

THE FREE INDOLOGICAL COLLECTION

WWW.SANSKRITDOCUMENTS.ORG/TFIC

FAIR USE DECLARATION

This book is sourced from another online repository and provided to you at this site under the TFIC collection. It is provided under commonly held Fair Use guidelines for individual educational or research use. We believe that the book is in the public domain and public dissemination was the intent of the original repository. We applaud and support their work wholeheartedly and only provide this version of this book at this site to make it available to even more readers. We believe that cataloging plays a big part in finding valuable books and try to facilitate that, through our TFIC group efforts. In some cases, the original sources are no longer online or are very hard to access, or marked up in or provided in Indian languages, rather than the more widely used English language. TFIC tries to address these needs too. Our intent is to aid all these repositories and digitization projects and is in no way to undercut them. For more information about our mission and our fair use guidelines, please visit our website.

Note that we provide this book and others because, to the best of our knowledge, they are in the public domain, in our jurisdiction. However, before downloading and using it, you must verify that it is legal for you, in your jurisdiction, to access and use this copy of the book. Please do not download this book in error. We may not be held responsible for any copyright or other legal violations. Placing this notice in the front of every book, serves to both alert you, and to relieve us of any responsibility.

If you are the intellectual property owner of this or any other book in our collection, please email us, if you have any objections to how we present or provide this book here, or to our providing this book at all. We shall work with you immediately.

-The TFIC Team.

Publication No. 160

AN INTRODUCTION
TO
JAINISM



5066
36

By

Dewan Bahadur A.B. Lathe, M.A.

Published By

Jain Mittra Mandal, Dharampura, Delhi.

Donated By

**M/s Mahabir Prasad & Sons,
Chawri Bazar, Delhi.**

111 K64

SD66/05.


INTRODUCTION

The Jain Mittra Mandal is the chief Jain Literary Society of India. Established on 30th March 1915, has to its credit 160 publications in English, Hindi, Sanskrit, Urdu, etc. besides its other multifarious activities. Thsee have been written by eminent Jain and other scholars of India and outside. The society has also to its credit the unique distinction of introducing in India for the first time in 1925 on a grand public scale the birthday celebrations of Bhagwan Mahavira. For the last 40 years, the Mandal has successfully propagated Mahavir Jayanti Celebrations in India and Foreign lands. In Delhi, these celebrations, held under the auspices of the Mandal, have been addressed by the Rashtrapati, Up-Rashtrapati, Ambassdors of Foreign countries, Cabinet Ministers of the Union, Governors and Chief Ministers of States, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Speakers of Vidhan Sabhas, Heads of different religions and scholars of repute.

On the occasion of the Golden Jubilee year of the organisation we take immense pleasure in bringing out the second edition of this treatise on Jainism as our 160th publication. The present book is an attempt to explain the basic principles of Jainism by an eminent scholar of world fame, Dewan Bahudur A.B. Lathe. In this treatise he has striven to explain in brief but with great clarity the doctrines of Jainism and has very successfully attempted to dispel certain prevalent wrong notions about Jainism from the minds of general public.

We had been longing to publish this treatise for well over ten years but were handicapped in our task on account of the non-availability of the manuscript. Lala Panna Lal Jain, a veteran in such undertakings, obliged us by securing a copy of this book from the Veer Sewa Mandir

(ii)

Library. We offer our thanks to both Lala  and Veer Sewa Mandir Library for their assistance.

Bharat Gaurava 108 Acharya Shri Desh Bhushan Ji Maharaj with his Sangh was in Delhi this year for his Chaturmash. His presence in Delhi has been a constant source of inspiration in respect of all religious activities in general and literature publication in particular. On the 25th July, 1963, he gave to the Community a jewel in *Muni Diksha of Chullak Shri Parsvakirti Ji*. Both, Acharya Shree and Muni Shri Vidyanandi Ji so known after Muni Diksha—the teacher and the disciple—are embodiment of Ahimsa and truth. Muni Shri Vidyanandi Ji has great admiration for this work and has been graciously kind to write a few words by way of encouragement to us regarding this work.

The famous Jain philanthropic business house of M/s. Mahabir Pershad and Sons, Delhi is well known for its religious inclinations. The founder—Late Lala Mahabir Pershad Jain was a Panch of Prachin Aggarwal Digambar Jain Panchayat, Delhi and was, for years the President of Jain Mittra Mandal. For the general good of the community, he has also established Mahavir Jain Charitable Trust of the value of Rs. 51,000. On the occasion of the Birthday Anniversary of Acharya Shree Desh Bhushan Ji Maharaj held in January in Delhi, L. Sham Lal Jain—the eldest son of the illustrious L. Mahabir Pershad Ji—gave a generous offer to bear the entire cost of publication of this book. L. Sham Lal has a great religious bent of mind and is also a Panch of Prachin Aggarwal Digambar Jain Panchayat. On the auspicious occasion of Diksha of Muni Shri Vidyanand Ji, L. Sham Lal Ji established two trusts for Charitable and religious purposes. The Mandal is proud in having Shri Ajit Pershad Jain the second son of Lalaji as its worthy President under

whose guiding spirit our activities are worked out. The third in succession—Shri Mahendra Pershad is at present Manager of Shri Digambar Jain Panchayati Mandir, Delhi. The other two sons Sarvashri Vijendra Pershad and Narendra Kumar and Lalaji's daughters, granddaughters and grandsons are equally popular and take keen interest in all religious matters. The Mandal expresses its gratefulness to this family for this generous donation.

The publication of this book has been possible mainly because of the keen interest taken by L. Mahtab Singh Jain, B.A.L.L.B. our General Secretary, L. Panna Lal Jain, Publisher, Daily Tej and Shri Munindra Kumar Jain, M.A. J.D., Editor, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi. Our thanks go to all these three.

We also owe our gratitude to the sons of late Dewan Bahadur Lathe (the author) and the previous publishers of this treatise—by whose courtesy—we have ventured on this publication.

Lastly we shall feel amply rewarded if this publication is utilised by all seekers of truth and others who have a longing to know about Jainism—the religion of the Universe—the principles of which alone can establish and maintain peace and end the present cold war.

Adishwar Prasad Jain,
(M.A.),

Secretary,

Jain Mittra Mandal, Dharampura,
Delhi.

24th April, 1964.

2562nd birthday of Bhagwan Mahavira.

दो शब्द

श्रमण-जैन धर्म ग्रंथिहा के सन्देश और साधना के लिए प्राचीन काल से मानवजाति की सेवा करता आ रहा है। तथापि खेद है कि जैन-धर्म के उदार सिद्धांतों, पवित्र विचारों, मौलिक मान्यताओं और अनुकरणीय चारित्र का अद्यावधि पर्याप्त और ठोस प्रचार नहीं किया जा सका। यही कारण है कि स्कूल-कालेज तथा विश्वविद्यालयों में निर्धारित पाठ्य पुस्तकों में जैन धर्म को लेकर अनेक प्रकार की भ्रान्त धारणाओं का प्रचार किया जा रहा है।

प्रस्तुत पुस्तक 'Introduction to Jainism' का निर्माण इसी उद्देश्य को लेकर किया गया है जिससे जनों को अपने धर्म का परिचय मिले तथा जनेतर भी इस उत्तम धर्म की विशेषताओं से अनभिज्ञ न रहें। मूल पुस्तक 'मराठी' में है, जिसका अंग्रेजी भाषा में अनुवाद देशभक्त श्री आण्णासाहेब लट्टे जी ने किया है। यह अनुवाद ई. स. १९०५ में प्रथम बार प्रकाशित हुआ था, जिसका यह द्वितीय संस्करण भारत की प्रमुख साहित्यिक संस्था जैन मित्र मण्डल, धर्मपुरा दिल्ली के द्वारा प्रकाशित किया जा रहा है। मंडल का यह प्रयास वास्तव में उपयोगी है। इस पुस्तक के प्रकाशन की अत्यन्त आवश्यकता थी। पुस्तक का वह प्रकरण जिसमें 'स्याद्वाद' की चर्चा की गई है, पाठक के हृदय में यह छाप छोड़े बिना नहीं रहेगा कि युद्ध एवं शस्त्रों का उत्तर हिंसा नहीं, अहिंसा है। और परमतसहिष्णुता की शिक्षा भी इस पुस्तक से मिलेगी। अंग्रेजी भाषा के साहित्य को समृद्ध करने वाले तथा 'की ऑफ नॉलेज' (Key of Knowledge) जैसी उत्कृष्ट रचना के लेखक बैरिस्टर चम्पतराय जैन की श्रद्धा में इसी पुस्तक से अभिवृद्धि हुई थी। यह पुस्तक अपने 'मिशन' में अधिकाधिक सफलता प्राप्त करे यही हमारी हार्दिक शुभाशंसा है।

—विद्यानन्द मुनि

वृषभ निर्वाण माघ वद्य १४

दिनांक १३-१-६४

PREFACE

The following pages speak their own intention. I may only add here that I hope this pamphlet to be an introduction to the publication of some of the original works whose shadow the following pages hope to be. I sincerely thank Mr. Hirachand Nemchand of Sholapur for permitting me to adapt his marathi lecture on Jainism in the first part of the pamphlet. He was good enough to look over the same and also my own article which follows.

But the credit of publishing this booklet belongs wholly to the religious zeal of Seth Natha Rangaji of Aklooja and Bombay. Had it not been for the inspiration of Mr. Ramachandrabhai of that firm, the idea of this pamphlet would not have come into my mind at this time. I am obliged to him for the inspiration.

I also thank Mr. B. C. Dhavate and Mr. A. B. Malgave for their help in carrying this pamphlet through the Press.

I must beg my readers to excuse me for spelling-mistakes due to indifferent proof-reading. It is the result of my mental disquietude due to the troubles of a person to whom all that I am, I owe.

Kurundvad

A. B. L.

June 1st, 1905

JAINISM

The divisions of the subject

IN response to the repeated invitations of the Local Union Club, I stand here to give you a short account of Jainism. I divide the subject into nine parts, thus :—

- (1) The meaning of Jainism.
- (2) Its principles.
- (3) The stages of initiation.
- (4) The nature of sin and virtue.
- (5) The nature of the bondage of *Karma* (action).
- (6) The nature and path of deliverance.
- (7) Image-worship.
- (8) The resemblance of other religions with Jainism; and,
- (9) The happiness of this world and the national welfare arising from Jainism.

I shall now briefly speak about each of these points.

Jainism is the religion preached by the 'Jineshwars.' Those who have conquered love, hate, sensual desire, and such other passions, or, those who have vanquished the eight *Karmas, are *Jins* and those who are the best of them are the Jineshwars. Frequently they are also called *चित्तराग* i. e. those who are free from all passions, *ग्रहंत* i. e. those who are revered by Indra and others, *सर्वज्ञ* i. e. Omniscient, *परमेष्ठी* i. e. those who have occupied the highest place and *मास्ता*

*The eight *Karmas* are explained further.

i. e. those who show the right path. There are hundreds of other names which also indicate their nature. The present Jains of India are divided into three sections, viz, the Digambars, the Shwetambars and the Dhundias. There is no difference between these sections as regards their principles. They all believe in the Seven principles, the twenty-four Tirthankars, the principle of non-killing, and Right Belief, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct. The difference comes in only with reference to image-worship, the nature of ascetics, and some other minor points. The images worshipped by the DIGAMBARS are naked and they are not adorned with any ornaments or glass-made eyes. The SHWETAMBAR images differ in all these points, while the DHUNDIAS would accept no images whatever. At present, I am going to speak principally about the Digambars; yet there is very little in the following that is contrary to the doctrines of the other sections.

There are Seven Principles of Jain religion, namely, [1] *Jeeva* or Life [2] *Ajeeva* or matter [3] *Asrava* or the path of *Karma* [4] *Bandha* or the bondage of *Karma* [5] *Sanvar* or the prevention of *Asrava*, [6] *Nirjara* or the partial destruction of *Karma* and [7] *Moksha* or Total Deliverance. The essence of a thing is its principle (*Tatva*.) The principle of *Moksha* is the highest of these. It is defined as the "freedom of a Soul from every *Karma*." The happiness of even a Chakravarti or Emperor, nay, even the glory of Indra in the heaven is perishable and consequently painful. Death is the fate of all of these and the thought of that fate eclipses all the worldly pleasure. The succession of births and deaths is a mighty source of affliction and as long as one is subject to it, there is no peace for him. The pleasure of the senses are all transient and painful in result and hence they

are called Shadows of Happiness. True happiness must be free from every possibility of pain even in the future. This can only be found in *Moksha* and hence its importance. The way to the *Moksha* is the main object of every Jain work. To whom is the Deliverance possible? This question is answered by saying that only animate beings can attain that highest of status and we have, therefore, to come to *Jeera* which is defined as the sentient or knowing or animate being. This sentience is its essence. It is

The classification explained divided according to the divisions of knowledge to which it attains. Sentience is divided into Knowledge (*Gyan*) Faith (*Darshan*), etc. But it is impossible for the *Jeera* to walk on upon the path of Total Deliverance as long as it is associated with another principle, the *Ajeeva* or matter. This *Ajeeva* is in all respects the opposite of *Jeera*. The association of these two is never complete, i. e. their separation is always potential. Gold may be mixed with any other metal but it can be separated at any time. Hence even when together, the two are possessed of their peculiar virtues. Matter or *Ajeeva* is divided in *Pudgal*, *Dharam*, *Adharam*, *Akash* and *Kal*. A *Pudgal* is either a material or its bundle. *Dharma* helps the *Jeera* associated with *Pudgal* to progress, just as water helps on the movements of a fish. *Adharma* entices a man from the true path just as the shadow of a tree does to a man travelling in the hot sun. *Akash* is the space in which all things exist. *Kal* is that through which things grow new and alter.

