

PRAJÑĀCAKSU PANDIT ŚRĪ SUKHALALJI
BHĀRATĪYA VIDYĀ GRANTHAMĀLĀ-2

ESSENCE OF JAINISM

by
PANDIT SUKHALALJI

Translated by
R. S. BETAI
M.A , Ph.D.



L. D. INSTITUTE OF INDOLOGY
AHMEDABAD-380009

PRAJÑĀCAKṢU PAṆḌIT ŚRĪ SUKHALALJI
BHĀRATĪYA VIDYĀ GRANTHAMĀLĀ-2

General Editors

DALSUKH MALVANIA
RAMESH S. BETAI
YAJNESHWAR S. SHASTRI

ESSENCE OF JAINISM

by

PAṆḌIT SUKHALALJI

Translated by

R. S. BETAI

M.A , Ph.D.

आ.श्री. कैलाससागर स्मृति ज्ञान मंदिर
श्री महाचार जैन आराधना केन्द्र, कोबा
स. क.



L. D. INSTITUTE OF INDOLOGY
AHMEDABAD-380009

Published by

Yajneshwar S. Shastri

Acting Director

L. D. Institute of Indology,
Ahmedabad-380009.

Printed by

K. Bhikhalal Bhavsar

Proprietor

Shri Swaminarayana Mudrana Mandir
21, Purushottamnagar, New Vadaj,
Ahmedabad-380013.

First Edition : 1988

Price : Rs. 55/-

GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

The L. D. Institute of Indology has great pleasure in bringing out this English version (translation) of Pt. Sukhalalji's work viz., 'Jaina Dharma no Prāṇ' (Essence of Jainism) for the first time for the benefit of lovers of Indian Philosophy in general and Jaina Philosophy in particular. Pt. Sukhalalji was an outstanding scholar of almost all branches of Indian Philosophy. This work of the learned author is really a compendious work on Jaina Philosophy and Religion. It covers almost all topics of Jainism in convincing manner.

This English translation is based on the 3rd edition of original Gujarati work which was edited by Pt. D. D. Malvania and Shri Ratilal Dipachand Desai in 1977. This work is second in the Prajñācakṣu Pt. Śrī Sukhalalji Bhāratīya Vidyā Granthamālā. The Institute is very much grateful to **Dr R S Betal** for translating this learned work into English. The Institute is also thankful to **Shri Pravinbhai K. Shah (U.S.A.)** for his generous financial assistance to get the work translated into English.

It is fully hoped that this publication will be of great help to the readers of Comparative Religion and Philosophy.

L. D. Institute of Indology
Ahmedabad - 380009.
22nd June, 1988.

Dalsukh Malvania
Yajneshwar S. Shastri
General Editors

**ACCEPTANCE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF ELDERS —
AN HUMBLE EFFORT
[Gujarati Version]**

Nearly fifty years have passed over the establishment of our publication house, Gurjara Grantharatna Kāryālaya. Our grandfather Shri Jagashibhai Morar, our elder uncle Shri Shambhulalbai, our father Shri Govindlalbai and our uncle Shri Chhaganlalbai—all these respected elders commenced their business-activity as book-sellers. They took untiring troubles to see that books reached every house. It is simply due to this that to-day our Organization can take the credit of publishing refined, cultured and interesting books in hundreds. Our family is happy to-day, again on account of the untiring effort and honest activity of our elders. As we bring to memory their good turns on us, our heads bow down in a spirit of thankfulness before them. These our four elders are no more. Yet their open-hearted, honest and sincere work has become a guide of all time for us.

This was our feeling since quite some time. We are so very much under the debt of our elders. We have won fame in Gujarat as respected and sincere publishers. All this is due to our elders. We should therefore take up some activity by which we can, to some extent, become free from this indebtedness. This thinking gave birth to “Shri Shambhulal Jagashibhai and Shri Govindlal Jagashibhai Memorial Books Trust.” We are delighted to-day to publish “The Essence of Jainism” written by revered Shri Sukhalalji, as the first in the series.

Revered Paṇḍit Sukhalalji is an undisputed scholar and authority of renown on Indian philosophical systems, religions and other allied lores. He was, however, always anxious, worried and careful about our development and help in calamities. We and our elders are, therefore, very much indebted to him. It is therefore, a good luck for us that we could catch this good chance of publishing the learned work of this scholar.

The third edition of the work is under publication to-day. The first edition was published in 1962 as the fourth book in the "Shri Jagmohandas Kora Memorial book-series" Bombay. The second edition was published in 1965 in the "Jñānodaya Trust" raised by Paṇḍitji himself. The book was still in demand. This reveals that the book has been immensely useful to those who were anxious to know and interested in Jaina dharma. The editors of the work have taken care to see that the work should become a standard text-book. The work has therefore become more welcome. We are thankful to the Trustees of the Jñānodaya Trust for granting us permission to publish the work in its third edition.

It is our desire to give, in the present series, highly cultural and refined works without any expectation of profit. We pray to God to fulfil this our desire.

Mahavira Janma Kalyāṇaka Parva,
V. S. 2033
Ahmedabad : 2-4-1977

Gurjar Grantharatna
Karyalaya

EDITOR'S SUBMISSION

[Gujarati Version]

Most revered Paṇḍit Shri Sukhalalji wrote so many Papers in Gujarati and Hindi. His short and big Papers on religion, philosophy and several other topics had the advantage of his typically original, wide and deep, insight touching the very purport and all-pervasive vision. Most of these are collected in the Gujarati publication 'Darshan ane Chintan' and Hindi 'Darshan aur Chintan.'

In the present publication, with the exception of the sixteenth Paper "Brahma and Sama", the rest are selected from the above-mentioned two works. In order to indicate the two source-works, we have placed their names into brackets. Papers written in Hindi are translated into Gujarati.

Placing in the language of the common man, with utmost clarity and simplicity, the subject of philosophy that is very deep and subtle, is an extraordinary trait of the scholarship and style of writing of Paṇḍit Sukhalalji.

The Papers in the present book are not taken fully and just from continuous pages in the respective works. Papers are prepared after a new co ordination from whatever is written in the author's Hindi and Gujarati works, keeping in view the general reader's desire to know, his liking and intellect.

In this our new co-ordination in the present work, we have kept two points of view principally, before us. One is to submit before the curious reader all original information about Jaina philosophy and religion. This information will easily give to the curious reader an idea about the speciality of Jaina religion and philosophy as compared to the other Indian philosophical systems; it will also show its similarities with them. The other view is to give to the curious reader some acquaintance with Paṇḍitji's scholarship that dives deep into truth and is comparative, impartial, synthetic and original. It needs hardly to be stated that Paṇḍitji's place is

unrivalled as a scholar who studies Indian philosophical systems and religions with equanimity and truth in the centre.

We must at this stage submit that this work is not prepared just from the point of view of the elementary curious reader. If however, curious readers, who already possess elementary knowledge study the present work with proper thinking and reflection, they will acquire new light in many respects; they will also be inspired to read and study more of the works of Paṇḍitji.

We recommend to our curious readers to read the first work in the series, “*Four Tirthankaras*” by Paṇḍit Sukhalalji. as an inspirer and forerunner of the present work.

In addition to the topics discussed in the present work, many others are worth knowing. We have, however, tried to give all useful material, keeping in view the anticipated number of pages. It is sincerely hoped that the work will be found useful by curious readers and students.

5-B, Anandbag,
Ahmedabad-6.

Dalsukh Malvania
Ratilal Dipchand Desai

Independence day-1962
Shrāvani Pūrnimā-2018

PREFACE

The title, "Essence of Jainism" of the present publication, is given following the paper of the same title given in the work. The title is meaningful. One peculiarity of the writings of Paṇḍit Sukh-Jalji is that he does not delight in giving just a superfluous narration of his subject; he catches the very significance of the topic under analysis and lays it down in the most effective words and expression. The discussion and analysis therefore of culture, religion, philosophy, Jainism, Jaina philosophy, Jaina ethics etc. touches their very basic significance. Visible as it is to the eyes, the external form of religion etc. is generally known to all. However, few people know the basic significance at the root of all these. In the present work, even the followers of Jainism will be disillusioned about their false notions; they will come to know so much that is new. For non-Jains, evidently the work is like a lamp that enlightens their path of acquaintance with Jainism.

Paṇḍitji gives greater importance to history and comparative study. This is another trait of his writing. Men of religion are very often not endowed with a deep understanding of their own faith and yet proclaim that it is the oldest and the best. But Paṇḍitji gives a deep shock to this faith by historical and comparative evidence and tries to purify this understanding. Man therefore becomes more awake and alert in matters religious instead of their being deficient in religious faith. They grasp reality and their faith further deepen and become firm. The method of presentation adopted by Paṇḍitji awakens a sense of discrimination in the mind of the reader. He is thus enabled to discriminate on his own between what should be discarded or adopted after a revaluation of his conventional beliefs. Thus, Paṇḍitji shakes, from the very roots, the faith of the reader. But here the purpose of Paṇḍitji is not to deprive the reader of his faith, but to make his faith firm. He wants that the reader should become full of faith in the real sense of the term and his obstinacy is lost, as a result thereof.

These are the two traits of the writings of Paṇḍitji. At the root there lies his vast reading and also a typical inclination cultivated after independent pondering and meditation thereon. This is the inclination of the scholar to bring about a co-ordination of and finding out the non-difference amongst all religions and philosophies in which difference is there. It is because of this spirit of co-ordination that in all his writings we find a spirit of equality applicable everywhere even though he is a Jain by faith and a renowned scholar of Jainism. In the writings on a topic like religion it is very difficult indeed to retain a spirit of equality. It is yet notable that we have in this book, a narration of the essence of Jainism that behoves an impartial scholar that he is. We do not find here an excessive glorification of Jainism as with a devotee of the religion; we do not find here a tendency of fault-finding as with its adversary. Actually it is the laying down of the very essence of Jainism by a real critic.

This book is prepared with the help of selections from his 2500 pages of writings in Hindi and Gujarati. It may not be able to fulfil all expectations of the readers; yet it positively expresses the essence of Jainism in its authentic form.

Like the Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava etc., the Jaina dharma is not known to have originated from one man. It is the name of the religion that is practised and preached by Jinas, i.e., the conquerors of attachment and jealousy. It would thus not be true to state that Jainism is propagated by some single individual or that only one personality is installed as a god in it. The conquerors of attachment and jealousy are Jinas, their religion is Jainism and those who follow and practise it are Jains. In course of time, the Jains installed as their gods those in whom they visioned victory over attachment and jealousy, accepted them as their respected gods and designated them 'Tīrthaṅkaras'. In their opinion, the number of these Tīrthaṅkaras was very much sizable, though, in the modern age, the number is construed to be twentyfour, beginning from Śri Ṛṣabhadeva to Śri Vardhamān. They are not incarnations of gods or proved gods since eternity. They have, in reality, attained to the status of Tīrthaṅkara by uniquely special Sādhanā in

their last birth because of the psychic impressions of the previous births. Their message is that they are one of the entire humanity and anyone who exerts himself like them can possibly attain to the status of Tirthaṅkara. They are thus the Tirthaṅkaras who have infused this self-confidence in humanity. In other religions, gods are conceived as other than human beings and are revered. In Jainism on the other hand, man acquires that power because of which even gods worship them. "Dharma is a lofty auspiciousness; (it comprises of) non-violence, control and austerity. Even the gods worship the person whose mind ever rest in dharma."

The high status of humanity is described in the Mahābhārata in these words : "There is none superior to human beings"—(Śānti Parva 299.20). The contribution of Jain Tirthaṅkaras is not ordinary in raising humanity to this status. Āryas were used to worship and venerate gods like Indra and to follow violence of animals etc. in sacrifices, till the Tirthaṅkaras dominated. The Āryas prayed for material wealth in return for the sacrifices. The Tirthaṅkaras put an end to this humiliation on part of the human beings and placed human destiny in man's own hands. They brought about a new awakening in the realm of religious beliefs thereby. Man started understanding his own abilities and he gave up the worship of gods like Indra. The result was that even the vedic Āryas started worshipping human beings like Rāma and Kriṣṇa; though, in course of time they were made incarnations of god Viṣṇu. Yet one fact stands that it was the Tirthaṅkaras who gave this message to the Āryas—"Man is greater than gods."

What is the nature of the dharma propagated by the Tirthaṅkaras? What is its essence? In one word, it is 'non-violence'. Non-violence has two forms in practice—control and austerity. In control there is compression of the body, mind and speech. Through control he stops falling a prey to new bonds and through austerity he cuts off the old acquired bonds. Thus, it is only through non-violence in practice that he is enabled to attain to liberation.

Non-extremism must be adopted if full observance of non-violence is to be resorted to. Thus, the principle of non-extremism, the philosophical doctrine of Jainism springs from non-violence.

The meaning of non-extremism is this—Keep the doors of thinking open, and you will acquire truth from the thoughts of all. For those who are insistent about truth, the false insistence to be given up is—“Only what I believe is truth and what others believe in is falsehood.” If one does not give up this, he will be doing injustice to others and this too amounts to violence. It is, therefore absolutely necessary for the non-violent to be non-extremist. Therefore, the development of Jaina philosophy lies not in extremism but non-extremism.

The conduct of the way of life of non-violence is precisely Jainism; and the philosophy that results from non-violence is Jain philosophy. In the way of life therefore, the Śramaṇas who follow Jainism protect gross Jīvas and further also the subtle Jīvas not visible to the naked eye. This is their spirit of non-violence. A line of so many prescriptions and prohibitions is shaped by the conduct that follows this spirit. Śramaṇas try to follow it to the full while the Śrāvakas try to follow it partly.

A spirit of sincerity does not enter the conduct that is not backed by a philosophy. Every dharma should therefore ponder over the bonds and liberation of the Jīva, its relation to the world and the form of the world. The entire Jaina philosophy evolved from this inevitability. As stated earlier, one peculiarity of Jaina philosophy is that it is ever anxious to probe into the secret of truth. Ācārya Jinabhadra and others have therefore proclaimed that the Jain philosophy is a philosophy of all philosophies.

The Jaina philosophy consists of just two elements: Jīva and Ajīva. The two are expanded into five Astikayas, six substances or seven or nine elements. The Cārvākas took the Ajīva to comprise of five gross elements; the seers of the Upaniṣads believed only in the Jīva that is Ātmā-Puruṣa-Brhma. These two views are synthesised as Jīva and Ajīva in Jain philosophy. The mundane world and its highest attainment that is liberation or bondage and liberation are possible only if Jīva and Ajīva both are there. The Jains therefore proved the logical co-ordination of the existence of Jīva and Ajīva both; and the Sāṃkhya philosophy of the

ancient days accepted the logical existence of Puruṣa and Prakṛti and brought their own co-ordination into being. Again, opposite states like bondage and liberation cannot exist in the Jīva if Ātmā or Puruṣa were to be taken only as firm and steady. The Jainas therefore looked upon the Ātmā also as non-eternal from one angle of vision, like the Citta as construed by Buddhism, after separating itself from all other philosophies. Again, Jainas have no opposition against taking Ātmā to be eternal like all others. This is because the wheel of bondage, liberation and rebirth exists only in one Ātmā. Thus, according to Jainism, Ātmā is taken to be eternal though changing. The followers of Sāṃkhya looked upon the gross element that is Prakṛti to be eternal though permanent and the Puruṣa was taken to be eternally permanent. The Jainas however looked upon both the *Jada* and *Jiva* as eternal though changing. Here also their theory of non-extremism reveals itself.

The *Caitanya* of *Jiva* can possibly be experienced only in the physical body. The *Jiva* is therefore of body-measure as Ātmā. Since the *Jiva* has got to take to more and more new births, the state of movement to and fro is unavoidable for the *Jiva*. It therefore became unavoidable to accept two *Ajiva* substances. *Dharmāstikāya* helpful in its movement to go and *Adharmāstikāya* in its movement to be back. In just the same way, if the *Jīva* has a worldly existence-Samsāra—then bondage must be there. This bondage comprises of the *Pudgala*, i.e., the gross substance. This led to the acceptance of one more *Ajiva* substance designated *Pudgalāstikāya*. Ākāśa is the substance that gives scope to all these, it was necessary to take that also as a gross *Ajiva* substance. Jainism has thus accepted five *Astikāyas* as *Jīva*, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *ākāśa*, and *Pudgala*. Further, the concept of the different states of these substances, *Jīva* etc., is not possible in the absence of the concept of time. This led to six substances also in place of the five *Astikāyas*. Since time is not accepted as an independent substance, it is taken to be synonymous with *Jiva* and *Ajiva*.

Let us now seek some clarification about seven and nine elements. In Jainism *tattva* is pondered over in a twofold manner.

The first is seen and analysed by us already. The second way is to calculate the *tattvas* in such a way that they are useful on the path of liberation. Here, one way is to consider and calculate seven *tattvas* as *Jīva*, *Ajīva*, *Āsrava*, *Samvara*, *Bandha*, *Nirjarā* and *Mokṣa*, while another view adds *Puṇya* and *Pāpa* and takes the *tattvas* to be nine. Actually, these seven and nine *tattvas* are calculated and considered only with reference to the expanse of *Jīva* and *Ajīva*, because the analysis is useful in the description of the path of liberation. *Nirjarā* is separation of the *Jīva* partially from *Ajīva-Karma-Saṁskāra-bandhana*; complete separation from these is *mokṣa*. *Āsrava* means the causes that lead to the bondage of karma with *Jīva*; their stoppage is *Samvara*. When *Jīva* and *Ajīva* become one in karma, it is *bandha* (bondage).

To summarize the whole, we can state that the mundane existence and its expansion lurks till attachment and jealousy as also infatuation exist as the causes of bondage in the *Jīva*. If these causes are obstructed, the mundane existence ceases in case of the *Jīva*, which, consequently, attains to *Siddhi* or a state of *Nirvāṇa*. The process of this obstruction—*Nirodha* is *Samvara*, meaning thereby that the *Sādhanā* of the liberation of the *Jīva* is *Samvara*. When the *Jīva* is not contented with only this *Sādhanā* that is *virati* and takes to very hard austerities etc., it attains to partial freedom from bondage that is *Nirjarā* and ultimately attains to liberation.

This information on the style of writing of Paṇḍitaji and a brief narration of Jainism and Jaina philosophy are given with a view to be useful to the reader. There is no other purpose in writing this preface. This was necessary because Paṇḍitji analyses his topics after taking for granted that his reader possesses the knowledge of the original elements of Jainism and Jain philosophy.

—Dalsukh Malvania

Contents

	Page
Chapter 1—Initial Background	..1 to 21
Religion, philosophy, Culture, 1-2—Philosophy and Religion, their Relation, 2—The seed of Religion, 2-4—The aim of Religion, 4—Religion, Universal Wealth, 4-5—Two forms of Religion, external and internal, 5-6—Perspective of Religion, Its sublimation, 7-12—Two Religious Institutions, 10-12—Religion and Intellect, 12—Religion and Thought, 12—Religion and Culture, 12-13—their difference, 14—Religion and Ethics, 14—Religion and Sect, 14-17—Philosophy and Cult, 17-19—Right Faith, Wrong Faith, 20-21.	
Chapter 2—Essence of Jainism	.. 22 to 40
The Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa tradition, 22-25—Influence on each other and synthesis, 25-26—Promulgators of the Śramaṇa tradition, 26-27—Emphasis on a state of detachment, 27—Concept of equality in Śramaṇa dharma, 27-28—Jainism, Gītā and Gandhiji with regard to real heroism, 28-29—Spirit of Equality and theory of non-extremism, 29-30—Non-violence, 30-31—Ātmavidyā and theory of Evolution, 31-32—Karma-vidyā and freedom from bondage, 32-35—Cāritravidyā, 36-47—Lokavidyā, 37-38—Jaina view and Īśvara, 38-39—Śtautavidyā and Pramāṇavidyā, 39-40.	
Chapter 3—Hoary Past of Nirgrantha Cult	.. 41 to 48
Principal Śramaṇa Cults, 41—Nirgrantha cults is Jainism, 42-44—Buddha and Mahāvira, 43-44—Influence of Nirgrantha tradition on Buddha, 44-48	
Chapter 4—Heart of Jaina Culture	.. 49 to 65
Stream of Culture, 49—Two forms of Jain Culture, 49—External Form of Jain Culture, 50—Essence of Jain Culture, 50.	

-51—a Religion teaching abstention, 51—Classification of Religions, 51—Anātmavāda, 52—Pravartaka Dharma, 52—Nivartaka dharma, 53-55—Its Influence and Development, 55—56—Its beliefs and thoughts, 57—Nirgrantha Cults, 57-59—Ideals of Jain tradition, 60-62—Purpose of Culture, 62-63—Abstention and Activity, 63—Activity leading to Abstention, 64-64—What Culture indicates, 64-65.

Chapter 5—Jaina Philosophy .. 66 to 79

Origin of birth of Philosophy, 66-67—Philosophical questions, 67-68—Brief classification of Answers, 68-69—Nature of Jaina stream of Thought, 69-71—Eastern and Western Philosophy, A comparison, 71-72—Oneness of basic questions on life, 72—research, 73-74—The Jain process, 73-74—Some detailed comparison, 74-79.

Chapter 6—Stages of Spiritual Development .. 80 to 88

Three stages of Ātmā, 80-82—Fourteen Guṇṣṭhānas, 82-84—Alternative stages of Development laid down, 86—The first type of eight visions, 86-87—The second type, 87-88.

✓ Chapter 7—Non-Violence .. 89 to 107

Narration of non-violence in the Āgamas, 89-91—Opposition against Vedic Violence, 91—Reasons of opposition between Jains and Bauddhas, 91-92—Violence of the non-violent type, 92-94—Stages of the Jaina discussion, 94—Jainas and Mīmāṃsākas, 94-95—Development of the spirit of Non-violence, 95—Compassion of Neminātha, 95—Pārśvanātha's Protest, 96—Mahāvira's non-violence, 96-97—Other propagators, 97-98—non-violence and non-hurt, 98—Aśoka, Samprati and Khārvel, 97-98—Kumārāpāla and Akbar, 100—Proof of spread of non-violence, 100—Service to humanity, 101-102—Prohibitive and Prescriptive Forms of Amāri, 102-103—Anticipation of death and non-violence, 104-105—When is end of body, a suicide, 105-106—Non-violence but spiritual heroism, 106-107—Suicide in Buddhism, 107.

- Chapter 8—Austerity and Endurance of Calamities ..108 to 116**
 Nirgrantha tradition dominated by Austerity, 108-109--Domination of austerities even before Mahāvīra, 109-110--Clarification on Buddha's repudiation, 110-112--Peculiarity introduced by Lord Mahāvīra, 112-114--Development of austerity, 114--Pariṣaha-hardships, 115--Co-ordination of Kriyayoga and Jnāna-Yoga in Jain Austerity, 116.
- Chapter 9—Celibacy according to Jainism ..117 to 118.**
 Clarification on Jain vision, 117-119--Some problems, 119--Definition of Celibacy 119-120--Qualified men and women, 120-122--History of Independence, 122-123--The aim of Celibacy and Means, 123-125--Variety and widening of the form of Celibacy, 125-127--Pitfalls in Celibacy, 127--Absence of exception in Celibacy, 128.
- Chapter 10—Āvaśyaka Kriyā ..129 to 138**
 Its ceremony in ancient days, 129--The meaning, 130-131--The meaning, 131--Nature of six Āvaśyakas, 131--Sāmāyika etc., 131-135--Naturalness and propriety of the order, 136--Spiritualism and Āvaśyaka Kriyā, 136-138--Conventional meaning of Pratikramaṇa, 138.
- Chapter 11—Jīva and Pañcaparameṣṭhi ..139 to 148**
 Meaning of Parameṣṭhi, 139--Some thinking on Jīva, 139-141--Indefinability of the nature of Jīva, 141-142--Jīva self-evident or the result of material mixtures? 142-143--Five parameṣṭhis, 143--Difference among Ācāryas, 143--Other-worldliness of Arihanta, 144--Nature of the five purpose and types of Salutation, 145-17--God, preceptor and religious elements, 147-148.
- Chapter 12--Karma Elements ..149 to 166.**
 Wide view of Karmavāda, 149--Belief in eternity of Scriptures, 149--Need of Karma element, 150-151--Believers only in Dharma, Artha and Kāma, 151--Those whose Puruṣārtha was

Emancipation, 151-153--Thoughts on the element of Karma and its knowers, 153--Thinking on Karma, 154-155--Belief of Jain and other philosophies regarding Īṣvara as the creator of the Universe, 155-156--Īṣvara, why he is not the creator of the Universe..., 156-157--Jīva and īṣvara, 157--Jīva, the cause of its own obstructions, 158--Karmaśāstra, a part of Spiritualism, 159-160--Meaning of the word 'Karma' and its synonyms, 160-161--Nature of Karma, 161--Test of Pāpa and Punya, 161--Genuine undefilement, 162--Beginninglessness of karma, 162--Ways of freedom from karma, 162-163--Independent existence of Ātmā and rebirth, 164-165--Peculiar thinking of Jain philosophy about Karma, 165-166.

Chapter 13—Theory of non-absolutism 167 to 171

General explanation, 167-168--Vision of non-absolutism in other philosophies, 168-169--Truth, the basis of non-absolutism, 169-170--View of non-absolutism by Mahāvīra, 170-171--Repudiation of the vision of non-absolutism, 171.

Chapter 14—Nayavāda 172 to 179

Doctrine of different viewpoints, 172--Origin of the word 'Naigama' and its meaning, 172--Other six Nayas, 172--Expectations and Anekānta, 173-174--Sphere of activity of Seven Nayas, 174-175--Dravyārthika and Paryāyārthika Naya, 175-176--Adoption of Niścayanaya and Vyavahāranaya, 176-177--Difference in knowledge and conduct, 177--Niścaya pertaining to Reality and Vyavahār viaewpoint, 177-178--Niścaya from Ācāra point of view, 178--Another important difference, 178--Difference of philosophical vision of Niścaya in Jainism and Upaniṣads, 179.

Chapter 15—Saptabhaṅgi 180 to 184

Saptabhaṅgi and its basis, 180--The seven Bhaṅgas, 180-181--Function of Saptabhaṅgī, 181-183--Reference to four important options, 183--Some thinking on meaning of 'Avaktavya', 183-183--It is not doubtful knowledge, 184.

Chapter 16--Brahma and Sama**186 to 191**

Sama and Samatā, 186--Brahma, its meanings, 186-187--
Background of Śramaṇa and Brāhmaṇa thinking, 187-188--
Viewpoint of Supreme Reality that inspires unity inspite of
opposition, 189-191.

Chapter 17--Four Institutions**192 to 199**

Four Sanghas, 192--Sādhusansthā, 192--Wise Constitution,
193--Sangha of female ascetics and its impact on the Bauddha
Sangha, 193-194--Aim of Sādhu, 194--Change of place and
community welfare, 194-195--Institution of holy places, 195-
196--Excellent arrangement for the preservation of divine wealth,
196-197--Things worth knowing, 197--Institution of knowledge,
197--Glory of knowledge and its means, 197-198--Erection and
development of treasures of knowledge, 198-199--Brāhmaṇa
and Jaina Bhandārs, 199--Non-sectarian vision of Jain
Bhandārs, 199.

Chapter 18--Paryuṣaṇa and Saṁvatsari**200**

Purpose of Jain Festivals, 200--The Paryuṣaṇa, 200--Saṁ-
vatsari, 200.



Chapter 1

INITIAL BACKGROUND

Religion, Philosophy, Culture :

It would not be true to state that knowledge and learning can be acquired through vast reading. Reading less or more is a matter of liking, capability and facility. Howsoever less ones reading may be, if one desires to reap greater attainment and benefit, then the unavoidable condition is to keep ones mind open. No prejudices or ingrained impressions should be allowed to come in the way of success of ones desire to know truth. For this, the first need is that of fearlessness according to my experience. If religion has any true and useful meaning, it is fearless search after truth. Philosophy is one of the paths of search after truth, and we should know that religion and philosophy have an invariable association, whatever be the subject of our study. The two—religion and philosophy—cannot be bound in any particular sect. If all the doors of the mind are open to truth and if fearlessness is in its background, whatever we think or do merges into religion or philosophy.

Let us remove filth and weakness from life and substitute it with all-sided purity and a spirit of wisdom. Only this is real culture of life. The same thing is known, right from the ancient days, as 'religion' in all countries and sects. The *Sādhanā* of religion is in progress even to-day in our country following its resumption thousands of years back. Our country 'Bhārata' is renowned for this *Sādhanā*. Humanity and nationalism are not created or sustained in the absence of real culture. Religion and culture become meaningful only when all the powers, attainments and activities of individuals are directed towards social welfare. Genuine and deep understanding of culture is necessary also for removing the distorted understanding of religion, culture and philosophy and for up-rooting age-old superstitions.

E-1

Philosophy and Religion—their Relation

Philosophy means doctrines that have resulted from and continue to result from our efforts at finding out truth. Religion is an individual and a community way of life that has evolved precisely following such doctrines. It is true that the capacity and deservedness of each individual or community is not similar. There will therefore be difference between one religion and another; its progress is bound to lag behind philosophy because religious following anticipates greater effort on part of men who follow it. Still if the directions of both these are basically different, religion remains deprived of the light of philosophy, howsoever deep and genuine philosophy may be. This results in curbing of the development of humanity. The purity, growth and ripening of philosophy is not possible without the dawning of religion in life. In a similar manner, in the absence of dependence upon philosophy, religion cannot free itself from superstitions. Difference of direction therefore in the case of the two will be suicidal.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, p. 7]

The seed of Religion

What is the seed of religion? What is its initial form?

It is our common experience that we all have a desire to live. Desire to live is not confined only to human beings or animals and birds. The minutest insects, butterfly and bacteria also have this ingrained desire to live. In the womb of this desire to live, there lies the unavoidable presence of a conscious or unconscious desire for happiness. Presence of the will to be happy implies the presence of the inclination to be saved from the adverse suffering and pain. The origin of religion lies precisely in this desire to live, inclination to be happy and to oppose pain and sorrow.

Any animal, small or big, cannot live if it desires to do so all alone; it can not pass such a life of loneliness. It must resort to its group. On being in its group, it experiences security and happiness, and, in a similar manner, it gives happiness to other individuals in its group by all possible

help and experiences happiness even in this. Scientific observation of ants, bees, and small insects like white ants, has given rise to a detailed description of this reality and fact. Persons who do not go so deep in their observations can also see from the study of the behaviour of birds and animals like monkeys that even birds like parrots, myna, crows etc., live and work not only for their kith and kin. It becomes clear how, in times of calamities, they put in efforts risking life to save their groups from calamities and also how they prefer to depend upon their own groups. If we catch hold of, say the youngone of a monkey, we will see how, not only the mother but all small and big monkeys in the group try to save it. We will also see how the trapped young monkey looks, not only at its own mother, but also at all other monkeys for its freedom. This daily affair in the world of animals and birds, is known and common. However, a subtle truth lies at its root.

It is true that the desire to live ingrained in living beings cannot be separated from their lives. It becomes satiating only when the living beings live in their respective groups, get helped and help others. The origin of religion lies in this spirit of seeking the help of ones group. If the desire to live on part of a living being were satisfied without living in a group and without seeking its help, there would have been no possibility of the birth of religion. There is thus no doubt about the fact that the origion of religion lies in our desire to live; the desire to live exists even in the most elementary state of evolution of life, be that an unconscious or unexpressed state.

It is observed, not only in the soft animals like the deer, but in the animals of stiff and rough nature like he-buffalo and rhenoceros, that all form their respective groups and live. We may take this as a genealogical trait or a trait inherited from previous births; but this group-sense is found positively even in the highly evolved human life. This sense of group in the world of human beings is found constantly and without any break, at the time when the tribal man of the days of old, was in a primitive state and also now when he is considered to be cultured. One fact, however, stands that this group-sense is not the same and constant

up to a certain stage of the evolution of life. It is almost the same and constant in the fully developed human being. This group-instinct may be known as fluid or flowing, when it is unconscious or sub-conscious. But this instinct itself is the basis of the origin of religion, without any doubt. The general and brief form of this origin of religion is this— to act up to all that; it is suitable to ones individual and community-life and to avoid or be saved from all that is unsuitable.

[Darśan ane Cintan pt. one, p. 202]

The aim of Religion

What could possibly be the aim of religion? Which aim of religion, accepted in principle, thinking and conduct could lead to the meaningfulness of religion and to greater progress in life?

The acceptable aim of religion could be only this. Every one should be fairly and reasonably conscious of ones individual and social duties; one should be alert and awake about his or her responsibility regarding the interest in ones duties and in the effort to reveal this interest in concrete form. There will be a total revolution in the life of the society if the abovementioned ideas are accepted as the aim of religion and are duly emphasised.

[Darśan ane Cintan pt. one, p. 64]

Religion-Universal Wealth

Spiritual religion originates in form of a smaller or bigger stream from the life of some individual and it soaks the background of the society all-round. Whatever be the power of expanse of that stream, it can soak the background of the social life only to a limited degree. So many insects are born from that incomplete wetness and they eat up the very vital and basic background. Then there evolves a stream of religion in another individual and it tries to wash out the evils born of insects of the first. The second stream washes out the moss that has spread on the first one and places more rewarding alluvium in the background of life. It may then happen that in course of time, it spreads on the second layer and it is washed out by the stream of religion that has arisen in the

third individual. Many streams of religion flow in this manner, on the background of human life. In this manner, the background becomes more and more appropriate and fertile.

The rise of the stream of religion is not the paternal property of any one country or community; it is the welcome fruit on the different branches of one tree in form of the human race. Its impact may be in a few rare individuals, but there is a certain development of the community thereby.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, p. 28]

Two Forms of Religion : External and Internal

Religion has two forms—one that is apparent and can be viewed, and the other not visible to the eye that can be grasped by the mind. The first can be called the body and the second the soul of religion.

The history of all religions shows that they all have their body. Let us first of all see how body is formed. On observation, these elements are commonly found in one and all religions and religious sects—a scripture; the scholar or teacher who composes and expounds it; holy places like *tirthas*, temples etc.; a certain type of prayer or fixed rituals; a class that nourishes these and has its maintenance thereon. In one form or another, all these will be found in all religions and sects, and this precisely comprises the body of that religion.

We have now to examine the soul of religion. What is it? Soul means life-force or life. The noble virtues like truth, love, selflessness, liberality, discrimination and humility etc., constitute the soul of religion. Bodies may be varied and many, but the soul is just the same everywhere. The same soul reveals itself through many bodies; in other words, we can state that the same one soul nourishes life in many bodies, makes life flow.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, p. 122]

*

*

*

Religion means an eagerness for grasping truth and a discriminative equanimity; it means a practical way of life. This same religion is spiritual also. Other prescriptions and prohibitions,

rituals, various types of prayer etc., that come under the category of religion, are all duties in the worldly life of man. They deserve the title of "religion" only till that time and to that extent that they have an invariable association with spiritual religion. Spiritual religion is the basic element in life, that is above the senses. Its experience and vision is possible only for religious individuals, while the practical religion is visible and it can be grasped by others. If the practical worldly religion is not related to spiritual religion, then all these duties and activities resulting from practical worldly religion are, in reality, only illusory, howsoever old and acceptable they might be to many.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, p. 28]

*

*

*

Religion has two forms; the first is subtle and spiritual. Generally there is no difference in that it is endowed with the virtue of theism. The other one is worldly and practical. It is of the nature of external activity in which various differences of outlook are unavoidable. The differences of outlook in the matter of practical and worldly religion do not affect as instigating conflict in case of those who clearly understand the difference between spiritual and worldly religion, who have the mental and intellectual capacity to ponder over their mutual relation; in brief those who have grasped the secret of the proper analysis, weaknesses and strength of worldly and spiritual religion. In brief, it can be stated that if one is endowed with a clear understanding of religion, no difference of outlook can create conflict; genuine understanding is the only means of the prevention of the differences of outlook that are instigating conflict. This kind of understanding can be spread with effort among human beings. Acquirement or training in such an understanding is therefore desirable.

Pure inclination and genuine sincerity is religion beyond doubt, while there are differences of opinion in the religiousness or otherwise of external worldly dealings. The test, therefore, of religiousness or otherwise of external conduct or worldly dealings, rules or customs can be in spiritual religion only.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, pp. 52-53]

Perspective of Religion and Its Sublimation

Sublimation means purification and expansion. With purification and the process of purification, the perspective of religion expands, i.e., it does not remain just individualistic; its community-form is created. This is to be known as sublimation.

Both, the will to live or interest in life and a perspective of religion are inborn and harmonious in every being. Interest in life is not satisfied in the absence of perspective of religion and its existence is possible only if there is interest in life. But the matter is different in case of human beings from that in the world of other living beings. In the world of animals and birds and that of ants and bees, the beings are observed to live and be active, not just for their physical existence; they have something or other to do in the interest of their respective small or big group and class. From one point of view this is their conduct of religion. But the fact is that, at the root of this conduct of religion, there lies a tradition, an ingrained group-instinct. The element of understanding and discrimination has not developed with it, it is not possible to be so. This conduct of religion cannot therefore be placed in the category of Perspective of religion.

It is only in human beings that the seeds of perspective of religion lie inherently. The dominant seeds here are knowledge and will to it, the power of decision-making and the capacity to discriminate between good and bad, the effort to be put in to bring to fruition his aims. Human beings are endowed with a unique memory of the past. No other being is endowed with the art of preserving the heritage of the past and giving to the new generation the heritage of the generations that have preceded, with due expansion. Once that man takes a decision to do something, he attains to it, he even revises and improves upon his decisions when he finds that they are faulty. His will to effort has no end whatsoever. He is ever in search of and works on in new fields. This capacity of human beings is precisely his perspective of religion.

Still however, this basis of development of perspective of religion that is visible in human life has not been acquired all of a sudden. History is a witness to this. A scholar, Edward Caird

by name, indicates in brief the basis of development of religion in these words : " We look out before we look in, and we look in before we look up." Dr. Anandshanker Dhruva expands the statement in these words : " First comes the external vision, then the internal and then the higher. We have our first vision of god in nature, then in the inner conscience and ultimately in the identity of both. In Jaina terminology, this can be known as states of *Bahirātmā*, *Antarātmā* and *Paramātmā*."

Howsoever strong man may be, he progresses from the gross to the subtle, i.e., from substance to feeling. At one time in Greece, architecture, sculpture, poetry, drama, philosophy, mathematics etc., took wonderful strides of development. Just at the time in a dazzling manner, there developed in one individual, a perspective of religion that put to amazement all humanity. He simply revolutionised the value of arts and humanities by the yard-stick of his own perspective of religion. This individual was Socrates. His perspective of religion is respected everywhere.

Jehovah issued an order to Moses. The order was not just for the uplift of the Jews; it also foresaw and suggested the destruction of other contemporary races. But in the same race Jesus Christ was born and his perspective of religion took quite a different form. Christ revalued all religious commandments internally and externally and brought them to a sublimated state when they could be applicable to all irrespective of the differences of time and place. Long before all this, in Iran, Zoroaster gave a new philosophy; it is living in the Avesta. Mohammad evolved a perspective of religion that did a lot to unify and to free from superstitions, the Arab tribes that were fighting one with the other and were steeped in countless superstitions.

But I propose, solely to depend upon Indian traditions, to give expression to the principal story of the development and sublimation of perspective of religion. In the *sūktas* addressed to Uṣas, Varuṇa, Indra etc., in the Rgveda, we read of the auspicious elements like the vision of beauty, deep respect towards heroism and a devotion towards some divine power. However, the perspective of religion on part of the poets here is mostly based on

desire. That is the reason why they request in prayers the divine power, to give to them and their families as also their progeny -cattle, prosperity etc. At the most they pray for long life. The basis of this state of being desirous develops during the period of the Brāhmaṇas. New and new paths of attaining to more and more this-worldly and other-worldly joys were planned during the period.

But, even while this perspective of religion had spread in the society, the attitude to the perspective seems to change. It struck to the mind of some sage or Ṛṣi that seeking joys and enjoyments just for ones self or for ones family and group or clan, may be superior to those sought by others. It is yet no perspective of religion. A new movement spread from this thought and its magic became widely pervasive. Many experiments are undertaken in the age of some eight hundred or a thousand years before Christ, of this desireless perspective of religion. The Upaniṣads analyse the same perspective. The basis of the Jaina and Bauddha *Saṅghas* is also laid in the same perspective. This desireless perspective of religion is the second stage of the vision of inner consciousness or development of religion. In this state, man first of all tries to purify himself and tries to experience a spirit of identity with the whole universe. In this, there is no regard whatsoever for the desire of any gross enjoyment, be it this-worldly or other-worldly.

From the idea that total desirelessness cannot be attained in family or society, the inclination of loneliness and a shelterlessness gets strong. It is popularised and strengthened, as if it were itself desirelessness or abstention from passion. Abstention from thirst or passions or the process of purification is replaced by the rejection of all activity. The society experiences as if a mental inclination that living is itself a sin or a curse. At this time again, the perspective of desirelessness is improved upon. The Tīśāvāsya Upaniṣad declares that the entire Universe is full with life-forces like ours. Therefore, wherever you go, you will come across enjoyers. The enjoyment of things is basically no fault; it is unavoidable for life. One should lead life keeping the idea of others' facilities in mind, one should not covet the wealth of others. Do perform

your duties in life and desire to live as much as you will. If one takes recourse to this attitude, no bondage of thirst of passions obstructs, no other attachment persists. The Tśāvāsya Upaniṣad has very greatly helped humanity in its march towards the sublimation of the perspective of religion by giving expression to the final meaning of this desireless perspective. The Tśāvāsya Upaniṣad is the very basis of the lofty mansion of the Gītā.

Mahāvira practised great *Sādhanā* in order to uproot the blemish of thirst and the other blemishes that spring from it. Buddha took to similar *Sādhanā* in his own way. But the general society adopted only a limited meaning that blemishes like thirst, violence, fear etc., should be got over. From this the inclination of the common man nourished and developed preventive or negative duties such as 'not to do this' or 'not to resort to that.' The side of developing prescriptive and prohibitive duties became subsidiary in the whole country almost. We can view this in the religious order of King Aśoka. Again, under the same state, the spirit of the Mahāyāna cult was born. It was then again that so many mendicants continued to develop this spirit in their own way. In Gujarat, in the sixth century, Śāntideva went to the extent of stating— "What is the use of that interestless liberation, that is merged in sorrow?" In the India of medieval and later ages, the country was gifted with so many saints, thinkers and promulgators of perspective of religion. But the sublimation that we have witnessed of our own perspective of religion in our life, and as we witness it to-day, seems to us positively to be the highest stage of the development of perspective of religion in the whole world so far.

[Darśan ane cintan, pt. 1, pp. 72-75]

Two Religious Institutions; the one centred in householder's stage and the other in that of renunciation :

In our country, mainly two types of religious institutions continue to exist. Their roots are older than even Tathāgata. Buddha and Nirgranthanātha Mahāvira. One of these two is centred in the stage of the householder, the other in the stage of *Samnyāsa* or total renunciation. The maintenance and nourishment

of the first was done mostly by the vedic brahmins. Their religion and profession continued with the help of Gṛhya and Śrauta sacrifices and the ideology suitable to it.

The other institution revealed itself in the beginning through the class other than the Brahmins and the Vaidikas—mainly other than the ritualist brahmins. To-day, we are so very much familiar with the four stages of life, the Āśramas, that almost all of us take for granted that the people in India have been the followers of this institution of the four Āśramas. But this is not really so. Actually the ideology and conduct of this institution of the four Āśramas have become steadied from the mutual conflict and the give and take of the thought and conduct of these two institutions centred in the stage of the householder and that of renunciation.

Persons who took the institution of the stage of the householder to be the main body of life, not only opposed Saṁnyāsa; they even disrespected it. On the other hand, those who were on the side of the institution centred in renunciation emphasised Saṁnyāsa so very much that it seemed to them to be the be all and end all of the life of the society. Brahmins passed their life only in their dependance upon the Vedas and the vedic ritual; this was something possible only for the householders and only in the stage of the householder. They therefore emphasised the dominance, virtuousness and all-sided usefulness only of the stage of the householder. Persons in whose case the path of life of the vedic ritualism was not open, who had deep liking for learning and religion, opened other doors of religious life. From this, in due course, the religion of the forester, the religion of the Saṁnyāsi and the culture of ' Tapovana ' in the language of Tagore, developed. This is the root of the culture of saints. The society came across brahmins who were accepted as the very pillars of this culture of saints. On the other side, there were many belonging to the classes other than the brahmins, who had no right directly to participate in this ritualism, who took the religious institution centred in the stage of the householder to be the dominant one. One thing is, however, certain that ultimately the two institutions were identified in the form of the four Āśramas. To-day, even a begotted

ritualistic brahmin cannot dare to disregard Saṁnyāsa. In a similar way, one who very much sides with Saṁnyāsa is not able to deny the usefulness of the stage of the householder.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, pp. 38-39]

Religion and Intellect

No thinker has, upto the present day, stated that the origin and development of religion are possible by any element other than intellect. The history of every religion and sect states only one thing that the origin or purification of religion took place only through certain intellectuals. When we study the history of any particular religion and the practical worldly life of its promulgator, we can arrive at only one conclusion that it is only the element of intellect that is the creator, researcher, nourisher and propagator of religion; only that can possibly be so. Are intellect and religion diametrically opposed? A brief reply to this question could be only this that there is no opposition between the two, there can be no opposition. If, in any particular religion, the two are conceived to be opposed, we can only state that we have nothing whatsoever to do with a religion that is opposed to intellect. Life can be happy, it can develop only in the non-acceptance of such a religion.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. one p. 13]

Religion and Thought

Thought is the only father, friend and offspring of religion. In the absence of thought, birth of religion is impossible. Thought is the basic need for the life and propagation of religion. The religion that does not give rise to and nourish thought loses its soul itself. If therefore, there is continued thinking or even examination of examination, this will certainly be beneficial in the end.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 1, p. 49]

Religion and Culture—their Difference

The real meaning of religion is spiritual uplift. Through it, it is, that an individual discards extroversion, i.e., becomes free from

the bonds of passions, and progresses towards pure consciousness or the Self. Only this can be designated as genuine religion. If such a religion reveals itself genuinely in life, even its external means, whatever they are in life and in whatever form, that is only religion and nothing else. If however, there is no freedom from the shackles of passions, if there is no effort exerted at freedom, it cannot come under the category of religion; the external means, howsoever genuine they are, become non-religion. In brief, it should be stated that religion is basically related to spiritual virtues like truth, non-violence, non-acceptance, etc. In reality, religion is nothing external. It still finds expression only through external life and practical worldly dealings. If we state that religion is the soul, then external life and all social dealings should be designated as its body.

