



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.

2000
NAH-J
JAINISM
PRECEPTS AND PRACTICE



**PURAN CHAND NAHAR
AND
KRISHNACHANDRA GHOSH**

VOL. 1

**CAXTON PUBLICATIONS
DELHI**

CHAPTER XIII.

Theories of Evolution

Theories of Evolution and Creation by External Agency—Spencerian Formulation of the Principle of Evolution—Difficulties in in Spencerian hypothesis.

183—190

CHAPTER XIV.

The Sankhya Philosophy

Sankhya principles of Evolution—Traceable in the 'Rigveda'—'Purush' and Prakriti—The Three 'Gunas' in their Equilibrium form 'Prakriti or the Root-Evolvent—Prakriti is the first Category—The Three other Categories—Inconsistency of the Sankhya Hypothesis.

191—210

CHAPTER XV.

Causation and Compound Evolution

The world is the permutation and combination of atoms—Causes of differences—Science fails to explain—The principles of causation—Criticism of Mill's conception of the law of causation—Patient and Agent—The Jain view of Causation and compound evolution.

211—256.

CHAPTER XVI.

God.

Jainism makes no room for an extra-mundane God.—Laplace and Nepean—The Idea is not singular in India—Yet the Jains are not dependent on any All-mighty Ruler standing in the without—Dr. Bose and the Super-physical Power—Spencer and Spinoza—"Tertium Quid"-nature of the Power—The Coalescence these powers in different beings on the attainment of "Nirvân" is the idea of the God-head of the Jains.

CHAPTER XVII

257-265.

Soul

Souls and the God-head—Materialistic conception of Soul—A bye-product of matter—Eastern and Western materialism compared—Chârvak and Hætel and Guardian, the Socialist—Cosmological and Moral difficulties involved in Materialism—Admissions by Huxley, Spencer and Darwin—The Jain conception of Spirit and Matter—Their Correlativity—Pradehas—Parts or Soul-Units—Conscious effluence form the spiritual essence of the Soul—Soul's constitutional freedom—Its Transmigration through the grades of Sansar and Emancipation.

266-280

CHAPTER XVIII

The Karma Phenomenology

Constitutional Freedom and Divinity of the Soul—'Karma' and Soul—How could Soul get enfeathered in the Chains of 'Karma'—Different Theories as to the Relation between Soul and 'Karma'—Law of 'Karma' and Re birth—The Basis of the Jain Ethics—Heredity can not explain differences between Organisms—Heredity and 'Karma'.

281—294.

CHAPTER XIX.

Churchianity and the Law of Karma.

Christian Criticism of 'Karma'—'Empty Heart of Jainism'—Examination of the Criticism—Inconsistencies and Difficulties of the Christian Theology—God and Satan—Good and Evil—The Indian Widows and Christian unmarried Girls.

295—302.

CHAPTER XX

Belief in Re-birth

'Karma' and Re-births—Complimentary Aspects of one and the Same Law governing the Universe—Buddhistic Nihilism—all without an Ego—Belief in the Law brings in Solace and Comfort in ones failures—Wide range of the belief in Asia and Europe—

Poets, Scientists and Philosophers—Transmigration has its root in reality—Karma Sarira.

307-310.

CHAPTER XXI.

Re-birth and Karma-Sarira

Prof. Huxley and Re-birth—Huxley's 'Character' and our Karma-matter—Character—Inner Nature—Linga-deha of the Hindu Philosophers—The Five Koshas or the Concentric Circles—Prānas of the Hindus and of the Jain Philosophers—Transmission of Character through Heredity Vs. Transmigration of Karma-Sarira through Re birth.

311-323

CHAPTER XXII.

Karma-Sarira and Oudarika-Sarira.

Relations between the 'Karma' and the 'Oudarika'—Stages of development—'Karman' produces the 'Oudarika'—'Oudarika' produces 'Karma'—Not Identical but two distinct Entities—Co-existence Inexplicable—Then no Inter-action possible—Relation of Concurrent Variation—Difficulties of Parallelism—The 'Karman' body and the 'Oudarika' stand to each other in Relation of Intermutation.

325-328

ILLUSTRATIONS.

- 1 From Life of Parshwanath (Kalpa Sutra Mss.)
Pre-Mahomedan Period
2. Do Mogul Period
3. Metal Image (Ardhapadmasan)

PREFACE.

In humbly placing the present book entitled AN EPITOME OF JAINISM on the table of the World-library, a few words of explanation by way of an *apologia* are, it appears, needed to justify the claims, it lays upon the valuable time of its various readers. And we may state at the outset that it is not an attempt to supersede any of the modern treatises on Jainism. Its claim to attention, if it has any, arises from the fact that it is but a compilation forming an *epitome* having for its basis the most orthodox principles, doctrines and tenets as found in the Jain original works of authority and high antiquity, or promulgated on the subject by Jain speculative writers and conformed to by accurate thinkers in their spiritual inquiries.

But to connect together these detached fragments of a subject never yet treated as a whole, from the real Jain point of view, in these days of transition under Western refinement, to harmonise the different portions of the seemingly discordant notes

lying scattered over the grey pages of works handed down from the spiritual sire to the spiritual son, by freeing them from errors which they have become more or less shrouded with, through the revolution of ages and empires, or through long-standing conventions which have come down to us from time immemorial, must require a power of interpretation and original speculation. To other originality than this, the volume lays no claim. For it goes without saying that in the present age of the cultivation of universal learning when the literati of both the East and the West are sedulously engaged in exploring the rich and almost inexhaustible mines of the ancient lores of India, it would indeed be very presumptuous on the part of any one to imagine even that he had contributed something new and original in the domain of ideas and ideals. But still for all that there is ample scope for thinkers to improve upon the methods of philosophising and interpreting the old ideas and ideals, tenets and doctrines in perfect keeping with the changed conditions of the times to suit newer environments without deviating in the least from the real spirit

and import which they are replete with. For it is only the form that changes and must change, spirit always remaining essentially the same all through. And if there is any deviation anywhere from the real spirit, it should be understood as due to some thing wanting in the qualification of the interpreter.

To do this we had, therefore, had to begin with the enunciation and interpretation of the Jain principles of epistemology as propounded by the omniscient sages and scholars of bye-gone days. Epistemology really supplies the key-note to the interpretation and understanding of a system of thought and culture. It gives us the stand point to have a clear and correct vision into the metaphysics of things and thoughts. This is the reason why every system of thought and culture in India really begins with a clear exposition of the principles of its epistemology, the moment it has done with describing in the briefest manner possible, its own hypothesis, its necessity and sublimity, and finally its right to be heard.

So is the case with Jainism itself ;

and having, therefore, explained all these, in brief in our Introduction and in Chapters I and II from the Jain point of view, we have begun discussing its science and philosophy from Chapter III headed as 'Knowledge and Its Forms' But with Chapter IV on 'Epistemology and Logic' begins the real discussion which ends with Chapter VIII on '*Syadvad* ultimately - and finally indentifying logic with ontology A patient perusal of these chapters will clearly show the readers as to how the formal logic of the other schools of thought becomes, in the hands of the Jain sages, metamorphosed, as it were, into transcendental logic in and through the processes of the dialectical movements of thought and Being inherent in their very nature.

But however it is generally held by students of modern thought and culture that this *dialectic* method of reasoning identifying logic with ontology is of Hegelian origin and meaning Indeed the word '*dialectic*' means reasoning *for* and *against*, exposing thereby fallacies and inconsistencies, and clearing them away. Socrates used this method of

reasoning in his ontological polemics with the sophists of his time, putting them between the horns of two definite alternatives. But in modern philosophy of the West, it was Kant who revived it in his exposing the contradictions involved in the fundamental assumptions of dogmatic philosophy and in the popular conceptions of Soul, World and God. But it was left to Hegel to give a new meaning to *dialectic* and to interpret it in a new light altogether. For with Hegel, Being contains within itself oppositions and contradictions. Every thought, every reality is but a mixture of Being and non-Being. Dialectic with Hegel, therefore, is equivalent to Self-development or unfoldment, and the world-process itself is a process of dialectic, of antithesis and synthesis, making differences serve as means to higher unities. The legitimate out-come of working out the Hegelian interpretation of the world-process as shown in his dialectic, is the pronouncement of the eternity of the world-process. And with it the soul is also declared to be in the never-ending process of higher and higher evolution without any ultimate rest or quiescent anywhere.

But those who have followed our exposition of the Jain principles of epistemology ending with *Syadvada* running up to Chapter XII, will be at one with us when we state that the dialectic method of reasoning identifying logic with metaphysic was not Hegel's own making. It originated with the Jain sages and omniscient *kevalins*, and has been prevalent in the field of philosophy in India from a time when Greece and Rome those cradles of European civilization, were still steeped in the darkness of ignorance. It is true that with the Jains the Absolute is but an Expression of Unity in Difference as distinguished from the Absolute beyond the Relative of the Vedantins, (Vide Chapter XI), and that the world-process is also without beginning and end (Vide Chapter XII to XV) , but the soul according to Jainism does not remain for ever entangled in the meshes of the dialectic process of evolution without knowing any rest or repose anywhere. The Jains, as well as every other system of Indian thought and culture, hold that the *Jiva* will never remain eternally caught up in the never-ending process of evolution. It

is bound to get at that state of being and beatitude which is all free and divine. For freedom is our birth-right. Every soul is constitutionally free and potentially divine. And the struggle for existence in this nether world means with the Jains not only the struggle for bare existence in this mortal coil, but for the realization as well of this *Ideal Freedom and Divinity*.

With this end the enquiries constituting the Right Vision—the basis of Right knowledge

But Right Knowledge which proceeds from Right Vision by a coherent train of thought and reasoning and which can only lead to Right Conduct without which the attainment of the Goal in vision is held to be impossible, is the knowledge which embraces concisely or in details, the relations in which the constituent factors of the world stand to soul and the changes as well of these relations in the dialectic movement of thought and being. And all these, more technically speaking, begin with Chapter XVIII on the 'Karma Phenomenology'. The readers will find much interest to enter on a new kind of

discussion on metaphysical issues of vital importance in regard to the relation in question and its changes as well. The question as to when and how the soul which is constitutionally free and potentially divine came to be entangled into the meshes of the dialectic movements of the world-process without beginning and end, and which irritates the metaphysicians and speculative writers most in these days of scientific enquiry, has been discussed and solution given once for all. Every other position being untenable, the Jains hold that both the Soul and the *Karma* (i.e. the materialised units into which *jivic* energetics resolve themselves) stand to each other in relation of phenomenal conjunction, which reveals itself in the continuity of the display from time without beginning, neither of the two being either prior or posterior to the other in the order of time, so far the question of their metaphysical entity is concerned—*anādi apaschānupurvaṃ sanyoga sambandha pravṛttaḥ*. Such is the position of the *jivas* in the ocean of *samsār* whereon tumultuous waves furiously surging in various names and forms, ruffle the vast expanse. And just as the angularities of

the gravels at the bottom of the grugling stream of strong currents are rubbed off by being drifted from place to place, so the angularities of the *Jiva* sunk in the ocean of *Samsâr* are also rubbed off by being driven from womb to womb, from region to region, under the strong pressure of *Karma*-causality. In this way with the rubbing off of the angularities and thinning out of the gross meterial veil and covering, when the *jiva* gets a comparatively improved vision into its own nature and ideal, it struggles to work out its own emancipation as a free-centre of origination. All these and such allied subjects as Rebirth and the like which are required to determine our place and function in the world, have been discussed with comparative details up till Chapter XXVI on the 'Classification of *Karmas*' with which end the enquiries into the constitution of Right Knowledge.

From Right knowledge of our ultimate Ideal, of our place and function in the world, arises the possibilites of Right Conduct which is imperative in the attainment of the Ideal. And the enquiries into the constitution

of the Right Conduct open with Chapter XXVII 'From Metaphysics to Ethics.' No system of Indian thought and culture has such a stage-by-stage exposition in a systematic way of the ways and means to the attainment of that Goal which we all have in view. The very arrangement, it will appear on a careful perusal, is not only most psychological so far the unfoldment of knowledge itself is concerned, but appears to be modern as well when we judge it from the scientific and practical point of view. Having cleared up the Jain Conceptions of Virtue and Vice (Vide Chapter XXVIII), of their fruitions here and hereafter, the problems of evil and the like rudimentary notions of the Jain Ethics, the moral categories have been taken up one by one in consecutive order beginning with 'Influx' (Vide Chap XXXI) of the alien matter into the constitution of the soul and the consequent bondage of the same under subreption (*Mithyâtta*) which is nothing else than taking a thing for something which is not that thing (*asate sat buddhi*) Thus, *mithyâtva* is the prime root of all troubles. Such being the case we have discussed

at some length, the psychology and philosophy of the matter and form of this *mithyātva*. A little reflection will be sufficient, we believe, to convince an impartial student of the history of Indian schools of thought that the theory of *Māyā* resolving into *āvaran* and *vikshepa* as interpreted by Shankar and others of his line of thinking, is but a distorted shadow of the Jain theory of *mithyātva*. For, to deny *Māyā*, therefore, of any positive entity and to posit it at the same time as the great impediment in the way to the true self-realisation is to be guilty of substantializing the abstraction. In order to escape from this difficulty, Ramanuja, another interpreter of the *Vedānta Sūtras*, had to draw inspirations from the teachings and writings of the Jain sages, and, in consequence, had to fall back upon the Jain doctrine of Unity in Difference or the Theory of *Bhedābheda vad*, the legitimate outcome of the *Syadvād* or the dialectic method of reasoning giving a more comprehensive view of thought and Being. It is true that Ramanuja speaks of Bodhāyana as his authority for the enunciation of the doctrine of Unity in

Difference, but nowhere in his scholium on the *Brahm Sūtras* could he quote direct from the writings of Bodhāyana. What Bodhāyan taught no body knows. Had there been the existence of any commentary by him on the *Sūtras* in question even at the time of Shankar, then Shankar, the upright and audacious, would never have left him unnoticed in his unrivalled commentaries and writings because he is found to freely draw upon his predecessors, friend or opponent.

Be that as it may, the Jain sages have made sifting enquiry into the nature and matter of this *mithyātva* and found possibilities of its removal through *Samvar* or Stoppage of the Influx and through *Nirjarā* or gradual dissipation of what already found its way into the soul. With the completion of this dissipation, the soul gets rid of all the veil and covering of Karma and shines in perfect freedom and omniscience enjoying bliss divine for all time to come, this is what called *Moksha* of *Nirvāṇ* or Extinction of all pain and suffering, the grand *Summum Bonum* of one and all life and living (Vide Chapters XXXII to XXXV).

But this final and ultimate state of being in bliss and beatitude cannot be attained all of a sudden. Great indeed is the vision but only the few behold. Great is the goal, but only the few attain. Great really is the struggle but only the few can withstand. For the goal in fact is gradually reached by steady and strenuous striving subjecting the self to gladly undergo a series practical disciplines in a manner and along the lines as enjoined in the Jural (*Charan*) and Teleological (*Karan*) Ethics of the Jains. And the stages which the *munukshin* has to pass through, are fourteen in number and are called *Gunasthānas* which can be squeezed up into four stages to suit modern intellect.

We have seen that according to Jainism, Freedom is our birth-right and that its philosophy declares this freedom to be already in us. Freedom is constitutional with man. Feel that you are great and you will be great. Feel that you are free and all quarrels will cease. With the Jain, it is but a question of realization in the very heart of hearts where life throbs and the soul of religion

which is unique in the history of the world. And this is why life in India really throbs in religion, where as in the West, it has been more or less a fashion to attend the Church.

But to return to the point at issue : as in India the function of philosophy is to support a particular form of Faith, so the function of Jainism is to harmonise all the contending religions of the world. And it is here that Jainism supersedes all the other forms of faith and creed. For, it is philosophy and religion both rolled in one. A little reflection on the theory itself and its predominance from time to time, along with its growth and spread, will prove the truth and validity of our statement. Will any one tell the world what is it that so boldly declares the glorious dignity of man ? Is it the civilization that creates for man new wants and desires only to bind him down more tightly to the mires of the world ? Or is it that reconciles for man all the seeming differences without sacrificing anything of permanent interest, kills that egotism by virtue of which his envenomed passions howl at every disappointment, and ultimately opens out to him the way to perfection, real happiness and

eternal beatitude where all wants and cares cease for ever, and all passions as well for good, and which makes man really to be *his own real* self in infinite delight divine? Surely you will have to pronounce judgment in favour of the latter, and in that case we state once for all, and that without the slightest fear of contradiction, that Jainism is the means to the introduction into this mundane world a reign of peace, ordered harmony and reasonable sweetness which are most wanting in these days of rank materialism and uncompromising self-aggrandisement wherewith this blessed land of Bharat has become surcharged.

It has, therefore, become highly imperative to repress this growing ardour of our youth in polemical polemics and practical tactics that are detrimental to and destructive of the felicity of their temporal and future lives, by a revival of the humble instructions of the ancient *Kevalins* and peaceful preceptors of old, and reclaiming them to the simple mode of life led by their forefathers from the perverted tendencies finding a firm hold on them under the influence of Western refinement. It is this degeneracy of our

rising generation from an utter ignorance of the superiority of their own code and adoption, in consequence, of foreign ideas and ideals, habits and manners, that ought to engage the serious attention of our educated children of the soil

Now apart from the question of any sublimity, necessity and utility of the cultivation of the Philosophy of Jainism roughly consisting as it does in outward peace (*Shanti*) and internal tranquility (*Chitta Prasānti*) united with contentment (*Santosh*) and apathy (*Varāgya*) to the alluring pleasures of the world, a glance at the description of the Jain Church as portrayed in Chapter XXXVII, a survey of the Jain places of Pilgrimage, of Art and Architecture &c. (Chapters XXXIX &c. XLI), a study of the great and not yet fully accessible complex of writings making up the Jain Literature and recording the appearances of the Tirthankars in the era of *avasarpini*, and chronicling the organisation of the *Sanghas*, the great split in the original camp into the Svetāmbaris and the Digambaris the consecutive succession of the *āchāryas* and the list of *gachchas* which originated with them, and

finally other secular events of historical importance to a considerable extent, will make it pretty clear that Jainism is a religion that is not only born of the depths of ages but also that its Tirthankars were real historical persons who lived, moved and had their beings amongst our forefathers.

Besides, these pages contain historical statements and allusions of no mean value. What we want to point out is that apart from the question of religious merit as is manifest in the literary works of the Jains, they go to a great extent to clear up many a historical anomaly and settle dates of important historical events. For instance, it is from the perusal of these pages that we could settle the date of Mahavira's *Nirvan* or the accession of Chandragupta. And it is from these pages we find that during the time of Rishaba Deva, the systems of *Jaina*, *Shurva* and *Sāṅkhya* philosophies were extant. The *Mīmāṃsā* and the *Nyāya* flourished during the period of Sitalnath whereas the *Buddha* and the *Vaisheshika* came to prominence during the time of Parshwanath and Mahavir. This account of the chronological developments of the different Schools of Philosophy may read

very strange. But when one remembers that none of the systems of philosophy came to being all of a sudden, but they were more or less in extant in a still remoter age, and that this development into systems of philosophy means their embodiment in the forms of Sutras at different periods, things becomes easy to understand. For this is further corroborated if we interpret the religious upheaval in view of the fact that in the great religious Congress of the Indian saints and sages of yore in the *Naimishāranya*, when the authority of the Vedas were being made as binding upon the free thinkers of those days, those who left the Congress in silent protest against such actions of the Brahman-Rishis, were dubbed as *Nāstikas*. The word *Nāstika* (atheist) in the Indian scripture does not mean one who did not believe in the existence of God, but rather one who did not accept the infallibility and ultimate authority of the Vedas. Were it otherwise then the System of *Sāṅkhyu* in which Kapil, like Laplace, did not care for getting in a God in the scheme of his universe, would not have been taken as one of the six theistic systems of philo-

all rights and privileges which so long belonged exclusively to them. Our Digambari brethren are squandering away good money in the name of religion. They are showing a great enthusiasm, at the present moment, to set up claims and run to the Courts of Law for the settlement of issues. Everywhere, whether at Sametsikhar, at Pawapuri or at Rajgir, we hear of litigations cropping up from their endeavours to get equal rights in the control and management of the sacred places which the Jain Svetambari Community have been doing since the foundation of these shrines and temples. If things really go on in this way, then the Jain Community, as a whole, will have not only to pay dearly for it, but those monumental works as well of the Jain genius in art, architecture and sculpture will shortly disappear into the surrounding ruins. And it grieves us much therefore to find that the Digambaris are quarrelling with the Svetambaris without any just cause to advocate in claiming equal share with them. In the South, the Digambaris have their well-known images at Sravana Belgola and other temples in their sole management. No

Swetambari ever thinks of interfering with the just rights of the Digambaris in those provinces. The Digambaris have got lands from the Swetambari Sangha for erection of their temples, sometimes they have also purchased land for the purpose and have built separate temples. But indeed deeply regrettable it is on their part that inspite of these stupendous facts, they have not put a stop to their policy of aggression.