Asrava is the third principle. It is defined as "what forms the inlet for auspicious and ominous Karmas." These inlets are opened in the case of the soul when it feels love or hatred for whatever it sees or knows through its seeing or knowing power (*Gyan* or *Darshan*) just as water is let into the boat through its holes. When the soul feels its love or

hated rightly, the *Asrava* is an "Auspicious (*Shubha*) *Asrava*" and when wrongly, it is "Ominous (*Ashubha*) *Asrava*." The soul is either in an "auspicious" or "inauspicious" or "pure" state. The first is superior to the second; but it is not capable of carrying the soul to *Moksha* as it is tainted with passions, which being of an auspicious nature may at the most lead to the heavens in after life or the eminence of a *Chakravarti* (Emperor) in this life. The ominous *Asrava* inflicts the pain of hells, beastly life and human poverty, diseases, separation, ugliness, etc. The "Pure" temper is the one that tends to lasting welfare and leads to *Moksha*, It is devoid of any passions at all. The Karma is primarily divided into eight classes: [1] The *Gyana-urniya* [2] The *Darshana-varniya* [3] The *Mohaniya* [4] The *Vedaniya* [5] The *Ayu* [6] The *Nam* [7] The *Gotra* and [8] The *Antaraya*. Corresponding to these there are different *Asravas*. For instance to have no taste for learning, to impede the progress of knowledge, to conceal wisdom, to be jealous of others' learning—all these produce the *Asravas* of the *Gyana-varniya Karma*. By imputing untrue faults to the Omniscent Lord or the Gospel of the Jins or the School of Jain Ascetics, the soul incurs the *Asravas* of the *Darshana-varniya* Karmas. The violent nature of passions leads to the *Asravas* of the *Charitra-mohaniya* Karmas. To make new beginnings and to keep up too big an establishment produce the *Asravas* of birth in hell. Deceptive and seductive conduct leads to *Asravas* of birth in beastly class. Small beginnings and limited establishment endow a soul with human life. Self-control with a view to get something, partial self-control, enjoyment without addiction and penance without right knowledge lead to birth in heaven. Simple faith of the right kind gives the *Asravas* of only *Kalpvasi* gods and not of the *Bhavan*, *Vyantar* and *Jyotish* gods. To guide the actions of mind, speech and

body on a wrong path and to be overtalkative, gives rise to the *Asravas* of the Karma of inauspicious name. On the contrary, guile-less native and moderate talk gives the *Asravas* of auspicious name. The *Asravas* of the name of *Teerthankar* are the result of pure faith, complete modesty, faultless conduct, unremitting love of learning, indifference to worldly life, charity and penance to the best of one's ability, reverence for ascetics, assistance to the needy, reliance upon the teachings of *Arhats*, *Acharyas* and the well-read, unfailing observance of the sixfold daily duties like *Samayik* and *Pratikraman*, promotion of the cause of religion by self-sacrifice and spread of knowledge & sympathy with the pious. The *Asravas* of the low *Gotra Karma* are the result of censuring others, praising one-self, concealing the merits of others and pretending to have what one really has not. Conduct opposite to it leads to higher *Gotra Karma*. Obstruction to good cause brings on the *Asravas* of *Antaraya*. The causes of the *Asravas* of the eight kinds of *Karmas* will be known from this.

Now the principle of *Bandh* or bondage. It is defined as the mutual entrance, into each other's spheres, of the soul and the *Karma*. When the soul is attacked by the passions like anger and love, it takes on the *Pudgal* [material] particles fit for the bondage of the *Karmas*, just as a heated iron-ball takes up water-particles in which it is immersed. This is the *bondage* of the *Karmas*. The *bondage* is fourfold: (1) *Prakrati Bandh* (2) *Sthiti Bandh* (3) *n.Aubhag Bandh* and (4) *Pradesh Bandh*. There are eight primary and hundred and forty-eight secondary *Prakritis* or qualities of the *Karmas* as a thing has the quality of being sour, salty and so on. One obstructs knowledge, another obstructs intuition (insight), another confuses truth and falsehood, another leads

to wrong path, another causes the illusion of pleasure and pain and so on. The primary Prakritis correspond to each of the eight *Karmas*. That which obstructs knowledge is the *Gyanavarniya Prakriti*; that which obstructs insight, is the *Darshanavarniya Prakriti*; that which produces the illusion of pleasure and pain is the *Vedaniya Prakriti*; that which makest he mind suspicious about the true good and creates the passions is the *Mohaniya Prakriti*; that which gives rebirth is the *Ayu prakriti*; that which gives name is the *Nam*; that which causes the differences like the lower and the higher is the *Gotra prakriti* and that which comes in the way of our charity, enjoyment etc. is the *Antaraya prakriti*. The secondary *prakriti*, here omitted for brevity, should be referred to in the *VIIIth* Chap. of the commentary of the TATTVARTH SUTRA. The staying of these *bandhas* of the *prakritis* for a definite period, is the *Sthitt Bandh*. The *Anubhag Bandh* is the undergoing of the results of the *Karmas* in that period. The detailed association of the numberless spaces of the *Karmas* according to their names, with all the space of the soul, is called the *Pradesh Bandh*.

The Vedant speaks of the bondage of *Karma* as being *Sanchit Karyaman* and *Prarabdh*. In the same way Jainism divides into *Satta*, *Bandha* and *Udaya*. The first means the previous bondage which is yet to be exhausted; *Bandh* is the new acquisition of *Karma* and *Udaya* is the beginning of the work of old *Karmas*.

Now the principle of *Sanvar* which means the prevention of *Asravas* described before. This *Sanvar* is the stopping of the entrance of the *Karma* into the soul just like stopping the holes in a boat to prevent water from coming in. This can be done by observing the three *Gupties*; the five *Samities* the ten *Dharmas*, the twelve *Anuprekshas*, the

twenty-two *Parishaha Jayas*, the five *Charitras* and the twelve *Tapas*. The three *Gupties* are (1) fixing the mind (2) keeping The *Guptis* silent and (3) stopping the movements of the body. As they cannot be observed at all times, the five *Samitis* are prescribed for observance. (1) The *Ippya Samiti* is such behaviour The *Samitis* as gives trouble to no life while walking, sitting or sleeping. (2) The *Bhasha Samiti* consists in being careful to speak what is true, useful and endearing. (3) The *Eshana Samiti* is taking care not to eat what is forbidden, what might be burdensome and troublesome to others and what might give rise to idleness inebriation and disease. To be careful not to give pain to any life in the taking up or keeping down of the *Pinchhi*, etc. [of the ascetics] is called the *Adan Nikshepan Samiti*. The last *Usargs Samiti* is the care to be taken to harm none in answering calls of nature. These five *Samitis* lead to *Sanvar*.

The ten Dharmas causing the same are (1) *Forgiveness* (2) The ten Dhar- *Humility* (3) *Fraudlessness* (4) *Truthfulness* (5) mas or duties *Indifference* towards the wealth and poverty of others. (6) *Subduing* the mind and the senses (7) *Tapas* or prevention of the desires (8) *Charity* towards deserving objects [9] Being without any thing with oneself and [10] *Celibacy*. The *Anuprekshas* which also cause *Sanvar*, twelve in number, are as follows : —

[1] The *Anitya Anupreksha* is meditation over the transience of one's body, wife, children and wealth. [2] The *Asrava* is the meditation over the ability of the Dharma alone to make The twelve one free from worldly sufferings and the cycle of *Anuprekshas* births and deaths. [3] The thought that this cycle of births and deaths is not ended although one is from immemorial times born in the heaven, the hells, this human life, the

life of beasts and so on, is called the *Samvar Anupreksha*. [4] To think that one alone has to bear all the results of one's actions, is the *Ekatva Anupreksha*. To think that the soul is apart from the body called one's own by illusion, is the *Anyatva Anupreksha*. [6] To always remember that the body, composed of the sevenfold segment, is so dirty that souls become themselves dirty by its contact and that it can never become pure by any amount of bathing, is the *Ashauch Anupreksha*. [7] The thought of the *Asravas* being the cause of the Pains of life, is the *Asrav-anupreksha*. [8] The *Sanvar-anupreksha* is thinking over the means of preventing *Asravas*. [9] The *Nirjar-anupreksha* is thinking over the actions that will lead to freedom from bondage. [10] To think that the universe was created by none is the *Lokanupreksha* (11) The *Bodhi Durlabhh* is the thought that the true knowledge of the soul and its true good, is very difficult to obtain and that one has not attained it in long ages in which one was again and again born and dead. (12) To think that the religion of non-killing is prescribed by the *Jineshvars* who are full of truth, forgiveness, etc. ; that one is moving constantly in to the *Sansar* owing to one's ignorance of this and that its observance would easily lead to the *Moksha* as well as the position of the *Indra* and the *Chakravarti*, is the last *Anupreksha* called the *Dharm Anupreksha*. All these cause *Sanvar*.

Now the enduring of the twenty-two Parishahas is also a cause of *Sanvar*. The Parishahas are :—(1) The Parishahas
Hunger (2) Thirst (3) Cold (4) Heat (5) The insect-bites (6) Nakedness (7) Indifference (8) Woman (9) Action (10) Sitting (11) Bedding (12) Crying (13) Killing (14) Begging (15) Loss (16) Disease (17) Touch of grass (18) Dirt (19) Modes of hospitality (20) Knowledge (21) Ignorance (22) Want of faith. These parishahas cause *Sanvar* if they are suffered

as occasions arise. The five fold conduct is also a cause of *Sanvar*. Its first element is *Samayika* which means the performance of the six necessary duties to be hereafter enumerated, e. g. the application of the mind to religious meditation or its concentration by occupying a sitting or standing posture for a fixed period in the morning, at midday, in the evening and at midnight. The second is *Chhedopasthapan* which consists of taking some penance or re-entering the ascetic life, on account of some fault of the man. Third is *Parihar Vishudhi* which means the avoidance of any injury while moving about. Sukshm Samparaya is the endeavour to root out the residue of passions after its tumult has subsided. The fifth consists in observing the rules of highest character.

The twelve kinds of *Tapas* or "the checks to the career of desires," are enumerated in the last foot-note. We have thus seen what are the factors of the principle of *Sanvar*.

Now comes *Nirjara* which is defined as the partial destruction of the *Karmas*. One kind of it is the destruction of the *Karmas* by their being suffered out and another kind is its bringing to maturity by some means before its ordinary period. Partial destruction here means that some of the *Karmas* are yet to run their course.

Then comes *Moksha* which is defined as "freedom from every Karma." In this state, material body disappears and only the soul consisting of infinite wisdom and insight remains. We have thus treated of the *Seven Principles*. Now I take up the third part of my lecture.

Every Jain work asserts that true insight, true knowledge and right conduct are the path of Deliverance. These are the Three Jewels. True insight is faith in the seven principles explained before. It is also defined as faith in the God who is faultless, omniscient and author of the Scriptures ; in those scriptures that are dictated by such Gods that are consistent with everything, that expound the principles and that refute the false doctrines ; and in those Teachers who have abandoned sensual enjoyments, any new work or unnecessary equipment of worldly existence and who are absorbed in the acquisition of wisdom, concentration and penance. True knowledge is such as depicts things as they are, and as is based on faith without doubt or perversity. Right conduct is a man's observing in action what he knows and believes through True Faith and Knowledge. This conduct is either complete or incomplete according as a man is an ascetic or a layman. I shall take up the latter first. A man is not a *Shravaka* (a Jain layman) if he only knows and believes rightly and does not yet begin living by that belief or knowledge, which alone entitles him to that position. A *Shravaka* is also called a *Desh Vriti*, i.e. one who observes the vows [rules of conduct] only partially. He has eleven stages through which he is to rise up.

The first is the Darshan Stage. Here a man must have his faith free from the five and twenty faults and must be free from the seven vices, namely, (1) Gambling (2) Flesh-eating (3) Drinking (4) Debauchery (5) Hunting (6) Theft and (7) Defiling other men's wives.

The second is the *Vrita* Stage. Here the five *Anu*, the three *Gun* and the four *Shiksha Vritas* or vows have to be observed, without any defects. The first *Anu Vrita* consists of abandoning in intention killing generally. A

man observing it should not intentionally kill or make any one else kill any life higher than the *One-Sense* life. It entails avoidance of five faults connected with it, which are [1] not cutting a limb of an animal [2] binding it up [3] beating it with sticks, etc. (4) working it beyond its capacity and (5) under-feeding it. The second *Anuvrita* is Truthfulness in a general sense.

The Satyanu
Vrita With it are connected five faults to be avoided by one who keeps it. They are, (1) to speak ill of others (2) to divulge any one's secret [3] to censure others [4] to fabricate false writings and [5] to doctor accounts. The

The Achaurya
Anuvrita The third *Anuvrita* is general abstinence from stealing. To take without its owner's permission what is kept, lying, forgotten or not one's own, is general stealing. The five faults of the Vow are (1) to make some one else steal (2) to buy stolen property (3) to disobey law (4) to make false measures & (5) to adulterate commodities for sale. The fourth is the *Abandoning* of sexual relation with any but one's own wife.

The Brahma-
charya In observing it, too, five faults have to be guarded against, namely, [1] to bring about other's marriages [2] to relish naked sexuality [3] to indulge indecent talk [4] to be too fond of sensuality and [5] to frequent the houses of prostitutes. The fifth is the circumscription of worldly equipments. It means that a man should make up his mind as to what are his needs and then limit his ambition there and that he should live within his means. The five faults to be avoided here are (1) to undertake unnecessary enterprise (2) to lay by too much (3) to admire with satisfaction other men's wealth [4] to be covetous and [5] to bear too much burden. These five vows observed without faults and the abandonment of intoxicants, animal food and honey, make up the eight primary qualities of a lay man. They are essential to make him a *Shravak*. The faults connected with each of the vows do not constitute, if not observed, non-observance of the Vows them-

selves, but only they sully the complete purity of a man's character.

The three *Gun Vritas* that follow are [1] *Dig* (2) *Anarth Dand* and (3) *Bhogopabhoga*. The first is a vow not to go beyond a certain distance in any of the ten directions. Its "faults" are—[1] going higher (2) lower (3) more obliquely than is vowed (4) increasing the limits once settled upon and (5) forgetting the limits. The second is taking care not commit causeless sins even within the limits, e. g. not doing such things as preaching wrong conduct without one's own concern, giving others tools of life-killing, brooding over evil things, hearing or reading vicious songs or stories, and making idle tricks. Its "faults" are (1) speaking indecently, (2) drawing indecent pictures (3) talking excessively (4) increasing the furniture of enjoyment and (5) undertaking work without realising its extent. The avoidance of these "faults" makes the *Vow of Anarth Dand* complete. The third *Vow* consists of measuring the objects of *Bhog* (enjoyment once only) like food, water, etc. and of *Upbhog* [enjoyment over again of one and the same thing] such as clothes, ornaments, houses, etc. and also it consists in not eating roots of trees, onions, butter, flowers of *Nim* trees, the ketaki flowers and such things as do not hurt one's health. The faults of this *Vow* are [1] liking the objects of enjoyment (2) entertaining the memory of past pleasures (3) coveting the objects of pleasure (4) thirsting for the objects of enjoyment and (5) imagining enjoyment where there is none. These three are called *Gun Vritas* as they raise the *Anu* (small) *vritas* to *Maha* (great) *vritas*, (as regards the limits excluded etc.)

The four *Shiksha Vows* are *Deshavakashiksha* (2) *Samayika* (3) *Proshadhovavas* and (4) *Dana*. The first aims at converting the *Anu Vows* into *Mahavritas* by always tending to narrow

the limits of the former Vows. Its observance entails avoidance of five faults which are (1) sending men beyond the limits (2) sending verbal messages beyond the limits (3) ordering things from beyond the limits (4) making signs by physical movements and (5) by movements of outward objects.

The Shiksha
Vritas

The second is *Samayika*. It consists in a man's fixing a certain time in morning, noon and evening and spending that time in devotion, reading the scriptures and concentration sitting or standing in some lonely place. At this a man should confess and repent all the evil done, spoken or thought of. This is called *Pratikarman*, which is a part of *Samayika*. A resolution not to commit the same mistake over again, is called *Pratyakhyan*, which also is included in *Samayika*. It is a great penance and it purifies the mind. To these praising the greatness of the God, making three salutations to each of the four directions and giving up desires over the body are added to make up the "six necessities." The five faults to be avoided here are [1] non-fixing of the body [2] the mind and [3] the tongue to one purpose, [4] non-reverence towards the *Samayika* and [5] forgetting the lessons or the rites of the *Samayika*. The avoidance of these makes the *Samayika* faultless.