There should, in reality, be no difference between religion and culture. If an individual or a society are considered to be cultured and are averse to religion, what is the difference between barbarism and culture? The real meaning of human culture is therefore only religious or just dealing of life. But in the world, the common man does not take this to be the meaning of culture. By culture, people mean various arts, researches and disciplines acquired by man. But that these arts, inventions and disciplines reveal themselves only from the viewpoint and intention of the bliss of human society, is no rule. History has shown to us that at the back of all arts, are so many inventions and varied disciplines, it is not always true that there lies the same pure intention of social welfare. Still these things come in society and the society welcomes them. We thus see and experience in our worldly dealings that the thing that takes birth from man's intellect and his concentrated effort, and guides human society from the old basis to the new one, comes under the category of religion. There is no absolute rule that it has some specific relation with pure religion. That is the reason why so many races known to be cultured and believed to be so, are averse to religion in many respects.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. one, p. 9]

Religion and Ethics—their difference

Ethics is that bondage or duty that is rooted in fear or selfishness. Religion is that duty which is not rooted in fear or selfishness but is undertaken purely as duty, duty that is dependent only on qualification. This difference between religion and ethics is no small one. If we go a little deeper and see, it becomes clear that though ethics is necessary for the maintenance and nourishment of the society, purification of society through it is not possible. Now only this purity is real development. If this understanding is realistic, we should stress that such development is only due to religion. Greater the following of this religion in a society, better is the society.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one p. 44]

Religion and Sect

In the former, i.e., religion, there is inner vision. It originates from the soul, gives a perception within the soul or turns man towards it. In the latter, i.e., sect, there is external vision, it comes from the external atmosphere and just from show and the consequent imitation and that only. It therefore leads to external vision and keeps man busy in the same.

Religion lives on and is dependent upon virtues and is therefore dependent upon *Ātmā* and that only. On the other side, sect depends upon external charm and lives on it. All its dependence is therefore upon external charms and show.

In the first there are feelings of unity and identity, waves of equality rise up. In the other, creaks of difference and inequality develop and expand. This would mean that in the former, man forgets the difference from others and leans towards identity; he forgets his happiness in the sorrows of others. In religion, there arises the vision of *Brahman* meaning real life and man experiences his Self to be very small before his comprehensiveness. It is reverse in sect. In it there is no virtue or glory and still man takes himself to be and believes himself to be superior to others. If there is humbleness in it, it is only showy and it gives a false idea of

superiority to man. His humbleness is also just to make a show of his superiority. Man who is indulged in sect fails to experience his own smallness, though he continues to make a show of it. This happens because man has no vision of real life and no consciousness of the endlessness of virtues and his own insignificance.

In religion, the vision is that of truth. As a result man has the patience of all-sided vision and the liberality of experiencing all-sided forbearance. In sect this is not so. It comprises of a vision of delusion about truth. Man therefore takes only one side, his own, to be true and has not the inclination to view and know the other side; man is here not gifted with a spirit of forbearance of opposed sides or the liberal outlook to understand these.

A religious man is mentally dominated by vision of ones own blemishes and the virtues of others. It is reverse with a man of the sect. A man of the sect prefers particularly to view the blemishes of others and not virtues and continues to sing these. It may even happen that his own blemishes do not strike in his mind.

A man with a religious outlook views god within his Self and around himself because of his religiousness. He is therefore afraid that 'god will see it.' When he commits some mistake or sin, he is ashamed of it. But a man of the sect has a faith that god resides in Vaikuṅṭha or a place of liberation. When therefore, he commits a blunder he takes god to be separate from his Self, as if noone knows it. He neither fears anybody nor feels ashamed about his faults. He is never sorry about his faults and even if he feels these, it is not for not repeating his mistakes.

In religion only conduct is preferred. There is therefore no place for the consideration of external elements like race, sex, age, asceticism, external signs, language etc. In sect, on the other side, the same external elements dominate and conduct is suppressed in their dominance. Very often it happens that a man with a race, sex, age, dress and external signs not renowned in the world, is endowed with a fine righteous conduct. A man lost in sect does not at all take this into consideration and very often dismisses such a man with scorn.

In religion, the universe is just one quadrangle. In it there are no smaller quadrangles. As a result, there is nothing like untouchability in it, and if at all there is any, it is the untouchability only of ones own sins. In sect on the other side, the inclination of ones group is such that man smells untouchability wherever he sees and the nose of this inclination fails to smell the foul smell of ones own sins. To such a man, whatever he believes is full of good smell, and the path on which he moves, the best path. As a result, he experiences foul smell and status of inferiority in all the rest as compared to his own sect.

In brief, it can be stated that religion drives and guides man to identity from the teaching of difference nourished day and night. Sect on the other hand, goes on constantly adding to this nourishment of difference. If, through providence, somebody brings about an opportunity of identity; the follower of the sect feels pained and hurt. In religion, small and big quarrels like those pertaining to wealth, woman, land, high and low status, etc., are quelled and calmed down. In sect on the other hand, quarrels and conflicts arise precisely in the name of religion and religious feelings. In it man experiences no defence except through quarrels and conflicts.

Sects were there in the past, they are in the present and they will remain in future. If there is something worth doing or improving about them, it is this. The soul of religion that is severed from it, be reinstated. This implies that we follow our own sect whatever it is, all the while preserving the elements of religion in it. Let us not commit violence, let us not utter falsehood to preserve truth. The basic condition of infusing life-force of religion in sect is that our vision should be that of emphasis on truth. The main traits of emphasis on truth are these in brief.

- (1) Our conception of whatever we believe and do should be thoroughly clear to us. Our faith is our own understanding should be thorough so that we can explain it fully to others.
- (2) The test of ones thorough belief and understanding in this. As we expound it and explain it to others, it should be done without the slightest excitement or anger. If we find any flaw along with its excellence, we should accept that also without the slightest hesitation.

- (3) Just as we have the patience to explain our own point of view we should also have the liberality and anxiousness to understand the views of others. We should be endowed with the inclination to compare and examine the peculiar traits and limitations of both from all angles of vision possible. Again, if one finds that his side is weak or faulty, he should feel happier in its abandonment as compared to its earlier acceptance.
- (4) No absolute truth is limited by country, time or heritage. Man should therefore be inclined to look at things from all angles of vision and to bring about a synthesis of these if he finds part-truth in each one.

[Darjan ane Cintan, pt. one, pp. 36-39]

Philosophy and Cult

It would, first of all, be proper to see what philosophy is and also what its real meaning can be. In a similar manner, it would be proper to ponder over the meaning of cult and what its relation to philosophy is, what virtues and faults have crept in as a result of this relation and so on. Generally, all understand, believe that philosophy means a direct perception of the Supreme Reality. All philosophers believe that only their philosophy of the cult is of the nature of direct perception. Here, the question is this. What does direct perception mean? Only one reply to this question is possible. Direct perception can be only that in which there is no scope for delusion or doubt, and there is no difference or opposition to or contradiction of the reality perceived. If such a definition of philosophy is acceptable to all, then this is the next question. Why are there so many different outlooks in the philosophies of these sects? Why are there mutual oppositions in reference to which there is no compromise? There is only one way out of this doubt. Let us derive some other meaning from the word 'philosophy'. If the meaning 'direct perception' of the word 'philosophy' found in the scriptures since centuries is correct and precise, then all philosophical systems of the sects can be distributed in and grasped from the

following modes of proof acceptable to all without controversy and in all clarity — (1) Rebirth; (2) Its cause; (3) Some element that takes to rebirth, and (4) bringing an end to the causes of rebirth by some special means.

These modes of proof are considered to be subjects of direct perception. We can assume and accept that some sage-like seer or seers must have had a direct perception of these. This is because so far no difference of opinion has arisen in any spiritual philosophy or philosophies regarding these and similar elements; no body has gone against these. Difference of opinion is found, however, in the matter of the particular forms of these basic modes of proof and in the detailed thinking on these. This difference of opinion and mutual opposition amongst the main philosophical systems and often among the different branches of some systems, is very acute. It is so very acute that no impartial critic would ever believe that the detailed beliefs of these cults have ever become a subject of direct perception. If these beliefs are derived from direct perception, then which cult holds these beliefs? It is a difficult task indeed to prove the promulgator of any cult as the seer in matter of the details. We can therefore take *darśana*-philosophy to mean revelation at the most with reference to the above mentioned basic modes of proof; we will have to give some different meaning to the word *darśana*-philosophy with reference to the details of these modes.

As we ponder over the problem, we feel that the second meaning of the word “*darśana*-philosophy” should properly be “a strong conviction”. Actually this is the second stage of the meaning of the word. This second stage of meaning is clearly visible in the sūtra—“*तत्त्वार्थप्रदानं सम्यग्दर्शनं*”, “the inclination towards validly determining the nature of things is *Samyak darśana*”, by Vācaka Umāswāti, and in the commentaries on his work. Umāswāti lays down in specific terms that “faith in or inclination towards modes of proof” and that only, is philosophy. Here, let us never forget that the word ‘*Śraddhā*’ means ‘a strong conviction or confidence’ and not ‘direct perception’. Faith or confidence is a typical background by which direct perception in cult is kept alive. I have known this as the second stage of philosophy.

Actually, we find cults in the thinkers of all the countries of the world. Even in Greece, the birth-place of philosophical thinking of Europe, there existed so many mutually opposed cults. The story of cults in the philosophical thinkers of India is a little different. Cults in this country have basically their life-force in religion; actually their very essence is in religion. All the cults have given shelter to philosophical thinking, have contributed a lot towards its development and spread. From one point of view we can state, that it is only through the efforts of these varied cults that the intellectual arena of Indian philosophical thought could become miraculous. However, we have, in the present context, to consider the fact that all these cults have very deep faith and confidence only in their own beliefs. Consequently, there will be beliefs in each cult which are not acceptable to the opposed ones. These beliefs can be matters only of faith of the cult or its own feelings; they cannot be matters of direct perception. It thus happens that the common stream of direct perception assumes the form of faith and conviction of the cult as soon as it is divided into various streams in the realm of the cults.

When direct perception assumes the form of faith, all the cults have to depend upon fancies, arguments and inferences in order to bring about steadiness in and justification of that faith. All philosophic thinkers take full help of fancies for the nourishment of their respective faiths, and still they believe and proclaim that whatever their faith in belief, it is not mere fancy but direct perception. Thus, in the meaning of the word 'daršana-philosophy'; fancies as also true or untrue or half-true inferences are also included. Thus, on one side, cult guarded and defended the basic philosophy, i.e., direct perception, continued with constant thinking for its clarification and took recourse to pleasing fancies for its expression. On the other side, the creeper of philosophical thinking expanding in growth, flowering and bearing fruit on the fence of the cult became so very dependent that it had ultimately no support except that of the cult. As a result, the creeper of philosophical thinking was too delicate and extremely narrow in outlook like beauties in purdah.

[Daršan ane cintan pt. 1, pp. 67, 69]

Right Faith-Wrong Faith

Faith means darśana-philosophy. The general meaning of the word 'darśana' is 'to vision, to perceive'. Whatever is cognized by the eye is 'visioned or perceived' or 'darśana'. But in our present context, 'dṛṣṭi' or 'darśana' does not mean only what is cognized by the eye. Here, its meaning is very vast. All knowledge cognized by any of the senses is here understood to be 'dṛṣṭi' or 'darśana'. Not only this, even the knowledge that the Ātmā can possibly acquire without the help of the mind, is also 'dṛṣṭi' or 'darśana'. Right faith therefore means and dawning of right knowledge and wrong faith means all kinds of wrong understanding.

Being embodied, breathing, knowledge of information type derived through the organs of senses and organs of action-only this is not life; whatever subtle and subtler sensations that we experience in the different stages of the mind and inner consciousness, these also mean life. The phases and angles of this life are also many. 'Faith' is that which gives all this and runs life. If this faith is true, the life guided by it is faultless; if this faith is wrong or full of faults, the life guided by it is bound to be full of blemishes. It should therefore be pondered over and decided, as to what is right faith and what is the wrong one.

Some words there are which apply only to the things visualised by the senses; some there are which apply only to mental objects. When the meaning of a word can be visualised by the senses, it is comparatively easy to modify it, not so when the meaning of the word is beyond the grasp of the senses, or is grasped only by the mind. The words 'right faith' and 'wrong faith' do not apply to objects visualised by the senses; they touch upon our mental feelings or the experiences above the senses. The true meanings of these words, therefore can be deciphered only through discrimination and effort; it is very difficult indeed, to modify, change or widen their meanings.

Even if faith in the ultimate reality is of the nature of right faith, that is not its final meaning. The final meaning is revelation.

of the ultimate reality. The former is therefore only one step towards the latter. With unstinted effort, we can have a revelation of the ultimate reality only when this step is firm. This comes to mean that the Sādhaka should experience a feeling of the same life-force in all the beings in the world. These elements and experiences are interwoven in his very life because they do not then remain objects only of faith. Only this is revelation of the ultimate reality, and only this is the final and the only meaning of the word "right faith."

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one p. 98-106]

†

Chapter 2

ESSENCE OF JAINISM

The Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa Tradition

The conduct and thought that is to-day known as 'Jaina dharma,' was known, in the times of Bhagavān Pārśvanātha, particularly in the days of Mahāvira, also as '*Nirgrantha dharma*'; it was also known as '*Śramaṇa dharma*.' The difference, if any, is that only Jaina dharma is not Śramaṇa dharma. This Śramaṇa-dharma had several other off-shoots besides Jainism in the past and to-day also some such as the Bauddha are living. Even though the '*Nirgrantha dharma*' or Jainism is endowed with the general traits of Śramaṇa dharma, it still possesses some peculiar traits of conduct and thought, which show its independence from the other off-shoots of Śramaṇa dharma. Before we probe into these peculiar traits, it would be better for us to know fully, first of all, the outstanding traits of Śramaṇa dharma by which we can decipher why it is different from the Brāhmaṇa dharma.

The wide expanse of ancient Indian culture is variegated in colours in so far as the colours of so many religious traditions are intermixed here in it. In the present context two religious traditions come before our eyes. They are (i) the Brāhmaṇa and (ii) the Śramaṇa. Let us set aside the controversial problems like the precedence or otherwise of one over the other and discuss a few points that are more or less acceptable to all. Through these it will become easy to know the supporting wall of the Śramaṇa dharma and through it to grasp the purport of the *Nirgrantha* or the Jaina dharma.

In several matters, small and big, there is basic difference between the Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa traditions. If we were to state this in brief, we can state in a general way that while the Brāhmaṇa or the vedic tradition stands on inequality, the Śramaṇa tradition bases itself on equality.

These inequality and equality are seen mainly in three matters : (i) pertaining to social status, (ii) with reference to the aim in view, and (iii) with regard to our approach to the world of living beings. Social inequality means the higher status of brahmins in the realms of social status and right of religious dealings as compared to the other classes that stand lower and inferior. The basic aim of brahmanism is uplift-*Abhyudayo* which includes the attainment of worldly prosperity, kingship, sons, cattle etc., and different other-worldly rewards such as attainment of Indrahood, happiness in Svarga etc. The principal means of this uplift is ritualism of the sacrifices, i.e., performance of various sacrifices. The slaughter and sacrificing of animals, birds etc., is unavoidable¹ in ritualism and we are told that violence laid down by the Vedas is only for religion. In this view, evidently, the attitude is that of inequality of the souls. Opposed to this, equality in Śramaṇa dharma in all these three matters can be explained in this manner. Śramaṇa dharma does not accept the superiority of any class by birth and believes in the superiority or inferiority resulting from virtue and action. It does not therefore concede the higher or lower status of any social class in the social structure and right to religion by birth, it organises society only on the basis of virtue and action. From their point of view, therefore, a virtuous Śūdra is superior to a brahmin full of blemishes. From their point of view again, in the realm of religion, men and women of all social classes have an equal right to higher status according to their qualification. The final aim therefore of Śramaṇa dharma is not uplift like the brahmana dharma but final beauty-Niḥśreyasa. This is a state in which all this-worldly and other-worldly benefits are given up and in which perfect equality expresses itself. Śramaṇa dharma views the entire world of living beings in a spirit of absolute equality of all Ātmās. The world of living beings includes, not only all animals and birds, insects and moths etc., but also the entire class of very low beings like plants etc. In this

1. Vide Taittirīya upaniṣad-Bhāṣya of Śāṅkara, p. 353 (Poona, Ashtekar Co) This same view is laid down in Yogasūtra 2.15 and the Bhāṣya thereon as also in the Sāṅkhyakārikā and the Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī on it.

the killing of any embodied self under any pretext is considered to be killing of the self and all killing is considered to result in *Adharma*.

The Brahmanical tradition originally commenced and developed round the concept of *Brahman*. The Śramaṇa tradition commenced and developed round '*Sama*' i.e., equality, tranquillity and effort. The word '*Brahman*' has so many different meanings of which attention should be properly drawn to two in the present context : (i) eulogy and prayer; (ii) sacrificial ritual. '*Brahman*' means various eulogies and prayers through the vedic *mantras* and *sūktas*. In the same way, even the sacrificial ritual, in which the vedic *mantras* are employed, is known as '*Brahman*'. Only those who recite the *mantras* and *sūktas*, i.e., the class of the *Purohitas* and those who preside over the performance of sacrifices, are brahmins. Through the prayers and eulogies of the vedic *mantras* and through the excessive hold of the sacrificial rituals, these brahmins dominated in the then contemporary society and religion. This dominance became so firm that the brahmin class began to believe and started proclaiming that it was supreme by birth. The same view became firm and steady in the society and this led to the belief in class-difference. It was proclaimed that the brahmin is the mouth of the *Puruṣa* in form of the society and all other classes were its limbs. Contrary to this, the Śramaṇa dharma believed and proclaimed that in any society, all men and women have an absolutely equal right to good deeds and status in religion. One who proves his qualification through diligence and effort, attains to higher status irrespective of class or sex.

Just like the idea of social and religious equality, both are mutually opposed with regard to the idea of the aim of life. The Śramaṇa dharma believes that this-worldly or other-worldly uplift is contemptible in all respects; according to it the only aim of life is final beauty or liberation. That is precisely the reason why it laid emphasis on *Samya*-equality of means as much as the end or aim. The principal means of liberation is non-violence, which means no violence whatsoever towards any living being in any manner. Other means are included in this. This vision of

equality is diametrically opposed to the sacrificial ritual dominated by violence. In this manner, there is so much of dissimilarity with reference to equality and inequality in the ideologies of brahmins and Śramaṇas that at every step there is a possibility of conflict between the two faiths. This can be noted in the history of two thousand years and more. This opposition existed in the age of the *Brahmaṇas* as also the times of Buddha and Mahāvīra, and even later. This some long-drawn stream of opposition is given expression to by Patañjali, the writer of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Earlier, even the *Sūtrakāra* Paṇini refers to this long-drawn opposition. While he illustrates the eternal enmity by birth, Patañjali gives the examples of snake and mungoose, cow and tiger. Along with these, he also gives the example of *Brāhmaṇa* and *Śramaṇa* in his *Mahābhāṣya* (2.4.9). It is true that the enmity between the snake and mungoose or between the cow and tiger cannot be uprooted even with a thousand efforts. However, with unstinted effort, the enmity between *Brāhmaṇa* and *Śramaṇa* can, possibly be got over. History cites some examples in which no enmity or opposition can be found between *Brāhmaṇa* and *Śramaṇa*. But Patañjali's statement, referred to above, is with regard to the classes and not individuals. Patañjali means to state that there can be individuals who have gone above this enmity and opposition, but brahmins as a whole class cannot be above enmity towards *Śramaṇas* as a class. The meaning of the word '*Śāśvata*'—eternal—here is 'traditional' or 'conventional' and not absolutely firm and steady. *Ācārya* Hemachandra came centuries later and laid down the same example of *Brāhmaṇa-Śramaṇa* and placed a stamp of approval on the experience of Patañjali. Even to-day, in the age of socialism, we are not able to state that the seed of the enmity between *Brahmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas* is completely rooted out. The vision at the back of the entire enmity is like that between the east and the west.

Influence on each other and Synthesis.

It cannot be stated that the two traditions have remained totally aloof and without influencing each other. Both in small and big matters, they have influenced each other. To cite one example, the spirit of non-violence of the *Śramaṇa* dharma, that is rooted in a perspective of equality, influenced, in due course, the

Brāhmaṇa tradition so very much that even for the Brāhmaṇa dharma, justifying violence in sacrifices became a matter only of discussion of old Scriptures. In actual practice, violence almost disappeared from sacrifices. Sāṃkhya, Yoga Upaniṣada, Avadhūta, Sāttvata and similar conventions, the very life-force of Brāhmaṇism, did not go against the supreme authority of the Vedas, and the status of *Purohita* or *Guru* given to the brahmin class. In due course of time, these traditions got themselves merged in one form or another in the all-pervasive sphere of Brāhmaṇa dharma. As against this, the Jaina, Bauddha and similar traditions remained firm in their opposition against the supreme authority of the Vedas and the highest status of brahmins as a class. They retained their independence. Still however, these traditions and their Nivṛtti-dharma were influenced, one way or the other, by the all-pervading tendencies of the Brāhmaṇa traditions.

Promulgators of the Śramaṇa Tradition

Authentic and complete history of the original promulgators of the Śramaṇa tradition, their time and place etc., are so far not known to us. But we can certainly state, on the evidence of the literature available to us, that Nābhīputra Ṛṣabha and the ancient scholar Kapila were the oldest and powerful supporters of Śramaṇa dharma. That is the reason why their names are not forgotten in the ancient tradition even though complete history remains still in the dark. Ṛṣabha is mentioned as an austere and tough Yogi in the brahmanic Purāṇas, but his real status and fame is found only in the Jain tradition. In a similar way, Kapila is mentioned as a Ṛṣi in the Jain literature, but his full status and fame is found in the Sāṃkhya tradition and the old works based on it. Ṛṣabha and Kapila emphasised the greatness of the spirit of equality of all Ātmās and the conduct based on non-violence born thereof. There were several branches and sub-branches that nourished this spirit and conduct. Some of these emphasised the need of austerity, some of meditation, while some placed emphasis only on purity of consciousness and detachment. But the fundamental aim of all these was equality. There was one cult that laid

greater stress on non-acceptance and on abandonment of the bondage of the acceptance of monastery-residence in house-scripture. It also stated that absolute non-violence or perfect equality cannot be attained till one is tied to the attachment of family or acceptance-*Parigraha*. This branch was popularly known by the name 'Nirgrantha.' It seems that only Neminātha and Parśvanātha are its known promulgators.

Emphasis on a state of Detachment

In the Nirgrantha dharma, the spirit of austerity and renunciation was invariably associated with the spirit of non-violence. But then there arose a thought in the mind of the Sādhakas. Can the purity and equality of Ātmā be attained fully by over-emphasis on external renunciation? The reply was this. One should conquer the defiled inclinations like attachment, jealousy etc. This is the principal end in view. The non-violence, austerity and renunciation by which this end cannot be attained are spiritually useless, howsoever good they may be. The promulgators of this thought are known as 'Jinas'. Many such Jinas are known. Sacchaka, Buddha, Gos'ālaka and Mahāvīra—all are renowned Jinas in their respective traditions. But at present, what we know as "Jain religion laid down by the Jinas," is the religion of Mahāvīra which emphasises mostly the victory over attachment and jealousy. History of development of religion states that the new conditions that evolve in the gradual uprise of religion include the ancient unopposed states of religion. That is the reason why the Jain dharma is both Nirgrantha as also Śramaṇa dharma.

Concept of Equality in Śramaṇa dharma

Let us now examine the status of the spirit of equality which is the very life of Śramaṇa dharma in the Jain tradition. In the twelve *Aṅgas* and fourteen *Pūrvas*, famed as Jain Scriptures, the first is '*Sāmāya*'-'*Sāmāyika*'; it is known as '*Ācārāṅgasūtra*'. A clear reflection of the thought and conduct of Mahāvīra, the last of the tīrthankaras, is to be found mainly in this sutra. Full emphasis is laid on equality in all these sutras.

The Prakrit word 'Sāmāiya' is related to *Sāmya*, *Samatā* or *Sama*. All thoughts and modes of conduct that are based on an outlook of equality and which nourish that outlook, find place in the Jain tradition as *Sāmāiya-Sāmāyika*.

Just as 'Sāndhya' is a necessary religious act in the Brāhmaṇa tradition, six acts are considered to be necessary both for the householder and the recluse. In this the dominant one is *Sāmāiya*. When the householder or recluse accepts religious life as per his qualification, he takes the vow "Karemi Bhanta ! Sāmāiyam"—"O lord ! I adopt equality and spirit of equality". Further clarification of this equality is given in the sentence that follows. The clarification is— "I renounce *Sāvadya yoga*—meaning all sinful dealings, according to my capacity." In the seventh century, the famous scholar Jinabhadraṅgi Kṣamāśramaṇa wrote his famous '*Viśeṣavaśyakabhāṣya*' on this because of the great importance of 'Sāmāiya.' He lays down that faith, knowledge and conduct that are subsidiary to dharma are *Sāmāiya*.

Jainism, Gītā and Gandhiji with regard to real heroism

Right from old days, the perspective of equality was well-grounded in other traditions like Sāṃkhya, Yoga and Bhāgavata. Lord Krishna wrote the Gītā with the help of their thought-content. That is the reason why the Gītā supports the perspective of equality by the frequent use of the words like *samadṛṣṭi*, *Samatā*, *Sāmya* etc. The spirit of equality is basically the same. The two yet differ, one from the other, because other thoughts in view of difference in traditions are mixed with it. Even when Arjuna was overcome with a forceful spirit of equality, the Gītā stops him from resorting to the life of a recluse. The *Ācārāṅga sūtra*, on the other hand, would not issue such an order to him but would only state that "if you are a real Kṣatriya hero, you cannot fight a violent battle after acquiring the perspective of equality; you can only accept the life of a recluse, fight the spiritual enemies and prove your Kṣatriya spirit (1.5,3)." The story of Bharata-Bāhubali enlightening this statement is famous in Jain literature. We are here told that after suffering fierce attacks from his blood-brother

Bharata, Bāhubali raised his hand for counter-attack. Just at that moment the inclination of the spirit of equality dawned on his mind. Under the spell of this inclination, Bāhubali embraced the life of a recluse. He did not desire to take revenge on Bharata by counter-attack; he did not even think of getting his just share of the kingdom. Gandhiji developed this spirit of equality in the true sense of the term in his life, following the word of the Gītā, Ācāraṅga etc. On their basis he proclaimed - "renounce outright the war that annihilates humanity and take recourse to the path of counteracting injustice only on the basis of equality or purity of the consciousness." Gandhiji gave this development to the meaning of the ancient recluse and renunciation and popularised it in society.

Spirit of Equality and theory of non-extremism

The Jain tradition has placed so much of emphasis on the perspective of equality that it has known the same to be '*Brahman*' that is renowned in the Brāhmaṇa tradition. For this they designated as '*Brahmacarya-Bambhacerai*' all thought and conduct that nourished this perspective of equality. It is like the spirit of friendship etc. being designated '*Brahmavihāra*' by the Buddhist tradition. Further, as in the Dhammapada¹ and Śāntiparva, in the Jain work Uttarādhyayana² also, only the Śramaṇa who adopts a spirit of equality is designated a brahmin and thus, an attempt is made to remove the distinction between Śramaṇa and Brāhmaṇa.

The spirit of equality expresses itself in two ways in the Jain tradition-(i) in conduct and (ii) in thought. All conduct in Jainism, be it external or internal, gross or subtle, it has evolved round the central principle of non-violence based on the perspective of equality. The Jain tradition does not approve of any conduct that does not protect or nourish non-violence. Granted that all religious traditions have laid greater or lesser emphasis on non-violence. Yet, the emphasis laid on it by Jainism and the extent of the widening of the concept are not found in any other religious

1. Dhammapada-Brāhmaṇa Varga 26

2. Uttarādhyayana-25

tradition. Not only the world of human beings, animals and birds, insects and moths, but by the spirit of equality of the Self, even the world of subtlest of insects under the earth and in the waters are enveloped in this spirit and man is asked, to avoid, at all costs, violence to all these.

The emphasis placed on the perspective of equality in theory has given rise to the perspective of non-extremism or *Anekāntavāda*. This spirit of equality is violated if we insist under our belief that only our own perspective or thought-process is full and final truth. It is therefore stated that perspectives of others should also be equally respected. This perspective of equality is the basis of the theory of non-extremism. From this background there evolved, in due course, *Syādvāda* that is language-dominated and *Nayavāda* that is thought-dominated. It would not be true to state that this perspective of non-extremism has no place in other traditions. The theory of non-extremism finds a place in the Sāṃkhya and Nyaya systems. The *Vibhajyavāda* of Lord Buddha, his theory of the middle path also results from this perspective of non-extremism. However, the Jain tradition has laid maximum emphasis on non-violence and this perspective of non-extremism. In Jainism, there is no topic in thought and conduct which is not associated with the theory of non-extremism and which, as a result, remains outside its pale. That is the reason why scholars of other religious traditions, though believing in the theory, have not written independent works on it. Scholars of Jainism have, however, written so much of literature that enlightens us on the theory and its subsidiaries like *Syādvāda*, *Nayavāda* etc.

Non-violence

Non-violence is just keeping away from violence. The matter would not be clearly and fully grasped till we have not grasped as to who becomes an object of violence, who commits acts of violence and for what reason. In order to answer these very questions, four principal disciplines have developed. They are (i) *Ātmavidyā*, (ii) *Karmavidyā*, (iii) *Cāritravidyā* and (iv) *Lokavidyā*. In a similar way the perspective of non-extremism has given rise to and nourished

Śrautavidyā, Pramaṇavidyā. Thus, non-violence, non-extremism and the disciplines born there of are the essence of Jainism. We discuss this later.

Ātmavidyā and Theory of Evolution

Philosophically, all Ātmās, be they earthly, aquatic or of plants etc., of the form of insects and moths animals and birds or human beings, are all equal. This is the essence of Jain Ātmavidyā. Putting into practice this doctrinal thought of equality, making an effort in all alertness to put it into practice in all spheres of life as far as possible, is non-violence. The Ātmavidyā specifies that if the experience of equality is not possible in worldly dealings, then, the doctrine of equality of souls is only an ism. The way to put into practice the doctrine of equality is laid down in the Ācārāṅga-sūtras 80, 96 and 97 in this manner. Experience the sorrows of others as you experience your own. This proves that the success of non-violence is not possible if one does not acquire the sensibility to the sorrows of others as your own.

Just as the conduct of non-violence is substantiated through the philosophical thought of equality of all souls, in the Jain tradition one more spiritual belief evolved. It is that whatever the disparity physical, mental etc., inherent in the Jīva, it comes from outside, i.e., it is born of Karma; it is not real. It is therefore possible for the lowest of the Jīvas to rise sometimes to the status of a human being while a human Jīva can fall down the lowest, i.e., the Jīva in the plants. In a similar manner, the Jīva in the plant can, through its evolution and development, become free from all bondage. Karma is the only basis of higher or lower movement or birth-whatever the Karma, the impression of actions, the inclination, so is the state of the soul. Yet philosophically, the form of all souls is as if similar and it reveals itself fully in a state of actionlessness. This is precisely the theory of evolution based on the equality of all souls.

Whatever be the difference of outlook of the dualist traditions like Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Bauddha etc., that uphold non-violence, in other matters with Jainism, all these disciplines are unanimous in

the matter of conduct dominated by non-violence and the theory of evolution.

The Upaniṣadic tradition that upholds identity of souls justifies non-violence not on the basis of the principle of equality, but on the basis of non-duality. It proclaims that all Jīvas are of the nature of pure Brahman, Brahman one without a second, in essence. The difference that is found between one Jīva and another is not real; it is due to nescience-*Avidya*. We should therefore look upon all other Jīvas as identical with ours, take the sorrows of others to be ours, and keep away from violence. There is just this difference between the dualist disciplines like Jainism and the non-dualistic traditions, The former accept the realistic difference between one Jīva and another and still accept their sameness. Following this, they preach non-violence. The non-dualistic disciplines, on the other hand, take the difference between the Jīvātmas to be illusory, accept their complete essential identity and preach non-violence on this basis. According to the Advaita tradition, in different living beings and the beings in different states, the root cause of the visible dissimilarity is Brahman that is one, pure and perfect. According to the dualistic traditions like Jainism, however, every Jīvātma is, as existence, independent and pure Brahman. According to one tradition the whole creation has arisen from one complete Brahman while according to another tradition, so many different and equal Jīvas are countless pure Brahman. It seems that the principle of identity based on non-dualism has evolved by stages from the doctrine of equality based on dualism. The conduct of non-violence and the theory of spiritual evolution has been interpreted in non-dualism also as in the thought of dualism. Whatever be the ism, the matter of importance from the viewpoint of non-violence is just this only. The conception of non-violence originates from the realistic sensibility of equality or identity of Jīvas, one with the other.

Karmavidyā and freedom from bondage

If, in reality; all Jīvātmas are equal, why this mutual dissimilarity amongst them, and, with passing of time why is there

contradiction in the same Jiva also? The answer to this question has led to the birth of Karmavidyā. The belief that the state of the Jiva is according to his Karma explains this dissimilarity. It again adds that the Jiva is free in the performance of good or bad deeds or in non-performance. The Jiva can resort to good or bad effort at its will; that is again the force that shapes its present and future. The *Karmavāda* states that the present is shaped by the past and the future by the present. The concord of all the three is mutually dependent only on *Karmavāda*. Only this is the basis of the theory of rebirth.

The real fact is that only ignorance and attachment and jealousy are Karmas. Failing in the correct perspective about one's own Self and others is ignorance, or, according to Jainism; *Darśana-moha*—illusion in the realm of philosophical realization. Other traditions, Sāṃkhya, Bauddha etc. know this as *Avidyā*. The temperamental variations that are born or the inclinations that have arisen because of the ideas of good and bad born of ignorance are, in brief, designated attachment and jealousy. Actually only attachment and jealousy inspire violence, but the root of all this lies in ignorance and illusion or *Avidyā*—nescience. That is the reason why only ignorance is the root of violence. All *Ātmavādi* disciplines are unanimous in the matter.

The form of Karma that is described above is known as *Bhāva-Karma* in the Jain terminology. It is a typical psychical effect on the Ātmā. This *Bhāva-Karma* attracts the extremely microscopic gross atoms that ever envelop the Ātmā; and endow it with a typical form. These gross atoms in a heap, that have acquired a typical form are known as *Dravyākarma* or Karmaṇa body. They go with the Jiva in the next life and become the background for the creation of the gross body. If we view the matter superfluously, we might feel that the idea about *Dravya-karma* is found in the *Karmavidyā* only of Jainism, but that is not really so, if we probe deep into the matter. Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Vedānta etc. describe the subtle body or the *līṅga Śarīra* that remains with the soul in its several births. It is contended that

this body consists of the inner consciousness, pride, mind etc. that are illusory-*māyika* elements born of nature-*Prakṛti*; actually they are in place of the gross *Kārmaṇa* body according to Jain tradition. The concept of the subtle or *Kārmaṇa* body is just the same. If there is any difference, it is in the type of the description, in lesser or more details and in classification, and this is possible and natural in the different traditions that ponder over the problems from different angles of vision. In this way we see that in all *Ātmavādi* traditions, the element of *Karma* is accepted as the cause of rebirth. So is accepted the *dravyakarma* also in form of the gross body accompanying the soul in its series of births. The Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika traditions have not accepted the subtle body in particular, have accepted the mind of the form of the atom accompanying the soul in its series of births and have thus adopted the concept of *Dravya-Karma*.

After the concepts of rebirth and Karma the concept of liberation also steadied itself in philosophical thinking. From that time up to the present days, the concepts of the Indian philosophers regarding the nature of *Ātmā* vary when they lay down the idea of bondage and liberation. The concepts of all the philosophies of the principal traditions are given here in order to give a clear idea about the nature of the Jain belief from the view-point of evolution :

- (1) According to the Jain tradition, every body has a different soul in it. He performs good and bad deeds and is the enjoyer of the fruits of his deeds such as happiness, sorrow etc. In its new birth the soul goes to another place and contracts or expands according to its gross body. The same soul attains to liberation and liberation is the period when it becomes completely free from all worldly happiness and sorrow, knowledge and ignorance etc. and is freed from all good and bad *Bhāvas*.
- (2) According to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga, *Ātmā* is different with every body; but since it is unchangeable and pervasive, it is neither the doer of Karma, nor its enjoyer; it does not go to another birth, it is not having motion; it is not seeking only

liberation. In accordance with natural intellect, *Buddhi* or the inner consciousness performs Karma, is the enjoyer, moves to another birth, is of the nature of compression and expansion, knowledge and ignorance etc., it supports the *Bhāvas* and is above the *Bhāvas* at the time of liberation. The Sāṃkhya-Yoga tradition takes the bondage and liberation of the inner consciousness to belong to the Puruṣa.

- (3) According to the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika traditions, there is a plurality of souls. The soul is taken to be pervasive and unchangeable. It is still taken to be the performer, enjoyer, bound and liberated.
- (4) According the Advaita Vedānta, Ātmās are really not many but one. This Ātmā is pervasive and unchangeable as with Sāṃkhya and Yoga. This would mean that actually the Ātmā is neither bound nor liberated. In this tradition, only the inner consciousness is taken to comprise of bondage and liberation.
- (5) According to the Bauddha view, Ātmā or *Citta* is many; they are the performers of Karma, enjoyer and the resort of bondage and liberation—*Nirvāṇa*. They are neither pervasive nor unchangeable. They comprise only of the series of moments of knowledge. They continue to be born and die in several centres like the heart and the senses, simultaneously or in due order according to circumstances.

The brief description given above clearly suggests that—

- (a) The nature of Ātmā accepted by the Jaina tradition is an ancient form based on the conceptions of the Jaina philosophers in their own experiences.
- (b) This is the second stage of the conceptions of the philosophers of Sāṃkhya and Yoga. It is,
- (c) according to the conceptions of the Advaita, only a revised form of the conception of plurality of the souls as with Sāṃkhya and Yoga, while
- (d) it is only a mix up of the Jain and Sāṃkhya-Yoga conceptions as approved by Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika.
- (e) The same as approved by the Bauddhas is a form revised by a rational thinking of the Jaina concept.

Cāritravidyā

The place of conduct—*Cāritra* in spiritual evolution can be known only after we know the nature of *Ātmā* and Karma. According to the thinkers on liberation, the purpose of this conduct is only to free the *Ātmā* from Karma. Even after assuming the freedom of *Ātmā* through conduct, one question remains to be answered. If *Ātmā* is inherently pure, when and why did Karma get related to *Ātmā* for the first time? Who brought about this relation? In a similar way, one more question arises. If it is assumed that Karma gets, some way or other, to *Ātmā* that is pure by nature, is it not possible that once more the relation may arise even after freedom is attained to through conduct? All spiritual thinkers give more or less the same reply to these two questions. Like the philosophies *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* or *Vedānta*, *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* or *Bauddha*, the Jain philosophy also believes that the relation between Karma and *Ātmā* has no beginning because the first movement of that relation is totally out of the limit of knowledge. All philosophies have assumed that the relation of Karma, *Avidyā* or *Māyā* with *Ātmā* is beginningless as a flow; still, individually it has a beginning. This is so because of the experience of all of us that the desire for Karma arises in the *Jīva* through ignorance, attachment and jealousy. Once that the Karma is abandoned outright, the perfect and pure form of the *Ātmā* is revealed. Spiritual philosophers give this explanation as to why Karma and desire are not reborn in it. By its very nature, *Ātmā* sides with purity. Through *Cetanā*-life-force and other inherent qualities that have fully developed, the faults like ignorance, attachment, jealousy etc., are destroyed from their very roots. This means that these faults get totally weakened in finding their place in the *Ātma-tattva* that is purified with extreme effort.

The function of conduct is to remove the causes of disparity in life. This is known as *Samvara* in the Jain terminology. Ignorance, the basic cause of disparity is made possible by the true realization of *Ātmā*, the faults like attachment are removed by the attainment to *Mādhyasthya*—a state of neutrality. That is the reason why only two things are included in inner conduct—(i) know-

ledge of *Ātmā* or *vivekakhyāti*; (ii) *Mādhyasthya* or victory over faults like attachment and jealousy. Only those means like meditation, vows, *Niyama*, austerity etc. that nourish inner conduct are acceptable as external conduct.

The evolution of spiritual life is dependent upon the development of inner conduct. The order of this development as *guṇasthānas* is described in full details in the Jain tradition. For those who are anxious to know the order of evolution in the spiritual sphere, the *Yogaśāstra* lays down the renowned stages such as *Madhumati*; the Buddhist scriptures lay down *Sotapanna* etc. The *Yogavāsistha* lays down the famous basis of ignorance and knowledge and the Jain tradition stresses *guṇasthānas*—modes of virtues and *Yogadṛṣṭis*—yogic visions. Comparative study of all these is very much interesting and useful. It is not possible to describe all this here in details. Interested readers may consult other published writings.*

Instead of describing the fourteen *Guṇasthānos*, I narrate here in brief just three stages and in these the *Guṇasthānas* are included. The first is *Bahirātmā*—external Self in which there is no rise of *Ātmajñāna*—knowledge of the Self or *Vivekakhyāti*; the second is *Antarātmā*—inner self—in which the knowledge of *Ātmā* arises, but blemishes like attachment and jealousy get mild in their effect and yet continue to show their influence; the third is the *Paramātmā*—*Ātmā* the supreme—in which the state of detachment reveals itself on account of attachment and jealousy being completely uprooted.

Lokavidyā

In *Lokavidyā* the form of the *Loka*-world is described. The coming together of the two—*Jiva* and *Ajiva* constitutes *Loka*. *Cetana* and *Acetana* are the two elements that are never created by any body and they never die. Still, through their inherent nature—*Svabhāva*, they attain to different results. The only element that can deeply influence the *Cetana*—life—force during the period of its material existence, is the heap of atoms that are lifeless. They come in contact with the *Cetana* in different forms and delimit its

* Vide 'Purātattva-1' p. 142—Paper 'Bhāratīya Darśanamān Adhyatmika Vikāśakṛanā'.

powers. The natural and original powers of the life-force are such as to make it free from the influence of the gross elements some time or other when the correct direction is obtained. The sphere of mutual influence of life and lifelessness constitutes *Loka* and freedom from that influence is *Lokānta*. The conception of the sphere of *Loka* as found in the Jain tradition is very much similar to the conceptions found in *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*, *Purāṇa* and the Buddhist traditions.

Like the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, the Jain tradition accepts the atomic theory; it does not accept the concept of *Prakṛti* like *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*. Still, the nature of the atom as approved in the Jain tradition is very much similar to the nature of *Prakṛti* as approved by the *Sāṃkhya* tradition; not so with the nature of the atom as accepted by the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* tradition. This is because the atom as approved by the Jain tradition is the resultant like the *Prakṛti* of the *Sāṃkhya*, and not unchangeable with the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*. That is the reason why just as the same *Prakṛti* becomes the *upādāna-material* cause of the material creations like the earth, water, light, wind etc., in a similar manner, just the same atoms result in the different forms like earth, water, light etc. The Jain tradition does not believe, like the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* that the material atoms of earth, water etc., are basically of different genre. One more difference should also be noted. It is that the atom accepted by the Jainas is so very much more subtle than the one acceptable to the *Vaiśeṣika* that in the end, it becomes *Avyakta*-unmanifest like the *Prakṛti* of *Sāṃkhya*. The Jain theory of endlessness of atoms is not much dissimilar from the theory of multiplicity of *Prakṛti* that is in line with the plurality of *Puruṣas* as approved by the ancient *Sāṃkhya* theory.¹

Jaina view and *Īṣvara*

The Jain tradition, like the *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*, *Mīmāṃsā* etc., looks upon the *Loka* as beginningless and endless in its fluid form. It does not accept its creation and destruction as the *Paurāṇika* and *Vaiśeṣika* views do. There is therefore no place whatsoever for *Īṣvara* as the creator and destroyer in the Jain tradition. The Jain

1. Vide 'Ṣaddarśanasamuccaya' Guṇaratna ṭikā, p. 99

doctrine lays down that every *Jiva* is the creator of its own world. According to the doctrine, philosophically, every *Jiva* has the potential of becoming *Īśvara*, and this fact reveals itself at the time of liberation. This godliness itself becomes an object of worship for the common man. The *Īśvara* acceptable to the *Yogaśāstra* is also just an object of worship; he is not creator or destroyer. But the Jaina and *Yoga* vary in their outlook. The *Īśvara* accepted by the *Yogaśāstra* is of a different status than the other *Puruṣas* because he is ever liberated; not so the *Īśvara* in the Jain scriptures. The Jain scriptures state that *Īśvarahood* is to be attained to by hard effort and is therefore attainable by all the *sādhakas* and all liberated *Jivas* deserve to be worshipped equally as *Īśvara*.

