (moha) may be divided into Mithyatva, ajnana and avirati, according to the Fourth Karma Grantha, mithya-darsana is divided into - abhigrahitva, anabhigrahitva, abhinivesika, samasvaika and anabhoga. However, the most popular division is of Pujyapada - ekanta, viparita, vainayika, samsaya and ajnana with their numerous sub-division. The five-fold causes of bondage is sometimes reduced to two or three (mithya-darsana, kasaya and yoga or simply kasaya and yoga) or four. In short, nescience or mithyatva is at the root of all evils and the cause of worldly existence. The Jainas do not like to bother about its whence and why. It is coeval with the soul, hence eternal and beginningless. Both the questions of the Self and Nescience are accepted as facts on the basis of uncontradicted experience. As the bondage is determined by the karmas. There are eight fundamental varieties of these karmas, i.e., jnanavaraniya, darsanavaraniya, vedaniya, mohaniya, ayu, nama, gotra and antaraya with their different sub-divisions. Vidyananda Swami in his Tattvartha-Sloka-Varttika says that as Right Attitude, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct constitute the path to liberation, the anti-thesis of this Trinity, i.e., Wrong Attitude, Wrong Knowledge and Wrong Conduct must lead to the bondage. If the very outlook is wrong, one cannot expect right knowledge and there cannot be right conduct without right knowledge. There is close relation between knowledge. Theory without practice is useless as practice without theory is blind. Knowledge enlightens, penances purifies and restraint protects. Even after attaining tattva-jnana, the soul remains embodied for sometime to enjoy the fruits of its past sancit karmas. So on the psychological grounds, the Jainas reject the metaphysical position of all those who subscribe to the Doctrine of Unitary principle (i.e., Wrong knowledge alone) as the cause of the bondage.

### **The Concept of Omniscience**

Definition and Analysis - Omniscience or Keval-Jnana is a kind of direct but extra-sensory perception, "the perfect manifestation of the innate nature of the self, arising on the complete annihilation of the obstructive veils." which is gained by the destruction of Deluding, Knowledge obscuring, Belief obscuring and Obstructive Karmas, when the soul is free from all karmic-matter owing to the non-existence of the causes of bondage and to the shedding of all karmas, the subject-matter of which is all the substances in all their modifications at all the places and in all the times. Nothing remains unknown to the omniscient.

On analysis of the concept of omniscience, we have to decide whether he is human or divine or both; whether the knowledge of an omniscient is simultaneous or successive; whether the power of omniscience is potential or actual; whether an omniscient knows all the objects or simply the most important objects, and whether he knows the past and the future as the present or as the past or future. To the Mimamsakas the term omniscient may either mean (1) the knower of the term 'omniscience' or (2) complete knowledge of one thing such as oil or (3) knowledge of the entire world in a most general way or (4) perfect knowledge of one's own respective scriptural matters or (5) simply knowledge of respective things through the respective Pramanas as far as possible.



## Historical Development and Comparative Estimate of the Concept of Sarvajnatva

The germinal concept of omniscience can be traced back to the Vedas where Varuna sits looking at all. In the Upanisads, the state of omniscience is the state of bliss or Turiyavastha. He who knows Brahman, knows everything. Atman being known everything is known. Hiranyagarbha is Sarvajna. Likewise in the Vedanta, the Brahman alone, who is one without a second, is omniscient. In Buddhism, omniscience is granted to the Buddha. True to their non-metaphysical attitude, they do not bother about each and everything, but only about their Four Noble Truths, and their own religious observances etc. Prajnakargupta in his commentary on Dharmakirti's work has established the trio-temporal-spatial omniscience of Sugata and that state is attainable by any man free from attachment and taints. Santaraksita supports this. In idealistic schools of Buddhism like Sunyavada and Vijnanavada, the Concept of omniscience comes very near to that Upanisadic monism where all-knowledge amounts to self-knowledge. However to the Buddhists, who subscribe to the Doctrine of Momentary Stream of Consciousness, the fact of omniscience, extending to past and future becomes meaningless. The creating Isvara of Nyaya school is omniscience. Vaisheshika regards God as omniscient besides other Yogic-souls. Similarly, Alaukika Pratyaksa of the Nyaya school, Asamprajnata Samadhi of the Yoga, Jivan-Mukti of Samkhya and Vedanta Turiyavastha of the Upanisads and Radhakrishnan's Religious Experience have very clear implications of omniscience, although they partly encroach on the realm of religious mysticism. According to the Nyaya-Vaisheshika, omniscience means knowledge of its seven principles, to the Buddhists, it implies the right knowledge of Panca-skandhas, to the Vedantins it is the knowledge of the Brahman and to the Jains it will mean the all comprehensive-knowledge of the six categories. Excepting the Mimamsakas and the Carvakas all Indian systems believe in the possibility of human omniscience, however, the Sramanic culture insistence on human omniscience more than others to grant infallibility to their prophets, because on this depend the very life and death of their systems.

In short, the Doctrine of Omniscience follows as the sine qua non from the metaphysical, religious and psychological view-points of each of the school. True to their realistic metaphysics, the Jains conceive of omniscience as purely human and actual - a direct knowledge of all knowable of all places and times. The Agamas and the logical treatises have equated Sarvajnatva with Dharmajnatva. Later Jaina thinkers like Samantabhadra, Siddhasena, Akalanka, Haribhadra, Vidyānand have separated the concept of omniscience from the idea of religious experience. With Acarya Kunda-kunda Sarvajnatva is a dogma, a religious heritage, almost similar to the Advaitic and Upanisadic emphasis on treating Sarvajnatva as Atmajnatva. The names of other Jaina thinkers such as Umasvami, Anantakirti, Patrakesar, Prabhachandra, Abhayadeva Suri, Rajasekhara, Vaidibh Singh Suri, Anantakirti, Manikyanandi, Pujyapada Devanandi, Santi Suri, Yasovijaya, Mallavadin, Vadi Deva Suri, Nemichandra, Hemchandra, Mallisena, Dharmabhusana, Devendra Suri, etc. are relevant.

### Mimamsaka's Objections and Their Replies

The Mimamsakas try to show that omniscience cannot be established through any of the Pramanas. It cannot be established through Pratyaksa. Perception implies sense-object-contact during the present time and in the case of Kevala-jnana, this is lacking. To this, we can say that the question of sense-object-relation is not always valid, because things are beyond the power of senses. Such invisible things like atoms, things or persons remote in time or things far beyond (like the Meru hill) became known as the object of direct perception, just like the knowledge of existence of fire in hill from the smoke is also the subject-matter of perception. Here we may be reminded of the researches in para-psychology and extra-sensory perception including telepathy and clairvoyance. As for perception, we can say that only a type of perception which claims to know all things of all times and places, can definitely say that omniscient does not exist. But if there is such a type of all-comprehensive perception it is no other than the omniscience.

Similarly, omniscience cannot be established through Anumana, because we cannot think of a relation of universal concomitance between the Sadhya and the Hetu. Sabda Pramana also cannot prove it, because there is no infallibility of the Agamic authority to support it and the fallible Agamas are either created by omniscient or non-omniscient. Now, if it is through omniscient, there is the fallacy of circular reasoning and if it is through non-omniscient, there is fallacy of Contradiction. Upamana also cannot establish this, because it works on the basis of imperfect resemblance between two instances, but there is complete absence of any similarity with the objection that the Arhat is not omniscient because he is speaker like some vagabond, it is said "there is no contradiction between the speakership and the omniscience. With the perfection of knowledge, verbal skill is also perfected. However it may be retorted that Vitaraga Omniscience can not speak for speech is related with desire to speak, and a Vitaraga Omniscient is devoid of any desires. But as a matter of fact, this argument is fallacious. There is no relation between the two. An intelligent person even if he has desire, may not explain the Sastras and during swoon and dreams, where there is absence of desires, people are seen talking and uttering something. Similarly, when it is said that the proof of the omniscience follows from the final consummation of the progressive development of cognition, the Mimamsakas object to it and say that there must be a limit of all progress like that in any human activity. The Jainas reply that physical progress is different from mental progress. Knowledge is limitless and infinite. When the soul shines in full splendor it attains omniscience. To the objection that if an omniscient knows all the objects of the universe at one instant, nothing remains to be cognised by him in the next moment, hence the soul would turn to be unconscious having nothing to cognise; it is reported that it would have been so only if the perception of the omniscient and also this world-order were destroyed in the following moment. But both of them are eternal. Hence it is foolish to hold that there is one single cognition. With respect to the objection that because the omniscient knows 'everything', he might be tainted by the evils contained in them, it is replied that knowledge is different from active participation. One cannot be subjected to attachment and miseries simply in knowing them, because we cannot be called a drunker simply as we know about the different ingredients of the drink. Next, it is objected that we cannot think of an omniscient because through the world we find only ignorant persons. To this it is said that our ignorance cannot be our excuse. We cannot say that persons like Jamini etc. were ignorant of the Vedas because we do not find any such person at the present time. When it is argued that since the beginninglessness and endlessness are apparent in the state of omniscience, things must appear in that way, it is replied that the nature of reality does not change in perceiving them. Things appear as they are. When it is said that because the Agamas establish omniscience of the Arhat and omniscients also create Agamas, this is simply paradoxical, it is said that the Agamas of the present are profited by the past Agamas. The Mimamsakas say that omniscience may mean either successive or simultaneous knowledge of all objects. Now, if it is regarded as successive knowledge, omniscience becomes impossible since the objects of the world in the past, present and future are inexhaustible, hence the knowledge would also be ever-complete. If the knowledge is regarded as simultaneous, there will be confusion and contradiction due to the presence of contradictory objects at the same time. Past and future are non-existent at the present time, hence a knowledge about them would always be illusory.

### **Some Proofs for the Existence of Omniscience**

We have to face these difficulties because we regard omniscience only as ordinary perception writ large. As a matter of fact omniscience is a form of direct simultaneous extra-sensory-perception where there is no scope for CONFUSION, ILLUSION or IGNORANCE. "Our phenomenal knowledge suggests the noumenal as a necessity of thought, but not known through the empirical Pramanas. Metaphysically, manifold and complete objectivity implies some extra-ordinary perception. Psychologically, differences in intelligence etc. in human beings presuppose the possibility of omniscience, somewhere and in some body. Logically, on account of the lack of contradictory proof, it is established beyond doubt. According to the researches made by Sukhalal Sanghavi, the origin of all these proofs may be traced back to the Yoga-Sutra

of Patanjali. Knowledge like measure and quantity has got degrees, hence knowledge is bound to reach its final consummation. References about omniscience, in all other literatures, are after the date of the Yoga-Sutra. In Jaina literatures, this argument was first of all advocated by Mallavadi, though the sources concerned are not exactly clear.

We can sum up the most formidable proofs of Akalanka Deva under the following three categories - firstly, omniscience is proved because there is absolute non-existence of any obstructive-Pramanas against it. Akalanka tries to in the astronomical spheres, which indicates correctly about the future eclipses of the sun and moon. Lastly, omniscience follows from the essential nature of the soul as knower of all things. As the sun shines fully after the removal of the clouds, so the self knows everything when the knowledge-obscurer-karmas is completely liquidated. According to Virasena Svami, we can infer about the whole mountain after perceiving a part of it, so we can be sure of complete knowledge in self by perceiving partial knowledge. Samantabhadra has proved the existence through the reasoning based on Anumeyatva, or capable of being known through inference. Dharmabhusana explaining this says that 'perception' does not mean only 'actual perception' but also 'object of knowledge'. Let us repeat with the author of Apta-Pariksa, "when omniscience is proved by all the six Pramanas, who dare to reject it ?" None, perhaps none. Omniscience is perfectly consistent with the Jaina conception of knowledge as the removal of veil.

## OMNISCIENCE : MISCONCEPTION AND CLARIFICATION

### Meaning of the Term

There is a striking parallel between 'Omniscient' and 'Sarvajna' because the Latin 'Omnis' corresponds to the Sanskrit 'sarva'. Even in ancient Indian languages like Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrt, etc. there are many equivalents of the term 'Sarvajna', but the most commonly used term is 'Sarvajna' itself. The etymological meaning of Sarvajna is governed by a particular rule according to which the affix 'ka' comes after a verbal root that ends in long a, when there is no prefix preceding it and when the object is in composition with it (ato-anupsarge kah). As the Pali and Prakrt grammars practically follow the rules of Sanskrit, the dictionary meanings of other important European languages like German, Russian, Italian, Spanish, French, English etc. are generally grounded on the Latin meaning. Thus literally, the term 'Omniscience' means 'all-knowledge' or 'knowledge of all'. But the terms 'all' and 'knowledge' are used or can be used in different contexts. Similarly the term 'omniscient' has got both straight forward and idiomatic meanings. When we call a man 'omniscient', we do not mean that he knows everything, we simply mean that he is very learned and he knows a lot. Thus there is a distinction between the 'strict' and the 'hyperbolic' meanings of the term. Then there are special meanings also that are determined by the philosophical and cultural background of a particular system.

It is clear that the lexical works do help to determine the meaning of a term but they cannot finally decide the meaning because they report only the existing usages. While retaining the lexical identity, the term may have different connotations, hence the meanings of the term 'omniscience' also differ accordingly. For example, "the man who knows the word 'all' may be 'all-knowing' in name." It means that the man who knows the meaning of 'all' will also know what it signifies. But this is a meaning in name only for no one can prevent another person from giving a word any meaning he likes. The meaning of a term depends upon human stipulation. Secondly, a man may be called 'omniscient', if he knows about everything of a given context (for example, the names of all dramas of Kalidas and Shakespear). This is precisely the hyperbolic or idiomatic meaning, when a versatile genius or highly learned man is described as 'omniscient'. A third meaning of 'all' may be understood in the sense of the epitome of the world included under the two categories, positive the Buddhists limit it to the knowledge of morality

(Heya-Upadeya) and to the Jainas, it is the knowledge of "all substances with all their attributes and modes in all times and in all places." (Sarva-dravya-guna-Paryayesu).

### **Analysis of the Meaning of the term Omniscience**

If we suppose that omniscience means the knowledge of 'all substances with all their modes', we can ask : whether omniscience is false or true knowledge ? If it is false, it is sheer non-sense but if it is true, we can further ask : "whether it is knowledge of only the important things or of all the things." If it is the former, it is not omniscience in the sense under study, if it is latter it raises a further question : Is it the knowledge of all the objects without or with their attributes. If we accept the first alternative, it will raise many complicated metaphysical issues, such as whether or not an object can be known without knowing its attributes or whether objects and their attributes are so separable in knowledge even if not in reality ? Thus, the second alternative is accepted which will imply 'knowledge of objects with their attributes'. But on further analysis, it will raise another question : whether the knowledge is of all objects with some or all attributes ? If the former, the scope becomes limited, if the latter, there is another dilemma. Is such a knowledge restricted to some particular place or to all the places ? If we accept the first alternative, it becomes restricted in space but if we accept the second alternative, we are faced with a further problem : whether the omniscient knowledge (unlimited in space) covers the entire present only or the entire span of time - past, present and future. If we accept the former, it is restricted to the present moment only but if we accept the second knowledge is successive or simultaneous ? If it be successive, there can be no omniscience for all the objects with all attributes and modes at all places and at all times can never be exhausted. But if it is taken to be simultaneous, there crops yet another difficulty : Is such a simultaneous knowledge obtained by a single act of cognition or by a series of cognitions ? The first alternative is unacceptable since then it would be impossible to distinguish between contradictory things and characteristics like heat and cold simultaneously through the act of one single cognition. But suppose, if it can be known through a single supernormal cognition brought about by communion, then there can be no means of cognition to vouch for such knowledge because it is not produced either by perception, inference or authority. But if we accept the second alternative, we can still ask : whether it is actual or possible ? If it is actual it would be difficult to conceive a state of knowledge obtained through several cognitions covering even mutually contradictory things. Then it is impossible to apprehend even in hundreds of thousands of years each one of the innumerable things and thus characteristics of all places and at all times. But to avoid this difficulty, if we suppose that such a knowledge is only possible we are again confronted with another problem. If it is possible to know all things and their attributes simultaneously, nothing will remain to be known by the omniscient being. In that case after having the knowledge, he would behave as an unconscious being, since he will have left nothing to cognate. Supposing, for the moment that we somehow try to overcome this difficulty, we shall still be beset with another problem : Whether past and future will be known as present or as they are, i.e., the past as past and the future as future. If we accept the first alternative, distinction of time will be lost because the past and the future will merge into the immediate present. But if we accept the second alternative it will imply that the omniscient being cognise the past and the future which are at present non-existents. Thus, in both cases, our knowledge would be illusory and wrong.

### **Categorization**

In order to avoid these difficulties involved in the analysis of the concept of omniscience, it has been interpreted to mean the knowledge "important and essential things through their important characteristics" and not of "each and everything in their numerical details." But it may be told that unless all the objects with all their attributes are known, how can the distinction between the

`essential' and the `non-essential' be made. Even if it be possible, some of the old difficulties will reappear. But supposing as it is, even then we can ask : what does this omniscience (as the knowledge of important things through their important characteristics) refer to ? To this question, there are some answers in Indian thought, but for my convenience, I shall choose only three for their elucidation and examination : (a) Omniscience as the knowledge of reality, (b) Omniscience as the knowledge of duty and (c) Omniscience as knowledge of the self. I shall take one by one :

(a) Omniscience as the Knowledge of Reality - Suppose, omniscience means knowledge of reality, it is to be clarified : whether it implies the knowledge of the `transcendental reality' or the `empirical reality'. If it be the former it will mean difficulty in different systems of thought and metaphysics. But if we do not bind ourselves to any particular metaphysical stand-point and instead vaguely hold the general view that omniscience means knowledge of the essential things, we are faced with a difficult task of explaining the status of the contingent and its relationship to the essential. The Samkhya for example, may say that the knowledge of the essential implies that of the contingent world. But if we admit that the knowledge of the essence does not contain the knowledge of the accident, we shall have to turn ourselves to the pluralistic-realistic systems. However, if we accept the second alternative that omniscience is the knowledge of the empirical reality, there is perhaps then no need of philosophy as the different sciences are already doing the work. But no scientist ever makes any claim to omniscience. But suppose we do have knowledge of reality anyhow in any sense, there still remains a problem : whether it is knowledge of the temporal or non-temporal reality ? If we accept the first position, we shall have to argue with science that omniscience is not possible. But if we accept the second view that the ultimate reality is far from spatio-temporal limitations, we will be driven to an idealistic view of the universe. Thus, either we accept the views of science according to which omniscience is not possible or we accept the idealistic position, in which case again, there can be no unanimity.

(b) Omniscience as Knowledge of Duty - Viewing those difficulties omniscience has been treated as the knowledge of duty (dharma), since our moral life and hence its knowledge is of supreme value to us. Here omniscience (Sarvajnata) will be equated with the knowledge of duty (dharmajnata). But even this religious-ethical approach involves some difficulties : whether duty, referred to here, is duty in general (Samanya dharma) or duty in particular (Varnasrama dharma). If the first alternative is accepted, there may be conflicting lists, since duties vary from person to person and to the same person from time to time. If we adopt the second alternative, another difficulty will arise : whether the particular duty is private or public ? If the former, it may lead to narrowness and sectarianism; but if it is the latter, we have to explore some universal and eternal principles of duty, which is very difficult. Even the concept of `Universal Religion' is still an utopia.

(c) Omniscience as Knowledge of Self - To simplify matter we can give up the dualistic approach of subject and object and identify the object with the subject. Here the knowledge of the object is identical with the knowledge of the subject. However, this meaning of omniscience as the knowledge of the Self is highly specialized and metaphysical because Sarvajnata is identical with Atmajnata."

### **Implications of Omniscience : Doubts and Difficulties**

Those who argue for the existence of omniscience as a fact, rests on metaphysical postulates that knowledge is the self-functioning of the self. This is the theory of the innate possession of omniscience by every soul. What is needed is the actualisation of this potentiality. This is a contravertial question, whether there is soul or not and if there is, whether even potentially it is capable of knowing everything. But if we accept these metaphysical postulates, there are serious moral implications. If one knows the future acts of human beings, there was no meaning in voluntary action. So Locke says about omniscience of God : "If God exists and is essentially omniscient, no human action is voluntary." Augustine also says : "If you say, God foreknows that a man will sin, he must necessarily sin. But if there is necessity there is no voluntary choice of sinning but rather fixed and unavoidable necessity." To say that since God compels no man to



sin, though he sees before-hand those who are going to sin by their own will. God's omniscience cannot entail determinism on the analogy of an intimate friend having the fore knowledge of another's voluntary actions without affecting his friend's moral freedom, is not a very good argument. A person's knowledge about the future action of an intimate friend of his is at most a good guess and not a definite knowledge. To say that a man is free to do something which without knowing that it is within his power to do otherwise is not freedom but ignorance. What is foreseen is necessary and what is necessary is outside the scope of ethics. However, if it is said that "it is not because God foreknows what he foreknows that men act as they do, it is because men act as they do that God foreknows what he foreknows," will create awkward situation in which man's actions will determine God's knowledge. But suppose if it is the case of human omniscience it will mean that the knowledge of the omniscient being is not unfettered but determined by the actions of other men. But since different people perform different actions, it will create a difficult situation for the cognising mind. To say that the omniscient being believes in an infinitely large number of true synthetic propositions is vague and self-contradictory, for this depends upon the belief at least in one proposition : "Nothing is unknown to him". But this is to admit his omniscience and hence it is like arguing in a circle.

### **Validation and Vindication**

But such a 'Vicious circularity' as Fugel says, we cannot escape when we cannot validate any fundamental principle or ideal like this. J.S.Mill also says that "questions of ultimate ends are not amenable to direct proof" or as Carnap says that it is necessary always to distinguish between 'question within presupposed frame' and 'question concerning the frame'. In order to grasp this situation, a fundamental distinction often neglected and blurred, must be made between the two types of justifying principles or knowledge-claims, namely, validation and vindication. Validation generally means a vigorous logical proof or 'legitimizing of knowledge-claims'. Vindication on the other hand, means the justification of an action, which is, though weaker than validation, is an equally respectable method, especially when we know that validation is impossible in matters of fundamental principles.

It seems that although the logicians have exhibited great diabolical skill in enunciating the concept of omniscience and arguing for its exemplification in reality the concept has not been made altogether clear or completely defensible. But apart from the rational approach, there is also another approach. It is sometimes called the approach of faith or the intuitional approach, which is applicable in matters of suprasensible and beyond space-time objects. The non-rational (ahetuvada) approach though different from the rational approaches (hetuvada) is not an irrational approach. After all, there are limitations to our reason as there are limitations to our senses. Thus, there are two separate fields of investigation, science and spirituality. Science deals with spatio-temporal phenomena with the help of senses and common-sense reasoning including scientific experiment. But there are other fields also, unexplored and also beyond the scope of scientific reach. It seems that there are different ways of knowing. True, there is the western emphasis on critical intelligence and eastern emphasis on creative intuition but there is universal recognition of the spirit in man. It is necessary to be reasonable and not logical. Our whole logical life grows on the foundation of a deeper insight. If intuitive knowledge does not supply us with universal major premises which we can neither question nor establish, our life will come to an end. Intuitions are not substitutes for thought. They are challenge to intelligence. This spirit of man or creativity of felt everywhere in artistic achievement and poetic genius, religious experiences and ethical life, in scientific genius and psychological life.

The concept of omniscience is such a concept, which can admit of vindication (justification actions) on the ground of faith which is supported by the seers having intuitional insight. Modern researches in the field of para-psychology specially in clairvoyance, clair-audience, precognition, telepathy etc. also support the knowledge which can be gained by transcending space-time and the senses. The science of Yoga can be also examined in this direction. It has been the abiding spiritual ambition of man to extend the frontiers of his knowledge. The very attempt to put a limit, an absolute limit to our knowledge is unscientific. It was customary for the old philosophy to



discredit the knowledge gained by the senses, as it was for an old fashioned theology to discredit the nature of the worth of the body. Both have proved to be erroneous. Human thinking with regard to goodness, duty and morality, art and beauty, "extends without assignable limit the knowledge of mankind." The growth of human knowledge has been a sort of progressive limitation of sceptical and agnostic attitude. Thus the possibility of omniscience is also contained in the ideal of knowledge or ideal of science. Even in the ideal of epistemological certainty without which all our claims to knowledge must be suspects" suggests that the quest for certainty in knowledge is indeed a quest towards omniscience. In reasoning, context is not seen simultaneously with the meaning which has to be the object of reflection and analysis. Thus reason cannot make prime discoveries. The miracle of mind is well-known. What is needed is to unfold the gates of mind and extend the limitless horizon of knowledge.

## **SIX APPROACHES TO OMNISCIENCE IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY**

The acceptance or non-acceptance of the idea of Omniscience in a particular system of Indian Philosophy can provide us with a new principle of division of the Indian systems. There are those like the Buddhists, the Jainas, the Nyaya-Vaisesikas, the Samkhya-Yogins and the Vedantins who accept the idea of Omniscience either as a religious dogma or as an epistemological-metaphysical principle. However, the idea is very important and fundamental both to the sastras and common usages. Its germinal concept can be traced back even to the Vedas.

However, the Carvakas, the Indian Agnostics, the Mimamsakas reject the very idea of omniscience. The Carvakas, for example will naturally reject such an assumption is direct sense-perception. Hence, they cannot accept anything which is transempirical or transcendental like soul, God, Paraloka, Karmaphala (the consequences of good-evil actions). If the existence of Atman or the eternal metaphysical subject is denied, the very idea of omniscience is put to a naught. Soul is supposed to be the substratum of knowledge and when this ground is lost, the entire edifice falls down. Attributes cannot exist without the substance.

The Indian Agnostics Sceptics accept a self-imposed limitation to their knowledge, while the Nihilists by their attitude leave no room for any discussion upon this subject. Knowledge by its very nature is limited. However, refined and developed it might be, it cannot grasp all the complexion and substitution of the whole world in the past, present and future. The reality, to use Kant's words, is unknown and unknowable.

However, the worst critics of the doctrine of Omniscience, are the Indian Retreatists or Mimamsakas. Strangely enough, though they accept the unchallengeable authority of the Vedas and Pre-birth etc., they openly and most avoided by deny the existence of the omniscience God. The reason is obvious and somewhat extra-ontological but thoroughly practical. The Mimamsakas are essentially ritualists. To them rituals and their proper performances can guarantee us the highest good of life. So they in their enthusiasm to accord the means, all knowledge or the perfect knowledge. This may apparently look to be a very simple idea but really it involves many problems. Let us discuss a few of them.

All-knowledge is rather a very vague term. We have to see whether this knowledge is to be taken denotatively or connotatively, i.e., whether an omniscient being knows all the objects with all their attributes numerically or through their important characteristics. Then if Omniscience means knowledge of Past, Present and Future, we have to know whether the Omniscience knows past and future as the present or past as past and future as future. In brief, whether Omniscient knowledge is simultaneous or successive, is an important question. Now, let us also

discuss, who is an Omniscient ? Whether he is human or divine or both ? We know that there are references both about human and divine Omniscience in our religious and philosophical literature. But then, we have to find out the particular system that has laid the foundation of this idea and it would be more interesting to know the socio-cultural causes for the emergence of this idea which is so much talked about in our books. Whether this idea is the product of pure philosophical speculation or a mere religious dogma or both ? It is generally argued that the idea, at first, evolved as a religious dogma but later on logical arguments were also advanced to defend its validity. This view finds its support in the fact that the validity or invalidity of the Vedas formed the main plank of all discussion for and against the idea of Omniscience. Connected with this, we have to discuss the relation between the idea and God and Omniscience.

Apparently, we do not see any relation save and except the fact that Omniscience is regarded as a divine attribute of God, But in Indian Philosophy, both the theistic and the atheistic schools have supported the idea of Omniscience. For example, the theistic systems like the Nyaya-Vaisesika and Yoga along with the atheistic schools like Samkhya, Jainism and Buddhism and purely metaphysical disciplines like the Upanisads and the Vedanta accept Omniscience. Of course, there are certain differences too. For example, the Nyaya-Vaisesikas accept the idea of both divine and human Omniscience. However, Omniscience is a capacity of knowledge only among the Yogis and not ordinary average people. Nyaya-Vaisesika do not regard Omniscience as a pre-conditions of Moksa because the state of Moksa is the state of utter unconsciousness. Samkhya, Yoga and Vedanta also don't insist upon attainment of Omniscience as a pre-condition of Moksa as otherwise held by the Jainas.

Then there is yet another very important problem : the relation between the two very important and related concepts of Sarvajnata (Omniscience) and Dharmajnata is a product of the idea of Dharmajnata or vice versa. Buddhism is the veritable champion of Dharmajnata because Buddha's Omniscience is the sense of Dharmajna or Margajna (Path-leader). It senses that both these principles of Omniscience and revelation have got independent origins, although later on they have fused together. As pointed out earlier that the Buddhists, at first, subordinates the idea of Sarvajnata to the idea of Dharmajnata but later on, perhaps on account of the Jaina influences, we find separate and independent treatment of Omniscience even at the hands of the Buddhists. Lord Buddha becomes an Omniscience deity. However, this is interesting to know that the sectarian bias of each of the schools like the Jainas, Buddhists, Samkhyas lead them to think only their own perceptor as Omniscient and non-else. This has naturally led the Mimamsakas to put them in a very awkward position. How is it that if all of them are Omniscientists, they differ so vitally.

Before, I take up a fuller discussion of the problem, I like to discuss broadly the six main approaches to the concept of Omniscience in Indian Philosophy.

### **The Approach of Worship**

The Vedic Approach to the concept of omniscience is the Approach of Worship. There is a tendency to extol each of the many gods as the Supreme God, who is naturally the Creator of the universe and possessing the attributes of omnipotence, omniscience etc. However in the whole of the Vedas, the particular term Sarvajnata or Sarvanjanta never occurs, yet there are many words denoting the meaning of the said word, as can be inferred from the following expressions : Visva Vedas, Visva Vid, Visvani Vidvan, Sarvavit, Jatvedas, etc. However, throughout all these discussions, `Omniscience is a purely divine attribute. No where is found a single passage where it is human. However, there are prayer-passages to the gods to grant infinite knowledge and strength. In the Vedic speculation, which is mostly primitive and crude, we find that each god at first is a symbol of Nature or a picture of the gross physical world as indicated by names. Hence, we find the concept of physical omniscience and physical omniscience as can be inferred from the following expressions : Sahasraksa, Visvatascaksuh, Visva-Drastah, Visva-carsane etc. Infact, this physical omnipresence forms the basis of their physical than psychological or mental, so much so that the power of vision is glorified more often

than the power of mind. Such omniscience of Lord Varuna is evident. The words Pasyati, Prati-pasyati, Maha-pasyati and Sarvam-pasyati, are very suggestive in this respect (The omniscience of Agni, Indra, Varuna, Vaka, Purusa, Soma, etc. Is referred here and there.).

### **Approach of Atmajnata**

In the Upanisads, the concept of Sarvajnatva has been equated with the concept of Atmajnatva or Brahmajnatva. When 'All this is Atman', we can conclude that 'Atman being known everything is known'. It is a common assertion of the Upanisads that 'By knowing the Atman, one knows everything'. However, Atman and Brahman are used synonymously, as expressed in the following. This 'Self is the Brahman', 'I am Brahman'. Like the expression 'All this is Atman' we have the expression 'All this is Brahman'. The famous Upanisadic dictums That thou art and 'I am Brahman affirm this identification. This makes clear that the concept of Brahman is the primal and pivotal concept of the Upanisads together with the concept of Atman. So like the conversation in the Brhadaranyaka, we also meet a similar conversation in the Mundak about Brahman when Saunaka inquires from Angira 'knowing what one knows everything' it is replied that 'It is Brahman'.