The third *Shiksha Vrita* is *Proshadhopavas*. A man observing it has to keep a complete or partial fast on the prescribed i. e. every eighth day of Hindu fortnight. All the day is to be spent in a lonely place in reading scriptures or meditating over asceticism. The best form of the Vow is in observing it for the whole day prescribed, in addition to the preceeding and following twelve hours. To be faultless, its observance must avoid (1) spreading the bed (2) observing the

Proshadhopavas

calls of nature (3) taking up necessary tools without examination and cleaning of the ground, (4) non-reverence for the rite and [5] forgetting it.

The last *Vow* is *Dan* or *Vayyavritya*, also called *Athithi* *Dan* or *Charity* *Sanvibhag*. It consists of giving food, medicine, safety and knowledge to needy men. If the *Dan* leads to or encourages laziness, grossness, madness, disease or sin, it is no *Dan* at all. So one must be very careful in giving in charity. The five faults to be avoided here are (1) giving food kept in an objectionable pot (2) concealed in it (3) giving it through others (4) giving it out of envy and (5) not giving it in time. A man who observes these twelve *Vows* without faults and the three *Shalyas*, is a man in the second stage.

The three *Shalyas* are (1) *Maya* (illusion) (2) *Mithyatva* (false-
The *Shalyas* or hood) and (3) *Nidan* (covetousness,). The first
Darts is the pang of fraud, the second is the pang of false faith and the third is the pang of coveting certain things. A layman who observes the *Vows* must be unaffected by these darts.

Such a man has to observe in the last *Sanllekhana* at the time
Sanllekhana of dying. He should give up all love for his wife,
or peaceful children and friends and hatred towards his en-
death emies. Pardon should be sought from all and extended to all. The idea of houses, etc. being one's own should be thrown aside. The dues should be paid up. The remaining estate should be given to children, wife, servants and in charities. The actions of the closing life should be reviewed. Evils should be repented. There should be no pain, no fear, no anxiety ; but attention should be fixed on scriptures being read at the time. Food should be diminished gradually until

it should be substituted for *Kanji* and further for water merely. Lastly strict fasting should be kept. The five salutations, namely, to the Arhats, the Sidhas, the Acharyas, the Upadhyayas and the Sages should be recited till the soul calmly leaves the body. This *Vow* is to be observed only when a man feels certain that death is near at hand. The faults to be avoided in the complete observance of this *Vow* are (1) a desire for prolonging the days of life, (2) or for hastening death, (3) fearing death and its pain (4) remembering friends & relations and (5) wishing for certain fruits of the [meritorious] acts done. A man who dies a Sanllekhana death, surely reaches the heavens or attains the *Moksha*.

Then comes the third, the *Samayika* stage. It consists in the faultless keeping of the *Samayika* Vow. The fourth stage is named after and consists in the regular observance of the *Proshadhopavas* Vow. The fifth, called the *Sachitt-tyaga* stage, is the one in which a man does not eat fruits, vegetables, roots, branches, seeds and flowers that are not dried or ripe or boiled. The sixth consists in abandoning the habit of eating, drinking, licking and chewing beetlenuts and *pan* from sunset to sunrise. The seventh stage requires complete celibacy and conquest of the sexual desire. The eighth is that stage of life in which engagements like commerce, agriculture, service, etc. are completely abandoned. The ninth stage is reached when a man gives up the ten external appendages such as wealth, corn, cattle, etc. and keeps the mind unruffled.

The tenth stage requires a man to be free from interfering with and consenting to occupations, marriages, etc. The final stage of a layman is that in which he leaves home altogether, goes to some ascetic from whom he takes vows, lives by mendi-

cacy, dons a very small piece of cloth only and practices Tapas all the time. A man rising to a higher stage must rise by each successive stage along the march and must keep all the practices of each stage below.

Tapas is twelvefold :- [1] Fasting [2] Eating less than a full meal [3] fixing dinners [4] omitting some *Ras* [ghee, etc.] from the dinner [5] sitting and sleeping in a lonely place [6] putting the body to exercise. This is external Tapas. The internal Tap is [1] Doing penance [2] keeping restraint [3] serving the Teachers [4] Reading the Shastras daily [5] indifference towards one's own body and [6] concentration of mind.

The fifty three rites prescribed for a layman are the eight primary qualities, the twelve Vows, the twelve Tapas. The fifty three rites one *Samyabhava* or equanimity, the eleven Stages, the four *Danas*, the habit of drinking water passed through cloth, giving up night-meals and the three jewels. They are all detailed before.

The six daily duties of a man are, (1) worship, (2) business for livelihood by means of (a) the sword, (b) the pen (c) the plough, (d) the scale (e) the tools of arts like carpentry, mechanics, drawing and (f) the rod of the herdsman. No one should be idle and burdensome to others. One who handles the sword has to perform six duties, viz:—self-protection, maintaining purity of heart, up-holding the royal family and treating his subjects and his sons alike and subduing his foes. [3] Charity. [4] Reading and thinking. [5] Self restraint; and [6] Penance.

I shall now briefly enumerate the fifty three ceremonies through which a man living in family life is to pass. The fifty three ceremonies of the Mahapurāṇ

(1) *Conception ceremony*—When a woman attains puberty, she and her husband should on the sixth day thereafter go to the temple, perform worship and at night should go together only for the sake of pregnancy. Cohabitation without Ritu, i.e. the time just following the monthly course, is prohibited.

(2) *Propitiation*—In the third month after conception, worship, music, etc. should be performed to keep the pregnant woman delightful.

(3) *Super-propitiation*—The above ceremonies should be performed in the fifth month, after conception.

(4) *Dhriti Kriya*—means that worship should be performed, in the seventh month, for the sake of the child to be born.

(5) *Moda Kriya*—consists in the writing of the primary letters असिआऊस on the body of the pregnant woman in the ninth month, etc.

(6) *Birth ceremony*—It consists in worship, etc. at the birth of a child.

(7) *Naming*—It is to be done on the twelfth day after birth with worship of the Gods, the Preceptors and the family priests.

(8) *Bringing out the child from the delivery room* in the second, third or the fourth month.

(9) *Laying up the child on a bed.*

(10) *Feeding the child with boiled rice* in the eighth month or so.

(11) *First Anniversary* to be performed with feasts, etc.

(12) *Keshavaya*, i.e. the ceremony of keeping hairs after shaving for the first time.

(13) *Lipi Sankhyān*—means that the child in its fifth year should be taught to write *Om* at the hands of the priest.

(14) *Thread ceremony*—This consists in giving the boy, now eight years old, the five *Anu Vritas*.

(15) *Student-hood*—wherein the boy should keep the vows, study religion and other subjects.

(16) *Completion of the Vows*—means that the boy should, after completing studies take up asceticism if he likes or should be a house-holder, i. e. should take on the habiliments of a layman instead of a celibate, should abandon intoxicants, flesh, honey, the five udumbaras and the five sins beginning with killing, and should adopt one of the six ways of livelihood.

(17) *Marriage*—When the man wishes to marry he should select with his parents' consent a good girl from a proper family and marry her in the presence of fire. For a week after marriage, they should keep on celibacy whereon they should go together on some pilgrimage. After returning, the marriage thread on the wrist should be untied. Cohabitation is allowed once in a month just at the time of *Ritu*. Weaker persons should keep longer intervals.

(18) *Varnlabh*—requires that the married persons, after taking some property from their parents, should make a separate household.

(19) *Kulcharya*—i. e. the six daily duties of a householder should be performed.

(20) *Excellence in Layman's duties* should be attained through wisdom, character, etc., with a view to become lay-preceptor.

(21) *Quietude* to be got by assigning family-affairs to the care of the sons.

(22) *Desertion* of the house should come when a man is sure that the family would do without him.

(23) The *Pre-ascetic life*, i. e. the life of the layman in the last stage, should be taken up.

(24) *Jin Rupata* consists in the throwing up of the clothes and taking on the life of an ascetic without any bondage.

(25) *Concentrated Study* should now begin when there should be no talk on any thing but study.

(26) *Teerthankar Bhavana* consists in studying the sixteen *Bhavas*, the first of which is *Darshan Vishudhi*.

(27) The duties of a leading ascetic—*Acharya*—should then be performed.

(28) *Preaching* and correcting the wrong going men.

(29) *Becoming an Acharya*.

(30) *Handing over the place* to a pupil and taking to lonely meditation.

(31) The attempt at total concentration.

(32) Total concentration.

(33) Attaining Indra's birth after death.

(34) Accession to Indra's throne.

(35) Giving of *Vimans* and *Riddies* to others.

(36) Enjoyment of Indra-ship.

(37) Abandoning the place.

(38) To be conceived to become a *Teerthankar*.

(39) The shower of Jewels upon the newborn.

(40) To be born and worshipped by Indra on the *Meru* mountain.

(41) Worship of the to-be Teerthankar by the Indras.

(42) Heir-apparentship.

(43) Empire.

(44) Acquisition of the *Chakra* i.e. the nine stores and the fourteen jewels.

(45) Starting for universal conquest.

(46) Celebration of the conquest.

(47) Proper regulation of the subsidiary kings.

(48) Giving over the empire to the son and becoming an ascetic.

(49) To attain absolute knowledge.

(50) Raising up of the *Samaya Saran*.

(51) Preaching the truth by the Teerthankar.

(52) Drawing the soul into itself.

(53) Final Deliverance.

This is the progress of the layman to *Moksha*.

Now a few words about asceticism, which comes after the The Jain Monk eleventh stage of laymanship. Ascetic has to possess twenty-eight Primary Qualities, namely, the five great *Vows* [the *Anuvritas* in a stricter form], the five *Samitis*, the six necessities beginning with *Samayika*, abandonment of the objects of the five senses, throwing off clothes, drawing out the hair with one's own hands, one meal a day, standing up while taking his meal, eating the food taken only in the palms of the hands, non-bathing and non-rubbing of the teeth. The secondary qualities of an ascetic are eighty four lacks and they may be referred to in special works on the subject. But their absence

JAINISM

does not make the ascetic defective. But no defect in the eight primary qualities is allowable in an ascetic.

An ascetic should come for his meal to the town from his lonely abode; he should try five houses and should take his meal in the first of them where he may be willingly welcomed; if he is nowhere called in, he should return to his study and meditation and only try in the same way for his meals the next day. He should eat whatever is given without asking any thing else. In summer, he should practise his penance on the top of a hill; in winter, by the side of a river, and in autumn, under a tree.

We now come to the fourth part of our lecture the nature of merit and sin. False belief, killing, falsehood, theft, debauchery, unlimited luxury, covetousness, anger, pride, fraud; love, biting behind one's back, idleness, grossness, eating uneatables—all these are sins. Compassion, benevolence, gentleness, charity, self-sacrifice, celibacy, appreciation, sympathy, praise of gods, reverence for the teachers, studiousness, modesty, philanthropy, self-maintenance in a rightful way, pilgrimage, etc. are prescribed to be merits [virtues]. There is no virtue in baths [of sacred rivers, as Brahmins hold]. The layman should bathe for cleanness and health but there is no bearing of river-baths or seabaths on the virtues of a man. There is no religious significance of the eclipses or the equinoxes. There is no *Shradh* [the anniversary of dead forefathers] no *Paksha*, no giving of the *Pinda* to departed souls, no worship of the cow, no worship of the *Tulsi* shrub or the *Vad* (वड़) tree. We shall take up the fifth part of the lecture viz—the nature of the binding of *Karma*.

This topic has been mostly dealt with in the second part of the lecture. The soul is roving in worldly existence owing to

its connection with *Karma* from times without beginning. The connection breaks off only by the extirpation of the latter. Insight and knowledge are the essences of the soul. Whatever is believed and known by the soul, attracts the soul with love or hatred. The development of this love or hatred is the bondage of *Karma*. Here comes our next subject.

Moksha, its nature and its path. It has been already explained to be freedom of the soul from every *Karma*. In the progress of the soul from the state of bondage to total freedom, there are successive changes in its state, called *Gunasthanas*, fourteen in number.

The first is *Mithyatva Gunasthan*, where the soul is completely immersed in all the *Karmas*. The soul does not know its true good. When by some cause it happens to have faith in the right path, it reaches the third or the fourth step of merit. On the fourth step, the faith is pure.

On the third it is mixed with a certain amount of illusion and thus that step is called the step of mixed merit.

The soul sometimes falls back to the first step. On its way back, it passes the second step, called the *Sasadan* step.

Until the fifth step is ascended, faith alone is right, on reaching which the soul must also guide its conduct rightly. So a man who observes either one or all of the *Vows* belonging to the eleven stages of laymanship is on this—the *Sanyatasanyat*-step of merit.

Keeping the great *Vows* of the ascetics, a man rises to the sixth step. Here the sins due to physical grossness, are alone committed by the soul.

These too disappear before the next—the *Appramatta*—step is reached.

The eighth step, as its name indicates, gives the man experience of unique nature. Here a man increases his concentration by the Yogas and the coils of *Karmas* are fast unloosened.

The ninth step—called the *Anivrith karan*—makes very small changes in the above.

On the next step, the passions become very weak and so it is called the *Sookshma-Samparaya*.

On the eleventh, the passions are pacified. But from here a descent to the sixth step is possible.

The first three classes of *Karmas* have to be totally destroyed in order to reach the twelfth-step. The first two parts of pure contemplation are present here. Any explanation of the Jain Yoga would carry us beyond the scope of the lecture and so the point has to be rather dropped in obscurity here.

This concentrated contemplation carries the soul up to the thirteenth step, where eternal wisdom, illimitable insight, everlasting happiness and unbounded prowess bless the soul. When this absolute knowledge is acquired, Kuber and other heavenly beings raise the *Samayasarana* where the twelve conferences meet to hear eternal wisdom from the *Kevali*. After prayers are offered, the *Kevali* goes about preaching truth until, when the days of deliverance approach, he takes to the third part of pure contemplation (*Shukladhyan*). Here the soul reaches every part of the universe and is yet within the body whose connection alone remains now. The last part of contemplation follows on, when the fourteenth step is ascended the body disappears like burnt camphor. This is the *Nirvana*.

The going of the Soul to the pure place, called the *Shidha* Shila, from whence it returns not, is the *Moksha*. In numerable delivered souls exist and are to be there for ages that never were begun and which never close. The *Sidha* soul has eight characteristics (1) Rightfulness (2) Absolute knowledge (3) Illimitable insight (4) Boundless prowess (5) Minuteness (6) Power to reach every where (7) Power to be big and small and (8) Unaffectedness. This *Moksha* is obtained by means of the three jewels whose acquisition is gradual through the fourteen steps of merits, described before.