We, therefore, sincerely appeal to the Digambaris, at least to the sensible and educated members amongst them, to put an end to such sort of dealings and avoid litigation especially in matters of religion. Even before the Court of Justice, there is a limitation to everything. For centuries after centuries, the Swetambaris have tried their best to build, maintain and improve the sacred places. They hold *Firmans, Grants, Sunnuds* and *Parwanas* from the reigning Sovereigns of the past and have been managing the affairs generation after generation, without any co-operation from the Digambaris from time immemorial without any clamour, dissension or intervention. And it is a disgrace that they

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

purification of our hearts and minds and establish the *tirtha* or the order. According to the Jains, the first Tirthankara '*Rishava Deva*' of the present era, gave to the world a systematic exposition of Truth in all its aspects, both secular and spiritual. He also laid down rules of conduct for the proper guidance of the church as well as of the laity. *Rishava Deva* is also mentioned in the Hindu Scripture, the '*Srimat Bhagvat*', as the second in the list of kings, who, towards the end of his life, abandoned the world and went about as a naked ascetic and rose from manhood to divinity by meditation. '*Pārshwanatha*', the twenty-third, and '*Mahavira*', the twenty-fourth, were not founders but they were merely reformers like other Tirthankars in different ages. On the face of such overwhelming evidences as can be collated from pages of high antiquity, there cannot be any doubt as to the existence of Mahāvīra or Pārshwatha as historical personages. M Guérinot, in the Introduction to his learned Essay on Jain Bibliography, indicates the important points of difference between the life of Mahāvira and that of Buddha.

INTRODUCTION

MAHAVIRA

BUDDHA

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Born at Valsali (Kunda grām) about 599 B. C. 2. His parents lived to a good old age. 3. Assumed the ascetic life with the consent of his relatives. 4. His preparation in the ascetic stage lasted for 12 years 5. Died at Pawa in 527 B. C. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Born at Kapilavastu about 557 B. C. 2. His mother died soon after giving his birth. 3. Made himself a monk against the wishes of his father. 4. Obtained illumination at the end of 6 years only. 5. Died at Kusinagar about 488 B. C. |
|---|---|

Pārshwanātha was born at Benares in 877 B. C., and reached *nirvāṇa* in 777 B. C. on a hill which is still known as Pareshnath Hills in Bengal. Mahāvira or Vardhamāna, the last Tirthankara of this age, only improved upon the then existing doctrines and customs according to the exigencies of the time, and it was he who gave Jainism its final form. The current tenets and practices of Jainism, as embodied in the existing Sutras or canons, are his utterances

Mahāvira was the son of Siddhārtha, the chief of the *Nāṭ* clan of Kundagrama near the city of Valsali, who belonged to a noble

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Hegel

unified knowledge". "Philosophy" according to a third, "is the science of the Absolute," in the sense that it takes the world of Nature not as a product of chance but of a Single Infinite Power whose activity consists in the working out of a plan or purpose in the course of which It evolves this world out of Itself. Thus has philosophy been variously defined by different thinkers of different ages and climes.

Philosophy
as defined
by the Ji-
nas

The Jains, however, teach that philosophy consists in the voluntary and consistent striving, intellectual and moral, manifest in the removal of impediments on the way to Right Vision (सम्यक् दशन) into the metaphysics of things and thoughts leading to Right Knowledge (सम्यक् ज्ञान) of the world as a whole, and of our own function and place—Right Conduct (सम्यक् चारित्र) therein with the express object of realizing finally the free and beatific state of our being—the ultimate end and purpose of all life and activity

Its Method
of enquiry

Taking philosophy, then, as an attempt to attain to a free and beatific state of being by the virtue of Right Conduct—(सम्यक् चारित्र) proceeding from Right Know-

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ledge (*samyak jñāna*) acquired through Right Vision (*samyak darshan*) into the realities of things and thoughts, we can ascertain beforehand what the principal branches and problems of our enquiry will be. We can see that there are two fundamental factors of the world : (i) *Jīva*, the Cogitative Substance or the Soul, including the system of finite minds either in *Nigoda*, fixed, fettered, or free, in the various gradations of their being ; (ii) *Ajīva*, the Non-Cogitative Substance, the Non-living or the Non Soul, including objective things and processes and the like Hence our enquiry into philosophy, roughly speaking, will branch out into,—

The two fundamental factors of the world.—

(i) *Jīva*.

(ii) *Ajīva*.

(i) The Cogitative Substance or Soul (*jīva*),

(ii) The Non-Cogitative Substance or the Non-Soul (*ajīva*), and finally,

(iii) The End or Freedom (*moksha*) of the soul in relation as to how it is attained.

But from a consideration of these fundamentals, it becomes evident that we have to make a frequent use of such metaphysical ideas and notions as *Dravya* (substance), *Guna* (quality), *Paryāya* (modality or modi-

Necessary Ideas and Notions.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

fication), *Karma* (action, motion or change of relative position), *Kāraṇ* (causality) and the like; and no consistent result of our enquiry into philosophy can be expected until appropriate and complete understanding has been arrived at in regard to these fundamental ideas and notions. But an understanding of the content and origin of these ideas involves, to a great extent, analytical psychology of cognition.

And understanding of these involves analytical psychology of cognition and question on the means or conditions of knowledge.

Furthermore, philosophy, as we have seen above, claims to know the realities as they are, and therefore it must proceed with the justification of its rights by showing what the conditions or means (*Pramāṇas*) of attaining knowledge are, and proving as well, that knowledge of realities corresponding to the above ideas is within its power and competence. Otherwise, instead of explaining the relations which the *Jīvas* and *Ajīvas* bear to each other, it will go on only dogmatising, sometimes sinking into the lower level of scepticism and agnosticism, or at other times rising into pseudo-rationalism—only to add to the impediments of which there are plenty already to obscure

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

our right vision into realities of ideas and ideals and forge thereby fresh links to the chains of misery that tie us down to the mires of this suffering world. But to avoid such pitfalls and to know the realities in conformity with the rules and canons required to be observed in the acquirement of a correct knowledge, we must proceed from such and other notions and ideas as form the subject-matter of the next chapter.



CHAPTER II.

PREDICAMENTS BY PRE-EMINENCE.

Fundamental Notions.—Categories or Predicaments by pre-eminence.—Their Necessity and Origin—How determined.—Advantages of such determination.—**Dravya, Guna, Paryaya and Karma.**—**Papa and Punya.**—Classification and description in general of the Predicaments.—Their enumeration.

We have already seen that Right Vision, Right Knowledge, and Right Conduct are the three principal departments of our philosophical enquiry.

Origin and context of the fundamental ideas and Notions such as .—

But in dealing with these, as we have remarked, we have often to make use of such and certain fundamental ideas or notions as are not only the necessary forms according to which we ourselves must conceive things but which must also be regarded as necessary forms and relations of the things themselves. For in thinking, to be more clear, we think something about a thing and what we think about a thing is that it has powers

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Its constitutional Freedom,

bondage and attain to a free and beatific state of being by means of the True Gems (रत्नत्रयी), the *Jiva* is held to be constitutionally free and essentially all bliss (आनन्द). It is potentially *divine* in the sense that it attains to Divinity or Perfection in the end when it shines in all its glory and effulgence beyond all thought and speech near the regions of *Aloka*.

Its Divinity,

And its Infinitude, not in magnitude but in number

Now there are an infinite number of these *Jivas*—filling the entire space and void of the universe and are mainly grouped into,—

1) The Freed *Jiva*

(A) Freed *Jivas*—are those beings who have attained to divinity and become self-conscious and self-luminous near the hyper-physical regions and,

(2) The Fettered *Jiva*

(B) Fettered *Jivas*—are those who are still bound down with the chains of *karma* either on Earth, in Heaven, or in Purgatory

Which is classified again into,

These fettered *Jivas* are again subdivided into (i) *Sthāvāra* and (ii) *Trās*

(i) The *Sthāvāra* and

(i) *Sthāvāra Jivas*—are those which are devoid of all power of locomotion and have only one organ of sense, viz, that of *touch* (स्पर्श). Earth, water, fire, air and all those that come within the

PREDICAMENTS.

range of the vegetable kingdom, are known as *Jivas* belonging to the *Sthāvara* class Symptoms of life in these *Sapraṇ Sthāvar* (सप्राण स्थावर) or living fixtures consist, amongst other phenomena, in *responsiveness* which evidently involve memory as displayed in the mental activity of *feeling*, *cognition* and *re-cognition*

(ii) *Tras Jivas*—are those who have the power of locomotion and are grouped into four kinds according to the nature and number of the sense-organs they are possessed of The four kinds of *Tras Jivas* are, —

(2) The *Tras*.

The four kinds of the *Tras*.

(a) those that have the organs of *touch* and *taste*, (स्पर्शेन्द्रिय and रसेन्द्रिय) e g., leeches, worms, etc

(b) those that have three organs such as *touch*, *taste* and *smell*, (स्पर्शेन्द्रिय, रसेन्द्रिय and गन्धेन्द्रिय) e g, ants, lice, etc

(c) those that have organ of sight (नयनेन्द्रिय) in addition to the above three organs, e g, bees, scorpions, etc.—

(d) and, lastly, those that have all the above four organs in addition to that of the hearing (शब्देन्द्रिय) This last kind of

AN ÉPITOME OF JAINISM.

Jivas includes birds, acquatics, animals and human beings and all those that people Heaven, Earth and Purgatory.

II. *Ajiva* (अजीव)—Non-cogitative substance, Non-soul, Not-self or the Object is all what is absolutely bereft of all *intelligence*, and consequently of the tripartite modes of *consciousness*. This *Ajiva* or Non-cogitative substance is of five kinds, viz ;—

Ajiva defined

(1) *Pudgala* signifies what *develops fully only to be dissolved again*.—It is that

kind of dead dull ponderable (रूपी) matter, which is qualified with touch, taste, smell

Ponderable
Ajiva—Pud-
gal and its
indications
—*Lakshana*

and colour. It is found to exist generally in two modes of being :—(a) *Anu* (अणु)—

atom, and (b) *Skandha* (स्कन्ध),—compound.

When the dead and dull matter exists in the last indissoluble stage where the ingredients admit of no further analysis, it is called *anu* or atom. And *Skandha*-compound is the natural conglomeration of *pudgal*-atoms under chemical and physical laws. It is these *Pudgala*-atoms that incessantly enter and leave our bodies and are infinitely more numerous than the *Jivas Karma* is a kind of fine *Pudgal*-atoms.

PREDICAMENTS.

The *Pudgala*-matter is also classified in the following manner according to other modes of its being :—

Pudgala
Classified.

(a) *Sthula-Sthula* (स्थूल-स्थूल) or the Grossesst of the gross, as, for example, logs of wood or blocks of stone ; i.e., solids which can be cut into equal parts.

(b) *Sthula* (स्थूल) or the Gross-simple, milk or water, i. e., liquids, which are restorable to their original mass-forms even after their measurable divisions.

(c) *Sthula-sukshma* (स्थूल-सूक्ष्म) or the Compound of the *gross* and the *fine* (e g. gases which is visible in the light of the sun or the moon but cannot be caught , as for example smokes and the like)

(d) *Sukshma-Sthula* (सूक्ष्म-स्थूल) or the Compound of the *fine* and the *gross* is what is not visible to the eye but is perceptible by the auditory or olfactory nerves ; as, for example, music and smell.

(e) *Sukshma* (सूक्ष्म) or the Fine.

(f) *Sukshma-Sukshma* (सूक्ष्म-सूक्ष्म) or the *Finest* of the *fine*, the ultimate atoms which admit of no further divisions. These finest of the fine, are mere simples as oppos-

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

ed to compounds and like points have positions but no magnitude.

(ii). *Dharma* or *Dharmāstikāya* is that simple imponderable (अमूर्त) substance by the virtue of which bodies are able to move. *Dharma* here seems to be a reality, corresponding to the *Rajus* (रजस) of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, helping to the mobility of material things.

(iii). *Adharma* or *Adharmāstikāya* is that simple imponderable (अमूर्त) substance by the virtue of which bodies are able to be at rest. *Adharma*, like *Dharma*, appears to be a reality corresponding to the *Tamas* (तमः) of the Sāṅkhya philosophy tending to bring things to a rest.

(iv). *Ākāśh* or Space is the uncontained container of all that exists.

(v) *Kāl* or Time is what reveals itself in a series or succession of events or changes. It is in the course of time that things wear out, unfold themselves or undergo changes. It is this time that is conventionally divided and termed as moments, minutes, hours and the like for which reason it is technically called *Kalanātmak Kāl*.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Five Forms
of Know-
ledge,—

Now knowledge is of five different forms, such as, (1) *Mati* (मति), (2) *Sruti* (श्रुति), (3) *Abadhi* (अवधि) (4) *Manaparyaya* (मनःपर्याय) (5) and *Keval* (केवल) Thus,—

Mati is that form of knowledge by which a *Jiva* (जीव) cognises an object through the operation of the sense-organs, all hindrances to the formation of such knowledge being removed.

(2) *Sruti* is the clear knowledge formed on some verbal testimony of the Omniscient, all obstruction to the formation of such knowledge being removed.

(3) *Avadhi* is the knowledge in the form of recognition of particular physical occurrences that happened in some time past, all obstruction to the way being removed;

(4) *Manaparyaya* is the knowledge of what is in others' thoughts, originating, as it does, from the removal of hindrances to the formation of such knowledge.

(5) *Keval* is the pure unimpeded knowledge—knowledge absolute, which precedes the attainment of *Nirvana*. It is characterised by *omniscience*, transcending all relativity of discursive thought involving

KNOWLEDGE AND ITS FORMS

the idea of succession and series. Being devoid of every sort of ratiocinative element, we may call it '*Intuition*' power. By Intuitive knowledge we mean, of course, what we get by a single stroke of cognition, unadulterated by any of the processes of representation. As for us, finite beings, conditioned naturally by the relativity of thought, we cannot have this sort of cognition; because a careful analysis of the psychological processes seems to show that by virtue of the frame and constitution of our mind, in every cognition which we can have, both the presentative and the representative elements are, as it were, inseparably blended together. Indeed, some philosophers may hold the quite opposite view and affirm that we can perceive objects directly by our senses and that formation of the percept requires no help of representation. But, surely, we can meet them in the language of Kant by saying that mere sensations, unalloyed with any reactionary and representative processes, are as good as nothing, because they are no better than manifold of senses quite undifferentiated and homogeneous in character. But this—though an im

Characteristic Indication of *Keval* or Intuition

Impossibility of Intuition by ordinary minds

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

The observ-
ance of which
is essential
to the
formation of
a correct
Judgment

canons that a Judgment must obey in order that it might be true. A good and correct Judgment has some responsibility, and this responsibility takes on the form of rules, laws and canons that a Judgment must obey, or else be an untrue or false claimant of the respective demands. To disobey these rules would, therefore, be tantamount to treason to knowledge itself.

We have already dwelt on the first two elements of Judgment. We are now to deal with the third one, or the laws and canons for the formation of correct Judgment.

Ety molo-
gical signi-
ficance of
Pramāṇ.

Students of Indian systems of thought all know that the word *pramāṇa* (प्रमाण) originally meant an instrument of measurement—from *mān*-to measure and *pra*-forth. It may be translated as a measured, standard authority.

Function of
Pramāṇ

But the *pramāṇa* which serves as a means (साधन) of determination produces *pramiti* (प्रमिति) which means accurate or right knowledge, just as *sādhana* (means) produces *siddhi* (truth or certainty). This *pramāṇa* is a means of information and determination and has variously

EPISTEMOLOGY AND LOGIC

been admitted, divided and defined from different points of view by different sages and scholars of different ages and climes to suit their respective systems of thought

The Châr-
vâka Critti-
cism of
Knowledge

Whoever has a little acquaintance with the different Indian systems of thought knows full well that the followers of the Châr-vâka School admit of but one source of knowledge, viz Experience, i. e sense-perception (प्रत्यक्ष), contemptuously rejecting the other sources, viz. Inference, (अनुमान), Testimony (शब्द), Tradition (ऐतिह्य), Implication (अर्थोपपत्ति), Probability (सम्भाव) and Non-entity (अभाव), which are warranted in drawing from facts of experience Little indeed do we know what is really taught by the Sage *Bṛhaspati*, the oldest propounder of the most uncompromising materialism and thorough going Epicureanism or whence he drew his inspiration to rely solely on sense perception or facts of actual experience and to overlook other logical inferences and the like which have been in vogue from time immemorial, for, where we perceive smoke we infer at once the fire there, or, when a reliable person informs any one that there are fruits he

There is but
one Source
of Know-
ledge and
that is *Pra-
tyaksha*.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

requires on the bank of the river, he runs to the place and plucks fruits. Thus, Inferrence and Testimony along with others have all along been held to be valid sources of knowledge. But, curiously enough, the Chârvâkas question the validity of these. And so far we could gather from the fragments of this philosophy, scattered here and there in the different systems of thought and as collated by Mâdhavâchârya in his *Sarvadarshana Samgraha*, he begins his enquiries into Epistemology with such startling questions as, what is the value of Inferrence? How can ever its conclusions be certain?

Invalidity of
Inference
—*Anuman*.

The most elementary form of conclusion must invariably have three terms—two extremes and a reason, mark or middle term (हेतु, सिद्ध or साधना). To give a conclusion, the middle-term or mark (हेतु, सिद्ध or साधना) must be universally and unconditionally connected with the major-Sâdhya (व्यापेक, साध्य) on one side i.e., according to the phraseology of European logic must be *distributed*, and on the other side with the minor term *paksha* (पक्ष) But what evidence can we

EPISTEMOLOGY AND LOGIC.

ever have that the connection between the *major* (साध्य) and the *middle* or *sign* (व्याप्य, हेतु or लिङ्ग) is necessary and universal? For,—

(a) Sense-perception (प्रत्यक्ष) cannot prove it in as much as universal connection is not a fact of *experience*. Experience can give only one particular fact and that only of the present moment and not of the long past nor of the distant future. The eye by fact of its exercising its functional activity only in the present reveals the objectivity of a particular thing *here* and *now*. But a universal truth goes infinitely beyond what the eye can give. Hence sense-perception cannot prove any necessary connection between the *major* (साध्य) and the *minor* (पक्ष)—any universal proposition or *Pratijñā*—(व्याप्ति प्रतिज्ञा)।

Sense-evidence cannot establish Inference

(b) But here a *prima facie* objection might be raised to the effect that perception being both internal and external it includes intuition of reason which gives necessary and universal truth. Not even that thunders forth the thorough-going materialist; there is no such thing as intuition

A *Prima Facie* objection raised and set aside

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

c f Reid,
Hamilton,
Mill and
Comte.

or internal perception. For mind has no perception except through the senses and therefore external. It is interesting to compare the Chârvâkas with Reid and Hamilton, who on the one hand deny the possibility of internal intuition of universal truths, and Mill and Comte on the other hand who reject all 'Introspective knowledge' as ever possible.

Inference
cannot give,
for it is only
assumed

(c) - Then again, "*Inference*," says the Indian materialist, "cannot give it; for *Inference* (अनुमान) itself always requires universal proposition affirming the connection between the *major* and the *middle* as universally true" For example when we say that a man is mortal. Socrates is a man and therefore mortal, we are assuming a necessary connection between humanity and mortality. But the possibility of such a connection, at least of our knowing such a connection, even if it existed, is just what we require to prove. Thus we can see that mere *Inference* cannot prove it, for *it is only assumed*. To say that the connection, though assumed yet makes inference possible is to argue in a circle. And hence we cannot

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

states and processes of the psychology of cognition of extra-mental realities.

Intermediary Stages of the formation of such Knowledge.