While the term 'Sarvajnata' does not occur even a single time in the whole of the Vedas, it occurs for 31 times in the whole of 120 Upanisads but where as in the principal Upanisads the term denotes 'knowledge about the self', in the minor Upanisads, we find references about the omniscience of God and other deities. We pass from the Vedic conception of Physical omniscience to the metaphysical omniscience of the Upanisads. Soul-knowledge is all-knowledge, hence the Upanisadic message : 'Know thyself'. But this 'soul-knowledge' which is equivalent to 'all-knowledge' does not mean each and every details of the contingent world. It would simply mean the complete negation of nescience, the cosmic illusion, by fully grasping the underlying reality. Strangely enough, this Atmanic Approach to knowledge is common both to the Upanisads and some of the Jaina thinkers like Kunda-kunda and Yogindu. Kunda-kunda identifies Sarvajnata with Atmajnata meaning thereby that any ethics of self-realization must aim at knowing the Self which is the highest principle of their metaphysics and morality. But at some places there is greater emphasis over Brahman or even the Creator God and His omniscience than this subject-objectless Atman. Like the Vedic tradition, sometimes the Upanisadic seers also indulge in prayerful exhortations to the deities. Omniscience of Visnu, Brahma and even Mahesh finds explicit references. Lastly, the concept of omniscience is also associated with the mystical syllable 'Aum' which is the acme of spiritualistic cosmogony of the Upanisads. 'Aum' is the world-all and hence to know 'Aum' is to know everything.

### **The Approach of Dharmajnata**

The heterodox systems like Buddhism and Jainism have a religion without God but they would not like to miss the advantage that one gets in accepting God. God is omnipotent, omniscient etc. Hence what is said by God, acquires additional prestige and power. Hence as a substitute of God, they have prophets who are also omniscients in. This is the simple law of spiritual sociology that necessity is the mother of invention. Instead of God or godeses, they strictly adhere to their respective religious dogmas. The basis of religion is ultimately faith. 'The heart has reason of which reason has no knowledge', says Pascal. Tennyson in his 'Memorium' has said 'Believing where we cannot prove'. The need for believing is inherent in human nature. So we have nothing to say against the religious dogmas. "Religion may sometime justifiably be taken in the Lucretian sense of superstition", says Galloway. But what of that ? 'Religion is the poetry which we believe' - as Santyana says in his Reason and Religion. Thus omniscience is demonstrated as a religious necessity, i.e., we pass from metaphysical determination to an ethical and volitional determination of knowledge. This spirit of the evangelic religions may also be traced back to the

Mahabharat, where knowledge of Dharma is held as the supreme knowledge. Even in the Jaina Agamas, the concept of Sarvajnata has been equated with the conception of Dharmajna together with Sarvajna. Santaraksita also supports it.

### **Approach of Reason**

Dogmas if lift to the private field should not be questioned, but if made public, they are bound to face postmortem examinations and hence the formal reasoning is bound to step in. So, we find quite a best of logicians who try to prove Omniscience with the rarest dialectical skill and logical acumen. Among the Buddhists, the names of Santaraksita (749-770) and Prajnakargupta (about 10th century) are important. Among the Jainas, there is long and continued tradition of logicians who have tried to prove Omniscience with the help of arguments. The names of Umaswati (2nd Century), Siddhasena (5th Century), Samantabhadra (6th Century), Pujiyapada (6th Century), Akalanka (7th century), Abhayadeva Suri (7th Century), Haribhadra (8th Century), Vidyananda (9th Century), Manikyanandi (9th Century), Anantakirti (11th Century), Prabhacandra (11th Century), Hemcandra (11th Century), Vadideva Singh Suri (12th Century), Mallisena (14th Century), Dharmabhusana (14th Century), Yasovijaya (18th Century) etc. are important in this connection.

### **Mixed Approach of Reason and Faith**

Man has both head and heart, hence needs not only to be silent but also to be convinced, i.e. we want a synthesis of faith and reason, which is in conformity with the best traditions of Indian Philosophy. Bare reason is empty and blind faith is dangerous. So what is needed is an integral approach where we should learn to respect the intuitional experiences of the trusted and tried persons and also maintain the intellectual and logical standards. I think, this is the typical Jaina approach to the concept of omniscience. With the Jainas, the logical theory. The Agamas and the logical treatises equally try to establish the theory of omniscience. Lord Mahavira's omniscience is a religious necessity and possibility of human omniscience is a rare intellectual achievement of the Jaina Logicians in the face of terrific opposition from the side of the Mimamsakas.

### **The Yogic Approach**

In the literature of Nyaya-Vaisesika and also Samkhya-Yoga and some of the Tantras, we find that there are yogic-disciplines, which if perfected can enable us to have extra-ordinary powers, such as extra-ordinary perception, extrasensory perception, pre-cognition etc. The Nyaya-Vaisesika recognizes Alaukika Pratyaksa of which the Yogic intuition is one of the three varieties. Yogic perception differs from divine omniscience in that if the art of Yoga is perfected, we can achieve the redirection of our consciousness, which is brought about by practice and conquest of desire. The normal limits of human vision are not the limits of the universe. Asamprajnata Samadhi of Yoga indicates the possibility of human omniscience. Recent researches in the field of para-psychology simply go to strengthen this position.

### **CONCLUSION**

Of all the six approaches to the concept of omniscience in Indian Philosophy, the Jaina approach is most serious and sincere. This problem is a problem of life and death to them. They accept it as a religious dogma, as an outcome of reasoning and Logic and also as a fruit of yogic exercises.

## NON-ABSOLUTISM AND OMNISCIENCE

### Is Non-absolutism Absolute ?

Is non-absolutism is absolute, it is not universal since there is one real which is absolute and if non-absolutism is itself non-absolute, it is not an absolute and universal fact. "Tossed between the two horns of the dilemma non-absolutism thus simply evaporates." But there are also the following points :

- (a) Every proposition of the dialectical seven-fold judgment is either Complete or Incomplete. In complete judgment, we use only one word that describes one characteristic of that object and hold the remaining characters to be identical with it. On the other hand, in Incomplete Judgment, we speak of truth as relative to our standpoint. In short, Complete Judgment is the object of valid knowledge (pramana) and Incomplete Judgment is the object of aspectal knowledge (Naya). Hence the "non-absolute is constituted of the absolute as its elements and as such would not be possible if there were no absolute."
- (b) The unconditionally in the statement "All statements are conditional" is quite different from the normal meaning of unconditionality. This is like the idea contained in the passage - 'I do not know myself', where there is no contradiction between 'knowledge' and 'ignorance' or in the sentence, 'I am undecided', where there is at least one decision that I am undecided. Similarly, the categorically behind a disjunctive judgment ( A man is either good or bad etc.) the categoricity is not like the categoricity of an ordinary categorical judgment. 'The horse is red'. The question of 'why' has been discussed elsewhere in detail.
- (c) Samantabhadra, an early Jaina logician, in one of his worship-songs, clarifies this position the light of the doctrine of manifoldness of truth. He says, "even to the doctrine of non-absolutism can be interpreted either as absolute or non-absolute according to the pramana or Naya respectively. This means that even the doctrine of non-absolutism is not absolute unconditionally.
- (d) However, to avoid the fallacy of infinite regress, the Jainas distinguish between Valid non-absolutism (Samyak anekanta) and invalid non-absolutism (Mithya Anekanta). Like an invalid absolute judgment an invalid non-absolute judgment, too is invalid. To be valid, Anekanta must not be absolute but always relative. In short, the doctrine of non-absolutism is an opposite (theory) or Ekantavada, one-sided exposition irrespective of other view points. Anekantavada literally means not, one, aside, exposition but many sided exposition taking into account all possible angles of vision regarding any object or idea.

Now, if we consider the above points, we can not say that "the theory of relativity cannot be logically sustained without the hypothesis of an absolute." Thought is not mere distinction but also relation. Everything is possible only in relation to and as distinct from others and the Law of contradiction is the negative aspect of the Law of identity. Under these circumstances, it is not legitimate to hold that the hypothesis of an absolute cannot be logically sustained without the hypothesis of a relative. Absolute to be absolute presupposes a relative somewhere and in some forms, even the relative of its non-existence.

Jaina Logic of Anekanta is based not on abstract intellectualism but on experience and realism leading to a non-absolutistic attitude of mind. Multiplicity and unity, particularity and the Universality, eternality and non-eternality, definability and non-definability etc., which apparently seem to be contradictory characteristics of reality or object, are interpreted to coexist in the same object from different points of view without any offense to logic. All cognition be it of identity or

diversity or after all are valid. They seem to be contradictory of each other simply because one of them is mistaken to be the whole truth. In fact, "the integrity of truth consists in this very variety of its aspects, within the rational unity of an all comprehensive and ramifying principle." The charge of contradiction against the explicit, when knowledge is classified into Pramana (knowledge of a thing in its relation). This aspect of knowledge existing in relation to a number of things and being liable to be influenced by others is a fundamental feature of Jaina epistemology. Pramana is complete knowledge (sakaladesa) and Naya is Incomplete knowledge (vikaladesa). Other controversies between the two traditions of Jainism Agamic and the Logical, regarding the classification of knowledge are referred to elsewhere.

For clarification, it may be said that the terms 'immediacy and mediacy' are used in different sense than the common meaning and understanding. Jainas deny the immediate character of the ordinary perpetual knowledge like the western representationalists but unlike the Realists. "The knowledge is direct or indirect accordingly as it is born without or with the help of an external instrument different from the self."

However, to avoid sophistication and also bring their theory in line with others a distinction is made between really immediate and relatively immediate. The latter is empirically direct and immediate knowledge produced by the sense-organs and the mind.

Pramana and Naya represent roughly the absolute and the relative characters of knowledge respectively and taken together, as knowledge is constituent, it becomes non-absolutistic. A closer study of the theory of Pramana is defined as the knowledge of an object in all its aspects and since an object has innumerable characteristics it implies that if we know all. The universe is an interrelated whole. Nothing is an isolated phenomenon. Hence, right knowledge of the even one object will lead to the knowledge of the entire universe. This shows that our knowledge has got a relative character. This shows that our knowledge has got a relative character. This relativism is realistic. It not only asserts a plurality of determinate truths but also takes each truth to be an indetermination of alternative truths." These so many truths are really alternate truths, so it is a mistake of finding one absolute truth or even one cognition of the plurality of truths.

"If knowing is a unity, known is a plurality, the objective category being distinction or togetherness. If finally, knowledge is the object, refers to the known, the known must present an equivalent of this of relation or reference, a relation and its content." Intellectualistic abstractionism has to be given up and we should try to dehumanize the ideal and realize the real. The reality is not a rounded ready made whole or an abstract unity of many definite or determinate aspect but that "the so called unity is after all a manifold being only a name for fundamentally different aspects of truth which do not make an unity in any sense of the term." So far we know or can know, the making of truth and making of reality is one. Reality like truth is therefore definite-indefinite (anekanta). Its indefiniteness follows from the inexhaustible reserve of objective reality and its definiteness comes from the fact that it grows up into the reality of our own knowing which we make.

So we can fairly conclude that in Jainism, non-absolutism is not only a metaphysical but also an epistemological concept. There is no absolute reality, so there is no absolute truth.

Jainas believe that "when there is isolation and obstruction, there is everywhere, so far as the abstraction forgets itself unreality and error."

### **Distinction between Syadvada and Sarvajnata**

Syadvada is not the final truth. It is merely an attitude of knowledge. In fact, it simply helps us in arriving at the ultimate truth. Syadvada works or can work only in our practical life and it is therefore that the Jainas regard it as practical truth (Vyavahara Satya). Siddhasena Divakara points out this fact clearly in following verses -- i.e., without the help of Syadvada, we cannot execute our business in our practical life.



But there is another realm of truth which is not in any way partial or relative but absolute and which is the subject matter of omniscience or perfect knowledge.

Let us illustrate the point of difference between these two types of knowledge - Syadvada and Sarvajnata.

(a) The immediate effect of valid knowledge (Prama) is the removal of ignorance, the mediate effect of the absolute knowledge or Kevala-Jnana, is bliss and equanimity, which the mediate effect of practical knowledge or Syadvada is the facility to select or reject, what is conducive or not, for self realization Prama or Jnana is the right knowledge. The development of omniscience is necessarily accompanied by that of perfect or absolute happiness, being free from destructive Karmas. This happiness is independent of everything and hence eternal it is not physical but spiritual. It is not the pleasures of those senses which are in fact miseries, the cause of bondage and dangerous.

(b) Syadvada is so foundational to the Jaina Philosophy that it has been assigned a very high place in Jaina metaphysics of knowledge. It is said to be flawless, perhaps because it is associated with the great Mahavira. True "both Syadvada and Kevala-jnana (omniscient knowledge) illumine the whole reality, but the difference between them is that while the former illumines the object indirectly, the latter does it directly. Vidyananda further explaining the point stresses the fact that there is no contradiction between the two kinds of knowledge, since by 'illumining the whole reality', it means revolution of all the seven categories of self, not self etc. This attitude shows the spirit of Syadvada is so much ingrained in Jaina culture that it finds it difficult to assign Syadvada an inferior place than omniscience.

(c) A vital point of difference between Syadvada and omniscient knowledge is that while in the case of the former, one knows of all the objects of the world in succession, in the case of Kevala-jnana, the knowledge is simultaneous. By its every definition, omniscience means "an actual direct nonsensuous knowledge, the subject matter of which is all the substances in all their modifications at all the places and in all the times. The omniscient knowledge is regarded as simultaneous rather than successive, perhaps because it is successive, there can be no omniscience. Since the objects of the world in shape of past, present and future can never be exhausted, consequently knowledge will always remain incomplete.

But their might be difficulties even if we regard omniscient knowledge as simultaneous, such as the following --

- (1) The omniscient person comprehend contradictory things like heat and cold by a simple cognition which seems absurd. To this objection, it may be replied that contradictory things like heat and cold do exist at the same time, for example, where there is flash a simultaneous perception of the two contradictory things.
- (2) Then, if the whole world is known to the omniscient person, all at once, he has nothing to know any further, and so he will turn to be quite unconscious having nothing to know. To this, it may be said on behalf of the Jainas that the objection would have been valid if the perception of the omniscient person and the whole world were annihilated in the following instant. But both are everlasting, hence there is no absurdity in the Jaina position regarding the simultaneity of omniscient perception.

(d) The most fundamental difference between Syadvada and Sarvajnata or Kevala-jnana is that while the former "leads us to relative and partial truth where as omniscience to absolute truth." It comes within its own range. After all, Syadvada is an application of scriptural knowledge which determines the meaning of an object through the employment of one-sided Nayas, and the scriptural knowledge is a kind of mediate or indirect knowledge.

True, unlike Naya (knowledge of an aspect of a thing), Syadvada in it sweeps all the different nayas; but even then it never asserts that it is the absolute truth. In fact, Syadvada is merely an attitude of philosophizing which tells us that on account of infinite complexities of nature and limited capacity of our knowledge, what is presented is only a relative truth. Now, one can point out that if we combine the result of the seven Anekanta (non-absolutism) is non-absolute (Anekanta) in respect of Prama and Naya. Further, the distinction is made between Samyak-Anekanta and Mithya-Anekanta (i.e. Real and False non-absolutism) and it is held that

the real Anekanta is never absolute but always relative to something else. However, this is not the case with omniscience. It is the knowledge of the absolute truth.

(e) There is one more minor point of difference between Syadvada, knowledge and omniscience. Syadvada like ordinary knowledge rests on sense-perception, i.e., it is limited to our sense-organs only. But Kevala-jnana has no dependence on any sense and arises after destruction of obstructions. Ordinary individuals do not have this knowledge but only the Arhats, whose deluding (Mohaniya) Karmas are destroyed and the knowledge and Belief obscuring (Jnanavaraniya + Darsanavaraniya) Karmas are removed and the obstructive Karmas (Antarayas) are also destroyed.

Here, knowledge is acquired by the soul directly without the intervention of senses or signs, for in that case it would not have cognated all objects, for the senses can only stimulate knowledge of object which can be perceived by them. Here we find a complete absence of dependence upon anything except the soul. Jainas like the western Realists and Representationalists held that the ordinary sense-perception is really mediate in character and hence according to the Jainas, the transcendental perception (Kevala-jnana) is immediate along with Avadhi and Manah-paryaya, all of which do not require the help of the senses.

This attempt to free perception from the limitations of senses accords it a very high status and hence it is regarded as supreme knowledge characteristic of supreme state of self-realization and bliss.

## CONCLUSION

The following points have emerged out of the foregoing discussions :

(a) Importance of Anekanta Logic : Anekanta logic is as important as the absolute wisdom or omniscience. The loss caused by Anekanta or Syadvada by its being mediate is fully made up by its capacity to demonstrate the truth of the absolute wisdom to mankind. That is why it has been regarded as indispensable for common practical life. Not only this, it has been accorded a special religious status. Even Lord Mahavira's sermons are delivered through the technique of Syadvada, which is very much perfect technique of expressing the manifold nature of reality. This is the technique of the Victor and the perfect.

(b) The dual nature of Anekanta - Anekanta & Ekanta : Anekantavada is both Anekanta and Ekanta. It is ekanta in as much as it is an independent view point, it is anekanta because it is the sum total of view points. Anekanta may also become Ekanta, if it does not go against the right view of things. As the doctrine of Anekanta shows all possible sides of a thing and thus does not postulate about a thing in any fixed way, in the same way Anekanta itself is also subject to this possibility and other side-that is to say, it also sometimes assumes the form of one-sidedness. However, the Jainas do not have any objection even if their doctrine recalls on itself. On the contrary, it strengthens their position and shows the unlimited extent of the range.

(c) Beyond Anekanta : True, absolute wisdom is baseless without the Anekanta logic but to suppose that there is nothing beyond Syadvada in Jaina theory of knowledge, is wrong. The importance of Syadvada lies more in its analytical inquiry than in concrete results. It is a way of philosophizing rather than a ready-made metaphysics. The demand of higher spiritual life is the life of a Yogin, who realizes the complete unity of existence in his consciousness, transcending the sphere of the phenomena. He can view things sub-species aternitatis, through his pure insight and intuition. "He is in possession of absolute truth, transcending the realm of provisional truths." This is the state of supreme knowledge, free from all limitations, where "the soul vibrates at its natural rhythm and exercises its function of unlimiting knowledge." This is another name of pure perception or infinity in epistemology and mysticism in religion. This is an attitude of mind which involves a direct, immediate and first hand intuitive apprehension of the reality. Some Jaina teachers and another like Acarya Kunda-kunda and Yogindu are outspoken mystics. Their mysticism turns round two concepts - Atman and Paramatman (God but not creator). Paramatman in Jainism is nearer to that of

a personal Absolute and the different states of spiritual development are merely meditational stages being caused by sick-mindedness of the soul for its final deliverance. (d) From Anekanta to Advaitiya Omniscience : So far Jainism puts the highest value on the mystical experience of a Kevalin who transcends the realm of the phenomenal and reaches at the absolute truth, "it approaches very near Advaita Vedanta". Yogindu's identification between the spirit and the super spirit is a triumph of monism in the history of Indian religious thoughts. As the Vedantins distinguish between the higher and the lower knowledge, so here also we find a distinction between omniscience and Syadvada. However, inspite of many other similarities, there is one vital difference, in the Vedantic conception the objectivity is not outside the knower, while for Jaina omniscience, there is a complex external objectivity infinitely over both time and place and the individual self retains its individuality even in the search of omniscience and bliss.

(3) An Examination of Brahma-Sutra (11.2.33).

## ADVAITA TRENDS IN JAINISM

### Avidya : The Cause of Bondage

Spiritualism is an essential feature of Indian mind. It always endeavors after spiritual light or the vision of truth. Hence the Vedic prayer - "lead me from falsity to Truth, from darkness to light, from death to immortality." Bondage is the process of birth and rebirth, the consequent miseries. Liberation therefore is the stoppage of this process. The vision of truth is the vision of freedom. Ignorance therefore is the cause of the bondage.

This is the principle which acts as the hindrance against the apprehension of truth, obstructs our innate capacity to know the truth. This is our degeneration or descent. Hence knowledge is essential for liberation and hence the prayer.

The seeds of Vedantic (Advaitic) thought can be traced in the Upanisads, where Avidya is perversity of vision and attachment to the world. Maya is the cosmic force that brings forth the world of plurality. If the Maya conditions the universe, Avidya keeps one attached to it. There is Maya because there is Avidya. To Gaudapada, Maya is the cosmic illusion and the avidya the individual. However the freedom is the goal. But this freedom is only through knowledge (Jnanat-eva-tu-Kaivalyam) without knowledge there is no emancipation (Rte-Jnananna Mukti). The purpose of man (is effected) through the mere knowledge of Brahman thus Badarayana opines. He who knows the self, overcomes grief. He who knows that highest Brahman, becomes even Brahman. He who knows Brahman, attains the highest. Moksa is the absence of false knowledge says Padmapada. This insight, this changed attitude to life and its happenings is not so much a condition of Moksa, as Moksa itself. The cause of pain is simply error or false knowledge. The Jaina term for Avidya is Mithyatva. Knowledge downs only after the destruction of darkness. So the path of freedom is the path of knowledge. Knowledge therefore is the first of the 'Three Jewels'. The soul is inherently perfect and has infinite potentiality. It is self luminous. It shines as the sun. But there are clouds and fogs of Karma. So the moment the clouds disappear, the sun comes into its own different views regarding the nature of Mukti - positivistic and Negativistic. The Buddhists, the Naiyayikas, the Samkhyas, Yoga and the Purva-Mimamsa, hold that in the State of Mukti there is complete absence of miseries but not the attainment of some positive happiness. The Jainas and the Vedantins do hold that the State of Mukti is the state of double blessedness. There is first the end of miseries and then there is also the attainment of Positive bliss. This is because the self possesses infinite knowledge, Power and bliss. Here comes a difficulty. If Moksa is the result of spiritual discipline, it can not be eternal, if otherwise it is beyond attainment. Vedanta solves this difficulty. To the Advaitins Moksa is the

realization of identity of Jiva and Brahman. It is not something to be attained afresh. It is 'Praptasya Praptih', so says the Upanisads 'That Thou art' and not "That Thou become", Since Brahman besides Sat and Cit is also Ananda so Jiva becomes Anandamaya when it realizes it. Bliss and knowledge are identical. Thus liberation is a positive bliss besides cessation of all kinds of miseries. To conclude with Mandana, mere absence of misery is not happiness because misery and happiness, may be experienced together by a person merged in a cool tank with the scorching sun above.

### **Nature of Soul**

The concept of bondage and liberation follows from the concept of the soul. For the self is prior to all, bondage and liberation, truth and falsehood. Its existence is self-proved, it can not be doubted, for it is the essential nature of him who doubts it. It is known in immediate perception, prior to all proof. It is logical postulate. Metaphysically the conception of self-existence implies that the self is eternal, immutable and complete. So far Jainism and Advaita Vedanta affirm the existence of self.

Again we find that self is conscious, both in Vedanta and in Jainism, when bondage is the Soul's Association with the body through ignorance, soul is something other than the physical self. Self is the pure existence which is not only uncontradicted but also uncontradictably. this persists through all its states. The moment we try to negate we affirm. Then this pure existence is also pure consciousness. Therefore the Atman is nothing other than the consciousness. However, this consciousness is not the flux of states, a stream of consciousness. It is an universal and eternal consciousness. It is undifferentiated consciousness alone (Nirvisesa Cinmatram) or pure consciousness with no difference of knower, knowledge, the known, infinite, transcendent, the essence of absolute knowledge. Coming to the Jaina conception of soul, we find that as Jiva is also a substance or Satta is real or existence. However the most important characteristics of Jiva (like the Vedanta) is consciousness or Upayoga. So it is co-extensive with knowledge. Further, as in the Vedanta we find the Soul described as eternal, Pure, Self-illuminated, free, real, supremely blissful, infinite (Nitya, Suddha, Buddha, Mukta, Satya, Paramananda), so also is Jainism.

### **Atman Paramatman**

The career of the individual self sketched by Sankara is exactly parallel to the sketch given by Jaina Metaphysics. There are two kinds of Self, recognized in Jainism - Pure or Swa-samaya or Ego-in-itself and Para-Samaya or Empirical Ego. Ego-in-itself is the same as the Paramatman of Upanisads or Brahman of Vedanta. Sankara calls the ultimate reality as Paramatman or the Supreme-Self. To Sankara Paramatman and Brahman are inter-changeable terms. The doctrine of identifying Jivatma and Paramatma is common to both the Upanisads and the Jaina thought. In this connection it is worth pointing out that both Kunda-kunda and Sankara used the word 'Advaita' the indication of the oneness of Jivatman and Paramtma." It is the individual Self which is the doer, the enjoyer, the sufferer. The Atman clothed in the Upadhis is the Jiva which enjoy, suffers and acts from both of which conditions, the highest soul is free. Paramatma Prakasa of Yogindu strikes a more idealistic note when it says that it is the internal by leaving everything external that becomes the Supreme Soul. Paramatman is peace, happiness and bliss.

The doctrine of three-fold individuality (external, internal and the supreme) is supported by Kunda-kunda, Yogindu, Pujya-pada, Amrtacandra and Gunabhadra etc. Similarly in non-Jaina literature, in the doctrine of Pancakosa of the Upanisad. However, these are ultimately one. Atman is nothing but sentinancy, knowledge and bliss. The Atman itself is Paramatman. Paramatman was called Atman only because of Karmic limitations. Yogindu Superspirit or

Paramatman represents the ultimate point of spiritual evolution, which is above subject and object.

However, there is no denying the fact that inspired by vast similarity, we still miss the monistic and pantheistic grandeur of the Upanisadic Brahman in the Jaina conception of paramatman. The assertion of the Jainas about the Plurality of Selves, is apparently in contra-distinction with the Advaitic thought. However, this is not quite in conformity with other Jaina texts or Jaina view of substance or reality. Substance is that which always exists as the universe, which has neither beginning nor end. Substance is one (as a class). It is inherent essence of things. It manifests itself through diverse forms. What is not different from Satta or Substance, that is called Dravya which is derived from the root 'Dru' meaning 'to flow'. It is non-different from substance or existence. It is reality. Kunda-kunda goes to the extent that there is neither origination (Utpada) nor decay (vyaya or Vinasa) but eternal and immutable. Origination and decay etc. concerns the Paryayas of the substances not the substances itself. According to Umaswati, the definition of Reality or existence or substance is Sat (Existence). 'Reality is substance' and 'Substance is reality' or 'Reality is existence' or Satta. So existence is reality or reality is existence. This is to say that all is one because all exists. So says Sthananga-sutra that there is 'One Soul', 'One Universe' (Ege Aya, Ege Loe). Thus we see that we are very near to the Upanisadic or Vedantic conception of absolute idealism.

However, a dualistic bias of the Jainas lead them to demarcate between ideal existence and Material existence, which is only illogical. Reality is reality, Existence is existence. It is all inclusive. There is no distinction of subject and object. The concept of such an all pervading existence can only be ideal. The Jaina canons being too crude could not solve this apparent dualism. hence posited Jiva-Dravya and Ajiva-Dravya, but in Umaswati and Kunda-kunda we do not find such an apparent gulf between reality and reality. Thus Jainism can not escape monism in the last analysis. While they are opposed to each other, they do not seem to be opposed to the Unity which is a synthesis of opposite. Mere Jiva and Ajiva, Spirit and Matter are abstractions. They are moments of one universal. This is the concrete universal - a reality at once divided and united. This is unity in diversity or identity-in-difference.

Yogindu and Kunda-kunda equates Atman with Parmatman. The separateness and individuality of a Jiva is only from the point of view of Vyavahara or experience. Plurality of souls is a relative conception - which reality presents when we lay stress on sensations, feelings and bondage. There is no need to deny plurality of the Jivas at the psychological level. But in Philosophy, Psychological and practical levels are not all. Logic is the hard task-master. Pluralism and Relativism are the two features of a first analysis of common experience and Jainism stops short of it, disregarding its implications. Plurality may be existence or actual. But it is not real. Similarly infinite is inherent in the finite. We cannot sustain the hypothesis of relativism without an absolute.

Thus we find great similarity between Advaita and Jainism. Prof. A. Chakravarti gives a unique proof of it. He says that Sankara enumerates various schools he considers erroneous as Buddha, Samkhya, Yoga, Vaisheshika and Pasupata etc. regarding the nature of soul. It is strange that he does not mention the Jaina account of self as one of the erroneous views. Perhaps the Jaina concept of Self and the world appearance has no permanent illusion for all the people, but each person creates for himself his own illusion. From this follows the doctrine of Drsti-vada, i.e. the theory that the subjective perception is the creating of the objects and that there are no other objective phenomena apart from subjective and perception. Even in the Upanisads there is distinction between Atman and Jivas. And the theory of Eka-Jiva-Vada sometimes goes against the Upanisads and the Brahma-Sutras.

### **Doctrine of Standpoints**

Thus to speak of a thing as one or many is entirely dependent upon the point of view we adopt. Sankara says that though Devadatta is one, he is thought and spoken as a man, a Brahmin, a



learned in the Vedas, generous, boy, youngman, old man, father, son, grandson, brother, son-in-law etc. from different standpoints. This is very similar to the Jaina theory of Syadvada or Asti-Nasti-Vada. Even in the Upanisads we have glimpses of how reality reveals itself in different ways at different stages of our knowledge. This distinction of standpoints is a common feature of Vedanta (Sankara) and Jainism. Sankara distinguishes ultimate reality from practical reality. Vyavahara view is useful, essential so far it leads to the realistic view-point. Just as a non-Aryan can not be made to understand except through the medium of his non-Aryan language so the knowledge of the absolute can not be communicated to the ordinary people except through the vyavahara point of view, But in itself it is in-sufficient. He must rise higher. Kunda-kunda therefore examines every problem from these two points of view in dealing with problems of an empirical life and the real point of view in dealing with supreme reality transcending limitations of the empirical life. So to transcend the lower is not to ignore it. Hegel has recognized it; Spinoza has accepted it. James has prescribed it; Bergson admitted it; Plato affirmed it; Vedas and Upanisads have proclaimed it; Buddhists and many others formulated it; Jainas and Advaita too have recommended it. Deussen rightly says that "the Para-vidya is nothing but metaphysics in an empiric dress, i.e., Vidya as it appears considered from the standpoint of Avidya, the realism innate in us. Thus the distinction between the practical and real standpoint of view is a common feature of Vedanta and Jainism, may even of Buddhism of the Upanisads.