We now take up Image-worship. The *Image* or the picture is intended to give us a view of the all-knowing beings in their concentrated posture—the high-souled beings who attained Godhood by the slow path along the fourteen *Gunasthanas*,

Image-wor- after throwing off the sensual life for the sake of
ship Justified asceticism. Even now, photos and statues of great men are placed in private houses and public situations in order that they should remind us of their virtues. Images are worshipped with the same object, and the worship is not of the stone or metal of which the images are made but of the virtues they represent. They also teach us vividly what the posture of contemplation with concentration is. The images are either in sitting or erect postures and the postures are called *Padmasan* or *Kayotsarga* respectively. The erect image has its feet close to each other, the hand left straight down and the half-closed eyes pointed to the end of the nose. In the sitting attitude, the eyes are in the same position but the feet are twined into each other and the up-turned palms of the hands are placed together

The posture of a Jain Image in the centre of the folded feet. Neither cloth nor ornament has any place on the images. No female image is to be in their vicinity. It is in fact an embodiment of a perfectly dispassionate mind in complete selfconcentration..

The best attitude of Yoga as given in the *Bhagavadgita* ch. VI transcribed below is found in these images. Illustrated from a Brahmin Work Says the Gita:—"With body, head and neck erect and immoveable; with eyes directed straight to the end of the nose and without trembling; with the mind kept at complete rest and fearless; keeping celibacy; subduing the heart; devoted to me (the God); a man should remain, with faith on me, in the state of concentration. He who thus concentrates the attention and pacifies the mind in contemplation, becomes united with me and obtains final peace."†

A similar description is met with in ch. V. 26. 27 and 28 of the same (non-Jain) work.

† समं कायशिरोग्रीवं धारयन्तच्चलं स्थिरः ॥
 संप्रेक्ष्य नासिकाग्रं स्वं दिशश्चानवलोकयन् १३
 प्रशान्तात्मा विगतभीर्ब्रह्मचारिव्रते स्थितः ॥
 मनः संयम्य मच्चित्तो युक्त आसीत मत्परः १४
 युञ्जन्नेवं सदात्मानं योगी नियतमानसः ॥
 शान्तिं निर्वाणपरमां मत्संस्थामधिगच्छति १५

Bhagavadgita ch. VI 13, 14, 15.

[कामक्रोधवियुक्तानां यतीनां यतचेतनाम् ॥
 अभितो ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं व्रतंते चिदितात्मनाम् २६
 स्कशन्कृत्वा बहिर्वाह्यांचक्षुश्चैवान्तरे भ्रूवोः ॥
 प्राणापानौ समौ कृत्वा नासान्यन्तरचारिणौ २७
 यतेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिर्मुनिमोक्षपरायणः ॥
 विगतेच्छाभयक्रोधो यः सदा मुक्त एव सः २८

Bhagavadgita ch. V.

The householder worships the images with eight classes of things while the ascetics only offer salutations to them. The eightfold worship is (1) *Bathing* the image with water; (2) *Sprinkling* of *Keshar* and *Chandan*; before the image: (3) offering rice in front; (4) placing flowers before the image; (5) offering (Boiled rice) *Naivedya* (sugar-candy, etc.); (6) keeping up a light near the image; (7) burning incense; (8) offering fruits. There are different hymns to be sung in offering each of these things. The eight together make the *Arghya*. The offerings are to be poured into three cavities in ground with the three fires in them—the *Ahavaniya*, the *Garhapatya* and the *Dakshin* fires. Worships are classed into [1] the worship of *Arahants*, [2] the worship of *Sidhas*, etc. all the worships consisting of praise of the virtues of the objects of worship. The offerings are called *Nirmalya* and they are not to be taken for use or eaten by any one. It is said to be a great sin to do so.

So far for image-worship. I will now point out the resemblance of Jainism with other religions. The chief doctrines of Jainism are [1] the independent existence of the soul, [2] the observance of the five *Vows*, [3] the abandoning of animal-food and intoxicants, [4] the theory of actions meeting with their requisite fruits necessarily and [5] the conception of *Moksha*.

Jainism compared with other religions Jainism shares these views with many other religions. The Hindus, the Parsees, the Islamites, the Christians and the *Budhas* admit the immortality of the soul. The Mohamedans and the Christians do not believe in rebirth; but still they hold that the soul survives death and reaps the fruits of its actions by the decree of God. So the immortality is still unchallenged. About the *Vows* of *Jainism*, the Hindu work known as the *Divine Lay* speak in very similar terms thus:—

“Religion is defined as Non-killing; killing is irreligious. So, those who desire piety should be compassionate towards beings. Non-killing, Truth, Non-stealing, Celibacy—in these four, every duty has been included.” *

About the non-eatables in *Jainism*, the *Maha Bharat* says:—
“Pilgrimage, meditation and penance are in vain for those who use intoxicants, take their dinners at night and who eat roots of trees.” ‡

The *Bhagvat* says with regard to the same subject:—

Abandoning intoxicants, animal food and honey; giving up eating the five Udumbaras (fruits full of minute lives); not eating at night; this is the characteristic of a Brahmin.” †

So again says the *Shiva Dharma* :—

“In liquors, flesh, honey and butter removed from curd innumerable small lives take birth and die away.”

There are Hindu authorities to which may be added the *Parsee*, the *Mussalman* and the *Christian* as regards non-killing, eating flesh, and drinking wines.

* ग्रहिषातक्षणो धर्मो ह्यधर्मः प्राणिनां वधः ॥

तस्माद्धर्माधिभिलोकि कर्तव्या प्राणिनां दया १

ग्रहिता सत्यमस्तेयं तथा मय्युनवर्जनम् ॥

चतुर्वर्षेषुसूक्तेषु सर्वे धर्माः प्रकीर्तिताः २

‡ मद्यमांसाशनं रात्रौ भोजनं कन्दभक्षणम् ॥

ये कुर्वन्ति वृथा तेषां तीर्थयात्रा जपस्तपः १

† मद्यमांसमप्युद्यागो त्यक्तोदुग्ध रपंचरः ॥

निशाहारपरित्यक्त एतदब्राह्मणलक्षणम् १

Firdosi, the author of the Persian sacred work, the *Shahnama*, says :—

“The son-in-law of the prophet Mohamed-Ali prohibited flesh-eating. Akabar [the emperor] desisted from flesh-eating every Friday, Sunday, eclipse day and the whole of the Faruadin month. Mohamed himself has strictly ordered non-killing in front of the *Kayaba* at Mecca. Even a Mohamadan passing through the *Salekashareayat* to the *Tareekat* does not eat flesh. Drinking and debauchery are strictly prohibited to the Islamites. The *Koran* commands truthfulness and non-stealing. Of the Ten Commandments, those that refer to non-killing, stealing, purity of character, drinking, etc. are quite in consonance with Jainism. The Bible prescribes vegetarianism.

“Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth and every tree which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.”

[Genesis chapt 1, 29.]

“While the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the wrath of the LORD was kindled against the people, and the LORD smote the people with a very great plague.”

(See verse 33 and also verses 19 and 20)

General Booth of the Salvation Army, himself a vegetarian, preaches that creed to all his followers. Vegetarian societies are founded everywhere in Europe and they justify vegetarianism on hygienic, economical, ethical and religious grounds.

So it will be seen that on vegetarian and temperance grounds, many other religions agree with *Jain* doctrines. It was an error of Shankaracharya to stigmatise *Jainism* as being atheistic. In writing his commentary on the Sutra नैकास्मिन्संभवात् Shankar has

tried to refute the *Syadvad* of Jain Logic. This attempt displays the ignorance of Shankar about the doctrine criticised and his prejudice against *Jainism*. *Anekant* means the existence of many qualities in one and the same object. The same man is spoken of as father, uncle, father-in-law, son-in-law and so on, in his different relations. To his son, he is father; to his nephew, he is uncle. So again, a man is both wise and ignorant—the first with reference to an ignorant man, the second with reference to a wise man. Every thing is existent in some respects from the point of view of the *Swachatusaya* and non-existent in some respects from the point of view of the *Parachyatusaya*.* There is nothing existent or non-existent in all respects. N. P. Even Shankaracharya himself avails of the same mode of reconciling opposite views by calling the one true 'ordinary' or *Vyavahartah* and its opposite as also true *Paramarthatah*, i. e. from the stand-point of the highest considerations. For instance, the inconsistency of the Gita in the following. The Gita says in one place that the universe is not created by any one.† This view is contradicted by the same work when it says that God pervades every being and puts in illusion by means of his *Maya*. §

* The *Swachatusaya* are *Swaroop*, *Swadravya*, *Swakshetra* and *Swakal*. These mean respectively, one's own nature, material, place and time. *Parachatusaya* similarly are the nature, material, place and time of others. See further note on *Anekant* Logic.

Editor.

‡ न कृत्तृत्वं न कर्माणि लोकस्य सृजति प्रभुः ॥

न कर्मफलसंयोगं स्वभावस्तु प्रवर्तते १

नादत्ते कस्यचित्पापं न चैव मुकृतं विभुः ॥

अज्ञानेनावृतं ज्ञानं तेन मुह्यन्ति जन्तवः २

§ ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति ॥

आमयन् सर्वभूतानि यंत्रारूढानि मायया १

To say that God does nothing and also that he does everything is obviously contradictory. This is reconciled by saying that the two are true from two different points of view.

Even now we look at everything from ethical, hygienic and other points of view. This subject is very clearly explained by Dr. Bhandarkar, in his report regarding the Deccan College Manuscripts. He says :—

“There are two ways of looking at things, one called Dravyarthikanayaya and other Paryayarthikanyaya. The production of a jar is the production of some thing not previously existing, if we take the latter points of view, *i. e.* as a Paryaya or modification; while it is not the production of something not previously existing, when we look at it from the former point of view, *i. e.*, as a Dravya or substance. So when a soul becomes, through his merits or demerits, a god, a man, or a denizen of hell, from the first point view, the being is the same, but from the second he is not the second, *i. e.*, different in each case. So that, you can affirm or deny something of a thing at one and the same time. This leads to the celebrated ‘Saptabhangi Nyaya’ or the seven modes of assertion. You can affirm existence of a thing from one point of view (Syad asti), deny it from another (Syad nasti); and affirm both existence and nonexistence with reference to it at different-times (Syad asti nasti). If you should think of affirming both existence and nonexistence at the same time from the same point of view, you must say that thing cannot be so spoken of (Syad avaktavya); similarly under certain circumstances the affirmation of existence is not possible (Syad asti avaktavya); of non-existence (Syad nasti avaktavya) and also of both (Syad asti nasti avaktavya). What is meant by these seven modes is that a thing should not be considered as existing

everywhere, at all times, in all ways, and in the form of every thing. It may exist in one place and not in another, at one time and not at another, etc. It is not meant by these modes that there is no certainty or that we have to deal with probabilities only, as some scholars have thought. All that is implied is that every assertion which is true is true only under certain conditions of space, time, etc. This is the substance of the section which treats of *Dravyas samanya* or *Dravya* generally."

Had *Jainism* been atheistic, the *Vedas* would not have referred to it in respectful terms. Says the *Rig Veda* :—

"I bow down to the twentyfour *Sidhas*, *Rishabh* to *Vardhaman* celebrated in all the the worlds."†
Vedas on Jainism.

Similarly,
 says the *Yajaman* "We propitiate the naked Gods who are holy, and who purify others."§

So again, vide *Yajur Veda*, XXV, 19.

† This passage seems to be spurious from its language as well as from its reference to *Vardhaman*.

Ed.

ॐ त्रैलोक्यप्रतिष्ठितानां चतुर्विंशतितीर्थकराणां ॥

ऋषभादिवर्द्धमानान्तानां सिद्धानां शरणां प्रपद्ये १

§ ॐ पवित्रं नग्नमुपवि (ई) प्रसामहे येषां नग्नं

(नग्नये) जातिर्येषां वीरा ॥

• ["ॐ नमोऽर्हन्तो ऋषभो"

ॐ ऋषभं पवित्रं पुरुषोत्तमध्वरं यशो यं नग्नं परमं माहृत
 स्तुतं वारमं शत्रुं जयं तं पशुरिदमाहुरिति स्वाहा । उत्तरा-
 तारमिन्द्रं ऋषभं वपन्ति प्रमृतारमिन्द्रं हवे मुगतं
 सुपावमिन्द्रं हवे शक्रमजितं तद्वर्द्धमानपुरुषानमिन्द्रमा-

(contd.)

The same *Veda* refers to *Nemi*, one of the Jain Teerthankars. §

Thus it will be seen that many Jain prophets like *Rishabh*, *Suparshva*, *Nemi* and *Vardhaman* are worshipped and praised in the *VEDAS*, hence *Jainism* cannot be called *Nastika* (in the sense of 'profane' or 'unvedic'). It also appears to be prior to the *Vedas*.

Rama says in *BRIHAD YOGAVASHISHTA* that he wished
Non-Jain refer- to get peace "like Jin.†
ence to Jainism

DAKSHIN-MURTA-SAHASRANAMA says: "Said Shiva 'a Jain is one who lives Jainism, subdues anger and conquers disease.'"‡

Bhartrihari speaks of the dispassionate of the Jinas as being matchless.*

(contd.)

हुरिति स्वाहा । ॐ स्वस्ति नः इन्द्रो वृद्धश्रवाः स्वस्तिनः
पूषा विश्ववेदाः स्वस्ति नस्तार्क्ष्यो अरिष्टनेमिः स्वस्ति
नो ब्रह्मस्पतिर्दधातु दीर्घायुस्त्वायवलायुर्वा शुभजातायु ॥

S ॐ रक्ष रक्ष अरिष्टनेमि स्वाहा । वामदेवशान्त्यर्थ-
मुपविधीयते सोऽस्माकं अरिष्टनेमि स्वाहाः ॥

† राम उवाच—नाहं रामो न मे बांछा भावेषु च न मे मनः ॥
शान्तिमास्थतुमिच्छामि चात्मन्येव जिनो यथा ॥

‡ शिव उवाच—जैनमार्गरतो जैनो जितक्रोधो जितामयः ॥

* एको रागिषु राजते प्रियतमादेहाह्वं धारी हरो ।

नीरागेषु जिनो विमुक्तललनासङ्गो न यस्मात्परः ॥

दुर्वास्मस्वाराणपन्नगविगव्यासक्तमुग्धो जनः ।

शेषः काकविडम्बितो हि विषयान्भोक्तुं न मोक्तुं कमः ॥

Such instances may be multiplied manifold, but it will take long time.

These references further support our point. PANINI'S authority may be added to this. He defines Nastikas as those who deny the existence of post-mundane worlds.* The Jains can of course stand on this ground in trying to rebut the charge. They accept sixteen *Swargas* or heavens, seven hells, and this world through which a soul wanders according to its *Karmas*.

Some, however, base their charge upon the non-creation theory of Jainism. Jainism holds that God is the creator of the universe only from certain points of view, not, absolutely, in so far as he explained to the world the true good of the soul, pointed out to all the means of livelihood, and inculcated the truth of the law of *Karmas*, God is called the maker of the universe. But Jainism denies that God is the source of all human actions, good and bad; for, this is opposed to the very nature of God. To say that a thief commits theft because he was so moved by Gods will, and yet God punished him for the theft, is clearly inconsistent. There can be no satisfactory solution of the difficulty here arising. Hence it is that great philosophers have denied creation by God. For example see the passage quoted from the Bhagavat Gita, on page 53. Here the will of God being the source of any

The usual reading of this Shloka substitutes जन for जिन in 1 & 2. But the reading here adopted is met within a Jain work, some centuries old, the Mokshamargaprakasha. Besides, it gives a better meaning to the shloka.