Knowledge born of the contact of the senses with their corresponding objects (इन्द्रियार्थ सन्निकर्षज ज्ञान) is not direct. There are, remark the Jain Psychologists, five intermediary stages from sense to thought: viz. (a) *Vanjyandvagraha* (व्यञ्जनावग्रह), (b) *Arthdvagraha* (अर्थवग्रह), (c) *Ihā* (इहा), (d) *Avaya* (अवय) and (e) *Dhāranā* (धारणा) as will be presently explained.

CHAPTER V.

PRATYAKSHA IS REALLY PAROKSHA.

The Jain dissension with reference to *Pratyaksha* *Pramāṇ*.—Direct Perception is really Indirect.—Analysis of the Psychological Processes of Cognition.—The Different Stages—From Sense to Thought—Proof of the Truth and Validity of the Jain Point of View.—The sensuous '*Pratyaksha*' is really '*Paroksha*'

While discussing the questions of epistemology and logic in the previous chapter, we have seen how the different schools of Indian thought substantially agree as to the character of the different instruments of knowledge. And so far the characteristic indication, specially of the Direct Perception (प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण), is concerned, we have seen too that almost all the schools, from the out-and-out materialist *Chārvāka* down to the all-believing *Paurāṇikas*, agree with one another. But the Jain *savants*, as we have stated already, do not fall in with this view. According to them, the so-called *Pratyaksha*—Direct Perception—is but an *Indirect* source of knowledge. The so-called *Pratyaksha* is really *Paroksha*

The Jain criticism of the so-called *Pratyaksha* *Pramāṇ* Direct Perception —

But the *Indirect* is really *Indirect*

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

The supposed abandonment of original position by the Jains.

in manifest opposition to the uniformly accepted sense and signification of the terms in question? Besides, this would be construed as an abandonment on our part of the original position (प्रतिष्ठा सत्ताच) taken up by us in the demonstration of the logical possibility and validity of *inferential* knowledge (परौक्ष ज्ञान) in addition to the *perceptual* and yielding as well to the view held by our adversary, in so far, indeed, as the epistemological side of the question is concerned, simply by a cunning display of *pun* upon words and terms from their etymological significations. Specially such is your position when we, Chârvâkas, do not admit of Pure Intuitions or Transcendental Perceptions which are impossible on your own statement to the ordinary mortals living, moving and having their being in the empirical world of ideas and ideals

Vindication of the Jain-position and examination of the Chârvâka hypothesis

Indeed! we, the Jains, reply There is much of sense in your argument. But that is only apparently in as much as they vanish altogether like cob-webs on searching analysis, as we shall see presently True it is that our definition and interpretation of

JAIN THEORY OF FORMAL LOGIC.

the logical terms in question are in contradiction to the too common acceptation and uses of the same. But common is the common place and being too common would not diminish the weight and gravity of our philosophy. We walk straight along the lines of *Riju-sutra* (रिजु सूत्र) and interpret and explain things both as they *are* and *appear* instead of wrangling and beating about the bush. In our empirical life and thought, we indeed admit *Perception* as the *direct* and *Inference* as the *indirect* means of knowledge. But, however, to meet you on your grounds,—

First,—You hold that direct *Perception* (प्रत्यक्ष) in the common acceptation of the term is the one and only means of knowledge and that the so-called *Inference* (अनुमान) being not possible according to your view is not to be recognised as valid knowledge.

Summary of
the Hypo-
thesis

Now, do you or do you not adduce any proof in support of your contention? If you do not, your assertions would be but *ipse dixit* and none will care to listen to you. On the other hand, if you adduce proof, yours would be a suicidal procedure making-yourself

The Châr-
vâkas in a
Dilemma

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

guilty of a crime for the abandonment of the original position (प्रतिष्ठा सञ्चास) already taken up by you in some form or other.

Unconscious admission of induction in sensuous perception

Secondly,—Again when you maintain that excepting *Perception* all other forms of evidence are alike fallacious and as such homogeneous, you admit yourself the legitimacy of *induction* which is but a form of *inference*.

Vindication of inferential knowledge.

Thirdly—Then again you reject every kind of *inference*, but how do you carry on your debate? Surely by means of words which are but symbols of thought and when you attack your antagonists for their mistaken faith in *inference* without which you could not so much as surmise that your antagonists held erroneous opinions, such erroneous opinions being never brought into contact with your organs of sense but are only supposed to exist on the strength of *inference* (अनुमान) from the symbolic movement of thought. And,

Finally,—you can not but admit of *inference* being another means of knowledge as will be evident from the following To take for example, I have been very often into

JAIN THEORY OF FORMAL LOGIC

the kitchen room as well as in other places and I have invariably observed that where there was smoke there was fire. Having met with not a single exception to the rule, I become convinced of the fact that there is an universal antecedence of fire in respect of smoke. Afterwards I go to a hill for a trip. I see smoke there and I doubt somehow whether or not there is fire in the hill. And the moment I observe smoke on it, I recall to my mind the invariable concomitance between fire and smoke of which I had become pretty well convinced before, and I conclude that the hill has fire in it as there is smoke on it. Surely this is a case of *inference* to the point and and you cannot but admit the legitimacy of the issue in question.

Demonstration of the legitimacy of Inference

Having thus refuted the Chārvāka hypothesis so far their means of knowledge is concerned and having demonstrated as well the legitimate possibility of *Inference* (अनुमान) beyond all shadow of doubt according to the general acceptation of the logical term in question, it is imperative that we shall, ere we enter on any other topics bearing upon

Necessity of a brief Survey of the Jain Theory of formal logic

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

in their proper significance and acceptance express real objects not inconsistent with what is established by perception.

and its
classification

This *Testimony* is of two kinds—(a) *Loukika* (लौकिक) and (b) *Shastraja* (शास्त्रज्ञ)

(a) *Loukika sabda* (लौकिक शब्द) is the Verbal Testimony from reliable persons having authority to speak.

(b) *Sastraja sabda* (शास्त्रज्ञ) is the Scriptural Testimony. By *scripture* is meant that which was invented by self-realized persons who have *seen* truths and whose pronouncements in consequence are not incompatible with truths derived from perception

Now the Jain sages hold the Scriptural Knowledge to be of three different kinds, viz, —

Classifica-
tion of the
Shastraja
Testimony

(1) Knowledge derived from the teachings, recorded or otherwise, of *ku devas* or bad spiritual teachers.

(2) Knowledge derived from the *Nayā Sruta* or that part of the Jain scripture which teaches us as to the ways of comprehending things and realities in one or the other of the many aspects they are possessed of

JAIN THEORY OF FORMAL LOGIC.

(3) Knowledge derived from *Syādvāda* or that part of the Jain scripture which teaches us how to test and comprehend things and realities in *all* their aspects for which reason it is also called *Anekāntavāda* or the doctrine of the versatility of aspects.

Of these three kinds of scriptural knowledge, we shall deal with the *Nayavāda* and the *Syādvāda* in the subsequent chapters and leave the first to be dealt with later on for the sake of our arrangement and convenience

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

(viii) *Kramo-
pādhi sāpek-
sha asuddha*—

under the immediately present external mode of its appearance as in the case of taking a redhot piece iron for fire itself ; or taking a man to be insane for the temporary fit of insanity he has displayed for the moment

(ix) *Utpāda-
vyaya sāpek-
sha s a t t ā
g r h ā k ā
asuddha*—

(ix) *Utpāda vyāya sāpeksha sattā grhāka asuddha*—implies taking a thing in its tripartite aspects of origination, destruction and permanence at one and the same time , as in the case of casting a gold necklace into the mould of a bracelet, the substance remaining the same substance all through the time, involving, as it does, in it the idea of the origination of the bracelet from the destruction of the necklace, gold remaining essentially the same all through

*Bheda kal-
panā sāpek-
sha asuddha*.

Bheda kalpanā sāpeksha asuddha—is the consideration of the thing after resolving it through the processes of mental abstraction into substance and quality, though the two are really non-different and inseparable from each other for instance, consciousness is the essential quality of the soul , but we often draw a line of distinction between consciousness and soul in our ordinary

THE JAIN LOGIC AND THE NAYAS

parlance when we say, "the soul's consciousness," or "consciousness of the soul", though soul is non different from consciousness or the latter from the former

ON PARYAYAS

Before we come to the discussion of the second class of *Naya* known as the *Paryāyārthika*, it is imperative that we must have a clear understanding of what we mean by a *paryāya*.

A *paryāya* is but a mood or state of being Or whatever has origin and end or destruction in time is *paryāya* The ripples in waters or the surging waves ruffling the vast expanse of the ocean are but typical illustrations of what is really meant by *paryāya*

Definition of
Paryāyas

Such being the nature of *Paryāyas*, they are but phenomena or appearances and as such they must be appearances of something with which they stand in certain relations. Following up the character of these relations, the Jain sages have classified *paryāyas* primarily into (i) *Sahabhāvi* and (ii) *Kramabhāvi*.

Classification
of *Paryāyas*

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

- Of these two kinds of *paryāya*, the first, (i) *Sakabhāvi* *Sakabhāvi* refers to the quality which is co-existent with what it reveals, as for example, consciousness (विज्ञान) is the *Sakabhāvi paryāya* which is co-existent with soul, and the second, *Kramabhāvi* stands for the (ii) *Kramabhāvi* *paryāya* proper *Kramabhāvi paryāyas* may be described as *contingent* in the sense that their presence depends on the variable circumstances so that they may differ in the same thing at different times just as happiness and misery or joy and grief which are not co-existent with the mind like consciousness but are moods which depend on the environment, the mind finds itself placed in by the virtue of its own *karma*

It is also interesting to note, by the way, how the Jain philosophers have otherwise classified *paryāyas* as in the following.—

- (a) *Svabhāva dravya vyānjana paryāya* —means substantive variation in the ultimate constitution (चरम शरीर) which a thing undergoes in the course of its adaptation to the environment as we find in the cases of *siddha* souls whose nature differ only

*Svabhāva
dravyavyān-
jana*

THE JAIN LOGIC AND THE NAYAS.

slightly from the ultimate and real nature of the soul which is essentially free and full of bliss.

(b) *Svabhāva guṇa vyāñjana paryāya*
—means variations in the natural quality of a thing as we find in the case of the finitude of vision and imperfection of the embodied soul whose real and essential quality consists in the infinitude of vision and perfection which become manifest of themselves in the pure and disembodied state of being on the attainment of Freedom.

(b) *Svabhāva
guṇa vyāñ-
jana paryāya*

(c) *Bibhāva dravya vyāñjana paryāya*
—is an accidental variation in the general constitution of a substance as is observed in the soul's transmigrations through various kinds of *organic* beings.

(c) *Bibhāva
dravya vyāñ-
jana paryāya*

(d) *Bibhāva guṇa vyāñjana paryāya*—means an accidental variation in the form of knowledge which is but a quality of soul, as in the case of *matijñān* and the like as distinguished from the immediate intuitive knowledge possible to the *kevalīns* only.

(d) *Bibhāva
guṇa vyāñ-
jana paryāya*

The above is but a kind of classification of *paryāyas* as applied to living beings. But the Jain philosophers hold that the same classi-

As applied
to Inorganic
world.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

fication is also applicable with equal logic to the inorganic world of *pudgal*-matter.

(a) Indivisible atoms or electrons are examples of the first kind of classifications as applied in the non-living world.

(b) Each kind of colour, smell, taste and two non-conflicting sensations of touch are but instances of the second class of variation in the non-living

(c) The binary and tertiary compounds of the *pudgal*-matter are illustrations of the third kind of variation

(d) Chemical compounds stand for the fourth.

Unity, Variety etc., are but Other modes or *Parjāyas*

In fine, it is also to be noted that *Unity* (एकत्व) and *Variety* (वृथक्त्व) are but *modes* of appearance—*Parjāya* *Unity* is complete *Identity* and *Variety* consists in *Differences* of feature Combination (सयोग), Configuration (संस्थान), Division (विभाग), Number (सङ्ख्या). Newness and Oldness under the influence of time are but other characteristic indications of *parjāya* or phenomenon For it is said,—

एकत्वं च पटुत्वं च संख्या सांठणमिव ।
संज्ञोगो य विभागो य पञ्जयाणं तु लक्षणम् ॥

THE JAIN LOGIC AND THE NAYAS

SUBSTANCE AND QUALITY

From the above classification of *Paryāyas* into *Sahabhāva* and *Kramabhāva*, we are constrained to discuss, in brief, qualities and attributes as distinguished from substances. For without having made our ideas and notions about *quality* and *substance* pretty clear, it would be difficult for us to understand and – appreciate the utility and importance of *Naya* as applied in the study of the phenomenology of thought and being.

Substance, as we have seen, is what has some degree of independent existence of its own, preserving itself as it does by reacting on and resisting other things. This power of self-preservation constitutes the *essence* or *reality* (सत्ता) of the thing and manifests itself in the different effects which it produces by re-acting on other things. And the powers of re-action which thus manifest themselves in producing effects in other things are known as *qualities* or *properties* of the thing and are represented in terms of the effects they produce. To illustrate, when a thing has the powers of occasioning in us

Substance
and quality
distinguished

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

the sensations of colour, taste, smell, weight, we say that it has the qualities of colour, smell etc., for which reason qualities are understood to be inherent in or to constitute the *nature* of the thing in as much as they are but different ways in which the self-preservative power which is the real essence of the thing manifests itself outwardly.

(1) Generic
qualities

But qualities of things appear to us as being of two kinds, so different that one may be described as *essential* and the other as *non-essential*. For, some of the qualities which perception reveals appear to constitute the very *essence* of things—qualities without which there cannot be any conception whatsoever of things as extra-mental realities and these are called *generic* (सामान्य) qualities which are common to all things and beings.

The Jain sages hold that the generic qualities without which a thing becomes wholly inconceivable to us are ten in number viz, —

(1) Entity (वस्तुत्व)—which may be described as having the characteristics of

THE JAIN LOGIC AND THE NAYAS..

reality (सत्ता) and permanence (धौव) in and through the principle of which it manifests itself as the ground for the phenomena of both the *Universal* (सामान्य) and *Particular* (विशेष)

(2) Thinghood (वस्तुत्व)—may be described as the property revealed in and through the relations of the universal and particular in which objects subsist (सामान्य विशेषात्मक वस्तु)

(3) Substantiality. (द्रव्यत्व)—means the power of self-preservation constituting the *essence* of reality (सत्) which is characteristic indication of *Dravya*

(4) Knowability (प्रमेयत्व)—may be described as the capacity of being known or measured by the means of Valid-knowledge

(5) Subtlety (अगुरुत्व)—may be described as the capacity of being in the state of irriducible minimum with a maximum intensity (of vibration) defying thought and speech.

(6) Extension (प्रदेशत्व)—may be described as the property of occupying space.

(7) Sensibility (चेतनत्व)—may be described as the capacity of responding to stimuli

(8) Insensibility (अचेतनत्व)—may be described as the property incapable of giving any response to a stimulus

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

(9) Ponderableness (**मूर्तत्व**)—may be described as the quality of existing in some *form* or other.

(10) Imponderableness (**अमूर्तत्व**)—may be described as the power of existing without having any particular *form*.

These are, then, the ten *generic* qualities of things or substances in general.

(ii) Specific qualities.

But there are certain other qualities which do not appear to constitute either the essence of or common to all things. Because the things may have them or be without them and yet remain essentially the same in kind for which reason these are understood to be but modifications of our consciousness and are termed as *specific* qualities.

Enumeration of Specific Qualities as belonging particular substances

(i) Consciousness (**ज्ञान**), (ii) Vision (**दर्शन**), (iii) Pleasure (**सुख**), (iv) Vigour (**बोध्य**), (v) Touch (**स्पर्श**), (vi) Taste (**रस**), (vii) Smell (**गन्ध**), (viii) Colour (**वर्ण**), (ix) Mobility (**गतिहेतुत्व**), (x) Inertia (**स्थिति हेतुत्व**), (xi) Volumeness (**अवगाहनहेतुत्व**), (xii) Becomingness (**वर्तनाहेतुत्व**), (xiii) Sensibility (**चेतनत्व**), (xiv) Insensibility (**अचेतनत्व**), (xv) Ponderableness (**मूर्तत्व**), (xvi) Imponderableness (**अमूर्तत्व**). Of these

THE JAIN LOGIC AND THE NAYAS.

sixteen specific properties, the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 13th, and the 16th belong to the *Jiva-soul*, the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th 14th and the 15th belong the *Pudgal*-atoms, the 9th, 14th and the 16th belong to the *Dharmāstikāya*, the 10th, 14th and the 16th belong to *Adharmāstikāya*, the 11th, 14th and 16th to the *Akāśh* and finally the 12th, 14th and the 16th to *Kāla*.

II THE PHENOMENAL NAYA.

Having seen what is implied by a *paryāya*, it would be easy now to comprehend the process of analytical enquiry into *paryāyas* or Phenomena which form the subject-matter of the *Paryāyarthika* or Phenomenal *Naya*. Of these *nayas* the first is,—

(a) *Anādi nitya suddha* &c—is what deals with that kind of *poudgalic* variations, the series of which remaining unbroken from time without beginning puts on, in consequence, the appearance of permanence, inspite of the ravages of time upon the same. As for example, the Himalayas, though time has wrought havoc on the same, yet the high mountain ranges appear ever the same from time immemorial.

(a) *Anādi
nitya suddha
&c—*

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

(b) *Sādi nitya suddhāparyāṭhika* &c —has for its subject such particular class of variations as have origination in time but undergoes no subsequent transformation · as for instance, when the embodied soul enters on a liberated state of existence, it attains to a state of variation which has, as a matter of fact, a beginning in time but knows no subsequent change ; because a soul once liberated cannot enter into any bondage again.

(c) *Sattā gounatvena utpāda vynyagrāhaka nitya suddha* &c —enquires into that kind of variations which flow in rapid successions of destruction and origination consisting as it does in the ever-changing character of the phenomena without looking into its permanent feature underlying the same

(d) *Sattā śūpeksha nitya asuddha*—not only investigates into the origination and destruction of variations but takes also into consideration the persisting element underlying them as well The word *paryāṭha*—variation—usually means variations in quality, modality and configuration, a thing undergoes without any reference to the substance itself which persists all through the changes

THE JAIN LOGIC AND THE NAYAS

and which on that account is generally left out of consideration. But here, as the persisting element is taken into consideration along with the changes in its appearances, it is called *asuddha* i.e. improper.

(e) *Kramopādhi nirapeksha nitya suddha* etc.—deals with regard only to the essential and real nature of the noumenon irrespective of the phenomenal variations it undergoes. It consists in looking into things with reference to its real nature as apart from the temporal variations which the thing might happen to undergo.

*Kramopādhi
nirapeksha
nitya s u d-
dha etc*

(f) *Kramopādhi śāpeksha anitya asuddha* &c.—is an enquiry into the temporal and perishable aspect of variations in so far only as they are subject to causality of *karma*.

*Kramopādhi
ś ā p e k s h a
anitya asud-
dha etc*

THE SEVEN NAYAS

It is now clear how the two *nayas*, Noumenal and Phenomenal, differ from each other. The one enquires into the very substance of a thing under consideration and the other investigates into the phenomena in and through which the substance makes its appearance to us.

*The Seven
Nayas*

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

of knowledge so far as we are concerned ; because it has the characteristics of necessity i.e. the constituent elements of it are apprehended, not as isolated or independant terms or notions but as related to or flowing out of each other so that one being given, the others must necessarily follow and the whole body of knowledge constitutes one *organised* system

Ordinary
way of think-
ing *Aprvas*

A penetrating insight into things will make us sure of this existing unity among the factors of the world. To the unreflective observer, the objects present themselves as separate individual realities quite simple in character. But this is not the case, for they are essentially complex. They are made up of parts which lie outside of one another in space, they do not remain absolutely the same through successive movements of time. They are continually betraying the phenomenal changes when brought into relation with other existences around them. How, then, can we think of them as individual things inspite of the changes ? The answer often unhesitatingly forwarded by philosophers is that we can combine diversity with

Ordinary
Parplexities
—How can
the world
seem to be
a unity ?

