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Eliade, in his celebrated work *The Sacred and the Profane*, defines the sacred as being “equivalent to a power, and, in the last analysis, to reality”. “Man becomes aware of the sacred”, he observes, “because it manifest itself, shows itself, as something wholly different from the profane”. He maintains further that “for those who have a religious experience all nature is capable of revealing itself as cosmic sacrality”. Accordingly, Eliade sees a religious man as one “who attempts to remain as long as possible in a sacred universe” and believes that “the completely profane world, the wholly desacralized cosmos, is a recent discovery in the history of the human spirit”.

**Sacred for the Systems**

It is obvious that Eliade’s concept of the sacred and his idea of religious man are appropriate only to those religions which affirm the existence of a “wholly other reality” capable of manifesting in the “profane”. The idea of a reality that is wholly other is somewhat unsatisfactory to the Hindu tradition: otherwise, Eliade’s scheme, if suitably modified, would appear to be adequate to comprehend the classical Vedic darsanas and Hindu theism in its multiple forms. The latter has all the major ingredients of a “sacred” tradition: belief in an Almighty Creator, his divine incarnations and power of his grace; belief in the authority of a revealed text, namely the Vedas, which are seen as the source of all knowledge, both ritual and spiritual; and belief in the divine origin of a social system which defines and regulates the activities of each and every member of society. Eliade’s concepts of the sacred are, however, deficient when we consider the heterodox systems, particularly the religion of the Jains. Unlike the Carvākas, the Jains are salvationists; unlike the Buddhists, they believe in the existence of souls; hence they must have a concept of the sacred. Nevertheless, their atheism requires that this sacrality be located neither in a Deity nor in its divine ordinances and manifestations, but in man himself, both in the middle of his bondage and in the very act of his isolation (kaivalya) from that bondage. Jainism is distinguished by its man-centredness, a feature which forcefully presents itself in the Jain opposition to all forms of theism and the alleged sacrality of the phenomena inspired by the Deity.

It is the Jain Claim that he alone among salvationists can truly explain the twin doctrines of bondage and freedom, of a beginningless *samsāra* and an endless *mokṣa*. The Vedāntin, because of his doctrine of the Absolute Brahman,
is forced to declare phenomena as illusory; he must hope that bondage can be wished away merely by denying its reality. The Sāṃkhya might admit the reality of both individual souls (puruṣa) and Prakṛti, but he renders the bondage of the soul a mere mockery by declaring that Puruṣa is totally incorruptible and unchangeable. The Mimāṃsaka is loath to admit the very idea of mokṣa, and does not accept the possibility of a man ever knowing anything beyond what the senses will perceive. Lest human beings should imagine that their puny intelligence is capable of properly managing their affairs, the Mimāṃsaka, who quietly disposes of gods as mere nominalizations with dative case-endings, stipulates that the dharma or the laws of the universe and the duties of mankind are known only through the Vedas. These are not the relations of a God whose authority must depend on a circular “validation” by the Vedas, nor are they compositions of human beings, however exalted. Rather, these are eternal words, emanating from no man (apauruṣeya) but manifest themselves throughout the cyclical movements of the universe.

Yoga and Jain Systems

Yoga is one Vedic system which probably comes close to the fundamental teachings of the heterodox schools. The term Jina is primarily a description of a yogin who has attained the goal of isolation (kaivalya) and omniscience (kevalajñāna); indeed, the Jains have claimed that they are the true successors of the yogin depicted in the Indus valley seal. They point to the very significant fact that Hindu divinities are never represented in the posture of meditation (with the possible exception of Śiva as Daksināmūrti) and that the early Buddha images depict him either in the bhūmisparśa or the abhaya-mudrā of preaching. By contrast, images of the Jain Tīrthankaras, from the immemorable past to the present day, are invariably shown either seated in a lotus posture or standing erect, rapt in meditation. The discipline of the Pārśājala yoga, comprising of yama, niyama etc., agrees in many respects with the rules and regulations and holy practices prescribed for a Jain aspirant. It is conceivable that the Jains and the Buddhists on the one hand and the compilers of the Upaniṣads and the Gītā, represented by the Pārśājala school, on the other, all draw upon an earlier source of yoga which is common to both the Śramaṇa and the Brahmanical traditions. What mainly distinguishes the Vedic yoga from that of the heterodox systems is Pārśājali’s adoption of Īśvara-praṇidhāna (devotion to the Deity) as a means of attaining yoga, however inconsistent this may be with the doctrines of the atheistic Sāṃkhya and the monistic Vedānta.