### **Concept of Omniscience**

Our phenomenal knowledge suggests the noumenal as a necessity of thought but not as something known to through the empirical pramanas. Owing to the apparent inadequacy of empirical knowledge, Jainism and Vedantins have developed another organon of knowledge. Not content with Mati, Sruta, Avadhi and Manah-paryaya, Jainas have developed the theory of Keval-jnana or omniscience which is the highest type of perception which falls in the category of extra-sensory perception, where the soul intuitively knows all substances with all their modes. Nothing remains unknown in omniscience. Self and knowledge are co-extensive. Its apprehension is simultaneous sudden and ubiquitous. This is practically the same as intuition or integral experience, Anubhava or Saksatkara (Direct perception), Samyag Jnana, i.e., perfect knowledge or Samyag Darsana (Perception-intuition) in Advaita Vedanta. Omniscience is the culmination of the faculty of cognition of conscious principle. It is the full manifestation of the innate nature of a conscious self, emerging on the total cessation of all obstructive veils, is called 'that' (intuition) transcendent and pure. Jaina literature is full of discussion on omniscience. There are various proofs for it. Inductively, the gradation of knowledge implies omniscience. So says Hemchandra that the proof of it follows from the proof of the necessity of the final consummation of the progressive development of knowledge and other grounds. Metaphysically, complex and manifold objectivity implies some extraordinary perception. Psychologically, differences in intelligence etc. presupposes omniscience. Religious-Mystical argument proves omniscience on the basis of religio-mystical experience. Logically, on account of the lack of contradictory proofs, omniscience is established. What Vedanta puts negatively, Jainism puts positively. Vedanta links omniscience with misery and Jaina links omniscience with eternal bliss. The Vedanta annihilates omniscience by submerging the individual into the universal while Jaina says that individual itself becomes universal. The Jainas hold that each and every entity is related to all entities. Nothing is wholly independent. Nothing is intelligible by itself. So logically the perfect knowledge of one thing means the perfect knowledge of all things. Jacobi has quoted an old Jaina Stanza "one who knows one thing, knows all and he alone who knows all things knows everything completely."

This is the culmination of enlightenment, soul-knowledge in its pristine form, perception par-excellence. It does not depend upon any senses (Atindriya) and arises after destruction of all obstruction.

This is relativism par-excellence. To an omniscient the limitation of Syadvada or conditional predication logically cannot bind. He is all knowing. The veil of ignorance is lifted which obscures vision. Thus here we see that the theory of relativity presupposes the hypothesis of an absolute.



The very consciousness of our relativity means we have to reach out a fuller conception. A mere pooling of the contributions of the different standpoints (Naya) will not lead us to the truth in itself. Truth is not a haphazardous jumbling up of its every bits but is a harmonious whole. Dr. Raju holds that "their (Jainas) doctrine is a doctrine of the relativity of knowledge". They hold "there is reality; its nature is such and such. still, it is possible to understand it in quite opposite ways". But to the omniscient there would not be relative but absolute and unconditional knowledge. Thus relativism as logically pushed forward leads to absolutism. The moment we accept that there is intuitional knowledge of the Kevalin, which is higher than thought, we are led to monism absolute and unlimited.

### **Theory of Causation**

Following the doctrine of identity between the cause and the effect, Acarya Kunda-kunda maintains (consistent with Jaina Metaphysics) that the Cetana cause can produce non-cetana effects. Strangely enough the Advaita-Vedanta which maintains the Brahman to be the ultimate cause of all reality also maintains the spirit and the matter seem to be opposed to each other they do not seem to be opposed to the unity which is a synthesis of opposites. Again, each portion of matter may be conceived as like a garden full of plants, or like a pond full of fishes. There is nothing fallow, nothing sterile, nothing dead in the universe. Considered from this point of view Jainism comes very near to Vedanta.

### **Conclusion**

The different categories, thus viewed as functional variations of one principle, are no longer in a position of antagonism or indifferent isolation. It seems legitimate to conclude that the universe is one existence which manifest itself, as substance as it unifies the modes and attributes. It is one universe that the Jaina metaphysics gives us. All is one because all exists. So we find in the Sthananga-sutra such utterance as 'Ege Aya; Ege loe', 'One Universe, One soul'. But unfortunately the Jaina Metaphysics was not allowed to develop along this line. So says Radhakrishnan, "it is only by stopping short at a half-way house that Jainism is able to set forth a pluralistic realism."

Since these two substances are interdependent, the dualism must in its turn and finally be resolved in a monism. Any way whether Jainism can be transmuted into Advaita or not it is certain that there are obvious Advaita trends in Jainism.

## **NATURE OF UNCONDITIONALITY IN SYADVADA**

(1) Ahimsa, Anekantavada and Syadvada - Jainism is a great experiment in Ahimsa (non-violence) in world, deed and thought, Infinite knowledge, faith, power and bliss are the innate characters of every soul. What is needed is external non-interference. The doctrine of Anekantavada (non-absolutism) is simply an extension of Ahimsa in the field of reality. When things have many characters (anantadharmatmakam), naturally they are objects of all-sided knowledge. Any particular object can be viewed from different points of view. So when we speak of a particular aspect, we have to use the word 'syat' i.e., from a particular point of view, or as related to this aspect, this objects is such and not otherwise. So Syadvada is the doctrine of Relativity of Judgment which is born out of the non-violent and non-absolutistic attitude of the Jainas, which, led to the uttermost cautiousness of speech of "explaining problems with the help of Siyavaya (Syadvada) or Vibhajjavaya. Our thought is relative. Our expressions are relative. Thus the doctrines of Ahimsa, Anekantavada and Syadvada are organically related.

(2) Syadvada : A form of Scepticism - Scepticism 'denies the possibility of knowledge', said James Iverach. It starts from 'no more such than such' and ends in 'we know not where, why and whence'. It doubts or denies the very possibility of knowledge. But the position taken by Jainism is this "there is reality; its nature is such and such' still it is possible to understand it in quite opposite ways." Prof.K.C.Bhattacharya who gives indeterministic interpretation of this theory clearly says that the Jainas "the theory of indeterministic truth is not a form of scepticism. It represents, no doubt, but toleration of many modes of truth." Prof.Kalidas Bhattacharya, who tries to interpret Anekantavada from alternative standpoint also holds that "the Syadvadin is quite definitely assertive so far as asti, nasti etc. are concerned." This is a form of realism which asserts a plurality of determinate truths and they have thus developed a wonderful organon of Saptabhangi or the seven-fold pluralistic doctrine of Jaina dialectics. True, every judgment bears the stamp of relativity, but this relativity does never mean uncertainty. In fact, this theory of seven-fold predication is 'derived from Jaina ontology that reality is determinate'.

(3) Is Non-absolutism Absolute - Put into the dialectics of the seven-fold predication, the negation of non-absolutism (i.e. non-absolutism does not exist) is equivalent to the affirmation of absolutism. If non-absolutism is, it is not universal since there is one real which is absolute; if non-absolutism is itself non-absolute, it is not an absolute and universal fact : thus "tossed between the two horns of the dilemma non-absolutism simply evaporates."

But we should remember that every proposition of dialectical seven-fold judgment is either Complete or Incomplete. In complete judgment "we use only word that describes one characteristic of that object, and hold the remaining characters to be identical with it." On the other hand, in Incomplete Judgment (Naya) we speak of truth as relative to our standpoints, hence a partial knowledge. "Hence the non-absolute is constituted of absolutes as its elements and as such would not be possible if there were no absolute."

(4) Is Conditional Judgment Unconditional - We have seen that every judgment is true but conditionally or relatively. But the statement that 'all propositions are conditional' "all statements including even the statement that 'all statements are conditional' would be conditional." But the Jainas insists that all propositions except the proposition of its own system have, relative truth. They say that all seven alternatives are true and so their seven-fold conditioned predication is an all comprehensive categorical statement. True, they treat the alternatives as mutually exclusive, they are nevertheless making a categorical judgment. Does this mean that their doctrine is the doctrine of relativity of knowledge but not of relativity of truth ? Yes, the Jainas do hold that their own system is absolutely true. But if knowledge is relative, our knowledge of reality also can have only relative truth.

So we come to this statement that 'every statement is conditional' may in sense be taken as unconditional. This is unconditionally in conditionality, or absolutism in non-absolutism. When the Jainas say that 'every thing is conditional', they are unconditional to this extent that 'every thing is conditional'. Now, does this not mean self-contradiction or complete overthrowing of the absolutistic position ?

Let us analyze, "A categorical judgment asserts an actual fact absolutely" in which the relation between the subject and the predicate is simple and unconditional one. Now, in the above proposition, 'every proposition is conditional', the relation between 'every proposition' (i.e. subject) and 'conditional' (predicate) is apparently unconditional, but there is no clash between its unconditionality and conditionality.

For example, when Bhattacharya say that consciousness associated with ignorance is the Self, on account of such Sruti passages, "During dreamless sleep the Atman is undifferentiated consciousness." Even in the waking state a man says - 'I do not know myself' though he is aware of his own existence. 'I had no knowledge' means that I have at least 'the knowledge of having no knowledge'. But here there is no clash between knowledge and ignorance, hence no contradiction.

Similarly in Logic, we have disjunctive judgments - "The signal is either red or green", "A man is either good or bad" etc., we do mean something categorical behind them. But this categoricity

is not like the categoricity of a simple unconditional judgment, 'The horse is red'. True, the basis is always categorical but this categoricity does never clash with the proposition being disjunctive.

When a logical positivist says that "there is no metaphysics and reality may come through the back-door. Like "Hydra they raise their heads over and over again, not to be destroyed afresh, but to conquer a new."

In the conclusion we may say that the unconditionality in the statement, 'All statements are conditional', is quite different from the normal conditionality. This is how and why ?

(5) Senses, Reason and Faith - There are primarily two sources to understand the world - senses and reason. Closely connected and corresponding to them there are two grades of Reality - existence and essence (as the existentialists will say) or existence and reality (as the Hegelians will say). Existence is actuality, or actual verification. This is unconditional, absolute and categorical. There is no alternation or condition, being monistic and unilateral in attitude. But there is another thing thought. Thought is rational thought or simply reason. Thought gives us essences. However, this interpretation is not verification. There may be alternative essences or hypothesis in terms of each, which the world can be interpreted. Thought therefore is not concerned with existence, but with essences, and there is always the possibility of alternative essences or hypothesis. This is exactly what we mean, when we say that 'everything is conditional'. To thought or reason thus, every thing is conditional or alternative.

But we cannot live in the world of thought alone; we cannot forget existence. But this attitude to existence must be other than thought or reason and what is other than thought or reason must be unreason or irrationality. This irrationality leads us to existence, which as such is unconditional. Behind reason there is always the unreason. We can give the name of faith to this phenomenon as Kant, Herder, Jacobi etc., have suggested. There are many grounds of faith - one being the scripture. Scripture differs from one another. Jainas must stick to their own position. Here is definiteness. However, we cannot expect such definiteness, on the other side. Reason only differs from one another. Jainas must stick to their own position. Here is definiteness. However, we cannot expect such definiteness on other side. Reason only offers alternative pictures - Jaina, Advaita, Vaishesika etc., all are equally possible. But do we always obey the command of reason ? No, we have also own interest on irrationality. Hence, in order to avoid indefiniteness etc., we stick to one such possibility which is chosen for us by the community to which we belong or by some superior intuition. Thus there comes unconditionality. However, another may choose another possibility as existence if he belongs to another community or if his genius moves in another direction. So there appears to be again alternation among existence. But this alternation is not genuine. There is alternation only so far as we think. There is alternation only on thought level. We compare thought with other thoughts. And, what is comparison ? Comparison involves thinking and reasoning, so it is thought process. Some are bound to admit alternation. My standpoint is only a possible one. But I cannot always fly in the air of possibilities, I must have moorings in some one definite form of actuality. I must adopt one standpoint.

## **Conclusion**

Jainism is against all kinds of imperialism in thought. For each community there is a special absolute. But the absolute themselves are alternations so far as they are possible. But this is only on thought level. But when I have chosen one it is more than possible, it is existence or actual. So there is a wonderful reconciliation between conditionality and unconditionality. Every thing is conditional on thought level, but not on the level of existence. Thus there is no real contradiction.

## AN EXAMINATION OF BRAHMA-SUTRA

( II. 2. 33)

( From the Jaina Standpoint )

Aphorism & Contradiction - The aphorism under examination seems to be an innocent statement about the Law of Contradiction. However, the purpose of this aphorism is to examine the Jaina logic of seven paralogsms, which is declared to be a wrong theory on the ground of the impossibility of the presence of contradictory qualities in one and the same substance.

However, I think that many of the misgivings could have been avoided had there been a sincere effort to understand the Jaina point-of-view more sympathetically by trying to realize the importance of what is called, 'universe of discourse'. For, even the Law of contradiction means that two contradiction terms B and not B cannot both be true at the same time of one and the same thing A. In other words, two contradictory propositions can not both be true, i.e. one must be false. A man can not at the same time, be 'alive' and 'dead'. This means that the products of thought should be free from inconsistency and Contradiction, i.e., valid in Hamilton's sense. However, Mill goes ahead and holds that it must also be true, i.e., agree with the reality of things. It means that "before dealing with a judgment or reasoning expressed in language, the import of its terms should be fully understood, in other words, logical postulates to be allowed to state explicitly in language all that is implicitly contained in thought." The Pragmatists also complain against 'Formal Logic' for its neglect of the 'context'. Even Mathematical Logicians, according to whom, there is "no essential connection between connotation and denotation" admit the conception of a Universe of Discourse in the sense of 'a given context, or range of significance'.

The Four-cornered Negation and Contradiction - The four-cornered negation of the Madhyamika Buddhists throws light on the problem. According to them, Reality is not (neither B, nor not B nor both B and not B, nor neither B and not B). Now, if Reality is, neither being nor non-being can be negated. But, the Madhyamikas hold that though the Reality is not Being or Non-being it can not be different from them. Thus even the neither nor (i.e. neither Being nor non-Being) has to be negated, and consequently there has to be a double negation.

This looks like violating the Law of Contradiction, for the denial of the contradictories suggests the possibility of a possible in between the two contradictories. Professor Raju, however, suggests a technical device for the relief of the Buddhists to meet this charge of the possible violation of the Law of Contradiction. In the doctrine of four-cornered negation if we distinguish between contrary and contradictory opposition in the manner of western logic, we will see that two contraries can be negated but not the two contradictories.

Law of Contradiction and the Advaita Vedanta - To Sankara, Being and Non-being are contraries not contradictories. Reality is Being; Non-being is unreal; but there is the third order of reality which is neither Being nor Non-being, This is the phenomenal word which is neither real nor unreal but phenomenal, this is Maya.

To illustrate this point, a reference to the Upanisadic account of the self would be instructive, self is mobile and yet immobile, distant yet near, transcendent yet immanent." Sankara, in his interpretation of this verse anticipates the objections of his opponents with regard to the question : how these contradictory predications are made about the same subject ? Sankara says that there is no fallacy here (naisadosah) because two contradictory statements have been made from two separate standpoints. Atman is said to be immobile and one viewed from the ultimate point of view, when the Atman is free from all conditions. But it can also be described as mobile (more mobile than mind itself) when it is associated with the powers of limiting adjunct, of being an internal organ. Similarly, Atman is described as far and distant because it is beyond the reach of the ordinary mind, but for the wise people, it is described as being there within (tadanrasya sarvasya). Similar statements with contradictory predications are found at other places and Sankara has no other alternative but to reconcile them with the help of his multi-valued logic, the

merit of which he unfortunately forgets while criticizing the Jaina theory of affirmative-negative-predications (asti-nasti-vada). However, if we remember the Jaina doctrine of reality as identity-in-difference which is both a permanent and changing entity manifesting through constant change of appearance and disappearance, then we can easily understand that reality when looked at as the underlying permanent substance may be described as permanent, but when viewed from the point of view of the modes (paryaya) which appear and disappear, it may be described as non-permanent and changing. This difference of aspect is the well known Jaina doctrine of Naya. It is indeed a tragedy that Sankara, while making a distinction between the Vyavaharika and Paramarthika points of view throughout his commentary forgets the same in respect of Jainism. In common experience, we find in the same object, the existence of one thing (pot) and the non-existence of the other (cloth). This does not mean that the same thing is both pot and cloth, hence there is no contradiction. Examples of co-existing self-contradictory attributes are daily perceived but only from different points of view. For example, in the same tree, the trunk is stationary while the branches and leaves are in motion. Like Kunda-kunda, Sankara examines every problem from the two points of view, practical and real, and this doctrine is the supporting edifice of the Advaita Philosophy. The same material clay or gold may be transformed into various forms. So to speak of a thing as one or many entirely depends upon the points of view we adopt. The same substance 'mud' is spoken differently as jar, jug. etc. Devadutta although one only, forms the object of many different names and notions according as he is considered in himself or in his relation to others; thus, he is thought and spoken of as a man, Brahmin, son, grandson, etc. Does it not exactly look like the Jaina point of view of asti-nasti-vada ?

**Ramanuja and Contradiction** - Like Sankara, Ramanuja also criticizes Jaina theory of seven paralogsms. No doubt, he recognizes substances and attributes as distinct but he says that asti and nasti cannot be predicated of the same thing from the Dravya point of view alone, i.e., the same substance cannot have the two contradictory predicates. In spite of this, Ramanuja seems to be very much prejudiced against the Jaina theory when he asks : How can we say that the same thing is and is not at the same time ? However, Ramanuja forgets that if we describe a thing both from the standpoint of underlying substance (dravya) and its modifications (paryaya), we shall have no such difficulty. We meet with these difficulties because we prefer to live in the world of empty abstractions. In a sense, the Vedantic metaphysics of Ramanuja is the doctrine of one and many. It is one when we talk of the one Absolute Brahman, it is many when we know about the multiple jivas and the multiverse. And when reality is one and many at the same time, Vedantism itself becomes a sufficient argument in favor of Syadvada. How does the Absolute, which is one and only one, become the all ? How can the one Brahman consist of both conscious (cit) and unconscious (acti) elements ? If these contradictions can be reconciled by Ramanuja, he should not find fault with the very logical calculus of reconciliation adopted by the Jaina doctrine. Thus Ramanuja's attempt to discover contradictions in Syadvada destroys the entire edifice of his metaphysics itself. Anekantavada pleads for soberness and loyalty to experience which discards absolutism. The dual nature of things is proved by a reduction-ad-absurdum of the canons of logic. the concept of pure logic which is prior to end absolutely independent of experience is dangerous. "Logic is to systematize and rationalize what experience offers". In one word logic must be loyal to reason and experience alike. Even Vedanta ultimately relies on experience to prove the reality of the triune principle of existence, consciousness and bliss.

**Some other Vedantic Acharyas and Contradiction** - According to Vijñānabhikṣu, unless the qualitative differences (prakārabheda) are recognized as true, two fundamentally opposite differences are recognized as true, it amounts to the Vedantic position. But can we not ask the Vedantist : how can ultimate differences be reconciled with the ultimate identity of Brahman ? Either they should accept identity as ultimate or differences as ultimate by accepting the differences from relative standpoints. We can speak of existence (bhava) and non-existence (abhava) of the same thing from two standpoints without being inconsistent. Existence and non-existence coexisting in the same thing is said to be contradictory because both of them are taken as whole-characteristics. It can be well reconciled by taking them as part-characteristics. Vallabha also suffers from the same defect as Vijñānabhikṣu when he insists upon the fact that differences can be reconciled only in the enjoyment of bliss. However, it is difficult to follow how



the formless Brahman assumes different forms, how the One becomes many ? If the law of contradiction is not violated here, the same charge cannot be leveled against the Jaina position when the contradictory attributes are said to inhere in the same object from the different relative standpoints.

Srikantha has clearly misunderstood the Jaina standpoint itself. While he accepts the possibility of reconciliation of the contradictory attributes in the same object from different standpoints, he outright denies that Jainas ever adhere to the relativistic logic.

Lastly, Nimbarka and Bhaskara, who broadly accept the Jaina principle of identity-in-difference or unity in diversity with regard to the nature of reality, also fail to appreciate the true import of Jaina principle. Nimbarka, for instance, refuses to admit the application of this principle in matters of Syadvada. His commentator Sri Nivasacarya's explanation becomes unphilosophical when he says that the justification for admitting the principle of identity in-difference lies in the Sruti and not in logic.

Bhaskara argues that if non-absolutism (Anekanta) is universal, it becomes absolute (ekanta); if not, it is nothing definite. Thus "tossed between the two horns of the dilemma non-absolutism thus evaporates". However, Bhaskara fails to note the Jaina distinction between valid non-absolute (samyak-aneanta) and invalid non-absolute (mithya-aneanta). To be valid, anekanta must not be absolute but relative. The doctrine of non-absolutism can be interpreted either as absolute according to Pramana or Naya respectively, which only suggests that non-absolutism is not absolute unconditionally. But the unconditionality of Anekanta or Syadvada is quite different from the normal meaning of unconditionality. This is like the idea contained in the expression "I do not know myself", where there is no contradiction because there is no contradiction between knowledge and ignorance. Similarly, in the sentence, 'I am undecided', there is at least one decision that 'I am undecided'. As a matter of fact, these critics of Syadvada fail to appreciate the fact that everything is possible only in relation to and as distinct from something other. Contradictory characteristics of reality are interpreted as to coexistent in the same object from different points of view without any offense to logic.

## KARMIC IDEALISM OF THE JAINAS

Karma is the matrix of the universe which undergoes evolution due to karma. Karma is not only the ground-mass of individual's destiny but also the mould in which anything and everything takes shape.

(1) Karma is generally regarded as the principle of determination of the individual's destiny, his well-being and suffering. But a careful study will show that karma is also the ultimate determinant of the various courses of events. There are three reasons for this : first, the problem of individual happiness and suffering is not an isolated affair, because it is somehow related to the entire universe. The past karma puts a world before the individual which brings appropriate pleasure and pain to him. In short, karma determines both his heredity and environment. Secondly, even Time, Nature, Matter, etc., are not outside the scope of karma and they are merely the different expressions of the working of the universal law of karma. Thirdly, karma is the principle of determination of the world. the variation in matter and time can only be ascribed to karma if we are to avoid the defects of Temporalism (Kalavada), Naturalism (Syabhavavada), Determinism (Niyativada), Accidentalism (Yadrcchavada), Materialism (Bhautikavada), Scepticism and Agnosticism (Samsayavada and Ajnanavada), etc.

(2) According to the popular and traditional scheme of Jaina classification of Karmas, they are of eight fundamental types. The different karmas determine our faith (darsana), knowledge (jnana), feeling (vedana), delusion (moha), age knowledge (jnana), feeling (vedana) status (gotra) and power (antaraya). In short, the karmas determine the entire personal-social set-up of the

individual, and they also condition a world set-up for him. Of course, in the Leibnizian manner, the set-up is different for everybody. The Jainas also believe that the effects of karma are different upon different individuals in accordance with the nature (prakṛti), duration (sthiti), intensity of fruition (anubhaga) and quantity (pradesa) of karmas. It is true that in the list of enumeration of various types and sub-types of karmas, we do not find a satisfactory explanation as to why any of this is this and not otherwise. But the Jaina thinkers try to uphold the relevance of karma-theory to the minutest details of life. For instance, the nama-karma is said to be of forty-two kinds with sub-classes of ninety-three kinds as they bring about their respective effects. This demonstrates the anxiety of the Jainas to ascribe anything and everything to some or other form of Karma. In other words, this is to assert the doctrine of universal causation known as Karmavada.

(3) I think, this may be interpreted as a sort of Idealism, known as Karmic Idealism, which will be distinct and different from both Subjective and Objective Idealism. A rough comparison, however, may be made with Kantian Idealism, where there is a construction of categories. But here the categories are not created by the understanding. They are only related to the understanding. That way, even the Nyaya-Vaisesikas have said that generality and particularity are relative to our understanding. In fact, samanya and visesa are pure objective categories but they only point out that there is some sort of relativity, but this relativity is objective and not subjective. Hence, we can conclude that Karmic Idealism is not a form of subjective Idealism. Nor is it eternal co-existence of matter and mind as independent principles of reality. The union of soul and matter is regarded as self-proved and hence the eternal bondage of soul and karmic matter is described as its very nature, as dirt in golden ore. This is the starting point of Jainism.

(4) However, in the ordinary sense of the term, we cannot speak of karmic idealism because karma, in the Jaina philosophy, is not an 'idea'. It is an aggregate of very fine imperceptible material particles. It is the foreign element that infects the purity and perfection of the soul, which has consciousness as its distinguishing feature. This is the doctrine of the material nature of karma, which is peculiar to Jainism. With other systems of Indian philosophy, karma is formless. But the Jainas regard karma as the crystallized effect of the past activities or energies. They say that "in order to act and react and thereby to produce changes in things on which they work, the energies must have to be metamorphosed into form or centers of forces." Like begets like. The cause is like the effect. The effect, i.e., the body is physical, hence the cause, i.e., karma has indeed a physical form.

The karmic-matter is one of the six kinds of matter or pudgala. It is very fine and imperceptible, but it is capable of becoming matter. The material molecules or varjanas are molecule-groups of the same kind of matter. There are twenty three kinds of such varjanas of which the thirteenth is the karmic-molecule or karma-varjanas. There is an intricate arithmetic about the number of karmic molecules. The material nature of karma is quite evident.

(5) But even if karma is considered to be physical in nature, it has a tendency to determine psychic characteristics. "It has the peculiar property of developing the effects of merit and demerits." Then karmas are of two kinds, physical or dravya-karma and ideal or bhava-karma. The thought of the spiritual activity is bhava-karma whereas the actual matter flowing into the soul and binding it is called dravya-karma. The bhava-karmas may be compared with the saṃskaras or latent tendencies of other systems. The Nyaya view of pravṛtti (activity) and the Yoga concept of vṛtti (modifications) are very near to it. As our saṃskaras or latent tendencies determine our overt actions, life and personality, so bhava-karmas also affect our physical side of personality. The dravya-karma is also characterized as cover (avarana) and bhava-karma as faults (dosa). Both of them, however, are related to each other as cause and effect. The material aggregate of karmic molecules is dravya-karma; its power to operate is bhava-karma. Bhava-karmas will condition our bhavas or emotional states, which may be either pleasant or unpleasant. Now, if these states of emotion (bhava) are really brought about by karmic matter, how can Atman be said to be the cause of these bhavas? But the soul's agency is such that while giving up its own state, it can effect entirely alien or non-mental changes (i.e., it is the cause of its own mental states which are also indirectly conditioned by karmic matter). To this, we can say that emotional states (bhavas) are conditioned by dravya-karma and karma in its turn

is conditioned by karmic-thought or bhava. Jiva is not the essential cause, in that case and still without essential cause, these changes cannot happen. The soul which brings about changes in itself is the upadana-karana (material cause) of such mental states but not of the changes in karmic matter, which are distinctly material in nature. This means that there is a psycho-physical parallelism. Jiva brings changes in consciousness, and matter in the case of material things, and yet the two series are interrelated in a parallel pattern. This implies that neither can matter become mind nor can mind become matter. Jiva is the agent of its own bhavas, as it causes its own resultants. But it is not the agent of pudgala-karmas.

(6) However, much of these difficulties will be got over, if we adopt the Jaina doctrine of standpoints or naya. According to the practical point of view, the soul is the doer of material-karmas (dravya-karmas), but according to the real point of view, it is the doer of ideal karmas (bhava-karmas). For example, in making a pot, the existence of the idea of pot in the mind of the potter is the ideal karma (bhava-karma). The potter is directly the cause of the bhava-karma and the bhava-karma again is the cause of dravya-karma. Therefore from the real standpoint the 'potter having the idea of the pot' is the agent but according to the practical standpoint, he is the agent of dravya-karma. Really, a jiva is neither the material nor the efficient cause of the material-karmas but only the agent of its own emotional states or bhavas. Therefore, it is only from the practical standpoint that the jivas are described as enjoying happiness and misery which are the fruits of material karma. In fact, the jiva is the possessor of consciousness only. Atman or jiva is the agent of its own bhavas, as it causes its own resultants.

(7) In an important sense, science of karma has been described as the science of spirituality. Spirituality aims at unfolding the real nature of spirit or self. This is self-knowledge or self-realization. But to know the self is also to know that it is different from the non-self, with which it is in beginningless conjunction. Karma is the material basis of bondage and nescience of the soul. The beginningless relation between soul and non-soul is due to mithyatva (nescience) which is responsible for the worldly existence. This is determined by the nature, duration, intensity and quantity of karmas. Jivas take matter in accordance with their own karmas because of self-possession (kasaya). It is therefore clear that the science of karma is a necessary part of the science of spirituality. Unless we have a thorough knowledge of the karmas, we cannot know about the true nature of spirit or self. The knowledge of karma removes the false notion of identity between the body and the self, and so on. This is nothing other than the science of spirituality.

## **Omniscience : Determinism and freedom**

(1) If X foreknows that Y will act in a manner known as Z, and if Y really acts in the same manner, there seems to be no choice for Y but rather fixed and inexorable necessity. If it is admitted that somebody is omniscient, no human action can be free or voluntary. So it may also be deduced that if the omniscience is a fact, morality becomes a delusion.

(2) In the case of God, omniscience is regarded as the very nature of God, because He is the maximum being and the only cause of the effected beings. As maximum being, He is the most perfect being, hence most conscious and absolute self-conscious. But being the only possible cause of beings, God is eminently whatever any effected being may be. Thus knowing himself perfectly and most directly, he knows himself as he is, hence as the only possible cause of all possible beings, and thus knows everything real or mere possible, in the awareness of his own essence. One reason why God is omniscient is His omnipotence. Since He created all things He knew them before they existed, while they were still mere possibilities. He knows not only that which actually exists, but also that which could possibly exist, i.e., future realities and future possibilities, in word, everything. The second reason for God's omniscience is His omnipresence from which no one can escape whether he ascended into heaven, lay down in sheol or sojourned at the furthest limits of the sea.

(3) Now, a serious consequence might follow from such a position, "when God created man, He foresaw what would happen concerning him", for to confess that "God exists and at the same time to deny that He has foreknowledge of future things is the most manifest folly... ..one who is no prescient of all future things is not God." If we say that God foreknows that a man will sin, he must necessarily sin. But "If there is necessity there is no voluntary choice of sinning but fixed and unavoidable necessity." So also Locke says, "If is voluntary." Boethius also says, "If God is omniscient, no human action is voluntary."

(4) Now, one may say, if we apply the concept of omniscience to human beings, the results will be all the more devastating. But it may be pointed out that "God compels no man to sin, though He sees beforehand those who are going to sin by their own will." Hence, it may be argued that divine omniscience cannot entail determinism. For instance, an intimate friends and have foreknowledge of another's voluntary actions but it does not in anyway affect his moral freedom.

(5) But this does not seem to be very good argument. A person's knowledge about the future action of an intimate friend of his at most a good guess and not definite knowledge. Locke's argument that there may be a man who chooses to do something which without knowing that it is within his power to do otherwise (e.g., "If a man chooses to stay in the room without knowing that the room is locked.") seems to reconcile necessity with freedom but in fact it is a reconciliation of ignorance and knowledge, e.g., he thinks himself free only so long he does not know that he is not free.

(6) If it is said that "It is not because God foreknows what He foreknows that men act as they do : it is because men act as they do that God foreknows what He foreknows", it will create a very awkward situation in which man's actions would determine God's knowledge. We can also apply this to human omniscience, where it is likely to create greater complications. It will mean that knowledge of the actions of other men. Different people perform different actions, often quite contrary to that of their fellows. This will create a difficult situation for the cognising mind if it is to be so determined.

(7) To say that the omniscient being is one who is justified in believing an infinitely large number of true synthetic Proposition is not only vague but also self contradictory. For example, it all depends upon the belief in one proposition at least. 'Nothing is unknown to him'. But this is to admit his omniscience and hence it is like arguing in a circle. Thus, the concept of omniscience whether logical or actual does involve difficulties.