Śrutavidyā and Pramāṇavidyā

Śrutavidyā is a truth-aiming collection of the thoughts of all the preceding renowned thinkers right from the ancient days and on ones own thoughts based on ones self-experience. Its aim is that no truth abiding thought or line of thought should be disregarded or ignored. That is the reason why the Jaina *Śrutavidyā* has continued to develop with the development of every new lore. That is the reason why first the *Sadadvaita* of *Sāṃkhya* was adopted as *Samgrahanaya*, but later on the thinking on the non-duality of *Brahma-Brahmādvaitavāda* found place after the development of the thinking on it. In the same way, the ancient theory of moment and adopted as *Rjusūtranaya*. With the development of *Mahāyāna* thinking, all the four famous Buddhist lines of thought—*Vaibhāṣika*, *Sautrāntika*, *Vijñānavāda* and *Śūnyavāda* were accepted as *Rjusūtranaya*.

The sphere of non-extremism is so wide and expansive that all worldly and other-worldly lores beneficial to human life find their proper place in it. That is the reason why, in addition to the other-worldly lores, worldly lores have found place in the Jaina *Śrautavidyā*.

In the *Pramāṇavidyā*, we come across a detailed analysis of all types of knowledge as direct proof, inference, etc., their means and their weakness and strength. There also, non-extremism is

made use of in such a manner that no appropriate thinking of any philosopher is disregarded or ignored; actually all knowledgeable thinking related to knowledge and its means is appropriately included in it.

The narration so far pertains to non-violence and non-extremism that are the very life of the Jaina tradition. Just as Prāna cannot be retained without body, similarly *dharmaprāna* cannot exist in the absence of a *dharmasārira*. The religious body of Jainism exists in its varied forms as Saṅgha-formation, literature, religious places like tirthas, temples etc.; its architecture, sculpture, its modes of worship, its libraries with rich collections of manuscripts and so on.

[Darṣan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 116-131]

Chapter 3

HOARY PAST OF NIRGRANTHA CULT

Principal Śramaṇa Cults

The cult opposed to the religious cult known as the Brāhmanic or Vedic cult is Śramaṇa cult. It positively existed in India in some part or other in some form or other just along with the spread of the Vedic cult. The branches and sub-branches of the Śramaṇa cult were so many and of these the names of Sāṃkhya, Jaina, Bauddha and Ājivaka are famous. In the beginning many of these were diametrically opposed to the Vedic cult, but in due course they merged in the Vedic cult due to one reason or another. To illustrate, we can give the names of the Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva cults. Ancient Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva Āgamas were not only different from the vedic tradition, they even opposed it. That is the reason why the Ācāryas who upheld the Vedic cult, looked upon the ancient Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva Āgamas as opposed to the Vedas and therefore outside the pale of the Vedas. To-day, however, we can see that the Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva traditions and their branches, have merged completely in the Vedic cult, and are taken as Vedic. In spite of this, there are some Śramaṇa cults that call themselves non-Vedic; even scholars of the Vedas know them to be so. The dominant ones here are the Jaina and Bauddha.

A general and brief acquaintance of the Śramaṇa cult is this. It does not accept the supreme authority of the Vedas as not composed by any human being or eternal or composed by god. It does not accept the supremacy of the brāhmin class because it acts as *Purohita*. The Vedic cult accepts this authority of the Vedas and brahmins in the present context. All the Śramaṇa traditions take the best and noblest personality in their cult as the promulgator and take his words as the final authority. They prefer virtues to the race as higher and nobler and accept only the Saṃnyāsī or the recluse as the preceptor.

Nirgrantha Cult is Jainism : Some Proofs

In the ancient times, in most of the Śramaṇa traditions, the words used generally for the preceptor or the recluse were these—Śramaṇa, Bhikṣu, Anagāra, Yati, Sādhu, Tapasvī, Parivrajaka, Arhanta, Jina, Tirthankara etc. The Jain cult, like the Bauddha and Ājivaka, also uses these very words for its preceptors. But there is one word which the Jain cult and only the Jain cult has used right from the beginning in its history for its preceptors. The word is *Nirgrantha* (Prakrit *Niggantha-Acārāṅga* 1.2, 1.108) according to Jain Āgamas; *Nirgrantha* is ‘Niggantha’ according to the Bauddha Piṭakas. We can state even to this extent that in no tradition except the Jaina has the word ‘*Nirgrantha*’ become prominent or conventional. That is the reason why the Jaina scriptures are known as ‘*Nigganthapayaṇa*’, i.e., ‘*Nirgranthaprayacana*’. In no other cult is this word used for the scriptures.

The relation that persists between the Nirgrantha cult as stated in the Āgamas with the Bauddha Piṭakas is not to be found with the Vedic or Paurāṇika traditions. These are its reasons.

- (i) The Jain and Bauddha cults being Śramaṇa cults, there is a fraternal relation between the two.
- (ii) The promulgator of the Bauddha cult and the last promulgator of the Nirgrantha cult Lord Mahāvira, were contemporaries. Again, they passed their lives in the same or similar sphere. Their sphere of activity was, not only one region but one city, one street and just one family. The followers of both were used to meeting each other now and again and used to discuss, in a friendly or challenging manner, the preachings and conduct of their respected preceptors. There were so many followers who changed their loyalty from one cult to the other. This happened as if the followers of Buddha and Mahāvira were very close neighbours or family members. It should be conceded that this happened as if so many members of the same family held different beliefs as it is seen even to-day.
- (iii) Buddha and his contemporary pupils have described so many matters of the Nirgrantha cult as if they were eye-witnesses, even though the description might be only incidental and critical.

The references therefore to the thought and conduct of the Nirgrantha cult that we come across in the Bauddha Piṭakas, is historically very important. Later on we have references in the works of the Buddhist sects about the Nirgrantha cult and we have references to the same in the Āgama literature. If the two are compared, we have no doubt that both are equally authentic even if there be two opposed sides. The composition and collections in the Bauddha Piṭakas and the ancient Nirgrantha Āgama are more or less the same.

Buddha and Mahāvira

Buddha and Mahāvira were near contemporaries. Both supported the Śramaṇa cult. We cannot yet derive any conclusions without knowing the distance of time between the two. The first difference is this. Starting with his great voyage—*Mahābhiniṣkramaṇā* he propagated his new path or dharmacakra. He continued acceptance and rejection of the different *tapasvi* and *yogi* sects during the course of these six years. The path of dharma, however, which Mahāvira had acquired in his family tradition was accepted by him. He proceeded further on the same path, brought about change and improvement in it according to his own understanding and capability. The path of Buddha was that of rejection of old sects and the establishment of a new religious order; the path of Mahāvira was simply that of reconsideration and research in his family-religion. We therefore see that Buddha evaluates at several places, the thinking of the sects rejected or accepted by him and states : “ The leader of this particular sect holds this belief, another holds this. I do not agree with them; I hold this view ”. etc. Nowhere in the Piṭakas does Buddha state thus—“ What I hold is only inherited from the old; I am only its propagator.” There is only one sentiment at the root of all statements of Buddha. It is that “ My path is the result of my own pursuit.” Mahāvira does not say so. The proof is that once a few followers of Pārśvanātha asked some questions to Mahāvira quoting the authority of the words of Pārśvanātha who brought them to his own

fold!¹ This is precisely the reason why Buddha has not co-ordinated the views of any predecessor or contemporary with his own; he has expressed the traits of his own outlook. Mahāvira has not done this. He has co-ordinated his own reforms and changes with the then followers of Pārśvanātha.² The path therefore of Mahāvira is suggestive of the inclination of co-ordination with the sect of Pārśvanātha.

Another point to be drawn attention to is the life-time of Buddha and Mahāvira. Buddha attained Nirvāṇa at the age of eighty; Mahāvira at seventy two. It is now more or less a proved fact that Buddha preceded Mahāvira in Nirvāṇa.³ Buddha was slightly older than Mahāvira. Again, when Mahāvira independently started preaching of his religion, Buddha had already established his cult. Buddha was expected to gain strength from more and more of followers of his path; Mahāvira had to keep within his fold and influence the old followers of Pārśvanātha in addition to winning over new followers to his cult. Buddha could not have succeeded in the formation of his Saṅgha without a complete evaluation and rejection of all other contemporary sects. Mahāvira's problem was slightly different. He brought to his own fold the contemporary followers of Pārśvanātha on the strength of his own conduct and the strength of his own personality, which won their hearts.

The problem therefore, of recruitment of new followers was not as acute for Mahāvira as for Buddha, It is, therefore, full of criticism of others.

Influence of Nirgrantha tradition on Buddha

Buddha discarded several sects one after the other, before he established his own path. One of these was the Nirgrantha path, Buddha has narrated his own life.⁴ On reading this and comparing it with the conduct described in the Jaina Āgamas, it can be

1. Bhagavati 5.9. 225.

2. Uttarādhyayana, Adh. 23.

3. Viranirvāaa Samvat aur Jain Kālagāṇanā-Bhāratīyq Vidyā pt, 3, p, 177,

4. Majjhīrnanīkāya-S. 26-Fudhacarita (in Gñjarati) by Prof. Kaustambi.

known without doubt that Buddha had passed some time of his life in the Jain cult as in others. Mahāvira had not carved his path during the period of the Sādhana of Buddha and at that time in eastern India there existed no sect other than the Nirgrantha path of Pārśvanātha. This shows that just for some time, Buddha passed his life in the Nirgrantha cult of Pārśvanātha. As a result of this, Buddha severely attacks austerity-tapas that was firmly established in the Nirgrantha cult when he analyses its conduct and thought. During the course of this attack, he describes in fairly good details, the Nirgrantha cult in its own terminology. The time of preaching of Buddha and Mahāvira was the same for some years. It seems further that they toured the same regions without ever meeting each other. That is the reason why the Piṭakas refer to Lord Mahāvira as “*Nātaputta Niggantha*”.

Four Yāmas and Buddhist Cult

The great vows—*Mahāvratas* of the Nirgranthas are discussed in the Dighanikāya and Saṃyuttanikāya of the Bauddha Piṭakas.¹ In the Sāmajjāha sutta of Dighanikāya of the Bauddha Piṭakas, Ajātaśatru-Kuṇika, the son of Śreṇika-Bimbisāra gives a narration of his meeting with Jñātaputra Mahāvira. In this, Juātaputra Mahāvira tells that the Nirgrantha is controlled by the Caturyāma Saṃvara; only such a Nirgrantha is of controlled self-*yata*tmā;—and steady self-*sihita*tmā. In the same way, a person Niṅka by name, tells Buddha that Jñātaputra Mahāvira is compassionate, clever and endowed with Caturyāma, the reference is in the Devadattasamyutta of Saṃyuttanikāya. These Buddhist references inform us that in the times of Buddha, and even later till the Piṭakas assumed their final shape, the Buddhist tradition looked upon Mahāvira and his other Nirgranthas as endowed with Caturyāma. ‘Yāma’ means a great vow—*Mahāvrata*, which is also known as ‘Yama’ in ‘Yogaśāstra’ (2.30). Till this time, the Nirgrantha tradition of Mahāvira was endowed with five great vows and it is known by the same designation in the scriptures and the worldly ways. ¶Under this state of affairs what are we to understand when the Buddhist works know Mahāvira

1, Dighanikāya S. 2,

1. Dighanikāya-s. 2, Saṃyuttanikāya Vol. One, p. 66.

and other Nirgranthas as holding four great vows ? This is a very natural question.

The reply to this question can be had from the Jaina Āgamas available then. Fortunate we are that we have, in the then available Āgamas, so many levels of ancient thought of the Nirgrantha tradition that enlighten us regarding the tradition itself as also the condition of the Nirgrantha tradition of the earlier Pārśvāpatyika. Āgamas like the Bhagavati and Uttarādhyana tell us¹ that many Pārśvāpatyika Nirgranthas, who were upholders of four great vows, accepted the preaching of Mahāvira and adopted the five great vows as preached by Lord Mahāvira. He thus changed the older tradition of four great vows. However, there were some Pārśvāpatyika Nirgranthas who continued the old tradition of four great vows. One more historical problem is this. Why and when did Mahāvira establish five great vows in place of the old four ? The reply to this 'why' is given by the Jaina works. They however, give no reply to the 'when'. Bhagavān Pārśvanātha had firmly established the four great vows of non-violence, truth, non-stealth and non-acceptance. But in due course, looseness crept in, in the Nirgrantha tradition. This looseness went to this extent that certain Nirgranthas confined the meaning of the word 'Aparigraha' to 'non collection, and kept contact with women even without collection or acceptance and believed that the vow of Aparigraha is not broken thereby. Bhagavān Mahāvira wanted to remove this looseness and so established the vow of celibacy—Brahmacarya—independently of this Aparigraha and tried to purify the fourth vow thereby. It is not possible to state as to when, during the course of his sermonizing, he established the vow of Brahmacarya apart from Aparigraha. But the vow was laid down with so much of emphasis that the Nirgrantha cult came to glorify the five great vows. Those Pārśvāpatyika Nirgranthas who remained aloof from the five great vows of Mahāvira almost ceased to exist in no time. If the four great vows were not mentioned by the Buddha Piṭakas and the Jaina Āgamas, we would not have known that for a time this tradition upheld four vows.

1. The Mahāvira Issue of 'Utthāna' (Sthānakavāsi Jain Conference, Bombay, P.46)

We come to know automatically from this discussion that in the beginning, when Jñātaputra Mahāvira took to the initiation of the Pārśvāpatyika Nirgrantha tradition, he had adopted only four great vows. But looking to the position of the cult he undertook reform now and then. The dialogue and discussion that took place on these in the ancient Nirgrantha tradition are partially revealed in the dialogue between Keśi and Gautama in the Uttarādhyayana sūtra. Certain Pārśvāpatyika Nirgranthas doubted and asked this. If liberation is the only aim of both Pārśvanātha and Mahāvira, why do we find difference in their preaching regarding the great vows? Keśi Submitted this question before Gautama and the latter clarified it. Keśi was delighted and he accepted the order of Lord Mahāvira.

We can easily come to the following conclusions on the basis of this discussion—

- (1) Before Mahāvira, there was a custom of acceptance of four great vows at least from the time of Pārśvanātha. Mahāvira slightly changed it and developed it into five great vows. Only this developed form is, without any controversy whatsoever, accepted by all Jain sections, while the ancient custom of four great vows is preserved only in the Scriptures.
- (2) Buddha himself and all the Bhikṣus who were his contemporaries and followers, looked upon the Nirgrantha tradition as comprising of only four great vows; they did not know of the internal reform that brought these to five. They repeatedly gave expression to what Buddha stated once and what became popular in the common public, in their works.

Buddha has laid down five Śīlas or vows. These are similar to the Yamas of the Nirgrantha tradition from the viewpoint of number, but with a difference, It is that the fifth vow is *Aparigraha*—non-acceptance in the Nirgrantha tradition, but it is abandonment of wine etc. in the Buddhist tradition.

It is true that four *Yāmas* are referred to at several places in the Buddhist works, but its meaning in the original Piṭakas and its Attha stories is wrong and lacks in clarity. What is it due to?

In the first instance we would be surprised that the Buddha writers were ignorant of and unclear about the Nirgrantha tradition in their neighbourhood that was contemporary and renowned and had accepted four Yamas. But when we consider the position of the cult then, our surprise disappears. No cult has even given full justice to the other. It is possible that in the beginning Buddha and his contemporary pupils know the precise meaning of the word 'Caturyāma.' It was known to all and needed no elaboration. But with the process of the collection of the Piṭakas in progress, it was found necessary to clarify the meaning of 'Caturyāma.' Some Bauddha Bhikṣus, through the force of his imagination supplemented the meaning, and with time this continued and nobody cared to assess whether or not this meaning was acceptable to the Nirgrantha tradition. At several places, the same thing has happened about the Bauddhas at the hands of the Jainas. The real and authentic form of the beliefs of any cult can possibly be known only from its own works and tradition.

[Darṣana aur Gintan, pt. 2, pp. 50-59, 97-100].



Chapter 4

HEART OF JAINA CULTURE

Stream of Culture

The stream of culture is like the flow of a river. Right from its origin to its end, it mixes with other small and big streams, expands and changes and becomes full with other confluences. It continues to acquire some change or other during its course in its form, touch, smell, taste etc. The culture known as Jaina is also not an exception to this rule applicable to culture in general. Who gave rise to the culture that we know as Jaina before it arose? In what form did it arise for the first time? Actually it is outside the limits of history, fully and specifically to give a full and authentic description of this. We can, however, probe into the heart or essence of this Jaina culture if we ponder over the stream that has continued to flow in the sphere of its supports; the stream that exists before us of the ancient flow as it is.

Two Forms of Jain Culture

Like other cultures, the Jaina culture also consists of two forms : external and internal. External is that which the people other than those involved in that particular culture can decipher by their eyes, ears and the other sense-organs. The internal form of culture is not of this type; this is because only one who merges completely this form of internal culture in life can possibly grasp it and evaluate it. Other people who desire to know it cannot grasp it thoroughly. Such other people can get acquainted with it only through the way of life of person or persons who have brought the internal culture to bear on their personalities. Here, I propose to narrate that acquaintance of the form or essence of Jain culture that is dependent only on imagination and inference that result mostly from my study.

External form of Jain Culture

As in the case of the external form of other cultures, in the Jain culture in its external form, several things are included. Scripture and its language, temples and their architecture, the shape of the idols and the types of worship, things that are of use in this worship, the habits of food and drink of the society, festivals and holidays and so many other things have a typical relation with the Jain society. These matters are the limbs of the external culture. It is yet not a rule that wherever and whenever these and other similar things are present, the essence of the culture is present. It sometimes happens that these externals are present and still the essence is absent; it also happens that even in the absence of these the essence of culture might be present. Any individual, keeping this point of view before himself and pondering over it will very easily understand that the essence of Jain culture that I intend to describe here may be found not necessarily only in the persons born in the Jain society and proclaiming to be Jains. The essence is to be understood to be absent if the persons commonly known as Jains and proclaiming to be Jains are not basically and internally qualified to be called Jains. On the other side, if the individuals not claiming to be Jains are duly qualified, this essence is to be taken to be present—in all probability. Thus, the external form is limited only to a certain society, it is not easy to come across it in any other society. The essence of culture, however, can possibly be found in the followers of other society as with the followers of that particular society. The real fact is that the essence of culture or its soul are so wide and independent that place, time, race, language and customs cannot bind its flow and bind it to themselves.

Essence of Jain Culture : Religion teaching abstention

The question is as to what the essence of Jain culture is. It is that abstention is the very soul of Jain culture. The religion which presents us with abstention, i.e., destroys the circle of rebirth or as a means to this abstention when the religion is born, has developed and is propagated, is known as *Nivartaka* dharma, i.e., religion

teaching abstention. We should ponder a little over the nature of ancient and contemporary religions in order clearly to understand what *Nivartaka dharma* means.

Classification of Religions

If we were to classify the internal form of all the living religions of the world and religions whose history is available more or less, they can be divided into three types :

- (1) The first is that which ponders over only the present birth.
- (2) The second is that which brings into consideration birth and rebirth both.
- (3) The third is that which considers birth, rebirth as also beginning and end or uprooting these.

Anātmavāda

In remote ancient times as to-day, there were thinkers who were not inspired by any conception of happiness beyond that in the present life. They were not inspired by any such idea and did not think it proper to pass their time in the pursuit of its means. Their only aim was enjoyment of the happiness only of the present life. They collected all the means to fulfil this aim. They held that whatever man is he is so only till the present birth persists. To them the meaning of rebirth was, at the most, propagation and continuance of the family-line through children. Man is not going to be reborn to enjoy the fruits of all the good actions that he performs in life. The fruits of our actions may be reaped by our children or the society. If this is to be designated 'rebirth', there is no objection. The class of persons who thought on these lines are known in our ancient Scriptures as Anātmavādī or atheists. Later on, this class was designated Cārvākavādī. From the viewpoint of this group, all aims worth making an effort for, are simply worldly enjoyments. The Cārvākans did not conceive of any dharma as a means to this; they did not conceive of any rules or prescriptions for the purpose. They can therefore be known as exerting only for passion-*Kāma*, or, at the most believing in two efforts - *Kāma* and *Artha*.

Pravartaka Dharma—Prescriptive Religion or Religion of activity

Another class of thinkers no doubt takes physical joys of life to be an end, but they also believe that the happiness that is possible to be had in this life also continues in the births that follow after one is reborn on death. In this manner, the series of rise and fall of physical and mental joys continues. If we want to be happy in the other birth as in the present one, or if we want to acquire greater happiness, we should resort to religious deeds also. Earning of prosperity may become a means useful and beneficial in this life, but religious merit is a must for the high and higher happiness of other lives. Persons who held this ideology resorted to various religious works and had the faith of acquiring the higher joys of other worlds. This class of thinkers is Ātmavādi and accepts higher the theory of rebirth, but its expectation is to scale higher and heights of happiness and to make this happiness more and more steady for longer periods of time. Their religious practices are therefore known as *Pravartaka dharma*. A brief summary of this view would be this. One should try to make ones social system regularized and active in such a manner that every member of the society reaps happiness as per his ability and status and prepares for the life after death in such a manner that he is enabled to acquire greater and more steady happiness even in the other birth. The purpose of *Pravartaka dharma* is to better the birth hereafter along with the social system. It is not to uproot the life hereafter. According to the *Pravartaka dharma* thus, there are 3 efforts—Puruṣārthas. The fourth Puruṣārtha liberation—*Mokṣa*—is not conceived of along with *Kāma*, *Artha* and *Dharma*. The ancient Iranian Aryans whose religious scripture was the Avestā and the ancient Vedic Aryans who believed only in the mantra and Brāhmaṇa part of the Vedas, were all the followers of this *Pravartaka dharma*. The ‘*Mīmāṃsā-darśana*’ that was written later in the Vedic tradition was of ritualistic nature and a living form of this *Pravartaka dharma*.

Nivartaka dharma – Religion of Abstemion

Nivartaka dharma is totally contrary to the *Pravartaka dharma* described above. The class of thinkers who believed in this and the other worlds as also in rebirth, who also believed that the Ātmā was subject to the cycle of birth are those who believed in *Pravartaka dharma*. But they were not at the same time satisfied with the happiness high, higher and steady to be attained to in one's series of births. Their vision was this. Howsoever high our happiness of series of births may be, we may or may not reap happiness, howsoever long it may persist; this happiness is to come to an end sometime or other. If this be the truth, then, even this lofty and long-living happiness is of a low status in the end and therefore not worth aspiring after. They were in search of some happiness, which, once acquired will never die. As this struck to their mind, they felt that acceptance of liberation as a *Puruṣārtha* is unavoidable. They began to believe that a state of the Ātmā is possible, which, once it is acquired, will rule out the need of birth or births for the body. They knew this state of Ātmā as *Mokṣa*—liberation or stoppage of births—*Janmanivṛtti*. The followers of *Pravartaka dharma* were trying to reap the joys of this life and the life hereafter by higher and higher religious practices. The followers of the *Nivartaka dharma* looked upon these religious practices not only as incomplete, for, their aim was liberation. They also looked upon them as obstructive in the attainment to liberation and therefore to them these religious practices were absolutely contemptible. The distance in matter of aim and vision being like that between east and west, what was worth practising for the followers of the *Pravartaka dharma* was contemptible for the followers of the *Nivartaka dharma*. Again, even though *Pravartaka dharma* was considered obstructive with regard to liberation, the followers of the path found it necessary to invent a path that has a well-founded means for the attainment of liberation. In seeking this path, they found out a way that was not dependent upon external means; it was dependent solely upon the purity of thoughts and means of the *Sādhaka*. This path of extreme and perfect purity of thought and behaviour became renowned as the

path of *Nivartaka dharma* or liberation. On studying this strange and variegated warp and woof of Indian culture, we can clearly see that in the *Ātmavādi* philosophies of India, all except the ritualistic Mīmāṃsakas are adherents of the dharmas of abstention. The Buddha and Jaina philosophies, are no doubt *Nivartaka*, but even the Vedic Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya-Yoga and Upaniṣadic philosophies are well-grounded in *Nivartaka dharma*. All these, whether vedic or non-vedic, look upon ritualistic practices as just contemptible. They all look upon right knowledge or knowledge of the Self and the life of dispassionateness based on its knowledge as acceptable and praiseworthy. They further believe that only through this man can free himself from the cycle of rebirth.

We have stated above that the *Pravartaka dharma* was society-oriented. It is here meant that every individual lives in his society and observes all social duties that are related to his life in this world and all religious duties that are related to his life hereafter. Every individual is bound in debts such as, to the sages, ancestors and gods, that he can be free from them only by study, continuation of family line and performance of sacrifices etc., respectively. It is proper for an individual to ponder over his negligible desires; but a total annihilation of these is neither possible nor desirable. According to the *Pravartaka dharma*, the stage of the householder is a must for all individuals; and for him no development is possible by transgressing these.

Nivartaka dharma is individualistic. It originates from the intense inclination of self-realization. It therefore very naturally inspires the person desiring liberation to seek answers of these questions : Is there anything like Ātmatattva or not ? If yes, what form does it have ? How is it related to other elements ? If its realization is possible, by what means, etc. These questions cannot possibly be answered in the absence of pondering, meditation, austerity and an absolutely detached life. Such a realistic life is possible only in case of certain unique individuals; it is not possible that it may become socio-oriented. That was the reason why, as compared to *Pravartaka dharma*, the sphere of *Nivartaka dharma* was very much limited. For the *Nivartaka dharma*, there

was no bondage of the stage of the householder, because it did not depend upon the perusal of desires, but their suppression. That is the reason why the follower of *Nivartaka dharma* does not believe that he is bound by all social and religious duties. In his view, the main duty of an individual is just one and it is to resort to the path of self-realization to the best of his ability and try to annihilate all desires that create an obstruction on it.

Influence and Development of Nivartaka Dharma

It seems that *Nivartaka dharma* was in prevalence in some form or another in some part of the country when the Vedic Aryans, the followers of *Pravartaka dharma* came to this country for the first time. In the beginning, there was a clash between the followers of these two paths. Yet the very few followers of the *Nivartaka dharma* by their austerity, method of meditation and detached conduct, slowly and steadily influenced the common man in the then society. This attracted several followers of *Pravartaka dharma* to itself, resulting in the development of *Nivartaka dharma* in so many forms in so many institutions. In the end, the result of all this was that the followers of the *Pravartaka dharma* who opined originally that the dharma was based on two stages—those of studenthood and householder, added both *Vānaprastha* and *Samnyāsa* to its fold. With the rise of so many institutions of *Nivartaka dharma* and their expanding influence in the society, followers of *Pravartaka dharma* started proclaiming that the path of renunciation directly from the stage of studenthood and without entering into the stage of the householder was possible, permissible and logical. Thus, there arose a co-ordination of the *Pravartaka dharma* in life, and its fruit is visible today in the philosophical literature and the life of men of the world.

The seers who were born in the line of the Brahmins who followed the *Pravartaka dharma* and had still fully adopted the *Nivartaka dharma*, revealed the great glory of the *Nivartaka dharma* by their own thinking and life. They still approved of the *Pravartaka dharma* that was their ancestral wealth together with the

authority of the Vedas on which it was based. The primary seers of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* and Upaniṣadic philosophies were such philosopher-sages. There were some supporters of the *Nivartaka dharma* who forcibly opposed the ritualism that obstructed the progress of austerity, meditation and self-realization. They still did not question the authority of the vedic literature that was the basis of this ritualism. One such great person was Kapila, the promulgator of the Sāṃkhya philosophy. That is the reason why, though the Sāṃkhya-Yoga philosophies were basically opposed to *Pravartaka dharma*, the two ultimately merged in the Vedic philosophies.

The process of co-ordination of this sort went on for centuries in this country. Then there arose extremists in both these dharmas who did not accept the dharma opposed to one's own or even accept it as good. Even before Lord Mahāvīra and Buddha, so many followers of this extreme *Nivartaka dharma* were known. In the times of Mahāvīra and Buddha, however, there were so many institutions that nourished this *Nivartaka dharma* and also those that very strongly opposed the *Pravartaka dharma*. Till this day, in all the classes of the society, high and low, various austerities, varied paths of meditation and so many conducts based on renunciation developed and influenced the society under the shadow of this *Nivṛttidharma*, so much so that in the time of Mahāvīra and Buddha, there developed a fierce tide of opposition between *Pravartaka dharma* and *Nivartaka dharma*. Proofs of this can be had in the contemporary Buddha and Jaina as also Brahmin literature. *Tathagata* Buddha was such a mature thinker. He was so very much firm in his conviction that he did not, in any way, give shelter to the beliefs and scriptures that had their basis in *Nivartaka dharma*. Long time sage Mahāvīra too was an extreme follower of *Nivartaka dharma*. As a result we find that in both the cults, the Buddhist and the Jaina, so many Brahmins who followed the Vedas were converted. They made no effort to establish the authority of the Vedas in the Jaina and Buddha literature; nor did they give sanction to any sacrificial ritualism.

Beliefs and Thoughts of Nivartaka Dharma

Centuries back, slowly and steadily, so many beliefs and conduct that had already developed as limbs of *Nivartaka dharma* upto the time of Mahāvira and Buddha, are as follows in brief :

- (1) Purity of the Self is the basic aim of life and not the importance of the status – this-worldly or other-worldly.
- (2) Completely uprooting the spiritual delusion, nescience and the desires born thereof in the fulfilment of this purpose.
- (3) Acquiring spiritual knowledge for this purpose and thereby making the dealings of the world bereft of desire. Following various types of *dhyāna* and Yoga paths and various types of physical, mental, oral and other austerities and the observance of three, four or five great vows.
- (4) Taking as authority only those words and statements that describe spiritualism as stated by men with spiritual experience. They looked upon as authority not those statements that are divine and not composed by human beings or works written in some special language.
- (5) Only spiritual purity should be looked upon as the only test of the qualification and teachership, and not any particular class by birth. From this point of view, even woman and Śūdra have the same right to religion on equal status with Brabmins and Kṣatriyas.
- (6) Prohibition of the use of wine, meat etc. in religious and social life. These are traits of *Pravartaka dharma* in which conduct and thought differed. These were rooted deep in the land and were getting stronger day by day.

Nirgrantha Cult

Of the institutions and cults that had the abovementioned traits, there was one ancient cult of *Nivartaka dharma* which continued to evolve in its own way centuries before Mahāvira. In the same cult earlier, renowned personalities were born. They were Nābbinandana Rṣabhadeva, Yadunandana Neminātha, and

Pārśvanātha the son of the king of Kāśī. They were the approved great men of the cult. With the passing of time, so many names became renowned in the cult. The names—Yati, Bhikṣu, Muni, Anagāra, Śramaṇa etc. became current in the cult. However, when Mahāvira took up the leadership of the cult, the cult became better known as ‘Nirgrantha Cult’. In the sects following the *Nivartaka dharma*, the word ‘Jina’ was used for the individuals who had scaled very lofty spiritual heights. But in the times of Mahāvira, and for sometime after him, the word ‘Jaina’ was not used for the sādhus and householders who followed Lord Mahāvira. Today, the word ‘Jaina’ denotes the recluse, householder and all followers of the cult nourished by Mahāvira. For this the words used were ‘Niggantha’ and ‘Samaṇovāsaga’.

In place of the prayer and worship of heavenly gods like Indra-Varuṇa etc., the Jainas worship ideal, perfectly pure human beings. But the gods and goddesses, banished from Jain thought and conduct, which has no alliance whatsoever with the aims of the Jain culture, again entered in the prayers and worship of the Jains, may be in a minor form. The Jain tradition gave place to human idols as a symbol in its prayers and this is consistent with its aims. But with this, so much of decoration and show gathered round this and this is totally inconsistent with its aims of abstinence. It was the purpose of the Jain culture to raise up women and Śūdras and to give to them an honoured place in the society. This aim disappeared to such an extent that they stopped outright the very process of the adoption of Śūdras! They further raised the walls of race known to the Brāhmaṇa dharma. It further happened that in the areas where the Brāhmaṇa tradition dominated, the Śūdras were debarred by the Jains as non-Jains. Jains who prided in their opposition to race distinctions, thus created new race distinctions particularly in south India and declared women to be incapable of full spiritual qualification. Evidently this is the influence of begotting Brahmanic tradition. Lore such as those of *Mantras*, *Jyotiṣa* etc., which are in no way related to the aims of Jain culture, also found place in Jainism; even the Anagāras who accept spiritual life also adopted these

lores! The *Samskāras* such as those of initiation—*Yajñopavita*, which had originally no relation with Jain culture became a part of it in south India in the middle ages. For this purpose, a class of *purohitas* found a permanent place in the Jaina tradition as with the *Brāhmaṇa* tradition. Rituals that precisely imitated sacrifices etc., also entered the ceremonies. All these and many other small and big things happened because the Jaina tradition and culture had to protect those of its followers who had come from other cults, or those who could not protect themselves from the thoughts and conduct of other sects.

Let us now examine in brief how the Jaina culture influenced others. Actually as a doctrine, Jainas believe in compassion towards all beings as others do. But the emphasis that the Jainas laid on protection of animals and the great enthusiasm with which they have worked on it had far-reaching consequences in the historic age. Wherever Jainas influenced one or the other sphere of society, whenever they did this, a strong impact was laid on the common man regarding protection of animals. This happened to such an extent that in many parts of the country those common men who proclaimed to be non-jains or believed themselves to be opponents of Jainism also started entertaining a dislike towards violence to all living beings. It is due to this impact of non-violence that the thinking and conduct of so many non-jain traditions such as the *Vaiṣṇava* have completely severed themselves from the ancient Vedic tradition. The same thing happened in the matter of austerity. All persons, be they recluses or householders, stoop towards Jaina austerity - *tapasyā*. This had so much of impact on the neighbouring societies that they too adopted so many *Sāttvika* austerities. Generally the common society had great regard and respect for the Jaina *tapasyā*, to such an extent that being attracted by it, even muslim emperors and their other able officers have greatly respected it, have given several facilities to the Jainas.

The Jainas have tried very hard to bring an end to or to lessen the seven addictions wine, meat etc. The effort went to such an extent with the Jainas that they were enabled to impart good *samskāras* on so many races that were drowned in these addictions.

The Buddha and other cults were trying with all strength at their command in the same sphere, but the effort of Jainas continues even to-day. The result is that wherever the Jaina influence is strong, even muslims and other non-vegetarians hesitate in the public use of wine and mutton. Lokmanya Tilak has rightly stated that in areas like Gujarat state where protection of animals and vegetarian food dominate, it is the impact of Jain tradition.

One original doctrine of Jain thinking is that every problem should be considered, thought on and analysed from the maximum possible sides and angles of vision, and, in controversial matters one should try to understand the view of the opponent with the same sympathy with which one views ones own side. Decision should be arrived at in the end about the worldly dealings only in a spirit of co-ordination. In reality, the doctrine is working in the life of all thinkers in one form or another. In its absence life in society will not be systematic and no peace will be possible. Still the Jaina thinkers have discussed the doctrine so much and placed so much of stress on it that even the most begotted opponents of it also derive some inspiration or other from it. The *Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda* of Rāmānuja is only non-extremism based on the Upaniṣads.

Ideals of Jaina Tradition

In order to understand the essence of Jain culture, we will have to get ourselves acquainted with those few ideals of its tradition that are equally acceptable to and worshipped by all. The most ancient ideal before the Jain tradition is that of Rṣabhadeva and his family. He passed the major time of his life in intellectually unburdening himself of the responsibilities that had befallen him along with the responsibility of ruling over his subjects. He taught reading and writing to the most illiterate in his days. He taught carpentry, agriculture, pottery etc., —avocations that were useful in life to those who knew no occupation. He gave to them lessons in mutual behaviour and the way to observe rules of a decent life. He entrusted his son Bharata with the responsibility of governance of his kingdom after he was convinced

that he will be able to undertake all responsibilities of ruling and protecting the subjects. Then it was that he left his house and became a formidable *tapasvī* in order to resolve deep spiritual problems.

Rṣabhadeva had two daughters—Brāhmi and Sundarī by name. The custom of marriage between brother and sister was prevalent then. Sundarī protested against the custom and deeply influenced her brother Bharata by her gentle austerities. The result was that Bharata gave up the idea of marriage with her and further became her devotee. In the Yama-Yamī sūkta in the R̥gveda, the brother Yama refused to marry his sister Yami, while here, the sister Sundarī converted the demand of marriage by her brother Bharata into austerity.

Bharata and Bāhubali, the two sons of Rṣabhadeva, fought fierce battles for the kingdom. It was ultimately decided to solve the problem by a duel. The fierce blow by Bharata failed. It was then the turn of Bāhubali who was more powerful. Just as he was about to give a blow to Bharata by his fist, he thought that with the blow of his fist his brother would suffer. He converted the moment of victory over his brother into a victory over his own Self. He thought on these lines. Real victory lies in conquering the ego and desire rather than sowing the seeds of family feud and revenge and counter revenge by victory in battle for the kingdom. He used his power only on anger and pride and set a living example resisting revenge by non-revenge. The result of this was that in the end even the covetousness and arrogance of Bharata were also destroyed.

There was a time when non-vegetarianism was prevalent not only in Kṣatriyas but in other classes in society. In daily meals, social festivals and religious functions the killing of animals and birds was as common and prevalent as the gift of cocoanut and fruits in modern days. In that age Yadunandana Nemikumāra took an exceptional step. He was deeply moved by the silent painful speech of the animals to be sacrificed in the dinner on the occasion of his marriage. He resolved to give up marriage that involved the unnecessary slaughter of innocent animals and birds! With this

serious decision, he refused to hear anybody and went back from his marriage-procession. From Dwarka he went straight to the Girnar hills and commenced austerities. Right in his young days he discarded marriage with a princess and took the path of meditation and austerity. By his own example he gave such a severe blow to the age-old custom of slaughter of animals and birds that the custom disappeared outright from the whole of Gujarat and from the provinces influenced by Gujarat. That brought into prominence the renowned institutions like asylums for animals-*Panjarāpoles*.

The ideal of the life of Pārśvanātha's life was a little different. He once took the serious risk of suffering the rage of a short-tempered sage like Durvāsā and his followers, and tried to save a burning snake from wet wood. The result of this is that today also even snakes are not killed in the areas in which Jainas dominate.

Lord Mahāvīra gave proof of his absolute Sādhanā of non-violence once in the same way. When he was standing in meditation in a forest, a terrific cobra gave a sting. At that time he stood unmoved and further experimented friendliness towards the snake. This became a living example of the sūtra- "when non-violence dominates, revenge is discarded (even) in the presence of it [i.e., the cobra]." He continued to exert all effort to prevent violence from sacrifices and other religious works. Only these ideals have made the Jaina culture full of vitality and life. It has constantly tried to keep the essence of its ideals alive even in the midst of countless difficulties at all cost. It lives in the very life of the religious, social and political history of the country. With every available opportunity, recluses and kings, ministers and businessmen have propagated these ideals of non-violence, self-control and austerity of the Jainas.

Purpose of Culture

The only purpose of culture can be to proceed further towards the bliss of humanity. It can fulfil this purpose only when it is ever ready to contribute to the bliss of ones country that has

given birth to it and has nourished it. The external traits of any culture develop only when it is in ascent and only during that time they are attractive. But the matter regarding the essence of culture is different. Time may be of calamity or of ascent, in both the need of essence of culture is the same. Any culture that does not contribute on its own to shaping that future cannot live or win steady ground only on its history or singing of eulogy.

It would be relevant to think of the Jain culture from this point of view. We have earlier seen that this culture has revealed itself from the point of view of freeing itself from activity or rebirth. The structure of its thinking and conduct is in line with this aim. But we also see that ultimately the culture did not remain confined to the individual; it shaped itself into a peculiar society.

Abstention and Activity

No society can live in the complex and complicated structure of mere *Nivṛtti*; it cannot at the same time take to the *Sādhanā* of genuine *Nivṛtti*. If some way or other, persons not believing in *Nivṛtti* and accepting only the importance of the circle of *Pravṛtti* can die by falling a prey to the engulfment of storm and whirlwind of *Pravṛtti*, it is equally true that without the support of *Pravṛtti*, *Nivṛtti* becomes only a castle in the air. The historical and philosophical truth is that *Pravṛtti* and *Nivṛtti* are only two sides of the coin of human bliss. No man is able to save himself from faults, mistakes, and sins till he does not engross his mind in activities that inspire good virtues and are blissful just along with abstention from blemishes. No sick man can possibly live by abstaining from unwholesome and unhealthy things; he has, at the same time, to take to wholesome foods etc. The movement of new blood in the human body is as much necessary as removing bad blood from it for life.

Activity leading to Abstention

The Jaina culture has lived right from the days of Ṛṣabhadeva to the modern days some way or other even though it is said to

be aiming at abstention. This became possible not just on the strength of abstention, but on the basis of blissful activities. The Brahmins, who were activists, adopted the good traits of the path of abstention and gave rise to an all-pervasive, blissful culture. It was enlivened in the Gītā and came in its new form through the useful form that Gandhiji gave to it. In a similar way, the Jain culture of abstention can continue to live only by taking to necessary blissful activities under the changed circumstances. Depending upon the basic principles and rules of philosophy and conduct, and the ideals that are looked upon by it as its wealth, it can lead to a happy state that would be blissful for all.

In the Jain tradition the first place is given to recluses while the householders come only next. When the recluses are asked to adopt the five great vows, it is only the primary condition for creating a capability for resorting to the maximum activity in virtues and taking up activities that nourish virtues. Again, without giving scope to activities that inspire virtues, saving ones self from violence etc. is impossible in all respects. One who has not the capacity to adopt the universal great vows at once, is shown the path of smaller vows—*Ahuvratas* by which he can slowly progress towards abstention. For such householders, saving themselves to some extent from the blemishes of violence etc. is laid down. This should mean that the householders shall first of all try to save themselves from blemishes. This implies practice to save himself from such blemishes. There is a further scriptural order that he goes on removing one fault after another and gives scope to the respective opposed virtues. If violence is to be removed, one should reveal in life the virtues of love and unity of *Ātmā*. How is abstention from untruth possible without uttering truth and acquiring strength to do so? If one intends to save himself from acceptance—*Parigraha* and covetousness, one should merge his self into the activities that nourish virtues like contentment and sacrifice—*tyāga*.

What Culture Indicates

Culture indicates constant lessening of covetousness and delusion, and wants these to be uprooted, without uprooting outright

activity itself? Activities that are not possible without *Tyaga* deserved to be abandoned, as for example, passionate conduct and individual *Parigraha*. The activities that lead to the maintenance, nourishment and its development can be taken up with or without attachment. Culture therefore only gives an indication of abandonment of attachment.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt-2, pp- 132-142].



Chapter 5

JAINA PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy is thinking from philosophical point of view, regarding the external and internal form of the Universe and with regard to its general and particular rules. It would not be true to state that such thinking arises in any one particular country or race and people in due order. But since this sort of thinking is a peculiar form of human nature, it arises more or less in all races that inhabit a country. Such sort of thinking arises and evolves due to the contact of different races; sometimes even independently it assumes greater development, and after passing through a general background, it divulges into various forms.

The human races that resorted to philosophical thinking right from the oldest days, are not all living to-day. Even their history of development in due order is not available to us. But on the basis of the material available to us to-day, and the little or more that we know about it to-day, we can state, without any controversy one thing. Whatever be the different streams of philosophical thinking, sometimes visibly opposed to each other, these have one common form. It is to find out the secret of the general and pervasive rules that govern the external and internal form of the universe.

Origin of the birth of Philosophy

No human individual is perfect right from the beginning. Right from his childhood, man passes through different states, enriches his experiences and following that advances in the direction of perfection. This applies to human races also. Different states beginning with childhood are found with human race also. The life of the race is very much longer than that of the human individual. It is therefore natural that the period of the different

states like childhood etc. of the human race will be far longer. When the human race came on the lap of nature and opened its eyes for the first time to view the universe, wonderful and magical things and events stood before it. His attention was drawn to the sun, moon and the world of stars on one side and on the other the ocean, mountains, wide rivers, the roaring of clouds, and the sparks of lightning. Human mind proceeded to think on the subtle at the root of the gross objects. This led to the rise of numerous questions in its mind. Just as several questions arose in the human mind with regard to the deep and extremely subtle form of the external world and the general rules that govern it, several questions arose in the human mind also with regard to the deep and extremely subtle form of the inner world. The rise of these questions is precisely the first step to the birth of philosophy. Numerous and varied though these questions are, and even though many more questions arose from these in future, these can, on the whole be expressed as follows in brief.