Editor.

* सूत्र अस्ति नास्ति दिष्टं मतिः ॥

परलोकः अस्ति इति मतिर्यस्यैवः आम्निकः ।

परलोको नास्ति इति मतिर्यस्यैवः नाम्निकः

द्वयमस्ति इति मतिर्यस्यैवः द्विदिग्ः ॥

activity is denied. The falling of the rain, the milk in the breast of the mother, the heat given out by fire or the light of the sun are not creations of God but they *exist* by their own nature. If God is to take credit for these, it is as well that he should be censured for creating famines, plagues, inundations and earthquakes. The Hindu Vedant says that the origin of evils is in the *तमो गुण* of God and of good things, in the *सत्य गुण* of God. The Christians and the Muslims consider Saitan to be the doer of evils. God is said to be full of all the best qualities but not of all the vices.

The Jains go further and limit the duty of God to explaining the right path. Christianity concurs with it in saying that God has handed over the duty of giving judgments to his Son. In substance this doctrine means that God is the legislative power while his Son is the executive. This resembles the *Jain* doctrine in many respects, in so far as it holds that the *Teerthankars* do not have the 'executive' powers in them.

Aristotel, the celebrated Greek philosopher who lived in 384 B. C. refers to God in these terms :—
 Aristotel on creation

“Not taking cognizance of, and not regarding the affairs of the world, which owed not its existence to him, to which his presence and influence do not extend.”—

We shall now take up the last part of our discourse—the individual and national welfare arising from Jainism. From the above account some may be led to think that Jainism aims at after-life happiness and that there is no provision in it for worldly and natural happiness. But the fact is that Jainism is a source of happiness in this world and even from a national point of view. Worldly comfort consists in materials like food,

clothes, wealth, etc. Now the Jains, 2.2 million in number are spread over Punjab and Kashmir in the North, Mysore and Rameshwar in the South and Bombay, Gujerat and Rajasthan in the West. But not one will be found to wander over public streets in search of food. Material prosperity of the Jains
Famine, fire or floods may have reduced some to destitution ; but they are very few. Most of the Jains are merchants, money-lenders or landholders. A few are servants. But they are well-doing men as a class. Some are owners of lacs. A few are owners of crores too. Thus the Jains are a materially prosperous class. We shall consider their ethical condition now.

The proportion of jail-going population is a good index to the moral condition of a community. The following table, drawn from the Jail Administration Report of the year 1891 for the Bombay presidency gives useful figures.

Moral conditions of the Jains

Religion	Population in 1891	Total prisoners in 1891	Proportion of persons to prisoners
Hindus	1,46,57,179	9,714	1,509
Mohamedans	35,01,910	5,794	604
Christians	1,58,765	333	477
Parcees	73,945	29	2,549
Jews	9,639	20	481
Jains	2,40,436	39	6,165

The last column shows that the Jains stand highest in morality. The figures from a later Report, i. e. for the year 1901 show an improvement even over this. That is, out of 7,355 Jains, only one man was in prison in that year.

The following table will show that an observance of the five *Anu Vritas* described before without committing any "faults" pertaining to them, is practically tantamount to complete conformity with the principles of morality enforced by the Indian Penal Code.

The Vows and the Penal Laws

Ch.	Substance of the Sections	Sections	The equivalent writ etc.
I	Preamble	I	Command to take the Shastra as an authority.
II	Definitions	6-52	The definitions of sins and the Vows.
III	Punishments	53-75	Penances.
IV	General exceptions	76-106	There is no sin unless an action is actuated by passion.

Ch.	Substance of the Sections	Sections	The equivalent writ etc.
V	Abetment	107-120	The five Vows and the "faults"
VI	Offences against the State	121-130	<i>Virudhrajyatikram tyaga.</i>
VII	Offences against the army and navy	131-140	"
VIII	Offences against public tranquility	141-160	The <i>Ahimsa</i> vow and its "faults"
IX	Offences committed by public servants	161-171	The "faults" of <i>Satya</i> Vow and <i>Acharya</i> vow with its "faults"
X	Contempt of court, etc.	172-190	See ch. VI above

Ch.	Substance of the Sections	Sections	The equivalent writ etc.
XI	False statements, etc.	191-229	<i>Anrit, Mithyopadesh and Virudhrajyatikram tyaga.</i>
XII	False coinage, etc.	230-263	<i>Pratirupaka vyavahar and V. rajyatikram tyaga.</i>
XIII	Offences regarding weights, etc.	264-267	<i>Heenadhik manon-man atichar tyaga.</i>
XIV	Offences against health, safety, etc.	268-294	The avoidance of the "faults" of the first two <i>Anuvritas</i> .
XV	Offences against religion, etc.	295-298	„
XVI	Offences against person.	299-377	The <i>Ahinsa</i> vow with its "faults"
XVII	Offences	378-462	The complete

Ch.	Substance of the Sections	Sections	The equivalent writ etc.
	against property.		<i>Achaurya</i> vow.
XVIII	Regardingf also documents, etc.	463-489	<i>Kootlekhhkriya & Praturupaka vyavahar.</i>
XIX	Regarding failure to perform services, etc.	490-492	The <i>Satya</i> vow.
XX	Offences about marriages.	493-499	<i>Parastree Tyaga.</i>
XXI	Defamation.	499-502	The <i>Satya</i> vow & <i>Rakobhyakhyan tyaga.</i>
XXII	Intimidation.	503-510	The <i>Satya</i> Vow.
XXIII	Attempt to commit offences.	511	The five vows.

Thus if a man but observes the *Vows* avoiding their faults, Repentence he has no fear from the Penal Code. A *Shravaka* every day recites the *Pratikraman* which gives him the habit of being free from offence. Some of the *Gathas* in it are given below in English :—

“I forgive all. Let all forgive me. I am friend to all; enemy to none. I unloosen the knot of anger, hatred, pleasure, humility, eager desire, fear, pain, liking and aversion.”

After recounting the wrongs done by mind, tongue or act, goes on the man :—

“Ah! what evil have I done! Ah! what evil idea have I entertained! Ah! what wicked words have I uttered! I repent it; my heart is deeply afflicted!”

The *Pratikraman* proceeds to recount the “faults” of vows committed, to confess and repent them and then *Pratyakhyan*—or a determination not to recommit the same follows. This is to be found in *Shravaka pratikramana*.

I have hitherto described how Jainism affects the national welfare and morality of people. National welfare depends on the moral condition of society. Morality begets mutual trust which strengthens union. Union makes great achievements possible. The Joint stock companies of Bombay, Ahmedabad, etc. are supported greatly by Jain capital. Of late, however, the Jains have been confining their attention to secondary matters to the detriment of their primary interests. So they have not only lost learning and political power but they have come to lose every influence in the administration of the country. If they attend to their chief principles, they will achieve their own and their national good. Jainism offers direct happiness by the aid of the law of cause and effect. No mira-

cles are invented for the purpose. The results good or bad that it promises, are proved to be so with convincing reasons.

Several things are to be told with various objects : of these objects the principal and secondary ones differ according to the circumstances ; for instance, the Jain religion prescribes drinking of water after filtering and boiling it and this command is zealously obeyed by the Jains. In this, non-killing (अहिंसा) is said to be the primary object ; yet sanitation too is one of its motives. It is also meant for preventing poisonous germs from entering the stomach. So also, non-killing is the principal object in disallowing eating at night. Still the object of sanitation goes along with it. Poisonous bacilli multiply numerously at night. Hence the modern science of medicine advises to stay at night out of the town in the days of plague and to take care about their entrance into the eatables. Also if there is no objection to eat at night, there remains no rule as to how far meals should be taken at night. Consequently eating at night goes on up to 11 or 12. Owing to this eating irregularly at night, sound sleep cannot be obtained and we cannot get up early in the morning. So the violation of the laws of sanitation gives rise to diseases due to indigestion.

SOME ASPECTS OF JAIN

PHILOSOPHY

VERY few men will be found ready to hear the claims of a religion that is professed by only a meagre two million people, to be considered as being one of the greatest faiths preached for the moral welfare of humanity. The standard by which the common man judges of the soundness of a theory, is the number of men who are willing to say 'yes' to it. When a comparative study of religions is begun, the attention of the scholar at once fixes itself upon those only that are numerically strong beyond comparison. While Hinduism or Christianity counts tens of millions, it is only with some difficulty that Jainism can advance a little further than the first unit. It is only of late that the great Comparative Religionists of the west have had their eyes slowly opened to the hitherto ignored treasures of philosophy going under the common name of Jainism. But the question still remains, why this faith should show such a small number of adherents, if, as is claimed, its tenets possess that power to appeal to the sentiments of the highest men which all great principles are said to possess. While considering this problem, the critics of Jainism in modern times naturally avail themselves of the charge laid at the doors of this religion by its Vedic opponents. It is asserted with some show of reason that Jainism has failed to capture the hearts of mankind as it has rebelled against the very authority that holds sway over men civilized and uncivilized. The absence in Jainism of a creator who is only to be prayed to grant any boons that a disciple may chance to ask for, is thus said to be the reason why it claims such a small number of followers. This may or may not be

so. We shall have to consider this aspect of the question later on. It may, however, be said here that for the scholar and the thinker, the question is not whether a religion satisfies the craving of a more or less unthinking mob ; for, on this theory, the sacrificial rites of Aryan and Un-aryan barbarians which seek to propitiate the gods by offerings of lives, may pretend to stand on higher grounds than those that are occupied by the best and subtlest speculations of our highest heads. In giving a verdict on such a charge as this, it is necessary, therefore, to see if it stands the test of intellectual and moral criticism. Judged from this standpoint, the war waged by Jainism against the fictitious power that professes to be able to set all Law at defiance and work miracles for the satisfaction of its favourites, is a war in the cause of truth and morality. There can be no indictment of Jainism on this ground. It would be better to examine the nature of its teaching, its aims and objects and its triumphs in ages gone by, before we give our judgment as to the cause of the small number of its professors. This we shall be able to do not in the beginning, but in the end of our inquiry. Yet the very first step we have to take is to mark the Theosophical Nature of Jainism.

This is reading makes it so, shows why the charge has at all come into vogue and the way in which it is to be answered. Jainism is in fact neither a religion nor a sect nor a school of Philosophy. It is the essence, the abstract, the undercurrent, in short, the religion of religions. It may be defined almost in the same terms as were used by Zeller or Ferrier in forming a definition of philosophy in general. Jainism is a purified system of rational knowledge holding only such principles as appeal to reason *qua* reason. It is not Vishnu thus the Jains adore; it is not Shankar that they accept as their God. Neither is Budha or Christ their object of worship. Yet in one sense it is Vishnu(the protector), it is Shankar(the doer of good),

it is Budha (as awakened), as it is also Christ as the teacher of right that are raised to the universal adoration of men and animals. Even the Twenty-four Teerthankars of every age in the unending and unbegun series of ages, do not command our reverence as being Shri Vrishabha or Shri Vardhamana or any so and so. It is every *Jin* as such that is our God and more than a God. A *Jin* is not a particular personality or even a cut and dry principle; it is an eminence of position attained by illimitable excellence in knowledge, conduct, joy, etc. Every soul may aspire to reach it by a long series of lives in which it may free itself from the trammels of worldly action. And whoever succeeds in this—the path of success is sure though slow and clear though difficult—may command our reverent homage. It is in this spirit of adoring whatever is best, wherever it may be found, that the Acharya Akalanka offers his salutation to बुद्ध्वा वर्द्धमानं शतदलनिलयम् केशवं वा शिवम् वा, The faith which a Jain is asked to lay in his God, his Scriptures and his Preceptor is also of a very logical nature. The faith of *Jainism* is the faith in truth (*Samyaktva*) and it is only faith as long as the knowledge of truth has not realized it into Absolute Wisdom. The Jain faith is only provisionally blind—nay, it is never blind, it is opposed to sight and is a vague appreciation of truth as a result of past ages of ever developing knowledge. It is not the usual *bhakti* or the feeling of worship; but it is an *insight* (*darsan*) into the truths of the universe that is itself accountable in every detail and is destined to be justified by increased knowledge or the widened circle of light. A very illustrative instance as to how their insight works may be found in the faith which the Jain Shashtras dictate. Our acceptance of those scriptures relies on their being proved to be “impossible to be transgressed” if freedom for the soul is wished for and also to be “fully consistent with what is seen and desired.” A stricter test than

this could scarcely be found to examine a religion. The first ground on which this religion appeals to all truth-loving souls is, therefore, an appeal of reason to criticise itself by the most logical standards. It is not a name that is the rallying point of its disciples. But as a path that leads by critically examined steps to a consummation which is universally wished for, Jainism claims our earnest consideration.

THE THEORY OF GOD

The same critical nature of *Jain* Philosophy may be prominently found at work in the conception of God. *Swami Samant Bhadra's Apt-mimansa* illustrates the way in which an intelligent Jain would set about his enquiry of Godhood. The sage has in mind the task of composing a great commentary upon the Tatvarth Sutras. Naturally the first thing that occurs to him is the invocation of Divine blessings. But his mind is so ablaze with criticism that he could begin nowhere with closed eyes. So he asks himself at very first step, why should I call you my God? Is it your entrance into this world accompanied by all the splendour of Indras and more, that entitles you to my homage? Is it your power to work through the sky? The plain answer is in the negative. These may be the powers of an enchanter, says the Acharya. Do then the two classes of *mahodayas* (e. g. good form, immunity from physical pains, etc.) constitute your claim to our reverence? Here also the answer is, no; for, it is argued, such glories may be found in the heavenly deities who are still haunted by passions. Are you then our God by being the founder of a religion? No. There are others too who have founded religions. Thus he goes on discussing one after another the various attributes that are considered the essence of true godliness by some school or other. Finally the conclusion arrived at is that God is not the creator of the world.

He is entitled to our reverence only on the ground of his being omniscient. Such a theory cannot but dispel the innumerable superstitions that cling to any other notion of God. The Jain God is the wise man's God. But the mass of mankind still likes to lean upon some imaginary entity that would be ready to offer its rescuing hand to any one suffering from any cause. Such an entity must be endowed with capacity to do and undo anything that suits the devotee. Hence the conception of Jainism is always open to misunderstanding and as such calls for a few remarks in this place.

There may be difficulties in the way of belief in an uncreated universe ; but those in the way of the dogma of creation, are greater and more insuperable difficulties. Hinduism or Vedism, the contemporary opponent of Jainism in this respect, is not a pure type of the creation-theory. Hence the antagonism of the two was not so marked in this field. The perpetual existence of Brahma out of which every visible existence grew, was the root of many opinions that favoured the Jain theory. At the best, the Hindu creator ; must be a mere architect planning his work. Even this is not allowable in the school represented by the best-known critic of Jainism, *Shankaracharya*. Adwaitism is not at all better than Jainism, if the doctrine of non-creation is to be taken as a defect. Keeping aside its moral results for a moment, Jainism might still hold that for Adwaitism, a different theory is impossible and inconsistent. Clearly, therefore, the ascription of a title of notoriety to Jainism by *Shankar* and his school, is one of the lower expedients to which worsted adversaries stoop in their baser moments. The advocates of the Jain theory need not be content with this negative advantage, for they may well claim for more.