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD.

unity in our conception of things by thinking them as individual entities each endowed with manifold qualities. They are substances according to philosophers, which possess various properties such as extension, solidity, weight, colour etc. Or they are substances or subjects to whom belong the capacities of sensation, feeling, and perception etc. But a careful observation will show that such a device obviously fails to give us any real apprehension of existence—even though it may be the simplest individual existence. because in trying to give unity to a number of unconnected determinations by ascribing them to a common substance what we really do is to add to these determinations another determination, equally isolated and unconnected with the rest. Take away the other determinations what will be left of your substance? It is impossible to explain the known by the unknown. So to apprehend the real unity of different qualities or to put in other words, to think them as one what mind demands is, that we should think or have a rational notion of the relation of each to each and that we should discern how the

Criticism of
the Solutions
offered by
the Jaina
Realistic

Idealistic
solutions
supersede the
Realistic

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

same end and to which it owes its existence and life? So true apprehension can only be possible if we take it in the light of not what *it is* only : but also what it *is not* as well. But this may appear paradoxical to an untrained mind because it obviously transgresses the law of contradiction. The most firm convictions which we have cherished from our cradles without the least hesitation, are backed up and supported also by the vigorous rules and canons of formal logic whose fundamental principle, as we have seen before, is the law of identity and contradiction that *A* is *A* cannot be *not-A*.

In the New
Vision of
things,—*A* is
not merely
A, but *Not-A*
as well.

But now we come to a new vision of things in which *A* appears to be not merely *A* but *not-A* as well ; because *A* is real in so far it stands in relation with what is *not-A*. The true life of *A* would then consist not only in *A* as formal logic teaches us but also in *not-A*. The ideal nature of a thing consists therefore, not only in assertion of its being but also at the same time in the denial of it—in that which comprehends those antagonistic elements and yet harmonises and explains them. So if there be any knowledge in the

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD.

proper sense of the term, if there be any vision we may call spiritual and far from being *nave* realistic, it is undoubtedly this notion of ours in which all antagonistic and contradictory elements are reconciled and find repose in a higher universality which includes them all and yet is not aggregate of them, which explains all and yet does not merge in them. This is what the *Syādvād* or the Doctrine of the Assertion of Possibilities explains and emphasises

SAPTABHANGI FORMS

With these preliminary remarks we come straight to our subject-matter or to be more definite to the *Saptabhangi* or the Heptagonic forms of our ontological enquiry. We have mentioned before that *Saptabhangi* is the method which supersedes all other methods of cognition in matters of apprehension of the spiritual realities by virtue of its universal and synthetic character of vision. Now we shall try to explain how by the help of this heptagonic vision, *Saptabhangi Naya* we get, as it were, into the real coherence and harmony which permeate through the world

Saptabhangi
Forms

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

revealing themselves through a system of interrelated parts

FORM I

“स्यादस्त्येव सर्वमिति सदंश कल्पना विभजनेन प्रथमोभङ्गः : as for example—स्यात् अस्त्येव घटः ; *i.e.* *May be, partly or in a certain sense the jar exists.*

Although this form is applicable to every

thing or being in affirming its existence still

the *ghata*, the jar, is only here taken into

consideration as a concrete instance for the

illustration of this heptagonal principle This

is no more than affirming the existence of

the jar as such and none can ordinarily deny

the existence of it when clearly perceived

So this affirmation relative to the existence

of the jar as such presupposes an anterior

perception of the object It may be con-

tended, indeed, that we often rely upon the

words of others and do not perceive things

directly. But if we dive deep into the

question, we find that everything, the exis-

tence of which we either affirm or deny, is in

relation to some particular thought or percep-

tion having a finitude of expression—a fact

so emphasised by the ontological argument

The First
Form—Some
how the thing
exists

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD

Thus we find that we can affirm the existence of the jar only when we have previously perceived it and the formation of the percept presupposes, as a careful psychological analysis reveals, comprehension of the thing in respect of the four particularising elements viz,—substance *dravya* (द्रव्य), duration *kāla* (काल), locality *kṣhetra* (क्षेत्र) and attributes *bhāva* (भाव). There is no percept which does not involve, as we have elsewhere seen before, these elements, and unless a percept is formed we cannot be conscious of the thing at all. So the understanding of every object involves, comprehension of the object in these four aspects. We may go so far as to say that these four elements or aspects so interrelated as in this case of the *jar* go together to make up the identity of the jar as such. Take away or change one of these elements and the jar loses its identity. From these facts we may safely state that the identity of the jar is kept up and reveals itself through these four elements which stand mutually into peculiar relationship to one another.

How the
thing is said
to exist

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

So long these four elements exist in this particular combination, the jar is said to exist there as such

Another way
to arrive at
the truth

We may arrive at the same conclusion in another way. We know that there is a distinction between the noumenal and phenomenal aspects of a thing. Phenomenal aspect is that in which a thing presents itself to us or as it appears to us. Clearly then it follows that we are conscious of an object only as it appears to us. But a deeper reflection reveals to us that what we know of the thing is only knowledge of its powers and properties. What is an orange to us except a peculiar combination of different qualities viz size, shape, colour, taste etc. These peculiar qualities in such particular combination as is found in an orange constitute what we call the knowledge of it. Of course it may be objected that these qualities cannot exist by themselves and so require a ground for their inference, so that these qualities themselves cannot make up the orange itself. But we are far from denying this as we hold the view that all that we know of the thing is merely its

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD. ,

qualities or attributes which exist in such peculiar combination. What the thing or substance is apart from these modes or modifications, we don't know except this that it is a principle which manifests itself in and through these attributes linking them together and constituting what we call the knowledge of the object. Therefore we may well say that so long these qualities are intact and exist in such peculiar and particular combination the object is there

FORM II

सगन्तास्तेष्व सव्वमिति पथुं दास कल्पना विभजनेन
द्वितीयो भङ्गः—*as स्यात् नास्तेष्व घट . i e Maybe,*
partly or in a *certain sense* the jar does
not exist.

In the previous form we have taken the jar as a self-subsisting, self-complete reality as if subsisting in and by itself and possessing different attributes which go together in making up the knowledge of the object. We thought of the jar as an individual independent object as it were amidst innumerable objects of the same kind in the neighbourhood. In short, we took it in the light of a self-identical unit. But this is only a

The Second
Form—*Some*
how, the thing
does not
exist

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

partial and dogmatic view of the reality as it overlooks one important truth viz., the world is a system of interrelated parts in which nothing is so self-identical, self-complete as we suppose the jar to be. Every thing which is, exists only in relation to and distinction from something else. The jar exists there, not alone as a self-complete reality but exists in relation to and distinction from what is *not-jar*. In fact, the existence of the jar as a self-complete unity is possible only because it differentiates from what is *not-jar*. If, on the other hand, it loses its distinction and merges in the rest that is *not-jar*, then how can it present its own self-subsisting and identical character. We may, therefore, well state that because it keeps itself in distinction from what is *not-jar*, and yet bears at the same time essential relation to it as the principle of mutual reciprocity postulates that it can lead a life of self-completeness, self-identity. But this self-completeness cannot obviously be absolute in character simply for the reason that it has to depend for its existence upon other things from which it rigidly distinguishes itself and yet stands

Every thing exists in relation to and distinction from something else,

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD.

as well in essential and vital relationship To be more clear and precise, we may say that the true life of a being consists in self-abnegation or in ceasing to be. So if in a sense we emphasise the fact that the jar is a self-complete reality amidst various factors of the world possessing numerous attributes to act and react with, we can also with equal logic and emphasis state that it does *not* exist in the *above sense*, because for its existence, it has to depend upon what is not-jar to which it must oppose itself to preserve its so-called self-subsisting aspect. Thus to sum up, we may say, the jar is a jar only in contradistinction with what is not-jar, expressing a vital relationship between the positive and negative character of it co-existing simultaneously in the same stroke of cognition of the thing in question and making way thereby for the third form which is as follows.

FORM III

स्यादस्तोव स्यान्नास्तोवेति क्रमेण सदंशासदं कल्पना
विभजनेन तृतीयो भङ्गः as स्यात् अस्ति नास्तोव घटः—
May be, partly or in a certain sense

The Third
Form—Some
how the thing
exists and
does not exist
as well

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

the jar exist as well as in a sense it does not exist.

Another way
of arriving
at the same
truth.

We may explain this from two different stand points. We will arrive at the same conclusion if we proceed from the world showing it to be a system in which everything is determined by everything else in such a way that nothing is self-identical and self-complete in the sense in which the untrained mind takes it to be. Everything being determined by other things in this system of reals, the doctrine of pluralism propagating the view of self-sufficiency of objects falls to the ground as we have discussed at length in the preliminary remarks as well as in the Form II

Besides, we may explain the above otherwise which will, we believe, throw sufficient light on the close relationship which exists between the self and the not-self or between mind and matter. We must of course bear in mind on this occasion that though these forms apparently deal with concrete instances such as the jar, still they are no less applicable to every thing and being which this universe contains. So

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD.

it would be convenient for us if, instead of dealing with concrete instances, we proceed and manipulate the subject in its generic aspect. In fact we will try to show that instead of 'saying the jar *is* and *is not*,' we may say more generally that in a sense matter exists and does not exist at the same time. Of course it is necessary first of all to clear up our position and to defend our cause and vindicate our themes by defining the relationship as graphically as possible which exists between self and not-self or between mind and matter

But before stating the exact relation between them let us try to depict as clearly as possible the view cherished by the common people regarding it

To the untrained intellect, things are before us,—rather matter and material objects exist apart in themselves just as we perceive them—as a world of realities independent of any mind to perceive them, on the other hand we, who perceive the world are here in our complete and independent existence. In short, matter is matter and mind is mind and there exists neither any

The view of
the common
people

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

similarity nor anything commensurate between them

Of the other
Schools of
Thought

Many attempts have been made to define the exact relationship. Some have uncritically asserted the hard and fast opposition between them giving rise to absolute dualism like the *Sāṃkhya* materialist, others have again tried to solve the problem at a stroke as it were by explaining away one or the other term giving rise to materialism of the *Chārvāka* School or Subjective idealism of the *Buddhist* School. As materialism ultimately fails to evolve this world and all thought out of matter or material forces, so subjective idealism fails in showing that the whole objective world is but a phantasm of the heated brain. We won't speak of the rigid dualistic theory as it obviously fails to explain knowledge owing to its own inherent inconsistency of thought as revealed in its presupposition that the constituent elements of knowledge stand in hard opposition and cannot be reconciled. Now if we try to account for this failure in solving the problem of mind and matter, we will find no doubt that its main cause lies in

THE DOCTRINE OF SYADVAD

the false presupposition that nature and mind, the world without and the world within, constitute two fixed independent realities, each by itself complete in its own self-included being

The real solution however of the problem in question lies not in the assertion of self-individuality and self-sufficiency of objects constituting the external world, but in the surrender of this false identity and substantiality for that principle of organic unity which we have discussed at length and explained before in the preliminary remarks. Beginning with the rigid isolated existences separated by the impassable gulf of self-identity, no theory or doctrine can ever force them into a rational coherence or consistency. But when we begin to see in nature without and mind within not two independent things, one existing in isolation from the other, but two members of one organic whole having indeed each a being of its own, but a being which implies and finds itself in the living relation to the other, then and then only can we bring such two factors into a rational coherence Nature in

In what lies
the real solution ?

CHAPTER IX.

SHANKAR AND SYADVAD.

Vyasa, and Shankar against the Doctrine of Syadvad.—Impossibility of the co-existence of the contradictory attributes in one—Shankara's summary of the Syadvad and its interpretation—Its critical examination by Shankar—Inconsistencies and fallacies in Syadvad.

The unique position of the *Saptabhangi* in the arena of philosophical speculation

The above, in short, is the principle and character of the *Saptabhangi Naya*, the grand heptangular stronghold of the Jain philosophers. It is from these angles that the Jain philosophers see into the realities of all thought and being. It is from within this heptagonal fortress that they throw off their gauntlets as a challenge to their antagonists to outwit them. Being guarded by the seven trenches of this their logical synthesis, they measure the strength of their adversaries and test the truth and validity of their knowledge and doctrines. Such being the high and prominent position ascribed to the *Saptabhangi* in the arena of philosophical speculation in quest of truth, many a scholar and philosopher, ancient or modern, have invariably been

SHANKAR AND SYADVAD.

found to cannonade on this heptagonal fortification which has been from time immemorial shielding the whole structure of the Jain philosophy against any attack. Many have brought in their heavy artilleries to damage one or the other angles of this fortification and force an entrance into the same and many have been baffled in their attempts and thus become the buttend of all ridicule before the whispering galleries of the Jain philosophers and Omniscient beings. At least such has been the case with the venerable Krishna Dwaipāyan Vyāsa, the compiler of the *Vedas*, maker of the *Brahma Sutras* and the author of the Great Epic, *Mahābhārata*, who flourished towards the end of third age.

It is the target of attack by the enemies of the Syadvad

Vyasa and the Syadvad

To come straight however to the point, the venerable old Vyāsa fired his first artillery "नेकस्मिन्सम्भवात्" as the thirty-third canon in the Second Section of the Second Chapter of his *Brahma Sutras*. By this he wants us to understand that on account of the impossibility of co-existence of contradictory attributes as abiding in the same substance,

Brahma Sutra and Shankar

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

the doctrine of the Jainas is not to be recognised. In his famous scholium on the *Brahma Sūtras*, Achārya Shankara, the ablest exponent of the *Advaita Vedānta* philosophy while commenting on the canon referred to, writes —

The Rudimentary Principles of Jain philosophy as summarised by Shankar

The Jainas admit of seven predicaments such as (1) *Jīva* (2) *Ajīva* (3) *Asrava*, (4) *Samvara*, (5) *Nirjarā*, (6) *Bandha*, and (7) *Moksha*. These seven they admit and nothing beyond these.

Summarily speaking, the *Jīva* and the *Ajīva*, are the two primary predicaments. The others are included in either of these two. Besides they admit of five composites or compounds from the above two categories and are designated as "*Astikāyas*" or composites such as *Jīvāstikāya*, *Pudgalāstikāya*, *Dharmāstikāya*, *Adharmāstikāya*, and *Akāśhāstikāya*. They fancy, again, an infinite number of variations of these '*astikāyas*' or composite and to all and each of these, they apply their so-called synthetic logic known by the name of *Saptabhāṅgi naya* in the following manner —

SHANKAR AND SYADVAD.

(1) In a sense it *is*. (2) In a sense it *is not*. (3) In a sense *it is* and *it is not*. (4) In a sense it *is not predicable*. (5) In a sense *it is* and *is not predicable*. (6) In a sense *it is not* and *is not predicable*. (7) In a sense *it is* and *is not* and *is not predicable*.

Now this *Saptabhangi* form of reasoning is also directed to the determination of such notions as, unity, plurality, eternity, identity, difference and the like. In other words following up the principle of *Saptabhangi naya*, they hold that existence itself is a contradiction, for instance unity is not only *unity* but also a *plurality* as well. A thing is not only *eternal* but *otherwise* as well and so on.

Having thus summarised the fundamentals of the Jain philosophy, and taking his stand on the above *Vyasa Sutra* Shankar Swami remarks

Examination and criticism view point of the Law of Contradiction

1. It would be contrary to reason to accept the Jain doctrine. Why?—Because of the impossibility of co-existence of contradictory attributes in one. Just as a thing cannot be hot and cold simultaneously, so

Being and Non-being can not at the same time belong to one thing

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

being (अस्तित्व) and *non-being* (नास्तित्व) cannot, at the same time, belong to one thing.

Knowledge would be of as undeterminate character as doubt or diffidence is

II. And to speak of the *seven* predicaments which have been determined to be as *so many* and such if they really be *so many* in number and *such-and-such* in character, then they must as the Jains teach exist in either of their modes of *suchness* (तथारूप) and *unsuchness* (अतथारूप) at one and the same point of time. If it were so, it would follow that because of the indefiniteness as desiderated to be expressed in their *being* as such and *not-being* as such at the same moment of time, the knowledge of the same would be also equally indeterminate like diffidence or doubt for which reason it cannot be held as a true criterion of right knowledge

The Knowledge, the knowabilities and, the knowingsubject—all being indeterminate in themselves, the Syadvada cannot be a source of valid knowledge

III If the Jains contend here that the thing itself being instinct with multiplicity and versatility of modes or aspects (अनेकान्त स्वभाव) is really of determinate character *as such* and the knowledge of the thing, therefore, both as being and non-being, cannot be non determinate and consequently *non-authoritative* like that of doubtful knowledge, Shankar

SHANKAR AND SYADVAD.

rejoins, it is not right on your part to say all that ; for, every thing being admitted to be instinct with a multiplicity of nature, without having any check or rest any where, the determination of the nature of very determination itself through the means of '*partly-is*' and '*partly-is-not*' being not excluded it would simply result in non-determinate knowledge. And for the very reason as well the means of knowledge (प्रमाण), objects of knowledge (प्रमेय), the knowing subject (प्रमाता), and the act of knowledge (प्रमिति), all would remain themselves non-determinate. And where the determinator and the result of determination, both are thus non-determinate, how can then the teacher, who is thus of indefinite opinion himself, can give definite instructions on a doctrine the matter and the principles of the epistemology of which are themselves indeterminate in their very nature and character? Again, what would prevail upon the followers of such a doctrine to actualise in life and conduct the moral principles inculcated in the same? For, if the effects of their actualisation in life and conduct be of themselves instinct

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

with uncertainties, nobody would have any inclination to work-for the same. Therefore the doctrine, pungently retorts Shankar, of those undecisive masters who have nothing definite to teach or preach, is not to be accepted.

Further demonstration of the unsettling character of reasoning—Fewer more than five

IV. Then, again, applying this unsettling principle of reasoning to that portion of their doctrine which teaches that the composites (अवस्थिकाय) are five in number, one has got to understand that on the one hand they are five and on the other, they are not five i. e. from the latter point of view, they are fewer or more than five which is a ridiculous position to uphold.

Involving an abandonment of Original Position.

V. Also you cannot logically maintain that the predicaments are *undescribable*. If they were so, they could on no account be described, but as a matter of fact they are described and as such you abandon your original position.

Ridiculous self-contradictions

VI. If you say, 'on the contrary, that predicaments being so described are ascertained to be *such* and *such*, and at the same time they are *not* such and such,

SHANKAR AND SYADVAD.

and that the consequence of their being thus ascertained is Right Vision (सम्यक् दृष्टि) and *is not* Right Vision as well at one and the same point of time, and that Un-Right Vision *is* and *is not* opposite of Right Vision at one and the same time, you will be really raving like a mad cap who is certainly not to be relied upon

VII If you argue further that Heaven and Freedom, are both existent and inexistent at once or they are both eternal and non-eternal at one and the same moment, none will be inclined to work for the same the very nature of whose existence is so uncertain and indeterminate in nature and character And,

Heaven and Freedom—both are uncertain

VIII Finally, it having been found to follow from your doctrine that *Jīva*, *Ajīva* etc whose nature you claim to have ascertained and which have been in existent from all eternity at once relapse into the condition of absolute indetermination, and that the being excluding the non-being and *vice-versâ*, the non-being excluding the being, and that further more it being impossible to decide whether of one thing there is to be

On account of the impossibility of any definite ascertainment, the doctrine of the Syadvada must needs be rejected

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

predicated oneness or plurality, permanency or non-permanency, separateness or non-separateness and the like, your doctrine of *Syādvāda* must needs be rejected.

CHAPTER X.

EXAMINATION OF SHANKAR

Examination of Shankar's animadversion and his position—Further discussion of the Principle of Syadvad and the Law of contradiction—Thought is not simply a distinction—It is a relation as well—Reply to Shankar point by point

Such is the criticism which Shankar makes taking his stand on the *Sutra* "Not; because of the impossibility in one"—("नैकस्मिन्सम्भवात्") of the *Vedānta Sūtras* by *Vyāsa*. Or in other words, 'it is impossible', remarks Shankar, 'that contradictory attributes such as *being* and *non-being* should at the same time belong to one and the same thing' This is the long and short of his whole argument as urged for the rejection of the doctrine of *Syadvad* which forms the metaphysical basis of our religion. And it is imperative, therefore, that we should examine the above animadversion as briefly as possible and see how far his reasonings reveal his real insight into the heart of things as well as how far is Shankar correct in his understanding and

The ground of Shankar's objections—

Contradictory attributes cannot co-exist in the same thing

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

estimation of the principle of our dialectic movement as applied to thought and being—a form of reasoning which originally and exclusively belongs to the Jain philosophy.

To begin with, therefore, so far the fundamentals of our doctrine as summarised by Shankar are concerned, we must at once admit that he is not guilty of misrepresentation.

Thus Shankar lays stress on the Law of contradiction.

But when he starts his criticism with the startling remark that, *being* and *non-being* cannot co-exist in one and the same thing, we beg to differ from him. Shankar puts all through his arguments, a great stress on the Law of Contradiction. And as it is a law of thought which cannot be transgressed without committing ourselves to contradictions and inconsistencies as the Formal Logic teaches, any theory which does the same, he says, cannot be accepted as having any worth at all.