Philosophical Questions

When was this external universe, evidently changing every moment, born? From what was it born? Was it born on its own or some other force gave birth to it? If it is not born, was this universe just the same in the past and is so in the present? If it is born through some causes, should these causes be eternal and unchanging or subject to change? Again, are these causes varied or the external universe was born of just one cause? The structure and movement of the universe seems to be systematic and bound by rules. Is it preceded by some intelligence or it is just mechanical and proved to be without a beginning? If the order of the universe has some intellect behind it, whose intellect is it? Does that intelligent element rule over the order of the universe while being neutral itself, or it results itself or is seen as the universe?

With regard to the internal universe also similar questions arose. Which is that element which enjoys this external universe or ponders over it? Is that element, showing itself as 'Aham', of the same nature as the external universe or of a different nature?

Is this element without a beginning or born of some cause sometime? Again, are the so many elements appearing as *Aham* basically different, one from the other or they are the creation of some other basic element? If these live elements differ from each other, are they subject to change or they are firm and steady? Have these elements an end or they are endless from the viewpoint of time? Again, are these elements limited by body all-pervasive or limited?

These and so many similar questions arose in the realm of philosophical thinking. Answers to these or some of these questions are found differently in the history of the philosophical thinking of different races. Right from old days Greek thinkers started analysing these questions. Their thinking developed in a variety of ways and it has a very important place in western philosophy. Centuries before the Greek thinkers, the thinkers of Āryāvarta made several efforts to find answers to these questions. Its history is clear before us.

Brief classification of Answers

Each question is answered in different ways by the different Āryan thinkers and there are countless branches of controversies here. We can yet classify the answers in brief as follows :

One spring of thought looked upon the external universe as born. It yet stressed its refusal to the universe so born as being completely new. It stated that just as butter is hidden in milk and at times reveals itself, this gross universe only continues to reveal itself from some subtle cause while that original cause is self-dependent and without a beginning.

Another spring of thought believed that this external universe is not born of any one cause. It has several different causes by its very nature and even in these causes the universe does not lie hidden as butter in milk. This external world is created entirely anew from the synthesis and analysis of different types of original causes. The first being *Pariñāmavādi* and the second *Kāryavādi*. Both these streams of thought differ in their views regarding the birth or revelation of the external universe, but they generally

held one opinion regarding the nature of the internal universe. Both held that the *Āmatattva*, *Aham* as it is called, is without a beginning. It has neither resulted from any cause, nor is it born of any. Just as this *Āmatattva* is without a beginning, it is also endless from the point of view of place and time. It is different in every body; it is not really one.

There was a third thought-stream which looked upon both the external universe and the internal world of Jīvas as the resultant of some absolute *sattattva*. It also refused to accept any difference in the original external or internal nature of cause of the universe.

Nature of the Jaina Stream of Thought

The three streams of thought mentioned above, can here be known as *Prakṛtivādi*, *Paramāṇuvādi* and *Brahmavādi* respectively. A fourth stream of thought, more allied to the first two and yet independent, was also in progress. This stream of thought was actually *Faramāṇuvādi*, but it did not favour, like the other stream, to consider the atoms which are taken as the cause of the external universe to be basically of different types; they believed that basically all atoms are of the same type. Even though they accepted the atomic theory, they did not believe that only the universe is born of the atoms. Like the *Prakṛtivādīs*-naturalists, they believed in result and revelation and consequently stated that the external universe very naturally results from the heap of atoms. In this manner, the tendency of the fourth stream of thought is to accept the result of *Prakṛtivāda* on the basis of the background of the atomic theory.

One peculiarity of it was that instead of looking upon the entire external universe as revelatory, they looked upon certain acts as creatory from it. The view also stated that there are so many objects in the universe that are born of the cause in form of the atom without the effort of any *Puruṣa*. Such things reveal themselves, like oil from the sesamum only from the cause; they are not newly born. However, there are so many things in the external universe which are actually born from their gross causes, but expect the effort of some *Puruṣa*. The things that are born

with the help of the effort of some *Puruṣa*, are not concealed in the gross causes like oil in the sesamum. When a carpenter collects several pieces of wood and shapes these into a horse, the horse is not concealed in the pieces as is oil in sesamum. The horse is there in form of an imagination in the intellect of the carpenter, and it takes a concrete form through the pieces of wood. If the carpenter had so desired, he could have shaped a cow, cart or any other thing instead of the horse. Extracting oil from sesamum is a totally different matter. Howsoever expert one may be, he cannot extract ghee or butter from sesamum. In this way, the relevant fourth stream of thought is atomic and still it was allied to *Prakṛtivāda* in the matter of believing in result and revelation, and on the other side it was allied to the second atomic theory in matter of action and creation.

This is the belief of the fourth stream of thought with regard to the external universe; in matter of *Ātmatattva*, its belief was totally different from the other three streams of thought. Here the view was that *Ātmā* is different with every body, but from the point of view of place all these *Ātmās* are neither expansive nor steady. The view further opined that just as the external universe is subject to change, all the *Ātmās* are constantly changing because they are resultant. The *Ātmatattva* is subject to compression and expansion and is therefore of the size of the body.

This fourth stream of thought is the ancient source of Jain philosophy. The stream of thought continued since long before Bhagavan Mahāvira. It continued to develop and get steadied in its own way. The clear, developed and steady form of this fourth stream that we have to-day, is mostly indebted to the thinking of Lord Mahāvira. Jainism is divided into two sects—*Śvetāmbara* and *Digambara*. Though the literature of both is different, the philosophy of Jainism is more or less the same. Here one thing is particularly notable. The Vedic and the Buddhist cults are divided into so many small and big paths. Some of these hold mutually contradictory views. Their peculiarity is that all the Vedic and Buddhist paths hold differing views regarding conduct and ethics as also in the matter of philosophical

thinking. All the paths of Jainism are based only on conduct and ethics. In the matter of philosophical thinking, no remarkable difference is found till to-day. Not only in the history of Āryan philosophical thought, but in the history of all human philosophical thinking, there is not a single such example of just the same stream being present in philosophical thinking.

Eastern and Western Philosophy—A Comparison

A philosophy might be eastern or western, we can see in the histories of all philosophies that philosophy does not confine itself only to speculations on the world, the Jiva and the Īvara, each philosophy takes up the question of conduct in each region. One way or other, to a greater or lesser degree, every philosophy covers up the analysis of life. There is of course some difference in this matter in the development of eastern and western philosophies. Greek philosophy starts just with the questions regarding the nature of the universe. Later on it gets associated with Christianity, and the question of analysis of life is added to it. After this it is that analysis of life occupies a very important place in one branch of western philosophy. Right up to the modern days we find that in the Roman Catholic sect philosophical thinking is associated with analysis of life. In the history of Āryan philosophy we find one unique feature. It is that the very starting point of Āryan philosophy is the question of analysis of life. In the three principal branches of Āryan philosophy—Vedic, Buddhist and Jaina—analysis of life is associated with thinking on the problems of the universe in almost the same manner. No philosophy in Āryāvarta experiences a sense of fulfilment with analysis only of the problems of the universe. On the contrary, we find that each principal philosophy or a branch thereof lays down its peculiar thoughts on the world, Jiva and Īvara and then invariably analyses the problems of life and end in revealing the process of analysis of life. We therefore find that every Āryan philosophy in its original Scripture begins with liberation as the aim and ends in the same. That is precisely the reason why the Sāṅkhya philosophy holds its own typical Yoga and is inseparable from the Yoga philosophy. Similarly

we find the basic doctrines of Yoga in the Nyāya, Vaiṣeṣika and Vedānta philosophy. Some peculiar Yoga processes have found place in Buddhism also. In a similar manner, the Jain philosophy also has its full thinking on the yogic process.

Oneness of the basic questions on life-research

We have thus seen that the Jain philosophy has two principal parts : of philosophical thinking and of research on life. On comparing any tradition of Vedic philosophy or Buddhist philosophy with the tradition of Jain philosophy, one thing is clear that all traditions differ on two points : One with reference to the thinking on the nature of the world, Jīva and Īṣvara and the other with regard to the gross and external prescriptions about conduct and way of life. In matter of life-research in all traditions of Āryan philosophy on the other hand, there is no difference whatsoever. One may believe in Īṣvara or not, one might be believing in Prakṛti or atom, one might accept plurality of souls or oneness in all traditions of Āryan philosophy on the other hand. There is no difference whatsoever. One may believe in Īṣvara and the other may not; one might be accepting *Prakṛti* and the other the atom; one might accept plurality of souls and the other oneness; one might look upon Ātmā as universal and eternal while the other may accept the reverse; one might lay stress on devotion through sacrifice and ritual and the other might lay stress on renunciation depending upon more stringent rules. These questions are common to all traditions—Does sorrow exist or not? If it does, what is its cause? Is the destruction of the cause possible? If yes, how? What should be the ultimate aim of our pursuit? Answers to these questions are also the same in all traditions. There might be difference in words and expression, it might be brief or detailed, yet all traditions have just one reply that nescience-*Avidyā* and desire are the causes of sorrow. Their annihilation is possible. *Vidyā* and destruction of sorrow lead to the annihilation of the causes of sorrow and that automatically puts an end to sorrow itself. This is the chief aim of man's life. The tradition of Indian philosophies is unanimous about the basic thinking on life-research

and its rules. It would therefore be more relevant mainly to analyse its life-research when we mean to write anything on Jain philosophy.

The Jain process of Life-research

The Jain philosophy states that *Ātmā* is naturally pure and of the form of existence, consciousness and delight (*Saccidānanda*). Whatever impurity, disorder and sorrow we find in it is due to ignorance and delusion in an endless flow. Ignorance is to be reduced and put an end to, delusion is to be annihilated. For this the Jain philosophy asks us to develop a sense of discrimination on one side and to put an end to the effects of attachment and jealousy on the other. The Jain philosophy divides the *Ātmā* into three stages. When ignorance and delusion are very powerful, the *Ātmā* fails to ponder over its reality and is not able to place even one step in the direction of truth and permanent happiness. In this state it is known as *Bahiratmā*. This is the first stage of the *Jiva*. The circle of birth and rebirth, will not possibly stop during this stage and the *Ātmā* will really be undeveloped, in spite of all development visible from the worldly point of view.

The second stage commences when the power of discrimination reveals itself and the power of the effects of attachment and jealousy gets reduced. The Jain philosophy knows this as *Antarātma*—the inner Self. During this stage all worldly activities useful to the embodied soul are there, but these are detached in proportion to the development of the power of discrimination and in proportion to the reduction of attachment and jealousy. Even though activity persists in this second stage, inherently the element of abstention is present.

When several steps are taken and crossed in this second stage, the *Ātmā* attains to the state of *Paramātma*. This is the final and perfect stage of life-research. The Jain philosophy states that the circle of rebirth stops completely when the *Ātmā* reaches this stage.

The brief narration given here tells us that according to the Jain philosophy, false vision and desire are the two that form the *Samsāra* – mundane world or are the causes of *Samsāra*. Opposed to this, only discrimination and detachment mean liberation or the path thereof. This same brief analysis of life-research in Jainism is given in so many Jain works in various ways, in brief or in details and in varying terminology. The same life-research can be found almost verbatim in Vedic and Buddhist philosophies.

Some detailed Comparison

We have given here, in barest outline, the basic Jain thought-process in philosophy and also the thought-process of spiritual development in Jainism. It would now be in fitness of things to compare it with the thinking of other philosophies, for further clarification.

(A) Like the *mayāvādins*, the Jain philosophy does not look up on the world as only illusory or imaginative. To it the world is *Sat*-existence. In the same manner, the *Sat* element acceptable to Jain philosophy is not merely life-force—*Cetana* as with the Vedānta and just as it is not merely—*Jada* or bereft of natural *Caitanya* as with the Cārvākans. But, just as the philosophies Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Pūrvaṃimāṃsā and the Buddhist philosophy divide the *Sat* element into two mutually independent parts as *Jada* and *Cetana*, in a similar way the Jain philosophy accepts the eternal two natures of this element as *Jada* and *Cetana*; these two are totally independent of each other in the flow of place and time. The Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika and Yoga philosophies etc., accept that the active form typical of this world is both *Jada* and *Cetana*. There is still one eternal, powerful life-force at its back, and the wonderful work in this world is not possible without the hand of this godly power at work. The Jain philosophy refuses to accept this view. Like the ancient Sāṃkhya, Pūrvaṃimāṃsā and the Buddhist philosophy, the Jain philosophy believes that the flow of the powers of *Jada* and *Cetana* that are of the nature of existence, continues to exist and proceed automatically without the hand of any third power at work. They there-

fore do not accept the existence of any third independent eternal power like *Īśvara* for the creation and systematisation of the world. The Jain philosophy no doubt accepts the *Jaḍa* existent element as beginningless and endless independent existence like the Nyāya, Vaiṣeṣika, Bauddha etc., but not in the form of just one independent element.

In this manner, according to the belief of the Jain philosophy the constantly changing course of the world runs on its own. Still, it is clear about the fact that the events in the world that seem to take place thanks to the intellect and effort of some power, they have actually behind them the hand not of *Īśvara*, but of the worldly *Jiva* that is a party to the result of these events. What is meant is that knowingly or unknowingly, these events take place thanks to the intellect and effort of some *Jiva* or other. In this matter, the Jain philosophy holds views that are the same as those of ancient Sāṃkhya and Buddhist philosophies.

For Jainas the *Cetana* element is not one and indivisible as in the Vedānta philosophy. It is of the nature of endless individuals as with the ancient Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiṣeṣika, Bauddha etc. Here also, the Jain philosophy has some difference of opinion. The *Cetana* element is not just a course of change for Jainism as with Buddhism; it is also not merely constant as with Sāṃkhya-Nyāya etc. The Jain philosophy states that basically the *Cetana* element is steady, i.e., beginningless and endless, and still it cannot help coming under the effect of time and place. This would mean that according to Jain views, the *Jiva* is *Pariṇāmīnityā* like the *Jaḍa* element. The Jain philosophy does not accept any individual power like *Īśvara* and yet it concedes that all traits of *Īśvara* are to be found in all the *Jivas*. This would mean that all the *Jivas* have the power of *Īśvara* in them, may be this power is suppressed due to obstacles. If, however, the *Jiva* exerts itself on proper lines, it can fully develop its godly powers and become *Īśvara* itself. Thus, according to Jain beliefs, the element like *Īśvara* has no independent place in its philosophy and still it accepts belief in *Īśvara* and its worship. All the *Jivas* that become completely free from activities and passions are of the status of *Īśvara*. It is

therefore the aim of Jain worship that the Sādhakas should keep this ideal before their eyes and reveal the absolute power that is inherent in them. Just as the Śāṅkara Vedānta believes that the *Jiva* itself is *Brahma*, the Jain philosophy also states that ultimately the *Jiva* is *Īvara* or *Paramātmā*. According to the Vedānta philosophy, the state of being *Brahma*—*Brahmabhāva*—of *Jiva* is engulfed in nescience—*Avidyā* and it comes within the sphere of conscious experience when *Avidyā* is dissipated. Here according to Jainism the *Paramātmabhāva* of the *Jiva* is covered up and it comes into the state of perfect conscious experience when this covering is removed. In this matter there is no difference between Jainism and Vedānta except that Jainism believes in plurality of *Jivas*.

(B) We have compared the two elements *Jiva* and *Ajiva* above of the seven elements accepted by the Jain Scriptures. We have now to consider only four of the five elements.¹ Only these four other elements have a bearing on life-research and the order in spiritual development. These can therefore be known as characteristic elements. These four elements are bondage—*Bandha*, inflow of Karma—*Āsrava*, its stoppage—*saṃvara* and liberation—*Mokṣa*. These four are described in the Buddhist Scriptures as sorrow—*Duḥkha*, causes of sorrow—*Duḥkhaḥetu*, the path of Liberation—*Nirvāṇa mārga* and liberation—*Nirvāṇa* which are designated the four *Ārya Satyas*. The same four are designated *Heya*, *Heyaḥetu*, *Hānopāya* and *Hāna* and described as *Caturvyūha* in *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* philosophies. In *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* philosophies these same four are described as *Samsāra*, *Mithyājñāna*, *Samyakjñāna* and *Apavarga*. These same four are described in the Vedānta philosophy as *Samsāra*, *Avidyā*, *Brahmā-Sākṣātkāra* and *Brahmabhāvanā*.

In the Jain philosophy, the external Self—*Bahirātmā*, inner Self—*Antarātmā*, and the Supreme Self—*Paramātmā* are the three stages which are expanded and described as fourteen. These fourteen stages are known as *Guṇasthāna* in the Jain tradition. In the Vedānta works like the *Yoga Vāsiṣṭha* also, fourteen stages of

1. The element *Nirjarā* is not taken into consideration here. Partial annihilation of Karma is *Nirjarā*, while complete annihilation of Karma is liberation. Editor.

the *Ātmā* are described, seven being of absence of knowledge and Seven of knowledge. These fourteen stages are briefly classified in the *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* philosophies as five stages of consciousness—*Citta*—restless: *Kṣipta*; torpid—*Mūḍha*; distracted—*Vikṣipta*; concentrated—*Ekāgra* and restricted—*Niruddha*. In the Buddhist Philosophy also this same order of spiritual development is classified into six stages as *Prthagjana*, *Sotāpanna* etc. We can thus see that there is a unanimity and the same thought-process in all the Indian systems of philosophy in matters of the state of the *Jīva* beginning from mundane existence to liberation, the order of evolution and its causes. Here one question arises. If there is this basic unity in the thinking of all these philosophies, why do we find difference between one cult and another that cannot be stitched?

The answer to this is clear. The difference of cults is due to two things—difference in philosophy and difference in external thought and conduct. There are some cults in which, besides the difference in conduct and thought, there is some difference in the thought-process of their philosophies. Here, the illustrations of Vedānta, Bauddha and Jain cults can be given. There are again certain cults and sects whose thought-process of philosophy is not different; their difference is nourished by and arises from different external conduct—to illustrate, the three branches Śvetāmbara, Digambara and Sthānakvāsī in the Jains.

Some may take *Ātmā* to be one, others many; some may believe in *īśvara*, others may not believe. This difference in philosophic thinking is an account of the higher and lower experiences of the intellect and this is inevitable. Similarly, the differences in external conduct and rules arise from difference in intellect, liking as also circumstances. Some might have faith in acquiring holiness through bath in the Ganges or the *darśana* of Viṣvanātha at Kāśī; some might experience fulfilment in a pilgrimage to Buddhagayā and Sāranātha and the *darśana* of Lord Buddha, some might experience success by embracing Śatruñjaya and some might experience bliss by a pilgrimage to Mecca and Jerusalem. In a similar manner, some might feel that the austerity and fast of the

eleventh day—*Agiaras* is very holy; some others might give importance to the vows of the eighth day—*aṣṭami* and the fourteenth day—*Caturdaśi*. Again, some might lay stress on liberal gifts—*dāna* instead of austerities, others might lay stress on austerity. In this manner, the nourishment of different traditional *Samskāras* and the mental atmosphere of difference in likes and dislikes is inevitable. The result is that the difference in external conduct and activity cannot ever be erased. Still, in spite of so many things that cause the rise and nourishment of difference, truth remains the same, it cannot be spite. That is the reason why we find the same truth revealing itself in life as we compare the order and stages of spiritual development, whatever be the way, the language or the form. This is to be found in the experience of all philosophers.

Coming to the end, let me refer to two typical traits of Jain philosophy that are universally accepted by all Jains. These are non-extremism—*Anekānta* and non-violence—*Ahimsā*. The entire Jain literature is shaped by these two doctrines. The peculiarity of Jain conduct and cult can be revealed only through these two. In reality, truth is only one, but man's vision and grasp fail to adopt it in just one way. Man should therefore widen the sphere of his vision and admit in it all the ways of grasping of truth, This lofty and widened feeling has given birth to the thought-process of non-extremism. The thought-process is not planned to become victorious in argument and counter-argument or to play the puzzles of nets of words or to fight sophistry. It is planned and evolved to develop the power of discrimination and to make man progress in the direction of visioning of truth as a part of life-research. The real meaning therefore of non-extremism is to give proper place to all the sections and parts in the wide circle of the human mind, keeping in view the visioning of truth.

Man's limits of vision widen along with the enrichment of his power of discrimination, and he has to fight against the pressures of narrowness and passions in his Self. Man is not able to adopt the ideology of non-extremism in life till he does not face and fight narrowness and passionate desires. The question therefore of non-violence follows the question of the protection and enrichment

of the ideology of non-extremism. Jain non-violence is not confined only to keeping mum, giving up ones business and attaining to a lifeless state like that of wood. Actually the power of the soul is expected in non-violence. Some perversity arises, some bad desire reveals itself and the mind gets conservative. Here, the Jain non-violence asks man not to be suppressed or defeated by conservatism. Fight it out, and conquer the opposing forces. The effort for spiritual victory is the main point in non-violence. Call it self-control, call it austerity or meditation or give any name to it; in reality it is non-violence. The Jain philosophy tells us that non-violence is not just gross conduct but it is the conduct of sublimation in life that arises as a result of pure thinking.

If, however, some external conduct arises from the subtle and realistic form of non-violence described above, or, if some conduct is destined for the nourishment of this subtle element, it is non-violence in the Jain philosophy. Conversely, if even apparently looking conduct or dealing is not related to this subtle element of non-violence, then that conduct or worldly dealing cannot be designated non-violence or the nourisher of non-violence.

The discussion on modes of proof with regard to the Jain philosophy is not detailed here purposefully. We have just shown a part of the thought-process. Even with regard to conduct external rules or constitution are not discussed; we have only touched upon slightly the basic elements as a part of life-research. These elements are known as Āsrava, Saṁvara etc. in the Jain terminology.

(Darṣan ane Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 1049-1061)

Chapter 6

STAGES OF SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT

Liberation-*mokṣa* means perfection of spiritual development. Such perfection cannot be attained to all of a sudden because some period of time must elapse in its attainment. That is the reason why an order of or specified stages of spiritual evolution are to be accepted for acquiring spiritual evolution. The question that arises as a result of philosophical inquiry is this. What are the stages of this spiritual evolution?

Three Stages of Ātmā

As we think of the stages of spiritual evolution, we immediately ponder over the beginning and end. The beginning and end are their two extreme limits. The limit of the stages of spiritual evolution here means the order in which the Ātmā develops in its sublimation from the first to the second extreme. Here, the first stage is that of the absence of spiritual development or the preliminary state in the mundane world; the final is the stage of liberation or the perfection of the spiritual development of the soul. In this manner, the state of the Ātmā divides into three from the viewpoint of time : (a) Absence of spiritual development, (b) The order of spiritual development and (c) Liberation.

(a) The Ātmā strives for steady happiness and perfect knowledge on one side and does not have any liking for sorrow and absence of knowledge. Still it is thrown to and fro in the whirlpool of sorrow and ignorance. What is the reason? This is a complex question. Philosophers have, however, a striking reply here. It is this. "The natural inclination of the soul to win happiness and knowledge, proves that the soul is of the nature of perfect delight-*Pūrṇānanda*-and perfect knowledge. This is because it does not rest in peace till it acquires perfect delight and perfect knowledge. Still, because of the very powerful influences of

ignorance, attachment and jealousy, the Ātmā is not able to become conscious though slightly, it is not able to act for attaining to real happiness." Ignorance is diametrically opposed to the striking of consciousness – *Cetana*. Its striking is therefore very slow and weak till there exists in the soul, an intensity of ignorance. As a result there is no inspiration of the means of real happiness or real happiness itself. It is because of this that the Ātmā becomes active to gain happiness in one object and runs after the other on failure. It runs after the third when it fails in the second. Consequently it comes to the sad state of a piece of wood in the midst of a whirl-pool or a grass-blade blown off by tidal winds. The experience of this series of pains and sorrows lessens ignorance to some extent; still the Ātmā fails to move in the real direction of happiness because of the intensity of attachment and jealousy. Very often, due to the lessening of ignorance, it becomes conscious that the seeds of happiness and sorrow do not exist in the external world. Yet, it is due to the intensity of attachment and jealousy that the soul takes the fully familiar objects to be the means of sorrow and happiness and continues to experience joy and dejection. This state is devoid of any fixed aim. The result is that the state of the soul is like that of the sailor who roves his ship without the decision regarding a fixed direction. Precisely this is the state of the soul during the period of absence of spiritual development.

(b) Now, the power of the wheel of ignorance, attachment and jealousy cannot remain the same for all time. This is because it is totally inconsiderable before the power of Ātmā, howsoever strong it may be. The amount of fire required to consume a lakh maunds of grass or wood is surely not in the same amount; even an atom of fire is enough for the purpose. The auspicious might be less in quantity, it is yet innumerable times better than the inauspicious. When the inspiration of the life-force in the Ātmā gets enhanced in a natural way, and when the power of attachment and jealousy gets minimised in the battle of the soul with these two, the virility of the Ātmā working in the opposed direction now turns to the right one. It is just at this time that the Ātmā

becomes decisive about its end, and, with a firm determination, activates itself for the purpose. It is at this time that the foundation of spiritual development is laid. Now the Ātmā, with its knowledge and prowess of virility, wrestles with ignorance, attachment and jealousy. It may occasionally suffer a setback, but in the end, just as a result of this, its knowledge and virility of prowess are doubled and it continues to fight and suppress the enemy, and continues to grow more enthusiastic thereby. With the enrichment of enthusiasm, there is released an unparalleled stream of delight—*Ānanda*. The Ātmā, totally engrossed in this stream of delight continues to weaken the cycle of ignorance, attachment and jealousy and continues to advance towards its natural state of the stages of spiritual development.

(c) The ultimate limit of this state is precisely the perfection of development. Once this state of perfection is attained to, the Ātmā attains to a state far higher than the mundane world. Here, only natural *Ānanda* dominates, this is the time of what we call liberation—*mokṣa*

Fourteen Guṇasthānas and their Explanation

In the ancient Scriptures of Jainism, known as Āgamas, we come across a systematic thinking and analysis of the stages of spiritual development. The states of the Ātmā are fourteen and they are known as Guṇasthānas in these works.

Guṇasthāna

Guṇa means the life-force or inspiration of the soul, equanimity, conduct, virility etc. *Sthāna* means the higher and lower stages of the purity of these prowesses. These inherent natural *Guṇas* are enwrapped by various obstacles in the state of mundane existence. The purity of the *Guṇas* here, is lesser or greater in proportion to the rarity and the destruction that they bring about being greater or lesser. In this manner, innumerable types of the higher or lower quantum of the purity of the *Guṇas* are possible. They are, in brief, divided into fourteen and these are the *Guṇasthānas*. The fourteen *Guṇasthānas* are conceived of mainly on the basis of

the rarity and destruction of illusory *Karma*. The illusory *Karma* consists of two prowesses. The function of the first is to cover up the *Guṇa* of the *Ātmā* known as right faith—*Samyaktva*, so that philosophic liking and right vision do not evolve in the soul. The function of the second prowess is to enwrap the quality—*Guṇa* of the soul known as conduct—*Cāritra*. As a result the *Ātmā* acquires natural liking and right vision, but is not able to undertake the right activity following this; it is not able to attain to the right self-perspective. The first prowess of illusory *Karma* that obstructs *Samyaktva*—right faith—is designated *darśanamohaniya*—that which eludes right vision and the second is designated *Cāritramohaniya*—that which eludes right conduct. Here, the *darśanamohaniya* is more powerful of the two, because, the prowess of *Cāritramohaniya* is not lessened unless and until the former becomes rare or is destroyed. Once the prowess of *darśanamohaniya* is minimised, *Cāritramohaniya* gets weaker by stages and comes to annihilation in the end. In all the obstacles to *Karma*, the most dominant and the most powerful is the illusory. The reason is that all other coverages—*āvaraṇas* remain acute till the power of the *mohaniya* is acute and with the power of the *mohaniya* in the decline the power of other *āvaraṇas* is also on the decline. This is precisely the reason why the conception of *Guṇasthānas* is dependent upon the comparison and superiority of the *mohaniya Karma*.

These are the *Guṇasthānas*¹ or ladders of spiritual development :

- (i) False vision—*Mithyā dr̥ṣṭi*.
- (ii) Slight taste of right vision—*Sāsṛvādāna Samyak dr̥ṣṭi*.
- (iii) right, false or mixed vision—*Samyakmithyā dr̥ṣṭi*.
- (iv) Constant right vision—*Avirata Samyakdr̥ṣṭi*, but not self-discernment.
- (v) partial self-control—*deśavirati*, sometimes wavering through negligence.
- (vi) complete self-discernment—*Pramatta Samyata*.

1. Vide, 'Samavāyāṅga', 14th Samavāya.

- (vii) Self-control without negligence—*Apramattasam̐yata*.
- (viii) Practice of the process called *Apūrvakarāṇa*--with passions still in gross form.
- (ix) *Anivṛtabādhora*--with passions still occurring.
- (x) *Sūkṣmaparyāya*--passions still occurring in subtle form.
- (xi) *Upasāntamoha*--calming down of all passions and yet the Ātmā not being *Sarvajña*.
- (xii) *Kṣīṇamoha*--one who has annihilated all passions but yet does not possess omniscience.
- (xiii) Omniscience with activity--*Sayogikevali*.
- (xiv) One who is Siddha--*Ayogakevali*.
- (1) The stage in which, due to the excessive power of *Darśanamohaniya*, the quality of *Samyaktva* is enveloped. and, as a result, the liking of the Ātmā regarding the reality is not enabled to be revealed, and whereby the vision is false, i.e., opposite of truth, it is the state of false vision--*Mithyā dṛṣṭi*.
- (2) *Sasvādana* is the stage that remains only for a very short time when one falls from the elevated place of quality and comes to the first. This state is designated *Sāsṽādana* because the Ātmā has just a little taste of the liking of reality though it is on the path of downfall. This second stage can be attributed only to the Ātmā on way to downfall.
- (3) A stage in which the Ātmā is in a movement to and fro, like the man on a swing, and is not able either to have a perfect vision of reality, or to be in a state of completely false vision, i.e., it is in a state of doubts, is the state designated *Samyak-mithyā dṛṣṭi*. In this *Guṇasthāna*, the poison of *darśanamohaniya* is not as acute as in the first, but it is there.
- (4) We have then the *Avīratasamyak dṛṣṭi*. It is the stage in which the force of *darśanamohaniya* has got subsided or has gone rare, or has gone totally weak, because of which the Ātmā is enabled to have a clear vision of truth. It is designated constant--*avīrata*--because there is greater dominance of *Cāritramohaniya*, and, as a result, the spirit of renunciation does not arise,

- (5) The next stage is designated as *Deśavirati* in which, besides the vision of truth, the spirit of renunciation arises, though slightly. In this, the dominance of *Cārītramohaniya* is reduced no doubt but the spirit of renunciation is in proportion to its shortage.
- (6) *Framattasañyata* is the next stage in which the spirit of renunciation reveals itself fully, but there is infatuation now and then.
- (7) *Apramattasañyata* is the next stage in which there is absolutely no possibility of infatuation.
- (8) *Apūrvakaraṇa* is the next stage in which the Ātmā experiences a purity never experienced before; it experiences the revelation of power of the soul not experienced before. Another name of this state or stage is *Nivṛtībādara*.
- (9) The next stage *Anivṛttabādara*, is one in which a process is on to calm down or weaken the residue of *Cārītramohaniya Karma*.
- (10) *Sūkṣmasamparāya* is the next stage in which the residue of *mohaniya* reveals itself as miserliness or covetousness, though in a very small degree.
- (11) When even the small amount of covetousness is calmed down, we have the stage known as *Upasāntamohaniya*. In this *Guṇasthāna*, total annihilation of *Darśanamohaniya* is possible, not so of *Cārītramohaniya*, which is only calmed down. It is because of this that infatuation can possibly get excited again and the Ātmā can positively fall down from this state and can be forced to go down to the first.
- (12) The next is the stage in which both *Darśanamohaniya* and *Cārītramohaniya* are annihilated. There is no possibility of a downfall from this stage.
- (13) The next stage, *Sayogaguṇasthāna*, is the one in which the Ātmā attains to a state of all-knowledge when the state of detachment reveals itself on account of the complete absence of infatuation.
- (14) In the next stage *Ayogaguṇasthāna*, there is further a complete absence of physical, mental and speech activity. This is the final *Guṇasthāna*. As a result, it ends with the fall of the body and after that the Ātmā attains to *Videhamukti* which is for above all *Guṇasthānas*.

The first stage denotes a time of absence of development; in the second and third, there is a slight revelation of development, but absence of development dominates. From the fourth there is a constant rise of the Ātmā slowly and steadily and it is in full bloom in the fourteenth stage. It is then that liberation follows. Here, we can just state that the first three denote a time of absence of development, while from the fourth to the fourteenth is the time of development and widening; then the time of liberation follows.

Alternate Stages of Development laid down by Śrī Haribhadrasūri

This theory of old is described in a different manner by Haribhadrasūri. Here, the description comes in two types.

The first type of eight Visions

In the first, the orders both of absence of development and development are included.¹ He knows the former as *Oghadr̥ṣṭi* and the latter as *Saddr̥ṣṭi*. The latter is divided further into eight as *Mitrā, Tārā, balā, diprā, sthīrā, Kāntā, Prabhā* and *Parā*. In these there is a constant progress in development.

Dr̥ṣṭi means philosophy or revelation. It is of two types. In the first there is an absence of true faith; in the second, there is true faith. The former is designated *Oghadr̥ṣṭi* while the latter is known as *Yogadr̥ṣṭi*. In the first, the tendency of the Ātmā is towards the mundane existence--Saṃsāra--while in the latter it is towards spiritual development. *Yogadr̥ṣṭi* is therefore known as true vision.

Just as in a cloudy or cloudless night or on a cloudy or cloudless day, there is extremely little, very little, comparatively little and little perceptive knowledge; here also, by the difference of man enveloped by planets or one free from them, by the difference of a child or a young man, by the difference of a man with tardy and pure eyes, the perceptive knowledge is clear or unclear comparatively; in a similar way, in the stage of *Oghadr̥ṣṭi*, there is a tendency of the flow of mundane life and still, in view of comparative or superlative degree, knowledge too is comparative. Howsoever nice this *Oghadr̥ṣṭi* may be, it is untrue or false vision from

1, Vide, *Yogadr̥ṣṭisamuccaya*.

the point of view of spiritual development. Later on, when spiritual development commences, true vision resumes. This is so because the tendency of the soul then has ceased to aim at mundane existence and proceeds towards liberation.

This true vision or Yogic vision has eight types in proportion to its development. In these eight types there is constantly growing knowledge and greater and greater awakening. In the first vision designated *Mitrā*, the force of knowledge and awakening and power of potency is like the lustre of fire in grass-blade. In the second vision, known as *Tarā* it is similar to the lustre of fire in a dung-cake. In the third vision, *Balā* by name, it is like the lustre of fire in a piece of wood. In the fourth, *Diprā*, it is like the lustre in a lamp; in the fifth, *Sthirā*, it is like the lustre in a jewel; in the sixth, *Kāntā*, it is like the lustre in constellation; in the seventh, *Prabhā*, it is like the lustre of the sun; in the eighth, *Parā*, it is like the lustre in the moon.

Here, in the course of the first four visions, there is no clear experience of *Ātmā*, the object of knowledge; this experience of *Ātmā* exists clearly in the last four visions. Still, the first four are considered to be true visions or Yogic visions because, once the *Ātmā* enters these, its path of spiritual vision is fixed. The Yogic vision has eight limbs in accordance with the eight limbs of Yoga as *Yama*, *Niyama*, *Āsana*, *Prāṇāyāma*, *Pratyāhāra*, *Dhāraṇā*, *Dhyāna* and *Samādhi*. In the first there is steadiness of *Yama*, of *Niyama* in the second and in due order of *Samādhi* in the eighth.

In the first four visions, *Mitrā* etc., there is a little spiritual development, but there is also dominance of ignorance and infatuation; in the last four visions, *sthirā* etc., there is predominance of Knowledge and absence of infatuation.

Second Type—Five Parts of Yoga

In the second type of description, the *Ācārya* describes only the order of spiritual development as Yoga. He has not described the previous state.

Now, Yoga is a religious activity by which liberation can be attained to. In the beginningless wheel of time, unless and until

the activity of *Ātmā* is averse to its own form, it has fallen from its aim; till then, all its activities are devoid of good intentions and do not come under Yoga. From the time that its activity changes and becomes centred in its own form, the element of pure intention enters its activities and it is religious. It is Yoga because then it leads to liberation. There are thus two parts of the time of mundane existence of *Ātmā*—religious and non-religious. In the time of non-religion, religious activity is there, but not for religion; it is just for public entertainment. This activity therefore does not constitute dharma. Religious activity for its own sake commences only during the time of religion and it is known as Yoga.

He divides this Yoga into five parts as *Adhyātma*, *Bhāvanā*, *Dhyāna*, *Samatā* and *Vṛttisamkṣya* :

- (1) *Adhyātma* or spiritual is the state in which, with just some renunciation, there is scriptural spiritual pondering and the feelings such as friendship, compassion etc. develop.
- (2) It is *Bhāvanā* when the mind in *Samādhi* is under constant study and nourished and strengthened by the *Adhyātma*. Impure study comes to an end by *Bhāvanā* and pure and sacred study is facilitated.
- (3) When the mind takes recourse only to pure and sacred things, it stands steady like a lamp that is lustrous. The *Ātmā* here is in a state of subtle knowledge and this is known as *Dhyāna*. Through *Dhyāna* the mind becomes dependent on the *Ātmā* in all its activity, the *Bhava* becomes steady and all bonds are broken.
- (4) The next is the stage of *Samatā* in which the spirit of good and bad disappears through discrimination from all things conceived as good and bad through ignorance.
- (5) It is *Vṛttisamkṣaya* when all the intentions born of desires are totally uprooted and annihilated.¹ This twofold description is a narration only under a new methodology of the thoughts on *Guṇasthānas*.

[Darśan and Cintan, pt 2, pp. 1011-1014, 1017-1021]

1. Vide, Yogabindu, Verses 357-365.

Chapter 7

NON-VIOLENCE

The doctrine of non-violence is very old in the Aryan tradition. It is respected equally in all the Aryan cults. With this we find that the doctrine has developed in a variety of ways in thought and wordly dealings along with the development of different religious traditions and the spread of the life of the common man. Right from the ancient days, two streams regarding the thinking on non-violence have flown in the Aryan tradition. One stream is dependent on the *Śramaṇa* way of life while the other one is dependent on the concept of life in the Brahmanic tradition together with the concept of four stages of life--*Āśramas*. From the viewpoint of philosophic thinking, no difference of opinion can be found between the two streams of thought. Differences of opinion come to the forefront in worldly life when we consider its utility. Here difference of opinion and internal opposition will be found in all the smaller branches of both these wider streams. The main reason here is the difference of outlook on life. The outlook on life as found with the *Śramaṇa* tradition is mostly individualistic and spiritual. The outlook on life to be found with the Brahmanic tradition is mostly social or of social welfare. In the former, *Loksaṅgraha* is desirable only to the extent that it is not averse to spirituality. When it is found to be averse to spirituality the first tradition will remain indifferent towards it or even oppose it. In the second tradition *Loksaṅgraha* is undertaken on such a large scale that no conflict arises in it between spiritualism and materialism.

Narration of non-violence in the Āgamas

One stream of thinking regarding non-violence in the *Śramaṇa* tradition was flowing in its typical pattern. In course of time, as it proceeded further it revealed itself in an ennobled form in the life of Lord Mahāvira, a life-long ascetic. A clear revelation of

this is found in the ancient *Āgamas* such as *Ācārāṅga*, *Sūtrakyaṅga* etc. The glory of non-violence as a doctrine of religion has arisen from the vision of similarity of Souls. This doctrine is narrated and analysed in the *Āgamas* as follows :

- (1) All violence deserves to be discarded because it leads to sorrow and fear. This is the basic argument of the doctrine of non-violence.
- (2) Violence means ending somebody's life or torturing others. Still, the blemishes born of violence depend only on infatuation or attachment and jealousy etc. If there is no infatuation or attachment, mere ending of life cannot come under the category of violence. This constitutes an analysis of non-violence.
- (3) The purport of the blemish of violence does not depend upon the relative importance of the size, number and senses of the living beings that are killed. It depends upon the result of the violating person or the intensity or otherwise, his knowing or unknowing action or the use of force. This constitutes the purport of non-violence.

The three matters mentioned above became fruitful in the thought and conduct of Lord Mahāvira and are woven in the *Āgamas*. Howsoever spiritual an individual or a group of individuals may be, when they ponder over the question of sustaining life with self-control, the abovementioned analysis and stages naturally result from it. Thinking on these lines, we must concede that the detailed discussion that took place in the later Jain literature regarding non-violence had its basic support right from the beginning in the Jain *Āgamas*.

When we take a review of the discussion of non-violence that we come across in the Jain literature, we can clearly see that this discussion is mainly dependent upon four forces. The first is that it takes into consideration the non-violence principally of the lives of *Sādhus*, i.e., of perfect non-violence.

The second is that it strongly protests against the violence such as that in the sacrifice as laid down in the Brahmanic tradition. The third is that the other *Śrāmaṇa* traditions insist on the

perfect restraint in the life of renunciation of Jain Śramaṇas rather than the life of renunciation in general. The fourth is that it makes an attempt to resolve the questions of mutual opposition that arise in the other branches of the Jain tradition.

Insistence on nine-fold perfect non-violence in practice on one side and justifying the maintenance in life from the viewpoint of the development of restraint and virtues on the other, are the opposed views that gave rise to a discussion on violence and its types such as *dravyahimsā*, *bhāvahimsā* etc. Ultimately this led to one decisive doctrine that in its ultimate sense, only infatuation is violence. Worldly dealing devoid of infatuation might seem to be violence-oriented on superficial viewing; actually and in reality it is non-violent. As far as this final doctrine is concerned, there is no difference of opinion whatsoever among the branches of Jainism such as Śvetāmbara, Digambara etc. All these branches lay down more or less similar thought-process, technical terminology and arguments.

Opposition against Vedic Violence

In the Vedic tradition, violence pertaining to sacrifice, guests, *Śrāddha* etc. due to varied reasons, is considered to be religious and therefore well-founded. The Sāṃkhya, Bauddha and Jain traditions are similar and one in their protest against this. Still, as time passed the, protest only of Buddhism and Jainism persisted. A deep impression of and reaction to this protest are found in the discussion on non-violence in the Jain literature. Now and again, refutation of Vedic violence is found here. Against this, there is this counter-argument by the followers of the Vedic tradition, "How is it possible for you, the Jainas, to include as non-violence, raising of temples, worship of Gods etc. which are religious activities?" Such arguments are also analysed and answered in details in the Jain literature in its discussion on non-violence.

Reasons of Opposition between Jainas and Bauddhas

Principally infatuation--a mental blemish is violence, so is annihilation of life born thereof. Both the Jain and Bauddha traditions accept this. In spite of this we find that right from the ancient days, lots of mutual acceptance and rejection in their thinking

on non-violence has taken place between the Jain and Bauddha traditions. Even in an ancient *Āgama* work like the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* we come across a refutation of the Buddhist view on non-violence. Similarly, a ridiculing refutation of the non-violence of the Jainas is found in a Piṭaka work like the *Majjhimanikāya*. The same old refutation is found in the later Jain works like *Niryukta* etc. and *Abhidharma Koṣa* etc., though in a new light. However, both the traditions are one and unanimous in their refutation of the Vedic violence. Now, when there is no basic difference in their definitions of non-violence, how is it that mutual refutation went on between the two right from the beginning? This is indeed a puzzling question. Clarification to this will be available to us when we read and study the literature of both with greater concentration. One of the many reasons here is this. The Bauddha tradition did not accept the excessive restraint on external activities of man which the Jain tradition resorted to in order to put into practice the most subtle definition of ninefold perfect non-violence. It is clear that this internal mutual refutation resulted from the excessive restraint on external activities on one side and the looseness born of resorting to the middle path on the other. In the discussion on non-violence in the Jain literature, this refutation forms a vital part.¹ An impartial study and observation of this mutual refutation in both the traditions convinces us that both have wrongly understood each other. One example of this is the *Upālisutta* of the *Majjhimanikāya* and the other is the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*. (1.1.2.24-32; 2.6. 16-28)

Violence of the non-violent type

Just as the Sanghas of the Sādhus continued to expand and widen and new problems arose in view of new circumstances following different places and times, the Jain philosophers revealed a new clear thought from the definition and analysis of non-violence. It was that if some life is killed or one is forced to put an end to some life in a total absence of infatuation, this violence is of the state of non-violence. It is therefore not only blemishless, it

1. Vide the Jain and Bauddha quotations in "Jñānabindu-tippaṇa."

even enhances, virtue (*Nirjarā*). According to this line of thinking, if a *Sādhu*, even after adopting perfect non-violence, takes recourse to various activities considered to be violence, for the further nourishment of his ascetic life, he without doubt, progresses a step further in the enrichment of his self-control. This is precisely determined non-violence--*Niścaya Ahimsā*--according to the Jain terminology. The *Sādhus* who were totally against keeping and using clothes, began to criticise, in the name of violence, those who were making use of facilities like clothes etc. It was here that the ascetics who justified the use of clothes etc. took recourse to this *Niścaya-Ahimsā* and stated that if one uses clothes etc., within proper limits, like the body, simply for supporting and maintaining their self-control, this is no obstruction against non-violence. This type of discussion on part of the Jain Sanghas, born of the difference in conduct, has considerably enriched the discussion on non-violence. This is clearly visible in the *Oghaniryukti*--an *Āgama* text etc.