(8) According to the early Pali sources, Buddha offered a qualified support for the doctrine of omniscience even with regard to himself, and he often criticized Nigantha Nattaputta claiming omniscience in the sense of knowing and seeing, all objects on all times - past, present and even future. His reluctance in claiming unqualified omniscience is mainly concerned with knowledge pertaining to future possibly because it will lead to some sort of determinism in metaphysics and morals. "To speak of omniscience in relation to future is to maintain an impossible position," because the course of future events are partly determined, by the past and present and partly undetermined. I think, Buddha's hesitation in claiming unqualified omniscience was influenced mainly by moral considerations. If he knew the future acts of human beings, there was no meaning in voluntary action or freedom of will which forms the basis of ethics and morality. In fact, what is foreseen (i.e., known conclusively), is necessary and what is necessary is outside the scope of ethics.

(9) In view of these difficulties, I wonder why the belief in omniscience in some form or other has been a matter of faith, closely connected with the spiritual aspirations of the people. In India, it has been accepted sometimes as a religious dogma, sometimes as a philosophical doctrine and sometimes as both. Except the Carvakas, almost all the systems of Indian Philosophy -both orthodox and heterodox accept it. Even to the Mimamsakas, "All that is pertinent is the denial of knowledge of dharma by man.." They do not intend to deny "the possibility of person knowing all other things. Even the famous passage of Kumarila in question "does not set aside omniscience."

(10) To my mind, the reason and motives in formulating the concept of omniscience are extra-logical, for it is always at the cost of freedom of will, the basis of our moral life.

## JAINA MOKSA IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

### Introductory

The concept of Moksa is perhaps the biggest idea in man's quest of happiness. Sri Ramashankar Bhattacharya says that the science of Moksa is an experimental science of mental power. The history of human existence is a history of endless effort to eliminate sorrow and attain happiness. This is human nature. But we do not get what we want. We are a miserable lot. Death alone is the full-stop to our sufferings. But if we accept this idea of death, it would mean a tragic blow to the sense of human adventure, freedom and effort. We cannot be satisfied with less than immortality. More than that, Immortality must be accompanied by joy. This state of eternal joy bereft of all sufferings is regarded as Moksa or liberation. This liberation in itself seems to be a purely negative idea; but since the search for absolute freedom involves the search for ultimate purpose of the life of the individual (Parama Purusartha), there is a positive aspect also.

The concept of Mukti roughly distinguishes Indian thought from Western thought. The reason is to be found in the concept of the Soul in Indian Philosophy. With the exceptions of Plato and Platinus, Western Philosophy is quite unaware of a philosophy of the Self. On the other hand, all Indian systems, both orthodox and heterodox, recognize the idea of the Self as the first requisite for any philosophical adventure. This is the spiritual basis of our ethical life. The three pursuits of human life, namely Dharma (virtue), Artha (Wealth), and Kama (enjoyment) are regarded as simply subservient to moksa. It is the highest pursuit (Moksa eva paramapurushartha). The genesis of the idea of Moksa is traced in "the endeavor of man to find out ways and means by which he could become happy or at least be free from misery", as in the state of 'sound sleep'.

### Concept of Moksha in Indian Philosophy

Just as no school of Indian philosophy, not even the Carvakas, deny the concept of Self, similarly there is absolute unanimity regarding the central conception of Moksa as the highest goal of life; but the different schools differ with regard to the nature of Mukti and the means for its realization, according to their different metaphysical positions and attitudes.

For example, in consonance with the materialistic conception of the Soul (caitanya-visista-deha-eva-atman), the Carvakas come to a materialistic conception of liberation (dehachedah-Moksah or Moksastu Marana ca pranavayu-nivartanam). Similarly, in consonance with the doctrines of the Middle-path and Dependent Origination, Buddhists reject both Eternalism (Sasvatavada) of the Upanisads and Nihilism (Ucchedavada) of the Carvakas. They deny the continuity of the stream of unbroken successive states of five kinds (Panca-skandhas). The soul or ego is nothing more than this Five-fold, Aggregate, hence Nirvana must be the destruction of this mental continuum (cittam vimuccate), or at least the "arrest of the stream of consciousness (santati-anut-pada)", leading of the cessation of the possibilities of future experience (Anagatanutpada).

In Nyaya, the destiny of the individual Self is determined by the concept of the Self and its relation to consciousness, which has not been regarded as an essential and inseparable attribute of the soul. Consciousness arises, when it is related to the mind, which in turn is related to the senses, and the senses related to external objects. So in the disembodied condition, self will be



devoid of consciousness. Release is freedom from pain. So long as the soul is related to the body, pain is inevitable. Pleasure and pain are produced by undesirable contacts with objects. Thus the state of freedom is like the state of deep dreamless sleep, devoid of consciousness. Pleasure and pain go together like light and shade. So absolute cessation of suffering (atyantika-duhkha-nivrtti) must by implication mean cessation of pleasure too. Now to escape from this dilemma, faced by the majority of the Nyaya-thinkers like Vastasyana, Sridhara, Udayana, Raghunatha Siromani, there is the opposite thesis of the Naiyayikadesins and other Naiyayikas like Bhasarvajna and Bhusana, that freedom is bliss, instead of a state of painless, passionless, unconscious existence free from the spatio-temporal conditions. However, this is not possible unless they revise their conception of the self and its relation to consciousness.

Like, Nyaya, the Self in Vaisesikas has cognitions of things when it is connected with the body. So it is only when the soul is free from the qualities (either pleasure or pain) produced by contact with name and form (atmavisesa gunanama atyantocchedah), or as Sridhara would say navnama atmavisesa gunasnama atyantocchedah Moksa, that liberation is possible. It is the absolute destruction of nine specific qualities of the Self. To save this view from the charge that Moksa comes perilously near the unconscious condition of a pebble or a piece of stone, the Vaisesikas propound a doctrine of Inherent Felicity in the state of Moksa. But they have yet to explain how felicity is Unconscious.

Mimamsakas, like the Nyaya-Vaisesikas, regard the soul as eternal and infinite, with consciousness as its adventitious attribute, dependent upon its relation to the body. It survives death to reap the consequences of action. Since the Mimamsaka school belongs to the ritualistic period of the Vedic culture, the final destiny of an individual is regarded as the attainment of heaven - the usual end of rituals (Svarga kamoyajete). But latter on, the idea of heaven is replaced by the idea of liberation for they realized that we have to fall back to the earth as soon as we exhaust our merit. The concept of heaven was indeed a state of unalloyed bliss (at least temporary). But the state of liberation is free from pleasure and pain, since consciousness is an adventitious quality of the Soul. To Prabhakaras, Moksa is the realization of the Moral Imperative as duty (Niyoga-siddhi). To Kumarila, it is the "Soul's experience of its own intrinsic happiness with complete cessation of all kinds of misery," which is very much like the Advaitic conception. The general conception of Bhattas is the realization of intrinsic happiness (atmasaukhyanubhuti). Parthasarathi Misra and Gagabhatta deny this. Narayanabhatta, Bhattasarvajna and Sucaritra Misra clearly admit the element of happiness in the state of Mukti, since to them, Soul is consciousness associated with ignorance (Ajnanopitacaitanyatmavada) during embodied existence.

According to Samkhys, consciousness is not a mere quality but the soul's very essence. The soul is pure, eternal and immutable. Hence it is not blissful consciousness (ananda svarupa) or stream of consciousness (caitanya pravaha) or material consciousness (caitanya-deha-visita). The Self (Purusa) of Samkhya remains untouched either by joy or sorrow, migration, bondage and liberation. Bondage and liberation are phenomenal. The latter requires the formal and final cessation of all the three kinds of sufferings without a possibility of return. This neutral and colorless state of Kaivalya is again an unattractive picture with no appeal to the aspirant. Similarly, in Yoga, freedom is absolute isolation of Matter from self. It is only when we can effect a cessation of the highest principle of matter (citta = mahat = Buddhi) that the state of absolute isolation and redirection of our consciousness is possible of matter (citta = mahat = Buddhi) that the state of absolute isolation and redirection of our consciousness is possible. However, there is clear ambivalence in Samkhya doctrine of release in so far as it says "it is the spirit (Purusa) that is to obtain release, and yet the apparently predominant characterization of spirit is such that it is impossible that it should either be bound or released."

Unlike Samkhya-Yoga, the Self in Sankara is not only consciousness but also blissful consciousness. Unlike Samkhya-Yoga and Nyaya-Vaisesika, what is needed is an intuition of identity instead of an intuition of difference. Unlike Purva-Mimamsa, Moksa in Advaita Vedanta is not only destruction of individual's relation with the world (Prapanca-sambandhavilaya), but dissolution of the world itself (Prapanca-vilaya).

Ramanuja believes that there is both identity and difference between God and Man. Man's body and soul are real. The soul's is not pure and impersonal consciousness, but a thinking substance with consciousness as its essential attribute. Hence, Moksa is not self-annulment in the absolute, but a self-realization through self-surrender and self-effacement - the supreme satisfaction of religious emotion. The liberated soul is not God, but neither is he separated from His all-comprehensive existence. This is Sayujya-bhakti (unitive devotion). To Madhva, the distinction between God and Self is real. Though the Jiva is absolutely dependent upon God, he is active and dynamic. Hence, Moksa is 'blessed fellowship' and not a mere identification. Thus in the state of Mukti, there is not only the utter absence of pain but also the presence of positive bliss. To Nimbarka, with whom the soul is both different and non-different from God (Bhedabheda), complete submission results in both God-realization and self-realization which is endless joy and bliss. Suddhadvaita school of Vallabh regards the relation between God and Soul as that of whole and part. Duality and distress go together. The moment the soul is one with God, we get final release which is utter bliss. To other Vaisnavites like Sri Caitanyadeva, Jaideva, Vidyapati, Candidasa etc., to whom the ultimate reality is love and grace, liberation means love through divine grace. Bhakti is Mukti.

In the, Gita, we find that the status of souls is that of different fragments or sparks of God; hence Moksa must be the unity with Purusottam-indeed a blissful state. However, it must be sameness of nature (Sadharmya) with God, and not Identity (Sarupya). But in the Upandisads, as in the Advait Vedanta, the realization of Oneness with God is the ideal of man, which is a state of ecstasy and rapture, a joyous expansion of the soul.

To the Kapalikas, Moksa is found in the sweet embrace of Hara and Parvati (Hara-Parvatyalingam); to the Pasupats, it lies in the holding of all power (Paramaisvaryam); to the Udasins (atheists), it is in the eradication of egoism (ahankara nirvtti); to the Vaiyajaranas, it is in the power of speech (Brahma rupya banya darsanam); to the Sarvaganas, it is in the eternal continuum of the feeling of the highest felicity. (Nitya niratisaya sukhabodah) etc.

Broadly, there are two different approaches to the conception of liberation in Indian Philosophy :

- (1) The Materialistic Conception of Moksa of the Carvakas, and
- (2) The Non-materialistic Conception :
  - (a) Positive Conception - Vedanta & Jainism.
    - (i) Sarupya - Becoming like God in Nature and Form = Gita.
    - (ii) Sampya - Blessed fellowship = Madhva, Nimbarka, Vallabha, Caitanya etc.
    - (iii) Salokya - Residing in the world of God (Vaikuntha) = Ramanujists.
    - (iv) Sayujya - Becoming one with God = Advaita Vedanta.
  - (b) Negative Conception : Buddhism.
    - (i) Ucheda - Nihilism = Madhyamika Buddhism.
    - (ii) Nirodha - Cessation of suffering = Nyaya-Vaisesikas & Mimamsakas.
  - (c) Neutralistic Conception : Samkhya & Yoga.

However, there is ample evidence to prove that some of the Buddhists texts, and some Naiyayikas and Mimasakas go so far as to prove a positivistic conception of liberation.

### **The Jaina Outlook**

Jainism is an important ideological phenomenon in the religio-philosophical history of mankind. It attempts a 'reapproachment between warring systems by a breadth of vision which goes in the name of Syadvada or Anekantavada. It shares the realism of the Vedas, the idealism of the Upanisads, the worship-cult of the Puranas, the colourfulness of the Epics, the logical analysis of the Naiyayikas, the atomism of the Vaisesikas, the metaphysical dualism of the Samkhyas, the mysticism of the Yogins, and most surprisingly even the monistic trends of the Advaita Vedanta, reflected specifically in Kunda-kunda and Yogindu. Siddhasena affirms that all heretic views combined constitute the sayings of Lord Jina. He is the non-absolutistic attitude of Anekantavada, which is an extension of Ahimsa in the intellectual field. Absolutism or

imperialism in thought, word and deed is unknown to the Jainas, who are opposed to all kinds of force and fanaticism. Jainism has tried to develop a neither-nor attitude by avoiding extremes.

### **Soul and Karma : The Basis of Freedom and Bondage**

The Jainas believe the Doctrine of Soul as the Possessor of Material Karma and the Doctrine of Extended Consciousness. The Jainas subscribe to the Doctrine of Constitutional Freedom of the Soul and its Potential Four-fold infinities, meaning thereby that the Soul is intrinsically pure and innately perfect. But Soul and Karma stand to each other in the relation of beginningless conjunction. Karma is an aggregate of very fine imperceptible material particles, which are the crystallized effect of the past activities or energies. The link between matter and spirit is found in the Doctrine of the Subtle Body (Karma-Sarira or Linga-Sarira), a resultant of the unseen potency of Passions and Vibrations. "The soul by its commerce with the outer world becomes literally penetrated with the particles of subtle-matter." Moreover, the mundane soul is not absolutely formless, because the Jainas believe in the Doctrine of Extended Consciousness. While the Samkhya, Yoga, Nyaya-Vaisesikas and the Buddhists kept consciousness of the inter-influencing of the soul and Karmic-matter; hence the relation between soul and Karma become very easy. The Karmic-matter mixes with the soul as milk mixes with water or fire with iron. Thus formless (amurta) Karma is affected by Murta Karma, as consciousness is affected by drink or medicine. Logically, the cause is non-different from the effect. The effect (body) is physical form. But unless karma is associated with the Jiva (soul), it cannot produce any effect; because Karma is only an instrumental cause; it is the Soul, which is the essential cause of all experiences. This explains the Doctrine of the Soul as the Possessor of Material Karma. The question arises, but why is the conscious soul associated with unconscious matter. Unlike Samkhya, which propounds Doctrine of Unconscious Teleology, Jainas work out a karma-phenomenology. Karma is a substantive force or matter in a subtle form, which fills all cosmic space. It is due to karma that the Soul acquires the conditions of nescience or ignorance. The relation between soul and non-soul is beginningless, and is due to nescience or avidya. This is responsible for worldly existence, or bondage which is determined by the Nature (Prakrti), Duration (Sthiti), Intensity (Anubhava) and Quantity (Pradesa) of Karmas. Jiva takes matter in accordance with its own karmas and passions (kasaytas). This is our bondage, the causes of which are Delusion (mithya-drsti), Lack of control (avirati), Inadvertence (pramada), Passions (kasaya) and Vibrations (Yoga), Nescience is at the root of all evils and cause of worldly existence. the Jainas do not bother about its whence and why. It is regarded as coeval with the Soul; hence it is eternal and beginningless. Both the Self and Nescience are accepted as facts on the basis of uncontradicted experience. Vidyananda Swami says that Right Attitude, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct constitute the path of liberation. Naturally, the antithesis of this Trinity must lead to bondage. If the very outlook is wrong, one cannot expect right knowledge; and there cannot be right conduct without right knowledge. Theory and practice are interlinked. So, on this realistic ground, the Jainas reject the metaphysical position of all those who subscribe to a unitary principle as the cause of Bondage.

### **Jaina Moksha**

(a) Definition of Moksha - Moksha, the last of the Jaina moral categories, is the gist of Karma-phenomenology and its relation to the Science of the Soul. Mukti is total deliverance of the Soul from karmic-veil - Sarvavarnavimuktirmuktih. As Umasvami says, Moksha is the total and final freedom from all Karmic-matter; in other words, the non-existence of the cause of bondage and the shedding of all the Karmas. Asrava is the influx of the Karma-particles into the Soul. This influx is caused by the actions of the body, speech and mind. As the Karmic inflow is the principle of bondage and its stoppage is a condition of Moksha, so Samvara is opposite to Asrava. Samvara literally means controlling. But Samvara only arrests fresh-flow of karma-particles. What we require is not only stoppage of the fresh-flow, but also dissipation of

the old one. This shedding or dissipation called Nirjara is possible by austerities. Umasvami has used two prefixes - VI (Visesarupena), PRA (Prakrstarupena) in defining Moksha, meaning thereby that Moksha is the total and exhaustive dissolution of all karmic particles, which is the condition of omniscience.

(b) The Nature of Moksha : The Agamic verse "sukhamatyantikarm yatra" etc. admits the experience of eternal bliss in the state of Mukti. "It is the safe, happy and quiet place which is reached by the great sages." Some of the Jaina Acaryas regard bliss as an attitude of knowledge. In Advaita Vedanta, consciousness and bliss commingle together in the undifferentiated One Brahman. Mallisena ridicules the Naiyayikas for reducing Moksha to a state which is indistinguishable from pebbles, etc. He says that our phenomenal life is better, in which happiness comes at intervals, than the state of Mukti, which is emotionally dead and colorless. But the Jaina claim for attaining a state of eternal happiness in the state of Moksha faces a serious dilemma. If it is a product (of spiritual Sadhana), it is non-eternal, and if it is not such a product, it must be conceded that either it is constitutional and inherent or at least impossible of attainment. So the very conception of Jaina Self and bondage makes the enjoyment of eternal happiness well-nigh impossible. This might be a logical objection. But the Jaina idea of Moksha is one of Infinite Bliss, which follows from the Doctrine of Four-fold Infinities of the Soul.

(c) The Doctrine of Constitutional Freedom and Four-fold Infinities : The Jivas possess four-infinities (ananta catustaya) inherently, which are obscured by the veil of four Ghatia (destructive) Karmas. but the Jaina doctrine of Constitutional Freedom of the Soul and the Four Infinities presents a difficulty. If the Self is inherently good and essentially perfect, how can Karma be associated with the Soul ? If karma is said to be the cause of bondage, and bondage the cause of Karma, then there is the fallacy of regressus-ad-infinitum. But if Karma is beginningless, then how can the soul be essentially perfect ? All the doctrines, of Moksha-Sadhana then seem to be quite meaningless. Bondage and Moksha are both phenomenal, not real. As Samkhya-Karika says - "Of certainty, therefore, not any (Spirit) is bound or liberated." We think that the Soul is constitutionally free. But this freedom cannot be manifested without spiritual discipline. This is in consonance with the Jaina doctrine of Satkaryavada which makes a distinction between the Manifest and the unmanifest. Samkhya and Advaita Vedanta hold that Moksha is not the attainment of what is unattained but what is already attained (Praptasya praptih). But whereas Samkhya stresses the need of 'discrimination', and Advaita Vedanta emphasizes 'identification', the Jainas work out a scheme of 'manifestation'. The logic is simple. If what is non-existent cannot be produced, the effect is existent even before the operation of the cause.

(d) Jivan-Mukti and Videha-Mukti : The Jainas, like the Upanisadic thinkers, Buddhists, Nyaya-Vaisesika, Samkhyas, Yogins, Vijñānabhikṣu and Vallabha etc., recognize the existence of Jivana-Mukti together with Videha-Mukti. But Ramanujists, Nimbarka, Madhva etc. do not accept Jivana-mukti. Apart from Jivana-mukti and Videha-Mukti there is an idea of Krama-Mukti (Gradual salvation) in the upanisads. However, Mukti is Mukti-it must be one and indivisible. Any reference of the persistence of body etc., is meaningless. The duality of Mukti in Jainism is perhaps a legacy of the Upanisadic influence. Since the Jainas, like Advaita-Vedanta believe in release through the dawn of wisdom and the annulment of nescience, Jivana-Mukti is the one and only legitimate concept. Mukti refers to the soul, not to the body; and the dissolution of the body is neither an inevitable pre-condition nor an integral feature of Mukti."

(e) Nirvana and Moksha : Moksha literally means 'release', release of the soul from eternal fetters of Karma. Nirvana (Buddhist) is derived from the Pali root 'nibuttu', which means 'blowing out'. However, instead of taking it in a metaphorical sense of 'blowing out' of passions etc., it is taken in the literal sense of extinction. There is ample evidence to believe that Buddha himself looks upon Nirvana as a positive state of consciousness. The distinction between Sopadhisesa & Nirupadhisesa Nirvana is a significant one. One refers to the annulment of the dirt of the mind, while the other refers to the annulment of existence itself.

(f) Bhava Moksha and Dravya Moksha : The Jiva attains Moksha when he is free from the snares of Karma (Karma-phala-vinirmuktah moksa). The Moksha is either Bhava (Objective) or Dravya

(Subjective). When the soul is free from four Ghatiya Karmas (Jnanavaraniya), Darsnavaraniya, Mohaniya, Vedaniya), it is Bhava Moksa; and when it is free from Aghatiya Karmas (Nama, Ayu, Gotra, Antaraya), it is Dravya-Moksa. After freedom from Aghatiya Karmas (action-currents of non-injury), the Soul attains a state of never ending beatitude. A person attains the state of Omniscience when Mohaniya (Deluding), Jnanavaraniya (Knowledge-obscuring), Darsnavaraniya (Faith-obscuring) and Antaraya (Obstructive) karmas are destroyed. After the attainment of Kevala-Jnana a person is free from all kinds of Karmas and attains final liberation. The Soul comes into its own and regains infinite knowledge, infinite bliss and infinite power.

(g) The Abode of Moksa : When the Jiva attains freedom, it rises higher and higher and reaches the summit of Lokakasa which is called Siddha-Sila (Region of the Free and Liberated). It may be pointed out that this is a new conception. The Vedic conception regards Atman as all-pervasive. The Buddhists do not accept any such things as Atman; The Mandali sect of the Jainas think that there is no such fixed place of Moksa. The Soul is ever-progressing. But the Jaina concept of Dharma and Adharama (Medium of motion and rest), present in each object, leads us to think that there must be a fixed state where the motion must stop.

(h) Conclusion : Moksa in Jainism is not something new. It is a rediscovery of man himself through self-realization. True happiness lies within. 'Look within' is what Jainism says. "Self-realization is the ideal of systems such as Nyaya-Vaisesikas and the Samkhya too." Advaita-Vedanta also is a philosophy of self-realization par-excellence. The Karma-phenomenology of the Jainas is the realistic and the externalistic approach. Constitutional freedom of the soul is a logical necessity. This is simple Satkaryavada.

## PARA-PSYCHOLOGY AND JAINISM

### Introductory

Jainism is an important ideological phenomenon in the religious history of mankind. It is a well known non-Brahmanical religio-philosophical system which represents a missionary spirit of an evangelist culture with an important heterodoxical departure from the accepted Vedic traditions of India. The entire edifice of Jainism rests on one principle 'Life is dear to all.' This attitude of respect for life is called non-violence (Ahimsa) or positive love. That is Jesus. That is Gandhi. Love is the basis of life and religion This is manifested in the 'work of relieving misery' and 'securing welfare' of man. In other words, personality is the ultimate truth. Therefore the entire emphasis of Jainism is upon the worth and dignity of man and an 'alloyed holiness' of his personality which alone can 'raise mankind to the supreme status of Godhead'. Any form of subjection is a standing negation of the worth of personality and antithetical to the spirit of self-realization. So the spirit of Jainism is a foe to all kinds of force and fanaticism-either in word, deed and thought. Any form of absolutism or imperialism in thought is repugnant to the spirit of Jainism. Yasovijaya, a great Jaina logician (18th Century A.D.) describing the Jaina view says that the Jainas have a sympathetic attitude towards all other religions just like a mother who loves all her children alike. Another early Jaina philosopher Siddhasena Divakara (5th Century A.D.) goes to the length of affirming that all heretical views combined constitute the doctrine of Jainism. Anandaghana (18th Century A.D.), another Jaina thinker in his extra synthetic mood, describes the six systems of Indian Philosophy as different forms and figures of the same Sweet Mother Divine. It seems that "Jainism has attempted a reapproachment between these warring systems by a breadth of vision which goes by the name of Syadvada or Anekantavada." Anekantavada or the Doctrine of Manifoldness of Truth means that truth is relative to our standpoints. The nature of reality is very complex. It has innumerable characteristics and attributes. But there is limit to human knowledge. Reality is given to us in several partial views.



To assert one is not necessarily denying the other. No one can claim the ownership of the whole truth. Total monopoly in the realm of truth and knowledge is only possible for an Omniscient. This is the typical Jaina non-absolutistic attitude which forms the metaphysical foundation of the principle of Non-violence in thought. All the confusion of thought which is prevailing in the world is the outcome of inexhaustive research and the acceptance of a part for the whole. Almost all our disputes only betray the pig-headedness of the blindmen, who spoke differently about the same elephant. Thus we see that truth is not exclusive to anyone. Huxley also asks us to persuade people that every Idol however noble it may seem is ultimately a Moloch that devours its worshippers. In other words, it is fatal to treat the relative and the homemade as though it were the Absolute. "All dogmatism owes its genesis to this partiality of outlook and fondness for a line of thinking to which a person has accustomed himself." Madame Blavatsky also says "when one party or another thinks himself the sole possessor of absolute truth, it becomes only natural that he should think his neighbors absolutely in the clutches of Error or Devil." Hence the Jainas are very correct in providing a theoretical basis for their practical belief in non-violence, since theory and practice are interlinked. Anekantavada or the Doctrine of Manifoldness of Truth is thus the extension of Ahimsa (non-violence) in the realm of thought.

### **Religion and Para-psychology**

Religion is perhaps "man's first attempt to make clear to himself its own position in the universe." But despite thousand years of effort and about a hundred years of systematic psychological research, this question remains conspicuously obscure and unsolved. Our mind is still a mystery and who knows it will not remain so if we go on beating the same pathways of research within the old frontiers of mind. However, the type of religion which is compatible with modern philosophy is one "which is detached from the world and unresponsive to intelligence. Hence an irrationalist religion can fit their philosophical requirements." In Indian thought, the word 'religion' has been given additional connotation than the Latin word (Re-legere). It is called 'Dharma'. This Dharma as Annie Besant defines "is the inner nature that has reached in each man a certain stage of development and unfolding." However, every religion is a "process which has two sides, an inner and an outer : from one point of view it is a state of belief and feeling, an inward spiritual disposition, from another point of view it is an expression of this subjective disposition in appropriate acts." Judged from this standard, the inner side of Jaina religion consists in spiritual realization through the practice of non-violence (Ahimsa) in word, deed and thought since Ahimsa is the essence of Jainism. Nevertheless, Jainism combines epistemological relativism (Syadvada and Anekantavada) metaphysical dualism of mind and matter, numerical pluralism of nine fundamental elements and sociological self-transcendence by observing different vows of non-violence, truth etc. In its synthetic spirit, it shares the realism of the Vedas, idealism of the Upanisadas, worship-cult of the Puranas, colourfulness of the Epics, the spirit of logical analysis of the Naiyayikas (Indian Logicians), metaphysical dualism of the atomism of the Vaisheshika, Samkhyas, mysticism of the Yogins, some sort of monistic trend of the Advaita Vedanta, the spirit of revolt of the Indian Materialist (Lokayats) and the sense of compassion of the Buddha. As a religion, it has a great historicity. According to Rhys Davids, Hopkins, Oldenberg, Bendole, Monier Williams, W.W. Hunter, Harnsworth, Wheeler, Charpentier, Madmuller, Bhandarkar, Jayaswal, Tilak, Jainism is older than Buddhism. According to Jyoti Prasad Jaina, it is 'the oldest living religion'. To others, like Hoernle, Jacobi, S. Chetty etc., it is the primitive faith of mankind.

Before we discuss the relation between para-psychology and religion, let us have a word about para-psychology itself. What is it ? Is it a 'recrudescence of superstition' or an organized attempt at deceiving the masses with the superstitious non-sense in the interest of the bourgeois reactionaries. Supporters may argue that such big names such as Sidgwick, Myers, Prime Ministers Gerald Balfour and Gladstone, Wallace, Thomson, Rayleigh, Ledge, Curie, Bergson, W. James, Tennyson, Ruskin, Crookes etc., are associated with it. But then a clever critic might retort, "Sir William Crookes was a great physicist but it does not preclude the possibility of his having been hoodwinked in the matter of psychic matter." Is it then a "tendency to the third order

of knowledge largely a search for an aesthetic satisfaction" or a sheer 'mystification'. To the natural scientists, it is 'a convenient asylum ignorant'. Let us close this chapter by recalling Goethe's remark to Eckermann, "If anyone advances anything new. People resist with all their might." Supporting this psychological explanation for the opposition of para-psychology, Tyrrel says that "there is undoubtedly an instinct which urges us to reject the unusual and the inexplicable whatever the evidence in its favor may be." However, Virchow offers another explanation for such opposition : "Facts are inconvenient and the facts are all the more inconvenient because the strike at the root of things." Evidences are so correct that a person like William James was forced to confess : "In fact, were I asked to point to a Scientific Journal where hard-headedness and never-sleeping suspicion of sources of error might be seen in their full-bloom, I think I should have to fall back on the Proceedings of Society of Psychical Research." It is needless to repudiate the charges of those who believe that through the researches in para-psychology, the "public has been misled, funds expended, energies of young-men wasted." Instead "the assertions of eminent investigators among them scientists if world-wide renown are too numerous and too decided." So far its achievement is concerned, it is simply wonderful. Schopenhauer once said, "The phenomena under consideration are incomparably the most important among all the facts presented to us by the whole experience." "No scientific movement ever set on foot has, in the same length of time, contributed so much towards the advancement of knowledge as psychical research." Rt. Hon.W.E.Gladstone said : "It is the most important work which is being done in the world. By far the most important." Sir Henry Bergson addressing the 28th session of Society of Psychical Research said, "This new science will soon make up the time lost." Prof. Charles Richet feels that though the claims may seem to be "Absurd, but not matter, it is true." But after all, we wonder as to why such hyperbolic statements are being made ? Is this the real study of man ? Man is man because of his mind. And our mind is still a mystery. True "psychology has explored a vast field, from academic deserts to Greenland of five human material, but there still exists a Gobi Desert, virtually unexplored and uncharted, concerning which the books say nothing." And the official aim and purpose of Psychical Research Society is to "examine without prejudice or prepossession and in a scientific spirit those faculty of man, real or supposed, which appear to be unexplicable on any generally recognized hypothesis." Let us conclude with L.K.Anspacher : "To believe that everything has been discovered is as profound an error as to mistake the horizon for the limits of the world."