When the Formal Logic laid down the Law of Contradiction as the highest law of thought, what it evidently meant is simply this that distinction is necessary for thought. Unless things are definitely

EXAMINATION OF SHANKAR.

what they are and are kept to their definition, thought and knowledge become impossible. For instance, if *A* and *not-A* be the same, it is hardly possible to find any meaning even in the simplest statements, for the nature of the thing becomes absolutely indefinite and so indeterminate. Hence Formal Logic teaches that thought is distinction and is not possible without it.

But is thought simply a distinction and nothing else? Is the distinction absolute and ultimate? We, the Jains, would undoubtedly say that it can never be absolute distinction. If thought is distinction, yet it implies at the same time relation. Everything implies something other than it, 'This' implies That; 'Now' implies 'Then' 'Here' implies 'There' and the like. Each thing, each aspect of reality, is possible only in relation to and distinct from some other aspect of reality. If so, *A* is only possible in relation to and distinct from *not-A*. Thus, by marking one thing off from another, it, at the same time, connects one thing with another. A thing which has nothing to distinguish from, is as impossible as equally unthinkable is the thing which is

Is thought a
determination
simply?

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

The Number
five—of the
composites.

IV. With reference to objection regarding the *composites* (अस्तिकाय) being numerically five, we point out that the number five as such is really five, but as the *other* than five itself, *i.e.* relative to such numbers as four, six or seven, the five is *not*. Let us take otherwise—the number Five only. Here we have undoubtedly a definite concept. Now the definite concept of five by the fact that it is definite excludes other thoughts and specially the opposite thought. We, the Jains, admit this, but proceed still further and hold that every definite thought or concept by the fact that it is definite, has a necessary relation to its negative and so cannot be separated from it without losing its own meaning. Five is five as distinguished from eight, nine, ten, or *not*-seven and so bears essential relation with them. Hence we hold that the composites which are numerically five can thus be neither more nor fewer than five.

Indescrib-
ability

V. Then again the seven predicaments, they are certainly never absolutely indescribable. They are indescribable in the sense

EXAMINATION OF SHANKAR

that they cannot be described all at once and simultaneously (अवस्तव्य युगपदपेक्षायां), but surely they are describable gradually and successively (वस्तव्यक्रमपेक्षायां).

VI To repudiate the sixth, we submit that the knowledge accruing from the ascertainment of the predicaments both as *such* and *not such*, according to the four-fold constituent elements of themselves and as belonging to the *Other* than themselves and our determination as well of their existence and non-existence in like manner being Right Knowledge (सम्यक् दृश्यं), and Un-right Knowledge (असम्यक्-दृश्यं) being opposite to Right Knowledge, the Right Knowledge exists only as *such i.e.* in so far its own matter and form are concerned but *does not exist* in the matter and form of the Wrong Knowledge and *vice-versa*, the Wrong Knowledge *exists* in its own matter and form and *does not exist* as the matter and form of the Right Knowledge. And likewise the Heaven and Freedom, they are in their own matter and form; but they are not as the matter and form of what are known as Hell and Bondage

Final Repu-
diator.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Also such is the case in respect of eternity which is real and actual only in its own matter and form as distinguished from its opposite, the matter and form of what it is not. Or in other words, the predicaments are eternal in relation to noumenon only but non-eternal in relation to *paryāya*—phenomenon.

And this is how to a thing, being is ascribed in relation to Its own matter and form as well as non-being in relation to the matter and form of the Other.

CHAPTER XI.

THE DOCTRINE OF UNITY IN DIFFERENCE.

The dialectic reasoning leads to the Theory of Bhedabhed i.e. of Unity in difference—Distinction presupposes Unity—The world system is an expression of thought—The Jain conception of the Absolute distinguished from the Absolute beyond the relative of the Vedantins

Now what has been discussed in the preceeding pages on *Syadvadd*, it is quite apparent that the law of contradiction is the negative aspect of the law of identity. We have seen that with the Jains, everything implies 'something' opposed to it. 'This' implies 'that', 'here' implies 'there', 'now' implies 'then' The trend of the argument is that everything is real only in relation to and distinction from every other thing This being so, the law of contradiction is not virtually denied absolutely. What the Jain philosophers want us to understand is this that absolute distinction which the ordinary interpretation presupposes is not a correct view of things. Rather it is to be borne in mind that distinction presupposes a unity of which, the *Jiva* and *Ajiva* and the like that

The law of contradiction is the negative aspect of the law of identity.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

go in pairs of opposites are but two expressions.

The world-system is the expression of thought.

The world system is not alien to thought. Thought is not accidental to world. Thought is embodied in the world-system. Popular view is that thought is connected with man's brain and so accident to the world system. In opposition to this the Jains teach that the world system is the expression of thought. The world system is that in which thought goes out of itself. Thought is thus made the essence of the world. It is the Vedānta that somewhere teaches that Nature is the working out of the will and is real in so far the intelligence of man is concerned. But we differ from the Vedāntins and hold that thought which is the essence of the world is objective, is something universal or absolute in which the particular thoughts of particular men partake.

An objection

But then there is a *prima facie* objection we have to meet. Some says it is impossible to take thought as the essence of the world. For it would tantamount to ignoring the feeling or willing which is as important as thought. True, the objection

UNITY IN DIFFERENCE.

would have been valid had we conceived thought as excluding will and feeling. Thought is not one thing, and feeling another thing. Will is not apart from thought. How are we to conceive of will if it is exclusive of thought?

Again thought implies will. Dynamic thought is Will. When I identify myself with the end, I am said to will. But I cannot do so unless I am conscious of the end. So activity is impossible without thought. Thus our thought is not exclusive of will. With us thought is concrete, thought inclusive of feeling and will and is the constitutive principle of the universe.

Dynamic
thought is
will

Now therefore the Absolute is the ultimate unity of thought which expresses itself as *Jiva* on the one side and correlative of the subject as *Ajiva* on the other side. This unity is all inclusive unity which embraces everything that is real.

Absolute is
the ultimate
unity.

But this conception of the Absolute has to be distinguished from the absolute beyond the relative of the Vedāntins. These philosophers hold that our intellect deals with the relative only. The world of experience

Jaim conception
of the
absolute as
distinguished
from the
Vedāntic.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

is the world relative only. So the absolute lies beyond the world of the relative—beyond the world of phenomena. Shankar thinks in this way. We hold, however, that absolute is not beyond the phenomena rather all phenomena are but particular aspects or phases of this all inclusive unity which is Absolute—The whole and the aspects of The whole. The whole of reality conceived as a single ultimate unity is noumenon and phenomena are but its partial phases.

Noumenon
and Phenomena

But then the question is, What is a Noumenon? Is it an aggregate of phenomena? The Noumenon, we hold, is superior to phenomena; because it is all inclusive whole. Phenomena are but fragmentary aspects of Noumenon. This all inclusive whole (noumenon) cannot stand apart from those which it includes (phenomena). If it is an all inclusive unity and phenomena are fragmentary aspects of this unity, then is it an aggregate of phenomena? No. The Self is not apart from its various determinations or states of the Self. It is not something above and over the psychoses. 'What is the Self?' It is not a mere sum of its determinations as the

UNITY IN DIFFERENCE.

Vijnānvādī Buddhists hold ; nor is it different from the sum of its determinations as the Vedāntins try to explain. It is a unity of all its determinations. It is an ideal unity which realises itself through these particular determinations

So the partial phases of the Absolute are phenomena and these are related to the Absolute as the members of a living body are related to the body itself. The particular things of experience are aspects of the Absolute which is the all inclusive unity expressing itself through particular determinations. It is the subject, but not as correlative of the object, rather a unity implied in the correlation

Phenomena are but partial phases of the absolute

The Absolute is thus the ultimate Unity. But here again the familiar conception gives us trouble. If the Absolute is One, then the Absolute is not Many. If it is unity then it is not a Plurality. The Vedāntins of the type of Shankar hold that the absolute is the Unity. It is not a plurality therefore. But Plurality is a stupendous fact which cannot be denied. So plurality, according to those Vedāntins, is but an illusion—*Māyā* (माया) and not a reality

Suppose... difficulty in the acceptance of the two conceptions of the absolute

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

From the stand-point of the relation between the One and the Many

Plurality is a fact, although it may be another kind of experience. Anyhow to give it the name of Illusion (माया) is not to explain it. The question then turns to this. How thus Illusion comes to be reconciled with the Absolute? How is this solution possible, if the Absolute is the One without a second to stand by it (एकमेवाद्वितीयं). And the Ultimate Reality without anything to aid or stand by it being One, what is the source of this Illusion of Plurality. Thus the whole question resolves itself into the Relation of Unity and Plurality.

difficulties in the establishment of the Relation

If the ultimate reality be many, how can you explain a single self-existent coherent system? If there is a relationship between A. B. C. D., and so on then these are elements of a single whole and so related to each other

Set out in a Definite alternative.

If you begin with the Absolute separation between Unity and Plurality, then you must either deny Plurality like Shankar or deny Unity like Kanād, the propounder of the Specific (Vaisheshika) school of thought. But these difficulties crop up only on the assumption that the ultimate Reality is either One or

UNITY IN DIFFERENCE.

Many And we, the Jains, therefore, reject this disjunction altogether. From our point of view, all differences are differences of a Unity which is expressed in the differences One is One not apart from the Many, but One is in the Many. So Plurality must be taken as the self-expression of this unity—the Absolute. To conceive of the Absolute as the One is not to conceive the facts of experience as Illusion—*Māya* (माया) Or, the Many is real in as much as the Many is galvanised into life by the One, because Many is the self-expression of the One The absolute is a Unity but the Unity which is immanent in the Many The Many, in Jainism, do not vanish in the luminosity of the One like clouds before the rising sun as taught in the philosophy of Vyāsa and Vasistha rather the Many is vitalised by the One and is as real as every other facts of experience In Jainism, One is shown to come out of its own privacy as it were and appears Itself as the Many The Many vanishes in the One (Shankar) but the One presents itself to us as the Many (the Jains) The One reveals itself in the Many and the Many is the self-

But this disjunction in the form of definite alternatives is rejected by the Jains

All differences being differences of a unity expressed in the differences—the two aspects not excluding one another

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

expression of the ultimate Unity. In our philosophy, the ordinary disjunction of 'either-or' falls to the ground. The two aspects of one truth do not exclude each other. The concrete whole is the abstract which is One in the Many and Many as grounded in the One

The Absolute is the Universal revealing itself in the Particulars

The Absolute is the Universal This Universal is not the abstract Universal of the formal logic but the concrete Universal The absolute expresses itself in A, but not limited to A A is the particularisation of the Universal Hence the Universal goes beyond A, to B, to C and so A, B, C, D are immanently and vitally connected with one another The Universal comes out of Itself and particularises Itself in the particular objects of the world system and which, therefore, is vitally and essentially and immanently connected with one another constituting the world system The Universal of the Jains does not fight shy of the Particulars of the world—the categories of thought and being—like the Universal of the formal logic ; but reveals itself in the particulars of the world

UNITY IN DIFFERENCE

Such being the Jain conception of the Absolute, the whole universe of things, we see, must needs be ordered in perfect agreement with our cognitions. We are conscious of things as different and non-different at the same time. They are non-different in their causal or universal aspect (कारणात्मना-जात्यात्मना चाभिन्नम्) and different in so far as viewed as effects or particulars (कार्यात्मना-व्यक्तात्मना च भिन्नम्).

Everything is different and non-different at the same time

But some hold that cognition of things as such is impossible and remark that like light and darkness, the identity and difference can not co-exist in the same thing. But we reply, the contradictoriness that exists between light and darkness is of two kinds. One is of the nature of impossibility of co-existing in one and the other of the nature of co-existing but in different things. But such contradictoriness is not perceived in the correct interpretation of the true character of the relation in which the cause and the effect or the universal and the particular mutually stand together. On the contrary we really perceive that the one and the same thing is possessed of

Reply to the critiques of the above vend

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

dual aspect (प्रत्युत एकमेव वस्तु द्विरूपं प्रतीयते).

Things are naturally of dual character

Thus when we say 'This jar is clay'; Ram is a human being. Here in the instance of 'clay' and 'the Jar', clay is the cause and the jar is the effect thereof. The jar is but a particular state of being of the cause which is clay. Were co-existence of the cause and effect contradictory it would never have been possible for clay to exist as in the form of the '*Jar*' in the second instance 'Ram is a human being' humanity is the universal (जाति) and Ram is but a particular (व्यक्ति) expression of humanity. Were Universal and Particular contradictory, one excluding the other, then Ram could never have been a human being. Nor even any one of many experience has ever perceived anything having an absolutely uniform character absolutely devoid of all distinction and difference whatever in the same. Nor can it be upheld that just as fire consumes straw and other combustibles so non difference (अभेद) sets at nought the difference on the ground that Identity being unity, it is a nullity of all Difference. And therefore the admission of identity and difference as co-

Identity is not always destructive of differences

UNITY IN DIFFERENCE.

existing in the same involves a contradiction. But this, we contend, is not borne out by facts of experience; nor is there any absolute law to the effect that identity should always and everywhere be destructive of difference. On the contrary, we have things with two-fold aspects, just because it is thus that they are perceived. For, the same thing which exists as clay or gold, or man &c at the same time exists as jar, diadem or Ram. And no man is able to distinguish in an object,—e g Jar or Ram,—placed before him, which part is clay and which the Jar or which part is the universal character of Ram and which the particular. Rather our thought finds its true expression in the following judgments, 'this Jar is clay' and 'Ram is a man'. Nor can it be maintained that a distinction is made between the cause and the universal as objects of the idea of persistence and the effect and the particular as objects of the notion of discontinuance—difference, in as much as, truly speaking, we have no perception of these two factors, in separation. However close we may look into a thing, we won't be able still

Impossibility of rigidly distinguishing between the Cause and the Effect or the Universal and the Particular

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Our thought
and life move
between
these two

of objects constitute one world, and in opposition to the Object, all experiences of the Subject, all its thoughts and actions are merged in the unity of one Self. All our life, all our conscious thought then moves between these two terms which are distinct from and even opposed to each other. Yet though thus set in antagonism which can never cease, because with its ceasing the whole nature of the both would be subverted, they are also essentially related, for neither of them could be conceived to exist without the other. The consciousness of the *one* is, we might say, inseparably blended with the consciousness of its relation to the *other*. We know the object only as we bring it back to the *unity* of the Self and we know the Self only as we *realise* it in the Object.

And lastly these two ideas within the spheres of which our whole life of thought and activity is contained and from one to the other of which it is continually moving to and fro, point back to a third term which embraces them both and which in turn constitutes

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Evolution
was original-
ly Teleo-
logical

from its embryonic beginning to its final and mature form. This adult form was regarded as the end *aimed* at through the whole process, so that the whole process was the working of an idea—entelechy or soul shaping the plastic material and directing the process of growth. Evolution, in short, implied ideal ends controlling physical means—in a word was '*teleological*'. But now the term 'Evolution', though retained, is retained merely to denote the process by which the mass and energy of the Universe have passed from some assumed primeval state to that of distribution which we have at present. It is also implied that the process will last till some ultimate distribution is reached whereupon a counterprocess of dissolution will begin and from which new Evolution will proceed

Spencerian
definition of
Evolution,

"An entire history of anything" Mr. Spencer tells us "must include its appearance out of the imperceptible and its disappearance into the imperceptible. Be it a single object or the whole Universe, any account which begins with it in a concrete form is incomplete." In these and such like instances Mr Spencer sees the formula of evolution

THEORY OF EVOLUTION.

and dissolution foreshadowed. He again goes on saying that "the change from a diffused imperceptible form to a perceptible concentrated state is an integration of matter and concomittant dissipation of motion and the change from a concentrated perceptible state is an absorption of motion and concomittant disintegration of matter."

Now there is one obvious and yet serious objection to this theory. It proposes to treat the Universe or in fact requires us to treat the Universe as a single object. Every single object is first evolved and then dissolved and so the Universe. The Universe also, he thinks, emerges from the imperceptible and into the imperceptible it disappears again. Surely Mr Spencer commits here the fallacy of composition. What is predicable of the parts, he thinks, can be predicated of the whole collectively. Again, we may ask on what grounds is it assumed that the Universe was ever evolved at all? A given man, a given nation, a given continent have their general finite histories of birth and death, upheaval and subsidence. But growth and decay, rise

Examination of the Theory

The universe can not be treated as a single *Object*

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

(a) Universally Co-existent ; (b) Universally Inter-dependent, (c) Universally Inter-mutative and lastly (d) Universally Inter-antagonistic. Thus,—

(a) They are Universally Co-existent, because the existence of one of the *gunas* requires the existence of the other two as necessary accompaniments.

(b) But from the fact that they are Universally co-existent and concomittant as they are equally fundamental, it follows that they stand to one another in relation of *mutual inter-dependence* so that none of them can have any functional activity of its own without the co-operation of the other two. Again,

(c) The *gunas* being thus mutually dependent upon one another, they are also *inter-mutative* so that just as heat is *convertible into* electricity so anyone of the *gunas* may become *converted into* one or the other of the remaining two *gunas*. And lastly,

(d) These *gunas* stand to one another in relation as well of Universal *inter-antagonism*. Though these are always present as

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

grees of excellences such as omniscience, greatness, smallness etc., proves the existence of a Being possessing the *non plus ultra* of excellence. This Being, Ishvāra, was, with the *yogins*, originally, no other than One among many *Purushas*, only with this difference that Ishvara had never been implicated in metempsychosis and was supreme in every sense.

Patanjali and Kapil. Whether this theism of Patanjali's Philosophy is consistent with its Sāṅkhya basis is often disputed. The simplest solution seems to be that Kapila was never directly hostile to theism, but was rather indifferent in his attitude towards the question and that this made it possible for Patanjali to foist his theistic *yoga* upon the Sāṅkhya philosophy.

Soleity is the *summum bonum* of *yoga*. In the *Yoga* system, however, no such importance has been accorded to God as could very well be expected, and as we find in such European systems, otherwise analogous with the *yoga*, as those of Martineau, Lotze and other Personal Idealists. Devotion to God, in Patanjali's system, is merely one of *Kaivalya* or Soleity

THE NYAYA PHILOSOPHY.

which is the highest object of the *Yoga* system.

THE NYAYA PHILOSOPHY.

Nyāya has always been translated by 'logic', and there are important considerations which partially justify such an interpretation of the system. For, here, in the *Nyāya* system, a greater amount of space has been allowed to logical questions than in any of the other systems of Indian Philosophy, and, the theory of inference (*anumān*) is, undoubtedly the predominant feature of the system

'Nyāya' is
not merely
logic

Nevertheless, we must not imagine that *Nyāya Sūtras* are mere treatises on Formal Logic. Logic is not the sole nor even the chief aim of Gotama's Philosophy. Its chief end like that of all other Indian systems, is the attainment of liberation or as the *Nyaya* calls it, *Niḥśreyasa*, the *non plus ultra* of blessedness. This liberation which the *Nyaya* Philosophy promises to all, is not a state of pure unmixed pleasure, as the Vedāntin affirms, but a state of pleasure which supposes pain as its pre-condition. In fact, the doctrine of a pure continuous happiness as the *summum bonum* of life, is, according

The real en
of 'Nyāya'

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

to the Naiyāyika, a chimera : it is a psychological fallacy to assert that any such state exists, for, pleasure is always accompanied by pain and without pain there could be no pleasure.

Liberation
of 'Nyāya'
—how it is
attained

Liberation, thus according to the *Nyāya*, is a state of negative pleasure and is produced by deliverance from pain. The next question that naturally presents itself to the Naiyāyika, is 'how this deliverance is to be secured ?' Liberation, says the Naiyāyika, arises from the knowledge of the truth, the knowledge of the cause of pain and of the means of its removal. Liberation, however, must not be supposed to arise immediately after the knowledge of the truth has been attained, for, the causes of pain form a series which can only be annihilated in succession, and succession is a process in time. The series of the successive causes of pain is : (1) false notions (*mithyagnanam*), giving rise to (2) faults (*doshani*) which lead to (3) activity (*karma*) which again is the cause of birth (*janma*) and birth is the cause of pain (*dukkha*). Hence in order to shake off pain we have to strike at the very root

THE NYAYA PHILOSOPHY.

via, Mithyagnanam, and the annihilation of *Mithyagnanam* will be followed by the annihilation of the entire series of causes.