GOD AND MAN

There are various ways of conceiving the inter-relation of the

two terms with which Indian Logic has ever to deal, God and man. Jainism was bold enough to occupy that end of the line which is conspicuous for bringing together the terms at the nearest points. Indeed, Advaitism is the school which avowedly achieves this most successfully. But its success is the result of annihilation of the one term for the benefit of the other, with the effect that the annihilation of the one leads to the evaporation of the other. Advaitism thus destroys not only man to give advantage to God but practically the Advit Brahma is its own Mahesh. As soon as it tries to establish absolute superiority where only a relative existence is possible, it cuts the tree under its feet and falls flat with what it fells. The God is empty, with all his essence centred in a mere, lifeless word. Where Advaitism thus fails, Jainism removes the difficulty by making the separation between God and man actual and yet retains the advantage of a theory that exalts man to the very God-hood, by making the union potential. Yet the potentiality is not the irresistible current of uncontrolled events ; this would, like Advaitism, make men Gods only awaiting their time. It is only the conditional possibility of the soul to attain the union whichever presupposes actual independent existence but total similarity in essence and attribute—conditional upon the soul going through a voluntary trial through ages. The trial is the existence of the soul in this world or in the two worlds above and below. This leads to the cardinal theory of Jainism, the theory of *Karma*. It is this principle that makes it so prominently a school of activity, not a mechanical but a voluntary activity for heaven or hell, as one chooses. But the total significance of this theory cannot well be understood without its complementary notion of the *Jagat Karan Yada*.

THE CREATION CONTROVERSY

Our philosophy handles the question from the logical,

empiricistmological and moral points of view. And the handling is as critical as it is finishing. † If God created the universe where was he before creating it ? If he was not in space, where did he localise the universe ? “How could a formless or immaterial substance like God” continues the author of the *Great Puran*—Shri Jin Senacharya—“create the world of matter? Was he a mere architect ? If not, whence could he bring his material ; What was the source of his material ? If there was any, who created the source ? And where was that ‘who’ ? If the material is to be taken as always existing, why not take the world itself as unbegun ? If the creator was uncreated, why not suppose the world to be itself self-existing ?” Again, “Is God self-sufficient ? If he is, he need not have created the world. If he is not, like an ordinary potter, he would be incapable of the task, since, by hypothesis, only a perfect being could produce it.” “If he is to be said to have created the world with an aim, it is what no one will allow. If it is a mere play of his will, it would be making God childish. If you say that God is an agency through which he creates every thing according as is determined by his *Karmas*, then, this makes him dependent upon others (for his activity). If he is only a निमित्त (or an agent through whom something produces something) in the production of what is caused by *Karmas*, why needlessly should his aid be presumed when everything is complete by itself ?” Further on, the Acharya speaks almost in the strain of Morley in one of his works on the French Revolution Literature when he says “If God is benevolent and if he has created the world out of his grace,

† The basis of the Jain doctrine of non-creation is thus summarised:—

भावस्स सगच्छि सगच्छि भावस्स चैव उप्पादो ।

गुणपञ्जसु भावा उप्पादवये हि पकुच्चन्ति ॥

Samavasara by Kundakundacharya.

he would not have brought into existence misery as well as felicity." The sage then goes on to ask of his opponents, why the world should be destroyed by him who gave it birth. If it is to stop the evil-doing of the wicked, why did he create the evil-doers at all? Then comes the teleological explanation of creation, so piously stuck to by even critical heads. * The answer briefly is that "the variety in the world" that is what strikes the teleologist—"is caused by the variety of the *Karmas* which is the action of the soul." The soul is, therefore, the cause of every thing through its own actions—of every evil by its evil actions and of every good by its good actions. The soul is its own God. But then,

WHO ARE THE TRUE GODS?

Jainism transforms the Adwait doctrine in its characterisation of divinity. The soul has the capacity either to degrade itself to the depths of the *Nigoda* or the lowest of the seven hells or exalt itself to the uppermost regions of unending Felicity, Absolute Wisdom, Total Insight and Unlimited Prowess. This Quadruple of Illimitables or *Anant Chatustaya* is not meant to meddle with the affairs of the world. The souls that attain this

* We might very well place by the side of this, a passage from Weber who while writing about Epicurus, says :—

"How can we assume that a world full of evil is the creation of the Gods? What have we? Barren deserts, arid mountains, deadly marshes, uninhabitable arctic zones, regions scorched by the southern sun, briars and thorns, tempests, hailstones and hurricanes, ferocious beasts, diseases, premature deaths; do they not all abundantly prove that the Deity has no hand in the governance of things? . . . It is possible, may, certain, that Gods exist; all the notions of the earth agree to that. But these supremely happy beings who are free from passion, favouritism and all human weaknesses, enjoy absolute repose." P. 137 *History of Philosophy* by A. Weber.

height are absolutely free from the contaminations of the worldly goods and evils. The Gods are related to the world only as its supreme teachers, inculcating lessons in the "Three Jewels." As teachers, however, they work only during a short period that intervenes between the fourth and the fifth or the last *Kalyan* or epoch of their worldly life. And then only, it is the influence of the *Punya* of the audience who gather around the Holy Teachers during those fixed periods that inspires the *Kevalins* in their *pre-Nirvan* periods, says the great author of the *Samayasara*, to undertake the work of expounding the path of salvation. Thus though the Gods are in a way related to the world as its teachers, they are, to use an usual Jain simile, lotuses in water i. e. related and yet aloof from the element, from which they grow and still remain free.

Says Lucretius (II, 646) :—

Omnis enim per se divom nature necesse est

Immortali avo summa cum pace frvater,

Semota a nostris relens subjunctaque louje.

Nam privata dolore ommi, privata periclis,

Ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,

Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira. *

Well may these words apply to the Gods of Jainism. This description of the Gods is not however the nature of what are styled *Devas* residing in the heavens, in Jain literature. These are in the essence beings like men, only enjoying higher, longer and more intense pleasure. But they have pains going along

*[Mr. Morley, in his *Gladstone* III-19, translates these lines thus, "For the nature of Gods must ever of itself enjoy repose supreme through endless time, far withdrawn from all concerns of ours, free from all our pain free from all our perils, strong in resources of its own, needing nought from us; no favour win it, no anger moves."

with their pleasures and especially they are at a disadvantage when compared with us, in being compelled to descend to human life before it is even possible for them to attain the Nirvan. They are 'men writ large.' The Jins,—this is the proper term for the true Gods of Jainism—are perfectly free from any passion that we know of. Their images are emblems of this feature of the Jains—I mean, the Digambar Jains. They are absolutely naked from head to foot. This is very often made a point of ridicule by partisan cavillers of Jainism but we might, with Milton, say :—

Then was not guilty shame; dishonest shame
Of natures work, Honour dishonourable,
Sinbred, how have ye troubled all mankind
With shews instead, mere shews of seeming pure
And banisht from man's life his happiest life
Simplicity and Spotless innocence !

Paradise Lost IV 313-18

This principle of Jainism has influenced the subsequent doctrines of the religion in many ways. The question of the creation of the universe as apart from man does not bear a direct relation with practical life and therefore a theory of creation assumes its fullest importance only as applied to man and his inner nature. If you deny the divine origin of things, what is the basis of morality? What is the root of human activity? What is the exact nature of *Karmas*? How far is the soul determined by his *Karmas*? What liberty of action does Jainism allow? Is the Jain Ethics a deterministic system like that of the Vedic pantheism? What is the influence of Dharma on human actions as moulded by the previous *Karmas*? Why did the holy teachers labour, if the *Karmas* was the master of man's destiny? Such questions that form the very essence of morality crop up in view as soon as we come face to face with the genesis of

human activity. We can hope to give but a brief reply to these problems, in the spirit of Jainism. So we might begin by asking ourselves,

WHY DOES MAN ACT ?

Who else, if not God, makes him a hero in the strife of life ? Whence is the strife at all ? It is one of the paradoxical but still true premises from which every system has to start that gives an answer to this question. The *Karmas* is in point of its origin as original as the soul itself. The two are packed together from unbegun times. And the strife springs up as soon as the soul sets about freeing itself from this company, and ends when it attains *Moksha*. Not that every soul is on its way to liberation ; for some of the souls do not take heed of the lessons taught by those who have accomplished liberation and hence they weave every day a web of *Karmas* round their own selves which gets more tangled at every step. The soul is thus the efficient cause of man's activity and his destiny. But in its own pure nature, the soul is a principle of rationality only. It becomes a cause only when combined with the material of its work, the *Karmas*. The final cause is the *Moksha*, which is attained by true insight which is acquired either by the effects of previous good acts or by the teachings of the *Shastras*. This insight or as it may be styled, this faith is never a sufficient cause of deliverance as is held by the followers of the *Bhagawat Dharma* like *Tukaram*. Faith is the basis on which the ladder of wisdom and character is to be placed to reach the highest place. But it is only a basis. Wisdom is supposed to be the path of beatitude by Vedantists like *Shankaracharya* but knowledge without action is brain without hands. Nor is the Nirvan reached by the vast, almost bewildering, mass of ritual that is performed to propitiate the stoned Gods of the temples. In its original, Jainism allows but a small part of the incumbrances that have

grown upon the superstitious ignorance of the faithless followers. The celebrated Jain Acharya, Shri *Kundkunda*, points out, three "pure" modes of worship which chiefly consist in the consecration of the soul to the way of life lived by the holy Teachers. The 'unpure' path of approaching the Highest is of course image-worship of the twentyfour. But even this worship consists of very simple ritual. And simple as it is, it occupies a very subordinate part in the system of Jain practices, which are more

A SCHOOL OF ETHICS

Than a system of ritual. Everything is for the development, the purification and the freeing of one's own self. There is no dependence on any power beyond that which every one may lay his hands on. There is no favour sought, no fear entertained but that which is one's due, due by one's own good or bad actions. The *Karma*, though powerful, as long as one is in its clutches, can be torn into tatters by any, only he must bear and forbear. The veil of bondage can be removed, however thick and heavy it may be, by any soul, however weak it may look ; only it must take the tools suited to the work. And those tools are offered to all without any expectation in return. There is no son of God, through whom the soul must seek to be saved ; there is no prophet commanding the devoted मामेव शरणं व्रज from the coachman's box of a warrior's chariot. From the fold of Jainism, no one is shut out, whatever his caste and birth may be. Thus the Jain ritual is a system of equality and a bond of brotherhood. It is a moral system being a system of inward inspiration, a system that subdues the low and ignoble in the heart of man. It is not an aimless asceticism that burns out all the man and thus empties the system of its whole content and that grows up on the soils of pessimism. Self subjection does not in Jainism mean the destruction of all the self but it is only

a subjection that raises man's higher nature supreme. Nor is self-conquest the end and aim of man. Truly does Shri Gunbhadra start his "*Self-discipline*" *आत्मनुशासनम्* by telling his self "Oh soul! greatly doest thou fear misery and long for happiness. I will tell thee the path of that [सुख] which thou thus longest for." It should be also remembered that Jainism is a true moral philosophy on another ground, although it is suspected to teach man utter depreciation of worldly life. The soul that was destined to attain Nirvan within the span of its running life was the soul that went through all the important epochs of man's life as we understand it. Nay, it is the principle of Jainism that the life we live, is the one on which the existence of its ascetics depends and through which its purified asceticism grows. While describing the value of human life, an ancient Jain teacher says :—It is in human life that Tapas, the great Vows, concentration or even Salvation is possible. † Nothing could give life a nobler ideal and a more glowing hue.

THE FREEWILL THEORY

Here we might resume our question as to whether the theory of determination by the *Karma* allows room for freedom of will. The pantheistic systems of the east are charged with being unmoral in tendency in as far as they make the human a part and parcel of the divine soul. The essential unity of the two is rightly considered to be a deathblow to moral feeling. If the part is what the whole has made it, there is no responsibility for wrong or credit for right. It is not however clear, how

† मखुअगईए वि तओ अखुअगईए महव्वयं सयलं ।

मखुअगईए भाणं मखुअगईए वि एणव्वारं ॥

The Anuprekshas of Swami Kartika.

Christian morality which asserts that the human soul is the creation of God, can answer 'nay' to the same charge, although its necessity is more indirect than that of Adwaitism. If the God is the father of all we have, if he is the ultimate authority of our moral intuitions, if his guarantee it is that makes the ethical *Ought* a categorical imperative, why is not the evil that makes us fall away from the path marked out for the righteous and that made Eve taste the fruit of knowledge—why is that evil not ascribed to the same source of the universe, the source that created light as well as darkness, the heaven as well as the hell. It is a higher notion of Zoroastrianism than of the Islamites or the Christians to say that there are two equally original and independent sources of good and evil. This dualism may have its difficulties ; but from the moral point of view, to hold that the same being of infinite goodness should have as well been the parent of so much vice and misery is a poorer idea than that of the struggle of Angra Mainyas and Spenta Mainyas, and if pantheism makes moral responsibility impossible, unitarian theology makes evil as necessary as good and thus makes moral conduct absurd. Free from the creation theory, Jainism makes its Gods neither the claimants of credit for our own virtue nor the unrelenting punishers of sins that we are *his* instruments in committing. The holy teachers of the Jains offer advice but even that is not in the form of commands. They sell universal truths which are their own justification. They are not to be accepted as being sanctified in their birth from God ; but as being intrinsically adapted to the highest *stages* of man, they appeal to him with natural *force*. The Dharma of the Jains is the condition, the *sine qua non* of the progress of the soul but it helps on such souls as are bent upon movement. Water enables the fishes to move about only if they choose to do so. It is for them to see whether they shall move or stand still. Similarly the soul may select to extricate itself from the whirlpools of life,

the Dharma comes to its help. But it may delude itself and covet what drives it in and in. The Dharma is potential steam which has to be worked by the internal drive of the engine to cover the distance between *Sansar* and unending felicity. Jainism is thus the most libertarian ethics possible. No one could for a moment say that moral freedom consists in total irresponsibility. And so, if Jainism makes men suffer long series of troubles and difficulties for sins committed in present or past lives, it makes its ethics no less libertarian. But at any moment, the teachings of the liberated may take effect and from that point of time, the Jain Dharma launches the soul upon its slow voyage to freedom. The choice is not instantaneously full with its distant results; for the *Karmas* may not be at that moment fully exhausted. But the ball has nevertheless been set in motion and the force must transmit itself to the end in spite of resistance. Instant escape is impossible. Even the soul may have advanced too far to be influenced by the holy teaching. The old hag who was carried by force to the presence of lord Mahavir, tore open her eyes to avoid even the sight of the Teacher. But there is nothing incompatible with morality in this necessary determinism inseparable with human nature, a determinism which is the condition of freedom with responsibility.

We have hitherto outlined the most salient features of Jainism with necessary brevity. But we cannot conclude our review without noticing some of the charges to which it is said to be open. Mr. Apte's* able paper tries to account for the later insignificance of the Jains as a martial race by ascribing the supposed weakness of the Jains to their principle of non-killing.