Pārśājali describes this Deity (Īśvara) as one who has never been in bondage, a being who is eternally free from afflictions, actions and their results. He is also an eternally omniscient being, “the guru of all gurus”, unrestricted by time. Although called a “puruṣa-viśeṣa”, Pārśājali’s ‘guru’ is not a human being like Mahāvīra or Gautama, both of whom also claimed to have acquired freedom from bondage and an irreversible state of omniscience. The belief in an eternally free
person capable of dispensing salvation by grace is a feature conspicuously absent in the heterodox systems. The Jains as well as the early Buddhists rejected this special category of an eternally free soul as purely arbitrary and observed the activities of a teacher were inconsistent with one deprived of the means of communication, namely mind, body and speech. They also maintained that the belief in such an omnipotent power makes the salvation of the human being dependent on the sweet will of an agency outside the control of the aspirant. They affirmed, and sought to drive home by the examples of Mahāvīra and the Buddha, the message that human beings formerly in bondage, are able to break the beginning less bond of samsāra, that they have within them the innate powers to realize, here and now, perfection and omniscience, independent of a Deity.

Theistic Systems

The Yoga school probably saw Īśvara playing only the limited role of the spiritual teacher, the Guru. But the theistic dārsanas like Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and the sectarian cults of Viṣṇu and Śiva, supported by their respective Upaniṣads. Āgamas and Purāṇas, saw this Īśvara not merely as a benign Guru but as the “Sacred Power”, the very source and sustenance of all creation. He, the omniscient and omnipotent Lord, created the world of matter and souls and presided over the destinies of His creations. He dispensed divine justice, weighing the actions of men, punishing the wicked and rewarding the righteous. He held in balance the forces of good and evil (dharma and adharma) by the mighty acts of His divine interventions, the avatāras. Through the Vedas this Lord instructed man in his duties to gods and manes, to the society, and to himself, and stipulated that he be guided not by a free chioce of conscience but by the dictates of varṇa and āśrama, that is, by the caste and stage of life in which he found himself. While stating in the Gītā that all actions (karma) must be followed by their results, the Lord also predicted dire consequences for breach of the caste duties, duties which must be maintained for the upkeep of the Universe. But it was further promised, rather benignly, that these duties, however unpleasant, could become “sacrifice”, or sacred acts, if performed as an act of devotion, and thus comprise the very means of man’s salvation from the bonds of action.

This kind of theism soon became the most favoured means of salvation, asking nothing more than conformity to the varṇāśrama-dharma and an emotional adoration for the Deity in any chosen (iṣṭa) form. It inspired mighty waves of bhakti movements which swept across the nation, absorbing countless numbers of diverse people, and assimilating a multitude of gods and cults within its fold. Caves were scooped and temples were erected to enshrine the images of the Lord, who was shown either in the terrible acts of destroying a demon, or, bedecked in royal splendour, enjoying conjugal happiness in the endearing company of His consorts. Poets and scholars alike, joined hands in glorifying the name of the Lord, whom
they trusted to take care of not only their ultimate salvation but even of their immediate yoga-kṣema, the daily bread and butter. The sectarian Purāṇas vied with each other in creating a world of fantasy for the benefit of the devotees, who silently accepted as “the Lord’s will” untold injustices of an oppressive caste system from within and humiliating defeats and devastations at the hands of unbelievers from without.