The Naiyāyika proceeds to prove the existence of God by an argument which is much like what is known as the cosmological argument in the European Philosophy. Like the latter, the Naiyāyika's proof also reasons from the world as effect to God as its First Cause 'चित्तादिकं सकलकं कार्यत्वात्, The four *mahābhūtas* require, as effects, a cause

Theistic argument of the Nyaya

This, however, looks, at first sight, like a *petitio principii*, for, to admit that a thing is an effect, is to say that it has a cause. The real difficulty lies, it will be said, not in showing that an effect must have a cause but in proving that a thing is an effect, that it has a हेतु or a mark possessed by the *Paksha* by means of which, its जन्मत्व (effect-hood) can be inferred. The Naiyāyika finds such a mark in सावयवत्व or the fact of possessing parts. Thus सावयवत्व (being possessed of parts) leads to जन्मत्व (effect-hood) and जन्मत्व to कृतिजन्मत्व (the fact of being effectuated or caused by an agent).

Effect-hood implies an intelligent agent to effectuate.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

But the Naiyāyika does not stop at the conception of a mere cause which a purely cosmological argument leads to, but shows that कृतिजन्यत्व or कार्यत्व (the fact of being effectuated or produced) implies, not only an agent but an intelligent agent—'बुद्धिमतं कृतिजन्यत्व'.

CHAPTER XV.

CAUSATION AND COMPOUND EVOLUTION

The world is the permutation and combination of atoms—Causes of differences—Science fails to explain—The principles of causation—Criticism of Mills conception of the law of causation—Patient and Agent—The Jain view of causation and compound evolution

Having discussed in a previous chapter how we look upon the Universe as self-existent something having its being from all eternity, and having briefly reviewed as well the other principal systems of thought bearing mainly on cosmology, we are led to enquire into how, according to our philosophy, old things change giving place to newer combinations and forms. We have seen that the Universe taken as one undivided whole must be in-create, eternal, self-existent and ever-permanent. But viewed from the standpoint of its inter-related parts, it is transitory, phenomenal and evanescent. And it goes without saying that the assertion of self-existent is simply an indirect denial of creation

Universe
being a self-
existent
unit.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Denial of
God

involving as it does the idea of an existence without beginning But this tantamounts to a veritable denial of an extra-cosmic personal God who builds the cosmos out of the chaotic matter which, according to the creationists and other deists, lay diffused homogeneously filling up the entire space, at the dissolution of the Universe with the end of the so-called previous cycle or created it out of Himself or His own energy (at a particular point of time) through a kind of dialectic process as taught in the other theistic systems of philosophy such as the Yoga, the Nyāya or the Vedānta.

If no God
whence this
vicissitudes
of Nature?

The question, therefore, is, if God is denied where are we to look for a rational solution for the various mysteries—which underlie the flashes of lightning dazzling our vision, or the thundering cataracts deafening our ears? Is it that the sprouting forth of the small seed bringing into existence a big tree, the bursting of the eggshells giving birth to beautifully moving bipeds and a variety of other awe-inspiring phenomenal changes, astonishingly mysterious in character, which not only infuse in us

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

a feeling of wonder and admiration but morally prevail upon us to posit and believe, as it were, in an Intelligent Designer and Maker behind,—is it that all these and the like changes are but so many results of chances? Wherein lies the necessity and utility of the philosophy then, if it denies God but cannot reasonably account for the amazing occurrences in the world of phenomena?

Indeed and it is worth while to remark that a patient perusal of the preceding pages on the predicaments, their character and their developments will convince anyone in the truth of the summary statement we make here that speaking of the Universe as a whole or in part, it is but permutations and combinations of our four primary rudiments *viz.*, time, space, soul and *Pudgal* matter. These rudiments are resolvable into the minutest of their minute parts which give a limit to fresh divisions by not admitting of any further analysis.

Universe—a permutation and combination of atoms.

Now a study of the nature of these ultimate ingredients reveals to us that these—each and everyone—are surcharg-

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Corrobor-
ation from
science.

ed with innumerable powers having the potentiality of being developed in various ways and of bringing as well into existence such an infinite variety of their permutations and combinations which will account for the amazing phases and phenomena of Nature. Even modern science has had to acknowledge the truth of this. Chemistry demonstrates beyond doubt that all compound substances owe their existence to the permutations and combinations of the atoms of Hydrogen, Oxygen, Nitrogen, and Carbon etc.—Heat, light, electricity, hold Physics, are but different arrangements of molecules-in-motion constituting the same. Biology teaches that all organisms—vegetable or animal—are only composed of cells under a variety of their combinations. This is not all. Science dives deep to fathom the amazing mysteries underlying the differences between things chemical, physical or biological ; and like a master-surgeon she dissects and analyses Nature and attributes the cause of the mutual differences between things to the said principle of permutation and combination

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

of atoms, molecules or cells forming the structure and character of the chemical, physical or biological evolution. Thus even according to the researches of modern science, Universe is nothing more than an ever changing permutations and combinations of the atoms, molecules and cells forming the character and composition of the same.

But what are permutations and combinations which seem to play the part of unitary method as it were in explaining the differences and diversities in and through which the Universe reveals to us its being? Permutation and Combination, we know, are but processes of mathematical calculations to find order in the atomic or molecular arrangement of things having their being in time and space. We all know that in the science of mathematics, the members 1, 2, 3, 4 etc or a, b, c, d, and the like are but so many symbols, each giving us a definite idea of something conditioned as represented by the same. And Permutation is their arrangement in a line reference being had to the order of sequence; as for

What is
Permutation

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION

Combina-
tion.

instance, a-b and b-a are but two permutations of a and b. Similarly Combination is their arrangement in groups without reference to the order of sequence, as for example, 'a-b-c' is a combination involving a, b, and c, and 'b-a-c' is but another combination, both consisting simply of a, b, and c, grouped together. In Combination, it is worthy of note, we take notice only of the presence or absence of a certain thing and pay no regard to its place in order of time and space. There being but a, b, c, d and so on, it finds out only how many combinations could there possibly arise by taking at a time the two, three, or four of the symbols.

Application
of the laws
of Permuta-
tion and
combination

While investigating into the structure and composition of chemical things we substitute,—H, N, O, C as symbolic representation of Hydrogen, Nitrogen, Oxygen and Carbon, the ultimate rudiments or atoms of which are innumerable in number, in the places of a, b, c, d. Now experiment shows that it is due to the innumerable variety of atomic combinations of H, N, O and C, that we have differences between the different

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION

compounds. To take Carbo-hydrates and fats for examples: Analysis shows carbo-hydrates to be a compound of C, H, O; and if we analyse fats, we get the same three chemical elements. Therefore the question is What makes for the differences both in colour, character and configuration between the two compounds, the component parts of a molecule of carbo-hydrate being found to consist of C_6, H_{12}, O_6 , and a molecule of fat to consist of C_{61}, H_{92}, O_6 . Then, again, to take the cases of Strychnine, Quinine, and Gluten. Analysis of these three shows them to be but combinations of C.H.N.O. And it is needless to add that the three compounds are wholly different from one another. Strychnine and quinine are poisonous whereas gluten is nutritious. A molecule of quinine is a combination of C_{20}, H_{24}, N_2, O_8 , whereas a molecule of strychnine is a combination of C_{21}, H_{22}, N_8 and O_2 .

in finding
out the
causes of
differences
in things

Now from a reflective study of the results of the above analysis, one might venture to remark that the mutual differences existing either between carbo-hydrate and fat or between strychnine and quinine, are due,

Scientific
explanation
as to the
causes of
difference

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Pattison
Muir on the
point in ques-
tion

it is apparent, to the numerical differences in the combination of the component atoms constituting the structure of a molecule of each of them. But is the numerical differences in the combination adequate to explain the causes of differences in question? The molecule of Ammonium of Cyanate is composed of two atoms of Nitrogen, one atom of Oxygen, one atom of Carbon, and four atoms of Hydrogen; and the molecule of Urea is composed of the same number of the same atoms. How, then, can the properties of the two molecules be different from one another? "What can that circumstance be", rightly enquires Pattison Muir in answer to the above question, "except the arrangement of the atoms that compose the molecules?"

But the answer of Pattison Muir given in the form of interrogation, will it satisfy the reflecting mind yearning for a rational solution for the differences in question in things we everyday find around us? To say that the difference is due to the difference in the arrangement of atoms forming the composition of the two molecules is to

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

simply state a fact. It is an attempt to explain X by Y both of which are unknown quantities. It does not clear up the mystery that underlies the real question at issue. The question is Whence is the difference? Every other condition being the same, what is it that leads to the difference in the combination of the component parts forming the composition of the two compounds? Modern science is quite out at sea here and her helm of Reason is lost. She can explain how things happen but gets hopelessly comfounded and confused to answer why they do so. And unless this 'Why' is cleared up, we cannot expect to get at the reason that lies behind the differences in the world of phenomena.

Scientific explanation is inadequate

The reason why modern science cannot answer the point in question, lies simply in the fact that she takes only a partial view of things and does not look straight to the two principles of Causation. We have stated that the Universe is a system of interrelated parts and the parts, as such, are conditioned. But things conditioned, it is a truism to say, are but products, *effects* of something

The two principles of Causation.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Causes--Sub-
stantial and
Determining

else which is termed as *cause*. A cause is what brings about an *effect*, the latter being what follows from the cause. Such being the definitions, in general, of the *cause* and the *effect*, many a logician have drawn a line of distinction between the circumstances and the active agents which co-operate to bring about an effect. One has been termed as the *Substantial* cause and the other as *Determining* or *Efficient* cause otherwise known as *Patient* and *Agent* in European logic. The reason why such distinction is drawn consists in this. We see the potter manufactures the jar out of clay by means of *Danda-chakra*,—the mill-stone-and-the-lever. The jar is thus the product or effect of the co-operation of clay, the lever, the mill-stone, and the potter *i.e.* the manufacturer himself. Such being the case, all these beginning with clay must have to be taken as the *cause*, the *effect* of which is the jar—the product or the output of the co-operation, for a *cause* is the aggregate of all such accidents both in the agents and the patients as concur in production of the *effect* propounded. The manufacturer, the mill stone and the like have

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

all co-operated indeed to bring about the jar ; but they have got their peculiar functions of their own. So long the jar is there, clay is there too. The actual existence of the jar cannot come to be as such if you extract out clay from it. But after the production of the jar, if the manufacturer or the mill-stone is separated from the jar, it is not in the least affected. Again the function of the manufacturer is not the same with that of the mill-stone or the lever or clay even. It is clay that is cast into the mould and moulded into the form of the jar, and it is for this reason that clay is named as the *substantial cause* and that by means of which the effect already *existing imperceptibly* in the substantial cause is brought about or developed into a perceptible form is the *efficient or determining* cause. That without which nothing can there be, that which invariably precedes something else which is but an effect, is the true nature of the cause. When we see that the jar cannot come into existence either without the manufacturer or without the mill-stone, and the lever, it follows a *priori* therefore

Nature and functions of the two causes explained.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

that the manufacturer, the wheel, the lever are also but causes which combine in the production of the jar.

Every effect
requires a
Determining
cause.

It is thus clear that every-*product* or *effect* requires also a *Determining* cause (in addition to the *Substantial* one) to bring the same into actual existence. We have stated already that the primary ingredients—each and every one of these—are surcharged with infinite powers of their own having the potentiality of being developed in innumerable ways and these being but materials giving constitution and structure to all earthly existences are worked upon by the *Determining* cause to bring the same into varieties of combinations. And therefore it is due to the intervention of this *Determining* cause that we find the difference in the arrangements of atoms constituting the structure of the two molecules of Ammonium of cyanate and of Urea and it is this that accounts as well for other various differences in things in all the three worlds, chemical, physical and biological. But would not the ascription of Causality to the *substance* which is worked upon involve the difficulty

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

of making the *Patient* to be the *Agent* ?

Indeed there is a school of logic predominant in these days of scientific culture which refuses to 'make any distinction between the *Determining* cause and the *Substantial* cause in the law of causation. Even the most classical of the English logicians, as Mr Mill, has taken exception to this distinction "In most cases of causation," writes Mill, "a distinction is commonly drawn between something which acts and some other thing which is acted upon, between an *agent* and a *patient* Both of these, it would be universally allowed, are conditions of the phenomenon, but it would be thought absurd to call the latter the cause—that title being reserved for the former."

Mill on the
Determining
cause and
Substantial
cause

The distinction, contends Mr. Mill in support, is a verbal one and not real, because of its vanishing on examination for the object which is acted upon and which is considered as the scene in which the effect takes place is commonly included in the phrase by which the effect is spoken of, so that if it were also reckoned as a part of the cause, the seeming incongruity would

Arguments
of Mill

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Illustration
of Mr. Mill's
contention

arise of its being supposed to cause itself. To cite an instance we have the falling of bodies. "What is the cause which makes a stone fall?" observes Mill, "and if the answer had been 'the stone itself' the expression would have been in apparent contradiction to the meaning of the word cause. The stone, therefore, is conceived as the patient and the earth (or according to the common and most unphilosophical practice, an occult quality of the earth) is represented as the agent or cause. But that there is nothing fundamental in the distinction may be seen from this that it is quite possible to conceive the stone as causing its own fall provided the language employed be such as to save the mere verbal incongruity. We might say that the stone moves towards the earth by the properties of the matter composing it, and according to this mode of presenting the phenomenon, the stone itself might without impropriety be called the agent; though to save the established doctrine of the inactivity of matter, men usually prefer here also to ascribe the effect to an occult quality and

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

say that the cause is not the stone itself but the weight or gravitation of the stone."

"Those who have contended for a radical distinction between agents and patients have generally conceived the agent as that which causes some state of, or some change in the state of another object which is called the patient. But a little reflection will show that the license, we assume of speaking of phenomena as *states* of the various objects which take part in them (an artifice of which so much use has been made by some philosophers, Brown, in particular, for the apparent explanation of phenomena) is simply a sort of logical fiction, useful sometimes as one among several modes of expression but which should never be supposed to be the enunciation of a scientific truth. Even those attributes of an object which might seem with greatest propriety to be called states of the object itself, its sensible qualities its colour, hardness, shape and the like are in reality (as no one has painted out more clearly than Brown himself) phenomena of causation in which the substance is distinctly the agent or producing cause, the patient

The distinction is a logical fiction.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Patients are
a l w a y s
agents.

being our own organs and those of other sentient beings. What we call states of objects, are always sequences into which the objects enter generally as antecedents or causes ; and things are never more active than in the production of those phenomena in which they are said to be acted upon. Thus in the example of a stone falling to the earth, according to the theory of gravitation the stone is as much an agent as the earth, which not only attracts but is itself attracted by the stone. In the case of a sensation produced in our organs, the laws of our organism and even those of our minds are as directly operative in determining the effect produced as the laws of the outward object. Though we call prussic acid the agent of a person's death, the whole of the vital and organic properties of the patient are as actively instrumental as the poison in the chain of effects which so rapidly terminates his sentient existence. In the process of education we may call the teacher the agent and the scholar only the material acted upon. Yet in truth all the facts which pre-existed in the scholar's mind exert either co-opera-

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

ting or counteracting agencies in relation to the teacher's efforts. It is not light alone which is the agent in vision but light coupled with the active properties of the eye and brain and with those of the visible object. The distinction between agent and patient is merely verbal *patients are always agents.*"

Taking stands on these and the like arguments, Hume, Whately and Mill and many other scholars of the same attitude of mind under European culture made themselves so bold as to attribute weakness to the exponents of our philosophy in regard to our drawing a sharp line of distinction as between the *Determining* cause and the *Substantial* cause. And as the Jain cosmology is based on the law of causation as stated herein before, it is imperative to enter into an examination, by the way, of Mill's doctrine on this point

Examination
of Mill—Pa-
tient and
'*Upādān*' are
not identical

Let us begin with the remark at the outset, that the *upādān* or substantial cause and patient of the European logicians are not one and the same either in meaning or in their bearing. Nowhere in our works on the subject has it been taught that the

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Pan-entheistic
conception
of the
Vedanta

confronts us in the form—who created or why and when was evolved that moral evil which provokes the punishment of pain and suffering? One might well contend that the Self-same Ultimate Reality who is of the nature of All-knowledge-bliss-absolute being but One Existence without a second to stand by It; all that exists being but He, it having been repeatedly declared that ‘That Thou Art’ and ‘That Am I’ too—all what is said to exist as evil or suffering, it is He that must labour under the same in the creature who is no the other than He Himself. For just as a spider spins its web out of itself and nestles in or creeps on it, so it is He who throws Himself out into the world of names and forms, in sport, as it were, and it is He that crawls on them in the form of a child, it is He that enjoys the pleasures of His own make in the form of a youth and it is He that totters on the road leaning on the stick in the form of the old and worn out. Indeed when thus viewed, the whole problem shifts the ground and there cannot crop up the question as to how God came to create evil and suffering for His creature. But still

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

and regular chemical transformation of the tissues and the preparation of the *effette* products which have to be given out. It is thus clear that the External Nature (वाह्यप्रकृति) stands to supply the needs, demands and requirements of the organism for its proper nourishment and normal growth. If she in any way fail to supply what is demanded of her by the organism, the latter deteriorates and becomes weak to carry on the struggle, to cope with the undesirable forces and elements, or to propagate species and thus goes to the walls in the long run.

3) *Niyati* (नियति) means, Fate or Destiny. According to some school of thought, it means Divine Decree which must come to pass to bear its command over our thoughts and activities. Thus interpreted, it takes away from us all the moral responsibility which lies only in our option of doing a thing, and not in compulsion. But in Jain philosophy, however, the term *Niyati* signifying 'Necessity' is described as the concatenation of causes whence all things must necessarily follow as the four follows from two plus two or as three angles of a triangle

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

and phenomena. To illustrate for a more thorough grasp of the point at issue as to how these *determining* causes and conditions co-operate in bringing about the countless differences and diversities in the processes of the compound evolution let us take the case of a huge tree developing from its own seed.

We have already stated that every thing in the universe is surcharged with infinite powers of developing itself after its own type. So also is the case with the seed. The seed of a particular tree is also instinct with infinite powers of developing itself so much so that the huge form of the tree together with its bark, branches, twigs, leaves, flowers and fruits in the course of time, lie hidden in a potential state of existence in the seed. The protoplasm which ultimately develops into the seed being the substantial cause, it changes and transforms itself into the seed and ultimately into the tree by the help of such causes, and conditions as time, nature and the like—which determine its manner and growth of development. On close examination of the seed we

Illustration of
the principle
of causation
in question.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

The pleasure
to-be or not
to-be

it is not, that is evidently the cause of of the world of distinctions and forms. If it is asked what was the root cause of the organism coming into existence, we must reply, "*Itself*." Who was the creator of the being? '*Itself*', is the ready answer we have to make in response to the question. '*Itself*' is its own object and *itself* alone is its reason for existence. And, therefore, it has been well said that all the true reasons and transcendant motives a man can assign for the way in which he acts can be rendered into the simple formula "*in that was my pleasure*." And likewise is the case with the wherefore of the other things and beings. The highest philosophy brings us no other reply beings and worlds are because it was their pleasure-to-be. To-be or not-to-be is but a matter of option for self-assertion, or otherwise wherein lies deep the primordial root of all responsibility.

Now Time (काल), the External Nature (स्वभाव), Necessity (नियति), Action (कर्म), and Exertion (व्रत) whose natures have been just discussed in brief, speak for the differences and diversities in the world of forms

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

So we see the seed has the potency to develop itself into a tree after its own type, but it has to wait for the proper *time*—the arrival of the season which might be the rainy one. The season is there but the seed must be planted in the soil with such other natural environment as would allow a reasonable circulation of the sap and chemical action of heat and light and would as be well able to supply the requisitions of the seed.

Causes and conditions for the development

Again, granted that the time, the external nature, the necessity—all the three are present, the seed, if not planted by some body, does not fall on earth by the virtue of its own *exertion* and weight, making all the necessary transformations thereby impossible.