* This reference is to a lecture by Mr. V. G. Apte, B. A. Editor 'Gyan Prakash'

Mr. Apte supports his view with a quotation from Col. Todd. His view seems plausible owing to the excesses to which that principle is reduced by a *small number* of modern Jains. In accounting for the peculiarities of a race, it should be remembered, principles expounded in writings that are not reached by many, should not be compelled to yield more than they imply. In the first place, it should be admitted that theories fashion the minds of their advocates as much as they receive their colour from the minds they occupy. It may be as true that the Non-killing theory in its extreme form, may have caused some minds to be averse to warlike pursuits, as that the originally simple and sensible *Ahimsa* may have—nay, is admitted on all hands to have—been reduced to its absurdities and immasculated forms by some of the later Jains who were already being borne along the current of foreign domination. The debasement of the principle may be the result of the degraded ages and the minds that made the ages so. We should also note that we are always apt to attach too much value to doctrines and too little to men. Then it is also important to examine what really the Jain Shastras teach. The full *Ahimsa* implies absolute freedom from the conditions of the world and hence the Jains who are on the higher stages of asceticism are directed to desist from killing by means that so unnecessarily meet with ridicule from unsympathetic observers. The ordinary householder has no such hard and fast rule to obey. He is not to kill from motives afforded by passions. That alone is killing which gives “pain to lives owing to our minds, tongue or body being affected by passion” (Shri Uma Swami). This allows latitude enough for any ordinary life to carry on his usual avocations that necessarily imply a certain amount of unintentional harm to others. The Kshatriya is yet more plainly enjoined to follow his duty and do his Dharm by being a true and generous warrior. The ultimate

goal is total non-killing. And even in the preliminary stages, a Jin has to avoid pain to others as far as possible. This is what is taught by European utilitarianism with the improvement that animals are placed upon the same footing as men in counting up the results of an action. It is to be left to the readers to judge whether the change is for the better or for the worse. That it is more comprehensive and wider in range, is plain enough. As to the propriety of this enlargement of the moral sphere, it depends on the moral susceptibilities of the man to decide the point.

The above is not a sketch of Jain philosophy in any way. It is an endeavour to point out to thoughtful students of comparative religion and moral philosophy that a vast and fruitful field is all but unexplored by them. True that scholars like Jacobi have been spending good deal of valuable labour upon this subject. I profess to enlighten none of this class. Yet I may venture to say that the labours hitherto spent are chiefly confined to the literary aspects of Jain scholarship. The few works translated into English are only works of secondary value from ethical and theological standpoints. The above will clearly bring out the fact that Jainism is as vigorous and practical a school of thought as any European school and that it adds to its logical keenness of a well-cut Eastern system. It would be a material benefit to the task it have in view, if attention were paid to the great principle of *anekant vad*, which anticipates the logic of paradoxes with which Hegel astonished the world. I hope the above will convince the indefatigable European scholar to look upon Jainism as a system pregnant with various lines of useful research and not as the chimera of a few fantastical minds. The small number of 2.2 million persons who profess the creed is not an index to the unpracticality of Jainism. The counting itself is at fault. The name may be borne by a small number;

but Jainism is no name of a prophet. It claims its conquests in every section of the Indian community where it was Jainism that spread humanity and manliness. The Vedic sacrifices were discontinued; the Budhistic atheism was exposed; the Hindu philosophy was brought nearer to truth by the post Budhic revivalists; the defects of Adwaitism were brought home to the minds of the Hindus and cruelty to the most trifling life was stopped or softened in vast populations all over India. It is not a small record. But here too, it does not end. Jainism is truth and truth is Jainism. It contains the best-known truth and wherever truth wins. Can we not then say, with a German Professor,

जिणपवयणं पसिद्धं जंबूदीवम्हि चेव सव्वम्हि ।

किंति जसं च अचिरा पावेज्जउ सयलपुढविये ॥

ANEKANT LOGIC

Logic, as applied to our present subject, is not a term denoting formal laws of thought. It constitutes the essence of Jain philosophy, without an adequate conception of whose importance, it would be impossible to realise the place of Jainism in the great philosophical systems of the world and the contribution it has made to the progress of human thought. As will be indicated further on, *Anekant Logic* is the doctrine which means to examine the very foundations of knowledge and also to explain the ontological problems that have beset philosophical speculations in all times. The value that Jainism itself attaches to this basis of its philosophy may appear extravagant to any superficial observer. It is asserted by a great Jain Acharya that this *Logic* is as important as the Absolute Wisdom possessed by the *Kevalin*. It differs from the latter only in being indirect as distinguished from 'immediate' which is the characteristic of Absolute Wisdom. This loss caused by its being 'mediate' (अप्रत्यक्ष OR श्रुत) is fully made up by its exclusive capacity to demonstrate the truth of Absolute Wisdom to mankind. Thus Absolute Wisdom itself, not to speak of inferior degrees of knowledge, is baseless without the *Anekant Logic*. Obviously, the reason of this is that this is the *Logic* that guarantess our capacity to know and provides us with criteria by which we should be able to test our knowledge. In one word it may be called the 'method' of philosophy or that instrument of thought by which *Tatra Gayan* or philosophy is polished (*Sanskritam*) It bears, therefore, the all comprehending sense that 'Logic' is invested with in Hegel. It is in Jainism what the Science of Ideas is in Plato or the Metaphysis is in Aristotle.

A science that carries so much importance must be necessarily misunderstood and misconstrued. From its very nature, it is open to misconception. It is a very complicated theory and as such, minds of limited capacity can but grasp only this aspect or that of this many-sided system. It strikes, moreover, by its paradoxes which appear from level-grounded standpoints as consisting of diametrically opposed elements. Their connection can only be brought into a comprehensive view by one who takes his stand upon a higher platform. The untrained eye fixes itself only on one point at a time and hence the difficulty in understanding what is but clear as daylight to one who possesses the philosophic insight of *Anekant Logic*. The beginnings of philosophy are, therefore, always monistic. So much so, that the very idea of philosophy is at first considered to consist in ascertaining the one under the many or earlier still, as in the physical philosophers of Greece, the highly immaterialised material substratum of the universe. All truth is here embraced by the *one*, beyond which nothing is. This doctrine, to be classed under the *Bhavaikant* school according to Jain terminology, received its highest form in the Eleatic philosophy of India. The *Bhavaikant* doctrine holds that *being* [existence] is the only property of all things. *Being alone is; all else is not.*

Anekant Logic has, therefore, to combat this monism (*Ekant Vad*) first. Monism is according to *Anekant*, self-destructive. It ignores one side of the antinomy. It is, therefore, called *स्वपरवैरि* or enimical to self and non-self. *Bhavaikant* makes mind and matter identical. It renders knowledge impossible by wiping out the difference between subject and its object. The *Sankhyas* who hold the same view make their *पुरुष*, the permanent being, alone existent. But how can the school that makes

पुरुष permanent on the ground that it is [सत्], cease to make *Prakritis* also permanent i. e. synonymous with *Purush* from whom they are so fictitiously distinguished? Again, the denial of all *non-being* by the *Bhavaikantis* means that the four kinds of *Abhavas* are unreal. But by denying, e. g., *pragabhava* and *pradhvansabhava* i. e. the absence of an effect before its production, and after its destruction, everything becomes eternally existing, which means that no change or evolution is possible in the world. Similarly the denial of *Anyonyabhava* or the absence of a thing at a place where another thing exists, would result in reducing all the diversity in the universe to blank uniformity. Lastly the denial of *Atyantabhava* i. e. the non-being of one thing what its redical opposite is would lead to the confusion of every-thing with everything else.

We, therefore, discard this form of monism and take up the next that follows to see if it satisfies our needs. Thought is said to move to and fro like the pendulum of a clock. As the school of Parmenides was followed by that of Heracleitus, *Bhavaikant* was followed by its opposite counterpart, the *Abhavaikant*. Both agree in being confined to an absolutely one-sided view of the universe; but the latter takes up just the end of the stick that their predecessors totally failed to grasp. *Abhavaikant* means that form of monism which holds every-thing to be *Asadroop* or non-being. It is hard to understand what this exactly means. But in its most obvious form, it is met very easily by Jainism by saying that if everything is unreal, the reasoning which tries to prove all else unreal cannot save itself from the same fate. The Baudhas, who are known in philosophy *Kshanikakant Vadis*, are however too hard to be thus summarily silenced. They slightly differ from their speculative kinsmen in emphasising upon the fleeting nature of all

existence which is, in its ultimate results, the same view as is taken by the *Abhaya Vadis*. Thus the Baudhas are exactly our "flowing philosophers" holding every-thing to be 'mere currents of incessant change.' Jainism waged a fierce war with them in old times, although by some irony of fate, in our own days, distinguished antiquarians piously confused one belligerent with the other. We shall only briefly recount of the principle objections against our Indian Heracleitians.

Nothing *is*, but everything *is not*, as soon as it *is*. The moment that it lives, is also the moment that it ceases to live. There is no *being*; all is always *becoming*. But is *becoming* possible for what is not *being*? Cause and effect are in reality two phases of one and the same thing. The two are relative terms, with their solidarity so vital that the negation of the one is the negation of the other. But *Kshanika Vad* makes the relation fictitious and consequently there is neither cause nor effect in any case. Causation is thus reduced to mere 'sequence in time.' But even this idea of mere time-relation is untenable in Buddhism. If there is no cause, if there is nothing in the cause that is necessarily productive of the effect and if there is no essential relation between the two, all certainty in the natural order vanishes and there remains no uniformity even for bare time successions, as the *Kshanikavadis* in ancient India or Comte and Mill in modern Europe tried to hold. The *Vadis* were not satisfied with these arguments and they rejoined by insisting that the 'unity of nature' between cause and effect as understood by Jainism was a fictitious or *Aupacharika* one. It is, said they, an illusion, a mental habit and not a *real* fact. What is an illusion, or as Mill would say a mental habit and not a real fact. What is an illusion mental habit? we think of *Manavaka* (a cat) as being 'a lion' or 'like a lion' by illusion or mental habit; but is this possible without our ever having seen some lion? Even an Illusion pre-supposes a reality of which it is an illusion.

The 'fiction' of causal relation is, therefore, founded upon unquestionable facts.

The Baudhas were not satisfied as yet. They took the last argument of the Empirical School, the argument of unknowability. The relation is either true or untrue or is both true and untrue or is neither true nor untrue. If cause and effect are one, there is no reason why we should distinguish them. If they are discrete, it is useless to find out relations as there is no certainty in the relations. To say that both the alternatives are true, is opposed to experience. Lastly, to deny both the alternatives would be to deprive everything of its nature. So, they conclude, that nothing can be said on the point. The answer to this sophistry is that if you call all relations to be unknowable, the things of which they are the relations also become unknowable by the same mode of reasoning. Again, the four-fold alternation' (चतुर्कोटिविकल्प) by being called unknowable becomes immediately known. And also if everything changes totally every moment, what reason have we to accept an opinion that also changes with every passing moment?

This brings us to another set of objections to the hypothesis of flux. In ancient India, both the ontological and epistemological aspects of the problem of philosophy went hand in hand. The Baudhas whose ontology we are considering, also held that the mind is formed of the unconnected but successive sensations received from objects. This is met with by pointing out that on this theory, the mind that determines upon killing an animal is not the mind that kills it the next moment; hence this latter commits the act without any motive and responsibility. And further the mind that has to suffer the consequences of this sin is neither the mind that planned the act nor the one that executed the plan. That is, the Buddhist theory of changes following

each other in unbroken succession, being so changing without cause, the killing of animals by a butcher is not caused and, therefore, implies no responsibility. The same objection applies to the theory of cognition as well as that of volition. If knowledge consists of passing sensations without the 'unity of apperception' to connect them, there is no प्रत्यभिज्ञा or recognition of, for example this house as being the one that I visited yesterday. The sensational theory, therefore, destroys all knowledge by making both the subject and the objective world unstable. All properties of objects become fictitious as there remains nothing stable of which they may be the properties. Under these circumstances, the doctrine of the persistence of human personality after death becomes out of the question. This deals a death-blow upon the theory on which all religion stands and which is so deep-rooted a conviction that a theory of such meagre pretensions as the Kshanika Vad can never hope to be in the least countenanced by any school, especially if it goes counter to that conviction.

With another swing, the pendulum of Indian thought reaches the celebrated view of *Advait Ekant* philosophy which has captured in our times the hearts of some of the most remarkable orientalist of the West. Jainism did not, however, meet in this school as dogged a foe as it is popularly believed to have met. It is only the fame of the best-known advocate and defender of this school that has invested the controversy with much interest for the ordinary reader. Advaitism is refuted on many grounds by Jain writers; but it will be here sufficient to indicate a few of them. Advaitism is only a form of the Bhavaikant doctrine that we have before reviewed. The two are related to each other just as Platonic pantheism is related to the principles of the Eleatics. As Plato developed and dramatised the Eleatic Being, the *Advait* school polished and refined the *Bhavaikant* doctrine

by introducing more spiritual notions into the former school. Not only all the phenomenal universe, but all the spiritual world also is one homogeneous spirit containing and absorbing all the illusory manifestations in the universe. Adwaitism starts with this theory and thereon tries to explain—or explain away—all the external as well as internal world. Thus it is as unqualified and positive an *Ekant Vad* (monism) as any and naturally, it is open to all the general attacks on that *Vad*. No monism can consistently justify its right to leap upon the world of real facts from its original and legitimate position. The failure of Plato's attempt to connect his Ideal with the real world is also a failure to which the Adwait school is obviously doomed. Visible differences cannot be accounted for by unaided *Brahma*. The intervention of *maya* may put its shoulder to *Brahma*'s wheels; but the entrance of the *maya* is the warning bell for the pantheistic *Brahma* to exit at once. In any case, therefore, the world that is to be explained by the *Brahma* sounds the deathknell of the *Brahma* as soon as it begins its work. Monism—and of course, Adwaitism—carries within it the seeds of its own destruction.

So the first objection is that Adwaitism digs the grave for the universally accepted duals like the doer and his action, the premiss and its inference and so on. Secondly, self cannot create the self. That means that Adwaitism cannot explain without some duality to help how the all-in-all gave rise to itself or to the other-than-itself. Again, has the Adwait doctrine any evidence to prove its truth? It may have it or it may be its own justification. In the former case the evidence brings in a duality; in the latter case, Adwaitism is condemned as unproved as nothing can be its own proof. If it is its own sufficient proof, why not extend the same right to Dwaitism and say that it is equally proved by its own nature? Yet again, it is a universal

law of the mind to have its negative ideas based upon the knowledge of its positive ideas. You know a "flower" and it is because you know it that you can say that there is no "flower in the sky." You know that fire is inferred from the existence of smoke; and only from this knowledge it is that you can say that you cannot draw the same inference from the existence of water. Similarly, when you know that there is dualism in the universe, then and then only, you can imagine its negative, the absence of dualism.

Another logical difficulty arises when we further consider this doctrine. Adwaitism holds that everything is homogeneous with everything else by its common property. But the supposition of a common property without reference to the special properties of things is itself absurd. For example, 'the horn of the ass' is without any differentia because it is totally non-existent. In the same view, a thing is without its differentia only when it is considered to be totally non-existent. Hence, on the assumption of Adwaitism, everything becomes *असत्* as being devoid of any differentiating quality.