Directly, para-psychology has to significance for religion. Para-psychology is para-psychology. It is not a religion but a branch of science whose business is to inquire into the nature of human personality. Indirectly, "the main significance of psychical research for religion lies in its promise to reveal a much wider background of thought than that provided by correct scientific philosophy." Science has been exploring almost entirely the external world but our "psyche is a field yet to be explored." "Manas maketh man as distinguished from both god and brute." Man is mystery, a miracle according to Carlyle. And mind of man is mystery par excellence. "In seeing what is, the mind is rendered transparent, it is divested of its will, it reflects without gathering dust." It is the man and his mind that is the cause of bondage and liberation, pain and pleasure - says wisdom of India. And "infact the study of human personality and the extense of human faculty form the main object of psychical research" Jung rightly says that the "place of deity seems to be taken by the wholeness of man." However, Barrett says that "psychical research, though it may strengthen the foundations cannot take the place of religion, using in its widest sense that much abused word. For fater all, it deals with the external, thought it be an unseen world. The psychic order is not the spiritual order." However, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle holds that "the ultimate result will be union of science with religion." Tischner also thinks that "the influence of psychical research extends further to the philosophy of religion and to ethics," because both these branches deal with the inner aspect of man. However to L.R.G.Crandon, "psychical research has as much to do with religion as golf." But he accepts that "it is going to be one of the most important factor in changing not religion but religious concepts and beliefs." Tyrrell in his 'Science and Psychic Phenomenon' has admitted that psychical research lies at the meeting point of three departments of human thought - Science, Philosophy and Religion." So we can conclude that "It will unite science and religion, more than any other activity of mankind has so

far done." In a recent symposium held at Cuttack under the auspices of Indian Institute of para-psychology, Dr.A.C.Das, the president, observed that para-psychology is just "developing as a new branch of psychology." Mr.M.N.Mukherjee in his paper "Materialism and Para-psychology" has gone so far to equate para-psychology with all other psychical science. Richard V.De Smet another symposiast held that it is 'a scientific description'. Prof. B.N.Banerjee quotes H.J.Eysenck (Sense and Non-sense in Psychology) thinks that para-psychological phenomena have been proved. However, Prof.G.S.Nair, holds that though "Para-psychology came upon the trail of science, but its genuine home is man's interest towards religion." In a recent Symposium on 'Para-psychology and Yoga' (21st and 22nd December, 62) organized under the auspices of the Lucknow University, the President Acharya Jugal Kishore observed that "as civilization advances further into nuclear age and education becomes a more complex phenomenon, the most natural science to take the place of psychology will be para-psychology."

### **Jainism And Para-psychology**

#### **(a) Soul Psychology and Karma Phenomenology**

The Jainas believe in the Doctrine of Soul which forms the basis of Higher Psychology popularly termed as para-psychology or Meta-psychology. The idea of psychology as the 'Science of Soul' seems old. "There was a time, when it lost its mind, now it seems to have lost its consciousness even." But so far and no further. Even eminent psychologist of today find themselves helpless to do away with the hypothesis of soul. Jung's book "Modern Man in Search of Soul" (London 1934) is amply illustrative of this fact. The reality of the self is obvious to the introspectionists. James regards the admittance of soul to be the line of 'least logical resistance'. His pupil Calkins comes out strongly for a 'Psychology of Selves' - not as metaphysical concept but an ever present fact of immediate experience. Stern, Dilthey, Allport, Spranger etc., have been endeavoring to build up a 'Science of Personality'. Alexis Carrel, the Nobel prize winner scientist demands that attention should be focused on the 'soul of man'. The 'Racial Unconscious' of Jung, the 'Group Mind' of McDougall, the 'Comprehensive Consciousness' of Myers have all something of a soul-psychology in them.

This Soul-psychology of the Jainas is not concerned with merely the measurement of sensation or the effect of emotions on the outer physical body within the spatio-temporal order. On the other hand, the soul has the inherent capacity to know all things, which follow from the Doctrine of Four-fold infinities of the soul. Every soul innately possesses infinite apprehension, infinite comprehension, infinite power and infinite bliss. Consciousness is the most essential characteristic of the souls. However, this perfect state of soul is possible only after the total destruction of the respective Karmic obstructions. This Karma is the basis of Jaina Psychology. Karma phenomenology is the root concept of Indian speculation which has reached its acme in Jaina ideology. Just as there is the Law of Causation in Science, Doctrine of Psychic Determinism in Freudian Psychology, so there is Doctrine of Karma in the field of moral life. It means, as a man sows, so he reaps. Every act must have its consequence and if the consequences have not been fully worked out in our life time, they demand a rebirth which in turn implies the idea of metempsychosis and the immortality of soul. To them, it is impossible to explain the diversity of universe especially the inequalities among men in worldly position and privileges without the hypothesis of Karma.

The Jaina accounts of soul and Karma are interlinked together. They believe in the Doctrine of soul as the possessor of Material Karma. The soul is innately pure and inherently perfect by something foreign called Karma, which has been defined as an aggregate of particles of very fine matter imperceptible to our sense. Just as shining sun is often obscured by either a patch of cloud or mist or a veil of dust, so the pure and perfect soul is clouded by the mist of some or other types of Karma. The Doctrine of soul as the Possessor of Karma involves three questions : Firstly, how can we say that (imperceptible multitude of atoms) exist ? Secondly, how Karma has

a physical form ? Thirdly, if Karma is material, how is it connected with the immaterial self ? Let us take one by one.

Karma phenomenology is the keystone supporting edifice of Jainism. Just as a sprout, which is an effect has a seed which is the cause, so our happiness and misery which are effects, must have cause - which is nothing but Karma. The objection that happiness is derived either from a garland, sandal paste, a woman etc., which are all objects of sight, is irrelevant since persons having same means for enjoying happiness do not get the same type of happiness.

To the second question, why Karma has a physical form, it is said that because of our experience of pleasure, pain etc., since there can be no such experiences in association with that which is formless, just in connection with other. Then Karma has a physical shape because it undergoes change in a way different from souls, which is inferred from the change of its effects like body. Now the last question is - how could the material Karma be connected with the immaterial soul ? It is said that it can be in the way consciousness is affected by a drink of intoxicant etc. Then the empirical soul is not absolutely formless. Jainas believe in the Doctrine of Extended Consciousness. The soul is equal in extent to its own body, for its attributes are found only in the body. Now Karma is material and soul is also extended, hence it can be affected by the material Karma. However, the Jainas regard that the soul and Karma stand to each other in a relation of beginningless conjunction, like the association of the dross with the gold. But just as the dross is removed by the action of an alkaline substance, so the removal of beginningless Karmic veil as possible by the practice of the prescribed course of religious meditations etc. This higher psychology of the Jainas has been worked out in greater details. The material particles constituting the Karma can be viewed from their nature and number depending upon the activities of body, mind and speech, and duration and intensity depending upon passions (Passions are four : greed, pride, deceit, anger).

Discussing the nature of Karma, the Jainas point out eight fundamental types each divided into a number of subtypes. Of the eight, four are Obscuring (comprehension-obscuring, apprehension-obscuring, deluding power-obscuring) and the remaining are non-obscuring (age, physique, status and feeling determining Karmas). Each type of Karma is determined by the nature of Karmic atoms. The detailed study of the various types and subtypes of these Karmas only reveal that the Jainas have a deep faith in the universal chain of causation, leaving no room for chance. Chance is nothing but law unknown. So we find that even our names and forms are determined by our past Karmas.

The number of the Karmic matter depends upon the activity of the soul. The maximum and minimum activities fall respectively to the feeling producing and age-determining Karmas according to the Jainas. The whole universe is full of Karmic matter having a constant influx into the soul.

Then the Jainas have a calculus of their own for measuring the duration of each Karma. The maximum and minimum length of duration of the four obstructive karmas is 30 kotakoti-sagaropams, 10 kotakoti = crore multiplied by crore palyopams = a Sagaropama), i.e., a measure.

Lastly, the intensity of the Karma depends upon the strength and weakness of our passions. The more sinful or virtuous a man is, the duration of his sinful or virtuous Karma is longer and the position thereof is stronger.

The conception of soul and Karma is thus the basis of higher psychology in Jainism. The soul is innately pure and inherently perfect but because of Karmic veils, there is obscuration and hence imperfection.

(b) Cognition : Sensory and Extra Sensory

Therefore, if the soul is free from the Karmic influences, it is omniscient and in this state the soul becomes liberated. But the worldly and empirical souls are infected with Karmic matter, hence its power of cognizing everything in all condition is veiled by the Karmic-clouds. "But as although the light of the sun may be veiled by cloud, some light, however, breaks through the clouds, so

there also a fraction of the faculty of cognition is preserved to the soul, for if it were to loose this, it is no longer the soul." Consciousness is the most essential and defining characteristics of the soul. Cognition is an important aspect of this consciousness which is divided into Indeterminate (apprehension) and Determinate cognition (comprehension) with their numerous divisions and sub-divisions. Thus we find that Jaina psychology follows from its 'epistemology of experience' with soul as its basis. Indeterminate cognition is detail less knowledge or the primitive stage of general awareness with simple existence as its content and without any other reference. It is of four types : Visual apprehension, nonvisual apprehension, apprehensive clairvoyance and apprehensive omniscience. Determinate cognition is divided into 8 categories : nonverbal comprehension, verbal comprehension, clairvoyance, Telepathy, omniscience and three wrong types of non-verbal, verbal comprehension and wrong clairvoyance. Three types of relations are envisaged between Apprehension (Indeterminate) and comprehension (Determinate) : of non-simultaneity, of succession, and of simultaneity. Broadly, comprehension has been divided into sensory (also called indirect) and Extra-sensory (also called Direct) perception. The reason that the sensory knowledge is called Indirect is because the soul gets the glimpses of reality through the media of sense-organs and not directly. This view gets some support by an analysis of the psychological process involved inference, a question raised of late by the psychophysicists.

Then we come to Extra-sensory perception : clairvoyance, Telepathy and Omniscience. "Empirical or sensory perception is conditional by the senses and mind as is limited", but Extra-sensory perception transcends the general laws of space, time and other conditions of normal perception. "Opinion in the West is yet divided on the question whether paranormal powers are biologically primitive and present in the organism or they are outgrown and replaced, or they are the latest acquisitions." Except the materialist Carvakas and the scripturalist Mimamsakas, all systems of Indian Philosophy believe in Extra-sensory perception. Extra-sensory perception is a form of Direct perception. It may sound odd. But this follows from the very conception of the Jainas that the basis of all knowledge is self. And "if the soul has the capacity to know, it must know independently of any external condition. It is as independent as existence. It is like a lamp which illuminates itself. It is not a spatial or temporal relation but a capacity. Space and time are no doubt principles of physical limitations which disappear with the stoppage of Karmic influx into the soul and their shedding. "The (full) manifestation of the innate nature of a conscious self, emerging on the total cessation of all obstructive veils, is called" that (intuition) transcendent and pure." This transcended and pure knowledge is of two kinds - Absolute (Sakala) and Relative (Vikala). When there is complete cessation of all possible veils, it is Absolute (Sakala) but when there is qualitative or quantitative difference in the subsidence and annihilation of these veils, there occurs two varieties of knowledge : Clairvoyance (Avadhi) and Telepathy (Manah-paryaya).

#### (c) Avadhi Jnana or Clairvoyance

Etymologically, Avadhi (Clairvoyance) means 'limit' and perhaps it is therefore defined as "that which is limited to objects having shape and form." Negatively speaking, formless things like soul, space, time, motion and rest are beyond the preview of Clairvoyance. We know that the soul is capable of perceiving everything in all its modes. However it is only possible when he has completely destroyed the influences of Karmas. But if he has destroyed it only partially, he acquires the power of direct perception of things limited to forms and shape, though they are too distant or minute or obscure. We know that the inherent capacity of soul of perceiving all things is limited or obstructed by knowledge-obscuring Karmas. Avadhi transcends the barriers of time and space in proportion to the difference of destruction-cum-subsidence of Karmic veils. The highest type of Clairvoyance will cognise all objects having form irrespective of past, present and future or near and far and the lowest type can perceive any object having very small fraction (Angula) and can penetrate only a small part of time (Avalika) and only a part (Atom) of all the modes. When a person has partially destroyed the influences of Karmas, he acquires the power of direct knowledge of thing (having forms) but are too distant or minute or obscure to be observed by the ordinary senses and mind. Clairvoyance differs in degrees according to four categories of space, time, matter and modes. Here the Jainas conceive of a Doctrine of



Gradation according to which clairvoyant perception differs in degrees. For, example, in point of space, the Clairvoyant perception extends from infinitesimal part of space (Angula = the smallest fraction of space) to the inhabited Universe (Loka = the biggest, fraction of space). Similarly from the point of view of time, it extends from avalika (the smallest fraction of time less than a second) to the countless number of cycles of time including past and future. The infinitesimal indivisible ultimate unit of time is called time-point (Samaya) and that of space is called space-point (Pradesas). They are beyond ordinary human comprehension and hence can be perceived only by the Omniscient. The indivisible unit of matter is atom and the indivisible unit of mode is one mode of an infinite number with regard to Time, Space, Matter and Modes - Time-point being the most extensive and Modes being the least extensive. Knowledge of all the modes is beyond ordinary knowledge which is possible only to an Omniscient.

Broadly Clairvoyance has been divided into congenital (Bhava-Pratyaya) and Non-congenital (Guna Pratyaya). The former is the birthright of denizens of heaven and hell and the latter is acquired through merit by men and lower animals. This has been further subdivided into six kinds. There is another classification of Clairvoyance into three kinds such as Clairvoyance of space (Desavadhi) corresponding to non-congenital form, ultimate and universal Clairvoyance (Paramavadhi and Sarvavadhi) which are possessed by the saints and the Arhats only. The former is liable to destruction but not the latter two. Avasyaka Nirukti provides us a more detailed study of Clairvoyance subject from fourteen standpoints of view. So sum up, if we are endowed with the highest type of Avadhi or Clairvoyance, we can perceive all the things having form.

#### (d) Manah-Paryaya or Telepathy

Literally Manah-Paryaya means 'mental state', though technically it means 'entering into other's mind'. As Clairvoyance (Avadhi) is the direct knowledge of things even at a distance of space and time, so Telepathy (Manah-Paryaya) is the direct knowledge of the thoughts of others. This should not sound something absurd in view of Jaina theory of soul as the possessor of infinite knowledge. If we can remove the obstacles like hatred, jealousy etc., that stand in the way of knowing other minds, we can have direct and unfailing access to the present and past thoughts of others. However, here besides the Jaina Doctrine of soul, we are also concerned with Jaina Doctrine of Mind which is based on the principle of vargas (group of atoms). The different atomic groups constitute the different bodies in the respective order of gradation-Physical, Fluid, Assimilative, Luminous and Karmic bodies, speech, respiration, mind, Karma Bodies etc.

A state of thought is a mode of mental-stuff. To perceive these mental modes is called telepathy. Mind is both physical and psychical according to the nature of atomic constituents. According to the Jaina doctrine of Karma, mind is a kind of material substance made of Karmic atoms. Hence the psychical mind is the double principle of attainment and activity of cognition.

Scholars are divided as to the fact whether telepathy should be conceived as perceiving the states and modes of mind alone as held by Jinabhadra, Hemcandra, etc. or it perceives also the external objects as held by Pujyapada Devanandi, following the Avasyaka Nirukti. To the former school in telepathy, we are directly associated with the states of mind engaged in thinking, denying the possibility of direct perception of external objects themselves and due to its association with the mental stuff, the object itself, is called mind. Hence external objects are also perceived by Telepathy. Anyway, the distinction between ordinary immediate knowledge, i.e., internal and external perception (Mati-Jnana) and telepathy must be maintained because the mind is only inactive in Telepathy and is due to the potency of destruction-cum-subsidence Karma.

Telepathy has been recognized of two varieties. Simple Direct knowledge of simple mental things, viz., of what a man is thinking now (Rju-mati) and Complex Direct knowledge of complex mental things viz., of what a man is thinking now along with what he has thought of in the past and will think in the future (Vipulmati). Naturally, the latter is purer and more lasting, more vivid though less wider in scope and therefore superior in the spiritual ladder.

#### (e) Telepathy and Clairvoyance

Both these kinds of direct and immediate knowledge are the resultant of destruction-cum-subsidence of karmic veils. In both of them, we intuit the states of material substance that constitute the mind. Like Clairvoyance, telepathic knowledge also differs in spatial extension and temporal penetration. However, they differ according to their purity, scope, subject and object. Intuition of mental states is more lucid and purer than in the states of Clairvoyance. So far as scope is concerned, in telepathic knowledge we can know only an infinitesimal part of the object of Clairvoyance -Simple-Telepathic knowledge knows an infinitesimal degree of the attributes of an atom, whereas in complex telepathic knowledge, one gets an infinitesimal part of simple mental knowledge. We have already seen that Clairvoyant knowledge is the birth-right of denizens of heaven and hell but telepathic knowledge is acquired due to merit, hence confined to the sphere of human beings only. The former is possible for living beings, in all the possible status of existence, viz., hellish sub-human, mankind, celestial beings, and liberated beings, whereas telepathic knowledge is possible only for human beings with exalted conduct, occupying anyone of the stages of spiritual perfection (Gunasthana) ranging between the 6th to the 12th stages. With regard to the object of Telepathic knowledge, it extends to the infinitesimal part of the subtlest form of mental atoms (Mano-varganas). In Clairvoyance, we intuit other forms of atoms limited to the material object and that again not covering all their modes. But a closer study will reveal that the line of demarcation between the two is not very clear. I do not say that they do not differ. they differ only in degrees. Qualitatively, they are the same. Hence a famous Jaina logician Siddhasena Divakara does not recognize any distinction between Clairvoyance and telepathy, and extends the scope of telepathy to the sub-human organisms. Anyway, for a specialized study, I think, the distinction will continue.

#### (f) Clairvoyance, Telepathy and Modern Psychical Research

"Legends and reports of apparent telepathy or clairvoyance must be as old as man", said A.S.Parkes in his opening remarks in a CIBA foundation symposium on 'Extra-sensory-perception'. During the last three decades, resolute efforts have been made to apply the different problems of extra-sensory-perception under laboratory conditions where millions of tests have been carried in the same way as those used in other ordinary branches of research, which may be said to establish the fact beyond the possibility of controversy and is regarded as an 'actual and demonstrable occurrence'. Myers' two volumes on 'Human Personality' are the Magnum opus and something of a Bible in the tradition of Psychical Research which have also been included in the examination for fellowship in mental and Moral Philosophy in Trinity College, Dublin. Not only this, centers of Research in para-psychology have been established in the Department of Biophysics at the University of Pittsburgh, a chair of para-psychology at the University of Pittsburgh, a chair of para-psychology at the University of Utrecht besides large scale experiments at Duke University.

Literally, Clairvoyance means 'clear seeing' and telepathy means 'far-feeling'. Telesthesia is an alternative word for Clairvoyance. Tischner agrees with Myers that telepathy is "the communication of impressions of any kind from one mind to another independently of the recognized channels of sense." "Wireless telepathy and the X-rays suggest themselves very strongly as analogous to telepathy and Clairvoyance." Philosophers like Hegel, Schelling, Fichte, Von Hartmann spoke of telepathy and Clairvoyance as 'accepted facts'. Distinguished physicists like Sir William Barrett, psychologists like William James, Heymans, Rhine, Pratt, Murphy, Price, Ryzl, Zorab, Thouless, Nandor Fodor etc., are the pioneers in the experiment of psychical research. Prof. Charles Richet, after years of devoted research in this field says that "Cryptesthesia, telekinesis, ectoplasm and premonition seem to be founded on granite; that is to say, on hundreds of exact observations and hundreds of vigorous experiments." Alexis Carrell holds that, "Clairvoyance and telepathy are a primary datum of scientific observation." To McDougal "the ancient belief in Clairvoyance seems also in a fair way established." Even such critical investigators as Lehmann, Dessoir and Baerwald admit today the existence of telepathy. Prof.H.H.Price sees no way of denying them. Telepathy forms a very ancient problem. Herodotus tell of a king named Xerxes who consulted the Delphic messenger. Classical and medical literature abounds in cases of the influence of one mind upon another. Swedenborg was renowned in this respect. Mesmer and his followers claimed its actual demonstrations.

R.Warcollier's La telepathic contains much valuable material about para-psychology. "Rhine has estimated that about fifty percent people have, or can develop the faculties required for experiments in Clairvoyance and telepathy." "Rhine also gives some suggestions to those who may care to repeat those experiments." Recently in the Statesman (Calcutta, 19th January 1963), we have read a news about transmission of thought waves between London and Moscow. This is Science. But let us conclude poetically.

"If the dull substance of my flesh was thought.

Injurious distance would not stop the way".

and

"As star to star vibrates light, may soul to soul.

Strike thro' a finer element of her own."

(g) Omniscience or Kevala-Jnana

Omniscience is recognized as an attribute of God but thanks to the Jainas who make it possible also for the ordinary human beings. This might have been partially motivated by the fact that since they do not believe in an Omnipotent or Omniscient God. They have brought in this conception of human Omniscience, just to compensate that loss. Anyway, Omniscience or Kevala-Jnana has been recognized as a kind of direct and 'extra-ordinary sensory perception'. (This phrase 'extra-ordinary sensory perception' instead 'Extra-sensory perception', we owe to Dr.W.L.M.Perry which has been also supported as referred above). They think unfortunate one, in that it begs the question as to the nature of the phenomenon under discussion, and has a slightly super-natural and mystical connotation. However, to Dr.Rhine, the old expression 'extra-sensory perception' is a singularly unfortunate one, in that it begs the question as to the nature of the phenomenon under discussion, and has a slightly super-nature and mystical connotation. However, to Dr.Rhine, the old expression 'extra-sensory-perception' is 'preferable which means by it a perception is a mode that is just not highest type of immediate and direct extra-sensory perception which is the perfection of the cognitive faculty of self when shines in its full splendor after the total destruction of the deluding, knowledge-obscuring, faith-obscuring and obstructing Karmas. So a person possessing omniscience can perceive all the substance with all their modes. This is regarded as the state of final liberation when the soul is free from all Karmic-matter to the non-existence of the cause of bondage and to the shedding of all Karmas, and it can perceive "all the substances in all their modifications at all the places and in all the times." Nothing remains unknown to the Omniscient." The Jainas try to prove Omniscience though all the recognized sources of knowledge in Indian Philosophy after meeting the onslaught from the side of the Mimamsakas who are the worst critics of the theory of human Omniscience in view of their unflinching faith in the validity of the scriptures. Briefly our phenomenal knowledge suggests the noumenal as a necessity of thought. Then this manifold and complex objectivity implies the need of some extraordinary perception. Psychologically, differences in intelligence etc., in human beings presupposes the possibility of Omniscience somewhere and in somebody. The Jaina logicians claim that since there is no contradictory proof against this, hence it can be accepted as a convenient and plausible hypothesis. Knowledge like measure and quality has got degree, hence knowledge is bound to reach its final consummation which is nothing but Omniscience, Akalanka, a famous Jaina Logician, tries to prove the existence of Omniscience on the basis of truth found in the astronomical sphere, which predicts correctly the position of future eclipses of the Sun and the Moon. Lastly, the concept of Omniscience follow as a logical corollary from the Jaina theory of soul as inherently pure and infinitely perfect. True, there is the Karmic veil but as the sun shines in its full splendor after the removal of the mists, fog or cloud, so the self knows everything where the knowledge obscuring Karmas are completely liquidated. From partial knowledge, we can infer about the complete or total knowledge, just as we infer about the whole of mountain by perceiving only a part of it. This is how Virasena Swami reasons. Samantabhadra, an early Jaina Logician has tried to prove the existence of Omniscience though the reasoning based on the capability of being known through inference. Dharmabhusana explaining this says that perception does not mean 'actual perception' but also 'object of

knowledge'. Shri Sukhalalji Sanghavi, perhaps the most erudite living Jaina Scholars, says that the origin of all the above varieties of proofs for the existence of Omniscience can be traced back to the Yoga-Sutra of Patanjali, especially the Sutra which deals with Omniscience. Let us conclude with the author of Apta-pariksa : "When Omniscience is proved by all the six traditional sources of knowledge, it is established beyond all doubt." The concept of Omniscience is perfectly consistent with the Jaina concept of soul as the possessor of infinite knowledge which is veiled due to various reasons as stated elsewhere in this paper.

## **Karma and Rebirth**

If the culmination of knowledge lies in Omniscience, the final consummation of spiritual life consists in the attainment of emancipation or better self-realization. It may be possible that owing to various limitations, the final salvation may not be possible during the present life time and hence we require a number of births for its realization. This is the metaphysics of rebirth. Rebirth is the inseparable twin of Karma. But if rebirth is a fact, the idea of pre-birth also cannot be rejected. As every event must have a cause so every cause must have its effects. This is the Law of Karma, the Ultimate Law of the Universe which adjusts effect to cause on the physical, moral and spiritual planes of being. This is the Law of the Conservation of Moral Energy or the Moral Law of Equilibrium operating in an undeviating and unerring manner like the Master Law going on incessantly and ceaselessly. Karma is rebirth latent and rebirth is Karma manifest like indivisible unity of cause and effect. There are broadly speaking two schools of those who believe in the Law of Karma. The Negativists despise all forms of Karma good or bad since they cause bondage. To the Positivists like the Mimamsakas and others, we should practice good Karmas to get good results.

The Karma phenomenology of the Jainas rests on the assumptions that every act must have its consequences which if not fully worked out in our life time, demand a future life for their fruition. This leads us to the idea of metempsychosis. The apparent diversities and inequalities among men demand an explanation which can be satisfied by the Law of Karma. But the Jaina meaning of Karma is different from the ordinary meaning. Karma here does not mean 'work and deed' but an "aggregate of particles of very fine matter which are not perceptible by the senses." This is the Doctrine of the Material Nature of Karman which is singular to Jainism. With other, Karman is formless. The Jainas regard Karma as the crystallized effect of the past activities of energies. But they argue that "in things on which they work, the energies must have to be metamorphosed into forms or centers of forces." Like begets like. The cause is like the effect. "The effect (i.e., Body) is physical hence the cause (i.e. Karma) has indeed a physical form." But unless Karma is associated with the soul, it cannot produce any effect because Karma is only the instrumental cause and it is the soul which is the essential cause of all experiences. Hence the Jainas believe in the Doctrine of soul as the Possessor of Material Karma. But why and how the conscious soul should be associated with the unconscious soul should be associated the unconscious matter ? It is owing to the Karma, which is a substantive force or matter in a subtle form, which fills all cosmic space. "The soul by its commerce with the outer world becomes literally penetrated with the particles of subtle-matter." Moreover the mundane soul is not absolutely formless, because the Jainas believe in the Doctrine of Extended consciousness like the Doctrine of Matter (Pudgala) in Buddhism and the Upanisads, and so to some extent in Plato and Alexander. While in Samkhya-Yoga, Vedanta, Nyaya-Vaisesika and the Buddhists kept consciousness quite aloof from the matter, the Jainas could easily conceive of the inter-influencing between the soul and the Karmic-matter, hence the relation between the soul and Karma becomes very easy. The Karmic matter mixes with the soul as milk mixes with the water or fire with iron. Thus the formless Karma is affected by the corporal Karma as consciousness affected by drink and medicine. This is the relation of concrete identity between the soul and the Karma.

Without the Karma phenomenology, the diversity of the variegated nature and the apparent inequalities among human beings and their capacities remain unexplained. Moreover, Karma,

explains the problem of the original Sin, Good and Evil. Heredity and many unexplained problems of science, say in ethnology and astronomy. The proper understanding of the Law of Karma destroys the causes of envy and jealousy and ill-will, impatience and even fear of death. This attitude enables the Jainas to reject many other theories such as Temporalism (according to which the root cause of diversity is Time which is the highest God, all-pervasive and all-powerful). Naturalism proclaiming the Omnipotence of Nature discarding all human endeavors. Determinism as preached by Purana Kasyapa and Makkhali Gosala leading to the doctrine of non-action, Fortuitism or Accidentalism like the Greek thinker, such as Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Epicureans etc. Agnosticism and Scepticism born out of Materialism of Ajita Kesa Kambalin, Sanjaya, Vellei Nathaputta and lastly Illusionism of the Advaita Vedanta. Karma is the basis of Jaina Psychology and the keystone supporting edifice of the Jaina ethics and metaphysics. Needless to say that the metaphysics of transmigration presupposes the metaphysics of Metempsychosis and Karma which are acknowledged as facts and axioms in the Indian thought. Karma is viewed from four points of view - its nature, duration, intensity and scope. According to their nature, Karmas are of eight fundamental varieties such as, Knowledge obscuring karma, Intuition obscuring karma, Feeling obscuring karma, Belief obscuring karma, Age determining karma, Status and Power determining karma. There are numerous divisions and sub-divisions of these varieties also.

The Doctrine of Karma and rebirth seems to be an important missing link in modern psychology. In Indian Philosophy, this dogma is an article of faith. In Vedanta, this Karma is used as Maya (Cosmic illusion), Avidya (Ignorance) or Prakrti (Material world), in Mimamsa it is called Apurva (without a beginning), in Buddhist though it is Vasana (clinging), in Samkhya-Yoga it is Asaya (Past actions), in Nyaya-Vaisesika systems it is used as Dharmadharma, Adrsta (stock of merit and demerit) and Samskara (impressions of the past), in other Hindu literature (Luck), Punya and Papa (Virtue and Sin). The Jainas by introducing this concept of Karma want to remove the defects in the Vedic conception of somewhat deistic God who interferes in the creation of universe without any purpose which leads to the suppression of individual freedom and effort. This also helps them to successfully refute Buddhist Doctrine of Momentariness and the Carvaka conception of Materialism.

### **Jaina Yoga**

Jainism like other systems of Indian Philosophy aims not only at intellectual explanation of truth but also at its realization. This involves the idea of the Path of spiritual realization known variously such as Yoga (merging of the finite with the infinite), Dhyana (Meditation), Samadhi (Concentration). To Patanjali, the author of the Yog-Sutra, Yoga means the 'Cessation of the states of mind'. The Jaina term for Yoga is Caritra (conduct). To them bondage is due to the inflow of Karmic matter that is due to the actions of body, mind and speech. Hence the process of emancipation will naturally start with the stoppage of this inflow and liquidation of the already accumulated Karma-particles associated with. But all these require a practical discipline of all round restraint of thought, speech and mind (Gupti), five-fold, regulations (Samiti) of five main vital functions, observances of ten-fold moral virtues (Dharma), contemplation of the twelve-fold objects (Anupreksha), Victory over 22 kinds of troubles (Parisahjaya), and observances of five-fold conducts Caritra. Besides, practice of six-fold external and internal austerities with their numerous subdivision are essential. This long list of the rules and regulations of conduct and their transgressions indicate that if physical austerity is an index of self-realization, moral life is a sine qua non for its achievement.

With this idea in view, the Jainas conceive of fourteen gradual stages of spiritual development (Gunasthana). A detailed study will show a logical order according to the principle of Gradual Evolution of soul from Decreasing sinfulness to the Increasing Purity leading to the final unveiling of the soul. "As one goes ascending in the stages of self-realization and the practice of Yoga, one gradually develops the perspective of truth." This I must confess is a very careful probe into the unhidden powers of the inner world. This Doctrine of Gunasthana or Spiritual



Development and Yoga are interconnected since the idea of stages of spiritual development involves the idea of the means of liberation. Yoga is the process eradication of the exterior and the interior to realize the transcendental self by cutting the knot for self-realization. But self-realization requires self-concentration or Dhyana for our mind is always restless. Like the two divisions of Yoga according to Patanjali, the Jainas also divide into five stages such as Practice of Spiritual life (Adhyatma), Repeated Practice (Bhavana), Equanimity (Samata), Final Annihilation of Residual Karmas (Vrtti Sanksaya) and Concentration (Dhyana). Thus concentration is the immediate cause of liberation and hence so much emphasis is laid down by the Jainas upon this concept of Yoga.