Then, again, though the season is there and the seed too has been planted in the desirable soil with favourable environment, yet the seed will not grow into the tree of such and such bulk and configuration for the manifestation of which it has the potency unless there be the concatenation of the causes and conditions which is but

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

The seed is
the seed
under parti-
cular condi-
tions

find that the granular protoplasmic particles—the contents of the outer shell, the cuticle, which holds together the granules in a particular combination is all through uniform both in texture and chemical composition without any difference and differentiation between its parts in the primary stage of its being. If you crush the seed so instinct with the potency of development, it will not bud forth and why not ? There are the component parts of the seed—the granules not an atom of which has been lost in any way. Why would it not then develop into a tree ? The answer is simple enough and we need not travel far to look for it. The seed is the seed under a particular arrangement and disposition of its constituent elements and as such it is the substantial cause having the potency of developing itself into a tree of its own type, if only the determining causes conjoin with one another to help its growth. But the crushing of the seed interferes with the relative disposition and arrangement of its constituent elements and thus has rendered it impossible for the five-fold determining causes to act on the seed.

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

ences of the two-fold nature—*Inner* and *Outer*. (अन्तरबाह्य) The seed is the *inner* nature of the tree where as the *outer* nature comprises the soil, the water, the heat, the light, and the air. The seed has the potency to develop into a tree and it is only the *outer* nature that stands as a help to the seed in the exertion of its latent powers for its proper development into a tree, but this *outer* nature is almost the same to all the different trees. The real difference, therefore, lies in the *inner* natures' of the different trees i. e. in the seeds. And the same old question comes round yet, Whence is this difference? If it is said in reply that the difference is due to the difference in the relative disposition of the particles constituting the two seeds, then the difference is only explained by another difference which tantamounts to explaining 'X' by 'Y' both of which are unknown quantities and therefore the second difference again has yet to be inquired into. Science stops short here She does not know. The mystery, though pushed back, remains un-

Yet whence
is the differ-
entiation?

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

another name for 'Necessity' that operates irresistibly.

of the seed
into a tree of
its parent
type.

The seed fructifies, as is often observed, but yet it may not sprout forth into a tree indetical with the parent one and bearing leaves and flowers and fruits or seeds of the same size, taste, colour, beauty and grandeur of the tree whereof the seed was born. And why? Surely these are the effects of *karma* of the seed in one or the other periods or stages of its existence and it is due to this very *karma* even done in some time past, that the seed has come to be a seed of this and not of another organism.

To enter a bit more into details as to the causality of *karma* in bringing about the phenominal diversities and differences, the existence of various kinds of vegetable organisms all around us, is undeniable. In the organic world, it is but a truism to say that the like produces the like. The mango seed will develop into a mango tree and to nothing else. So with the other kinds of seeds. Now in the processes of metabolism every living organism grows and undergoes through the adjusting and regulating influ-

CAUSATION AND EVOLUTION.

than to take recourse to the Law of *Karma* to explain the causes of differentiations and differences as manifest in their combinations and subsequent variations. The granules of protoplasm were registered with impressions of the acts and deeds they have done in their past lives whereof they have developed a kind of disposition or tendency towards each other under the influences of which they have come to the existing forms of combination making up the different 'Inner Natures' in the different species of trees and other organic beings. Or what else is there to explain the diversities of Nature? They can't be explained as her mere freaks or as fortuitous concourse of what is invariably conditional—a fact which is but a visible contradiction and negation of the chance-hypothesis; nor can they come out of nothing, for, we are unable on the one hand to conceive nothing becoming something or on the other something nothing. It being thus impossible to establish in thought a relation between *something* and *nothing*, we cannot but deduce thereof the indestructibility of matter (*pudgal*) and conti-

The differences are not mere freaks of Nature but are caused and conditioned by *Karma*

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Biology mis-
ses the mark

altered. However may a Lamarck take recourse to the principles of conservation (Heredity) and progression (Adaptation) and touch upon the struggle of each against all, or a Darwin may twist and stretch his so called principle of Natural Selection to show the Origin of Species and the Descent of Man or however may a Spencer write volumes on the interpretations of the Law of the Survival of the Fittest through the processes of which the weakest go to the walls, or to explain the unsurmountable gaps in the gradations of the organic beings—vegetable or animal or however may a Haeckel knock his brains out to find out the missing links in the ever-evolving chain of organic evolutions from *Monera* to Man, the present and the last expression of the organism of the highest type, Biology only misses the mark and beats about the bush when she says that protoplasms are alike and identical but does not assign any reason for their subsequent differentiations and variations. And years afterwards she will have to admit that there is no other alternative course

CHAPTER XVI.

GOD

Jainism makes no room for an extra-mundane God—Laplace and Napoleon—The idea is not singular in India—Yet the Jains are not dependant on any All-mighty Ruler standing in the without—Dr. Bose and the Super-physical Power—Spencer and Spinoza—"Tertium Quid" nature of the Power—The Coalescence these powers in different beings on the attainment of "Nirvan" is the idea of the God-head of the Jains.

In the last chapter on the compound Evolution and the Law of Universal Causation, it has been made clear as to how from the stand-point of phenomenal *Naya* the universe is ever changing and transitory, and how from the stand-point of Noumenal *Naya* according to which the universe is taken as one undivided whole of inter-related reals, it is self-existent and permanent. We have also seen that because it is self-existent and permanent, therefore, it is not an effect of some anterior cause working from behind the universe, and further that the diversities and differences in the world of phenomena and forms owe their existences to the operation of

No necessity of an extra-mundane God

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Indestructibility of *puṇya* and continuity of *karma*.

nuity of motion—*karma*. Other determinant conditions being there, it is the continuity of *karma* that explains why the properties of a molecule of urea and that of cyanate of ammonia are different, though they are composed of the same number of chemical elements and it is also this continuity of *karma* that accounts for the development of the diverse forms of a mollusc, a frog and a mammal though arising from *apparently* identical primitive cells.

GOD.

Emperor Napoleon, the latter remarked, "M. Laplace, they tell me, you have written this large book on the System of Universe, and you have never mentioned its Creator". Whereupon M. Laplace drew himself up and answered bluntly, "Sir I had no need of any such hypothesis." And this piece of dialogue between the two greatest minds of the Eighteenth century, does not strike singular in India, and the reason is that from the time when Greece and Rome, those cradles of western civilization, were still steeped in profound ignorance, nay, from long before the pyramids of Egypt had raised their hoary heads to have a look down upon the valleys of the Nile, such doctrines which do not find any rhyme or reason or necessity to call in the existence of the so-called Deity have been in vogue in India. The followers of the Numerical philosophy of India—The *Sāṃkhya* School of thought—not only do not postulate any such Divine being but make a definite pronouncement to the effect that "God is not in existence, because of the want of all manner of evidence." Nor the *Mīmāṃsaka* atheists

The *Sāṃkhya*, the *Mīmāṃsaka* etc. in God.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

To posit God
is to conceal
ignorance
unaware of
itself

the five-fold determinant causes such as Time, External Nature, and the like. Such being the trend of thought and progressive retiocination, the Jain philosophy leaves no room whatsoever for an iron-willed capricious God in the Jain scheme of the universe. The Jains hold that a correct understanding, according to the teaching of Victors, of the true principles of causality and phenomenology, dispenses with the necessity of any divine intervention in the affairs of the world. They are of opinion that the very attempt to posit an all-ruling extra-mundane God is, to conceal the ignorance of the true principles of causality under a pomp of delusive reasonings—an ignorance unaware of itself.

Laplace and
Napoleon on
God

Such a doctrine may indeed strike curious and atheistic to the adherents of the various European schools of Monotheists and to other doctors of Divinity so as to give them a rude shaking. But there is no help to it. Truth must be told. When Laplace, the world-renowned French scientist went to make a formal presentation of his famous work to the world-conquering

GOD.

who can curve out paths for ourselves here and herein-after both for enjoyment of pleasures and emancipation of our souls by our own will and exertion.

Here-in-before we have fairly discussed what sort of God we do not believe in, we have seen there what it is not. We shall see now what He is to us as taught by the Jain Teachers

According to the Jain philosophy the universe is not a fortuitous concourse of dead, dull matter (*pudgal*) only; for that would mean crude materialism which Jainism does not allow. The Victorians say that the series of changes as presented by the organic and inorganic worlds, show, as has been recently demonstrated by Dr. J. C Bose, that in addition to the dead dull *pudgal*-matter, there is something *superphysical* both in the living and in the so-called non-living. When this something *superphysical* departs from the constitution of the living and the so-called non-living, we say it is dead by which we mean that it does not respond. Experiments have shown that like plants and animals, a piece of metal responds in a like manner,

The Jain
idea of God-
head

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

yield an inch in their astute denial of an omnipotent extra-mudane God. The *Chārvaṇka* materialists openly and avowedly teach and preach that there is not only no God but there is no soul at all for the so-called redemption of which one should toil and moil all the day and night forsaking all pleasures of life and thought.

Are the
Jains athe-
ists?—No

One might well venture to remark here that all these schools being more or less atheistic, are the Jains too atheists of similar type? 'No', is the emphatic answer, we have to offer to the enquirers. The Jains do believe in a God after their own way of thinking—a belief which is in and through saturated with all the vigour and strength of life. It does not make us dependant on any Almighty Ruler for our being and beatitude here or hereinafter. It does not cast us into the 'moulds' of those weaklings who love to 'creep' with a quivering prayer on their lips to the silent doors of the Deity, nor of those who crawl, beating breast at every step before his fictitious feet or figure to adore. Rather it makes us feel that we are independent autonomous individuals

GOD.

Now that (call it soul, spirit, superphysical something or by any other name you like) by the departure of which the living becomes dead is of the highest spiritual essence and is common to all. The manifestation of this divine principle may differ in different living beings but the collective idea derived from such observations as of this something inherent in the living and in the so-called non-living, is called God. According to the Jains there are energies present both in the material and dynamic worlds. Living apart the material or mental energies, the spiritual ones as a whole is God giving materiality, mentality and substantiality to all things and beings

God is what gives substantiality, materiality or mentality to all things and beings

The Ultimate Spiritual Power, often called by Spencer, as Primal Energy, forming the last limit of the knowables, reveals itself in various forms and with varying degrees of perfection in different grades of being. The universe with all its bewildering manifestation, is nothing but the revelation of this Ultimate Power or Energy. This is by its nature a *tertium quid* being matter conscious only when it reveals itself through a senti-

Spencer and Spinoza.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

'Vital Force'
and Dr.
Bose's super-
physical
Power.

if suitably influenced. But when "*killed* by poison," like the plant or animal, it does not respond. European thinkers and biologists have so far assigned the presence of a separate '*vital force*' in the physical phenomenon connected with the living organism. In place of any real explanation, a hypothetical nomenclature was used either to explain away or to clothe in a greater mystery the most complex phenomena that we ever come across. From this position with its assumption of superphysical character of response, it is clear that on the discovery by Dr. J. C. Bose, the most renowned Bengalee scientist of the day, of similar effects in inorganic substances, the necessity of theoretically maintaining such Dualism in Nature, must fall to the ground. There is, therefore, not any unknown arbitrary *vital force* as Physiologists have taught us to suppose but a law, the working of which, knows no change, nor any deviation, but which, as the Victorians hold, acts uniformly from within throughout the inorganic and the organic worlds.

GOD

our lives sublime.' By following the foot-prints on the sands of time of the Ideal Tirthankaras who were real heroes, pure and free, who attained to omniscience and quietude, *Nirvana*, by the dissipation of their *karma*, we shall be able to raise ourselves from the mires of the world and to attain to *Nirvan* by a like dissipation of our own *karma* and by freeing ourselves from the eighteen blemishes that inevitably lead ultimately to omniscience, the next door to *Nirvānam*.

By dissipation of *Karma* *Nirvan* has to be reached.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

ent organism, and remains unconscious so long its embodiment is the sentient one. This is the Primery Reality from which other realities owe their existence and this is the sap which supports every thing what we call real. The same or allied thought is expressed also by Benedict Spinoza when he says that mind and matter are but two among infinite aspects of the Ultimate Reality which can neither be designated as material or psychical in the sense of being conscious.

The true
idea of God-
head.

God is, in short, the coalescence of this spiritual principle emancipated from the bondages of matter in all its purity, perfection, freedom and blessedness. They do us wrong when they say that we are agnostics ; for we worship this Supreme Essence.—the Ideal of all of life and thought. We bow down to this Ideal, because we desire to realize the Ideal in every acts of our life and thought. We worship the Tirthankaras, the pure and perfect souls, merely for the sake of their purity and perfection ; but not for the expectation of any reward in return. 'Lives of great men remind us that we can make

SOUL.

higher unity without losing the traces of their individuality in the same? What is the nature of this soul-substance? Is it a spark from the anvil of the Blacksmith, a bye-product of matter of the Physicist, the nascent or the just-born of the Chemists? The *Chārvāka* school of thought teaches that there is no plausible reason and evidence to demonstrate the existence of soul as something distinct and separate from matter and material forces, for consciousness which is a quality of the soul-substance is but the resultant of the concussion of the brain-matter. Just as liver secretes bile so brain produces consciousness. This phenomenon of matter and material powers which is characterised by consciousness in different forms in the living and the so-called non-living, is soul for which reason, we often take recourse to such forms of expressions as consist in saying in our common parlance that the plant lives, the brute lives and feels, and the man lives, feels and thinks. It is thus evident that more the subtle is the organic mechanism, by far the more clear

Soul—a by-product of matter and material forces

CHAPTER XVII.

SOUL.

Souls and the God-head—Materialistic conception of Soul—A bye-product of matter—Eastern and Western materialism compared—Charvak and Hækel and Girardian, the socialist—Cosmological and Moral difficulties involved in Materialism—Admissions by Huxley, Spencer and Darwin—The Jain conception of Spirit and Matter—Their Correlativity—Pradeshas-Parts or Soul-units.—Conscious effulgence form the spiritual essence of the Soul.—Soul's constitutional freedom—Its Transmigration through the grades of Sansar and Emancipation.

Soul and
God

While dealing with our conception of God, we have seen that the individual soul, when it becomes free from all taints and blemishes, reaches perfection characterised by omniscience and realizes itself as a self-conscious spirit of the nature of all-delight, distinct and separate from other than itself, it becomes God.

Conceptions
of Soul

But what is this soul which is thus potentially divine and attains to God-head, He being no other than the coalescence of the pure and free self-conscious spirits existing in a

SOUL.

seems to receive additional support from the researches in Biology by some of the master-minds of the west. In summing up his 'Last Words on Evolution, Earnst Hæckel says, "the very interesting and important phenomena of impregnation have only been known to us in details for thirty years. It has been conclusively shown after a number of detailed investigation that the individual development of the embryo from the stem-cell or fertilised ovum is controlled by the same laws in all cases. * , * * * One important result of these modern discoveries, was the phenomena given to one fact that the personal soul has a *beginning of existence* and that we can determine the precise moment in which this takes place ; it is when the parent cells, the ovum and the spermatazoon, coalesce . Hence what we call the soul of man, or animal, *has not preisted* , but begins its career at the moment of impregnation. It is bound up with the chemical constitution of the plasm which is the vehicle of heredity in the nucleus of the maternal ovum and the

Hæckel on
the origin of
Soul

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Soul-Units
and self-con-
sciousness.

to the regions of the un-extended which accounts for the plurality of its existence. The conception of *pudgal*-matter is that it has weight and fills up space, but the essence of the soul is conceived in self-consciousness absolutely devoid of any tinge of materiality whatsoever. The soul being as such it is according to our philosophy a self-existent ultimate reality without beginning and end. Bereft of all colour, taste, smell and touch, it is metaphysically formless though it takes on the form of that wherein it happens to dwell by virtue of its own *Karma*. Like the vacuous space it has innumerable *pradeshas*. By *Pradeshas* are meant the minutest parts, the soul-units, which do not admit of further psychological analysis. These indivisible parts of the soul or soul-units which are infinite in number are all alike in essence for which reason the soul is said to be characterised by unity with a difference. They are essentially of the nature of conscious effulgence which seems to have been put out, as it were, by the super-imposition of the *Karma* matter on the various parts of the soul, just as a mirror becomes clouded

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

happen And why? Because of the difference of 'heredity,' as they say, which is the conservative principle accounting for the comparative persistency of the type of the organism. But the validity of this principle of transmission into the offsprings, is still open to question.

Why is it that the children of the same parent show marked dissimilarities to their parents and to one another? Why do the twins develop dissimilar characters and possess irreconcilable tastes and tendencies, though coming almost at the same time, from the same stalk and nurtured and brought up with the same care and affection under similar conditions and environments? These cannot be explained away as accidents There is nothing as such in science Nothing in the universe of phenomena and form is exempt from the inexorable law of the cause and effect There must be some reason, therefore, underlying these inequalities And what is that reason? To say that these inequalities in children are due to the parents is to admit the truth and validity of the principles of heredity

THE KARMA PHENOMENOLOGY.

and adaptation to the environment as working out these differences in the spheres of organic evolution. But such eminent biologists as Dr. August Weisman and a good many others of equal authority and repute deny that hereditary tendencies of the parents predominate in one ; of the grand-father in another , those of the grand-mother in the third and the like. Not this alone. Weisman goes further and reasons out that the acquired tendencies are never transmitted to the offsprings. He believes in the '*continuity of germ-plasm*' and is of opinion that the inequalities are caused by the differences in '*germ-cells*'. "I have called this substance *germ-plasm*", says Weisman, "and have assumed that it possesses a highly complex structure, conferring upon it the power of developing into a complex organism" Heredity—Vol I. p. 170). Dr. Weisman states further . "there is therefore continuity of the germ-plasm from one generation to another. One might represent the germ-plasm by the metaphor of a long creeping root-stock from which plants arise at intervals, these latter representing the

Dr. Weis-
man and
Heredity

AN ÉPITOME OF JAINISM.

Hereditary
transmis-
sion impos-
sible,

individuals of successive generations. Hence it follows that the transmission of acquired characters is an impossibility, for if the germ-plasm is not formed anew in each individual, but is derived from what preceded it, its structure, and above all, its molecular constitution can not depend upon the individual in which it happens to occur, but such an individual only forms, as it were, the nutritive soil at the expense of which the germ-plasm grows, while the latter possessed its characteristic structure from the beginning, *viz.*, before the commencement of growth. But the tendencies of heredity, of which the germ plasm is the bearer, depend upon this very molecular structure and hence only those characters can be transmitted through successive generations which have been previously inherited, *viz.*, those characters which were potentially contained in the structure of the *germ-plasm*. It also follows that those other characters which have been acquired by the influence of special, external conditions during the life-time of the parent, cannot be transmitted at all." (vol I. p. 273-)
"But at all events," sums up Dr. Wiesman,

THE KARMA PHENOMENOLOGY.

"we have gained this much that the only fact which appears to directly prove a transmission of acquired characters, has been refuted and that the only firm foundation on which this hypothesis had been hitherto based, has been destroyed."—(Vol. I. p. 461).

So we see how the theory of heredity and adaptation, in short, the theory of Natural Selection through the cosmic processes of which Charles Darwin and a host of others of his line of thinking attempted to show the origin of species, fails to explain the real causes and conditions for the specific differentiations in the spheres of organic evolution.

In suffi-
ciency of
Natural
Selection.

The real causes and conditions determining the origin of the different types of organisms are to be found out in the principle of metempsychoses. And if the remarks of Dr. Weisman are read between the lines, it will be quite apparent that the Dr. stands on the very threshold of a revelation. He is knocking at the gate and it will open to give him an entrance into the mysteries of Transmigration, "the undivorceable spouse of *Karma*", for, according to

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

become angels or they loose their angelhood by the force of their own *karma* "The experience gained in one life", to quote the language of Hartmann, the great German philosopher, "may not be remembered in their detail in the next, but the impressions which they produce will remain. Again and again man passes through the wheel of transformation, and changing his lower energies into higher ones until matter attracts him no longer and he becomes—*what he is destined to be—A GOD.*"

THE KARMA PHENOMENOLOGY

to put the idea with all the Orientality we can command, because the *karma* of the human being is different. *Karma*, here, does not mean 'heredity' through the principle of which the offsprings are alleged to inherit the qualities of the ^{by}fathers. In Jain philosophy, it signifies what the soul carries with itself from an anterior stage of its being by virtue of its prior deeds and desires. The idea is that every thought we think, every act we do, tells upon our souls and thereby leaves an impression upon them, as it were, which continues to exercise influence on them in their subsequent careers. And accordingly our present happiness or misery is not the award of any power existing outside ourselves but is rather the consequent of what we ourselves had done in the past either in this life or in an anterior birth. None is exempt from the operation of *karma*—Nor Krishna, nor Buddha, nor Christ Jesus. This doctrine of *karma* thus unquestionably furnishes the key to the interpretation of the phenomenal greatness in humanity. Christ Jesus of Nazereth was a Christ by the virtue of his own *karma*. So angels

Karman accounts also for all organic changes

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Mrs Sinclair
on the Law
of *Karma*
and Rebirth

energy of his past actions, *Karma*, which can no more be affected by love or prayer than a run-away locomotive. On and on it goes remorselessly dealing out mutilation and suffering, till the energy it has amassed is at last exhausted and a merciful silence follows. The belief in *Karma* and transmigration kills all sympathy and human kindness for sufferers, since any pain a man endures is only the wages he has earned in a previous birth. It is this belief that is responsible among other things for the suffering of the thousands of child-widows in India who are taught they are now reaping the fruit of their own unchastity in a former life."