It seems that now and again, this discussion on non-violence has become just dry argumentation. One individual raises this question. "If you want to use clothes, then why not use untorn whole cloth? This is because when a cloth is torn, microscopically small atoms will fly out and hurt life. The reply to this is given in the same manner. If microscopically small atoms fly out when we tear a piece of cloth and these are hurtful to lives, when you use speech to prevent us from hurting lives, do you not violate life? Whatever it is, the perfect form of non-violence acceptable to Jain tradition is found in the clearcut statements of Jinabhadra-gani. He states that a spot may be full of life or without life; some one is found to be violating life and some not; violence or non-violence is not to be decided upon just on this. Real violence lies in infatuation--lack of self-control, irrespective of the fact whether life is violated thereby or not. In the same way, if absence of infatuation and self-control are well protected, even if we see life being violated, it is just non-violence.

Stages of Jain discussion

The rule mentioned above fixes up the following due stages of the Jain discussion on non-violence :

- (1) Annihilation of life is violence and should therefore be stopped. This will be non-violence.
- (2) The result of the problem of maintenance of life is that when one undertakes the activities considered to be unavoidable for life, for an ascetic life in particular, violence to life might take place. Still, if that violence to life is bereft of infatuation, it is no violence, it is only non-violence.
- (3) If one wants to remain completely non-violent, one should, first of all, give up mental infatuation. If this is done, non-violence has come to be attained. External activities have no unavoidable relation with non-violence, its actual and factual relation is with the mind.
- (4) Certain exceptional circumstances arise in which, in individual or community life, violence does not end in becoming non-violence; it conduces to enrich virtues. Under such exceptional circumstances, if one is frightened by this so-called violence, and does not act accordingly, it becomes a blemish.

Similarity between Jainas and Mīmāṃsakas

This discussion on dedication and exception to non-violence is similar, almost verbatim, that we come across in the Mīmāṃsā and the Smṛtis. The difference, if any, is this. The Jain line of thinking has become well-founded keeping before itself the life of a Sādhu or an absolute recluse, while the thinking of the Mīmāṃsakas and the Smārtas keeps the life both of the householder and the recluse into consideration. Similarity between the two runs on these lines :

Jain	Vedic
(1) All lives shall not be annihilated	(1) Do not kill all living beings.
(2) Question of the impossibility of the life of a Sādhu.	(2) Question of the impossibility of all members of the four Āśramas in their life and duty.

Jain**Vedic**

(3) Absence of the fault of violence in the activities laid down by the Scriptures; i.e., violence only in prohibited acts.

(3) Absence of the fault of violence in the activities laid down by the Scriptures, i.e., violence only in prohibited acts.

It should here be borne in mind that the Jain philosophers take only the prescriptions and prohibitions of the life of Śādhus to be the meaning of the word 'Scripture'. The Vedic philosopher on the other hand, includes all the Scriptures in the word 'Scripture--śāstra--wherein all duties--individual, family, social, religious, political etc., are laid down.

(4) The final purport of non-violence ultimately lies in the thorough following of the orders of Jina, i.e., the Jain Scriptures.

(4) The final purport of non-violence lies ultimately in obedience to the orders of the Vedas and the Smṛtis.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 412-417]

Development of the Spirit of non-violence

The Compassion of Neminātha

In the *Nirgrantha* tradition, Yadukumāra Neminātha precedes Bhagavān Pārśvanātha. The incidents of life of this great man that we come across in the semi-historical stories woven round him, can easily be adjudged as a milestone with reference to the spirit of non-violence as found in the *Nirgrantha* tradition. Even to day, the custom of feeding relatives and friends in the social festivals and marriages prevails. In those old days it was a custom to make community dinners attractive by slaughtering animals and preparing meals from their flesh; this custom was more prevalent with the Kṣatriyas. We are told that Neminātha simply melted with compassion just at the time of his marriage when he heard the painful cries of the deer and other animals to be slaugh-

tered for the dinner on the occasion. He simply gave up the idea of the marriage in which so many animals were to be slaughtered and attractive and tasty dishes were to be cooked from their flesh. The life-long celibacy of Nemikumāra, born of this compassion had a deep impression on the society. In due course, this deep impression grew wider and wider to such an extent that slowly and steadily so many communities discarded this custom. In all probability, this is just the first incident which laid the foundation of non-violence in social dealings. Nemikumāra was the younger cousin-brother of Lord Krishna, the crown of the Yādava family and the loved son of Devakī. It seems that because of this family relation, this incident had a deep impression on the Yādavas of Dwārkā and Mathurā.

Pārśvanātha's Protest against Violence

In the historical period we come across Bhagavān Pārśvanātha. He took a totally different step to develop the spirit of non-violence, as we learn from the story of his life. In the austerities like *Pañcāgni*, inspired by *Tamoguṇa*, there was a custom to kindle fire without even thinking over gross and subtle lives. The result was that sometimes even living insects etc. were consumed with fire-wood. Pārśvanātha, the son of the king of Kashi, Aśvasena by name, strongly protested against such violent austerities and educated public opinion towards the giving up of violence that resulted from lack of discrimination in the sphere of religion.

Bhagavān Mahāvira's Non-violence

Nirgranthaṇātha, Lord Mahāvira acquired as a heritage the spirit of non-violence nourished by Pārśvanātha. Like Tathāgata-Buddha, he singularly and strongly protested against violence committed in the different spheres of religion such as sacrifices etc. He firmly established non-violence in the sphere of religion to such an extent that later on non-violence became the very life of Indian religions. The pilgrimage of life of Lord Mahāvira, totally dependent upon severe practice of non-violence and his singular austerities attracted so many contemporary learned brahmins and Kṣatriyas towards the ideal of non-violence. The result was that the spirit of non-violence laid its firm foundation in the common

people in matters of social and religious festivals. On this was raised the palace of the career of the future generations of the Nirgrantha tradition.

Other Propagators of Non-violence

Samprati, the grandson of Aṣoka, further enriched the heritage of the culture of non-violence under the patronage of Ārya Suhasti. Not only within the countries under his domination, but even in the lands outside the boundaries of his kingdom, where there was no trace whatsoever of a non-violent way of life, Samprati propagated this spirit of non-violence. It is no doubt true that many have contributed to turn to flood, this stream of the spirit of non-violence; it was yet the only aim of the Nirgrantha Anagāras. In east or west, north or south, wherever they moved in the country, they propagated this spirit of non-violence. They preached the giving up of all addictions that had their roots in violence and that way experienced a fulfilment of the Nirgrantha dharma. Just as Śaṅkarāchārya established four *maṭhas* in the four corners of the country and raised the victory-pole of the doctrine of non-duality of Brahma-*Brahmādvaita*, similarly did Mahāvira raise the victory-poles of the spirit of non-violence and non-dualism in all the four corners of this vast country. Lokmānya Tilak has stated that the spirit of non-violence in Gujarat is a contribution only of the Jainas. History also tells us that at least some influence of the Nirgrantha tradition can be traced in the religious activities that were non-violence-oriented as undertaken by the Vaiṣṇava and many other Vedic traditions. As we discuss and analyse thoroughly each worldly dealing of these Vedic cults, any thinker will come to know easily that the activities of these cults are definitely coloured by the spirit of non-violence of the Nirgranthas. Even to-day, no supporter and upholder of sacrificial ceremonies based on violence to life, has the courage to inspire the sacrificer to slaughter animals.

Āchārya Hemacandra had brought king Siddharaja of Gujarat under the sway of the spirit of non-violence to a great extent.

EJ-7

This bore rewards in many spheres. Slaughter of animals to propitiate many gods and goddesses on festive occasions disappeared. This also laid the foundation for a wide movement to stop violence. Kumārapāla, the king of Gujarat after Siddharaja was *Paramārhat*. He was considered to be so in the real sense of the term because the nourishment that he gave to the spirit of non-violence, the propagation that took place at his hands, is unparalleled in history. The declaration of non-hurt — *Amārighoṣaṇā* — of Kumārapāla became so very much renowned that so many Nirgranthas and their household-pupils continued all their life-work with this declaration as the very aim of their life ! So many of the Nirgranthas had, before the time of Ācārya Hemacandra, initiated into Jainism, several flesh-eating communities and had installed Oswāls, Porvāls etc. in the Nirgrantha Sangha. Even the foreign groups like the Śakas could not save themselves from the spell of non-violence. Hiravijayasūri begged of emperor Akbar just this that he should agree to this amārighoṣaṇā at least on a few days if not for ever. Jehāngir and others followed in the foot-steps of Akbar. Even today, it would not be easy so much to propagate non-violence through persons like the moghal emperors who were flesh-eaters.

Today also we find that it is only the Jain society that tries hard to stop violence to animals and birds from all spheres of life as far as possible. In this vast country so many communities professing different cultures live side by side. So many of the castes are meat-eaters right from birth ! Still we find all-round us a liking for non-violence in the common men. In the medieval India, so many saints and fakirs have preached only non-violence and compassion. This is a proof of the fact that the roots of non-violence have gone very deep in the soul of India.

When Mahatma Gandhi vowed to infuse new life in the people of this country, he did so only on the basis of non-violence. He would hardly have succeeded in his mission if he could not acquire such a ready sphere of the spirit of non-violence.

[Darśana aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 75-78.]

Non-violence and Non-hurt

Human temperament consists of elements both of violence and non-violence. There were days of the great prosperity of the original inhabitants of this country and the later victorious Āryans, when varied sacrifices and slaughter of animals were prevalent. In these sacrifices, not only animals and birds, even human beings were slaughtered and sacrificed ! This type of violence, considered to be religious had become prevalent to such an extent that as a reaction to this, stiff opposition against it commenced. The cults of Lord Mahāvīra and Buddha, based on the spirit of non-violence, were already in earlier existence. We have, however, only two names--of Lord Mahāvīra and Buddha as very great historical figures before our eyes; only they were unique nourishers of the spirit of non-violence. Even to-day the running sacred Ganges of non violence is due to them. No other country in the world can be a match outside India to the nourishment that non-violence derived in their time, and the countless ways and different directions in which it has spread. The scientific and subtle discussion that took place in India is also a unique feature. Non-violence is the only unique element that has persisted and developed right upto the modern days after it originated in India thousands of years ago. It is this element that had an extraordinary influence on other countries and classes of people in the world; it is this element that won over their hearts.

Aśoka, Samprati and Khāraṇel

Once the Jain and Buddha Saṅghas got systematically and firmly established, their propaganda work commenced in all force on all sides. Evidences of this are found today also. The ordinances that we come across in the religious script of emperor Aśoka the great, clearly reveal that the king had ordered absence of violence in festivals and ceremonies, or, he had expressed his desire that people do not resort to violence. It would not be difficult today to guess the extent of the influence of the religious ordinances of king Aśoka, after he himself became free from violence, became a fakir and continued to hold the sceptre in his hand.

His grandson, the famous Jain king Samprati, scrupulously followed the path of his grandfather and nourished the spirit of non-violence in his own way. This shows that the spread of non-violence through-kingly orders has not stopped with king Aṣoka. It would be easy to decipher two things from the fact of kings, royal families and big royal officers leaning towards non-violence. One fact is that the extent of the propagation of non-violence by the Sanghas was so wide and effective that it had influenced great emperors. The other fact was that the common people were so very much influenced by non-violence, it had been so very much to their liking, that they paid great respect to the kings who propagated non-violence. Emperor Khārvēl of Kalinga seems to have done lots for non-violence as his career would show.

History clearly states that now and again, periods in which animals were slaughtered in sacrifices sprang from human nature. However, on the whole, it can be stated that the Sanghas that propagated non-violence had considerable success in and outside India. We have several reasons to believe that the first mission was the spread of non-violence in case of Jain and Buddha kings, royal families and their officers as found in south and north India.

Kumārāpāla and Akbar

The non-violence of emperor Kumārāpāla of western India is so very much renowned today that many take it to be rather exaggerated. The orders obtained by Bhikṣu Hīravijayasūri and his followers with regard to non-violence from king Akbar and his descendents, is an immortal fact of our history. Again, if we can get the records of promises of non-committal of violence from Thakores, Jamindars, concerned officers and heads of villages, we can get some idea of the effort put in by concerned Saṅghas towards the creation of an atmosphere of non-violence.

One proof of spread of non-violence : asylums for animals—Pāñjarāpoles

The institution of *Pāñjarāpoles* is found in this country as a positive proof of the spread of non-violence. It is difficult to trace the origin and time of its existence. But looking to its vast importance in Gujarat we can guess that perhaps King Kumārāpāla

and Ācārya Hemacandra were the personalities in whose time the institution flourished. In the whole of Kutch, Kathiawad and Gujarat there will not be one important city or town in which there is no Pāñjarāpole. At so many flourishing places, we have branches of these Pāñjarāpoles even in small villages, like the primary schools. They are meant mainly to protect and look after animals and partially birds also. We have no clear statistics, but it is my guess that Jains must be spending not less than fifty lakhs every year and not less than a lakh lives are being looked after by the Pāñjarāpoles. Outside Gujarat there are so many cow-pens—*Gauṣālās*—in which only cows are looked after. Their number too is fairly large and thousands of cows are protected and looked after in these. The activities both of Pāñjarāpoles and *Gauṣālās* regarding the protection of animals persist thanks to the hard efforts of the Saṅghas that propagate non-violence as any one can see and state. Again, the custom of feeding ant-holes, feeding aquatic beings with flour-pills, and stoppage of hunting and prey to Goddesses—all these result from the spirit of non-violence in practice.

Service to Humanity

We have so far considered the question of non-violence towards animals, birds and other insects. Let us now turn to the human world. In the old days, the custom of donations reigned so strong that no human being starved. We have reliable proof of liberal donors like Jagadushah, declaring open their godowns of food and their treasures in long periods of famine. It would be inconceivable that nothing was done for human beings in a country that spent crores of rupees on animals and birds. Our hospitality is renowned and it is hospitality towards human beings. This country has lakhs of recluses, ascetics and fakirs, the physically handicapped, orphans and the sick for whom every thing possible shall be done as the brahmin, Bauddha and Jain scriptures lay down. This reflects the inclination and spirit of those old days. The need of service to humanity is expanding day by day. 'Love thy neighbour as thyself' has become the most important duty. As a result, some persons in hot haste and excitement accuse those who profess

non-violence of confining their non-violence only to animals and birds and add that it touches humanity and our countrymen the least. The following evidences would decisively prove that the accusation is wrong :

(1) If we set aside the ancient and medieval periods and examine the history of terror-striking famines and other natural calamities, small and big, we find that the Sanghas proclaiming and nourishing non-violence have done lots for men and women suffering from shortage of food. Lots are spent, lots of money are spent on medicines and clothes. To take an example, details of the famine of 1956 V. S. are available.

(2) Let us collect the details of the donations and financial help given by the Mahājans or liberal donors who learn of somebody starving even in a remote village even when there is no famine or any natural calamity.

(3) Let us note that at least five million of fakirs, bāwās and sādhus, who do not work for their food, are maintained and continue to be maintained in fair comfort.

The Prohibitive and Prescriptive Forms of Amāri . Non Violence and Mercy

Non-violence or Non-hurt has two forms ; (1) Prohibitive; (2) the prescriptive that results therefrom. Not hurting any one or non-participating in sorrows of others when they do not desire, constitute prohibitive non-violence. Participation in the sorrow of others or giving benefit of ones own facilities to others constitute prescriptive non-violence. This is also known as service. For the sake of convenience we will know these two as non-violence and mercy. Non-violence is far more valuable than mercy and still it does not catch our attention as quickly as mercy does. If mercy is universally knowable, we can state that non-violence is self-knowable. The person who practises non-violence, experiences its fragrance. Its benefit is ofcourse invariably available to others. Still, even the persons who benefit from it do not often know the element of non-violence, that is its cause; a long time passes be-

fore the nice effects of non-violence show their influence on them. It is reverse with regard to mercy. It is an element which yields greater fragrance only to the person who reaps its benefit. The happy effect of mercy is found in no time on the person who reaps its benefit. Mercy is therefore like an open sword which is noticed by all. Practice of mercy is therefore the glory of dharma.

Non-violence and mercy both are required for a systematic maintenance and nourishment of the society. Greater is the sorrow and slavery of the society and the nation in which there is a torture inflicted on the society and the rights of the weak are suppressed. Opposed to this, the society and the nation in which there is lesser torture on the right of the weak and greater protection of their rights is happier and more independent. In a similar way, when the able individuals sacrifice their facilities for the weak and serve them, that society and that nation are more steady and prosperous. Greater selfishness of the individuals means greater weakness of both. We can thus derive a positive conclusion from the histories of societies and nations. It is that non-violence and mercy are the elements that are as much conducive to spiritual good as they maintain and nourish the society and the nation.

Both these elements are equally necessary for the bliss of the world. Still, bringing about mercy is easier than non-violence. Non-violence cannot be induced in life in the absence of inner vision. Mercy can, however, be induced in the life of the common people like us bereft of inner vision.

Non-violence being prohibitive, it is included in the freedom from causing torture to others; following it is possible even in the absence of very close observation. It is not so with mercy. It is prescriptive and its practice is dependent upon circumstances and situation. Proper thinking is therefore necessary in its observance. Here, very great alertness and a thorough consciousness of the situation of time and place are expected.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. 1, pp. 451-456]

Anticipation of Death and Non-violence

Non-violence means freedom from infatuation or passion and jealousy or attachment. Jain works have strongly protested against the custom of suicide that comes of old days. Fall from the top of a mountain, drowning ones self in water, taking poison were prevalent in the old days they are so to-day; the death in the case may be designated dharma or it may be due to some worldly reason. Both annihilation of animals and suicide are known right from old days. The two are prevalent to-day also, particularly at the feet of Śiva or Śakti.

The self-contradiction in prohibition of these customs on one side and fast unto death or anticipation of death is, indeed puzzling. The self-contradiction ceases to exist if we grasp the original spirit. Jainism prohibits only that ending of ones life that springs from infatuation or attachment. So many cases of suicide are known to take place following a desire to acquire this--worldly or other--worldly prosperity, desire for obtaining youthful beauty, with a desire for some other uplift or through a sense of dharma. Jainism states that all these cases of suicide constitute violence because the inspiring element at the root is one or the other type of attachment. If fast unto death and anticipation of death are inspired by the same spirit or fright or miserliness, they constitute violence. Jainism does not recommend the committal of these. Fast unto death that is recommended is death through Samādhi.

When a situation arises in which one has to choose between the body and self-control, a virtue that is spiritual, the individual will prefer not to care for the protection of the body if, to him, dharma is the very life of the self; he will sacrifice his body and save the genuine spiritual state. This is like a real *Sati*, who saves her purity by the sacrifice of her body, when no way is left. But it will happen almost invariably, that under such a state, the individual will get angry with somebody or will be frightened. This should not happen in the case of real sacrifice. In real sacrifice, all his attention will be on the defence of ones controlled life and towards the protection of equanimity. One should protect ones body as also self-control both till it is possible. But when the

question comes to the protection of one of the two, we, ordinary persons will protect the body and neglect spiritual control; the person who has duly attained to the state of death by *Samādhi*, will act quite the contrary. Physical and spiritual life both are realities no doubt; but one prefers one or the other as per his right and status in critical circumstances. Only a person possessing such a high spiritual life is permitted fast unto death in the Scriptures. Not so the cowards or the frightened or the covetous. From this clarification it can easily be understood that one saves ones self of the nature of divine life, from downfall by bringing an end to ones life by fast unto death. Such a person is totally non-violent in the real sense of the term from a philosophical point of view. **When is end of the body a Suicide? Answer to Critics**

When the writers describe as suicide such an anticipation of death, they have not thought and pondered sufficiently over it to catch its essence. If however, one undertakes fast unto death, like Gandhiji, under the inspiration of such a lofty purpose, without any passion or jealousy towards anybody, in a spirit of complete friendship, and with a delighted mind, then, the same critics will eulogize that fast unto death and will never take it to be suicide. This is because the purpose and way of life of such personalities is before their very eyes. On the other side, in the Jain tradition, there are persons who resort to fast in anticipation of death with an inspiration of sacred motives; their aims and order of life are not known to them. The words of the Scriptures accept the view and it is in complete tune with non-violence. Let us cite one example. If an individual sees that his house is on fire and he is not in a position to save it, what will he do? He will, in the end, allow his house to burn and save himself. The person desiring to resort to spiritual life is in the same state. He will not put an end to his body vainly, this is prohibited by the Scriptures. The Scriptures take protection of the body to be a duty, but for self-control. When one is in a totally hopeless state, end of ones body will be both death by *Samādhi* and non-violence under the conditions mentioned above. Otherwise it is death and violence.

If it comes to ones downfall from self-control for protection of ones body in times of shortage or one feels that he is causing unnecessary harassment to ones self and others on account of diseases, that would certainly cause death and there remains no possibility of the protection of self-control and virtues, anticipated death is recommended. Here, the only aim is to save ones subtle spiritual life. This is the precise point of view when Gandhi etc, talk of fast unto death and Mashruvala etc, justify it.

Not Violence but Spiritual Heroism

Here, there is not the slightest trace of violence. This statement applies only to a person who is a claimant to spiritual life and is engrossed fully in the observance of the good oaths accepted for the purpose. Many are the types of personalities who hold a right to this sort of life. The first are those who have accepted the preaching of Jina and the Jain way of life of spiritualism. He stays all alone and takes the service of none. If he intends, not to take service of anybody, even in the last moments of his life, it is necessary that he duly prepares himself even while he is alert and healthy. He fulfils all his responsibilities, resorts to meditation and austerity for twelve years and renounces his physical existence. But this conduct is reserved only for the Jinakalpi. Other statements are for others duly qualified. The summary of the whole discussion is that if it comes to the breaking of his oaths and he is not able to bear it, he should resort to death rather than breaking his oaths, only this would be blissful. This is genuine spiritual heroism; it is not cowardice or escapism to run away from death through being shaken from his spiritual virtues due to gross worldly covetousness. It is not suicide which means falling a prey to death through failure in worldly life. Such an individual is fearless like death and at the same time, ready to welcome it. *Samlekhanā* is not a ceremonious invitation to death; it is preparedness to be fearless in the face of impending death. He might be required to resort to anticipation of death. Thus, the whole idea originates from non-violence and the engrossment in the virtues born thereof. It is approved by the noble and cultured today in many different ways.

Suicide in Buddhism

The view of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan that Buddhism does not approve of suicide is not correct. Even in times of Buddha himself the Bhikkhus Channa and Valkali had committed suicide due to incurable diseases; the Tathāgata had approved of it. Both the Bhikkhus were perfectly alert. Their suicide is uniquely different in the sense that instead of preparing slowly for death by fasts etc., they kill themselves by just one stroke of the weapon. This can be known as harakiri. The Jain Scriptures do not approve of this. However, the basis is the same in both, the ideal being defence of a life of Samādhi. The Scriptures properly use the words *Samādhimaraṇa* and *Paṇḍitamaraṇa* here.

Some Sūktas

Let us take some illustrative verses in their translation here. “Just as cutting of a boil is not for bringing about death, in a similar way, Samādhimaraṇa is not for death but for its resistance.

He neither desires life, nor prays for death.

The Ātmā--purity incarnate—in ones conduct is *Santhāro*.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 533-636]

Chapter 8

AUSTERITY AND ENDURANCE OF CALAMITIES— TAPA—PARĪSAHA

In the Bauddha Piṭakas, the adjectives 'Tapassi' and 'Digha-tapassi' are seen now and again along with the term 'Nigganṭha'. In the same way, in the Buddhist Sūtras, we come across so many Nirgranthas performing austerities in places like Rājagṛhi; we also come across an analysis of the Nirgranthas performing austerities, by Tathāgata Buddha himself. In the same way, when Buddha narrated his previous births before his pupils, he described several austerities in the period of Sādhanā that can be adjudged as belonging only to the Nirgrantha tradition. This is almost the same as the Nirgrantha austerity described in the available Jain scriptures. We will now examine the historicity of the Nirgrantha austerities described in the Bauddha Piṭakas.

The Nirgrantha Tradition dominated by Austerity

The life of Jñātaputra Mahāvira is an embodied form of his acute austerity; it is found in the first Skandha of the Ācārāṅga. Again, in the ancient Āgamas of all levels, whenever there is a description of the *Samnyāsa* in which any recluse is initiated, we find that he follows the practice of Nirgrantha austerity.¹ From one point of view the very daily routine of the Saṅgha of Sādhus is fully engrossed in austerity. In the Āgamas like the Anuttarovavāia, we come across the description of so many munis who made just a skeleton of their body by very acute austerity.²

Again, even on the examination of the Scriptures of Jain tradition and on looking into the conduct of the Sādhus and the householders we can state that austerity shines in excessive glory in the order of Mahāvira. The impact of their austerity shows that Jainatva has become a synonym of austerity, Aṅga-Magadha

1. Bhagavati 9-33; 2-1; 9-6.

2. Ibid, 2-1.

and Kāśī-Kosala dominate among his places of convents. Rājagṛhī and other places that we come across in the Buddha works as the places where Nirgrantha ascetics performing austerities were found, were the principal sacred places of the time of Sādhana and religious preaching of Mahāvīra. The Nirgrantha Sangha of Mahāvīra was mostly residing at those places. Thus, putting together the Buddha Piṭakas and the Jain Āgamas, we come to the following conclusions :

- (1) Mahāvīra and his Nirgrantha Saṅgha laid greater stress on a life full of austerity.
- (2) Nirgranthas in large numbers, who were performing austerities, were living and moving in cities like the Rājagṛhī of Aṅgamaḡadha and Śrāvastī of Kāśī-Kośala.

Domination of austerities even before Mahāvīra

On the evidence given above, no doubt whatsoever remains about the fact that the Nirgrantha tradition that was contemporary and following Mahāvīra's times, held inclinations that were dominated by austerities. What we have to consider now is whether or not austerity dominated the Nirgrantha tradition before Mahāvīra.

The reply to this question is in the affirmative because actually Bhagavān Mahāvīra was initiated in the Pārśvapatyika Nirgrantha tradition. Right from the beginning, he was inclined towards austerity. We can know from this what the inclination of the Pārśvapatyika tradition was towards austerity. From the narration of the life of Bhagavān Pārśvanātha that we have in the Jain works, we can emphatically state that the Nirgrantha tradition of Pārśvanātha was dominated by austerity. Bhagavān Mahāvīra has, no doubt, introduced the elements of purity and development in it; he has certainly not newly introduced the path of austerity. We have evidence of this in another way also. Buddha refers to the austerity of the Nirgranthas at the place where he reveals the uselessness of various types of austerities while he describes his former life before his pupils. Buddha was born earlier than Mahāvīra, had renounced worldly life and had resorted to the path of austerities. Buddha temporarily resorted to the Nirgrantha cult like the other cults known then. He had even followed the conduct of the

Nirgrantha cult popular in his days. The description of the Nirgrantha austerities is included therefore when Buddha describes the austerities that he had resorted to earlier; this is found to-day nowhere else except in the Jain works and the Jain tradition. The Nirgrantha austerity resorted to by Buddha before Mahāvira could be no other than the Pārśvāpatyika Nirgrantha tradition. This is so because Mahāvira was not still born; the Pārśvāpatyika Nirgrantha tradition existed in and dominated places beginning with his place of birth—Kapilavastu down to Buddha's place of Sādhanā—Rājagrhi, Gayā, Kāśi etc. Sāranāth, the place where Buddha moved his wheel of dharma for the first time, is a part of Kāśi and we know that Kāśi was the place of the birth and austerity of Pārśvanātha. The five Bhikkhus, who were in Buddha's company at the time of his Sādhanā were performing austerities in Sāranāth or Iṣipattan after they discarded Buddha. It should be no surprise to us if these five Bhikkhus were the followers of the Nirgrantha tradition. Be it as it may, Buddha had definitely resorted to the conduct of the Nirgrantha austerity, at least for some time. This austerity could be only of the Pārśvāpatyika Nirgrantha tradition. We can therefore assume that even before Lord Mahāvira, the nature and form of the Nirgrantha tradition was dominated by austerities.

From the abovementioned discussion, historically we can prove that at least from the time of Pārśvanātha, the Nirgrantha tradition was dominated by austerity; Mahāvira greatly speeded up this tendency. Here, historically, two questions stand before us : Buddha has repudiated now and again the Nirgrantha austerities. How far is it just and what is its basis ? Did anyone try, before Mahāvira, to bring new traits in the known Nirgrantha austerity ? If yes, what was it ?

Clarification on Buddha's Repudiation

The main outlook of Buddha at the root of the repudiation of the Nirgrantha austerity was that it is torture of the body, the suppression of the body. It does lead to progress in the practice of bearing physical suffering, but, no spiritual happiness or purity of the mind is attained to by it.¹ If we were to

1, Majjhimanikāya-Sūtra 26—Buddhacarita, trans. Kosambi.

compare this vision and outlook of Buddha with that of the Nirgrantha tradition, we find that there is no basic difference between the outlooks of the Nirgrantha tradition and that of Mahāvira. This is because both the outlook of Mahāvira and the literature of the entire Nirgrantha tradition that upholds its preaching state, with one voice¹ that tortures to and suffering of the body can be very severe. If however, the two are not useful for prevention of mental suffering and for spiritual purity, then both are of no use. Physical torture is meaningful only till it is related to spiritual purity. Here, a question strikes our mind very naturally. Why did Buddha repudiate it then? We get an answer to this from Buddha's tendencies in life and his preaching. Buddha's temperament was excessively rational and prone to acceptance of change. When his temperament was not satisfied with acute suppression of the body, he discarded it and labelled it an extremity. He then laid greater stress on the path of meditation, an ethical way of life and intellect. He attained to spiritual happiness only on that path; he established a new Saṅgha on the same.

For one who raises a new Saṅgha, it becomes necessary that he tries to win the maximum acceptance of the people regarding his new leaning and attitude regarding his conduct and thought. He should also severely criticise the preceding and contemporary sects. In the absence of this, he can neither attract followers in his new Saṅgha nor retain them. Many were the existent traditions that could stand in rivalry to the new Saṅgha of Buddha and the Nirgrantha tradition had no mean influence on these. The common people, with their superficial vision are easily attracted towards ascetics because of their acute external austerity and physical torture. This is a universal experience. Now, the facts were these, The followers of the Pārśvapatyika Nirgrantha tradition had derived the spirit of austerity from its infancy and the general public was leaning very much towards the Nirgranthas because of the severe austerities of Mahāvira and his Saṅgha. Again, on seeing the looseness of Buddha regarding austerities, persons questioned him in these words. "Why do you not believe in austerity when all

1. Daśavāitālika 9-4-4. Bhagavati 3-1.

the Śramaṇas lay great stress on austerity?" At this time Buddha was to answer and defend his side and at the same time, he wanted to attract the common people, the officers as also kings and emperors towards his beliefs. It was therefore unavoidable for him severely to criticise austerity. He did this. But he could succeed in his criticism only when he could prove that austerity is nothing short of torture.

There were no doubt, so many paths of asceticism that took the fulfilment of austerity to lie only in various external tortures. Buddha's repudiation of austerity is correct as far as these paths of external austerity are concerned. But his repudiation does not sound rational and just when it comes to the repudiation of austerities associated with spiritual purity. Still, Buddha has openly criticised Nirgrantha austerities now and again. We can explain this away by stating that here Buddha has kept his mind only on external austerities without taking into consideration the outlook of the Nirgrantha tradition fully. He criticised even the Nirgrantha tradition along with the repudiation of other traditions. Again, whatever be the philosophical point of view of the Nirgrantha tradition, if we observe human nature, we can state, on the basis of several descriptions that we come across in the Jain works¹, that all Nirgrantha ascetics did not necessarily make meaningful their austerity or physical torture only in spiritual purity. If Buddha or his pupils have repudiated the Nirgrantha austerity under such circumstances, this is proper upto some limit.

Peculiarity introduced by Bhagavān Mahāvīra

The answer to the second question can be derived from the Jain Āgamas themselves. Like Buddha, Mahāvīra also did not look upon physical torture as the aim of life. This is proved from the fact that he has designated several ascetics undertaking physical torture as fruitless and false ascetics.² In matters of austerity also the outlook of Pārśvanātha did not confine itself just to physical suffering and torture; he aimed at spiritual purity thereby. Yet, we cannot doubt the fact that even the Nirgrantha tradition, being

1. Uttarādhyayana, Adh. 17

2. Bhagavatī, 3-1; 11-9.

drawn in the stream of time and becoming a prey to the weaknesses of human nature, leaned more towards physical torture and the spiritual aim got set aside as in the case of the modern tradition of Mahāvīra. Bhagavan Mahāvīra did just this, He associated the gross external austerity handed down by tradition, invariably with spiritual purity. He declared that the torture of the body and the senses through physical suppression, fasts etc. is external austerity if at all it can be designated as austerity; it is not internal austerity.¹ Internal and spiritual austerity is quite the other thing; it is of the nature of meditation, knowledge etc., and it has an invariable association with purity of Ātmā—Mahāvīra no doubt accepted the external austerity handed down by the Pārśvapatyika Nirgrantha tradition, but not in the form in which it existed. To some extent, through his own life, he brought acuteness in it and associated physical torture with internal austerity; he stated in clearcut terms that perfection in austerity comes only through the attainment of spiritual purity. Through his own conduct of life, he proved the correctness of his views. On one side he brought refinement in the Nirgrantha tradition by correction in the dry physical torture, on the other side, he designated as imperfect or futile the physical tortures prevalent in the other Śramaṇa traditions. We can therefore correctly state that the contribution of Mahāvīra is unique in the realm of austerity. He brought about an expansion in the meaning of the word 'tapas'—austerity, upto all the ways of spiritual purity from its confinement in just torture of the body and the senses. That is precisely the reason why at several places in the Jain Āgamas, internal and external austerity are described side by side.

Buddha intended to discard the preceding tradition of austerity in favour of the tradition of meditative *Samādhi*. Mahāvīra also wanted to associate spiritual purity with it and place due emphasis on the path of *Dhyāna-Samādhi*, but without giving up the preceding tradition of austerity. This is the main difference in the

1. Uttarādhyayana, Adh. 30.

activity and analysis of the two ascetics. In view of the deep influence of the ascetic life of Mahāvira and his pupils on the cotemporary public, Buddha was very much disturbed and had to introduce so many stiff rules in his Saṅgha. We get references to this effect from Vinaya-piṭaka. Still however, Buddha has never sided with external austerity, he has made a mockery of it whenever an occasion arose. All the writers on Buddhism who followed him adopted the same style. The result is that to-day, Buddha's opposition against physical torture has turned into tenderness in the Saṅgha. On the other side, the life of Mahāvira with its external austerity has resulted in just physical torture in the Jain tradition. These are natural faults of temper of groups and not those of the original ideal Sādhas.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 90-96]

Actually Mahāvira did not newly invent austerity; actually he inherited austerity from his family and society. He added an inner vision in this worst of the austerities, meaning thereby that he endowed external austerity with an inner vision. The matter can be placed in these words of Samantabhadra, the renowned Digambara logician. "Bhagavān Mahāvira performed severest austerity, but with the idea to be able to probe deeper into life and throw out the internal dirt or blemishes of life." This divides the Jain austerity into two : external and internal. The external austerity includes all visible restrictions pertaining to the body, while the internal austerity includes all necessary rules regarding purity of life. It should not be forgotten that Bhagavān Mahāvira was designated 'Dirghatapasvi' not just because of his austerity but because he made a full use of this in his internal life.

Development of Austerity

Austerity is one of the heritages that we have from the life of Mahāvira. No other cult has given a living development and expansion to austerity in the 2500 years following Bhagavān as the Jain Saṅgha has done. If we were to separate only the literature on austerity, written in these 2500 years, even that would amount to a fairly large part worth discussion and analysis. The

Jain austerity is confined not just to the scriptures; it is only an echo of the various types of austerities that live in and flow from the fourfold Sangha. To-day also Jains are considered to be uniquely expert in the observance of austerity. In other matters, Jains might lag behind, but if they were to be examined in their austerities, fasts and *Āyambila* in particular, Jain men or women would surpass all and stand first not only in our country but in the whole world. Festivals regarding austerities, their celebrations and other exciting ceremonies are so very much renowned that families, women in particular, feel a sort of vacuum in life if they have not resorted to austerity and have later celebrated it. It was one acute Tapasvini, a Jain lady, who could win the admiration of the moghul emperor Akbar.

Pariṣaha Hardships

Non-Jains also know the meaning of *tapas*, not so *Pariṣaha*, which is a rather new word for them. Yet, the meaning of the word is not new. *Pariṣaha* is all that a Bhikṣu has to suffer for the success of his aim after he renounces his house and gets initiated. The Jain Āgamas describe these *Pariṣahas* but only with reference to the life of a Bhikṣu. The twelve types of austerity that are described are applicable both to the householders and the recluses; the twentytwo *Pariṣahas* enumerated are only with reference to the life of the recluses. Thus *tapas* and *Pariṣaha* are different, their types are different yet they are inseparable.

Just as vows and prescriptions and conduct are not the same, in a similar way, knowledge is different from *Vrata-niyama* and *Caritra*. Still, the assimilation of the three is possible in the life of an individual. If that *Yoga*-assimilation is possible, greater and greater development is possible in life. Only the Ātmā who is endowed with this *Yoga* of the three, can have greater and wider influence on others; only he can guide others. This is the reason why Bhagavān Mahāvira has included three elements in *Tapas* and *Pariṣaha*. He could see that man's path of life is long, his final goal is very much far off, the goal is also very subtle and as one tries to reach the goal, he has to undergo and suffer so many

major difficulties. When man struggles to attain to the goal, so many internal and external enemies attack. The result is that his full victory under the circumstances is not possible just through only *Vrata-Niyama*, only conduct or only knowledge. On experiencing this in life, Bhagavān Mahāvira arranged *tapas* and *Pariṣaha* in such a manner that the two included *Vrata-niyama*, *Cāritra* and *Jñāna*—all the three. He proved the possibility of the assimilation in and through his life.

A Co-ordination of *Kriyāyoga* and *Jñānayoga* in Jain Austerity

Tapas and *Pariṣaha* are originally born of the life of the recluse and the Bhikṣu, though their effect and spread reaches right upto the commonest of the householders. The purpose of the life of renunciation was only spiritual peace. Spiritual peace means calming down of pains and mental tortures. Victory over pains and suffering was a great victory according to the Aryan seers. That is the reason why Maharṣi Patanjali shows the purpose of austerity in these words: "The purpose of austerity is to weaken sufferings and to strengthen the forces of Samādhi." Patanjali knows *Tapas* as the *Yoga* of activity because he includes only vows and rules in austerity. He is therefore further required to take to the *Yoga* of knowledge in addition to the *Yoga* of activity. But the Jain austerity includes both the *Yogas*. We should always remember that external austerity, which is *Yoga* of activity is for the nourishment of internal austerity, that is *Yoga* of knowledge. The former is useful in the attainment of the ultimate goal of life only through this nourishment and not independently.

[Darṣan ane Cintan, pt. 1, pp. 441-444]



Chapter 9

CELIBACY ACCORDING TO JAINISM

Clarification of Jain Vision

The Jain vision does not find its completion in mere philosophy or mere conduct, it accepts the limitations of both. Bringing about a realistic all-sided co-ordination of anything is the original basis of Jain philosophy of non-extremism, and retirement of the nature of remaining aloof from small and big incidents of attachment and jealousy is the basis of Jain conduct. The centre of non-extremism lies in impartiality and retirement is also born of this. Non-extremism and retirement both are supplementary of each other and they nourish each other. Knowledge and observance of Jainism would be in proportion to the understanding of the two elements and their dawning in life.

The stream of Jainism flows towards retirement. Retirement means the opposite, other side of activity, Activity means jumping in the events of attachment and jealousy. In life, the stage of the householder is the centre of the experience and reactions on the incidents involving attachment and jealousy. *Pravṛttidharma* is therefore that in which the stage of the householder is laid down; *Nivṛttidharma* is that in which only renunciation is laid down. Even though Jainism is *Nivṛttidharma*, the section on the stage of the householder that we see here is due to the imperfection of *Nivṛtti*. Individuals who are not able to acquire complete *Nivṛtti* are Jains in proportion to the *Nivṛtti* that they resort to. They should adjust *Pravṛtti* through discrimination in those parts in which they cannot resort to *Nivṛtti*. Still however, the Jain scriptures do not narrate this *Pravṛtti*; Jainism narrates only *Nivṛtti*. From the viewpoint of narration therefore Jainism can be classed as laying down one stage only—*ekāśrami*. This one stage is that of celibacy or renunciation in the stage of *Samnyāsa*.

This is the reason why the five great vows, non-violence etc. considered to be the very life of Jain conduct are of the nature of Nivṛtti. The *anuvratas* of householders are also of the nature of Nivṛtti. This is the difference. In one there is complete Nivṛtti, in the other it is partial. The principal centre of this Nivṛtti is non-violence. Complete retirement from violence includes all other great vows. When violence is understood to mean 'annihilation of life' in the Jain scriptures, its meaning is very much subtle and wide. Even if another Jīva may or may not feel offended, when the purity of the soul is defiled just with soiled inclinations, that too is violence. All types of gross and subtle inclinations of sinning are included in this. Utterance of falsehood, theft, sex-contact and *Parigraha*—acceptance have, at their root, the inspiration of ignorance or covetousness, anger, curiosity, fear etc, which are tardy inclinations. All the activities like falsehood etc., are therefore, violent. Keeping ones self away from such violence is observance of non-violence; this observance also includes other Nivṛtti dharmas. All other prescriptions and prohibitions are, according to Jainism, only nourishing subsidiaries of the non-violence described above.

Life-force and effort are the most dominant powers of Ātmā. If the misuse of these is averted, they can be diverted to good use. It is because of this that Jainism lays down first the *śīla* in form of renunciation of what is prohibited. But *Cetanā* and *Puruṣārtha* are the powers that would not become inactive by mere Nivṛtti. They will always seek some direction of motion to calm their hunger of development. It is because of this that along with Nivṛtti, Jainism has arranged statements on Pravṛtti. Jainism states that Ātmā should not be let down by tardy inclinations and both intellect and effort should be made use of in its defence that is self-mercy. From this Pravṛtti evolve the other prescriptive paths of true speech, celibacy, contentment etc. It will become clear from this discussion that according to Jainism, Nivṛtti from uncontrolled and free behaviour, is only a part of non-violence and due observance of this part evolves the path of celibacy. Nivṛtti from this free behaviour is the seed and celibacy is the result,

It is the intention of Bhagavan Mahāvira to propagate the Nivṛtti dharma mentioned above. In this therefore creation of class, social organization and the system of Āgamas find no place. Any person, duly qualified can resort to Nivṛtti from the current state of the way of the world, train himself and attain to liberation. The prescriptions and prohibitions laid down by Mahāvira are with this end in view. It is therefore natural that there should be no stage of the householder or ceremony of marriage in it. The Jain Āgamas do not refer to the institution of marriage in these circumstances.

Some Problems

We get lots of information in regard to celibacy in the Jain Scriptures because the Jain institution is dominantly that of recluses and persons resorting to renunciation are in its centre. It is proposed here to derive some points on celibacy and write something on the basis of the Jain scriptures. The points are these : (1) Definition of celibacy; (2) Persons men and women qualified to take to celibacy; (3) History of its separate status; (4) Aim and means of celibacy; (5) Variety and spread of its forms; (6) Excesses in celibacy; (7) Non-exception in celibacy.

(1) Definition of Celibacy

Celibacy—*Brahmacarya* has a twofold definition in the Jain Scriptures. The first definition is wide and perfect.¹ According to it, celibacy means perfect self-control embracing the entire life of man. This self-control does not include the control of all si ful instincts and that only that is *Āsrava-nirodha* according to the Jain terminology. Perfect self-control includes in it the development even of the good instincts like faith, knowledge, forgiveness etc. Thus, according to the first definition, celibacy means barring the rise of bad instincts like passion, anger etc. in life and also developing the good instincts like faith, life-force, fearlessness etc. and becoming engrossed in these.

1. Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra Śṛ-2, Adh-5, Gā. 1, Tattvārthabhāṣya, Adh-9, Sūtra 6.

The word 'Brahmacarya' in common parlance has a known meaning and it is only a part of perfect self-control described above. The second definition in the Jain Scriptures accepts this meaning. According to this celibacy means cessation of sex-life or sexual attachment. This second meaning of the word is so very much current that mostly we take celibacy to mean keeping oneself away from sex-contact. Thus, according to this common and current meaning man may be lacking in control in other matters; he is still a celibate if he is away from sex-contact. This second meaning is duly considered and adopted in the acceptance of vows and rules. It would therefore happen that when one discards his house and becomes a Bhikṣu, or lives in his house and adopts limited renunciation, his observance of celibacy is to be accepted separately of the rule of non-violence.¹

(2) Qualified men and women

(a) Men and women both without the difference of sex are accepted as equally qualified for celibacy. There is no prohibition of age, place or time for it. The Smṛtis give a different view here in that equal rights of this type are not accepted in the matter. The Jain and Bauddha Scriptures are one in their contention that the necessary capacity of the Self here can reveal itself equally in man and woman. This is the reason why sixteen women are known as *Mahāsatis* from amongst so many that observed complete and pure celibacy. In the prayers in the morning in every Jain family, names of these sixteen Mahāsatis are chanted along with those of so many noble men. Their remembrance is considered to be extremely sacred and a blessing.