**Jaina Concept of the Sacred**

As far as we know, no complaint was uttered either by the oppressed masses below or the enlightened brahmmins above. The only recorded protest that survives is to be found in the vast literature of the heterodox systems, especially of the Jains, a literature created mostly for the guidance of the Jain laity, which had to be protected from the overwhelming waves of bhakti that engulfed the rest of India. A careful study of this literature, particularly during the medieval period, shows the Jains as pioneers among those who challenged the authority of the Vedas, disputed the efficacy of their sacrifices, repudiated the doctrine of the Creator, rediculed the sacrality of the avatāras, and rejected the brahmanical rituals. In this way they sought to establish a “desacralized cosmos”, if we can use such an expression, in which to pursue kaivalya or “isolation”, their vision of salvation.

The Jain critique of the “sacred” in the Vedic tradition centers around the examination of the nature of an āpta, a technical term meaning ‘reliable authority’ in matters pertaining to salvation of the soul from the bonds of samsāra. This clearly falls in the realm of dharma, and the Mīmāṃsaka declares that only the Vedas, by virtue of their being apauruṣeya (uncreated by a human or divine agency) are to be considered āpta. The problem of eternal words engaged the attention of such scholastic philosophers as Jaimini, Kumārila and Bhāṛṭṭhāri; but Jains saw no difficulty in dismissing the whole controversy with the simple observation that the Vedas consist of words, and like any other composition, must have a human author. The Theist intervenes here, attempting to save the situation by declaring that the Veda are neither Uncreated nor man-made, but emanate as revelation from the Creator, the eternally free and omniscient being who alone deserves to be called āpta. The Jain arguments against this theory are basically two-fold: 1) Creation is not possible without a desire to create and this implies imperfection on the part of the alleged Creator. 2) If karma is relevant in the destinies of human beings, then God is irrelevant; if he rules regardless of karma of beings, then he is cruel and capricious. In brief, the Creator is not free from rāga and dveṣa and hence is neither free nor omniscient; therefore, he cannot be an āpta.

The Jain needed no better proof for his thesis than the Hindu Purāṇas, which narrated the most shocking deeds of their God, perpetrated as He assumed the forms of Brahmā, Viśṇu and Śiva. They extolled what appeared to the Jain the most hideous and immoral exploits of Narasimha or Krṣṇa, the Lord’s alleged avatāras or manifestations on earth. Akalanka, a celebrated ninth century logician
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expresses the Jain indignation over worship of the Hindu Trinity in his famous stotra to a Jina.

The Jain could allow that the Purānic tales of the avatāras were probably figurative and therefore their teaching should be tested against more definitive texts like the Vedas, the Brahmaṇas or the Dharma-sūtras, which claimed the prerogative to instruct on dharma and adharma. Even here the Jain was disappointed, for these texts bristled with self-contradictions and seemed to lack any universal ethic which could be applied at all times for all human beings. Having, for instance, enjoined that “Thou shall not injure any being” (na himsāt sarvabḥūtāni), the scriptures had no scruples whatsoever against openly prescribing killing of animals for the sacrifice to gods and also as offerings to the manes! Even more obnoxious to the Jain was the fact that such sacrificial himsā was not only declared to be without evil, but was even labelled as “dharma”, a virtuous act! Hemacandra (1088-1172) indignantly asks: If hurt, how cause of merit? If cause of merit, how hurt? The Dharmaşāstras, having said “Let him not speak what is untrue” (nānṭāṁ brūyat), proceed to make an exception: “For the sake of a Brahmin he may speak what is not true” (Āpastamba); they even list five occasions upon which speaking an untruth is not a lie: when spoken in jest, when told in dealing with women, at the time of marriage, when in the peril of life, or in the complete loss of goods. (Vaiśiṣṭa XVI 36). Having forbidden stealing and having repudiated taking what is not given, Manu has no hesitation in saying: “Even if a brahmin by violence appropriates another’s goods, or by ruse, nevertheless there is on his part no taking of what is not given; for all this (world) was given to the Brahmans, but through the weakness of the Brahmans the outcasts enjoy it. And therefore a Brahmin, taking it away, appropriates his own, a Brahmin simply enjoys his own, he dresses himself in his own, he gives away his own” (Cf. Manusmṛti 1, 101).