### **The Doctrine of Lesyas or Colorations of the Embodied Souls**

The association of the soul with Karma is beginningless. The soul when associated with Karma forms the Subtle Body (Karma Sarira) comparable to subtle bodies of Samkhya subtle Karmic matter in the soul throws a reflex producing certain colorations concern only the embodied souls which are connected with the matter. The passions determine the nature of the colorations since the infinite power and energy of the soul is circumscribed by the power obscuring Karma being defiled by the passions. The delimited energy as determined by coloration is Yoga or activity.

The color-index of the embodied souls is two-fold; material (Dravya Lesya) and mental (Bhava Lesya). Material colorations refer to the body or organism, which are produced by Karma-articles or by binding Karma or by mental activities. Mental colorations (Bhava Lesya) refers to the psychic conditions which result from the feelings and mental activities. Popularly six types of color-indexes have been suggested to fit in with all the moral and immoral kinds of beings such as wickedness and cruelty is represented by black (Krsna) anger and envy by blue (Nila), dishonesty and meanness by gray (Kapota), discipline by pink (Padma), subduing of Passions by Yellow (Pita) and meditation of virtue and truth by white colorations (Sveta). Similarly, the denizens of hell, the celestial beings and the human beings are different bodily colorations such as black, white etc.

In short, the doctrine of colorations is the tripe index of body, mind and heart. So the aura or radiation spreading round the gods and prophets like Jesus, Buddha, Mahavira, Zoraster etc., presenting a halo has got positive meanings. Just as every neurosis has got a psychosis, so every material color suggests a physico-psycho-moral attribute. It is held that these colorations are perceptible only through extrasensory perception. A concrete instance has been quoted by Dr.T.G.Kalghatgi of Dharwar university where a Tibetan Lama named Manglabjong Rama could see owing to the Yogic discipline he had undergone, the luster of the aura of an individual. He once saw blue of light emanating from a Chinese delegation which had gone to see the Dalai Lama (the Tibetan high priest who had taken refuge in India after communist on-slaughts upon them). He then appealed to the Dalai Lama not to accept the sweetened words of the members of the delegation, as they were full of fraud. J.Charpentur's Lesya-Theory of Jainas and Ajivakas (Frestskrift, 1910) may be consulted.

Corresponding to this Jaina Doctrine of colorations, we have similar references elsewhere also. In Mahabharata, there is a description about six types of colorations of souls. In Patanjali Yoga-Sutra, mental states have been classified into four kinds according to this coloration principle which is said to have been suggested having a Jaina influences. On the basis of an account in Digha-Nikaya, Leumann and Sukhalal Sanghavi both have found resemblances of six colorations with Makkhali Gosala's six-fold divisions of human beings. In Buddhism, Karma is classified into the same four colors as in Yoga-Sutra. The theosophical view of the transcendental color in the individual may also have some resemblance to the Jaina Doctrine of colorations.

### **Conclusion**

In spite of well-recognized centers of Psychical Research in the universities of Pittsburgh, Utrecht, Duke etc., and the societies of Psychical Research in London and New York with big names associated with them, para-psychology in the West has just emerged from the stage of heresy. This is precisely because the western scholars have approached this problem purely from the traditional experimental-laboratory standpoint, and hence so little achievement in spite of such a tremendous effort. Para-psychology demands a new methodology and a new understanding. Para-psychological experiences such as that of clairvoyance, telepathy, omniscience are not common to all and universal and hence it requires a man-to-man research depending mostly upon the individual experiences gained either by them or by ourselves practicing those methods. I am constrained to believe that one who is absolutely uninitiated in those disciplines even to a comfortable extent, it is difficult for him either to brand it either as magic or as scientific. In India, para-psychological phenomena have been investigated from the side of religion and their practices in everyday life. So it is not so much a matter of principle but an actual fact of life.

The Jainas have got a systematic discipline for the achievement of those types of extra-sensory perception as stated in the paper. What is required is to demonstrate to the West its validity. Now two methods may be employed. Firstly, every ardent research worker should see for himself what it is and one worker should compare his notes with the other. The second method will be to collect the reports of Psi-phenomenon from those who are already adept in this field and again compare their individual reports. The contribution of Jainism towards the conception of human omniscience is very significant and it needs special investigation.

## **NON-ABSOLUTISTIC HERITAGE OF BHAGAVANA MAHAVIRA**

[ 1 ]

Only man possesses culture and man lives in society. So culture grows out of the life-history of a nation. It is all-inclusive capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. It is transmitted by communication and is, therefore, an accumulative structure developed out of the reflective thinking of man. It is all the ways of doing and thinking of a group. In other words, it is the 'Stock in trade' of a group. Social groups are distinguished from each other by difference in their stocks of culture-patterns and values. Culture heritage is the sum total of the culture-patterns that a person inherits from the various social groups. Descriptively, culture includes customs, beliefs, morals, art, knowledge. Historically, it is the sum total of social heritage. Normatively, It is composed of traditions, attitudes, ideas that control human behavior. Psychologically, culture is the means by which people try to obtain their goals. Structurally, it is an organization of conventional understandings and learned behavior and genetically it arises from and includes all the products of social interaction. Culture includes not only patterns of behavior. It is the product of human societies and of the individuals who compose them. In short, culture is the mother of personality, thus culture and personality within the framework of human groups become inseparable. Personality dimensions are expressions in part of culture.

[ 2 ]

The age in which Mahavira (6th Century B.C.) was born, was a period of cultural revolution all over the world. Socrates was born in Greece, Zoroaster in Persia, Lao-Tse and Confucius in

China and Bhagavata Mahavira and Buddha in India. In India, this was an age of transition and uncertainty. Caste distinctions and priestly oligarchy has become a source of enormous irritation and a mean of popular exploitation. Rituals and superstition had over-shadowed the simple faith of nature-worship of the Vedas and had, therefore, led to the growth of Brahmanism. There was also an intellectual chaos and philosophical revolts. Economically, the society was passing through a transition from a pastoral-agriculture-handicraft stage to a developing capitalist economy, which led to a corresponding political changes in the political constitution leading to the rise and growth of small village republics and democratic consciousness. It is in this background that Lord Mahavira was born and had lived. No, doubt Jainism in the present form, is the heritage of Lord Mahavira but it would be wrong to ignore the origin and development of the creed of the long line of the Tirthankaras, of whom Lord Mahavira was the 24th and the last. However, the origin of these Tirthankaras, that is Jainism, has been a faithful source of speculation and error for the orientalist. Without going into the problem of historicity of these 24 Tirthankaras, we can safely conclude that the credit of India's greatness belongs to the Jainas no less to the Brahmins and the Buddhists. At this stage of information, we can conclusively reject either the Buddhistic derivation theory or the Hindu-dissenter theory and accord to Jainism an original system quite distinct and independent from all others. So Dr.G.N.Jha says : If it has similarities with the other Indian systems, it has its own peculiarities and marked differences as well. Though it may not be possible at this stage of our knowledge to determine the comparative antiquity of Jaina and Brahmanic things, we may say that Jainism is probably as old as the Vedic religion, if not the older ...." It is indeed very original, independent and systematic doctrine and is one of the earliest home religions of India. Unlike Buddhists Jainism, on the other hand, has preserved down to the present time its integrity as a separate world. Hence, it is wrong to hold that Jainism was founded by Mahavira in the 6th Century. That his predecessor "Parsva was a historical person, is now admitted by all as very probable." But again, Jacobi says : "There is nothing to prove that Parsva was the founder of Jainism. Jaina tradition is unanimous in making Rsabha, as the First Tirthankara" whose references as a recognized mystic, are found in the Vedic and Puranic literature. The Hindus, themselves recognize Rsabhadeva as the 9th incarnation of Visnu. The excavations at Mohenjodaro, specially the finds of nude images are similar to the characteristics of Jaina sramanas. The Kayotsarga posture of Yoga is peculiarly Jaina. In short, we can conclude that Jainism is a very ancient religion and is related to the primitive philosophy. It is believed to have a non-Aryan or of non-Vedic Aryan origin.

Nurtured into the synthetic culture of India and deeply influenced by the Jaina tradition, Mahavira showed wonderful ability in organization of his Order (Sangha), of the floating mass of Sramanic literature and culture. He propagated a veritable spiritual democracy admitting ascetics and laymen, Brahmins and Sudras, male and female - all into the folds of Jainism, rejecting the Varnasramas, the authority of the Vedas, God and the myth of maya and Karma-kanda. Positively, he enunciated that the Jaina doctrine of knowledge are inherent in soul, the Karma-phenomenology and inward strenuousness and affirmation of spirit through rigid ethical life for the attainment of salvation.

All the teachings of Mahavira have come down to us as a living tradition contained in the sacred works (Agamas) which are regarded as eternal and permanent teachings for the benefit of the entire mankind, contained in the 14 Purvas. Mahavira himself taught the Purvas to his disciples, known as Ganadharas. Further the 12 Angas, 12 Upangas, 4 Mulas, 2 Culikas Sutras, 6 Cheda Sutras, 10 Prakirnakas were composed. Their commentaries are known as Niryukits & Bhasyas (in poetry) and Churnis (in prose). The Purvas were gradually lost but they were superseded by new canons compiled from time to time by the religious conceals at Pataliputra (4th Century B.C.) and Vallabh (5th Century B.C.) for issuing Siddhanta. According to Jacobi, the Purvas contained the dialogues between Mahavira and rival teachers. The Drstivada, which is said to have included the 14 Purvas, dealt chiefly with the philosophical standpoints (drstis) of the Jainas and other schools. Notwithstanding the differences between the Digambaras and the Svetambaras, the entire ancient written literature of the Jainas known as Agamas, are ascribed to Mahavira. Hence it is important to study the philosophical attitude (drsti) of Mahavira in the perspective of Indian thought and culture.

### [ 3 ]

Broadly, we can find four marked philosophical attitudes in ancient Indian thought and culture : The Brahman, the Buddhist, the Jaina and the last but not the least the Carvaka attitude towards life. The Carvaka-attitude is out and out materialistic atheistic and hedonistic. The Brahman attitude is rooted in the Vedas and Upanisads and hence it is highly speculative and ultra-absolutistic. Ultimate reality is conceived as Truth, consciousness and Infinite (Satyam, Jnanam and Anantam), called as Brahman or Atman which is ultimately indefinable. The Buddhist attitude is rationalistic in epistemology and middle of the road (Madhyama pratipada) in metaphysics and morals. The Jaina attitude, from the days of Mahavira is radical non-absolutistic, which has developed perhaps out of their great regard for non-violence. Jainism, a religion, has practically been identified with non-violence (Ahimsa) and is the key-note of Jainism. Non-violence to be total and complete must be non-violence in thought, word and deed. Hence, they have formulated non-absolutistic theories in all these three fields of life - Anekantavada (thought), Syadvada (speech) and Ahimsa (action). Thus, non-absolutism is not partial but integral, not an accidental but an essential feature of Jainism. It is true that the spirit of synthesis (samanvaya) is found in the very texture of Indian culture because it has been a unity in diversity. Hence, even before the advent of Lord Mahavira, the non-absolutistic ideas in the seed form were present in the philosophical climate of India. In the Vedas and Upanisads, the ultimate reality is described neither as purely real (Sat) nor as unreal (Asat). Some say it was One, while others hold it become many. Ultimately, it is said that the ultimate reality is the same, though it is called by different names. Atman is Brahman. Even Lord Buddha's attitude was very close to non-absolutism. He always avoided two extremes - eternalism and nihilism, and held the middle view (madhyam pratipada). Lord Buddha's Vibhajyavada has contributed negatively a lot of the rise and growth of Syadvada. Even the pre-Mahavira Jaina thought was saturated with non-absolutistic ideas.

The Brahmanic, the Buddhistic and the Jainas are all engaged in the quest of truth only their methods are different. The method of philosophizing adopted by Mahavira is known as Anekantavada (Non-absolutism), which is characterized by two things - totality (Purnata) and reality (Yatharthata) or viewing the whole reality in its completeness and concreteness. Hence, it was never a Utopia but an attitude of practical life. The basis principle of non-absolutism is applicable in all works of life social and religious, literary and cultural, economic and political. We shall however limit ourselves to the three-fold non-absolutism in thought, word and action.

### [ 4 ]

(a) Non-absolutism in Thought : Anekantavada - Life is a unity of thought, word and deed. Thought influences action. Hence, emphasis has been laid upon right thinking (Samyak drsti or Samyak Jnana). But what is right and what is wrong, nobody knows because on the one hand, reality is complex, on the other hand, there is limitation to our knowledge, so long we do not attain omniscience. To know is to relate, therefore, our knowledge is essentially relative and limited in many ways in the sphere of application of the means of knowledge or in the extent of the knowable. Our thought is relative. The whole reality in its completeness, cannot be grasped by this partial thought. What is necessary is a change in our attitude, not with the thought alone. Jainism, no doubt, recognizes the objectivity of the material universe because it is the most consistent form of realism in that the universe is independent of the mind. This independence presupposes the principle of distinction, which ultimately leads to the recognition of non-absolutism (anekanta) realism. The theory of manifoldness of knowledge or reality is the logical terminus of the principle of distinction. Further, distinction presupposes the notion of plurality and also activistic implication of reciprocity among the reals which finally results into the

relativistic notion of knowledge and reality. The principle of distinction is the universal and basic axiom of all realistic metaphysics. The impelling logic of distinction presents to us an infinitely diversified universe, or in indeterminate reality. A philosophy which does not admit of distinction or independence of subject and object develops inevitably either into subjective or objective idealism. Hence, Anekantavada is the most logical and consistent form of realism. This is true of modern Einsteinian Theory of Relativity. Russell refutes the idealistic interpretation and says, "the fundamental assumption of relativity is realistic, namely, that those aspects in which all observers agree when they record a given phenomenon, may be regarded as objective, and not as contributed by the observers." Subjectivism or solipsism is against scientific relativism, which is sustained by the postulate of the plurality and objectivity of the universe.

Mahavira too was neither a skeptic nor an agnostic. He believed that these infinite number of attributes and characteristics can be discovered by experience alone, and not by a priori logical consideration or random speculations. But he does not admit of a distinction between the external and internal sources of knowledge or reality. A consideration will show the inadequacy of pure logic to give us the full knowledge of the real. The traditional laws of identity (A is A), contradiction (A is not A) or Excluded Middle (A cannot be both A and not A) have no appeal to experience and behavior of things. There is no denying the fact that they are Laws of Thought and hence also laws of Reality but we must determine their meanings by an appeal to experience alone. Reals are concrete facts of experience, Universal is the very life of particulars and particulars cannot be bereft of universals. But again, the truth of this can be realized through reference to our actual experience. Let us try to understand these problems with the help of dialogue between Mahavira and Gautama :

"Are the souls O Lord, eternal, or non-eternal ?

They are eternal, O Gautama,  
from the view-point of substance,  
and non-eternal from the view-point of modes."

"Is the body, O Lord, identical with the soul or different ?

The body, O Gautama, is identical  
with the soul as well as different from it."

Similarly, we have numerous dialogue regarding the problem, "whether universal and absolute non-violence is good or bad ?" "Whether to sleep or to remain awake is good ?" "Whether to be weak or strong ?" Whether the Jivas are mobile or not ?" "Whether the soul is powerful or powerless", and so on. And the replies of Mahavira are always conditional and double, which are also correct, because there is actual reference and experience.

A thing is neither real nor unreal, neither eternal nor non-eternal, neither static nor mobile, neither small nor big in the absolute sense but has dual nature. This is no offense to the Laws of thought because two-valued logic seems to unreal if there is loyalty to experience. There is no brass tracks in life or logic. Take for example, the case of being and becoming or identity and difference. It is presupposition of 'difference' that the 'identity' of a thing undergoing change is maintained. Change is meaningless without the idea of persistence. Hence, the contradiction between them is only so-called and illusory. The denial of pre-non-existence and post non-existence as part of a real leads to the impossibility of the law of causation and the consequential impossibility of all theoretical and practical activity. Similarly, the denial of non-existence of mutual identity (numerical difference) and absolute non-existence is also impossible. There plurality presupposes that the identity of one is not the identity of another. If there is no difference, there will be no distinction, hence no independence between the subject and the object. If there is the negation of identity, there is worse confusion. Hence, the nature of reality is not exclusive or extremistic. It is existent-cum-non-existent; identify-cum-difference, one-in-many. This is seeing both the sides, the obverse and the reverse of the thing. Similarly we



can think of the universal and the particular. The world of reals is not only plurality but also unity. But the oneness is not secured at the sacrifice of the many, nor are the many left in unsocial indifference. As regards relations, no relation is meaningful if there is pure identity and no relation is possible between two terms which are absolutely independent and different, hence relation is neither a case of unification nor mutual dependence. Relation has no status outside the terms. Hence, there is only one alternative to treat relation in the sense of identity-in-difference as an ontological truth, not merely inferable, but also as an indubitably perceptual fact. Lastly, if causal efficiency (Arthakriyakaritvam) is the test of reality, the real cannot be an absolute constant nor can it be an absolute variable constant. An absolute real can neither be a cause nor an effect for an absolute effect will have no necessity for a cause, and an eternal cause will be unamenable to any change is self-contradictory. Hence, real to be real must reveal itself not merely as many (Anantatmakam) but also infinitely manifold (Anantadharmatmakam) or non-absolutistic (Anaikantika). This is the integral view of identity-in-difference, or Being-in-becoming etc. (Ubhayavada or Misravada). We may be unable to understand this unique nature (Jatyantara) of this concrete unity through the recognized channels of knowledge but if we can realize at all the general features of the Absolute, we can see that somehow they come together in a known, vaguely and in the abstract, our result is certain.

This is another point, whether this kind of non-absolutism is itself absolute or not. If non-absolutism is absolute, there is at least one real which is absolute; and if it is not, it is not an absolute and universal fact. For the answer to this question, we shall have to turn ourselves to the theory of Relativism (Syadvada) including the theory of standpoint (Nayavada), sevenfold predication (Saptabhangi) and Verbal usage (Niksepa).

(b) Non-absolutism in Speech : Syadvada - Whether non-absolutism is itself absolute or relative depends upon the nature of proposition, which is either complete (Sakaladesa) or Incomplete (Vikaladesa), the former being the object of valid knowledge (Pramana) and the latter, the object of aspectal knowledge (Naya). This means that the doctrine of non-absolutism is not absolute unconditionally. However, to avoid the fallacy of an infinite regress, the Jainas distinguish between true non-absolutism (Samyak-anekanta) and false non-absolutism (Mithya-anekanta). To be valid, therefore, non-absolutism must not be absolute but always relative. When one attribute is stated as constituting the whole nature of the real and thus implies the negation of other attributes, such cognition are examples of the 'false absolute'. But Naya is not false thought it is partial knowledge from a particular standpoint. Similarly, the nature of unconditionality in the statement 'All statements are conditional' is quite different from the normal meaning of unconditionality. This is like the idea contained in the passage 'I do not know myself'. Where there is no contradiction between knowledge and ignorance, or in the sentence, 'I am undecided', where there is at least one decision; 'I am undecided'. The unconditionality is not at the level of existence, while at the level of essence (Thought) everything is alternative. We do not live in the realm of thought or reason alone. Behind reason, there is always the unreason (Faith). The Jainas, too have faith in their scriptures as anybody else has in his own. Here is definiteness or unconditionality. In each community, there is a special absolute. The absolute themselves are alternation so far as they are possible (till we are on thought level), but when I have chosen one and stick to it, it is more than possible, it is existent or actual. Thus, there may be a reconciliation between unconditionality and conditionality. So on thought level, the Syadvada statement 'Everything is conditional', holds good but when we adopt the point of view of existence, we are bound to rest on unconditionality.

But there is a problem, how to express this conditionality-cum-unconditionality in language ? From the point of view of anekanta. We cannot make one-sided exposition. But in actual usage, whenever we make any particular statement (S is P or S is not P), it takes the form of a categorical proposition. Even a hypothetical (If S then P) or a disjunction (Either S or P) is said to have a categorical basis and therefore, they can be converted into a categorical one. But since our thought is relative, so must be our expression. Then angles of visions or internal harmony of the opposed predications (S is P, S is not P, S is both P and not P, S is neither P nor not P etc.) It is therefore, they can be converted into a categorical one. But since our thought is relative, so

must be our expression. Then there is another problem also to synthesize the different angles of visions or internal harmony of the opposed predications (S is P, S is not P, S is both P and not P, S is neither P nor not P etc.). It is therefore, Lord Mahavira had always prefixed a restrictive expression, Syat ('somehow' or 'in some respect') as a corrective against any absolutist way of thought and evaluation of reality. This is a linguistic tool for the practical application of non-absolutism in words. Because of this prefix 'Syat' and the relative nature of the proposition, it is called Syadvada. But words are only expressive or suggestive (Vacaka or Jnapaka) rather than productive (Karaka). Thus, the meaning is, however, eventually rooted in the nature of things in reality and we have, therefore, to explore a scheme of linguistic symbols (Vacanvinyasa) for model judgments representing alternative stand-points (Nayas). A Naya in an alter-viewpoint a way of approach or particular opinion (abhipraya) or viewpoint (apeksa) about an object as an event. This philosophy of standpoints bears the same relation to philosophy as logic does to thought or grammar to language. We cannot affirm or deny anything absolutely of any object owing to the endless complexity of things. Every statement of a thing, therefore, is bound to be one-sided and incomplete. Hence, the Doctrine of Seven-fold Predication (Saptabhāṅgi) is the logical consummation of the doctrine of relative standpoints (Syadvada) which synthesize the different points of view. If we insist on absolute predication without conditions (Syat), the only course open is to dismiss either the diversity or the identity as a mere metaphysical fiction. Every single standpoint designated in every statement has a partial truth. Different aspects of reality can be considered from different perspectives (Niksepa). Thus Naya is the analytic and the Saptabhāṅgi is the synthetic method of studying ontological problems. In the forms of statements, this doctrine insists on the co-relation of affirmation and negation. All judgements are double-edged in their character. All things are existent as well as non-existent. The predicate of 'inexpressibility' stands for the unique synthesis of existence and non-existence and is therefore 'unspeakable' (Avaktavya). These three predicates, 'existence', 'non-existence' and the 'inexpressible' make seven propositions. These seven predicates are thus the seven exhaustive and unique modes of expression of truth.

It is wrong to charge the theory of Syadvada with the fallacies of self-contradiction, indeterminism, doubt, uncertainty or abandoning original position is describing the Avyaktam, Infinite Regress, Confusion, Vaidhikarana etc. It is also wrong to confuse the pragmatic and pluralistic-realistic attitude of Syadvada with either Pragmatism of Messrs. James-Dewey-Schiller or with the subjectivistic relativism of the Sophist or with the relative absolutism of Whitehead or Bodin or with Einsteinian relativity except in the most general attitude. Pyrrho's prefixing every judgment with a 'may be' must not be identified with Jaina 'Syat', for the former degenerate into agnosticism or scepticism, where as there is no room for any scepticism whatsoever in Jainism. Scepticism means in the minimum, absence of any assertion, whereas Syadvadins always assert, thought what they assert are alternatives each being valid in its own Universe of Discourse, which controls the interpretation of every word. This is the logic of Relatives.

Although, I have tried to designate Anekantavada as theory of non-absolutism in thought, while Syadvada as the doctrine of non-absolutism in speech, both of them are used as synonyms. It is opposed to one sided exposition or statement. There is relation between thought and speech. Hence, Buddha emphasized the importance of right speech (Samyak Vaca) along with right views (Samyak drsti). The Hindu thinkers have also recognized the virtue of speech (Vacaka) along with the physical (Kayika) and mental (Manasika) virtues. To the Jainas, non-absolutism is a virtue, absolutism is vice (Adharma). Views are bound to differ because we are guided by different conditions, thought and modes and attitude. Hence, we must avoid strong and absolute judgements, because we are not the sole possessor of truth. In other words, it is fatal to treat the relative and the home made as though it were the Absolute. It is the language that makes cognition illuminative of its objects. Hence, language too must be so disciplined as to conform itself with the dictum of reality, which is recognized as manifold.

(c) Non absolutism in Action : Ahimsa - The Jaina principle of respect for life (Ahimsa) is the origin of the respect for the opinion of others. Hence, anekantavada or syadvada is an extension of Ahimsa in thought. Non-violence in action must precede non-violence in thought. For Jainism,

of all moral principles, ahimsa is a universal and categorical rule of action and is prescribed for its own sake. It is, therefore called the supreme virtue. It is perhaps, because life is dear to all. The Acaranga says : "There art he whom those intendest to kill." One's soul is inviolable, so is that of others. Mahavira believed in the spiritual equality of all beings and the supreme importance of life. Hence, any action out of our passional vibrations inflicting injury or death is abjured on all accounts. But what is negatively, abstaining from violence is positively love, sympathy and fellow-feeling. Negations and affirmations are complementary to each other. So what is negation of the evil is also the affirmation of the good. Hence, there are the negative and positive aspects of Ahimsa. The Jaina philosophers have distinguished objective violence (Dravya-himsa) is concerned with the act, the latter with the agent. Purely objective violence like the surgeon's operation is not violence. Hence, the attitude of the soul, the bad motive and intention (Pramada and Kasaya) constitute the true basis of violence and non-violence. Of course, the Jainas also take into account the external behaviour. But the emphasis is upon intention. If only material (Dravya himsa is regarded as the touch-stone of Ahimsa, which we cannot remove in any form when we are living, individual salvation would become an impossibility.

Non-violence, however, is not only an individual affair. Individuality is a social affair because personality is a social product. It is embedded in social adjustments and accommodation, reason and persuasion rather than force and fraud. True, the concept of power is as fundamental to politics as that of energy to physics, but what is needed is power without passions, exploitation, hatred and subjugation of the fellow beings. Hence, non-violence has a social content. Its application to the problems of social relations gives rise to the principles of truth (Satya). Ahimsa here assumes the forms of anekanta, which is perhaps the most persistent and rigorous quest of truth in a dispassionate manner. Similarly, the vows of non-possession (Aparigraha) and non-stealing (Asteya) taken together constitute the principle of non-violence in the economic field. If murder is violence, disproportionate possessions, vulgar show of wealth, corruption, exploitation, adulteration etc. are violence, though veiled but more dangerous. Similarly, the principle of brahmacharya (Celibacy or self-control) is also nothing but a form of sexual ahimsa. There is also social violence which consists in the denial of equal, effective and maximum opportunity of self-realization to all. In the international field, imperialism and colonialism, also constitute violence like war and armament. On the other hand, the doctrine of peaceful co-existence and move for disarmament are the application of the principle of non-violence in the international politics. In short, Ahimsa is in reality of the basic social ethics.

Every set of institution requires a virtue, without which it loses organic vitality and becomes mechanical, ineffective and perverted. However, if non-violence is accepted as universal social morality, we can achieve a better society and a happier world. Therefore, Roman Rolland said that the 'Rsis' who discovered the law of non-violence in the midst of violence were greater geniuses than Newton, greater warriors than Wellington. Non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute.

Ahimsa has become both a philosophy and a creed for Jainism. It is distinguished from the Buddhist and the Brahmanical thinkers who would justify wars and even hunting etc. They believe in the purity of intention but they are not very particular about purity of behaviour. For the Jainas, the behaviour (external) must be as pure as intention (internal). Hence, the Jaina-agamas classify himsa into Sankalpaja and Arambhaja. The former is committed with the sole intention of himsa, the latter is committed unavoidably in the exercise of one's professions, duties, self-defense, etc. which may further be divided into Udyamis, Grharambhi and Virodhi. The householder can abstain from Sankalpaja Himsa, but not from Arambhaja although he tries his best to avoid it. The root cause of himsa, however, is passion. Therefore, the Jainas, indicate not only the transgressions (Aticara) of Ahimsa but also prescribe a number of ways and means for the preservation of Ahimsa, called bhavana (contemplation), both negative and positive.

The trio of *mana*, *vacana* and *karma* which is brought in our discussion is to establish non-absolutism. Hence, it is a trio rather than a trichotomy. It is vicious intellectualism and the error of exclusive particularity to separate thought from speech or action or vice-versa. Ethical life is a whole an integration of the three aspects of personality, which are interdependent and supplementary to each other. But as I have been able to follow the Jaina spirit and scriptures, I am constrained to believe that the metaphysics of *anekanta* together with the logical dialectics of *naya*, *syadvada*, *saptabhangi*, *niksepa*, have been explored to establish the doctrine of *Ahimsa* on a solid logical and metaphysical foundation. However, the motivation for Mahavira to adopt *Ahimsa* is to be traced outside the realm of logic and metaphysics. It has to be found out in the long heritage of non-violence in the Indian culture and also in the character and conditions of Indian society during Mahavira. It seems that the Indian society at this stage was worst victim of violence. Ethics is situational. It cannot be indifferent to the needs of the time. Cruel sacrifices, meaningless rituals, unequal social order, growth of capitalist economy and political rivalries led to this great emphasis upon the philosophy of non-violence. This is very similar to our time, when there is strong opinion in favor of disarmament and world peace. It seems, non-violence is a necessity, even today. We have to choose between Atom and *Ahimsa*. William James, therefore, calls for a 'moral equivalent of war'. It is not only an intellectual utopia but a concrete moral guide and social stabilizer. The all or the non-approach has brought us on the brink of total annihilation and social anarchy, hence the non-absolutistic approach in thought, word and deed is the only way before us.

## NON-ABSOLUTISM AND JAINA VIEW OF DARSANA

India has been the birth-land and play-ground of different types of philosophies, even the rustics and the illiterate talk about Brahman and Atman, Maya and Moksha, *Anekanta* and *Ahimsa*. Infact philosophy runs into the veins of Indian blood. Indian people not only talk but also live philosophy. Philosophy, Religion and Ethics are so close to the Indian life that they become inseparable parts of the personality of every Indian. Jainism, Buddhism or Vedanta are not arms-chair of philosophies but they are living creeds of the Indian people. Thus philosophy is not only the light-house but also the fountain of life for them. It is not only an inquiry into the meaning of reality but also into the meaning of life. Indeed, Indian philosophy is the philosophy of life.

However, in the technical sense, philosophy is used in three different senses in Indian thought, namely, vision, self-realization and ratiocination. The first meaning, i.e., 'vision' is very crude although very close to the literal meaning of philosophy or *Darsana* (*drs* = to see). Here 'seeing' means 'sense-perception' or *Pratyaksa*. The Carvakas accept this view of *darsana*, because it holds that perception alone is the source of knowledge. In our ordinary usage, we glibly talk about vision of a pot (*Ghata-darsana*) or vision of cloth (*Pata-darsana*). But I wonder, if we can accept such a crude view of philosophy, although we can not deny that the 'deeper-seeing' starts from the 'surface-seeing' of a perceptual 'pot' or a piece of 'cloth'. Even the Vedantic example that the different forms of pot have their ground in the mother-earth, forms change but not reality.

The second sense in which philosophy is used is that of Knowledge of self (*Atma-darsana*) or intuitive experience. The Upanisads and other systems recognize self as the ultimate reality and hence to know the self is to know the reality. Strangely enough, some of the Jaina mystics like Kunda-Kunda, Pujyapada and Yogindu accept this view of philosophy. For them knowledge of the self is the highest knowledge and self-realization is the highest value of life. "One who knows the self, knows all." The gathas of Kunda-Kunda, Pujyapada and Yogindu's words are also remarkable when he declares, "That Atman is known, everything else is known, so Atman should

be realized." Pujiyapada distinguishes 'self-knowledge' from 'self-delusion' like the Upanisads and the Vedanta.