(b) There are examples of some celibate men and women who had gone loose in their life of celibacy. Far more celebrated are the examples of those men and women who showed wonderful steadiness in their celibacy. These examples consist not only of recluses but of persons in the stage of the householder. Bhikṣu Nandiṣeṇa, the son of king Bimbisāra Śreṇika, fell down from his celibacy and accepted the life of worldly enjoyment for twelve

1. Vide *Pākṣikasūtra*, p. 8 and 23.

years. A muni Aṣṭābhūti by name, did the same. Prince Ārdra-kumāra became loose in his life of celibacy and leaned towards the life of the householder for twentyfour years. Ultimately all the three munis steadied themselves in celibacy with double vigour. Opposite examples are also many. Śrī Jambūkumāra was renowned for grasping the Jain Āgamas from Śrī Sudharmā guru, the principal disciple of Mahāvīra. In spite of all attraction, he discarded his eight women on the very day of his marriage and accepted and adopted complete celibacy in the prime of his youth. He even inspired the eight newly married women to follow his path. Sthūlabhadra, the son of Sakadāla, a minister of Nanda, lived in the house of the prostitute Koṣā, tasted fine food and saw her voluptuous attractions and still his celibacy was not disturbed in the slightest degree. Koṣā under his influence became a firm celibate.

Mallī, who finds place amongst the most venerated Jain Tirthaṅkaras, was a woman. In her days of virginity, she gave genuine preaching to six princes who came to marry her through attraction, made them detached and made them resort to celibacy. She made them her followers and proved her status as a preceptor, though a woman.

Neminātha, the twenty-second Tirthaṅkara discarded princess Rajīmati just before the marriage ceremony was over. She became a Sādhvī. While she was in meditation, Rathanemi, the brother of Neminātha was enamoured of her charms and he fell down from his celibacy. She gave genuine preaching to him and reinstated him in his vow of celibacy. She thus threw away the charge of unsteadiness thrust on women, found a unique position in steady Sādhakas and gave new confidence to prospective celibates.

It is also noted about Koṣā, the prostitute, that after she became a celibate Śrāvīkā she gave preaching and sermons to one elder brother of Sthūlabhadra, who had come with an unsteady mind to her. She raises womanhood to glory.

But, in this matter of celibacy, the example of Vijaya Sheth and Vijayā Shethanī reigns supreme. They had firmly resolved to

resort to celibacy in the bright half and the dark half of the month individually before marriage. After marriage, even though they shared the same bed, they remained firm in their resolve and remained celibate all life with joy. Their example is memorable. The firmness of this couple reminds us of their unworldly firmness first as a couple and later in the life of Bhikṣus, as Bhikṣu Mahākāśyapa and Bhikṣuṇi Bhadrākapilāni.¹ So many such events are noted in the Jain Ākhyānas. In these, there are more examples of men being steadied by women, while the examples of women being steadied by men are rare.

(3) History of Independence

There are several descriptions of four and five Mahāvratas in the Jain tradition. From the descriptions in the sūtras² we grasp that four Mahāvratas were propagated in the tradition of Bhagavān Pārśvanātha, while Śri Mahāvira added one vrata to it and preached the dharma of five great vows. In the Ācārāṅgasūtra, even three Yāmas or vows are listed.³ Their definitions show that perhaps this tradition was also approved by Jainism. All this means that there were days in which three great vows prevailed in Jainism. They were, giving up of (i) violence, (ii) falsehood and (iii) Parigraha. Abandonment of theft was later added to this and the number came to four. Later Mahāvira added abandonment of passionate conduct, i.e., observance of celibacy and the number came to five. In this manner, independent preaching of celibacy is noted right from the days of Mahāvira. Even in the days of three or four Yāmas, actually five were being observed. The far-sighted and simple munis of those days, desiring liberation took theft and Kāmācāra to be Parigraha and very naturally they discarded it. Till the time of the tradition of Pārśvanātha, the abandonment of Kāmācāra was included in the rejection of Parigraha, and so, no separate mention was probably found necessary. But, of the non-mention of the abandonment of Kāmācāra brought about

1. Vide 'Bauddha Sanghano Parichay', pp. 190 and 274.

2. Sthānāṅgasūtra, p. 201.

3. Ācārāṅga Su. 1, Adhy. 8, U. 1.

looseness in celibacy in the Śramaṇa cult, and so many fell a prey to a very much undesirable atmosphere. That is the reason why Bhagavān Mahāvīra separately mentioned celibacy as an independent fifth great vow.

(4) The Aim of Celibacy and Means

Like all other vows and observances in Jainism, the aim even of celibacy is liberation. Anything considered to be important may be fulfilled by celibacy; if liberation is not attained through it, then, from the point of view of Jainism, celibacy is not extraordinary, it is not spiritual. In the eyes of Jainism, only the things useful in the attainment of liberation hold real importance. When liberation is the ideal of celibacy, other goals like physical health, social force etc. are automatically attained to.

Two are the paths fixed for a complete attainment of celibacy. They are—the path of action and the path of knowledge. The path of action prevents the excitement of passion that is diametrically opposed to liberation and prevents the gross poison of disorder from entering the life of the celibate. It thus fulfils the prohibitive side. But passion is not uprooted outright by it. The path of knowledge roots out passion completely and makes celibacy always and fully natural. It thus fulfils its prescriptive side. To talk in Jain terminology, the path of action fulfils celibacy in a spirit of calming down passions etc.; the path of knowledge fulfils it in a spirit of annihilating passions etc. The function of the path of action is to prepare a firm background for the path of knowledge. The path is therefore imperfect and yet very much useful. For all Sādhakas, this path is the first necessity and therefore Jain Scriptures lay great stress on it. Several external rules are included in it. This is *Gupti-Gupti* is a defence mechanism or a hedge. Their number is nine. With the addition of one more rule, ten *Samādhisthānas* of celibacy are described.

The sixteenth Adhyāyana in the Uttarādhyāyana-sūtra describes the ten Samādhisthānas in a very subtle manner. This is its-

summary :

- (1) The bed, seat and residence etc., of divine or human females, goats etc., and those of the contact of the impotent shall not be used.
- (2) One shall have no dialogue all alone with a lonely woman. Stories should be narrated to women but not the stories pertaining to women. Women's caste, family, charms, dress etc. shall not be described.
- (3) One shall not sit on the same seat with woman. One shall not sit on a seat from which a woman has got up, at least for a while.
- (4) One shall not keenly observe woman's charming eyes, nose etc., or her different limbs and should carefully avoid pondering over these or their remembrance.
- (5) One shall not hear from behind a curtain or a wall, woman's unclear words during her sex act, the words of her quarrels of love, sounds of songs, her laughter; he shall not ponder over these or memorize these.
- (6) One shall not hear anything about sex sports experienced, undergone or heard about earlier.
- (7) Nourishing foods and drinks that enhance or excite virility shall not be taken.
- (8) Even simple foods and drinks shall not be taken in a bigger quantity than required.
- (9) One shall not decorate himself, i.e., one shall not arrange with reference to sex attachment, any bath, anointing, fragrance, garland, ornaments, dress etc.
- (10) One shall reject outright the words, forms, tastes, smells and touches that nourish and excite passions.

All other things that a celibate should avoid are included in these ten. They are—sex-inspiring smiles and laughter, keeping to oneself woman's pictures, contact of one who is not a celibate, etc.

The sūtra—writer states that if a celibate resorts to any of the prohibited acts mentioned above, he will most certainly, fall down from his celibacy. There stands the added possibility of his suffering from mental and physical diseases born of passionateness.

(5) Variety and Widening of the form of Celibacy

However, the purport of celibacy is far more subtle and expansive in the Jain Scriptures than ordinarily understood, as above. Whenever an individual takes to initiation of Jainism, he has to take five oaths, of which the fourth is the adoption of celibacy. It is in these words : O respected guru ! I completely renounce all sex acts. I shall not, for my whole life, resort to any sex act—divine, human or one pertaining to animals and birds. I shall not cause others to resort to the same by mind, words and body. If anyone else is resorting to it, I shall not give my consent to it in the three ways.

The abovementioned ninefold celibacy that finds place in the initiation of a muni as described above, is the ultimate and perfect form of celibacy. Still, the Jain Ācāryas have not nourished the false hope and insistence of making all observe the same. If an individual is endowed with full capacity and power, the complete and perfect ideal of celibacy would be preserved. If man's capability is meagre, pretension would spread in the name of perfect ideal. With the ideal that such a thing should not happen, the Jain Ācāryas kept the limited capability and spirit of man in view and preached limited celibacy also. Just as there is no scope of difference in perfection, there is no scope of absence of the same in limited celibacy. Limited celibacy would therefore have many types, and, as a result, it would naturally lead to varied types of its vows and observances. The Scriptures conceive of 49 types of this limited celibacy, and the person concerned selects one or the other according to his due qualification and capability. One might not be able to resort to perfect celibacy of the initiation of a muni, and still the householder, who is a prospective candidate, selects the ideal and desires to progress in its direction. The Jain Scriptures supply us with varied rules by which such householders

can take to the observance of one of the 49 types following his liking and capability. There is thus no difference between actual and ideal celibacy and still, from the point of view of worldly life, the vast variety of its types is described into full details in the Scriptures.

Sarvabrahmacarya is ninefold celibacy and *Deśabrahmacarya* is partial celibacy. These are their added details : A *Sarvabrahmacārī* renounces passionate behaviour by all the nine types as observing, causing to be observed and consenting to the observance of celibacy by mind, words and body. While they renounce the world, *Sādhus* and *Sādhvis* take to complete celibacy of these nine types, while a householder can duly qualify himself for the same. In addition to its nine types complete celibacy has also the limits of substance, sphere, time and spirit applicable to each of the nine. Every such limit is this in due order, *Dravyamaryādā* is the prohibition of passionate behaviour in its nine types with all living and lifeless figures. *Kṣetramaryādā* is the renunciation of the ninefold passionate behavior in the upper, middle and lower worlds. The renunciation in a similar manner during day, night and all time is *Kālamaryādā*. Total renunciation of passionate behaviour in all the nine types in a spirit of attachment or jealousy, i.e., illusion, covetousness, jealousy or pride is *Bhāvamaryādā*. Only the householder is qualified to take to partial celibacy. In addition to his family, he holds social responsibility as also that of looking after animals and birds. Marrying and getting others married, pregnancy of animals and birds occur now and then for him. The householder can observe this ninefold celibacy only in very rare cases of the nine types mentioned above. consent by mind, words and body do not exist in his case, i.e., in other six types he can, possibly observe complete celibacy. Six are the methods of resorting to partial celibacy :

(i) Twofold-threefold; (ii) Twofold-twofold; (iii) Twofold-one way; (iv) Oneway-threefold; (v) One way-twofold; (vi) one way-one way. The householder can accept any of these six types of celibacy according to his prowess. Twofold means doing and inspiring others to do; threefold means by mind, speech and body, i.e.,

renunciation mentally of doing and inspiring others to do, renunciation by speech of doing and others to do, and renunciation of physically doing or inspiring others to do. This is the first method. Other methods are to be understood in the same manner.

(6) Pitfalls in Celibacy

Any resolve can suffer from four faults. The higher and lower in these are to be understood from worldly point of view. They are no doubt annihilators of the resolve. The worldly dealings, however, look upon only the visible annihilation as annihilation. The names and forms of the four are as follows :

- (1) Bringing about transgression of the resolve, i e., bringing about a mental resolve of breaking it.
- (2) Bringing about a violation of the resolve, i.e., planning out of the bringing together of the helpful means of the resolve.

Even though both these are faults, worldly dealings look upon these as pardonable, i.e., in view of the imperfect background of human beings and in view of the surrounding atmosphere, both the faults may be tolerated.

- (3) The activity because of which a partial breaking of resolve is assumed in worldly dealings, i.e., the activity because of which man's conduct in worldly dealings is considered to be faulty and therefore worth being discarded. Only this activity is designated *Atticāra* or a fault. This is the third fault.
- (4) *Anācāra* , i.e., total annihilation of the resolve. This is a serious fault.

The writers of Scriptures state that there are five faults or pitfalls of the character of the householder. These are : (1) *Itvara-parigrhitāgamana*; (2) *Aparigrhitāgamana*; (3) *Anāṅg kridā*; (4) *Paravi-vāhakaṛaṇa*; (5) deep-rooted desire in the enjoyment of passions.

All these five types of activities are faults in the character of the householder who is satisfied just with his wife. If the householder remains completely faithful to his satiation by just his wife, he will never resort to any of the abovementioned five activities.

(7) Absence of Exception in Celibacy

The great vows non-violence, truth and non-theft can have exceptions; not so celibacy that can have no exception. When we say that the vow of non-violence can have exceptions, it is implied that if under the intention of some special benefit, one takes to the activity of violence, his vow is not broken because he observes non-violence in all ways. Certain incidents there can be, in which a man of non-violence may not commit violence or be not actively associated with violence. In these cases he is considered to be *Virādhaka*, which means one who has broken the Jain orders. The same state of affairs is to be understood in case of the vow of truth and that of non-stealth. But there is no exception whatsoever in celibacy. Every one is expected to observe the type of celibacy that one has accepted without any exception.

There can be an impartial and detached person who makes an exception in non-violence etc. with the spiritual good of others in mind. No such possibility exists in the exception of celibacy; such an eventuality is subject to attachment, infatuation or jealousy. Again, no such eventuality of passionate behaviour is possible in the spiritual bliss. It is with this point in view that statements have been made about the non-exceptional observance of celibacy, and all different means are shown for it. The atonements for those who break their vow of celibacy are no doubt very tough. Here also severe, more severe and most severe atonements are laid down in proportion to the breaking of the vow from a high status. To illustrate, if some common *Sādhu* breaks the vow of celibacy through ignorance or infatuation, his atonement is also low and also ordinary. If however, a learned *Ācārya* commits such a blunder, his atonement is far more severe and tough. The same rule prevails in the world. If some very ordinary man commits such a blunder, society remains almost indifferent about it. If, however, a nobly born ideal man commits even a small blunder, society refuses to tolerate it.

{Darśan ane Cintan, pt. one, pp. 507-515, 517-521, 524-527, 533, 534}



Chapter 10

ĀVAŚYAKA KRIYĀ

The importance that '*Sandhyā*' holds in the Vedic Society, '*Khor deha Avestā*' with the Parsis, 'prayer' with the Jews and Christians, is held by '*Āvaśyaka*' in the Jain society.

For *Sādhus*, performance of '*Āvaśyaka*' both in the morning and evening is unavoidable; such is the order of the Scriptures. If therefore, they do not abide by it, they cannot be considered duly qualified for the status of *Sādhu*.

The spread of '*Āvaśyaka*' is optional with the *Śrāvakas*. This shows that those who are sincere and bent upon observance of rules resort to it, while for others it is left to their will. But it is found that those who do not take to it daily, do perform it once in a fortnight or four months or a year.

In the *Śvetāmbara* sect, this '*Āvaśyaka kriyā*' is so very much venerated that even the individuals who never go to the temples, even little boys and girls, collect in the religious places mostly for the annual *Āvaśyaka kriyā*; they look upon its performance as their good fortune. This betrays the importance of the *Āvaśyaka kriyā* in the *Śvetāmbara* sect. All parents therefore insist on the study of this when their wards take to religious education.

Now, what is this *Āvaśyaka kriyā*? What is the form of what is known as *Sāmāyika* etc. in the *Āvaśyaka kriyā*? How are the different orders in it justified? Why is it considered spiritual? All these questions should be pondered over.

Its Ceremony in ancient days

But before we answer these questions, we should know one thing. It is that the ceremony of 'Āvaśyaka kriyā' is very much older than the times of Cūrṇi. A prominent Ācārya like Haribhadra-sūri refers to it in his 'Āvaśyakavṛtti' (p. 790). The ceremony is handed down mostly without any change, as it is in the Śvet-āmbara idol-worshipping sect. Not so with the Sthānakavāsī sect. This becomes clear when we refer to the *Samācāri* of the Gacchas like Tapāgaccha and Kharataragaccha. In the *Samācāri* of the Sthānakavāsī sect, just as the number of the sūtras to be muttered is reduced, so is reduced the ancient ceremony. No such reduction or change is found in the ancient ceremony of the *Kriyā* in the *Samācāri* of Tapāgaccha, Kharataragaccha etc. This means that the six sūtras, their order, the intermediary ceremony etc., are the same with them as they are laid down by Haribhadrasūri.

The Meaning

The *Kriyā* that is a must, that should be invariably undertaken is *Āvaśyaka*. It is not the same for all, but differs from person to person according to his qualification. We should therefore know the necessary qualifications before we know what it is.

Normally, embodied animals are divided into two : (1) Those endowed with external vision, and (2) Those endowed with internal vision. Those who are endowed with internal vision, are those whose vision is leaning towards Ātmā. Here, the *Kriyā* applies only to them who are trying hard to reveal natural happiness in their life. The statement fixes up one thing. Those persons who have not forgotten their selves in the gross elements of life, those whose vision not blurred by the external charms of things have to resort to this *Āvaśyaka karma*, which can lead to effortless happiness of the Ātmā. Persons endowed with internal vision possess virtues like right faith, consciousness, and conduct; only they are qualified to experience natural effortless happiness. The activities therefore that become helpful in the due development of these virtues

are designated *Āvaśyaka karma*. Thus *Āvaśyaka*—necessary activities are those that are positively necessary for the revelation of the virtues like knowledge etc.

Such necessary activities and knowledge are both result-oriented, i.e., undertaken with a view to their usefulness. The same is known as 'Āvāsaka' because it makes the Ātmā endowed with and rich in virtues. These are known as '*Nitya karma*' in the Vedic terminology. In the Jain terminology, words synonymous with 'Āvaśya' are '*Avaśya kartavya*', dhruva, Nigraha, Viśodhi, Adhyayanaṣatkavarga, Nyāya, Ārādhana, Mārga etc.¹

Nature of the six Āvaśyakas

Āvaśyaka kriyā on the face of it is divided into six :

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| (i) Sāmāyika, | (ii) 24 stavans, |
| (iii) Vandana, | (iv) Pratikramaṇa, |
| (v) Kāyotsarga, and | (vi) Pratyākhyāna. |

(1) Sāmāyika

One should remain in equanimity or neutrality instead of subjecting ones self to attachment and jealousy. This would mean behaving with all as one would behave towards ones own self. This is *Sāmāyika*². It is divided into three as (i) *Samyaktvasāmāyika*, (ii) *Śrutasāmāyika*, and (iii) *Cāritrasāmāyika*, because, one can steady ones self in equanimity only by means of rightness, knowledge and conduct. Following the individuals qualified, *Cāritrasāmāyika* has two sub-divisions as (a) *deśacāritra* and (b) *sarvacāritra*. The former is meant for householders while the latter is meant of *Sādhus*.³ The synonyms of *Sāmāyika* are—*Samatā*, *Samyaktva*, *Śānti*, *Suvihita* etc.⁴

1. *Āvaśyakavṛtti*, p. 53.

2. *Āvaśyaka Nirukti*, Gāthā 1032.

3. As above, Gāthā 796.

4. As above, Gāthā 1033.

(2) *Caturviṃśatistava*

The personalities that are endowed with all conceivable qualities and are therefore of the nature of ideal are the twentyfour Tirthaṅkaras who deserve all veneration. It is of two types—(i) Dravya-substance and (ii) Bhāva-being. The former is worship of the Tirthaṅkaras by pure things like flowers etc., and singing of their genuine virtues is Bhāva.¹ The benefits of *Dravyastava* for a duly qualified householder are described in the *Āvaśyaka Niryukti* (pp. 492-493).

(3) *Vandana*

The activity by mind, speech and body to express great regard for those who deserve to be worshipped is *Vandana*. Its synonyms in the Scriptures are—Citikarma, kṛtikarma, pūjakarma etc.² We should know these things in order to know the form and nature of *Vandana*. What are the qualifications of those who deserve to be venerated? Who do not deserve to be honoured? What are the types of the deserving? What will be the fault if we honour the undeserving? What are the faults to be dispensed with at the time of veneration? etc., etc.

The munis who command the twofold conduct that is constituted of substance and *Bhāva*-being deserve to be saluted.³ Munis qualified to be saluted are five : (1) Ācārya, (2) Upādhyāya (3) Pravartaka, (4) Sthavira and (5) Ratnādhika.⁴ The last is one who is endowed with the virtues like right perspective etc., more than ones own person not deserving to be saluted are those who are not endowed either with signs pertaining to *Dravya-Dravyaliṅga* or signs pertaining to *Bhāva-Bhāvaliṅga*. With regard to the persons deserving our salutation and not deserving the same, the *Catur-bhaṅgi*-fourfold non acceptance of the silver-coin is known.

1. *Āvaśyakavṛtti*, p. 492.

2. *Āvaśyakaniryukti*, Gāthā 1103.

3. *Āvaśyakaniryukti*, Gā. 1106.

4. As above, Gā. 1195.

Nobody will accept the coin with pure silver but no proper stamp. In a similar way, those who are endowed with Bhāvaliṅga but are devoid of Dravyaliṅga, are Pratyekabuddha etc., who are not saluted. A coin with a clear stamp but no pure silver is also not accepted. In just the same way those who are endowed with Dravyaliṅga but are devoid of Bhāvaliṅga, are Pārśvastha etc. of five types of bad Sādhus who deserve not to be saluted. The coin in which silver is mixed and stamp not clear is accepted by none. In a similar way, persons devoid of both Dravya and Bhāva, do not deserve salutation. Persons deserving salutation are those endowed with both Dravyaliṅga and Bhāvaliṅga, like the coin with pure silver and a clear stamp.¹

The person who salutes one not deserving to be saluted, attains to neither the cleansing—*Nirjarā* of karma or fame; actually he suffers from bondage of karma² in view of his consenting to faults like lack of control etc. The fault lies here not with the person who salutes, but also with the one who inspires salutation though not deserving. He thus enhances his lack of control, and, as a result, suffers downfall.³ Salutation should be free from thirtytwo faults, which are described in details in the Gāthās 1207 to 1211 of *Āvaśyakaniryukti*.

(4) Pratikramaṇa

Pratikramaṇa is re-attainment of pure Yoga after falling down to the impure from the pure through infatuation. In a similar way, abandoning of impure Yogas and attaining to pure Yoga in due course of time also constitutes Pratikramaṇa.⁴ The words synonymous with the word 'Pratikramaṇa' are—Prativarāṇa-Pariharāṇa-Karaṇa, Nivṛtti-abstention, Nindā-abuse, Garhā-scoffing, and Śhodhi-introspection.⁵ One example is given for us to understand the

1. Āvaśyakaniryukti, Gā. 1138.

2. As above, Gā. 1108.

3. As above, Gā. 1110.

4. Āvaśyakasūtra, p. 553.

5. Āvaśyakaniryukti, Gā. 1233.

meaning of each of the words, and these are very much interesting.¹
 'Pratikramaṇa means returning; i.e., going to another state from one and coming back.

The five types of Pratikramaṇa are—(i) Daivasika, (ii) Rātrika, (iii) Pākṣika, (iv) Caturmāsika and (v) Sāmvatsarika. These are ancient and approved by the Scriptures; they are referred to even by Bhadrabāhuswāmī.² From the point of view of time, it is three-fold as—(i) Analysis of faults of the past; (ii) Saving ones self from the faults of the present—*Samvara*; (iii) Prevention of faults of the future.³

Those qualified persons who intend, gradually to scale higher and higher heights of the purity of Ātmā should also know as to whose Pratikramaṇa is to be resorted to. These are four : (i) Falsehood; (ii) Non-abstention; (iii) Passions and (iv) Unworthy Yoga. What is meant is that one should discard falsehood and acquire truthfulness; one should give up non-abstention and adopt abstention; give up *Kaṣāyas*—passions and acquire virtues like forgiveness; give up the activity of the mind, speech and body that inflate mundane existence and attain to the real nature of the self.

Normally, Pratikramaṇa consists of two types Dravya and Bhāva. Only Bhāva-Pratikramaṇa is worth attaining to and not the other one. The Dravya-pratikramaṇa is just for show. If one discards all faults and then again resorts to them, it is Dravya-pratikramaṇa. In this, instead of purity the Ātmā attains to impudence and there is a greater nourishment of faults. For this, the famous example is that of an insignificant Sādhu who repeatedly breaks the earthen utensils of the potter and then begs pardon.

1. As above, Gā. 1242.

2. As above, Gā. 1247.

3. Āvaśyakavṛtti, p, 551.

Kāyotsarga

Giving up the egoism of the body after due concentration for dharma and meditation, is *kāyotsarga*. For a successful Kāyotsarga, its faults, nineteen in number, beginning with *Ghoṭaka* should be discarded outright.¹

Through Kāyotsarga, the dullness of the body is removed, i.e., the unevenness of *Vāta* etc. is removed, the dulness of the intellect is made to disappear and thinking-power develops. Through this again, the power of retention of equanimity in suitable and adverse circumstances both, develops. The practice of contemplation and meditation gets nourished. Pondering over transgression—*aticāra*—is also easy in it. It is therefore a very important and significant thing. The time of breathing in and out in Kāyotsarga is of the measure of the time of utterance of one *Carāṇa* of a stanza.

Pratyākhyāna—Renunciation

Renunciation means *Pratyākhyāna*. Two types of things are to be renounced—*dravya* and *bhāva*. Renouncing externally things like food, clothing etc., is of the nature of *dravya*—substance. Ignorance, lack of control etc., are of the nature of *Bhāva*. These, renunciation of external things like food and clothing etc. and that of ignorance, lack of control etc., should be resorted to with the ultimate intention of renouncing *bhāva*—being. Renunciation of substances that is not for this, does not endow the Ātmā with any virtue. Pure *Pratyākhyāna* is that which is resorted to along with six purities of—faith, knowledge, salutation, suitable observance, suitable speech and feeling.

The other synonym of *Pratyākhyāna* is *Guṇadhāraṇa*—acquisition of virtues in view of the fact that so many virtues are attainable by it. *Pratyākhyāna* leads to the obstruction of *Āsrava*—work of the senses—i.e., to *Samvara*—protection against or annihilation of the karmic flow. This leads to the annihilation of hankering and that leads to a unique equanimity of mind. This equanimity ultimately leads to liberation.

1, Āvaśyakaniryukti, Gā. 1546-47.

Naturalness and Propriety of Order—Krama

Persons endowed with an inner vision have, attainment of equanimity as the very aim of their life. In each activity therefore of such a person equanimity is visible. When persons endowed with inner vision view some others on the top of perfection of equanimity, they start eulogizing their basic virtues. They thus do not forget to salute saintly personalities who are endowed with equanimity. There is very great healthy alertness—absence of infatuation—in the life of persons endowed with this inner vision. The result is that even though once in a way they might swerve from equanimity because of the psychic effects of the passions of previous births or bad contacts, they regain their original state by *Pratikramṇa* because of lack of infatuation; sometimes they even advance further.

Only meditation is precisely the key to the development of spiritual life. The person therefore, endowed with inner vision very often resorts to the *Kāyotsarga* of meditation. They acquire purity of mind and consciousness by meditation and get all the more engrossed in the *Ātmā*. The renunciation therefore of gross objects also becomes a very natural activity for them.

It can thus be clearly understood that the analytical study of the lofty and natural life of spiritual personalities is the very basis of the order and stages of the *Āvaśyaka kriyā*.

Spiritualism and *Āvaśyaka kriyā*

Spiritual activity is only that which is undertaken with reference to the development of *Ātmā*. The purpose of this is again purification by stages of the virtues like rightness, consciousness, conduct etc.; when examined by this test, it is decisively proved that all the six *Āvaśyakas* are spiritual. This is because the reward of *Samāyika* is prevention of all sinful activity; it becomes instrumental in the development of *Ātmā* through the *Nirjara* of Karma. The purpose of *Caturvimsatīstava* is enrichment of attachment of virtues and acquirement of virtues thereby, but

it becomes instrumental in the development of the soul through the Nirjarā of Karma. Salutation leads to humbleness and the annihilation of egoism. One acquires worship and devotion to the elders, obedience to the orders of the Tirthankaras and propitiation of the dharma that is scriptural. All these by stages become instrumental in the attainment of liberation through the development of Ātmā. Persons who resort to salutation reap the benefit of hearing of the Scriptures because of humbleness. The reward, in due order, by the attentive hearing of the Scriptures is knowledge—Vijñāna, Pratyākhyāna, control, Anāsrava, austerities, annihilation of Karma, a state of actionlessness and liberation. Salutation is therefore clearly an instrument of the development of Ātmā. In reality, Ātmā is perfection in power and purity; it is enveloped by so many desires and faults due to its falling in the beginningless stream of various passions. When therefore, it tries to sublimate itself, committal of mistakes is natural to it, because of its beginningless practice. There is no attainment of the desired goal till the Ātmā gets purified of the faults and blunders.

The Ātmā therefore resolves, through Pratikramaṇa, to get pure of these and constantly remembers these committed at different stages. In this manner, the purpose of the activity of Pratikramaṇa is to remove the mistakes committed formerly and to make the Ātmā warned and alert about their non-repetition in future. This will make the Ātmā steadily free from faults and firm in its pure nature. Kāyotsarga brings about concentration of the mind and the Ātmā gets an opportunity to think on and ponder over its real nature. This wins fearlessness for the Ātmā and is enabled to attain to its difficult goal of liberation. The Kriyā therefore of Kāyotsarga is also spiritual. Everything that exists in the world cannot be enjoyed; it is not even enjoyable in its entirety. Genuine peace cannot be attained to even with countless sacrifices. Persons desiring liberation therefore save themselves by Pratyākhyāna Kriyā, from meaningless enjoyments and attain to eternal peace of the soul. Even this kriyā is therefore spiritual.

Conventional Meaning of Pratikramaṇa

The etymology of the word 'Pratikramaṇa' is on these lines—Prati+kramaṇa=Pratikramaṇa. The meaning accordingly is 'to turn back.' But in view of the convention, the word is suggestive both of the fourth Āvaśyaka as also the whole group of the six Āvaśyakas. The word in this sense is so very popular that for all the Āvaśyakas, the word Pratikramaṇa is used. In practice and in the modern works, the words 'Pratikramaṇa' and 'Āvaśyaka' have become synonymous. This was not the case in the ancient works. The word is used in the sense of general Āvaśyaka in the modern works like 'Pratikramaṇagarbhahetu,' 'Pratikramaṇavidhi,' 'Dharmasaṅgraha' etc. The Jains use the word constantly in the general sense of Āvaśyaka.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 174-185]



Chapter 11

JĪVA AND PAÑCAPARAMEṢṬHĪ

Meaning of ' Parameṣṭhī '

Question : What is Parameṣṭhī ?

Answer : The Jivas that have become steadied in their highest nature i.e., equanimity, are known as Parameṣṭhī.

Q. : What is the difference between Parameṣṭhī and other Jivas ?

A. : The difference lies in the presense or absence of spiritual development. Those who have attained to spiritual development and have acquired scatheless prowess of the soul are Parameṣṭhī. The Jivas, tardy in their prowess of the soul, are different from them.

Q. Can these others purify themselves by different means and become Parameṣṭhīs ?

A. : Sure.

Q. : What is then the difference between the two from the point of view of prowess ?

A. : None. The difference lies actually in the revelation or otherwise of the prowesses. In one, the perfectly pure form of the prowesses of the soul has revealed itself, not so in the second.

Some thinking on Jīva

General Nature

Q. : If all the Jivas are basically the same, what is their general nature ?

A. : The general nature of all Jivas is the absence of the virtues of *Pudgala*-matter and the existence of life-force.

Q. : This trait is beyond the purview of the senses. How can then the Jiva be recognized by this ?

A. : The Jiva is beyond the purview of the senses from the point of view of decisiveness. Its trait should therefore be beyond the purview of the senses.

Q. : The Jivas can be deciphered by the senses such as the eye etc. How can it therefore be beyond the purview of the senses ?

A. : From the point of view of its basic nature, the Jiva is beyond the purview of the senses. It can be deciphered by the senses in its impure superimposed nature. Absence of a concrete form, nature-*Roopa*, *Rasa* etc. being absent, the life-force is the basic nature of the Jiva. Speech, shape, happiness, sorrow, attachment, jealousy etc. are the synonyms of the Jiva born of karma. Basic nature is beyond the *Pudgala* and therefore above the senses. *Vibhava* is within the *Pudgala* and is therefore within the purview of the senses. The Jiva should therefore be adjudged to be beyond the purview of the senses from the point of view of its natural basic trait.

Q. : If the Jiva is related to modification, should it not be accordingly defined ?

A. : It is actually defined accordingly. But the definition will apply only to the Jivas of the mundane life and not to all the Jivas. These wordly Jivas are those that are endowed with happiness and sorrow, attachment and jealousy etc., those that undertake karma and reap the fruits thereof; they are the embodied Jivas.

Q. : What is the clear-cut distinction between these definitions ?

A. : The first trait is related to the inherent nature. It should therefore be acknowledged as perfect and steady from the point of view of decision. The other one is with reference to modification, and should therefore be acknowledged as imperfect and unsteady from the practical viewpoint. In brief, it can be stated that the first trait is from the view of decisiveness; it can therefore be applicable in all the three times—past, present and

future. The second one is from the point of view of worldly practical dealing and will not therefore be applicable in all the three times; it applies to worldly Jivas and not to the Jivas that are aspiring after liberation.

Q. : Just as two definitions are given in Jain philosophy on the basis of the two viewpoints as mentioned above, do we similarly find two definitions in the non-Jain philosophies also?

A. : In the philosophies of Sāṃkhya—Yoga, Vedānta etc., Ātmā is defined as constituting of the nature of life-force—*Cetana*—and being of the nature of existence, intelligence and rapture—*Sat, Cit* and *Ānanda*. In the philosophies of Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika etc., happiness, sorrow, desire, jealousy etc., are stated to be the traits of Ātmā from the viewpoint of practical and worldly point of view.

Q. : Do the words 'Jiva' and 'Ātmā' mean the same thing?

A. : Yes. In Jain Scriptures, the words 'Jiva' and 'Ātmā' both are used for worldly and other-worldly living beings. In the Vedānta philosophy, however, the 'Jiva' means the living being of the state of mundane existence and not liberated existence. But the word commonly used for both is 'Ātmā' also.

Indefinability of the Nature of Jiva

Q. : You have described the nature of Jiva. However, some scholars are of the opinion that the nature of Ātmā is indefinable, i.e., that which cannot be described in words. What is the truth here?

A. : They too are right in so far as only limited traits can possibly be described through words. The realistic nature of Jiva is unlimited and cannot therefore be described in words. The nature of Jiva is indescribable from this point of view. This is laid down in other philosophies by the word—*Nirvikalpa* or by the word '*Neti*'. In Jain philosophy it is stated that "from there, words come back and logic does not work there," etc. This indescribability should be understood from the point of

view of absolute decisiveness or from the point of view of absolutely pure material viewpoint. Subtlety is stated to be a trait of Jiva or life-force. This is from the point of view of decisiveness or pure material viewpoint.

Jiva – Self-evident or the result of material mixtures ?

- Q. :** It is heard and read that the Jiva is a chemical object, i.e., the result of material mixtures. It is not a self-evident object. It is both created and destroyed. What is the truth here ?
- A. :** This view results from illusion, because the experiences of knowledge, happiness, sorrow, delight, pain etc. are related to the mind and they result from their dependence on gross or subtle material objects. These material objects are only a means or instrumental cause in the creation of these inclinations and not the material cause. The material cause is totally different, and that is the Ātmatattva. It is therefore an illusion to look upon material objects as the material cause of such inclinations. If we think otherwise, countless faults arise, such as happiness and sorrow, being rich and poor, long and short life-span, respect and aversion, knowledge and ignorance etc. which are mutually opposed feelings and these may be found in the two offsprings of the same parents also. If we were to look upon the Jiva as an independent element, this would not be possible under any circumstance.
- Q. :** On whom should we place our trust with regard to the existence of the Jiva ?
- A. :** We should depend upon our own experience and on the words of unselfish seers who meditate only on the Ātmā since long and in full concentration.

Five Parameṣṭhis

Their Types

- Q. :** Are all parameṣṭhis of just one type ? What is the difference between the one and the other ?

A. : No, they are not just one type. From the gross point of view, they are of five types—Arihanta, Siddha, Ācārya, Upādhyāya and Śādhu. These should first be divided into two in order to know their difference. The first consists of the first two, and the second of the last three. This is because the first two—Arihanta and Siddha have developed themselves fully in the matter of knowledge, philosophy, conduct and prowess. In the last three, Ācārya etc., these prowesses have not fully shined out, they are under an effort to reveal these fully. Only Arihanta and Siddha have attained to the state of the venerated; they have no state of worship; they are therefore believed to be endowed with the divine element. The other three, Ācārya etc. have two states of worshipped and worshipper both. They are worshipped by those at the lower stage and they worship those of the higher stage. The element of higher and lower is thus accepted.

Difference between Arihanta and Siddha

Q. : What is the difference between the Arihanta and Siddha ?

A. : Siddhas are devoid of body and therefore far away from material modifications; the Arihantas are not so. They have a body, and therefore, moving, roaming, speaking, thinking and other physical and mental activities continue in their case. This is so in spite of the fact that in their case infatuation; illusion, ignorance etc. have come to an end. In brief, we can state that the perfection of the development of the prowesses of knowledge, conduct etc. are similar in their case. Yet the Siddha is devoid of Yoga, i.e., the activities of mind, speech and body; the Arihanta is not so. First one becomes an Arihanta, to become a Siddha later on after abandoning the body.

Difference among Ācārya etc.

Similar is the case with the other three, Ācārya, Upādhyāya and Śādhu. Even though the virtues of all the three are more or less the same, there are some traits associated with each.

One has to cultivate and acquire the traits, the genuine knowledge of the Scriptures and their meaning, ability to teach, sweetness of speech, and the power to discuss matters in order to attain to the status of an Upādhyāya; while for the Sādhu these traits are not particularly necessary. In a similar way, the status of an Ācārya means the acquirement of the power of administering the Saṅgha, fulfilling all responsibility of the Gaccha, extreme seriousness, and special knowledge of time and place. These traits are not very much necessary for a Sādhu. However, for a Sādhu, 27 virtues are necessary; but an Upādhyāya should be endowed with 25 virtues in addition. An Ācārya should, however, be endowed with 36 added traits. In the Jain order, Upādhyāya is more important than a Sādhu, while an Ācārya holds greater importance than an Upādhyāya.

Other—worldliness of Arihanta

- Q. : Just as the inner prowesses of an Arihanta are far superior to ours, is their external state also typical?
- A. : In view of the attainment of perfection in the cultivation of inner abilities, the impact of an Arihanta becomes so very much extraordinary that the common man would have no faith in him. The entire worldly behaviour is other-worldly. Human beings, animals, birds etc. grasp the preaching of Arihanta in their own language. In the event of *Samavasaraṇa*, snake and mungoose, rat and cat, cow and tiger who are revengeful towards each other right from their birth, forget their instinct of revenge and cultivate a spirit of brotherhood. The thirtyfive virtues found in the speech of an Arihanta are not to be found in the speech of others. Wherever an Arihanta sits, crores of gods present themselves for salutation; what then to talk of human beings etc.? They stand in supplication with folded hands in the presence of Arihantas. They are devoted to him and arrange for eight *Prātihāryas* such as the Aśoka tree etc. This springs from the supreme Yoga of Arihanta.

Q. : How can one have faith in all this ?

A. : Matters that strike us as almost impossible are just common to these supreme Yogins. An ordinary Bhil can have no idea whatsoever regarding the prosperity of a universal monarch. Vast distance exists between us and the Yogis. We are enslaved by passions, idols of covetousness and centres of instability. Quite the reverse are the Yogis to whose minds passions have no attraction whatsoever; greed or covetousness does not touch them; they are steady like the Meru mountain. What is our state of the mind ? We fail to keep our mind steady even for a short while; loss of even a small thing becomes a matter of life and death to us; we always fail to bear with a sour word from others; when we are under the stress and strain of selfishness, even brother and father become our enemies ! Supreme Yogis are far above all these blemishes. Their internal state is so high that this lofty status on their part is no surprise to us. If we consider the glory and influence of common *Yoga-samādhī* on part of noble sages and persons endowed with lofty character, we nourish no doubt whatsoever regarding the extraordinary personality of supreme Yogis like the Arihanta.

Nature of the five from the worldly and ultimate standpoint

Q. : What is the nature of the personality of Arihanta and Siddha from the worldly and ultimate standpoints ?

A. : For the Siddha, there is no difference between these two, because in the state that the Siddha has attained to, ultimate and worldly form an identity. Not so with regard to the Arihanta. Arihanta is embodied, and therefore his worldly mundane state is related to external objects. The relation of the ultimate standpoint is associated with the internal processes. From the ultimate standpoint therefore, the states of Siddha and Arihanta are the same.

EJ 10

Q. : What is the nature of Ācārya, Upādhyāya and Sādhu from the worldly and ultimate standpoints ?

A. : From the ultimate standpoint the nature and personality of all the three are just similar. In all the three the anxiety to propitiate liberation is the same; external and internal Nirgranthahood is similar; the ultimate standpoint and the absolute nature are similar. However, there is some difference in the worldly nature of the three. From the practical point of view, the Ācārya is the most qualified. This is because on his head lies the responsibility of ruling over the Gaccha and preserving the glory of the Jain order. The Upādhyāya is expected to acquire some more virtues to attain to the status of Ācārya. These may not be found in the Sādhu.

Purpose and Types of Salutation

Q. : Why are the Parameṣṭhis saluted ? What are the types of salutation ?

A. : They are saluted for the acquirement of virtues. They are themselves virtuous and one acquires these virtues by saluting them. This is because the aim-*dhyeva* and the person a *ming-dhyātā* become similar. One who nourishes a spirit of theft day and night can never become honest. In a similar way, one who loves learning and the learned does earn some learning or other. Salutation is expression of ones own humility before the great and a conduct which acknowledges their greatness. This salutation is dual-*dvaita* and non-dual-*advaita*, i.e., two-fold. When the fact is that specialised type of higher steadiness is not attained and the individual feels and experiences that he is a devotee and someone else is the object of devotion, it is *dvaita* salutation. Once the options of attachment and jealousy are annihilated, the mind becomes so steady that the Ātmā looks upon its own self as an object of devotion, and concentrates only on its own form. This is *advaita* salutation. Of these two, naturally *advaita* salutation is superior because *dvaita* salutation is only a means to the *advaita* salutation.

Q. : How many differences are there in the internal devotion of man ?

A. : Just two : One is *Siddha-bhakti* and the other *Yogi-bhakti*. *Siddha-bhakti* is the propitiation of the infinite virtues of Siddhas. *Yogi-bhak'ti* is the propitiation of the virtues of Yogis [= munis].

Q. : Why do we salute first the *Arihanta* and then the *Siddha* etc. ?

A. : Two are the orders of attaining to an object. One is *Pūrvānupūrvī* the other *Paścānupūrvī*. Referring to the smaller after the greater one, is *Pūrvānupūrvī* and to the greater after the smaller, is *Paścānupūrvī*. Of the five Parameṣṭhis, Siddha is the greatest and Sādhu the smallest. This is because the Siddha state of the development and sublimation of the life-force is its climax; the state of Sādhu being the first stage of the Sādhanā. The *Pūrvānupūrvī* order in salutation is resorted to here for this reason. From the point of view of annihilation of Karma, Siddhas are superior to Arihantas. Yet both are equal from the point of view of fulfilment. From the point of view of worldly dealings or practical point of view, Arihanta is superior to Siddha. This is because the indirect form of *Siddha* is revealed to us by *Arihanta*. The *Arihantas* are therefore looked upon as superior and saluted first.

[Darṣana aur Cintana, pt. 2, pp. 522-532]

God, Preceptor and Religious Elements

Technically Jain tradition is to be found in three elements—God, Preceptor and Religion. The absolutely pure state of Ātmā is the element named God. Genuine spiritual Sādhanā to attain to this pure state is the element designated Guru. Proper and discriminative self-control constitutes the element known as dharma. These three constitute the very essence of Jainism. The spirit that preserves and nourishes this is its body.

Temples endow the element that is God in a gross form. The idol installed, its worship, the means that maintain these, the firms that administer, places of pilgrimage etc., form the costume and ornament of the body that nourishes this spirit of godliness. In a similar manner, house, food, rules of residence and other prescriptions etc., constitute the dress and ornamentation of the element known as preceptor. Rules of prescription and prohibition such as those of food, conduct in certain places, general rules of conduct etc., are like clothes and ornaments of the body of the elements known as control.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. 1, p. 56]

Chapter 12

KARMA ELEMENT

The doctrine of the activists—*Karmavādins* is this. Man's life is not limited only to this birth; it was there earlier and will continue in the births to come. There is no good or bad, gross or subtle, physical or mental fact that results in life, the seed of which has not been sown by man in the present or the past birth.