Further, in examining the domestic rituals enjoined by the Law books the Jain found that a great many of these were acts of gross superstition, exploited by the brahmans to earn an easy livelihood. They scrutinized, for example, the ceremony of śrāddha to the ancestors by feeding the brahmans, a practice of great antiquity which forms the very foundation of the Hindu family system even to this day. This ritual is of crucial importance to the Hindu because it is considered a fulfilment of a major obligation under the varnāśrama-dharma. A man must enter the stage of a householder (gṛhaśāra) by marrying according to the caste rules. Begetting a son is obligatory because only a son can guarantee the ghost (preta) of the dead (father) a new body and a safe passage to the world of ancestors (piṭṛ); he does this by periodically offering nourishment in the form of śrāddha. Brahmans are fed sumptuous meals on these occasions and it is believed that they are able to transfer the merit directly to the deceased fathers. The son is rewarded for his service with the right to inheritance of the paternal property, and a prosperous lineage is expected to result from the blessings of the ancestors.
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The Jain ācāryas forbade this ritual to their laity not only because it defied common-sense but also because it was in direct violation of the law of karmas. They argued rather sarcastically that there was no invariable causal relationship between the performance of the śrāddha and prosperity of the lineage. It was clear that most people who performed it saw no increase in their lineage; on the other hand, such creatures as donkeys, pigs and goats increased their lineage even without performing the śrāddha. And as for the claim that “What is enjoined by the Brahmins accurses to the ancestors”, the Jain critic Malliṣena (1292 A.D.) retorts: “Whoever is to agree to that? For only in the Brahmin do we see the fattened bellies; and transference of these into their (the ancestors’ bellies) just cannot be believed; since at the time of feeding no single sign of such transferrence is perceived; and because only on the part of the Brahmins is satisfaction witnessed”.

The claim that the departed soul depended on his son’s offerings in order to acquire a new body was a rather serious one. The Jain believed that a departed soul automatically assumes a new body—human or animal, hellish or heavenly—forged by his past karmas, and also that the new incarnation occurs no more than three instants (samaya) after discarding the old body. The Jains had no place for the world of Fathers (Pitṛ-loka) in their cosmology and could not cherish the idea of preserving a “point of meeting between the living and the dead”, which they saw as a constant source of fear and attachment. Nor could they accept the dictates of the varṇāśrama, pertaining to marriage and the begetting of a son; rather than being obligatory, these acts were considered optional and preferrably to be avoided. A man owes nothing to either gods or ancestors; while kindness to parents is a virtue, it is nevertheless perfectly proper to renounce the world whenever one is ready to follow the higher call.

The Jain law-givers extended this same critical attitude towards variety of “holy” and “meritorious” practices which orthodox Hindus cultivated with the aim of coming closer to the divine manifest in nature. Somadevasuri (959 A.D.) gives a long list of such practices, which he labels as māṇḍhatās (follies): 1. Offering libations to the sun, 2. bathing during eclipse, 3. spending wealth at samkrānti (winter solstice), 4. performing sandhyā ritual (ablutions at dusk), 5. worshipping fire, 6. worshipping a house, 7. worshipping one’s own body (by smearing it with ashes, etc.), 8. ritual bathing in rivers and oceans, 9 saluting trees, 10. jumping from holy mountains, 11. saluting the end of a cow’s tail, 12. drinking cow’s urine, etc. “These and many others”, he warns, “are follies prevalent in the world. A Jain performing these, whether in order to obtain a favour or to maintain one’s position in society, will surely lose samyag-darśana, the true insight into the nature of reality”.