The third meaning of philosophy is reason or ratiocination. The Nyaya is the champion of logic in Indian thought. Logic is regarded as the light of all knowledge, means of all practical behaviour and even sustainer of all virtues. Without logic, philosophy loses its luster. Self-knowledge or Intuitive-knowledge is rare phenomenon. It can not be generalized. Hence, for ordinary use of life, logic is a must in the field of thought and behaviour. In the absence of reasoning, ideas become idiosyncrasies. They become too personal and private. Even intuition is not against reason, though it may be beyond reason. Those who do not know reason are beasts and fools and not men. Hence every system of Indian Philosophy accepts Nyaya or Logic as the necessary methodology of Philosophy. The importance of Logic is reflected in the fact that Logic or Nyaya is identified with one of the important systems of Indian Philosophy, attributed to Gotama. Hegel in the west had gone further and had identified not only logic with Philosophy but also with reality. This sort of para-logism is however not accepted by the Indian thinkers. Even Gotama regards reason as the means not the end. The technical Nyaya word for philosophy called 'Anviksa' means "investigation, since it consists in the reviewing (anuviksana) of a thing previously apprehended by perception and verbal testimony." Whatever is established is true. The purpose of the Nyaya is critical examination of the objects of knowledge by means of logical proof. Every Science is a Nyaya, which means literally going into a subject. Hence, it is sometimes called Tarka-vidya or Vada-vidya (science of debate and discussion). The Jainas also have a long and rich tradition of their own logic beginning from the Agamas. Samantabhadra called Tarka-vidya or Vada-vidya (science of debate and discussion). The Jainas also have a long and rich tradition of their own logic beginning from the Agamas Samantabhadra and Siddhasena, Akalanka and Hemchandra, Manikyanandi and Vidyananda, Abhayadeva, Devendra Suri, Vadiraja, Dharmabhusana, Anantavira, Yasovijaya are some of the most important logicians of the Jain tradition. It means that logic and life go together. Neither logic is unconnected with life nor life is adverse to logic.

However, there are two additional senses in which Philosophy is used in Jainism, which are peculiar to its own. In one of these senses, philosophy stands for faith (Saddha) of which we find mention in the second verse of Tattvartha-sutra (1.2). In fact, here we get the definition of Samyak-darsana which means conviction in the knowledge of things ascertained as they are. Tattva means 'thatness' and Artha is that which is ascertained, hence tattvartha means ascertainment of 'thatness' or 'tattva'. Tattvartha Saddhanam is Samyak-darsanam. This is the first of the trio of the Right Belief, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct, together which constitute the path of liberation. Faith is the precursor to knowledge. The Gita also says that he who has faith attains wisdom or knowledge. Faith is not blind belief, but it is the psychological condition of knowledge. Not only knowledge, faith is necessary even for attaining the highest degree of Yoga, and the worlds of righteousness. Even sacrifice becomes void which is empty of faith. Man is of the nature of his faith, what his faith is, that verily, he is. Right belief is the basis on which Right knowledge depends, hence we find the serial order in the sutra which mentions first the right belief and only second Right knowledge. Right belief or Samyak-darsana is either with attachment (Saraga) or without attachment (Vitaraga). The first is characterized by calmness (Prasam), fear of mundane existence (Samyag), Compassion for all living beings (Anukampa) and belief in the existence of things according to tattvartha. The second type of samyak-darsana consists in the purity of soul without attachment which can be attained either by intuition (Nisarga) or by tuition (Adhigama) - either by precepts or scriptures. Matter, place, time and five attainments are the external aids and subsidence of Karma (Upasama), Destructor of subsidence (Ksayopasama) of Karmas are the internal aids to samyak-darsana.

However, there is one lacuna in the concept of Right belief as to what is 'thatness'. Every system of philosophy has its own object of knowledge. Then, right belief will differ from System to system. But it does not matter. The supreme lord as the Gita says, confirms the faith of each and grants the reward each seeks. Every surface derives its soil from the depths even as every shadow reflects the nature of the substance. No matter what we revere so long as our reverence is serious, it helps its progress, which is required is serious and sincere faith.



The second special sense of darsana in Jainism is understood in the sense of the knowledge of the generality (Samanya-bodha) or Indeterminate knowledge (Alocana). This is also called formless consciousness or indeterminate knowledge (Anakara Upayoga). That knowledge which is gained without probandum (Linga) is darsana, which takes the help of probandum is Jnana. The former is restricted to the immediate present, where as which is spread over the past, present and future in the indeterminate intuition is the cognition of an object which leaves the specific determinations out of account and it takes place immediately on that very sense-object contact. The determinate intuition transforms into determinate perception. A cognition which fails to take note of specific characteristics is called indecision, because it falls short of certitude delivering itself in the form 'what may it be.' Where there is lack of decision or certitude, there can not be valid knowledge. Although, there is some similarity between Jaina 'darsana' and Buddhistic 'Nirvikalpa Jnana', but the latter cannot be called 'Pramana' as there is indecision. But darsana as Hemcandra holds is not sensation (Avagraha). That perception of the generalism (Samanya) of things without particulars (Visesa) in which there is no grasping of details is called 'darsana'.

Darsana whether is visual (Caksuh) or non-visual or clairvoyant (Avadhi), it is merely 'darsana'. It is neither right belief nor wrong belief. The logical tradition of the Jainas include darsana from the category of Pramana and scholars like Manikyanadi and Vadideva Suri treat it as semblance of Pramana (Pramabhasa). Abhayadeva in his commentary on Sammati-tarka, no doubt regard 'darsana' as 'Pramana' but it is not in the logical sense but in the scriptural sense where darsana is regarded as Samyak-darsana. Yasovijaya in his Trakabhasa (p.5) treats darsana as determinate perception and hence falls in the category of Pramana, on the other hand excludes darsana from the category of Pramana. Hemacandra also treat it is non-pramana.

We have seen that the term 'darsana' has been used in different senses in the Jaina Philosophy. However, even if we accept the most commonly accepted meaning of 'darsana' as direct knowledge of reality, it ceases to be universal in the true senses of the term as every system has its own conception of reality. Hence, there will be as many 'darsana' as system of thought. This leads us to posit alternative standpoints in philosophy. This is Anekanta, which is the soul of Jaina thought and culture.

## RELEVANCE OF ANEKANTA IN MODERN TIMES

Modern times is an era of crisis in the realm of human civilization. The reason is that we give so much attention to short-range and local problems that long-range and global problems continue to be neglected. Secondly, life has become more intricately interdependent and complex. So simpler solutions no longer suffice. A world civilization is fast emerging and we cannot afford to solve our problems with a parochial temper and sectarian outlook. For human survival, we need human cooperation on a plenary scale able to deal with rapidly increasing complexities. The critical problems are so complex that we need a philosophy equally complex to grapple with them. One dimensional man in a multi-dimensional world-crisis will be out of joint. Inter-existence is the positive option for mankind. Either there is organic growth of mankind or there is organic destruction of human civilization. Not only this is too late in history to convert all of mankind to Christianity or Islam or Jainism (or to Communism or Capitalism or any other isms), but also to some metaphysical principles which we have been cherishing since antiquity. The growth of scientific knowledge and outlook has destroyed most of our false dogmas and superstitions but it has failed to provide us knowledge that could sublimate our animal and selfish nature. Animality has been dominating our individual as well as social behaviour. Hence, our life has become full of tensions, turmoil and disorders. Therefore, although we are outwardly pleading for world-peace and non-violence, yet we have been preparing for war. This is the crisis of modern time that we aspire for peace but prepare for the formidable funeral procession of mankind.

Humanity is tottering today upon the brink of self-annihilation for lack of understanding, which includes understanding ourselves and understanding each other. It is a time of tragic importance for the world because even before the shadows cast by one war is lifted fully, the skies become overcast with dark threatening clouds. Hence, at no period of human history man was in need of sound philosophy than today. As war begins in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace should be built. Today, if one person does not agree with me, he is wicked, if a country, it is wicked as if there is no half-way, no neutrality. So ultimately it is our warring ideologies that are at the root of world-tension. But ideologies or philosophies depend upon our-way of philosophizing. Hence Locke rightly felt that epistemological problems are prior to all others. An epistemological reorientation will influence metaphysical grounding which in turn will determine our socio-ethico-political views. Any solution can ultimately be achieved through knowledge free from confusion and prejudices.

Since things have many characters, they are the objects of all sided knowledge. The knowledge which determines the full meanings of an object through the employment of one-sided knowledge, is partial knowledge. Hence we should discard all absolute judgements, otherwise truth would be violated. Reality has got innumerable characteristics. A valid knowledge is defined as that which gives us knowledge of a thing in its have got innumerable characters, hence all things are multidimensional or Anekantic.

The word is the store-house of great chaos in thought. All the confusion of thought which is prevailing in the world is the outcome of inexhaustive research and acceptance of a part for the whole. Almost all our disputes only betray the pig-headedness of the blind men who spoke differently about an elephant. The outstanding personalities like Sri Aurobindo, Raman Maharshi etc. spoke to us, in a world over organized by ideological fanaticism, that truth is not exclusive or sectarian. Every idol however noble if may seem is ultimately a Moloch that devours its worshippers. It is fatal to treat the relative and the home-made as though it were the Absolute. It is only intellectual clarity which will resolve all conflict and rivalry. All dogmatism owes its genesis to the partiality of outlook and fondness for a line of thinking to which a person has accustomed himself. This is imperialism and aggressiveness in thought. When the one party or another thinks himself the sole possessor of absolute truth, it becomes natural that he should think his neighbors absolutely in the clutches of Error or the Devil. Today, one man or one country fight with the other because their views vary. Views are bound to vary because we are guided by different conditions, thought and attitudes. Hence, it is wrong to think oneself right and rest others wrong. Here Syadvada-Anekantavada represents the highest form of Catholicism coupled wonderfully with extreme conservatism, a most genuine and yet highly dignified compromise better than which we cannot imagine.

We must realize that there is other's view-point as our own. This can happen when one puts oneself into another's shoes or to get under the skin of others. This is called sympathy which is the act of reproducing in our minds the feelings of another. Gandhiji once told : "I advise a man not from my standpoint but from his. I try to put myself in his shoes. When I cannot do so. I refuse to advise." He once said : "I am myself a Puritan but for others a Catholic."

Syadvada or Anekantavada is adoption of the safe and secure middle-path leaving the two extremes. It means that of a saint, chastity of a woman, innocence of a child, bravery of a hero etc. As a lover of nature, one can equally enjoy the rains of rainy season, coolness of winter and heat

add two pages 218 219 gada

demand that refuses to be actualized. The only scepticism is that there is concerning the so-called self-complete reality. So where as a sceptic is sceptical about any character of reality, Syadvada is quite definitely assertive. Yet he is more sceptical than any sceptic in the world so far as the definiteness of the ultimate reality is concerned. He would go beyond avaktavya or Sunya so far the Advaitins and Sunyavadins are concerned with regard to their statements regarding ultimate reality.

Hence, Anekanta stands against all mental absolutism. We can substantiate this relativistic standpoint on the cosmo-micro-physical ground supported by Einstienian doctrine of relativity and Maxwell's equation of electro-magnetism which go fundamentally against the notion of absolute truth. When we say, we know this, we are saying more than is strictly correct, because all we know is what happens when the waves reach our bodies. Researches in Psychology of thinking, perception of self and conception of self in Child-psychology, and Psycho-analytical studies in Freudian narcissism or Adlerian power-factor support relativism is justified for no smooth functioning of society is possible without mutual accommodation and adjustment which presupposes Catholicism in thought and sense of tolerance. In ethics and morality, we know so far relativism is dominating. In the field of logic, the doctrine of the universe of Discourse is sometimes limited to a small portion of actual universal of things and is sometimes co-extensive with that Universe. The Universe of Discourse controls the interpretation of every word. Logic of Relatives too recognizes the truth of Syadvada-Anekantavada when it discusses all relations embodied in propositions.

Much of the confusion either of Buddhism or Advaita Vedanta is due to false exaggeration of the relative principles of becoming and being into absolute truths. Same is the fault called the variety of philosophical doctrines.

Hence Anekanta doctrine is the exposition of the principle of 'comprehensive perspectivism'. No perspective is final or absolute unless it is understood in terms of relativity. Therefore, even Anekanta (non-absolutism) is subject to Anekanta (non-absolutism). If non-absolutism is absolute, it is not universal since there is one real which is absolute, it is not universal since there is one real which is absolute. And if it is not a non-absolute and universal fact. Tossed between the two horns of the dilemma, non-absolutism thus simply evaporates. But we can meet this difficulty by making a distinction between the theory and practice of anekanta. Every proposition of the dialectical seven-fold judgment is either complete or incomplete. In the former, we use only one word that describes one characteristics of the object and hold the remaining characters to be identical with it. On the other hand, in the Incomplete judgment, we speak of truth as relative to our standpoint. In short, the complete judgment is the object of valid knowledge (Pramana) and incomplete judgment is the object of aspectal knowledge (Naya). Hence the non-absolute is constituted of the absolute as its elements and as such would not be possible if there were no absolutes.

Here we can solve this difficulty by analyzing the nature of unconditionality of the statement 'All statements are conditional', which is quite different from the normal meaning of unconditionality. This is like the idea contained in the passage - 'I do not know myself', where there is no contradiction between 'knowledge' and 'ignorance'. In the sentence, 'I am undecided', there is at least one decision that 'I am undecided'. Similarly, the categoricity behind a disjunctive judgment (A man is either good or bad), is not like the categoricity of an ordinary categorical judgment like 'The horse is red'. True the basis is always categorical but this categoricity does never clash with the proposition being disjunctive. When a logical positivist says that 'there is no metaphysics', philosophy enters through the back-door. In short, the unconditionality in the statement 'All statements are conditional' is quite different from the normal conditionality. There are primarily two sources to understand the world - senses and reason, closely connected with two grades of reality (Hegel). Existence is actuality or actual verification, which is unconditional, absolute and categorical. There is no alternation or condition. But on the level of thought or reason or essence, there may be alternatives. But we cannot live in the world of thought alone and forget existence. We must also have something other than thought or reason which is unreason or irrationality. Behind reason, there is always the unreason, which we can give the name of faith (as suggested by Kant, Herder, Jacobi etc.). There are many grounds of faith - one being the Scriptures. Scripture differs from one another. Jainas must stick to their position. Here is definiteness. However, we cannot expect such definiteness with reason because it only offers alternative pictures - Jaina, Advaita, Vaisesikas. All are equally possible. In order to avoid indefiniteness we stick to one such possibility which is chosen for us by the community to which we belong or by some superior intuition. Thus there comes unconditionality. However, another may choose another direction. So there appears to be again alternation among existence. But

this alternation only on thought level. We compare thought with other thoughts. And what is comparison ? Comparison involves thinking and reasoning, so it is thought-process. Some are bound to admit alternation. My standpoint is only a possible one. But I cannot always fly in the air of possibilities, I must have moorings in some actuality. I must adopt one standpoint.

Jainism is against all kinds of imperialism in thought. For each community there is a special absolute. But the absolute themselves are alternatives so far as they are probables, But this is only on thought level. But when I have chosen one it is more than possible, it is existence or actual. So there is wonderful reconciliation between conditionality and unconditionality. Every thing is conditional on thought level, but on the level of existence there is no real contradiction.

To avoid the fallacy of infinite regress, the Jainas distinguish between valid non-absolutism (Samyak Anekanta) and invalid non-absolutism (Mithya Anekanta). Like an invalid absolute judgment, an invalid non-absolute judgment, too, is invalid. To be valid, Anekanta must not be absolute but relative.

If we consider the above points, we cannot say that the "theory of relativity cannot be logically sustained without the hypothesis of an absolute." Thought is not mere distinction but also relation. Everything is possible only in relation to and as distinct from others and the Law of Identity. Under these circumstances, it is not legitimate to hold that the hypothesis of an absolute cannot be sustained without the hypothesis of a relative. Absolute to be absolute presupposes a relative somewhere and in some forms, even the relative of its non-existence.

Jaina logic of Anekanta is based not on abstract intellectualism but on experience and realism leading to a non-absolutistic attitude of mind. Multiplicity and unity, definability and non-definability etc. which apparently seem to be contradictory characteristics of reality are interpreted to co-exist in the same object from different points of view without any offense to logic. They seem to be contradictory of each other simply because one of them is mistaken to be the whole truth. Infact, integrity of truth consists in this very variety of its aspects, within the rational unity of an all comprehensive and ramifying principle. The charge of contradiction against the co-presence of being and non-being in the real is figment of a priori logic.

## **SYADVADA : A SOLUTION OF WORLD-TENSION**

Expository : Syat (somehow) Syadvada is (an epistemological) solution of World-tension.

Analysis :

- (a) Syadvada - The Jaina theory of Judgment and truth as relative.
- (b) World-tension - "Present international tensions among nations.
- (c) Epistemological Solution - Solution emanating from the standpoint of knowledge.

Synthesis : Syadvada along with its complementary doctrines of Anekantavada and Nayavada, when applied to the phenomena of international tension, might result in perpetual peace.

World-tensions

By world-tension, we mean presence of international conflicts, hot and cold wars, so-called Peace and Defense treaties etc. But international conflicts and contradictions often lead to external and international aggressions and wars. Hence world tension includes "tensions within and among nations." It is no use denying the great dangers that threaten our present generation. The riven atom, uncontrolled, can only be a growing menace to us all. One atom bomb killed more than seventy thousand people, but now it is not a question of one or two or even hundred but of hundreds of millions of them. Prof. Yusuki Tsurumi says in agony - "Japan's mind is disturbed profoundly. We face war - how can we avert it ?" Therefore while inaugurating Silver Jubilee Session of Indian Philosophical Congress Dr.K.N.Katju fears that the story of

Mahabharata it seems is being re-enacted all over again. In the conclusion of that war there was neither the victim to lament his defeat nor the victor to celebrate the victory. Referring to Korea he observed, their towns and villages, their land and dwellings are being trampled under foot and destroyed over and over again by invading troops and retreating troops and human life there seems to have lost all sanctity. So that the war of liberation has been turned into a war of liberation. Surely this is completely a new version of liberation. Though the third-war might mean virtual end of all that western civilization stands for, yet there is inspite of all this an imminent danger of war. The result is the mounting suspicion and rivalry between the two power blocks, feverish rearmament and cold war, alternating with timid war. In spite of recent peace moves this is no gain saying the fact that the world is sharply divided into two opposing camps and there is an array of peace (war), defense (offense) treatises like NATO MEDO and many more yet to come out. The development of the international organizations in last fifty year recognizes that disputes which arise concern many states, and that they need to be settled. So we are practically in a world bewildered by the turmoil of nationalism and war. The whole world is in the ferment.

### **Need of a Solution**

Humanity is tottering today upon the brink of the principle of self-annihilation for the lack of proper understanding which includes understanding ourselves, understanding each other. It is a time of tragic importance for the world, because even before the shadows cast by the war lifted fully, the skies have become overcast with dark threatening clouds. Hence, at no period of human history man was in need of a sound Philosophy than today. As war begins in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace should be built. Today if a person does not agree with your country it is wicked; there is no half-ways, hence there is no neutrality. Unesco, realizing the need of a solution is however keen.

Solutions there are and are of many types - political including diplomatic, economic, religious etc. Broadly there are two approaches towards world peace -

- (a) Religio-Spirituo-Mystical Approach.
- (b) Politico-Economico-Positivistic Approach.

Religio-Spirituo-Mystical View - The upholders of the religio-spirituo-mystical view hold that without is within. We cannot banish war while we are perpetuating war within us accumulated in a national form leads to war. Hence the best solution of world-tension is to control the animal within us." Here the dictum is "Reform yourself and the world will be reformed." Some of the mystics, however, depend upon God's goodness.

Political Solution - Professional politicians often indulge in diplomatic double talk which breeds pessimism and cynicism on the part of the people and makes peace a mere will-o-the wisp. Some very irresponsible politicians talk of 'preventive war' as a solution of world-tension, for they think offense may be the best form of defense. From United Nations we cannot have any hope. Vyshinsky charges that "USA has stolen the sign-board of UN" and also Turner confirms that the "UN is really dead as a peace and security maintaining organization." Commenting upon the prospects for Berlin Meeting the Eastern Economist doubts "whether the meeting will prove another episode in the cold war or a real ground of understanding." Similarly the same Journal had declared that "Conference at Bermuda will hold out no new hopes for the world."

Hence political solution is practically no solution, for present day politics is not a politics of peace and brotherhood but of falsity and fraud, deceit and dishonesty. We cannot adopt politics as a profession and remain honest. So said Adolph Hitler that if you wish the sympathies of broad masses, then you must tell the crudest and most stupid things. Hence any politico-diplomatic talks of either big four or five for peace will prove a mere moonshine for diplomatic talks are talks of interest and convince.

Economic Solution - But political evils are to a large extent supposed to be eliminated through democracy which has no place for autocratic whims for waging war. But if we are working up to a democracy in politics we must have a democracy in Economics. Most serious of the problems which claimed their attention were not political or territorial but financial and economic and that



the perils of the future lay not in frontiers and in sovereignties but in food, coal and transport. Political rights too have failed to provide a key to the millennium. So political democracy if it to survive must be interpreted in economic terms. So long as there are tigers in society there will be wars. Permanent peace cannot come from the endless see-haw, but only from the elimination of the cause of enmity between nations. And in the present day these causes are mainly to be found in economic interest of certain sections and are therefore only to be abolished by a fundamental reconstruction, of course not of the type of U.N.R.R.A., W.M.B.I.B.R.D., I.T.A., E.R.P. and their counterparts.

This fatal neglect of the economic factor by the peacemaker of 1919 was the main theme of Mr. Keynes's famous book 'The Economic Consequence of the Peace.' Individual profit which in the 18th and 19th centuries provided the motive force of the economic system, has failed us and we have not discovered any moral for it rather than war. Mr. Keynes adds "Pyramid-building, earthquakes even wars may serve to increase wealth." During great US economic crisis Governor Lafolette however charged those who had squandered 40,000,000,000 dollar of American money in the most wasteful and futile war of modern history and were not prepared to vote money for public works to relieve distress. The Economic Digest confirms this waste today, when it published that US spends 16 million dollars a month on US forces in UK.

So somehow people think that if economies be reconstructed it can bring peace. So economies means political economies and political philosophy. And with this comes the perennial conflict of political ideologies. The free-world must adhere to Marshall and Keynes and the Keynesian Revolution, while the Reds find salvation in no other economic structure other than the Marxian, because the Capital is not a personal, it is a social power. So again, ultimately it is our warring ideologies that are at the root of world tension. So whether we philosophize or we don't, we are to be philosophized.

### **Transition to Epistemological Solution**

But we must philosophize only in a particular way as there are many methods of philosophy. Much of our philosophy depends upon our way of philosophizing. Empiricism leads to scepticism, whether of Locke or of the Carvakas. Similarly, dogmatism, rationalism, intuitionism, authoritarianism, mysticism etc. have their own consequences. This branch of philosophy has very lately been used firstly by Ferrier, although we can not forget Locke who first reminded us to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understanding were or were not fitted to deal with. In short, Locke felt that the epistemological problems are former to all others. After all any quest for reality presupposes (path of) knowledge. In any survey of the history of philosophy we come across with the treatment of knowledge. Cunningham calls it to be the problem of intellectual enterprise. But problems of knowledge pre-supposes the methods of acquiring Knowledge. Otherwise one may ask, "If it is the business of Kant in his Critique of Pure Reason to show how the critique of pure reason is possible ? To maintain that our knowledge is true, we must prove that it is really so. Thus the validity of knowledge is made to rest on the validity of the methods of knowledge. Doctrines of the Pramanas, ranging from one (Carvaka) to eight, I am sure, determine to a great extent the nature of philosophy. So an epistemological reorientation will influence metaphysical grounding, which in turn will determine our socio-ethico-political views.

Great logical inter-relations among all social and sociological studies prove that one fellows are the reductio-ad-absurdum from the other. Thus we see that any solution can ultimately be achieved through knowledge free from confusion and prejudices. Each addition to knowledge is in sober truth one step further to the things as they are in their inmost nature. But the main difficulty is to blend the divergent current of thought and in particular the methods of philosophy and science.

With this end in view we put before you an old wine in a new bottle - The relative. Jaina Theory of Judgment namely Syadvada as it expresses one aspect of reality. Syadvada is composed of

two words - Syat and vada. Syat may mean perhaps, some how, may be in some respect etc. So Syadvada with certain reservations may be translated into Probalism.

Syadvada must be understood along with its metaphysical counterpart of Nayavada, Niksepantavada and Saptabhangi which form a formidable part of Jaina philosophy, which was systematized in the second period of the evolution of Jaina Literature, namely Anekanta Yuga.

### **Theory of Syadvada**

Definition : In the earliest Jaina work on pure logic by Siddhasena Divakara, the author holds "since things have many characters, they are the object of all sided knowledge." The knowledge which determines the full meaning of an object through the employment in the scriptural method, of one sided Nayas, is called Syadvada Sruta. Similarly Samantabhadra says that "Syadvada discards all absolute-judgements." Even sermonic sentences of Lord Mahavira had always a prefix of 'Syat' for otherwise truth would have been violated. Scriptural knowledge is of three kinds - Scriptures of bad Tirthankaras, one sided method and all sided knowledge. So Syadvada holds that the knowledge of reality has got innumerable characteristics. The reality is not simply Sat, nor simply Asat, nor simply Universal, nor simply Particular but both and also more. Even Tattvarthadhigama-sutra, the Bible of Jainism recognizes the most important use of Naya as the theory of Syadvada. Even Pramana is defined as that which gives us knowledge of a thing in its various aspects. Sri Abhinava Dharmabhusana in Nyaya-Dipika holds that all expressions are somehow real. Let us hold with Mallisena Suri, the author of Syadvada Manjari non-eternal and hence do not disobey Syadvada.

### **Syadvada and Anekantavada**

A thing partakes the nature of both reality and unreality, Mallisena says, for example a man having characteristic of lion in one part and of man in other part is called Nrsimhavatara. So Anekantavada is called Syadvada, according to which the same object has got the presence of eternality etc. All object have got innumerable characters. So Manikyanandi in Pariksamukham giving example of Says that all things are Anekantic (possessed of different aspects) because we do not find that these have only one aspect. A thing that is real has three characteristics of production, destruction and stability. Object according to Nyaya-Dipika has many qualities, which is proved on the basis of perception, inference and testimony. Nyayavatara of Siddhasena also holds that things have many characters. So substance is that which has qualities and modifications and the real is substantial. So substance has anything which has origin existence and destruction and which may be described by opposite. The standpoint of Jainas is supported by Patanjali Yoga and Mimamsa. So reality to them is a unity in difference or bhedabheda or difference in unity. Substance perish through its own qualities and modifications. But the Gunas or qualities are inseparably related to substance. The qualities continue while the forms change. Every object has innumerable characters and that which has not many character is also not real like sky lotus, this is proved by the Method of Difference.

### **Syadvada and Nayavada**

Broadly, knowledge according to the Jaina is of two kinds-Pramana and Naya; knowledge of a thing in itself and knowledge of a thing in its relation. A Naya is a stand-point from which we make a statement about a thing. A thing conceived from one particular point of view is the object of Naya or one-sided knowledge. In Saptabhangi Naya, where we find pluralistic doctrine of the Jaina Dialectics, Muni Jinavijaya says that the doctrine points to the relativity of knowledge

concerning all the objects of the world. Champata Rai Jaina describes Naya as a Path or way which implies in connection with philosophy, the Method of accurate thinking, hence he calls Naya as the 'Science of thought'. In Nyaya Karnika's introduction Mohan Lal Desai holds that Nyaya-Vidya or Philosophy of Standpoints is an essential department of knowledge by itself, and bears the same relation to philosophy as logic does to thought or grammar to language or speech. Nathmal Taita calls Nayaways of approach and observation. Broadly Nayas divided into ten and six subclasses respectively. According to more popular scheme, the Nayas are seven, placed under two broad classes of Arthanaya and Sabdanaya, as they refer to object and meaning. So these seven Nayas may be in short called the heptagonal forms of our ontological inquiry or one-sided method of comprehension of seven kinds. In fact there may be as many kinds of Nayas as there are modes of speech.

Full knowledge of all characters even of a particle of dust cannot be claimed by anyone of us, because of our limitation and bias for a particular angle of vision. Truth is relative to our standpoint. We cannot affirm or deny anything absolutely of any object owing to the endless complexity of things. Being is not of a persistent unalterable nature. Every statement of a thing is necessarily one sided and incomplete. A thing may be true or untrue or partake of both while being neither. The ordinary human being cannot rise above the limitations of his senses; so his apprehension of reality is partial and valid only from a particular point of view. Thus Nayavada is an unique instrument of analysis.

### **Seven Nayas and their Fallacies**

Naigam Nayas or non-distinguished regards objects as possessing both the general and the specific properties, because no one can live without the other; all objects possess two kinds of properties Samanya and Visesa. So this way of pantascopic observation criticizes the one sided and wrong view of Nyaya-Vaisesika realism according to which Samanya and Visesa have separate existence from the object. Thus there is the synthesis of long drawn conflict between the universal and the particular. Hence Nyaya-vaisesika is accused of an abstractionist outlook technically called the Fallacy Naigamabhasa.

Nextly, Sangraha Naya remedies the extremism of universal and particular. In fact there can be no universal apart from the particular and vice versa. For example, not a single nimb or mango or any other tree can be conceived apart from vegetableness, so finger cannot be considered apart from hands. So Avaitins and Sankhyas, Plato and Kant etc. are accused of the Fallacy of Sangrahabhasa or who recognize universal alone as real.

An extremist assertion is likely to be met with a diametrically opposite view of analytic and particularistic approach where we will meet the Carvakas to whom object possess only the specific properties which is non-existent like donkey's horn. So this practical and particularistic view is to meet with the fallacy of wrong selection of species called Vyavaharabhasa, where one eats vegetable without being if of any kind, mango etc.

The particularistic approach sometimes forgets the past or the future aspect of a thing and confines only to the present, straight away referring to the natural thing. To them past is defunct and the future is unborn. The reality is momentary being, a great flux. These are Buddhist and the Heraclitus, who must be charged with the fallacy of straight and direct glimpse, devoid of temporal determinations or Kalikaniksepa. This fallacy is called Rjusutrabhasa.

But as the real is expressed and characterized by a word who must also examine the meanings of word. So comes Sabda Naya or verbal standpoint. Each name of has it own meaning and different words or (Synonyms) may also refer to the same object. So the relation between terms and meaning is relative one, and when we take them to be absolute we commit the fallacy of Sabdabhasa, which we find among the nominalist and the grammarians.

So Samabhirudha Naya or Etymological aspect distinguish terms according to their roots. With the difference of the words expressing the same object the significance of the object also differs as ghata is, which makes noise like ghata-ghata and so on. So the identification of reality with the root of the word by which it is denoted is the fallacy of Samabhirudhabhasa, again committed by grammarians.

The grammarians reach the climax when they identify reality with such like or specialized form of sixth kind for it argues that if a thing is really recognized, even when it does not fulfill its function, then why can cloth be not called a yarn? If we go against it, we commit the fallacy of Evambhutabhasa.