Wide view of Karmavāda

There is no gross or subtle, mental or physical activity that would come to an end without creating a result in this or the other life. The activist holds a wide vision because he covers up all the three times—past, present and future. This wide vision implies his individual, family, social and universal responsibilities and ethical bonds that differ very much from the responsibilities and ethical bonds that result from the very narrow outlook of Cārvāka. This difference should be grasped precisely and only a part of it should be adopted in life. If even a part is adopted in life, then, the charges levelled against Cārvāka would be found to be correct. We can then show even from practical dealings in life that the religious aim of the activists is far superior to that of Cārvāka and therefore worth adoption in life.

[Darṣan ane Cintana, pt. 1, 59]

Belief in Eternity of Scriptures

The Karmaśāstras of Śvetāmdaras and Digamdaras that live today in the Jain literature, are related directly to the ancient authentic works. Both the traditions take *Dṛṣṭivāda*, the 12th of the 14 *Angas* to be the second *Pūrva*; both equally believe and accept all the *Angas* and the 14 *Pūrvas*; to be the direct fruit of the all-knowing speech of Lord Mahāvīra. According to this age-old sectarian view, all the literature existent to-day, that is related

to karma is the sum-total of the preaching of Lord Mahāvira. Another traditional and conventional belief is that all these Scriptures with their purport, come down to us, not only from Lord Mahāvira, not only from the preceding Tirthaṅkaras, but belong to a still earlier time. In a way, this should mean that they have no beginning. The *Aṅga* Scriptures are beginningless as a flow, but they have assumed new form through the utterances of each new Tirthaṅkara. Ācārya Hemacandra, following Jayanta Bhatta, the famous writer of *Nyāya* aptly states in his *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* that
 अनाद्य एवैताः विद्याः संक्षे मविस्तरविवक्षया नवनवीभवन्ति, तत्तत्कर्तृकाश्चाच्यन्ते ।
 किन्नाश्रौषीः न कदाचिद्दीदृशं जगत् ।

“All these lores, that have no beginning, attain to a new form (with every Tirthaṅkara) with their desire to analyse in brief or in details. They are then known as analytical works. (O pupil) have you not heard that this universe continues just the same since times immemorial ?”

The abovementioned sectarian belief was taken to be true to the last word till today by the sectarians. They justified the eternity of these as do the Mīmāṃsakas with reference to the Vedas. Even though the sectarians hold in all honour the abovementioned belief with regard to the scriptures, here, it will be our effort to consider these *Karma* scriptures and the *Karma* element from another point of view. It is historical.

Need of Karma Element

The first question was whether to believe in the Karma element or not; and if yes, on what basis. One view there was that believed in no *Puruṣārtha* other than *Kāma* and *Artha* that is its means. According to this view, this world is the only *Puruṣārtha*.

This view therefore did not have the need to accept any *Karma* element which may lead to right or wrong, other birth or the higher world. This view became famous as the Cārvāka tradition. But parallel to this, right in the ancient day, there were thinkers who stated that there is another birth after death. Again, there are other higher and lower worlds in addition to this visible world of

ours. Such people were known as believers in rebirth and the higher worlds. Their belief was that if there is no *karma*, the relation between this and the other birth and this and the higher world will not fit in the context. It is therefore necessary to accept the *Karma* element along with rebirth. These *Karmavādins* designated themselves as *Paralokavādins* and theists.

Believers only in Dharma, Artha and Kāma

Karmavādins are divided into two groups. One stated that rebirth and higher world are no doubt the fruits of *karma*, but *karma* should be of the best order so that one may reap as reward the best birth and the best of the higher worlds. Promulgators of this view believed only in three *Puruṣārthas*—efforts—*Dharma, Artha and Kāma* because, to them, the best higher world was *Svarga* and the means to its acquirement was *Dharma*. In their eyes, Mokṣ—emancipation—had no independent place as a *Puruṣārtha*. Wherever we come across prescriptive *dharma*, the promulgators concede to the view that accepts three *Puruṣārthas*. To state in brief, in their view, *dharma* means noble actions and its fruit is *Svarga*, while the fruit of *Adharma* or unholy *karma* leads to hell etc Only *Dharma* and *Adharma* are *Pāpa* and *Puṇya* or *Adṛṣṭa*—the invisible. It is only through this that the cycle of birth and rebirth rotates. It is not possible to uproot it. What is possible is only this. Man must ever practise *Dharma* if he desires to attain to a noble higher world and greater happiness. According to this view, it is *Adharma* or sin that is contemptible and not *dharma* or *Puṇya*. This view supported the social order and organization. That is precisely the reason why they opine that noble conduct duly sanctioned leads to the rise of *dharma* while contemptible and low actions lead to *Adharma*. Consequently, the followers of this view supported all good social order and diverted all their attention to this. It is just this view that was later known as *Brāhmaṇamārga*—the path of the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Mīmāṃsaka* and ritualistic—*Karmakāṇḍi* view.

Those whose *Puruṣārtha* was Emancipation

The other *Karmavādi* held quite the reverse views. The view held that *Karma* is the cause of rebirth without doubt. One can

reap *Dharma* by actions approved by the noble and laid down by the Scriptures; these lead one to *Svarga*. But even this *Dharma* deserves to be cast off just like *Adharma*. They hold that there is a fourth independent *Puruṣārtha*, entitled *Mokṣa*, liberation. They firmly hold that this liberation is the only aim of life and all *karmas*—whether of the nature of *Puṇya* or *Pāpa*—are contemptible. It is not true to state that annihilation of *karma* is not possible; even that is possible through effort. Wherever *Nivartaka* *Dharma* is mentioned, we come across the same view. When abstention from *karma* is possible and desirable, according to their belief, they had to state that the cause of the birth of *Karma* was quite the reverse of what the first view laid down. The view laid down that the root cause of *Dharma* and *Adharma* was not in the social prescriptions and prohibitions, but in ignorance and attachment and jealousy. Man's conduct may be in tune with that which is approved by the noble and duly laid down by the Scriptures; it leads only to *Adharma* if it is born of ignorance as also attachment and jealousy. The distinctions between sin and merit exist only for those whose vision is gross and superfluous. In reality both *Puṇya* and *Pāpa* are born of ignorance as also attachment and jealousy; they constitute *Adharma* and are contemptible. This view of those who believed in a state of *Nivartaka dharma*—a state of actionlessness—was not social; it conduced to development of the individual.

When this view accepted annihilation of *Karma* and liberation as a *Puruṣārtha*, it had to ponder over the causes that led to annihilation of *Karma* and rise of liberation.

The causes that annihilate *Karma* were fixed by it as a result of this line of thought and this was precisely its *dharma* of actionlessness. Thus, the directions of *Pravartaka dharma* and *Nivartaka dharma* are diametrically opposed. The aim of one was establishment of the social order while that of the other was attainment of happiness par excellence. The latter therefore pertains only to *Ātmā*. Only the path of *Nivartaka Dharma* is known; in other words as the path of the *Śramaṇa*, the *Parivrātaka*, the *Tapasvi* and as the path of *Yoga*. The view fixed up that complete annihilation

of Karma lies in right knowledge that is opposed to ignorance and annihilation of attachment and jealousy, i.e., self-control because Karma persists due to ignorance and is also born of attachment and jealousy. The rest of the means--austerity, meditation, devotion etc.,--are accepted as the means of knowledge and control mentioned above.

Thoughts on the element of Karma and its knowers

Persons who believed in the Dharma of actionlessness, had to discuss and analyse the nature of emancipation as also its means; they had also considerably to ponder over the element of Karma. They fixed up the technical terms of Karma and its distinctions; variously analysed and classified the element of Karma from the point of view of cause and effect; they also discussed the capacity of Karma to bear fruit. They also pondered over the time-limit of different consequences and also considered the mutual relations of *Karmas*. This brought into a system a whole series of Scriptures of the persons who believed in *Nivartaka Dharma* with regard to Karma. Again, this continued to develop further with new questions that arose and the answers that were evolved in due course. Different isms in this *Nivartaka Dharma* held different views according to their own convenience. Exchange of thought continued amongst them as far as rejection of *Pravartaka dharmavāda* was concerned, and unanimity of views also continued in the matter. Even though the literature of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya-Yoga, Jaina and Bauddha philosophies available to us today, was mostly composed at a time when the mutual good-will of these views towards each other had considerably declined, still, we find very great similarity in their literature on *karma* with regard to technical terms, thought content, classification etc., both in words and their purport.

The promulgators of liberation faced one difficult question right from the beginning. It was this. Infinite are the *karmas* bound to the soul in previous births, and new actions continue to bind themselves round the soul every moment. If this be the case, how is total annihilation of all *Karmas* possible? They found out an answer to this very cleverly. To-day we come across brief and

detailed description of the answer to this question in the literature of philosophies that emphasise *Nivṛtti*, and it is more or less similar. This state of affairs proves that now and then the different schools of *Nivartaka Dharma* indulged in mutual exchange of thought. But a time came when these different schools did not remain close to one another. However, every school continued with its discussion with regard to Karma. In due course, there evolved, in the midst of these schools, a school that confined itself to thinking on Karma only; the school thought more deeply on Karma than on liberation itself. Mostly it studied and taught only this topic, as it happens with other thinkers also. This same group of thinkers on *Karmaśāstra* is known, in Jainism as *Karmaśāstra Anuvogadhara*—the upholder of the Yoga following karmaśāstra or the class of *karma-siddhāntavettā*—the knowers of the doctrine of Karma.

Thinking on Karma—How much Ancient and Similar

All schools propounding liberation as the only goal, are unanimous whether principally or in a subsidiary outlook, with regard to the causes of the bondage of Karma and its annihilation. We should, however, know the point of view of the abovementioned ponderers on *karma* with regard to the nature of Karma. The Vaiṣeṣika atomists, whose path is that of liberation, look upon Karma as found in life and so, a trait of life-force; while the followers of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga schools, whose philosophy is dominated by *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, looked upon it as lifeless and stationed in the inner consciousness. But the Jain thinkers looking upon *Ātmā* and atom as the resultant or consequential, looked upon *karma* as the result both of material and life-force and therefore of the nature of both. In their opinion, even though *Ātmā* is life-force, it is of the nature of compression and expansion like the inner consciousness born of *Prakṛti*. There is therefore a possibility of change of the nature of Karma in the *Ātmā* that can even identify itself with gross atoms. Karma being a trait of life-force according to the Vaiṣeṣika and others is not independent of life-force in reality, while according to the Sāṃkhya, Karma being a trait of the *Prakṛti*, is not actually independent of gross material. But

according to the belief of the Jaina thinkers Karma results both in life and material forms; they know this as *Bhava* and *drovya* Karma.

This whole thought-process with regard to Karma definitely belongs to that old time, when there existed the maximum exchange of thought amongst the thinkers on *Karma*. We cannot precisely judge how much ancient this time is. But there is considerable depth, mutual co-relation and an extraordinary depiction of the subtlest thoughts in it. If we take all this into consideration, we must concede that the typical lore of Karma of the Jain philosophy was firmly established in India before the days of Bhagavān Pārśvanātha. Those who knew this Śāstra, were known as Karma-śāstravettā--knowers of the science of Karma and its philosophy. The same became renowned as *Agrayaṇiya Pūrva* and *karmapramā-dapūrva*. Historically, *Pūrva* means the lores and Scriptures that have traditionally come down from the time before Bhagavān Mahāvīra. These 'Pūrva' were, undoubtedly renowned in one form or another from the times earlier than Bhagavān Pārśvanātha. On one side the Jain thinkers concentrated their attention on the thinking of Karma, while on the other, Sāṃkhya-Yoga concentrated greater attention on the path of meditation. In course of time, Tathāgata Buddha laid greater stress on meditation. However, all preserved their thinking on Karma that they had duly inherited. That is the reason why even though the Jain philosophy of Karma holds an unrivalled place from the point of view of subtlety and expanse, it is more or less similar to the thinking of Sāṃkhya-Yoga, Buddhist philosophy etc. Basically also the same stream of thought persists and it deserves to be studied by the students of *Karmaśāstra*.

Belief of Jain and other philosophies regarding Īśvara as the creator of the Universe.

Karmavāda is of the opinion that in the happiness and sorrow, prosperity and adversity, high and low etc. that we find in society, we have Karma as a cause along with the other causes known as time, nature, effort etc. But the Jain philosophy, dominated by

Karma, does not accept Īśvara as the cause of the orders mentioned above or the cause of the birth of the Universe, like the other philosophies. Other philosophies lay down that the Universe was born at sometime. Relation of Īśvara is associated with the birth of the Universe in some way or other in these philosophies. The Nyāya philosophy states that the fruit of good and bad deeds comes only through the inspiration of Īśvara.¹ In the Vaiśeṣika philosophy, Īśvara is assumed as the creator of the Universe and its form is described accordingly.² In the Yoga philosophy, Īśvara is assumed to be the presiding deity and through that assumed to spread the material universe that results from Prakṛti.³ Śankarācārya also takes Brahma to be the material cause of the Universe on the basis of the Upaniṣadic statements at several places in his Brahma-sūtra Bhāṣya.⁴

But the Jain philosophy looked upon Īśvara as the inspirer of Karma, so that the Jīva reaps the fruits. The reason laid down by Karmavāda is that just as the Jīva is independent in the performance of actions, it is also independent to enjoy the fruits thereof. In the same manner, the Jain philosophy does not look upon Īśvara as presiding deity of the Universe. This is because of its acceptance that the Universe has no beginning and no end, and is therefore, never born. Again, it requires no presidentship of Īśvara because it is itself of the nature of result.

Īśvara—why is He not the Creator of the Universe and the yielder of the fruits of Actions?

This world is never newly created, its existence is eternal. Changes continue in it, however. There are so many changes in which the need of the effort of human beings is felt to be necessary.

Even changes in which effort, not on anybody's part, is required, take place; these changes go on, as if in a natural course by the various combinations of the gross elements, i.e., by heat,

1. Gautamasūtra-4-1-1.

2. Praśastapādabhāṣya, p. 48.

3. Samādhipadāsūtra 24, Bhāṣya and Tīkā.

4. Bhāṣya on Brahma-sūtra 2.1-26; Brahma-sūtra 2-3-6.

speed, activity etc. To illustrate, when earth, stones etc. come together, small and big hills or mountains come into being; when streams from here and there come together, they form themselves into a flowing river, vapour rains in form of a river and again river-water changes into vapour. It is not therefore at all necessary to look upon Īṣvara as the creator of the universe.

An animal reaps the fruit in accordance with the *Karma*. *Karma* is something gross and no living being desires the fruit of its bad deeds. This is quite true. It should, however, be borne in mind that the contact of Jiva and life-force gives rise to such a power in *Karma* that it reveals, at a fixed time in the Jiva, the good and bad results of its *Karmas*. *Karmavāda* does not state that gross *Karma* is able to yield fruit in the absence of the contact with life-force. It states just this that for the bearing of fruit, it is not necessary to believe in the inspiration of life-force in form of Īṣvara. This is because all Jivas are endowed with life-force. Their intellect is in tune with their *Karma*, so much so that even in the absence of any desire for fruit of their *Karma*, they perform acts that yield fruit accordingly. Performance of *Karma* is one thing and not desiring its fruit is another. The fruit of *Karma* will not stop simply because one does not desire it. Once that the materials are collected, *Karma* proceeds on its own. To illustrate, if a man stands in hot sun or eats hot food stuffs, and then wishes that he should not feel thirsty, can his thirst stop anyway? Those who look upon Īṣvara as the creator, opine that being inspired by the desire of Īṣvara, *Karmas* reveal their respective fruits in the animals. Here, the *Karmavādis* state that in the Jiva, as per the measure of Ātmā, such psychic effects--*Samskāras*--arise at the time of the performance of *Karma*, whereby the Jiva is inspired to reap the fruit of its *Karma* on its own; the *Karma* on its own reveals its fruit on the Jiva.

Jiva and Īṣvara--Similarity and Dissimilarity

Both Īṣvara and Jiva constitute life-force. What is then the distinction between the two? Distinction, if any, could be this. All the powers of the Jiva are enveloped by obstructions, not so

of Īṣvara. But when the Jiva throws away all its obstructions, all its powers shine out to the full. What could then be the disparity between the Jiva and Īṣvara? Even when the cause of this disparity, which is the super imposed Karma, is removed, if disparity were to continue, what is the sense of liberation? The rule of disparity is limited only to the mundane existence, not beyond that. There is therefore no objection against the belief according to *Karmavada* that all liberated Jivas are Īṣvara. It would not be proper to state, only on the basis of faith that Īṣvara should be just one.

Jiva the cause of its own obstructions or obstacles.

When man becomes active in matters of works related to this and the other world, it is not possible that he has not to face any obstruction whatsoever. Man should cultivate this faith that the internal and basic cause of obstruction lies in his own self, whether or not he is conscious of it. The internal basis on which the poisonous tree of obstruction grows, must necessarily have its seed sown in the same land. Some other individual can possibly become instrumental in the growth of the tree like wind, water etc. that constitute external instruments. But man must have a steadfast intellectual faith that that individual is certainly not the seed of the obstruction. If this happens, man will vision the basic cause of obstruction in his own self and he will neither find fault with others nor will he be frightened himself.

Maxmuller's view regarding the doctrine of Karma

Dr. Maxmuller's views regarding the supremacy of the doctrine of Karma are worth knowing. He states--

"The whole world, such as it is, is the result of acts; the character and fate of each man are the result of his acts in this or in a former life, possibly also of the acts of others. This is with them the solution of what we venture to call the injustice of God.... A man who suffers and suffers, as we say unjustly, seems to them but paying off a debt or laying up capital for another life.... It cannot be by a Divine caprice that one man is born deaf or dumb or blind, another strong and healthy. It can be the result of former acts only, whether in this life, the doer of them is aware of them or not."

Karmaśāstra—A part of Spiritualism

Pondering over the problems pertaining to Ātmā is the purpose of the Scriptures on spiritualism. It is therefore necessary for them to expound the worldly day to day form of Ātmā before they narrate its absolute nature. One question arises. Why do these visible states of Ātmā not become its inherent nature? It is therefore necessary for the science of spiritualism, to justify the visible nature of Ātmā first and then only proceed further. The Scripture on *karma* has done the same. It states that all the visible states of Ātmā are born of *karma* and further lays down the separateness of Ātmā from these. From this point of view, *Karmaśāstra* is just a part of *Adhyātmaśāstra*.

When it is guessed that all the superfluous forms of Ātmā are *māyika* or illusory, a natural desire to know the real nature of Ātmā arises, *Karmaśāstra* states that Ātmā is precisely paramātmā and Jīva is Īśvara. The merging of Ātmā in Paramātmā means that the Ātmā should reveal its *Paramātmabhāva* enveloped by *karma* and attain to Paramātmahood. When it is stated that the Jīva is just a fractional part of Paramātmā, what is meant is that the digits of knowledge revealed by the Jīva, constitute only a small part of the moonlight in form of the perfect life-force that is enveloped. As soon as the covering of Karma is thrown away, the *Cetanā* reveals itself in its perfect form. This is what we know as the attainment of godliness or the state of being *Īśvara*.

When the external objects like wealth, body etc. are looked upon as Ātmā, i.e., experiencing I-ness in material objects, it is external vision. Illusion of this non-distinction constitutes the feeling that Ātmā is something external. The *Karmaśāstra* asks us to discard this by proving it. Those persons whose mental leanings experience only this externality of Ātmā may not like the preaching of *Karmaśāstra*, but this makes no difference whatsoever in its real state.

Karmaśāstra removes the illusion of the non-difference or identity between body and soul and reveals the sense of distinction between the two. Just with this, man's inner vision opens. Man

gets a view of his own state of being *Paramātmā* through this inner vision. Feeling of *Ātma* being *Paramātmā* and bringing it fully under the pale of self-experience would imply the Jīva becoming Śīva that is Brahman. The *Karmaśāstra* has accepted, though in a peculiarly different way, the work of revealing this *Brahmabhāva*. This is because it guides the Jīva to the knowledge of distinction from its illusion of non-distinction or identity between the Jīva and the material world, by taking it on a higher stage of the knowledge of identity between Jīva and Śīva. This is just its sphere of activity. Here we also come across a part of the principal motif of *Yogaśāstra*. It is therefore clear that the *karmaśāstra* is a mine of countless scientific and philosophical thoughts. This is precisely its importance. Many persons there are, who have no liking towards the calculation of the Kārmic Prakṛtis, the excess of their numbers and so on. But what is the fault of *Karmaśāstra* in this? Persons with material vision and that only do not get interested in the incomprehensible and interesting subjects like mathematics, physics etc. Here, what is the fault of these subjects? Fault lies with those who try to comprehend, their understanding. A student of any subject must necessarily go to the very bottom of a subject in order to get interested in it.

Meaning of the Word 'Karma' and its Synonyms

The word '*karma*' is used in two senses in the Jain Scriptures. The first is the result of the nature of attachment and jealousy; this is known as *kaṣāya* or *Bhāvakarma*. The other is typical *Pudgals* of the type of activity undertaken; these are attached to the soul on account of *kaṣāya* and are known as *Dravyakarma*.

For the meaning of the word 'Karma' in the Jain philosophy and for similar meanings, non-Jain philosophies use these words *Māyā*, *Avidyā*, *Prakṛti*, *Apūrva*, *Vāsanā*, *Āśaya*, *Dharmādharma*, *Adṛṣṭa*, *Sanskāra*, *Daiva*, *Bhāgya* etc.

The three words—*Māyā* (Illusion), *Avidyā* (nescience) and *Prakṛti* (primordial nature) are found in the Vedānta philosophy.

The word 'Apūrva' is used in Mīmāṃsā, the Buddhist philosophy and is also used in the Yoga philosophy. Other philosophies use the words 'Dharmādhārīna', 'Adṛṣṭa' and 'Samskāra', more particularly so in the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika philosophies. There are other words such as 'Daiva', 'Bhāgya', 'Puṇya-Pāpa' etc. which are more or less similar to all philosophies almost. Ātīnavādi philosophies, that believe in rebirth have no option but to accept the theory of *karma* in order to justify rebirth.

Nature of Karma

The activity undertaken by the Jīva under the inspiration of the causes such as falsehood (*Mithyātva*) and Kaṣāya is designated '*Karma*'. This definition of *Karma* applies both to the *Bhāvakarma* and *Dravyakarma* mentioned above. This is because *Bhāvakarma* is the change of state of Ātmā or Jīva. The Jīva and that only is therefore the material doer and *Dravyakarma* which is a change of the subtle *Pudgalas* of the *Kārmaṇajāti*, has just this same Jīva as the instrument. In the *Bhāvakarma*, *dravyakarma* is the incidental cause and in *Dravyakarma*, *Bhāvakarma* is incidental. The two are therefore mutually related as cause and effect like the seed and the sprout.

Test of Pāpa and Puṇya

It is the view of the common man that activities such as liberality, worship, service etc., lead to a bondage of good activities, i.e., *Puṇya*. Giving pain to others, acting opposite to ones desires etc., lead to a bondage of bad deeds, i.e., *Pāpa*. But this is not necessarily the basic test of determining *Puṇya* and *Pāpa*. When a benevolent doctor operates upon someone, no doubt the patient suffers pain. When again, genuine and well-wishing parents try to educate their innocent ward against his wishes, the child seems to experience sorrow. But we cannot, just with this, label the doctor as undertaking improper activity or find fault with good parents. Take the opposite example of a man resorting to liberality, worship etc. with the intention say to deceive others. Such a man creates for himself the bond of sin instead of *Puṇya*. The real test therefore

of the bondage of *Punya* or of *Pāpa* is not merely the deeds; real test lies in the intention of the performer. This test of *Pāpa* and *Punya* is commonly acceptable to all. This is because the principle acceptable to all is—"Attainment is in tune with the spirit in which activities are undertaken."

Genuine Undefilement—when is Karma not a bondage ?

Common men assume that non-performance of certain acts means not being enveloped by *Punya* and *Pāpa*. They therefore discard such acts. Yet mostly the relevant mental activity does not leave their mind. They are therefore not free even though they keenly desire to remain untouched by *Punya* and *Pāpa*.

We should therefore consider this. What is real undefilement? Mental agitation or *Kaṣāya* is defilement, a bondage. In the absence of *Kaṣāya* no activity can bind the soul. If however, the force of the *Kaṣāya* exists within the mind, no individual can save himself from bondage in spite of countless efforts. One who is free from *Kaṣāyas* and is free from attachments, remains undefiled and untouched by *Punya* and *Pāpa*, like a lotus in the midst of water. For an *Ātmā* full with *Kaṣāyas* on the other hand, cannot create even an iota of purity by all show of Yoga. That is precisely the reason why it is stated that when actions are performed in a state of detachment, they are not binding. Genuine undefilement thus lies only in renouncing mental agitation. We get just the same preaching in *Karmaśāstra*. Elsewhere also it is stated that -

"It is only the mind that causes bondage or liberation in case of human beings. One attached to worldly joys is bound, while a man free from these is liberated."

—Maitrī Upaniṣad

Beginninglessness of Karma

A man habituated to thinking has this question in his mind. Has Karma a beginning or not? To this Jaina philosophy gives this reply. With reference to every *Karma* of an individual, it has a beginning, but from the point of view of continuity, it is without a beginning. However, nobody can state as to at what time this

continuity of Karma commenced. In the face of the future, the depth of the past is endless. And the endless cannot be described by any word except beginningless and endless. There is therefore no option to designating this flow and continuity of Karma to calling it beginningless. All the prominent Indian philosophies concede that the flow of Karma is beginningless and also that the liberated Jivas do not return to this mundane existence in the world.

Cause of bondage of Karma

In Jain philosophy, *Mithyātva* (a sense of falsehood), *Avirati* (non-detachment), *Kaṣāya* and *Yoga* are stated to be the four causes of bondage of Karma. These four are compressed into the last two causes, i.e., *Kaṣāya* and *Yoga*. In brief it can be stated that only *Kaṣāya* is the cause of bondage of Karma. In fact, *Kaṣāya* is of several types, but philosopher-scholars have classified these in brief and have given just two types of it as attachment and jealousy. Ignorance, false vision etc. are known as the causes of Karma only in view of their relation to attachment and jealousy. With enhancement in attachment and jealousy, take it as a fact that knowledge starts changing in the opposite form. Jain philosophy has therefore no difference of opinion with other theist philosophies with regard to the causes of the bondage of Karma, even though the words used differ. In the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika philosophies, illusory or false knowledge is said to be the cause of Karma; while it is knowledge of identity between Puruṣa and Prakṛti in the Yoga philosophy, nescience in the Vedānta and *Mithyātva* in the Jain philosophy. However, let it always be borne in mind that whatever be adjudged as the cause of Karma, the state of bondage in it will be only due to the relation with attachment and jealousy. State of ignorance or *Mithyātva* starts diminishing with reduction in or absence of attachment and jealousy, or it comes to an end. In the Śāntiparva of the Mūlābhāṣita, we have the words—“living beings are bound by Karma” in which the word ‘Karma’ means only attachment and jealousy.

Ways of freedom from Karma

Three are the means shown by the Jain Scriptures for the

attainment of emancipation, the highest goal of life. These are : (i) right vision, (ii) right knowledge and (iii) right conduct. At places, only knowledge and activity are stated to be the means of emancipation. At such places philosophical vision of the form of knowledge is not taken to be separate. But the question is this. If, in the Vedic philosophies, four means—Karma, Jñāna, Yoga and Bhakti are laid down for liberation, why does the Jain philosophy take only three or two to be the means ? This is explained by the fact that in Jain philosophy, when right conduct is stated to be right activity, both the paths of Karma and Yoga are included in it; in right conduct control of the mind, victory over the senses, purity of consciousness, spirit of equanimity and the means for these are included. Control of the mind, victory over the senses, etc., are *Sāttvika Yajña* that constitutes the path of Karma and only purity of consciousness and the good activities undertaken for this constitutes the path of Yoga. In this way, a mixture of the path of Karma and the path of Yoga is precisely right conduct. Right vision constitutes the path of devotion because the element of faith dominates in it. Even right vision is of the nature of faith. Right knowledge constitutes the path of knowledge. In this way, the three means of liberation in the Jain philosophy constitute a combination of all the means in other philosophies.

Independent Existence of Ātmā and Rebirth

The relevance of all that is stated above about Karma is possible only when we take Ātmā to be an element other than gross and material. One of the proofs of laying down the independent existence of Ātmā is rebirth. Again, so many problems will defy solution if we do not believe in the existence of Ātmā after the present body is no more.

There are so many men who lead a very honest life and yet remain poor. There are also persons who get agitated and enraged by the very talk of justice, morality and religion and still they are happy in all respects. We also come across persons who commit blemishes and the fruits of their faults fall on others. One person is the murderer and often another is hanged; one commits

theft and another is held for the offence. All this should lead us to consider one thing. Will the Karma, good or bad, go fruitless in case of persons who do not reap their reward in this birth? When we take all these matters into due consideration, we have to accept that life-force is an independent element and it must necessarily reap the fruit of all good and bad Karma that it performs knowingly or unknowingly. It must therefore rotate in the cycle of rebirth. Even Lord Buddha believes in rebirth. Nitsche, a staunch atheist from Germany, accepts rebirth that brought about the cycle of Karma. Acceptance of rebirth in this manner, is a strong proof to believe in the independent existence of Ātmā.

Peculiar thinking of Jain Philosophy about Karma

Three are the states attributed to all Karmas in Jain philosophy. They are of the nature of binding, existence and rising and known as *Bandha*, *Sattā* and *Udaya*. These very states are described even in the non-Jain philosophies. The three Karmas, in due order, are also known as *Kriyamāṇa*, *Sancita* and *Prārabdha*. But this Karma, which has the tendency to envelop knowledge, is classified into eight basic types and 148 sub-types. No other philosophy has been able to explain the different states of worldly Ātmā, proved through experience as the Jain philosophy has done. In the philosophy of Patanjali, 'Jāti', 'Āyu' and 'Bhoga' are the three fruitions of Karma, but the thinking on Karma here sounds simply preliminary before the thinking found with the Jain philosophy.

What is the type of bondage of Karma with Ātmā? What are its causes? What causes lead to the prowess of its type in Karma? What is the maximum and the minimum time-span for which Karma remains attached to Ātmā? Is change possible in the fixed period of time of the result—*Vipāka*? When is one Karma converted to another? How is the active or low prowess during the period of bondage changed? Is it possible and if so, how to experience Karma that yields the fruit in form of *Vipāka*? Howsoever powerful Karma might be, how can that *Vipāka* be obstructed by the pure resultants of Ātmā? How does it happen that sometimes the Ātmā is forced to taste its *Vipāka* in spite of all efforts?

How is Ātmā the performer and enjoyer of Karma? The result of the nature of *Samkleśa*—affliction—envelopes the Ātmā, by its magnetic power, with a sort of subtle *Rajas*—covering. How does this happen? How does the Ātmā, throw away this covering, by revelation of its potent power? How does the Ātmā seem tardy as if, through the influence of Karma? Why does the Ātmā not swerve from its pure form in spite of the presence of thousands of coverings? How does it shake off its severe Karmas bound to itself at the time of its evolution? What sort of duel takes place between the Ātmā and the obstructing Karmas when it is anxious to view and experience its state of being Paramātmā? How does the Ātmā make its path of progress free from obstacles and with what results in the end? What is the nature of *Apūrvakarāṇa* and *Anivṛttikarāṇa* which are the aiding results in the realization of *Paramātmā* residing in the temple of Ātmā? How does the Jīva turn to pieces, mountains by the electric machine in form of its pure results of Karma? How does it happen that the suppressed Karmas at times, throw the Ātmā down on the earth, by rising up? Which are the Karmas that are mutually opposed from the point of view of *Bandha* and *Udaya*? Which are the Karmas, the results of which are fixed or fluid under this or that state? By which magnetic power does the *Karmaraja* that is above the senses, continue to attract the *Pudgalas*, though associated with the Ātmā? How does it continue to frame the gross body, the mind, the subtle body etc.? These and other similar questions are answered and explained by no philosophy other than the Jain by its thoroughly rational, detailed and clear clarifications. This is precisely the trait of Jainism with regard to Karma.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pp. 205–276, 223–229, 235–238]

Chapter 13

THEORY OF NON-ABSOLUTISM

Non-absolutism is the very basic doctrine of Jainism; it is accepted equally in both the spheres of philosophy and religion. In the modern days the words 'Anekānta' and 'Syādvāda' are generally used in the same sense. Not only Jains, even discriminative non-Jains know the Jain philosophy and the Jain sect as non-absolutist philosophy or as non-absolutist sect. For Jains this belief in non-absolutism has a place of pride in their faith and they have claimed that the doctrine is great, liberal and excellent. Let us now see what this non-absolutism is.

General Explanation

Non-absolutism is a method of thinking and analysis. It is a mental eye that is open from all directions and all sides. It refuses outright to view, from a broken or an incomplete angle, any subject of knowledge, thinking and conduct. It tends to be partial to all thinking and behaviour from all different angles of vision possible. This partiality is based on truth and that only. The life of this non-absolutism means the flow of truth and reality on all its sides. Non-absolutism is not just an imagination; it is a doctrine proved by truth, it is philosophy and a subject of discriminative conduct. The life-force of non-absolutism lies in this that it asks us to think with an open mind on its own self, just as it inspires us to think over and adopt other topics. The power and life of non-absolutism lies in openmindedness, clarity and impartiality of thought.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, p. 873]

Any individual philosophy or a religious cult is always endowed with a special vision of its original promulgator. To illustrate, in the philosophy of Śri Śankara, the vision of non-dualism and

the *Madhyama-pratipadā* vision of Buddha are special visions. Jain philosophy is typical amongst Indian philosophies; it is a special cult at the same time. A special vision therefore of its promulgators and principal saints must lie at its root. This vision is non-absolutism. Jain philosophy, conduct, everything is planned and laid down on the basis of non-absolutism. We can even state that non-absolutism is the only test of ascertaining and evaluating Jain thought and conduct from countless thoughts and modes of behaviour.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, p. 149.]

Vision of non-absolutism in other Philosophies

We all know that Buddha knows himself as *Vibhajyavādī*. Even Mahāvīra is known by the same word in the Jain Āgamas. The word means laying down of truth and untruth after proper analysis and the proper co-ordination of truths arrived at. Non-absolutism is the other nomenclature of Vibhajyavāda because partial or one-sided points of view stand rejected by it. *Madhyama-mārga*—the middle path—is more ingrained in place of *Vibhajyavāda* in the Buddhist tradition. Different points of view of different thinkers stand under consideration in non-absolutism even though extremes are rejected by it. That is the reason why we see that even in philosophies like Nyāya, Sāṃkhya-Yoga and Mīmāṃsā we find narration with the use of the word 'Anekānta'. The famous commentator Vātsyāyana on the Nyāyasūtra of Akṣapāda 2.1.15-16 narrates statements that clearly indicate non-extremism. He has reflected *Vibhajyavāda* in his statement—यथादर्शनं विभागवचनं. If we examine carefully the whole process of philosophical thinking in Sāṃkhya philosophy, it will be found that it is narrated from the point of view of non-absolutism. If one reads carefully the commentary on the sūtra 3.13 of the Yoga philosophy and the analysis Tattvavaiśārādī, one will thoroughly grasp the Anekānta vision of Sāṃkhya-Yoga philosophy. Kumārila too has made use of the view of non-absolutism in his philosophical system in his Ślokavārtika and elsewhere. Several isms like Kevalādvaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaitādvaita, Śuddhādvaita etc. take the help of the Upaniṣads only, but

in reality these are different types of the thought-processes of non-absolutism. Even if we draw our attention to different modes of conduct of human groups, while setting aside philosophical thinking, we will view the vision of non-absolutism in these also. Actually, the very nature of life is such that it fails to express itself fully in partial vision. The way of human life fails to sustain itself without resorting to the vision of non-absolutism finally.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 500-501]

Truth—the basis of Non-absolutism

Now, since the very basis of the Jain thought and conduct is in the Anekānta vision, we should, first of all see the elements which have raised it. A careful pondering and study of relevant literature shows that it is based on truth. All great men love truth and that only and pass their lives in search after and narration of truth. Yet their method and search after truth is not uniform. The method of revelation of truth of Buddha and the style of Śankarācārya basing his thinking on the Upaniṣads are different from the style of Mahāvira in the revelation of truth. Non-absolutism is just another name of the style of revelation of truth of Bhagavān Mahāvira. Truth is that which is perfect and is experienced in its realistic form. Realistic vision of anything in its all-time perfect form is difficult. Again, if this difficult task is acquired, it will be very difficult even for a viewer of truth and a truthful man to describe it as it is, in words. We might come across persons who undertake this very difficult task. Yet, even in their descriptions some contradiction or another, some difference or another, in view of difference of place, time, condition, language, style etc. is unavoidable. This applies to those rare visioners of perfection and truthful people, in whom we can keep faith and belief by mere imagination or analogy. Our experience is limited only upto common people, and it substantiates for us the fact that in the common people even though most are realistic, their vision is only partial and limited. Thus, even though truthful people might be realistic, now and again, their understanding and generalizations differ in view of imperfect vision and the imperfect means

of expression; difference in culture creates greater mutual conflict. Material of difference and contradiction reveals itself on its own through all truthful people whose vision is perfect or imperfect. Very often other people create such material on their behalf.

View of non-absolutism discovered by Bhagavān Mahāvīra and its conditions

Looking to this state of affairs, Bhagavān Mahāvīra thought of the possibility of finding a way by which there will be no injustice to the persons who view truth in perfect or imperfect form. What is the way of doing justice in case of both – of persons whose vision might be imperfect as also opposed to ours and still true, and ones own vision might be imperfect as also opposed to that of others and still true? This austerity, dominated by meditation brought to the mind of Bhagavān Mahāvīra, the vision of non-absolutism and his determination to find out truth succeeded. With the help of this key of vision of non-absolutism, he opened the lock of this-worldly and other-worldly problems individual and community life and obtained a conviction. As he did this, and shaped thought and conduct useful in life, he revealed the vision of non-absolutism and enlightened us about it under these conditions. He set an example by following these in his own life and preached these conditions. They are as follows :

- (i) One should not submit himself to the psychic effects born of attachment and jealousy. This would mean the adoption of the lustrous feeling of being non-attached.
- (ii) Let one keep ones self attentive on desire to know truth and that only till this impartiality is not fully developed.
- (iii) Let one not be frightened by any apparent opponent and respectfully ponder over the opponent like ones own self and become a strict critic of ones own view as of that of the opponent.
- (iv) One should practise liberality to bring about a discriminative co-ordination of all the elements that one finds to be true from ones own experiences or those of others. It is necessary also to discard ones false pride, correct himself and progress on those lines when one finds that he was mistaken on a certain point.

Repudiation of the vision of non-absolutism and its wide Influence

There were, however, some scholars who accepted this vision as an ism of the sect rather than as a philosophic truth. Criticism rained on it from all sides. The composers of sūtras like Bādarāyaṇa composed sūtras for its rejection; they composed relevant sūtras on the topic. Very great, influential Buddhist scholars like Vasubandhu, Dinnāga, Dharmakīrti took non-absolutism to severe task. Jain scholars also counteracted. This severe conflict led to an unavoidable result. On one side non-absolutism developed rationally and it influenced deeply the scholars of opposing sects. In south India there were great Digambara Ācāryas who entered into duels with great Mimāṃsaka and Vedāntic scholars. This actually led to wider influence of the doctrine of non-absolutism. A scholar like Rāmānuja, a staunch opponent of Jain philosophy wanted to oppose Śankarācārya and to lay down his own spiritual doctrines. For this, though he took the general support of the Upaniṣads, he made use of the theory of non-absolutism when he promulgated his own doctrine of qualified monism—*Viśiṣṭādvaita*. In other words, we can state that he brought to fruition the theory of non-absolutism in the construction of his doctrine of qualified monism. He decorated it in the garb of Upaniṣadic elements and evolved qualified monism from the theory of non-absolutism. He could thus bring to steadiness common men, who were attracted towards non-absolutism. Vallabhācārya, who established the *Puṣṭimārga*, had made use of all philosophical doctrines of the Upaniṣads for the evolution of his doctrine of pure monism. But actually, all his thinking is a new Vedantic form given to the theory of non-absolutism. The duels that took place between the great punḍits of Śvetāmbara cult and other scholars in northern and western India, resulted in vast spread of non-absolutism in the country. The net result of all this was that those who were critical of non-absolutism from the sectarian angle of vision also started adopting it knowingly or unknowingly. Thus, though as an ism the theory is considered to be that of the Jainas, its influence in genuine or perverted form is to be found in all parts of India. This can be evidenced in literatures of all parts of the country.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 151-152, 155-156]

Chapter 14

NAYAVĀDA

Doctrine of different Viewpoints

In the technical terminologies of Jain philosophy, the term *Nayavāda* holds an important place. *Naya* is the name of the vision of one side of absolute truth. The Jain scriptures speak of seven such *Nayas* right from the oldest days. The name of the first is 'Naigama'

Origin of the word 'Naigama' and its meaning

Evidently, the word 'Naigama' comes from 'Nigama'. Coins show that such *Nigamas* were in existence in Vaiṣali. A particular cadre running a similar type of administration is designated as 'Nigama.' There is a particular type of unison in it, and all material dealings run as if they are one. With the same purport in view, the Jain tradition evolved the word *Naigama* and thereby suggested a perspective that is purely material in society and worldly dealings run only in it.

Other six Nayas, their basis and Explanation

After *Naigama*, six other partial thought-processes are laid down. They are *Samgraha*, *Vyavahāra*, *Ṛjūsūtra*, *Śabda*, *Samabhirūḍha* and *Evambhūta*. Though all these six are related to philosophy, they are actually brought to their fruition and evolution on the basis of the then state and social organization and administration. Not only that, even the words 'Samgraha', 'Vyavahāra', etc., mentioned above, are taken from the use of language prevalent then. Several *Gaṇas*-groups together administer political and social organization. This was a group or *Samgraha* and it was dominated by the vision of non-difference in difference. Same is the sense in the meaning of the philosophical *Samgraha-naya*. *Vyavahāra* may be political or social, but it comes into being only through different

individuals or groups. Difference or division is the dominant meaning even in what we know as philosophical *Vyavahāra*. We are able to know from the coins discovered in Vaiṣāli that like 'Vyāvaharika' and 'Vinīścaya Mahāmātyo', even 'Sūtradhāra' was a status. As far as I understand, the work of the Sūtradhāra must have been the same as proposed to be expressed through the Jain *Rjusūtra Naya*. The word means thinking only of the present without going into the complications of past and future. It is very much likely that the sūtradhāra was doing just the same work as resolving the problems just as they arose. 'Śabda' or order is to be given central importance on certain special occasions in the society, cult or government. When matters are not resolved otherwise, orders of one particular individual are final authority. This sense of 'Śabda' being the principal is found in another form in the 'Śabda' Naya. Lord Buddha has himself stated that the Licchavi Gaṇas were used to respect old customs and conventions. No society can live by uprooting entirely all known conventions. Philosophically, the spirit of following convention is included in the *Naya* known as 'Samabhirūḍha.' Whatever be or not be the gross thought-process or organization of the society, state, religion and worldly dealings, it cannot survive or progressively evolve if the vision of the absolute being is not present in it. This vision is present and suggested by the 'Evambhūta Naya', and it is present in the word 'tathā' of Lord Buddha—Tathāgata—and the word 'tathata' of the Mahāyāna. The word 'tathati' is present, in the Jain tradition, right from those days. It suggests the due acceptance of something like truth on their part.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 1, pp. 58-60]

Expectations and Anekānta

A house cannot be constructed just in a corner; its various corners also do not exist just in one direction. When we observe the house from the angles of the four quarters, surely our observation is not perfect. It is, at the same time, not unrealistic. Perfect observation of the house is the sum-total of its observation on our part from all different angles possible. Every observation from

each angle is an unavoidable part of the full observation. In the same way, philosophical thinking of or observation on any one thing or the whole universe can be undertaken with several expectations. Expectation arises, just from the natural structure of the mind, the psychic effects befalling it, and the form of the object to be pondered over. Many are such expectations and one resorts to these to ponder over the object in view. They support our thinking, they also support the rise of the thought—process. These expectations are therefore known as angle of vision or point of view. All possible expectations, even though apparently opposed, lead to the pondering over or philosophising of the sum-total and this is precisely the total or *Anekānta* visioning of the subject on hand. Every philosophic vision that arises from these expectations, is each a part or limb of absolute knowledge. These are mutually contradictory, but yet not so because all are combined in absolute knowledge.

Sphere of Activity of Seven Nayas

Visioning of full or just one universe is possible, for a mental inclination is prepared to forget all the differences without leaning towards them and with just one consideration of completeness, be they caused by *Guṇas*, religion, form of individuality. '*Samgraha Naya*' is just one full visioning and experience of one absolute meaning that originates from the word 'Sat' born of the background of non-difference. The mental leaning that inclines towards the differences brought about by *Guṇas* or individuality and views the universe, is known as '*Vyavahāra Naya*.' This is because differences find special scope as a background of the worldly dealings accepted by the societies and individuals. The limits of the word 'Sat' do not remain intact by this visioning; they get divided into parts. That same differentiating mental leaning or expectation inclines towards the differences made by time, is efficient and views only the present as 'Sat' and removes the past and future from the definition of the word 'Sat'. When this happens, the resultant universal vision is known as '*Rjusūtra Naya*'. This is because it has discarded the revolving of the circles of the past and future and it moves on the straight line only of the present.