The Jain idea of the “sacred” is clearly shown in one of their most ancient litanies, which lists four śāraṇas or refuges, also called maṅgaḷas, the auspicious
ones. These are arihanta (Skt. arhat), siddha, sādhū and the dharma taught by the Kevalin or omniscient one. The first of these, the arhat, means the Worthy, the Holy One; he is also called Jina (The spiritual victor), after whom the Jains take their name. Both arhat and jina were originally Jain terms, which were adopted by many other śramaṇas including the Buddhists; the terms are conspicuously absent in the Brahmanical tradition. The arhat is an ascetic, like Mahāvīra, who by contemplation and exertion, has attained to omniscience and has acquired an irreversible state of freedom from the bonds of saṃsāra. While the current state of embodiment continues, he preaches the law (dharma) as he has perceived it through his omniscience. At the end of his normal life, his pure soul discards the last of the physical and karmic bonds; becomes totally isolated from all associations, and resides forever at the peak of the universe (loka-ākāśa), endowed with infinite knowledge and bliss. He is then called siddha, the Perfected One. Theoretically the siddha is higher than the arhat. but the latter is given precedence in the Jain litany, for only the arhat is able to preach the law and be a guide to the disciples.

The third refuge, the sādhū, is an aspirant, an ascetic who follows the path of purification and adheres to the doctrines preached by the arhat. These doctrines and practices will constitute what is called dharma, the fourth refuge, the mangala by which the Jain abides.

It is the contention of the Jain that a person becomes an arhat not by the grace of any Higher Being, but by dint of his own insights (darśan) and exertions (cārītra). He is no doubt helped by the example and preachings of previous Teacher-arhats, called Tīrthaṅkaras (‘Ford-makers’), similarly, he will help others who follow in his wake. The line of Teachers had no beginning and will have no end; any one can at any time join the line, be counted a Teacher and become a siddha. The Jain thus replaces the Yoga doctrine of a single and externally free Īśvara with an interminable succession of ‘human’ Teachers rising in the course of time. These Teachers do not respond to the aspirant’s devotion (prāṇidhāna), nor can they influence his career; they remain totally indifferent to whether their teachings are received or rejected. The relationship between a Jain and his Jina is strictly impersonal. There is no concept of īśta; although Mahāvīra is recognised as a historical person and his nirvāṇa is commemorated by an era (the Vīra-nirvāṇa-saṃvat, 527 B. C., probably the oldest historical era in India), he receives the same worship as any other Jina, since they all preached the same perfection and taught the same doctrine. The Jain layperson worships the image of the Jina totally independent of any priest; he does this in a rather lavishly furnished shrine—an imitation of the holy assembly (saṃvasaraṇa) where the Jina preached his sermon—and is fully aware of the absence of any Deity, considering the whole act as purely a reminder of his true goal. Nor is there any expectation of gaining absolution from the confessions (pratikramaṇa) he makes in the presence of the Jina image or of the sādhū, for the laws of karma are irrevocable and no power, however mighty, can enable one to escape the consequences of his own acts.
Through acts of worship a Jain may hope to secure such results as karma-kṣaya (destruction of karma), bodhi-labha (attaining enlightenment) or samādhī-marana (holy death in meditation), but as far as worldly gains are concerned, the Jina is past granting any boons; it is unbecoming to even entertain such thoughts in his presence. It is true that this situation makes it possible for the Hindu divinities and Jain demi-gods (yakṣas) to creep into the Jain temples in the guise of doorkeepers (dvāra-pālas) or guardian deities (āsana-devatās), catering to the emotional needs of the weaker sections of the Jain laity. But the informed Jain pays no more attention to them than he would to a distinguished guest visiting the temple; for he firmly believes that one reaps the fruits of one’s own karma, whether good or evil; no one can add to or take away from another’s karma, not even the mightiest of the gods, for they too are subject to the same law. Karma is a psycho-physical complex; although neither holy nor sacred, it is nevertheless a power to be reckoned with, a power which is not to be propitiated but rather to be challenged by the aspirant and overcome by his insight and pure conduct. The Jain ācāryas who struggled against the bhakti movements contended thatĪsvara and karma are not compatible; the God will always be invested with powers labeled as “sacred”, to intervene in the automatic operation of karma, to nullify its effects and finally to set it aside as mere illusion. They argued that such a belief destroys the roots of Universal ethics and justice; instead of making a man self-reliant and motivated to develop his innate powers, it makes him a fatalist resigned to the mercy and favour of a higher power. Therefore they attempted to depict the Hindu trinity of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva as a collection of sham gods (kudevas), not to be depended upon for salvation. Further, they exerted great effort in dealing with the two human avatāras, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, for these could not be dismissed as mere myth, and their cults had become a real threat to the integrity of the Jain laity. The Jain ācāryas had no difficulty in accepting the hero of the Rāmāyaṇa, whose life had been nearly ideal, except for the deplorable act of killing the demon king Rāvaṇa, an act which was the main purpose of the Rāmāvataśarpa. They could not let him kill Rāvaṇa and yet not take the consequences of going to hell! Therefore they very ingeniously drafted a Jain Rāmāyaṇa and saw to it that Rāvaṇa was killed not by Rāma but by his younger brother Lakṣman, and the latter was consigned to hell.⁶ They made Rāma renounce the world in the time-honoured fashion of Jain ascetics, and accepted him as an arhat and a siddha, a true model for the Jain laity. The controversial Kṛṣṇa, however, did not fare so well. The Mahābhārata is filled with accounts of his trickeries as a statesman; he had killed countless humans and demons. The Jain ācāryas tried as best as they could to paint a more flattering picture of Kṛṣṇa in their Purāṇas (e.g. the Harivaṃśopūrṇa of Jinasena), making him a contemporary of one of their Tīrthaṅkaras named Neminātha, but finally had no alternative but to send him to purgatory to suffer the consequences of his actions. They did predict however, that when he emerges from purgatory in the near future, Kṛṣṇa will be a Tīrthaṅkara and will be worshipped by both gods and men.
By their rather bold but not altogether unexpected treatment of Rama and Kṛṣṇa, the Jains were proclaiming their firm belief that violence (ḥimsa) is not compatible with the “sacred”; that the scriptures which approved violence as a means of dharma were not holy; and also that no person, however exalted, is to be emulated if his conduct brings harm to other beings. Non-violence or aḥimsa is the basis of all dharma; and this aḥimsa itself rests upon the knowledge that all beings, even the most insignificant ones, possess an immortal soul, capable of attaining perfection. This seed of perfection called samyakṣa is the single most “sacred” thing for the Jain. Upon this foundation he has built a very elaborate network of holy practices for the realization of his true nature. ⁷
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**Pavitra Jō Jain Darana**