Finally comes that ethical argument against the pantheistic conception of this school. There would be no distinction between an auspicious and an inauspicious action, virtue and sin, knowledge and ignorance or Beatitude and worldly misery. This criticism is met with by the assertion that *Vedant* removes the separate existence of individual souls and makes them "bubbles on the surface of water." This is said to go a long way in making altruistic morality acceptable to men. This interpretation of Adwait theory has held some *savants* of the west to applaud Vedic pantheism for its cosmopolitan tendencies. But in its logical foundations as well as practical results, this theory is singularly wanting in strength and consistency. Morality

consists essentially in struggle and consequently, pantheism, which by hypothesis makes struggle absurd, destroys the basis of moral conduct. Then again, the school which inherits the practical legacies of Vedant is the school that advises man to "defend his wife at the expense of his wealth and to defend *himself* at the expense of his *wealth and wife*" Surely this is not a doctrine to be championed by moral philosophy.

The logical successor of this Vedantic Idealism, is the *Nyaya* school. It occupies the exact opposite of Advaitism by holding that everything is separated from everything else. If Advaitism may be called the Nominalism of India, this may fitly deserve the title of Realism. While the former insists on the *one* being true, the latter insists on the many being true. The idea is the truth; this Platonic maxim may be applied to explain vedant. The individual is the reality; this is the thesis of the Naiyayiks. Jainism sets itself against every *Ekant* doctrine and evolves the truth by a combination of them. We have above shown that idealism is an empty generalisation without the individuals to be generalised. The antithesis may be similarly refuted. If every individual is independent, at least this individuality is a common property of all, e. g., materiality is the property common to घट, पट, etc. If not so, being devoid of individuality, their independence also would be lost. Although individuals are separate, individuality is a property residing upon all in common and hence, even individuals are homogeneous by their common property. Thus even the individualism of the Naiyayiks is vitiated by the very pre-suppositions of their own school.

This will bring out the standpoint of Jain logic. The idea is not true; also, the individual is not true. What is the truth? They are both true from different points of view. When the speaker lays stress on the *one*, he is speaking of the *many* with

only an implication. If the many are to the front, the one is not ignored but referred to only as secondary. The truth is neither in the *one* nor in the *many*; but it lies in the, *the one in the many* or *the many of the one*. Every individual implies an idea; and every idea pre-supposes the individuals. Existence as well as knowledge are governed by this relativity. Being possessed of the सद्भाव or the quality of existence, all things are one. So again, looking at the *Paryayas* or modifications, or again considering the differences due to material, place, time and quality (द्रव्य, क्षेत्र, काल, भाव), it is manifest that everything is different from everything else. Transferring the same idea to modern philosophy, the subject is the origin of all knowledge, because, he is the one in the many and thus he it is that makes the many possible. Exactly the same applies to the objects that give the subject all its contents. The subject differs from the objects by his rationality and the objects are different from the subject by their *Satswaroop* or the quality of *being*. This is not tenable since also the subject is characterised by the *Satswaroop*. The difference would deprive both the knower and the known of their reality. If the known is without *Satta*, the known would be non-existent. If the known are *Asat*, the knower who is constituted by the known would also become *Asat*. So in *reality* or सत्ता, there is no disparity between the subject and the object. The difference is only कथञ्चित् i. e. here, from the standpoint of rationality residing in the one and the materiality residing in the many.

This will make clear to a certain extent what the essence of the *Anekant* doctrine is. But the usual formula by which this doctrine is known to the world is a little dry and hence it is understood by very few men. The usual formula is framed in the form of *Sutras*, a form which Indian scholars were very fond

of in olden days. Obviously, that mode was useful in an age in which writing was unknown. But as time went on, the disciples of every faith degenerated and with that degeneration, the significant sutras of the older age begin to lose their meaning to the un-informed mind and critics, sometimes through bias but often through ignorance, began to turn and twist the meaning of opposite parties to suit their own purpose. The epigrammatic form of the sutras rendered the meaning borne by them open to mis-interpretation and irrelevant refutation. The sevenfold *Syadvad* * illustrates this more vividly than any other doctrine. The fundamental theory underlying this *Syadvad* is that everything in the universe is related to everything else and hence we ought not to narrow our vision by taking account of only this relation or that. It is but very crude and primitive philosophy to ignore the variety of things and their relations and to say that the side of the shield that faces you, is the all-in-all of the shield. It is a very imperfect appreciation of the magnitude and multiplicity of the problem and its facts to generalise until there is no possibility of extending the process. *Ekant Vad* is necessarily such generalisation. The *Syadvad* opposes all sorts of one-sided theories. It asserts apparently contrary predicates of one and the same thing. In the eyes of unrestrained absolute generalisers like the Ekantists, such reconciliation of opposites is an impossibility. Every statement that we make is qualified by its *pariyayas*. There are four classes of things which give rise to such modifications and make contrary predicates consistent. Time and space are the two causes that make variety of predication possible and that would easily be recognised by students of European thought. The *Syadvad* says that every assertion is variable with every change in time and space. This

* Vide pp. 54—56 Supra.

is a common way of putting the deeper theory of time and space being the essential 'forms' of every perception. They are two invariable agents in our determinations of objects. Every mode of looking at a thing must take into account these factors. If you introduce the slightest variation in any one of these two, the whole view is changed.

The other two variants are द्रव्य and भाव. The recognition of Dravya or matter as being an eternal coefficient in the products of our existence and knowledge, solves certain obvious difficulties. Idealism is nursed by every school that neglects the essential relation of matter to knowledge, without which, everything becomes a 'fiction' or a mere *flatus vocis*. By postulating matter as an original ingredient in knowledge, the endless webs of idealists are relegated to the realms of shadows and phantoms. The last factor is equally necessary for an adequate explanation of the universe. Matter without भाव or property is an unfounded abstraction. In this abstraction, indeed, it would be sufficient to create some indefinite and hazy counterparts corresponding to our ideal universe. But how to explain the variety in material experience and actual knowledge? That is done by attributing certain properties to certain Matter.

These four factors of knowledge necessarily lead to changes in our conceptions of things corresponding to changes in the factors themselves. In substance, this is what *Syadvad* teaches. The variety of standpoints recognised by this school is sometimes compelled to yield scepticism in knowledge. But, as Dr. Bhandarkar points out, this objection is groundless. One of the seven modes of predication expounded by the सप्तभंगी is positively intended to oppose scepticism. The अवक्तव्य vadis are always severely dealt with as being inconsistent with themselves. To call a thing 'unknowable' is to affirm some knowledge about

it. Hence uncertainty in knowledge is a self-contradictory position, according to our theory. There was very keen controversy and an amount of hair-splitting over the attempt of our school to reconcile existence and non-existence as residing in one thing. The answer to such criticism is that antagonism is only relative in the universe. But as "we are immersed in the conflict and occupied with our adversary, we cannot at the same moment rise to the consciousness of that power which is working in him and in us alike." † As Hegel would put it, being and non-being are identical. The *Adwait* and the *Prithaktva* of objects, idealism and realism, universals and particulars, unity and difference, subject and object, these are relatively opposite to each other ; but they are not parallels to run into eternity without for a moment converging towards each other. The absolute parallel is a fiction in true philosophy. It is only our narrowness of view that our horizon closes with a widening gulf. But this is forgetting the very ground of all opposition, the ground which makes the absoluteness of every opposition unthinkable and without which opposition would have nothing to stand on. This is to stop with half the truth ; for it is ignoring the integrating force in all nature which includes and transcends differentiation.

Appendix

JAIN KINGS

The Jains are celebrated in ancient history and there were many Jain kings in those days. King Vajrakaran who ruled in Dashanagara (the present Mandessore) was a Jain and bowed before none but the *jain* Gods. It is said that there was a great fight between this Jain king and Sinhodar, the Sarvabhaum king of Ujjain, in consequence of the insult which the Jain king offered to the latter by refusing to offer saluation to him, in which Sinhoder was worsted. Shishupal, the ruler of Chanderi near Lalitsur, was a Jain. Gandharvasen and Shrivarma, the kings of Ujjain, are described by some authors as being Jains but to me, it is still a question. The Vallabh king Kumarpal was a great patron of Jainism. Maharaja Sampadi, the greatgrandson of the famous Baudh king Ashoka had embraced this faith. Ashoka himself is held by certain scholers to have been a Jain before he was converted to Budhism. While writing about the Udaipur royal family, Col. Todd says in his *Annals of Rajasthan* that even uptil now, the queen of Udaipur receives with great ceremony any Jain ascetic who might happen to visit the city. The origin of this custom was that the famous Rana of Udaipur Pratap Sinha was assisted by a great Jain, named Bhamasah, with an army of ten thousand men, when the king was in great stress in his stuggle with Akbar. The story of Pannadai is known to us all. It is said that it was a Jain, by name Asasah, who gave refuge to that noble woman and the prince whom she had saved from Banveer at the cost of her own son. At Mamdu or Mandapachal, a Jain served the Mohamedan king of the place as his Dewan.

ARE JAINS ATHEISTS

There is a good deal of controversy as to whether Jainism is atheistic or not. Shankaracharya and following him, many European orientalisks answer the question in the affirmative. But to call the Jains atheistic is a misunderstanding. According to their view, the *Karma* and the Universe are unbegun, indestructible and everexisting. Whatever we do, i. e. our karma is sure to produce its results on us. God will not interfere to undo these effects even if we prayed to the utmost. That God is omniscient perpetually living and auspicious in nature, is admitted by the Jains. But that he will ever be kind to us beyond our deserts is denied by them. The Law of Karma is universally true. The soul of man elevates itself by the path of the three jewels, i. e., True Faith, Knowledge and Conduct and after attaining *Nirvana* or *Moksha* (i. e. freedom from all bondage of passions) it becomes divine. The God is not the creator, protector and destroyer of the universe. He is only the most perfect soul.

So they believe in God but differ as to his work. On this difference, they are charged with atheism. If so Shri Krishna who, in his *DIVINE LAY* says: "*The Lord does neither create the actor nor the actions of the world, nor does He determine what actions shall bear what fruits. This is all natural Nor does He take anyone's merits or sins. When ignorance throws a veil on wisdom, people go astray*"—surely, the Divine singer of these lines must be called an atheist. So the way to consider this problem is to accept the meaning of an atheist as given by Panini who defines a *Nastika* as "*one who does not accept the truth of after-death existence*" of the soul. The Jains who believe in the *Swargas* or heavens & the hells are to be considered as perfectly theistic. The *Digambars* and the *Shwetambars* differ as to the

number of heavens but there is no doubt that there are other worlds besides this which the soul has to pass through before final liberation. But if the atheists are those who deny the absolute authority of the Vedas, the Jains in company with the Moslems, the Christians and the Brahmos will have no doubt to be styled as atheists ! In fact, the Jains can under no circumstances be called *Nastiks* (in a derogatory sense.)

Transcribed from Mr. Apte's Marathi Lecture on Jainism.

**Latest Population figures of Major religions Communities
(In 1951 & 1961)**

	1951	1961
Hindus	30,35,75,474	36,65,02,878
Muslims	3,54,14,284	4,69,39,357
Christians	83,92,038	1,07,26,350
Buddhists	1,80,323	32,50,227
Jains	16,18,406	20,27,267
Sikhs	62,19,134	78,45,170
Others	18,48,224	16,06,964
Total	36,10,88,090	43,92,34,771

Index.

Abhavaikant	62	Bhavaikant criticised	61-62
Achauryanuvrita	11	Bible on animal food	28
Adharma	3	Brahmacharya	4
Adwaitism criticised	47-65	Budhistic theory of knowledge	64-65
Ajeeva	3		
„ association with jeeva	3	C.	
„ subdivisions of	3	Ceremonies, fifty-three	17
Akasha	3	Charitra-mohaniya karma	4
Anekant Logic	60	Chhedopasthapan	9
„ its purpose	60	Creation in Adwaitism	46
„ „ importance	60	„ refuted by Jinsen	48
„ „ essence	69-72	„ Weber on	49
Antaraya Karma	5	„ Samaya Sar on	48
Anubhag Bandha	6		
Anuprekshas	7	D.	
Anuvritas, the first	11	Dan	14
„ the fifth	11	Darshan stage	10
Aristotle on creation	34	Darshana varaniya karma	4
Asrava	2	Degeneration of Jains	57-58
Athithi sanvibhag	14	Desh vriti	10
Ayu Karma	4	Devas in Jainism	51
		Dharma	3
B.		Dharmas, the ten	7
Bandha	2, 5	Dhriti kriya	17
„ the four classes of	5	Divisions of the subject	1
Bhagavat	27	Dnyanavaraniya karma	4
Bhartrihari on Jin	32		

E.		„ corresponding Asravas	4
Ethics of Jainism	53, 54	Keshavaya	17
„ vedant	68	Kshanikekant	62-64
F.		L.	
Freewill theory	54-56	Lucretius	50
Ferdosi on killing	28	M.	
G.		Mahabharat	27
God related to man	47	Material prosperity of	
Gotra karmas	5	Jains	35
Gun Sthanas	2, 22	Milton	51
Gun vritas	12	Moda kriya	17
Guptis	7	Moksha	2, 9
Gnyanavaraniya karma	7	„ importance of	3
I		Moral prosperity	35
Image worship	24	Modes of Karmas	6
„ postures	25	N.	
„ as described by the		Nam karma	5
Bhagavat Gita	25	Nirjara	2, 9
J.		Nirmalya	26
Jain kings	73	National welfare	40
Jainism, meaning of	1	Non-creation theory	33-34
Jeeva	2, 3	Non-Jain references	
Jewels, thet hree	10	to Jainism	27, 28
Jins, meaning of	1, 44	Nyaya criticised	68
Jineshwars, meaning of		P.	
„ synonyms of	1	Panini's view of Nastika	33
K.		Parchatushtaya	29
Kal	3	Pariharvishudhhi	9
Karmas	4	Parishahas	8
		Pradesh Bandha	6

Prakras of Bandha	5	Smallness of Jain	
Pratikramana	40	population	42
Principles, (seven) of		„ accounted for	43
Jainism	2	Source of human activity	52
„ classification justified	2	Stithi Bandha	6
Proshadhopovas	13	Stages of life, next	15
Pudgal	2	Suksham samparaya	8
		Swachatushtaya	29
R.		Syadvad	28, 70
Results of Jainism	58	„ Dr. Bhahdarkar's	
Right conduct	10	views on	30, 31
Rites, fifty-three	16	T.	
S.		Tapas	16
Sallekhana	14	Tatva	2
Samayika	9, 13	Theory of God	45, 46
Samayika Stage	13	Theosophical nature	43
Samitis	7	True Insight	10
Samyaktva explained	44	„ knowled ^g _o	10
Sanitation	41	V.	
Sanvar	2	Vaiyya vritya	14
Sanvar causes of	7	Vedas on Jainism	30, 32
Satyanuvrita	11	Vows compared with	
Sections of Jains, names of	1	penal Laws	36, 40
„ compared	2	Vriat Stage	10, 11
Shalyas	14	W	
Shankaracharya	29	Worship justified	53
Shiva Dharma	28	„ described	26
Shravaka	10		
Siksha vritas	12		
Sidhas, characteristics of	24		