The threefold mental leaning narrated above shows that it ponders over an object without resorting to the word or its typical traits. But there are other inclinations that think of the meaning of a word only on the reliance on the virtues and traits of the word. That is precisely the reason why pondering over the meaning that results from such mental leaning is known as '*Śabdānaya*'. Only the grammarians, the master scientists of word are authorised in '*Śabdānaya*'. This is because *Śabdānaya* gets variegated due to their different points of view.

Those grammarians, who look upon words as complete in themselves and therefore non-evolved, do not accept difference in meaning due to difference in etymology. They still accept the variety in meanings on the basis of different traits of word such as gender, person, time etc. This visioning of the difference in meanings on their part in this manner, is '*Śabda Naya*' or '*Sāmprata Naya*'. Again, the grammarians, who consider the meanings with a mental inclination that looks upon every word as established by etymology and that only, look upon even the synonymous words and their meanings as different in view of difference in etymology. The difference in meanings of the synonymous words such as '*Śakra*', '*Indra*' that they have viewed is known as '*Samabhirūḍha Naya*'. The outlook that accepts difference in meaning because of presence or absence of the difference in meaning that results from, not only difference in etymology, but the same etymology, is known as '*Evambhūta Naya*'. There is one seventh Naya, *Naigama* by name, in addition to these six logical Nayas. All differentiating and non-differentiating types of thoughts according to Nigama, i.e., conventions of the country, are included here. However, thoughts of various kinds, proceeding with some part or another or one or the other point of view, are just Nayas that suggest those different expectations.

Dravyārthika and Paryāyārthika Naya

Two Nayas, *Dravyārthika* and *Paryāyārthika*, are renowned in the Scriptures. They are not different from the seven Nayas mentioned above; they are just a brief classification or a basis of

these. *Dravya*-substance meaning *Sāmānya*-common characteristic, *Anvaya*-logical connection of cause and effect, non-difference and unity are those, the thought with reference to which is *Naya* pertaining to substance. *Naigama*, *Samgraha* and *Vyavahāra* also pertain to the substance. Of these, *Samgraha* thinks and considers over pure non-difference and is therefore pure or original *Dravyārthika*-that which pertains to the substance. *Vyavahāra* and *Naigama* have their activities inclined towards difference and still the two proceed while depending on one or the other type of non-difference. These too are therefore taken to be *Nayas* pertaining to the substance. They are of course not pure like the *Samgraha*; but are impure or mixed *Dravyārthikas*.

Paryāya-modification or change—means the thought-process that is activated with reference only to *Viśeṣa*—Particularity, *Vyāvṛtti*—exclusion or difference. The rest of the *Nayas*, *R̥jusūtra* etc., are considered to be only *Paryāyārthika*. Thinking on difference after discarding non-difference starts only with *R̥jusūtranaya*. It is therefore known as the fundamental nature-*Prakṛti* or basis of *Paryāyārthika Naya*. The last three *Nayas* are just an extension of the fundamental *Paryāyārthika*.

The thought-process which is activated by taking only knowledge as useful, is known as *Jñānanaya*; that which is activated by only activity is *Kriyānaya*. The basic pillars in form of *Naya* are limitless with reference to perfect world-vision. This vision is therefore non-absolute but yet limitless.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 170-172]

Adoption of *Niścayanaya* and *Vyavahāranaya* in other philosophies.

Niścayanaya and *Vyavahāranaya* are renowned in the Jain tradition. Scholars know and accept that the basic viewpoint of this *Naya* is accepted by other philosophies also. Right from very old days, the Buddhist philosophy has been accepting and laying down the two viewpoints of *Paramārtha*—highest truth and *Samvṛtti*—empirical truth. The *Paramārthika* and worldly or *māyika* viewpoint of Śāṅkara Vedānta is renowned. In this manner, the two—*Paramārtha* or *Niścaya* and *Samvṛtti* or *Vyavahāra* are accepted both in

Jain and non-jain philosophies. Yet, the philosophical narration in these two viewpoints is quite different. Although the philosophical narration in all non-jain philosophies is not the same with regard to the viewpoint of *Niścaya Naya* in all philosophies that have liberation, *acāra* and *caritra* are just the same more or less, though their terminology, classification etc. might differ. Here, we have just to see and note that the two viewpoints accepted as *Niścaya* and *Vyavahāra*, are applied to both the spheres. Like all other Indian philosophies, Jain philosophy also includes in itself both knowledge of Reality—*tattvajñāna* and conduct—*acāra*.

Its difference in Knowledge and conduct

When the *Niścayanaya* and *Vyavahāranaya* are experimented upon both in knowledge of Reality and conduct, in a general way, one who ponders over the Scriptures fails to understand and grasp one difference. It is that the use of *Niścaya* and *Vyavahāra* in philosophy is fundamentally different from their use in the sphere of ethics or conduct, and as a result, differing results are suggested. Same should be our understanding with regard to the viewpoint on *Vyavahāra*. This can be clarified as follows.

Niścaya pertaining to Reality and the Vyavahāra viewpoint

When the nature of Reality is to be promulgated from the point of view of *Niścaya*, only one matter comes under its purview. What are the basic elements at the root of the universe? What is their number? What is their nature irrespective of place and time? Now, when the nature of Reality is to be promulgated from the point of view of *Vyavahāra*, the nature of the basic elements is laid down from the point of view of matter, time, place etc. If we make use of the *Niścaya* viewpoint and desire to lay down the nature of the elements as approved by the Jain philosophy, we can state in brief that *Cetana* and *Aretana* are the two elements that are diametrically opposed to each other. Both are endowed with the power to influence each other. The expansion of *Cetana* – life-force exists from the point of view of matter, place, time etc.

EJ 12

It can therefore be proved from the point of view of *Vyavahāra*. The *acetana Pudgala* being of the nature of an atom and indulgent in one place, is a topic of the point of view of *Niścaya*. But its result as a *Skandha* or physical aggregate, its giving scope to endless other atoms and *Skandhas* within its own sphere, is the laying down of the *Vyavahāra* point of view.

Niścaya from the Ācāra point of view and the Vyavahāra viewpoint

However, *Niścaya* based on conduct and the point of view of *Vyavahāra* are laid down in a different manner. Jain philosophy takes emancipation to be the final goal and arranges the concept of conduct accordingly. *Niścaya Ācāra* is therefore that which is associated with the conduct directly related to emancipation. Uprooting of false vision in conduct and sensual inclinations is included in this. But the worldly conduct is not that uniform. Sometimes, mutually contradictory modes of conduct seem to come under the category of worldly conduct if they spring from differing places, time, class, nature, liking etc., even if they spring from the background of the conduct of *Niścaya* point of view. The same individual, who has based himself on the background of the conduct of *Niścaya* viewpoint, passes through different types of worldly modes of conduct. We can thus see that the *Niścaya* point of view and the worldly point of view of conduct think principally from the point of view of emancipation. The *Niścaya* laying down philosophical reality and the worldly point of view get activated only with reference to the form of the world as it is.

Another Important difference in the matter

There is yet another important difference between the two *Nayas* and it is worth paying attention to. We, the common men in the world can never visualise the nature and form of the elements that are approved by the *Niścaya* point of view. We have to keep faith in the words of persons who have realized philosophical Reality and believe in these. Any alert and awakened *Sādhaka* can grasp the reality of and the high and low of his good and bad or true and false internal inclinations and their

acuteness or looseness more directly; while the inclinations of the former individual are in all respects, indirect for the latter. The form of knowledge of reality or philosophy is the same and uniform for all followers of that particular faith, be it in the realm of *Niścaya vision* or the *Vyavahāra vision*. Even its terminology is the same. The nature of the conduct of the two is, however, not uniform. For each individual, the conduct of *Niścaya vision* is direct and clear for him. It is our purpose, in this small discussion, to suggest that even if the words *Niścayanaya* and *Vyavahāranaya* may be similar, their application differs and glaringly too. In the realms of philosophy and conduct the two, consequently, lead us to different results.

Difference of philosophical vision of Niścaya in Jainism and the Upaniṣads

The background of Jain philosophy from the point of view of *Niścaya vision* is totally different from that in the philosophy of the Upaniṣads. All the Upaniṣads lay down the origin of the universe with the help of different terms such as *Sat*, *Asat*, *Ātmā*, *Brahma*, *Avyakta*, *Ākāśa* etc. They all yet arrive at the same uniform conclusion that even if the universe has varied forms in form of *Jada*, *Cetana* etc., the original element at the root of the universe is just the same. The Jain philosophy, however does not accept the existence of the one uniform element at the root of the universe; it accepts the existence of two mutually opposed independent elements and explains the variedness of the universe accordingly. There is no Indian philosophy except the *Sāṃkhya* with its 24 elements of *Prakṛti* and the *Vedānta* branches like that of Śāṅkara, that hunts after just one and only one element at the root of the universe. *Nyāya-vaiśeṣika* and the *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* with 25 elements accept more than one element at the root of the universe. It is therefore crystal-clear that the nature of philosophical thinking in Jainism totally differs from that in the Upaniṣads.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 498-500]



Chapter 15

SAPTABHANGI—Sevenfold Judgment

Saptabhangi and its basis

Bhangavāda comes into being only on the basis of the resultant different vision of the same thing with different expectations, points of view and mental inclinations. When the topics of two philosophies are diametrically opposed, there is an attempt to bring about a sort of co-ordination between the two. In this attempt positive and also negative parts of the thinking of both are brought together and sentences in series are formed. This is *Saptabhangi*. *Nayavāda* is the basis of *Saptabhangi*. Its aim is co-ordination that will give a very wide vision of the state of infinity. Just as a logical syllogism is constructed for the knowledge to be imparted on others regarding an object cognised by modes of proof, similarly this *Bhanga-vākya* is formulated by co-ordination of the mutually opposed parts with the specific purpose of enlightening the hearer. Thus, *Nayavāda* and *Bhangavāda* automatically yield reward in the realm of *Anekānta* vision.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, p. 172]

The Seven Bhangas and their origin

- (1) *Bhanga* means the construction of a sentence that exposes the all-sided form of the object.
- (2) These *Bhangas* are seven, though basically three—may be it is; may be it is not; may be it is indescribable. The rest of the four are—may be it is and it is not; may be it is and indescribable; may be it is not and indescribable; may be it is, it is not and it is indescribable. The latter four spring from the different co-ordinations of the former three.
- (3) We find difference in the beliefs of different thinkers with regard to the same object or the same religion. We have to

decipher whether the difference is of the nature of mutual contradiction. If it is not so, we have to examine as to how there is absence of contradiction in the apparent contradiction. To state in other words, the origin of this *Saptabhangi* lies in this. When, in case of a matter under description, differences in view are visible in matters of dharma, the differences should be co-ordinated with proper modes of proof and due justice should be given to these views by arranging the genuine views in proper order.

The Function of Saptabhangi—repudiation of contradictions

Let us take one example. There is difference of opinion with regard to the eternality of the substance that is Ātman. Some take it to be eternal, others refuse to look upon it as such. Again others state that it is a substance far beyond the pale of words. In this way, three views are known with regard to Ātman. We have therefore to think on these lines. Is it only eternal and its non-eternality is devoid of proof? Is it, again, only non-eternal and its eternality is bereft of proof? Or, instead of knowing it as eternal or non-eternal, will it be proper to designate it as just indescribable? As we examine these three optional views, we must remove their mutual contradictions if all the three are correct. We cannot claim the unity of mutual contradictions in one till opposition persists. The *Saptabhangi* therefore diverts its attention first and foremost to the repudiation of opposition. It settles that Ātmā is eternal but not in absolute perspective. It is eternal from the point of view of fundamental reality. This is because it would not be correct to state that this fundamental Reality was not ever-existent and was born later. It is therefore eternal as beginningless and that is precisely its eternity. Again, it is non-eternal too, but its state of being non-eternal is not from the point of view of fundamental Reality, but from the point of view of its states. States continue to change every time following circumstances. It is not possible even to imagine of an element that has no transformation whatsoever, in which the difference in states does not persist in continuum. That is the reason why we have to believe in

and accept difference in states and that is precisely its non-eternality. Thus, in a general sense Ātmā is eternal, but non-eternal in its particular sense. Contradiction creeps in when we state that eternality and non-eternality both persist in the same thing in the same form. To illustrate, contradiction creeps in if one were to believe and claim that Ātmā is eternal as fundamental Reality and non-eternal in the same form. In the same way, when the Ātmā is designated by words such as eternal, non-eternal etc., and known to be such thereby, it cannot be described by just one word in its entirety. It is therefore an object of wordy designation in its independent forms. It is indescribable because it cannot be known by just one word in its entirety. Thus, in the *Saptabhangī*, three descriptions—eternal, non-eternal and indescribable—prove to be just in the case of Ātmā.

In a similar way oneness, existence, inexpressibility, difference etc., are the all-too-common traits that can be applied to any object and constitute three *Bhanga*s; they then come to seven. *Saptabhangī* can be brought to bear even on uncommon or extraordinary dharmas like the state of being full of like earthiness of *ghaṭa* etc. *Saptabhangī* can be brought to bear on all wide and unwide traits of the same object, whatever they are.

In ancient times, Ātmā, Śabda etc., are the substances in which there is a wide variety of mutually contradictory states with reference to which they are eternality-non eternality, existence and absence thereof, oneness and multiplicity, state of being wide and otherwise. The theory of *Bhanga* evolved from the inclination to bring about a co-ordination of these. The same again took the form of sectarianism and that resulted in the principle of *Saptabhangī*.

The number seven is laid down because more than seven options—bhanga are not possible. Split the first three in a variety and *Saptabhangī* results. If we can find more than seven bhanga, Jain philosophy cannot insist on *Saptabhangī*.

A brief summary would be this :

- (1) The spirit of *Saptabhangī* is inspired by the desire to co-ordinate the contemporary mutually contradictory isms.

- (2) We should thereby precisely check the nature of the object and derive real knowledge. This is the goal.
- (3) Basically, only three options are possible with regard to any trait that strikes the intellect. Howsoever we multiply the number by changes of words, only number seven is possible.
- (4) *Saptabhangī* is found with each trait of an object. This is one proof of the view of *Anekānta*. Its examples are given as word, *Ātmā* etc. This is because the ancient Ārya thinkers thought principally on *Ātmā*, and, at the most, took *Śabda* in their discussion on the authority of Āgamas.
- (5) In the philosophies, Vedic etc., in the philosophy of Vallabha in particular, the doctrine of *Sarvadharmasamanvaya*—the co-ordination of all traits, is a form only of this. Śankara himself describes object but states that it is indefinable.
- (6) The purpose at the root is to bring together all that cannot be disproved by proof.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 1062–1064]

Reference to four important options elsewhere

Actually, only the first four of the seven options in *Saptabhangī* are of importance.¹ This is because, in the works like the Vedas, Upaniṣads etc., as also in ‘Dighanikāya’, Brahmajāla sūtra, there are stray references to four options; they are also found together. The last three of the seven options are not referred to, even as a belief of somebody anywhere else. The first four only have therefore a historical background.

Some thinking on the meaning of the word ‘Avaktavya’

One of the *bhngas* in the first four is *Avaktavya* by name. It deserves some thinking. Right from the beginning of the Āgama age, this is accepted as its meaning. There is no one word that can simultaneously enumerate the two elements such as *Sat-Asat*

1. The seven options are: May be it is; may be it is not; may be it is and it is not; may be it is indescribable; may be it is and is indescribable; may be it is not and is indescribable; may be it, it is not and is indescribable.

or *Nitya Anitya* etc. That is the reason why it is enumerated as '*Avaktavya*'—indefinable. But as we probe into the history of this word, we have to concede that it has another historical definition in the ancient Scriptures. Upaniṣads have the statement,

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।¹

(That from whom speech comes back together with the mind without attaining to Him).

The statement stresses that Brahman is indefinable or not within the purview of speech. In the same way, we have these words in *Ācārāṅga*—

“सर्वे सरा निअट्टंति, तत्थ झुणी न विड्जइ ।”²

(All arrows fall back and there is no sound there.)

Here also the nature of *Ātmā* is stated to be not within the purview of speech. Buddha also designates several things as "*Avyākṛta*"³ undefined and therefore out of the purview of speech.

In the Jain tradition, '*Anabhiḷāpya*'⁴ experiences are famous, and these never come within the purview of speech. I am of opinion that the meaning of the word '*Avaktavya*' in *Saptabhaṅgi*, is a controversial and rational form of an old definition.

Saptabhaṅgi is not doubtful Knowledge

It is necessary to refer to one thing in the matter of the thinking on *Saptabhaṅgi*. Śankarācārya refers to *Saptabhaṅgi* as 'doubtful knowledge' in *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* on 2-2-33. Rāmaṇujācārya follows the same view. This has reference to the old days of establishment of one's view and that of the rejection of others. In the modern days, wide and comparative studies are undertaken and we should know the views of moderns. Dr. A. B. Dhruva was an authentic and expert of a scholar on all the branches both of Indian

1. Taittiriya Upaniṣad, 2-4.

2. *Ācārāṅga sūtra* 170.

3. *Majjimanikāya-sūtra* 63.

4. *Vīṣeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*—141, 488.

and western philosophy. He specifically states, in his lecture on "Jain and Brahmin"¹ that *Saptabhangī* is not doubtful knowledge; it is a line of thought that reveals the varying forms of the nature of truth. Shri Narmadashanker Mehta, a great scholar of almost all the traditions of Indian philosophy, has in his "Hindu Tattvajñāna-
no Itihāsa" [History of Indian philosophy] (on pp. 213-219) narrated *Saptabhangī* purely from a non-sectarian point of view. This is really worth reading. When Dr. Radhakrishnan², Dasgupta³ etc. analyses *Saptabhangī*, it is purely from a thorough grasp of Jain point of view.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, p. 503-504]

1. Āpaṇo Dharma, p. 673.

2. Indian Philosophy, Vol. one, p. 302.

3. History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. one, p. 179.

Chapter 16

BRAHMA and SAMA

As far as Indian philosophical thinking on reality is concerned, we can state that it has two sources. One is *Svātmā*—the Self and the other is *Prakṛti*—primordial matter. The implication is that the former is internal and the latter external.

‘Sama’ the element that inspires equanimity—*Samatā*

In some remote unknown time, man was inspired to ponder over himself. He asked himself : What am I? What type am I? What is my relation to the other *Jīvas*? He becomes introvert to seek answers to these questions. As a result of his introspection, he realized that he was the element known as life. He also realized that other classes of animals hold the same life-force. This led him to the realization of his equality with other classes of animals. This realization further led to the introduction of the different meanings and their background in the realm of philosophical thinking and pursuits. This flow of the intellect is known as ‘Sama’.

‘Brahma’—its meanings

The other origin of intellect is the external matter. Persons who were attracted towards the various facets of universal matter, its events and inspiring forces, acquired from it the background of poetic thinking and poetry. To illustrate, the poet who accepted the shower of the heart-felt experience of the delighting and romantic vision of the goddess *Uṣas*, sang of her in the *sūktas* of *Uṣas* as a young lady dressed in red garments. The poet of the *R̥gveda*, who, while roving in a boat in the rising waves of and tides of the ocean, was reminded of *Varuṇa*, the presiding deity as a protector and he eulogized *Varuṇa* as all-powerful protector. The poet who had the romantic experience of the lighting and revealing powers of the flames of *Agni*, composed the *mantras*

addressed to Agni. The poet who had the romantic experience of the night enveloped in blinding darkness, composed the sūkta addressed to *Rātri*-night. The same thing can be stated of speech—*Vāk*, time etc., that are eulogized in sūktas. There may be different aspects of nature or some divine elements hidden in them or there can be some supreme hidden power behind them all. One thing is certain that when the Vedic poets composed the hymns, they resorted to one or the other symbol of the visible nature. The prayers that take recourse to these different symbols are known as *Brahma*.

Several meanings of the word 'Brahma' evolved in course of time from this primary meaning. Even the sacrifices in which these sūktas were made use of, came to be known as Brahma. Even the works narrating this and the Purohitas performing sacrifices were known as Brahma, *Brahmā* or *Brāhmaṇa*. In the ancient time itself, these different phases and aspects of nature or the divine elements were classed as just one element. Even in the first Maṇḍala of the *R̥gveda* itself, it is clearly and specifically stated that the gods originating from different elements known as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni etc. that are sung and eulogized as different gods, are, ultimately just one element and this one element is 'Sat.' In this manner, so many symbols of nature ultimately merged themselves into one supreme element known as Sat. The idea continued to develop and expand in several ways.

The background of Śramaṇa and Brāhmaṇa thinking

The worshippers of the spirit of equality—*Sama*—were known as *Samana* or *Samaṇa*. The word is transformed into Sanskrit as *Śamana* or *Śramaṇa*. But since the word *Sama* is originally a Sanskrit word, its form in Sanskrit comes to be *Samana*. The worshippers and thinkers on *Brahmanas* were known as *Brahmaṇas*. The first class—*Samaṇas*--remained pre-dominantly introspective and aiming just at *Ātmā*; the other—*brahmaṇas*--being inspired by universal '*Prakṛti*' that had reached the most subtle reality through its symbols, remained aiming at *Prakṛti*. Thus, the original source of inspiration of one and the other was different. Still, the streams of intellect of both were flowing towards some ultimate truth.

In several middling periods, the direction of both the streams turned and diverted to this or that side. At times even conflict arose. But the introspection that aimed at Ātmā, resulted in the establishment that there is just one life-force ultimately in the whole universe and naturally the same one element is present in all embodied beings. They therefore observed and experienced the same life-force in earth, water and even plants. On the other side, the other stream of thought that had nature dominantly in its view, touched several external aspects of the universe and diverted itself to the internal. Consequently, during the period of the Upaniṣads, it is laid down specifically that *Sat* and *Brahma* is the element at the root of the Universe; it is present in the embodied individual Jīvas also. Thus, in the first stream it happened that individual thinking resulted in the equanimity of the entire Universe, and just on its basis the path of conduct of life was framed. On the other side, a non-duality was framed in which it was proclaimed that the Supreme Reality visualised at the root of the Universe is also the individual soul-Jīva and it is in no way different from the Supreme Reality. So many modes of conduct were framed on the basis of this non-duality. The original sources of Ganges and Brāhmaputrā are different and yet both the rivers meet in the same vast ocean; just in the same way the two streams of thought aimed at Ātmā and *Prakṛti* ultimately meet on the same ground. Visible difference, if any, is only superfluous; at the most it is because of the impressions that arose as a result of conflict in the middle period.

View of Supreme Reality that inspires Unity in spite of Eternal Opposition

It is true that the differences and oppositions of thinking and conduct that evolved round *Brahma* and *Sama*, were reflected even in society, Scriptures and stone inscriptions etc. In the Buddha Piṭakas, Jaina Āgamas as also the stone inscriptions of Aśoka and again in so many works we find that two classes – Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa are mentioned. Patanjali, the writer of the Mahābhāṣya, refers to these two classes to be eternally opposed. Yet, if we were to state, as mentioned above, that both the streams touch upon

the same eternal Supreme Reality, what is our basis? Desire to know reality would not be satiated in the absence of a clarification on this question.

This is the viewpoint of Supreme Reality. It visions and observes the basic nature of things after surpassing the differences of family, race, language, ritual, dress etc. Next, it easily turns towards non-difference and sameness. Differences and oppositions that arose in practical life, spread in the respective sects of both and their followers. Notes of the difference between the two classes of Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa suggestive of this are preserved; similarly are preserved, along with this, the views of unity visualised and experienced by the learned who were blessed with the vision of Supreme Reality. These are found in countless traditions of so many Scriptures. The Jaina Āgamas that refer to this difference between the Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa classes also give to us the equalization of a real Brāhmaṇa and an authentic Śramaṇa. The Buddha Piṭakas also have a similar equation. In the Mahābhārata, at so many places, Vyāsa defines a genuine Brāhmaṇa as a genuine Śramaṇa.

In the Vanaparva, Nahuṣa, born as a python asks a question to Yudhiṣṭhira as to who is a real brahmin. Vyāsa replies through the mouth of Yudhiṣṭhira that every one who is born is of mixed origin. Vyāsa quotes the words of Manu and substantiate^s that all are born of inter-mixture, and a Śūdra of noble character and conduct is superior to a brahmin, just so by birth. Only an individual with noble character and intellect is fit to be classed as a real brahmin. This is the vision of Supreme Reality. The word *Brahma* is given in the Gītā at so many places. The word *Sama* is also found in a sublimated sense. The statement is — “The learned have a vision endowed with equanimity — *Paṇḍitāḥ Samadarśināḥ.*” There is one sūkta of Supreme reality — *Paramatṭhasūta* — in the Buddhist work *Suttanipāta*. It specifically states that “The view that I am superior while others are low or fake, is not a view of Supreme Reality. The Ganges and the Brahmaputrā have different places of origin but their confluence is at one place. Still however, the vast lands of the two great rivers, the population on the banks, language-

and modes of conduct are different. Persons whose minds are engrossed in this difference fail to see the sameness of their meeting-place. Still, this oneness is real and genuine. In the same manner, different thought-currents, coming from different sources, are nourished and also enriched in different ways and the result is that those individuals, who remain indulged in material and gross coverings, are not able to visualize the equalization of the two currents. Yet, the truth of it is unobstructed. Persons with lofty intellect, who visualize the truth continue to take birth and that too in all the traditions.

Even though *Samatva*—equality and unity—is the very basic truth, the words *Brahmacarya* and *Brahmavihāra* are so very commonly known in the Śramaṇa traditions like the Jaina and Bauddha, that they cannot possibly be separated from these traditions.

This view of Supreme Reality, that continues to exist with us since times immemorial, got very great importance and nourishment in later times with all care. That is precisely the reason why Vasubandhu, a brahmin by birth but Bauddha by initiation, states clearly in his *Abhidharmakośa* – “The path of Śramaṇism is a pure path, that precisely is brahmanism also.” His elder brother Asaṅga also gives a similar suggestion somewhere.

This traditional view of Supreme Reality or vision of absolutism finds expression even in a poet like Narasimha Mehta, whose outlook can be considered to be sectarian. He described in eulogistic poetry, Hari as one fundamental reality embracing the whole Universe. He also stated later on for the devotee of Hari, a Vaiṣṇava that he is “endowed with a vision of equality and has abandoned all attachment and hankerings.” In just the same way, Upadhyaya Yaśovijayaji, who is adjudged to be sectarian, states that attaining to the state of equanimity is attainment to the status of Brahma.

Dr. A. B. Dhruva also gives expression to the propriety of the difference between Supreme Reality and vision of mundane practical life as also the vision of Supreme Reality. When he refused to accept food cooked by a brahmin woman, he stated “this is

my family heritage as a Nāgara; I do not think that its reality is proved by rationalism and still I follow it." He has narrated the real vision at another places. He states, in his Introduction, to the Jain Āgama 'Sūtrakṛtāṅga' that : "It is not possible to become a brahmin without becoming a Śramaṇa of the Jain order. In a similar manner, it is not possible to become a Jaina without becoming a brahmin. The purport is that the basic reality of Jainism lies in conquering the senses and mental inclinations, while that of brahmanism lies in inhaling the vast expanse of the Universe in ones soul."

In this brief discourse, we can realize that ultimately the intellect rests in one truth. We can also realize that the differences and conflicts of worldly existence, whatever they are, cannot rub out the vision and experience of Supreme or Absolute Reality.

[From the lecture delivered as Chairman of the Section on Philosophy at the Ahmedabad Session of the Gujarati Sahitya Parishad in October, 1959.]



Chapter 17

FOUR INSTITUTIONS

(1) Four Sanghas

When Bhagavan Mahāvira rejected outright the Varṇa system, he classified his own institutions on the basis of renunciation-*tyāga*. The chief classes here are two ; The *Anagāra* class that moved from one place to another bereft of housing and family; the other *Agāra* class that enjoyed family life and was stationed at one place. The first had accepted complete renunciation. It comprised of both men and women who were known as *Sādhu* and *Sādhvi*. The other class had complete renunciation as its aim, it comprised of men and women both known as *Śrāvaka* and *Śrāvikā*. In this manner was commenced the fourfold Sangha organized, that may be known as fourfold Varṇa—Organization if we were to use the word in a new sense and purport. The organization of the Sangha of *Sādhus* is in their own hands. Even to-day its rules persist in the Sangha; the rules are placed into a fine system in the Scriptures. Nobody should ever hold the notion that the *Śrāvaka*-Sangha had no control at all over the *Sādhu*-Sangha. No doubt the *Sādhu*-Sangha is free in all good undertakings. Yet if there is some difference of opinion, or, if even in good works some special help is required, the *Sādhu*-Sangha voluntarily on its own accepts the control of the *Śrāvaka*-Sangha. In a similar way, even though the constitution of the *Śrāvaka*-Sangha is very much different, it always accepts the control of the *Sādhu*-Sangha. Thus, with mutual help and co-operation, the two Sanghas continue with mutually beneficial works.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. 1, pp. 377-378]

(2) *Sādhusansthā*

For the present institution of the *Sādhus*, Jains have to thank Bhagavan Mahāvira, though the institution is earlier. In the *Ājamas*

like the Bhagavati and in other older works we come across the stories of the pupils of Pārśvāpatya or Pārśvanātha. Some of the pupils hesitate in their approach to him; some tease him because they take him to be anti-religion; some submit varied questions to defeat him or test him. Yet ultimately the tradition of Pārśvāpatya is either lost in the tradition of the pupils of Lord Mahāvira or its defiled part falls off on its own. The Sangha of Mahāvira comes in a new form once more and it arranges itself into an institution.

Wise Constitution

Rules about life, mutual behaviour, and duties are framed in the Institution of Sādhus. Like a well organized state administration, rules are framed even in the Institution of Sādhus so that all Sādhus abide by the rules and duly control and punish those who break the rules.

Small and big officers are appointed and that too within the limits of the work on hand. The limitation on *Saṅghasthaviras*, *Gacchasthavira*, *Ācārya*, *Upācārya*, *Pravartaka*, *gaṇi* etc., their mutual dealings, their distribution of work, resolving their mutual conflicts, rules about approaches to, learning, food etc.—all this is described in the *chedasūtras*. As we study this, we feel greatly respectful towards the Ācāryas whose wisdom with regard to the constitution of the Sādhusansthā is revealed. Further, I have always felt that the study of the constitution of the Sādhusansthā would be very much helpful to all who desire to constitute the rules of big Institution or to expand it.

The Saṅgha of female ascetics and its impact on the Bauddha Saṅgha

The *Sādhusansthā* had spread in all the four corners of this country. It is stated that during the life-time of Bhagavān, there were 14 thousand Bhikkhus and 36 thousand female ascetics. We do not possess the details of the rise or fall in their numbers after Nirvāna. But it seems that for a few centuries after Bhagavān there was no reduction in their numbers, may be, the number

was on the rise. Mahāvīra was not necessarily the first to give place to women in the *Sādhusanstha*. Bhagavān Buddha was not willing to give place to women in the *Sādhusanstha*, but had ultimately to concede. On due consideration, it seems that some influence is there of the Jain *Sādhusanstha* in this.

Aim of Sādhu—Purity in life

Sādhu means Sādhaka and a Sādhaka is one who resorts to Sādhanā-Yogic practice—for the attainment of a certain aim. It has been resolved that the principle aim of Jain Sādhus is purity of life. Purity of life means prevention of the bondages, dirt, obstructions and narrowness of life. Setting example from his own life, Bhagavān taught this lesson to the discriminating. How can a Sādhu guide others unless and until he grows introvert, examines and searches his life, becomes steady in thought and conduct and becomes clearly and thoroughly conscious about his own aim and end in life? Again, if someone intends to guide others in the realm of an important fact like spiritual life, he should first of all prepare well his own self before becoming a preacher or a teacher. The time for this preparation is precisely the time of *Sādhanā*. A secluded spot, separation from ones near ones and others, not interfering in any social or other trickeries, observance of fixed rules of taking food and mode of life—all this is well planned.

Change of Place and Community Welfare

In this Institution we come across magnanimous personalities whose inner vision and subtle thinking were permanent. There were others with external vision, but certainly not lacking in inner vision. There were still others with very little inner vision, but dominant outer vision. Be it as it may, on one side Jainism expanded as society and family dharma, and Sādhus continued to enter the Institution from this society. On the other side, the place of residence of the Sādhus started changing slowly and steadily. Groups of Sādhus, from jungles, hillocks and the outskirts of cities started pouring in the populace of the common man. When the Institution of Sādhus entered the places of common men, they might have

accepted unwillingly a few blemishes born of contact with the common man. They have at the same time introduced several special virtues in the life of common people and have made heroic effort to do this. There were some recluses endowed only with inner vision and had attained to spiritual peace in their lives. The notes of their blessed and pure works were lost with them. This is because they never cared to transfer the notes of their lives to others. But there were some with or without inner vision, who had transferred the notes of their works of general welfare for which they had made their contribution. These stand firm and clear before us. Once our society was non-vegetarian and prone to taking wine. When this very society, encouraged and experienced a dislike towards wine and meat, very great credit for this change goes to the Institution of Sādhus. Day in and day out, this institution continued with one missionary work. Wherever they went, they taught the lesson, verbally and by their own example regarding the giving up of seven addictions—*Vyasanas*. Nobody can deny the fact that Jain Institutions of Sādhus contributed lots towards dislike for meat, aversion for wine, displacement of adultery and eulogy of *Brahmacarya* becoming current in the minds of the common man.

Institution of Holy Places

Mostly holy places arise when there is association with noble religious soul, there is beauty of nature, and, in the absence of both there is speciality of some structure, architecture or some idol brought about by spending lots of money by some rich man.

In most of the cases, holy places become renowned in villages or cities, and, in addition, seashore, bank of a river, other reservoirs and small and big mountains.

It cannot be stated that holy places of Jains are not found on reservoirs; actually beautiful holy places have developed on the glorious Ganges or other reservoirs. But mostly Jains have preferred mountains. In India, east, west, north or south, wherever we go, the principal holy places of Jains are situated on hillocks and mountains. Selection of place, both for Śvetāmbaras and Digāmbaras is only on mountains. Places with which the Śvetāmbaras

are not related at all, have got the *tirthas* of Digambaras in the southern part of India; these too are situated in hilly areas. All this proves as to what places were to the liking of and preference of the saints who were the life-force of these holy places. Again, we can guess from the development of particular *tirthas* as to what beauty of nature and seclusion was to the liking of devotees or human beings at large. After passing through a life full of mundane joys and restiveness, or even now and again in the middle, man turns his eyes to different places for rest and relaxation. What are these places? We can guess this from the choice of place for these *tirthas*.

Along with the *tirthas* there was development of idols; and along with this are closely related the art of idol-making and architecture. The specialities and beauties of architecture in our country are dominantly there thanks to *tirthas* and idol-worship. Architecture is there no doubt in places of worldly joys, but its origin lies in places of religion and *tirthas*.

Excellent arrangement for the preservation and protection of Divine wealth

The *tirthas* of Jains are in hundreds and they are found, not in just one part of the country but spread over the whole land. This itself is precisely a proof of the expanse of the Jain society once in days of old. The Jain *tirthas* comprise of one special institution. Even if we set aside household temples and those that are owned privately, we have treasures, small and big, of temples owned by Saṅghas, small and big. These have lots of wealth which is known as divine wealth—*devadravya*. The Jain Saṅghas are very clear and perfectly honest in its collection, care and maintenance, for which very stiff ways are adopted. The clarity and honesty that we find in the preservation and maintenance of divine wealth with the Jains will be found rarely with other sects in India. The Jain Saṅghas have, at the same time, created a fine atmosphere, ethical and practical, to see that this wealth is spent only on its specified purposes, it is not wasted or gulped by somebody.

Things worth knowing

Very much delighting and important indeed are the facts and history of idols, temples, treasures and movement of the Saṅghas, along with the places of *tirthas*. All this history is really worth knowing—what part was played, how and in which age by wood, metal and stone in the construction of idols and temples; how one system followed another; how disorganization and disorder crept in the treasures—Bhaṇḍārs; how these were replaced by good organization and control; how hundreds and thousands of men and women in Saṅghas moved to near and far off *tirthas* and what works they undertook, etc.

We have raised *tirthas* only from the inspiration to cultivate renunciation, peace and discrimination; our purpose in going on visits to these *tirthas* and spending energy, wealth and time on them is just the same.

[Darśan ane Cintan, part one, pp. 405–408.]

Institution of knowledge—treasures of knowledge

Wherever there is humanity, there is natural respect for knowledge. In India respect for knowledge persists and continues since last thousands of years. The streams of the Ganges and Yamunā of Brāhmaṇa and Śramaṇa traditions continue only on the expanse of vast knowledge. The austerity of Bhagavān Mahāvira is nothing short of deep search after knowledge. For this search he tortured his body, set aside the considerations of day and night. Thousands of people thronged to be enlightened on and heard of this deep search. This search is knowledge and the dharma of Bhagavān Mahāvira has its basis in it.

Glory of Knowledge and its Means

That knowledge took the name of *Śruti* and *Āgama*. It continued to be enriched and clarifications continued. The glory of knowledge continued to be enriched as more and more celibates came in larger and larger numbers on the banks of the Mānasa lake of *Śruti* and *Āgama*. This also led to the enrichment of the gross

means by which this knowledge took positive shape. Not only the pages of the books but the paper etc., writing, inks etc., that were used came to be respected, because knowledge was preserved through them. The same great respect was paid also to the implements by which these works were tied, and the means by which these works were preserved. It was accepted that the give and take of the material means of knowledge was as meritorious a work as that of giving and receiving knowledge.

Erection and Development of these treasures of knowledge.

On one side there was collection and enrichment of Scriptural writings and the glory of writing growing further and further. On the other side there were rivalries amongst the sects regarding knowledge. It was because of these two causes that the institution of knowledge running purely on oral tradition, was totally under change and started showing itself in form of large and larger treasures of knowledge, *Bhandārs*. Saṅghas in every village and city nourish a healthy feeling and they must possess a treasure of knowledge. Almost all Sādhus, who have taken to renunciation feel that protection of dharma lies only in the preservation and enrichment of treasures of knowledge. The result is that in the whole country, from one corner to another, the Jain institution of knowledge systematized itself in form of these treasures—*Bhandārs*. *Bhandārs* went on growing rich in manuscripts in which form the knowledge of various subjects and various sects continued to be collected and stored. There were only *Bhandārs* in the realm of Lord Mahāvīra—*Bhandārs* of Saṅghas, Sādhus and individual ownership. This gave rise to a class of copy—writers; the art of copy—writing developed and the class of researchers also developed. Even at the time when printing had not developed, it actually happened that as soon as some work was written, hundreds of its copies were prepared and were distributed among scholars in all the corners of the country. In this manner, the holy Ganges of the Institution of knowledge continued to flow unabated in the Jain world of sects. As a result of the living Jain devotion towards knowledge, even till to-day there are so many *Bhandārs* with such old literature in variety that no number of scholars can possibly

cope up with research in its entirety. Researchers Indian and from foreign countries in large numbers, and several other scholars, have passed years after these Bhandārs, and they are simply spell-bound by studying their contents and noting the methods of the preservation of manuscripts.

Difference between Brāhmaṇa and Jaina Bhandārs.

One remarkable difference between the two is that while the Brahmin Bhandārs are mostly owned by individuals, the Jain Bhandārs are mostly in the custody of Saṅghas. Some times some are owned by individuals, but this is just for good use. When misused, mostly the power of the Saṅgha dominates. Brahmins observe the festival known as *Sarasvatīśayana* for freeing the manuscripts from the dew of the monsoon and for looking after the preservation of the same. The Jains know the fifth day of the month of Kārtika as the festival of *Jnānapāñcamī* and on this day they worship the Bhandār and remove the dirt and impurity from the Bhandār on the occasion. Thus, the Jain institution of knowledge that was once only oral, has taken to several changes; it is today in a concrete form before our very eyes in all variety.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pt. 1, pp. 373-75]

Non-Sectarian Vision of Jain Bhandārs.

It would not be true to state that only Jain Śāstras and philosophies are preserved in these large treasures of knowledge, established centuries back. Actually all Śāstras and spiritual works are preserved through them, from a non-sectarian point of view, works on Vedas, Jyotiṣa, Tantra, music, Oceanography, linguistics, poetry, dramas, Purāṇas, poetics, and Kathā literature are preserved and protected in the Jain libraries. Further, through the study of and research on these works, by specially qualified scholars, new works that are rare to be found elsewhere, are composed by them and treasured in these libraries. Many of these are original too. Works even of Bauddha and other traditions are found in these Bhandārs and many of these are not available in their original form elsewhere.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 2, pp. 518-519]

Chapter 18

PARYUṢAṆA AND SAMVATSARĪ

The Purpose of Jain Festivals

Jain holidays and festivals are unique in the sense that there is not a single festival that is born of a desire for worldly prosperity or enjoyment, or originating from fear, temptation or awe. If any such thing has got mixed up with them, these are not approved by the Scriptures. The purpose of the festival is in some blessed deed of the Tirthaṅkars or something similar to it. The holidays or festivals current in view of these have, as their purpose only purity of knowledge and character and encouragement of these. In the Jain tradition, there are one-day festivals and holidays or festivals for nourishment of these.

The Paryuṣaṇa Festival

In long-time festivals, there occur six *Atthais* and the *Atthai* during the *Paryuṣaṇa* festival is considered to be the best. This is because of the annual holiday *Parva* that comes in it. In all the eight days of this festivity, people will pay lesser attention to their business etc. and try constantly to enrich renunciation and austerity, nourish the virtues like knowledge, liberality etc., and take to activities that will lead to this-worldly and other-worldly bliss. In the Jain society, wherever we move, the same religious atmosphere surrounds their life like the rain-clouds of the month of *Āṣāḍha*. On account of such an atmosphere, we find these things uniformly at all places.

- (i) An effort to lessen tumult in life, get relief and spare time;
- (ii) A proper control over ones food and other enjoyment.
- (iii) A tendency to study and hear Scriptures and pondering over the Self.

- (iv) Cultivation of proper devotion of Tapasvins. Tyāgis and co-religionists.
- (v) Forgetting enmities and cultivation of a genuine spirit of friendship.

In both the sub-sects of the Śvetāmbaras, this week is known as *Paryuṣaṇa*. Normally in both it commences and ends on the same day. But in the Digambara sect, the festival is observed for ten days and it is known as *Daśalakṣaṇi* instead of as *Paryuṣaṇa*. Their period of time also differs. The *Daśalakṣaṇi* commences on the second day of the ending of *Paryuṣaṇa*.

[Darśan ane Cintan, pp. 335-337]

During this week we can have ample of scope to hear of the noble deeds of Bhagavān Mahāvīra, and to ponder over their significance. These are the truths that Mahāvīra experienced, as a result of his hard austerities and *Sādhanā* and put into practice some of these for improving upon the contemporary social condition. He again, propagated and preached these so that common people shape their lives accordingly. These are the three truths in brief :

- (1) One should shape ones worldly dealings in such a manner that we look upon the sorrows of others as our own, so that the violent elements of too much attachment to worldly joys and disparity do not enter ones life.
- (2) One should fully sacrifice all happiness and amenities of life for the good of the society, so that the bondage of acceptance results in good turns to common men of the world.
- (3) One should keep constantly awake and alert and indulge in introspection, so that one can keep a watch over blemishes that creep in because of ignorance and weakness, and heroic efforts of the soul do not suffer.

[Darśan aur Cintan, pt. 1, pp. 483-484]

Samvatsari—a great festival

This is a great festival. It is greater than other festivals. Let us note where its greatness lies.

If an individual intends to experience real peace, desires to cultivate equanimity in prosperity and disparity or adversity, wants to preserve the internal unity and not to permit the discord of ones personality, then, the only principal way is that one closely observes all the spheres of ones activities of life. The purpose of this close internal observation is to see as to where, in which ways and with reference to whom one commits small or big blunders. When an individual observes ones blunders with all sincerity and humility, then he feels that even a small blunder of his is big like a mountain and he is not able to bear it. Consciousness of his own blunder and deficiency makes man awake and discriminative. Alertness and discrimination teach to man how to maintain and cultivate relations with others. In this way, internal observation prevents the break up of ones personality. This observation is necessary, not only for recluses and fakirs but for all men of all ages and for success in ones own business and institutions. This is because through this, man gradually gets free from his blemishes and wins over the hearts of all. This is the individual side of the due importance of this annual festival. We have yet to think over its importance from community point of view. As far as I know, no other festival holds the importance that this festival does from the point of view of introspection for the good of the community. We can also understand how important it is to make introspection from the point of view of the community, confess ones faults and pardon those of others heartily, for social health.

This has led the Jain tradition to the custom that in every village, town or city, Saṅghas resort to mutual confession of faults and pardoning them. The same is the conduct with Saṅghas of other places. Saṅghas include not only house-holders but also recluses. Saṅgha does not mean a Gaccha or an Ācārya or followers of one Upāsraya but every Jaina who follows Jain tradition. Again, it is

not that Jains live with persons of Jain tradition only. They are related with others also. Consequently, mistakes occur in relation to them also. The custom of confession and pardon is not confined only to Jain tradition, it is to be found widely in the whole society. It goes in extension also to the most subtle class of living beings. If one has offended them knowingly or unknowingly, one resorts to confession.

Really there is another vision behind this custom in that one becomes soft towards very subtle living beings. If man is ready for this, one naturally will care to purify ones heart. by an exchange of confession and pardon in all those cases in which sentiments are mutually offended and bitterness has arisen.

[Darṣan aur Cintan, pt. one, pp. 354-356]