प्रो॰ पद्मनाम एस॰ जेनी

कैलिफोर्निया विश्वविद्यालय, वैशाख, अमेरिका

ईलियडे ने अपनी पुस्तक ‘दी सेंजेड एण्ड दी प्रोफेन’ में पवित्र और अपवित्र को स्पष्ट: विभेदित किया है और बताया है कि मनुष्य धार्मिक अनुभव से पवित्रता के अस्तित्व का सत्य उज़ुबुख होता है। उनका कथन है कि यदि विश्व में अपवित्रता का गुण पहले नहीं था, तभी ही भाया है। यह मान्यता सर्वशक्तिमान ईश्वरबादी, बैद्धवादी, वर्त्तमान विपरीत वैद्वत्तिक धीमूँ, प्राचीन वैद्वत्तिक धीमूँ व धीमूँ धीमूँ, अंतः धीमूँ व धीमूँ धीमूँ धीमूँ के लिये यह अपवित्र अनुभव है। जैन मान्यता के अनुसार, पवित्रता का केंद्र विकास को कोई अविश्वासी व्यक्ति या ईश्वर नहीं, अपितु मानव नहीं न कोई मानव नहीं। मानव को सम्बंधित विकास की क्षमता का केंद्र विकास को प्रभावित व्यक्ति का मूल हैं। अन्यानि संसार और अनन्त कोण की धारणा की सही व्याख्या जैन मान्यता से ही ही ही सकती है। बैद्धता, गाञ्च और मीमांसक लोग ईश्वर या बैद्ध वादी
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होने के कारण विश्व और उसकी पवित्रता के समबन्ध में व्याख्या नहीं कहते। हां, योग और जैन मान्यताओं के बीच कुछ सह-सम्बन्ध सोचा जा सकता है। कियोंकि जैन भी योग का अभ्यास कर पवित्रता की ओर बढ़ते हैं। लेकिन पतंजलि की ‘पूर्ण विशेष’ की मान्यता जैन और बोधि से मेल नहीं खाती। ऐसे विशेष देव या पूर्ण की मान्यता मानव को अपने विकास के लिए परामर्शकीय बनाती हैं। मानव अपने श्रम और साधना से स्वयं ही पूर्ण विकास कर सकता है, यह महावीर और दुर्ग की मूलभूत लिखता है।