### **Doctrine of Saptabhangi**

Now the Jainas claim to embody all these seven aspects in their philosophy, hence treat it like a judge over all systems of philosophy which are separately one-sided. So this is the doctrine of liberal pluralism as contrasted with dogmatic monism. To a realist pot has no existence in the world outside. To a nominalist the pot is a sign in the outward world which calls up its image in the mind, to a Buddhist pot is nothing but a continuous stream of changes. So also to Bergson it is a great flux. Perceptionists regard the pot only as a bundle of qualities without any substratum containing them. But to a Spencerian Positivist pot is a vivid idea the causes of which are unknowable. However, to the Vedantins pot is a figment of illusion, a thing of nescience. All these philosophers look at the pot more or less from one dominating point of view, while neglecting the other. The Jaina logicians welcome all the light that comes from different ways of approach and integrate them in one whole in which all these finite traits can co-subsist. All philosophical disputes arise out of a confusion of standpoints. Even in practical life we find that a man is father in relation to a particular boy, in relation to another boy he is not father, in relation to both the boys taken together he is the father and is not the father, and since both the ideas cannot be conveyed in words at the same time, he may be called indescribable. Considering all these standpoints, a marvelous mechanism of Syadvada or Saptavada or Saptabhangi has been worked out which is a unique organon of knowledge to grasp the manifoldness of reality. When the reality is dynamic and truth is manifold, our task of knowing the truth becomes difficult for there is nothing certain on account of endless complexities of things, and hence the expression of truth must be equally difficult if not more, for the words fail to describe the different characters of a thing at the same time. So the speaker does describe one character which is prominent than the other characters in that object. Therefore, we have no right to make any absolute judgment. Every proposition gives us only a perhaps, a may be or a Syat. Absolute affirmation or negation of any object is therefore unreasonable. All propositions are only hypothetically true. Hence unlike ordinary logic Syadvada recognizes conditional predication, which is expressed by the prefix Syat. Logic of Syadvada differs from ordinary logic in the fact that instead of two kinds of judgment as affirmative and negative it recognizes as many as seven forms of judgment. So Syadvada is also called Saptabhanga.

### **Syadvada as a Doctrine of Seven Forms of Judgment**

So far prefix Syat is concerned, we must use, because any substance is unity-in-diversity, so if we insist on absolute predication without condition, the only course open is to dismiss either the diversity or the identity as a mere metaphysical fiction. So Anekantavada teaches that every single statement may have a partial truth, hence even Lord Mahavira, the Omniscient took recourse to a Syat before every sermonic sentence, so much so the scriptural knowledge of the Jainas has been called as Syadvada by Samantabhadra. Even Dr. Hermon Jacobi calls Syadvada a Synonym of Jainism.

Now, the seven forms of Saptabhangi Syadvada are predicative judgment regarding the same object according to the point of view of speech. As different aspect of reality can be considered from four different perspectives (Niksepa or Nayas) such as name, representation, privation and present condition, similarly seven modes of speech can be considered from four different points of view of its own matter, time, place and nature as well as from other point of view.

Now a thing exists as itself under certain circumstances from the points of its own material, place, time and nature. This table exists as made of wood in this hall at the present moment with such and such shape and size, but this does not exist as made of gold, at another place or at another time of a different shape. So the table exists somehow, i.e., not always, everywhere, in every shape. Hence let us say somehow the table does not exist, when considered from its other point of view. So existence and non-existence are to be asserted accordingly as the element of one or the other is in predominance. Things are considered in relation to their importance and not. Hence Syad Nasti.

But when can the table exists as well as not exist ? Yes the table can exist for me in certain form, place, etc. and does not exist in other form, place etc. So we may say that the table somehow exists and not exists.

But what will we say when we asked what is the real color of this table always ? The only honest reply would see that the table cannot be described under conditions of the question. Hence Syad Avyaktam. This seems to be something puzzling yet profound. Sankara in his Braham-Sutra charges the Jainas of contradiction. If reality is indescribable it cannot be expressed. To call something indescribable and again indulging in its verbal description are contradictory things. Some how Sankara forgot that it is not called simply 'indescribable' but 'somehow indescribable' which means that the thing is not indescribable absolutely but only hypothetically. Therefore, Dr.Ganga Nath Jha charges Sankara for not going through the Jaina text. Fani Bhusan Adhikari also for the same, charged Sankara of injustice while presiding over the annual function of Syadvada Mahavidyalaya. This fourth character of indescribability point out that it is impossible to describe a thing without making any particular standpoint. Again, philosophical wisdom does not always lie in straight forward affirmative or negative answers. Sometimes the nature of things are such that they render any description impossible.

The other three of the Saptabhangi are found by combining one by one each of the first three standpoints with the fourth, such as Syat Asti ca Avyaktam; Syat Nasti ca Avyaktam and Syat Asti Nasti ca Avyaktam. So from scientific standpoint of combination, no other form is possible.

Naya is the analytic and the Saptabhangi is the synthetic method of studying ontological problems. So the defect of Nayavada is supplemented of the method of Saptabhangi, a better organon of knowledge. Samantabhadra, the first exponent of Syadvada has characterized Sankhya, Madhyamika, Vaisesika, Bauddha as representing first four forms of judgment and Akalanka has completed by characterizing Sankara, Bauddha and Yoga as representing the last three. This doctrine insist on the correlation of affirmation and negation. All judgment are double-edged in their character. All things are existent as well as non-existent. Here three predicates make seven propositions.

### **Examination of Criticisms against Syadvada**

(1) Fallacy of contradiction - Application of existence and non-existence to the same thing is contradiction.

Reply : Here existence and non-existence are asserted not from one standpoint. Calling a thing both table and bench is contradiction but when we ascribe to the table from the view point of its matter and non-existence to it from the view point of it changing frame, it is not contradiction.

(2) Fallacy of Vaidhikaran - There ought to be two receptacles for we assume existence and non-existence in the same thing.



Reply : Tree is only one receptacle thought it contains both the qualities of stability and mobility.

(3) Fallacy of Anavastha - Statement after statement is made without observing any established rule regarding the finality of things.

Reply : Things having innumerable characteristics need innumerable predication, hence no fallacy of infinite regress.

(4) Fallacy of Confusion - Many confusing things are said of the same object.

Reply : What we say of it are actual.

(5) Fallacy of Vaitikar (Intermingling of Qualities) - We maintain both existent and non-existent in regard to a thing.

Reply : Existence is predicated from material standpoint, non-existence from phenomenal standpoint.

(6) Fallacy of Doubt - Cannot arise because we are definite from particular standpoint.

Where there is doubt, lack of understanding (Arthapatti) cannot arise, hence no negationism (Abhava) and no fraudism (chala), which also go contrary to its extreme realism.

Vyasa and Sankaracarya have also brought in their heavy artillery to damage one or the other angles of this fortification and force an entrance into the same. Their charges are to contradictionism, indeterminism, doubt, uncertainty, ridiculous. Self-contradiction, abandoning original position in describing the Avyaktam which are all treated above and elsewhere in this paper.

Besides, contemporary thinkers confuse the pragmatic and pluralistic but realistic attitude of Syadvada with the same pragmatic and pluralistic but idealistic views of Messrs William James, Schiller, Dewey etc. One should remember that even Jaina metaphysics accept Vedic realism and even in the Upanisads we have pluralistic trends. In the Upanisads also we have the glimpses of how the reality reveals itself in different ways at different stages of knowledge. However, Syadvada is probably due to the Jainas and so it cannot be traced to the Vedas and Upanisads though the Jainas believe that their fundamental creed can be traced back even before the Veda.

Then another case of confusion in comparing Syadvada with the subjectivistic relativism of the Sophist, with the objective Relativism or Relative Absolutism like Whitehead, Bodin. However there is no similarity with Einstein's relativity except in the most general attitude. To some extent we may find its parallel in old Pyrrhonianism in the west. The Upanisadic Neti, Neti, the Advaita doctrine of the world as Anirvacy, the yoga doctrine of Pradhana as Nihstadvaknirasat-Nihstadasat and the Sunyavadin's doctrine of the self or the ultimate reality as Catuskotiviniর্মুক্তা may also be profitably compared. Even on deeper study, we may find something in Kant's thing-in-itself and modern existentialism including Kierkegaard in this connection. But Pyrrho's prefixing every judgment with a 'may be' must not be thought identical with Jaina Syat, for Pyrrhonianism relapses into agnosticism or Scepticism, there is no room for Scepticism whatsoever in Jaina theory of Syadvada.

Syadvada does not lead to Scepticism. Scepticism means in the minimum, absence of assertion, where as Syadvadins always assert, thought what they assert are alternatives. Disjunctive judgment is still judgment, i.e., assertion. Many logicians believe that what a disjunctive assert is only the common character of the alternatives, the play with the alternatives being that what a disjunctive assert is only the common character of the alternatives, the play with the alternatives being either intellectual experimentation or hesitation as a function of ignorance. Some Hegelians interpret it in terms of identity-in-difference. Syadvada on the other hand just insists that there need be no element of identity, abstract or concrete. There is no reason why one blind man should reject the vision of another. Hence each vision is alternatively valid. So either there is no self complete Reality or any such Reality is wholly infinite, a mere demand that refuses to be actualized. The only Scepticism that there is concerning the so called self-complete Reality. So where as a Sceptic is Sceptical about any character of Reality, Syadvada is quite definitely

assertive in so far Asti, Nasti etc. are concerned. Yet he is more Sceptical than any Sceptic in the world so far as the definiteness of the ultimate Reality is concerned. He would go even beyond avaktavya (advaitin so far the world is concerned and Sunyavadin so far ultimate reality is concerned - Kalidas Bhattacharya's letter to me). So at best Syadvada is a form of Relative Absolutism, or objective relativism but never Scepticism.

So Syadvada stands against all mental absolutism. We can substantiate this relativistic standpoint on the Cosmo-micro-physical ground supported by Einstienian Doctrine of Relativity and Maxwell's equation of electromagnetism which go fundamentally against the notion of absolute truth. When we say, we know this, I am saying more than is strictly correct, because all we know is what happens when the waves reach our bodies.

Similarly, researches in Psychology of thinking, Perception of self and conception of self in Child Psychology and Psycho-analytical studies in Freudian Narcissism or Adlerian Power factor support relativism. The psychological researches into the nature of emotions was substantiated by the writing of Dostoevski, Kirkegaard, Neitzche, Freud, Jung and others who tried to reveal the force of conscious and subconscious feelings on the function of character and life. James uttered a definite activistic voluntaristic note in his Radial Empiricism. Graham Wallas showed how political aspect were dictated by emotional attachment to Party Shibboleths. Mc Dougall attacked the transcendent dextalism of the German idealistic rationalism as well as the sociological hedonism and the Epicurean rationalism of the classical economist and the Benthamite liberals. Thus relativism in Psychology is a truism.

Again from socio-cultural standpoint, the doctrine of Syadvada is justified for no smooth functioning of society is possible without mutual accommodation and adjustment which presupposes Catholicism in thought and sense of tolerance. In ethics and morality, we know how far relativism is dominating.

In Logic the Doctrine of the Universe of Discourse has a great justification for Syadvada. Universe of Discourse is sometimes limited to a small portion of the actual universal of things and is sometimes co-extensive with that Universe. "The particular aspect or portion of the total system of reality referred to in any judgment may be conveniently spoken as the Universe of Discourse. Hence Carveth controls Read says that supposition (or Universe of Discourse) controls the interpretation of every word. Logic of Relatives too recognizes the truth of Syadvada when it discusses all relations embodied in propositions.

So Syadvada holds a position of liberal pluralism as contrasted with dogmatic monism. Much of the confusion either of Buddhism or Vedantism is due to the false exaggeration of the relative principles of becoming and being into absolute truths. Same is the case with Parmendian being and Heraclitan flux. It seems that Syadvada doctrine has been given to the world after carefully shifting out the truths of a vanity of Philosophical doctrines. It does not originate as some seem to think from a vague indefinite and doubtful mental attitude in regard to things. It gives a practically definite knowledge. Syadvada is never s doctrine of doubt. Many-sidedness of the Jainas is the true secret of its irreputable perfection. Nayavada is the touch stone of the dogmatic pronouncement of all one-sided scriptures. It is the method of knowing a thing synthetically. Thus, the Philosophy of Anekantavada is neither self-contradictory nor vague or indefinite. On the contrary it represents a very sensible view of things in a systematized form. By means of it the seemingly warring ideas and beliefs of different faiths can very well be accommodated and reconciled to each other and then so many clashes would be avoided.

### **Syadvada and World-tension**

Peace is something which the world eagerly wants but which it does not know to secure. Peace needs a new civilization, a new culture and a new philosophy, where there is no narrowness and no partiality. Huxley is correct to a great extent when he says that war exists because people wish it to exist. We cannot check violence by remaining violent. But non-violence must precede

non-violence in thought. And here Syadvada gives us help to practice non-violence in thought. Prof. R.Prasad also holds that Syadvada is an extension of Ahimsa in epistemology. Unless we resolve our difference, we are bound to face tension. Analyzing the ultimate causes of world-tension, we had come to the conclusion that it is ultimately our divergent and conflicting ideologies that come in the world-tension, we had come to the conclusion that it is ultimately our divergent and conflicting ideologies that come in the way. Politico-socio-economic ideas are interrelated and all of them have definite ideological standpoint. The world is the store-house of great chaos in thought. All the confusion of thought which is prevailing in the world is the outcome of inexhaustive research and the acceptance of a part for the whole. All most all our disputes only betray the pig headedness of the blind men who spoke differently about an elephant. The outstanding personalities (like Aurobindo, Raman Maharshi etc.) spoke to us, in a world over organized by ideological fanaticism, that truth is not exclusive or sectarian. In fact, the spirit of India is a foe to every kind of fanaticism and intellectual narrowness. Huxley asks us to persuade people that every idol however noble it may seem, is ultimately a Moloch that devours its worshippers. In other words, it is fatal to treat the relative and the home made as though it were the Absolute.

Dr.Schillip also observes that humanity is tottering today on the brink of the principle of self-annihilation for lack of understanding. It is at the levels of human relationships that we reach the acme of misunderstanding. Prof. Tatia also holds that only intellectual clarity will resolve all conflict and rivalry. All dogmatism owes its genesis to this partiality of outlook and fondness for a line of thinking to which a person has accustomed himself. In his message to the Silver Jubilee Session of Indian Philosophical Congress, C.P.Ramaswamy also observes that "work and sacrifice (for peace) can only be on the lines of an abandonment of the so called imperialism and aggressiveness in thought, because peace demands a revolutionary desire, a new simplicity, a new asceticism. Blavatsky thinks that when the one party or another thinks himself the sole possessor of the absolute truth, it becomes only natural that he should think his neighbors absolutely in the clutches of Error or the Devil. These are obvious psychological roots of tensions proved by recent Psychological researches. Today one man or one country fight with the other because their views vary. Views are bound to differ, because we are guided by different condition, thought, modes and attitudes. Hence it is wrong to think oneself right and rest others wrong. Here we find that Syadvada represents the highest form of Catholicism coupled wonderfully with extreme conservatism, a most genuine and yet highly dignified compromise better than which I cannot imagine. Extreme toleration it that all views as possibilities are equally (alternatively) valid and extreme conservatism, in that form the point of actuality (or existence, as the existentialist term it) only one of the definite categories is mine. I cannot always fly in the air of possibilities (or demands). I must have moorings in some one definite form of actuality.

## Contribution of Haribhadra to the Yoga-vidya.

[ 1 ]

The Indian systems of thought and culture are not mere speculations on the external nature of things but also of the mysteries of our mind and soul. Even frankly realistic disciplines like Jainism, Nyaya-Vaisesikas and the Mimamsakas show most serious concern to fathom the depths of mind and unravel the knowledge like perception, inference etc. are found to be inadequate and it has been the abiding spiritual ambition of man to extend the frontiers of his knowledge. Even to a scientist, any attempt to put a limit to our knowledge is the result of some wrong notions. Nothing is regarded as static or absolute. Even to the Marxists, 'there is nothing in the nature which cannot be explained'. Thus the growth of human knowledge has been a sort of progressive limitation of sceptical and agnostic attitudes. It seems that it can extend without assignable limits to knowledge of mankind. A spiritual conviction and a constant urge for the

ultimate truth is the mean of our common Sadhana. It is not only the perfection of the cognitive faculty of the self but also its ultimate end. Hence 'know Thyself' (Atmanam viddhi) has been regarded as the climax of our spiritual Sadhana. There are obvious limitations to our sensory knowledge, there are antinomies of reasons. Hence, we have to transcend these usual sources of knowledge in order to realize the truth. This process has a common term in Indian thought - Yoga. It is not against but beyond reason (Jnana vijñana sahitam).

## [ 2 ]

The term Yoga symbolizes the core of Indian Spiritual Sadhana. The four-fold social division of occupation (Varnavibhajana), its trade and business, language and physical culture etc. are only the external signs of the Aryans; even the concept of other world (heaven-hell) is not its essential ingredients. Its real and inner spirit lies in the absolute concentration of thought or one-pointedness on the ultimate reality which is beyond the present space and time. Perhaps, on account of this distinctive feature, the Aryans have been judged as superior to all other races and climes.

In life, theory and practice, knowledge and action, empirical and the transcendental require a synthesis. As a matter of fact, the real practice of one's knowledge is called Yoga. Knowledge precedes, Yoga succeeds. But a knowledge without its practice or implementation is not only incomplete but also ambiguous. Thus Yoga is superior to the Tapas, Jnana and Karma. It is the best of all the three and includes devotion also. Yoga or union with God which is attained through bhakti is the highest spiritual goal. Jnana is scriptural learning (Sāstra paṇḍitya) and not spiritual realization. Truly wise man is the Yogi. Without Yoga or concentration of mind, the human energies are frittered away in many directions and go waste. Hence, the spirit of man is the key for the success of all practical activities. A man versed only in scriptural learning but lacking in Yogic realization is called as 'the friend of the learned' but not a Yogi.

Then there are two dimensions of Yoga - the external and the internal. Even the process of concentration is regarded its outer frame, whereas renunciation of all attachment and reducing oneself to zero is its inner spirit. The real Yoga, therefore, consists in the inner poise, self-mastery, its conquest of anger, sensitiveness, pride and ambition. So there are two types of Yoga - the Yoga of knowledge and the Yoga of action. The former consists in the knowledge about the Self, its bondage, liberation and the path of liberation. But mere knowledge or theoretical knowledge is no good. What is more important is the performance of work without any selfish attachment to results, with a view to securing the welfare of the world, with the realization that agency belongs to the modes of Prakṛti or to God himself. In fact, Yoga consists in practical realization of the self.

There are three-fold traditions of Yoga-literature in Indo-logical writings the Vedic, the Jaina and the Bauddha. Though the term 'Yoga' has occurred many times in Rg-veda, it has always been used in the sense of 'Union' only and never in the sense of meditation or concentration of mind. Even such key-words of the Yoga-literature like meditation, non-attachment, breath control, withdrawal from external world etc. are absent in the Rg-veda. However, the Upanisads do abound in the mention of these concepts. There might be differences of opinion regarding the nature or numbers of the ultimate reality but there is a remarkable unanimity regarding the acceptance of yogic sadhana for its realization. All the Vedic systems including the Nyaya-Vaisesika, Samkhya, Yoga and Vedānta accept the utility and relevance of Yoga in their respective systems. Purva-Mīmāṃsā is the only exception which does not ever refer to Yoga. It is interested in ritualistic action. The Gita and the Mahābhārata, the Bhagavat, the Yoga-vāsisṭha and the important works on Tantra including many works of Hatha-yoga accept the place and importance of Yoga. Many medieval saints and scholars like Jñānadeva, Āmbeyā, Kabīra etc. have discussed the subject of Yoga with great seriousness.

## [ 3 ]

Together with its tradition, the term Yoga has a chequered history. In the Rg-veda, it is used in the sense of 'union' later on in about 700-800 B.C., it is used in the sense of 'yoking a horse' (uncontrolled spiritual horse). It can be traced also in German-Joch, OE-Geoc, Latin-Juguma, Greek-Zugon. In Panini's time, the term 'Yoga' had attained its technical meaning of concentration. In Jainism, the term Carita (conduct) is the exact equivalent of the general term 'Yoga'. Jaina tradition, predominantly being ascetic and world-negating lays stress upon willful silence (mauna), austerities (tapas), and other yogic activities. The Jaina Agamas describing about the conduct of the Sadhus (Sadhucarya) refer to many yogic activities like the abstentions and observances (Yama and Niyama), study (svadhyaya), austerities (tapas), withdrawal of the senses (pratyahara) etc. Even the acts of volition (Pravrtti) has to be surcharged by the spirit of volition in the negative sense (nivrtti), technically called as Asta-Pravacana-Mala. Jaina Sadhus are directed to concentrate on study and meditation for the three-fourths of daily routine. In the Jaina Agamas and the Nirvyaktis, the term 'Yoga' has been mostly used in the sense of concentration of mind with numerous classifications and sub-classifications. Even Tattvartha refers to dhyana and the Dhyana-Sataka of Jinabhadra Gani Ksama Sramana is only explication of the notion of dhyana. Hence, Yoga has been rooted in the Agamic tradition.

#### [ 4 ]

But it was Haribhadra who for the first time gave an altogether new dimension in the interpretation of Yoga. It is only Haribhadra who defined the term 'Yoga' in the sense of 'what leads one to emancipation' (mukhena, jayano savvo vi dhammovavaro). Thus he has ushered a new era in the Yoga-literature of the Jainas. He wrote important Yoga treatises like Yoga-bindu, Yoga-drsti-sammuccaya, Yoga-vimsika, Yoga-sataka and Sodasaka. The term Yoga used in the general sense of subduing the senses and the mind the process of concentration and ecstasy even in the earlier stages of the Jaina thought as well as the early Buddhist thought. But the terms Jnana (dhyana) and Samadhi were more in vogue than the term Yoga. It is only in the Yoga-sutra of Patanjali that we find the proper location of dhyana in the eight-fold process of Yoga, for the first time. Haribhadra's in his characteristic catholic outlook did not discuss and interpret Yoga according to the Jaina tradition only but he made a comparative and critical study of Patanjali's Yoga etc. The description of eight-fold standpoints in the Yoga-drsti-sammuccaya is altogether a new dimension in Yoga literature.

All spiritual and religious activities that lead towards emancipation are considered by Haribhadra as Yoga. His ingenuity lies in the yogic interpretation of the Jaina doctrine of Spiritual development (Guna-sthana). The soul has inherent capacity for emancipation but this capacity remains dormant and inactive due to Karmic influences. But the soul can be roused to active spiritual exertion which is nothing other than yogic activities. The Jainas do not believe either in the eternal revelation of the truth like the Mimamsakas and the Vedantins, or, in its revelation by a Supreme Divinity like the Nyaya-vaishesikas and the Patanjali-yoga. Only rare souls known as Tirthankaras, who have acquired potency of revealing the truth and preaching it to the world by their moral and virtuous activities can also help in arousing us from moral slumber. The centrifugal tendency of soul to run away from the fetters of world existence is thwarted by a centripetal force of attachment (raga), repulsion (dvesa) and perverted attitude (mithyatva). However, the soul, when it achieves purification feel uneasiness with the worldly existence and shows manifestation of energy known as Yathapravrttakarana for the spiritual advancement. But the struggle between the two-fold processes, centrifugal and the centripetal continues unless the soul develops such spiritual strength as is destined to lead it to final emancipation by reducing the duration and intensity and also the mass of Karmic-matter through the triple processes of Yathapravrttakarana, apurva-karana and anivrttikarana. The soul then starts climbing up the spiritual ladders of Upasamasreni (ladder of subsidence) and Ksapakasreni (ladder of annihilation) up to the final fourteenth stage of absolute motionlessness.

Haribhadra's style of describing the fourteen stages of spiritual development through the process of Yoga is original and illuminating. While discussing, he has mentioned the names of many Yogis and treatises on Yoga. A crucial problem is posed by Haribhadra to know the real point of



the beginning of the spiritual development of soul desiring salvation in the timeless world of attachment. According to Haribhadra, when the influence of deluding Karma start decreasing, the process of spiritual development starts. The state prior to this beginning of the spiritual development is called 'Acaram Pudgala Paravarta', while the posterior state is called 'Caram Pudgala Paravarta'. Between these two poles of Acaram and Caram, we have the different stages of spiritual development. Here in the process of Yoga begins, which causes simplicity, humility, catholicity, benevolence and other virtues in the soul. The emergence of these ethical virtues are the outer signs of the spiritual development of the soul.

The special features of Haribhadra is his comparative studies in Yoga. For example, in Yoga-vimsika, wherein five kinds of activities (Sthana, Urna, Artha, Alambana and Analambana) divided into external activity (Karma-yoga) and internal spiritual activity (Jnana-yoga), are discussed, Haribhadra has tried to correlate them with stages of spiritual development (Guna-sthana). For example, these activities can be properly practiced only by those who have attained the fifth or a still higher stage of Guna-sthana. In this way, Haribhadra correlates the different stages of Guna-sthanas to the different stages of concentration (dhyana). Haribhadra compares analambana-yoga with samprajnata samadhi in Patanjali's system, the final consummation of analambana concentration is Asamprajnata samadhi. Similarly, the fourteenth stage of spiritual development corresponds to the dharmamegha samadhi to bhavasatru of a third system, to amrtatman of yet another system, to bhavasatru of a third system, to Sivodaya of yet another school. Similarly, Haribhadra tries to show the unanimity of the conception of final self-realization of all the systems of thought. Haribhadra enumerates eight primary defects, from which the mind of a yogin must always be free. By practicing the concentration of mind the soul realizes itself. This is known as Supreme bliss (Paramananda) in the Vedanta, the extinguished lamp (vidhmatadipa) of the Buddhists, extinction of Animality (pasutvavigama), end of suffering (dukkhanta), freedom from the specific qualities (Nyaya-vaishesika), and detachment from the elements (bhuta-vigama). Like an impartial truth-seeker, Haribhadra asks the seekers to keep their minds open and investigate the truth with perfect detachment and freedom from prejudices.

Similarly, Haribhadra shows that there is a fundamental unity among all apparently conflicting systems of thought regarding the means to free from the worldly existence. He asks us to see unity in diversities. He lays down five steps as a complete course of Yoga, i.e., Contemplation of truth (adhyatma), Repeated practice (bhavana), Concentration of mind (dhyana), Equanimity (samata) and Annihilation of all the traces of karman (Vrttisamksaya). The same principle, according to Haribhadra, is expressed by different terms. It is Purusa in the Vedanta as well as Jaina system, as Jnana in the Buddhist school, Ksetravit in the Samkhya system. Similarly, the fundamental ground of worldly existence is called Avidya (Vedanta and Buddhism), Prakrti (Samkhya), Karman (Jainas). Similarly, the relation between matter and spirit is known as Bharati (Vedanta and Buddhism), Pravrtti (Samkhya) and Bandha in Jaina system. Haribhadra referring to Gopendra of the Samkhya System holds that the Purusa does not even inquire about the path of realization unless the Prakrti has turned her face from it. In other words, it is the nature of the Spirit to get disentangled from matter. For this requisite purification of the soul is very necessary. Then the soul becomes a boadhisattva or Tirthankara. When a man becomes a bodhisattva, there is no mere spiritual degeneration to him. He does not commit evil or sin, on the contrary, he is taken exclusively in the well-being of others, acquires wisdom, treads upon right path and appreciates merit. Haribhadra compares the Jaina conception of Tirthankaras with the Bodhisattvas. He distinguishes three categories of souls destined to be emancipated-Tirthankaras, Ganadharas and Munda-kevalins. Haribhadra's contribution also lies in suggesting five-fold stages of preliminary preparation for Yoga as we find in Patanjali's scheme of Yama and Niyama. As we have referred earlier, the stages of the soul are adhyatma, bhavana, dhyana, Samata and the last Vrttisamksaya. Here the accumulated and obscuring karmas are destroyed for ever and the soul attains omniscience and final emancipation.

In Yoga-drsti-samuccaya, Haribhadra presents a novel plan of classification of Yogic stages. The core of this scheme is the concept of Drsti which means attitude towards truth. The most important features of spiritual development is acquisition of love of truth (Samyag-drsti). The gradual purification of its love of truth takes place corresponding to the purification of soul. So

long the soul has not cut the knot and attained purification, our attitude is bound to be wrong, and perverse called as avidya, mithyatva or darsana-moha. Without purification of the soul, we can have only common place attitude of the spiritually advanced soul (yoga-drsti). Haribhadra listed eight kinds of gradual development of love of truth (drsti) corresponding to the eight-fold stages of Patanjali's Yoga. Haribhadra refers to the consensus of opinion of a number of authors regarding the stages of Yoga in his Svopajnavrtti. His love of truth is so great that he can never be sectarian. Haribhadra asks us to realize the truth by means of all the three organs - scriptures, logic and practice of Yoga in keeping with best tried and trusted tradition of India. The truth is one. It cannot be many. There is only the difference of angles or terminology. Yoga is not the monopoly of a particular sect or system. It is based on direct experience of the seers and lovers of truth. Differences in terminologies of different system about the same concept is illustrated by Haribhadra. For example, the state of final realization is known as Sadasiva in one system, Parabrahmana in another, Siddhantatnam in the third and tathata in another system. Hence, there can be no conflict when the truth is realized. Controversies take place only when the truth has not been realized as an empty pot sounds much. The various revelations have to be understood from various contexts and angles. The love of truth (drsti) give us the power to cultivate faith in spiritual revelations, Similarly, referring to the seventh drsti (nrabha), Haribhadra compares it with Visabhaga-Pariksaya in the Buddhist School, Prasantavahita in the Samkhya and Sivavartman in the Saiva system, and as dhruvadhvan in the Mahavartikas.

Besides these eight-fold drstis corresponding to the eight steps of Yogic-sadhana in Patanjali, Haribhadra refers to the three-fold Yoga - The first stage is Iccha Yoga when inspite of knowledge and will, the Yogic practitioner falters in his practice on account of inertia (Pramada). The second stage is called Sastra Yoga, wherein the practitioner does never falter in his yogic practices, strictly follows the scriptural injunctions and has developed penetrating insight. The third and the last stage of Yoga is Samrthya Yoga, when he has fully mastered the scriptural injunctions and has developed the power to transcend them. There are the three broad divisions of all the possible stages of Yoga and the eight-fold drstis are only the elaboration of these three. Similarly, Haribhadra's four-fold classification of Yogins, viz., gotra, kula, pravrttacakra and nispanna. The first are not incapable of emancipation while the last have already achieved their final state. Hence, it is only the Kula and Pravrttacakra yogins who need yogic instruction.

In spite of these resemblances, there are fundamental differences also with the mystical way adopted by the Jaina monk. Yoga-system of Patanjali has not recognized the imperativeness of mystical conversion. Probably, it confuses moral with the mystical conversion, the importance of initiation by a Guru, and the necessity of seeking his guidance at every step, the possibility of fall from certain heights, i.e., dark-nights of the soul, the significance of Pratikramana and Pratyakhyana. Haribhadra knew these different systems of Indian thought. The process of spiritual development as traced in Yoga-drsti-samuccaya is different from that we find in Yoga-bindu. Yoga-vimsika does not describe the preliminary stages of spiritual development but it discuss adequately about the later stages. Altogether, Haribhadra's studies in Yoga-vidya is a landmark in Indian spiritual sadhana.