ईश्वरवादी दर्शाओं में कर्मकाण्ड और मृत्युवाद का विशेष रूप में विकास हुआ। देवता के मन्दिर बनने लगे, पूजाओं की विविध विषयों आरम्भ हुईं। ईश्वर से संबंधित कल्पनायों की जाने लगीं और ईश्वरीय इच्छा के आगे सभी नतमस्तक हो गये। इन मान्यताओं के विश्व विकास करने वालों में जैन सर्वस्वयम रहे। मध्यकालीन धार्मिक साहित्य के अंतर्गत से पता चलता है कि जैनों ने बौद्ध, बलिधारियों, ईश्वर, कर्म-काण्ड आदि का विवरण किया और सम्प्लेक्स विविधता के लिये 'अपवित्र' संसार की बात कही।

जैनों ने ईश्वर के विपयसित में आता पूर्ण का बात कहीं और तक तया पौराणिक कथाओं और औषधाओं के बि पर ईश्वर का उदयन किया। वास्तव में वांछित विरोधी आदेशों का उल्लेख किया। उन्होंने कर्मवाद और सामान्य अनुभूति के आधार पर बाद के समान वैदिक रूढ़ संस्कारों का विवरण किया। सोमेश्वर सूरि ने बालुह मूडताओं का वर्णन करते हुए बताया है कि उन्होंने सम्पूर्ण दर्शन में वाष्पक होती हैं।

जैन धारणाओं के अनुसार, विवेक में चार मंगल और शारण होते हैं—अरिहत्त, सिद्ध, सामु और धर्म। कोई भी व्यक्ति अपने दर्शन, जान और चारित्र की विवेशता से ही अरिहत्त हो सकता है, किसी की कुछ से नहीं। अनेक अवतार या तीर्थर्ष उसके लिये मार्गदर्शक का काम करते हैं। इस प्रकार जैन योगबाध के अनुसार किसी पूर्ण विशेष को न मानकर समय-समय पर रोशनी बाले पूर्ण विषयों या गुरुओं का मानता है। ऐसे पूर्णविशेषों की पूर्ण-भिन्नता से कर्मकाण्ड, बोधिवाप, समाधिमण्डल संबंधित है। इलाक्के इस संसारिक लाभ कुछ भी नहीं होता। जैन अन्य मत मानते हैं। कर्मवादी जैन कर्म को एक मनो-भौतिक जड़ता के मानते हैं। जिस पर विज्ञान वाता बति दुःख है। जैनाचार्यों ने बताया है कि ईश्वरवाद और कर्मवाद साथ-साथ नहीं रह सकते। ईश्वरवादी की पवित्रता मानव का उदार नहीं कर सकती। हिंसा और पवित्रता साथ-साथ नहीं रह सकते। अंतः ही परम्पर्य है। इसी को जैन शास्त्रों में सम्प्रभु धार्मिक है। जैनों के लिये रत्नव या सम्प्रभु (झड़ा, जान, चारिव) ही पवित्र है। इसकी प्राप्ति के लिये ज्ञानों में अनेक उपाय मुझे गये हैं। सम्प्रभु के अनुगमन से मानव पवित्र होता है।