So writes Mrs. Sinclare in exposing the so-called 'Empty Heart of Jainism and in vindication of her Christian creed. But alas ! she can not explain the world of inequalities and diversities from the stand-point of her *own* Christian Theology. If an All-merciful Personal God created this universe out of nothing, could He not make all things good and beautiful and all beings happy ? Why one is a born saint and another a murderer ?

CHAPTER XIX.

CHURCHIANITY AND THE LAW OF KARMA.

Christian Criticism of 'Karma'—Empty Heart of Jainism—Examination of the Criticism—Inconsistencies and Difficulties of the Christian Theology—God and Satan—Good and Evil.—Indian Widows Christian unmarried Girls

From what has been discussed in the preceeding pages so far the inexorable Law of *Karma*-causality is concerned, it is perfectly clear that man is the maker of his own Destiny This is the main principle whereon the grand edifice of the Jain ethics is securely based But this belief in the ethical autonomy of man making him thoroughly free and independent of the iron will of any Being outside himself cannot but irritate Christian minds.

Man is the maker of his Destiny.

"Instead of a God delighting in mercy, who rules and judges the fair world that He has made," writes Mrs. Sinclare Stevenson in her latest contribution, 'The Heart of Jainism,' "the Jain have set in this place a *heinous* thing the accumulated

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

This dramatical piece incident reminds us of the famous lines of another poet who sang in the following strain,—

"He who does not sin, cannot hope for mercy ;
Mercy was made for sinners ; be not sad."

The pit-fall
of Original
Sin.

But with the Jains such conceptions do not count for anything. If the Supreme Being *delighting in mercy* is the Prime Author of all that is, He should have shown mercy and perfect forbearance, from the very beginning to man,—His own handi-work, instead of allowing him to fall into the pit-fall of Original Sin. Man is not omniscient, and according to the Christian theology, nor a perfect being as well, and as such he must have his shortcomings and failures ; but as he was living under the protecting and paternal care of his All-merciful Maker, could he not naturally expect that if he were to commit any mistake in his movements, his Omniscient Father and Guardian who must have fore seen things long before he himself could realise, should protect his son, showing thereby, His perfection of forbearance and mercy to his creature which he is to delight in ? We have

CHURCHIANITY: LAW OF KARMA.

Why one waddles in wealth and opulence and another starves to death ? If God created one to enjoy the pleasures of life which the world can afford to supply with and another to labour life-long under the stiffling, tyranny of his master, how could he be an embodiment of All-love and All-mercy ? Need she be told in the language of the poet that "A God All-mercy is a God Unjust."

Christianity teaches that man has but one life on earth to live either for an eternal existence in Heaven or to be condemned into Hell according to the merits or demerits of his deeds. But this naturally encourages a man to make the most of his opportunities here. Besides an appeal for mercy at the hands of an Omnipotent God best suits him who has consciously failed in the discharge of duties. But the great disadvantage of such form of faith is that it makes some violently reckless so much so that when the poet Henri Hein was asked if he believed in Divine Grace, he replied, "God will forgive me, for that is his profession".

Mercy made
for Sinners

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

and Devil worked together to create this universe of ours which is therefore but a mixture of good and evil. And to push the question still further, both of them being equally powerful and limited by each other, it follows that neither of them was omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient. Does Mrs. Sinclair wish us to set up within the shrines of our tender hearts such a God the very conception of which is logically absurd.

The widows
of India vs
the unmarri-
ed girls of
Europe.

Turning to the effects of *karma* on social matters it is true, indeed, that here the earth is soaked by the tears of the child-widows, but will Mrs. Sinclair inform her readers as to why the Christian world echoes with the sighs of the unmarried? Here the Indian widows had had a chance for the husbands to love and to loose in this life as these were written in the their own *Karma* and there is every reason to hope that they would receive their beloved back more cordially in their warm embraces during the subsequent turn and term of their natural life quite in accordance with their own *Karma*. But what hope

CHURCHIANITY. LAW OF KARMA.

already remarked that we the Jains cannot persuade ourselves to believe in a God in the sense of an extra-mundane Creator who caused the down-fall of mankind but afterwards taking pity on them dropped down from Heaven his only Son through whose crucifixion mankind was saved.

Some Christian Divines hold, however, that the pit-fall of Original Sin which caused the down fall of the entire human race was but dug out by the Devil. They teach that God created all that is good and beautiful and it was Satan who brought in the Evil and spoiled man—the handi-work of God. But little do these Divines think that good and evil are but relative terms. Good can not be without evil and *vice versa* evil without good. There is a soul of goodness in things evil and conversely there is a soul of evil in things good. And when God created what is good he must, at the same time, have created the evil too. Similarly, when the Satan created the evil, he too must have created, at the same time, what is good. Now to view things as they stand, we cannot but logically infer that God

God and
Satan work-
ing together?

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

absolute exhaustion of the individual's *Karma*, liberation is surely and inevitably attained, sooner or later.

In fine Mrs. Sinclair would do well to bear in mind that the law of *Karma* which in the Physical world speaks of the continuity of motion and indestructibility of matter teaches in the domain of Ethics, the immortality of deeds and the inevitability of the moral responsibility in the case of an individual, family, or nation.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

hasty thinkers will reject it * * * Like the doctrine of evolution itself, that of transmigration has its root in the world of reality '

Christian
Theological
Leaders.

Among the Christian theologians many prominent theological leaders have maintained it. Dr. Julius Muller, the eminent German theologian, supports the theory of Re-births in his work known as "The Christian Doctrine of Sin." Besides Swedenborg and Emerson believed in metempsychoses.

BELIEF IN RE-BIRTH.

below and rise to the intellectual world, that we may not fall into a purely sensible life by allowing ourselves to follow sensible images etc."

Philo of Alexandria, a contemporary of Christ, says "The company of disembodied souls is distributed in various orders. The law of some of them is to enter mortal bodies, and after certain prescribed periods (as according to our *ayuh-karma*) be again set free"

Modern philosophers, scientists.

Besides these, copious passages could be gleaned from the philosophical writings and dissertations of such eminent men and leaders of thought as Kant, Schelling, Fichte, Schopenhauer, Goethe and the like. Even the most astute moulder of the Sensationist school of thought, Hume, the sceptic, in his Essay on the 'Immortality of Soul' had to acknowledge the truth and validity of the theory of rebirths. He says : "The metempsychoses is therefore the only system of this kind that philosophy can harken to".

Prof. Huxley of the modern scientific world somewhere remarks - "None but the

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

fant the character of the stock lies latent, and the ego is a little more than a bundle of potentialities ; but very early those become actualities ; from childhood to age, they manifest themselves, in dullness or brightness, weakness or strength, visciousness or uprightness ; and with each feature modified by confluence of another, if by nothing else, the character passes on to its incarnation in new bodies.

'Character
and Karma'
of Huxley.

"The Indian philosophers called 'Character' as thus defined, '*Karma*'. It is this *karma* which passed from life to life and linked them in chains of transmigrations and they held that it is modified in each life, not merely by confluence of parentage, but by its own acts. They were in fact strong believers in the theory, so much disputed just at present, of the *hereditary transmission of acquired characters*. That the manifestation of tendencies of a character may be greatly facillitated or impeded by conditions, of which self-discipline or the absence of it are among the most important, is indubitable . but that the 'character' itself is modified in this way is by no means so

CHAPTER XVI.

RE-BIRTH AND KARMA-SARIRA.

Prof Huxley and Re-birth—Huxley's Character and our Karma-matter—Character—Inner Nature—Linga-deha of the Hindu Philosophers—The Five Koahas or the Concentric Circles—Pranas of the Hindus and of the Jain Philosophers—Transmission of Character through Heredity-Vs-Transmigration of Karma-Sarira through Re-birth.

In another place of his last *Romane's Lectures*, says Huxley, "Every day experience familiarises us with the facts which are grouped under the name of heredity. Every one of us bears upon him the obvious marks of his parentage, perhaps remote relationship. More particularly the sum of tendencies to act in a certain way which we call 'character' is often to be traced through a long series of progenitors and collaterals. So we may justly say that this 'character'—this moral and intellectual essence of a man—does veritably pass over from one fleshly tabernacle to another and does really transmigrate from generation to generation. In the new born in-

Huxley on
Law of
Karma

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Transmission through
Heredity
or through
Re-births?

is another inviolable physical condition in the shape of a medium for the manifestation and operation of the above energies and it is the mortal physical frame which the *man* takes on. And there is invariably a kind of chemical affinity under the secret influence of which the man is drawn to a particular body wherein he is to take birth. It is true that *man* passes from body to body through the repetition of births and deaths, and as he progresses or retrogresses quite in accordance with the good or bad deeds he performed in the past, it is evident enough that he passes out with his own self-acquired habits, qualities and desires fitly called *karma-sarira* according to our philosophical terminology. But this does not necessarily mean that the habits and qualities he acquired through the processes of natural selection or through the processes of self-discipline he might have undergone—be these for good, or for bad—are transmitted to the off-springs through the physiological principle of heredity. True it is that the offsprings display at times such habits and tendencies as can well be traced out

RE-BIRTH AND KARMA-SARIRA.

certain, it is not so sure that the transmited character of an evil-doer is worse or that of a righteous man better than that which he received. Indian philosophy, however, does not admit of any doubt on the subject, the belief in the influence of conditions, notably self-discipline, on the *karmas* was not merely a necessary postulate of its theory of retribution, but it presented the only way of escape from the endless of round of transmigrations."

Huxley's misrepresentation and wrong interpretation of the Law.

Such is Prof. Huxley's interpretation and presentation of the law of *karma* and metempsychoses in Indian philosophy. But we differ from him in as much as neither the interpretation, nor the presentation, on that account, is correct. For we must have to draw a line of distinction between a man and his conditions. According to our philosophy a man may, indeed, be roughly taken as the embodiment of intellectual, spiritual and moral (दशं न ज्ञान चारित्र) essences which Huxley sums up by the word '*character*.' And the man as such is not different from the sum-total of the the energies summed up by '*character*' as just explained. But then there

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

attainment of bliss and beatitude, as the case may be, according to its *karma* in a previous birth.

Exposition
of the prin-
ciple

To enter a bit more into details we have stated before that there is some 'super-physical' power in every living body, by the presence of which the body is enabled to respond, if suitably influenced. Responsiveness, here, forms a predominating phenomenon of life, and death of the body means the departure of the 'super-physical' power, called *atman—Jiva* (soul)—from the living body after which it can no longer respond to any stimulus.

At the time of death, when this soul—or the 'super-physical' power shuffles off its mortal coil, it passes out assuming the form of a subtle unit of energy clothing itself, as it does, in a subtle body as its vehicle which is built out of the fine *karma*-matter—the crystalised particles of the soul's past experiences and unfulfilled desires etc. with which it happens to pass out. According to our philosophy, these fine *karma* matters or the crystalised particles of past experiences and unfulfilled desires, embodied in which the

RE-BIRTH AND KARMA-SARIRA

as if coming down from the parent or some remote ancestor. The way in which this hereditary transmission is explained by the modern physiologists cannot, as we have seen elsewhere, give us a satisfactory solution of the problem in question. The phenomenon of apparent transmission through the physiological principle of heredity as explained in our philosophy seems to clear up the difficulties involved in the question. According to our philosophy, the re-incarnating soul, bearing as it does about it the *karma-pudgal* which the *Jiva* acquired by dint of its past experiences and unfulfilled desires, forming its character in the past, automatically develops with a mathematical precision, a sort of affinity or tendency of attraction, for the appropriate physiological and moral conditions wherein it may find a fit and favourable soil for moulding out of the same, a suitable body as the manifesting media for the display of its powers and qualities, either to cope with nature in the fulfilment of its unsatisfied desires and enjoyment of the pleasures of the world, or to strive for the

Transmission
through
transmigration
of the
karma-
Sarira

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

forces of its own making, which become metamorphosed as it were into the form of *karma*-particles wherein remain stored up in a potential state all the experiences, desires and tendencies which Prof. Huxley sums up by the word '*Character*.'

*K a r m a -
S a r i r a*

The experiences and forces of its own, metamorphosed into a material particles, which the *Jiva* carries with it at the time of its departure from the body wherein it had been encased in a previous birth, and known as the *karma*-pudgal of the *Jiva*—form,—according to our sages, the physical basis of a future life. It is also technically called—*Kârman Sarira* of the *Jiva* which along with the *tejas sarira* which is also inseparable from it, clings round to the soul until it reaches final liberation. Here again we find another display of the grand truth teaching us of the indestructibility of matter and continuity of motion—*Karma*.

After shuffling off the gross mortal frame like a pair of old worn-out shoes, the individual soul, taking the form of a subtle unit of energy clothed in the *karma*-pudgal as explained, instinctively flies off to one or the other of the different grades of *sansâr* or

RE-BIRTH. AND KĀRMA-SARIRĀ

soul passes out leaving the body dead, form the very germ of physical life in future.

The use of the phrase "*karma-pudgal*"—*karma*-(matter) is singular in our philosophy. All *karmas*, the other systems of Indian Thought, accept unwaveringly the truth and validity of the doctrine of *karma*-causality and re-births ; but with them *karma* is *amurta*-imponderable. None has yet been found to take the word *karma* in the sense and significance as we find it to have been used in our philosophy. It is true that *karma* of the *Jīva* means its past activities or energies—forces of its own making that tend it to be a murderer or a saint in the next life. But the energies or forces, as they are in themselves are formless and as such they cannot act and react on any thing and produce changes in the tendency of the same. Sky, like void space, because of its being formless, cannot affect us. In order to act and re-act and thereby to produce changes in things on which they work, the energies and forces must have to be metamorphosed into forms or centres of forces. So are the cases with *Jīva's karma*—its past-activities or energies—

*K a r m a -
pudgal and
Character.*

RE-BIRTH AND KARMA-SARIRA.

gati, as it is called, for which it has developed a strong affinity and where, on that account, it may find a more favourable soil for fuller expressions of the energies and forces of its own making during the course of the previous term of the physical life. It may happen to be located for some time in the regions of hell (नरक) or go to some other world. It may travel among the brutes and beasts (तियर्क योनि) or may become a god or a demon in the world of gods and demons (देवासुर लोक). It may also by the virtue of its own *karma* under which it willingly laboured, run to Heaven, the region of the gods, there to enjoy the sweetest pleasures of life which he so much hankered after or be born again to such parents in the human world (मनुष्य लोका) as is consistent with its prior deeds and desires, either to waddle in wealth and prosperity, or to starve to death in poverty, or to strive after bliss and beatitude, forsaking all the pleasures of wordly life and living.

Gatis or the different grades of *Sansâr*

So we see that the 'Character' of Prof. Huxley is somewhat the same with the *karma-sarira* in the Jain philosophy, The Hindu

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

Prānas as
detailed in
the Jain
philosophy

But the *kārman-sarira* in our philosophy is of different make. It is true that the Jain philosophy speaks of *prānas* as organic and bodily powers, but these develop only as the *Jīva* ascends up the scale of evolution from lower to higher organisms. The highest type of organism of a *Jīva* has ten *prānas* and the lowest type must have at least four. Of the ten *prānas* or powers which are to be found in the higher types of organism as man,—five belong to the five organs of sense, viz., touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing. Add to these five, the three powers of body, mind and speech (काय मन वचन). The ninth is the power of inhalation and exhalation termed (आन पान) and the tenth is the *ayu-bal*—or the power whereby is determined the longevity of the *Jīva* during which it has to keep to a certain definite configuration of the body in which, it might happen to enter in a particular stage of its existence determined by its own past *• karma*. The Jain philosophers hold, however, that of these *prānas* in their abstract or etherial forms, accompany the *kārma-sarira* clothed in which the soul departs from an organism wherein it dwelt for a certain period

KARMA AND OUDARIKA-SARIRA.

ceases to exist, when it has grown up into a tree, so the inner world would cease to have its being after its transformation into the outer world, for they belong to the same thing although at different periods of its development. The fact of co-existence being thus inexplicable, the mutual interaction between them, which cannot be denied becomes inexplicable also.

The relation of cause and effect and its difficulties

Of course if the *purvapaksin* say that the earlier state is not altogether lost in the later state of a thing *developing*, but is retained there our obvious retort will be that if it is retained at all, it is retained in such a transformed manner that it loses its distinct existence. For what is accidental to the different stages of a *developing* thing, vanishes away with the lapse of time and what persists is the essence or the substance in abstract which reveals itself through these different stages of development.

To get over the difficulties as exposed in the above, some may erroneously hold that the inner nature produces the outer nature of a man. The relation is that of a cause and effect.

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

the *kārman*, the organ of thought, desires and will, determines the character of the former by its preferential interest. So the relation is intermutative. And this is borne out by our analysis of the question at issue.

How they
act a n d
re-act ?

The relation between *karma*-body and the *Oudārika*—this is our immediate topic. And we begin our discussion by defining the two in the clearest possible manner. By *kārman*-body we mean the *Experiential*-body where the effects caused by the *Oudārika*-body are stored up, as it were, in a subtle form. The operation of the *Oudārika*-body or the Perceptual organ leaves a permanent vestige upon the *karma*-body known as *karma*-vestige, just as the agitation of the brain molecules in thought, leaves a permanent vestige upon the brain itself. This is what we mean by *karma*-matter. This *karma*-matter again,, we shall show hereafter, determines the nature of the perceptual organ or the *Oudārika*-body. The operation of the *Oudārika*-body leaves thus vestiges upon the experiential body and thereby modifies it to a certain extent, while on the other, the *karma*-body or the organ

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

Conception
to the *Kāy-*
man-body.

valid ? Validity can well be established by the actual sensory contact of the object conceived. The conception thus becomes something general, universal in character, which differentiates itself, so to speak, without losing its unity and character, into so many individual actual objects capable of being presented to the senses. The individual objects, the subject-matter of the perceptual organ, becomes so many concrete embodiments of the conception itself which cannot be, like the former, presented to the senses. From the point of view of the perception also, it may be shown that they are unintelligible, unless they are interpreted with the light of the concept itself. An individual, or a single perception, caused by the actual contact of the object with the senses, remains unintelligible, unless it is subsumed under its respective concept which is, again, nothing but perceptions universalised. The conception we thus see, is the perception itself in its universal character and embodies itself in the actual objects forming the subject-matter of the perceptual organism (*चौदारिक ग्रंथौ*) and the perception is nothing but specific differen-

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM

A study from
another point
of view.

between the experiences of the *Ouddrik* body (**બૌદારિક શરીર**) and the experiences of the *kārman* body (**કાર્મણ શરીર**). By *oudḍrika* (**બૌદારિક શરીર**) we mean our neural organism which is the vehicle of the sensations, gross in form. While the experiences of the *kārman* body (**કાર્મણ શરીર**) is confined within its thought, ideas, desires and will. Here there is an important matter to note. The experiences of the *Ouddrika* body (**બૌદારિક શરીર**) which follows on the direct presentment of the actual objects, have no interest for us unless they are owned by us i.e referred to our own *inner nature* or *kārman* body (**કાર્મણ શરીર**). To be conscious that I am experiencing such and such things, the whole of objective experience requires to be viewed as the experience of my *inner nature* or in other words the objective experience, belonging to the *oudḍrika* body (**બૌદારિક શરીર**) must, be referred back to and determined by the *inner nature* ; otherwise the experience, being devoid of every subjective reference, will lose all interest for us, and cannot be viewed as my own experience. The *outer* experience, unless they are referred

KARMA AND OUDARIKA-SARIRA

As a mere theoretical thinker, we cannot get any idea of individuality, nor can we form any clear conception of it. We can prove all this by psychological analysis of the development of a child's mind. A child's first ideas are all unconsciously universal or vaguely abstract ideas. Even the child's first conscious ideas must be of what we call the universal as such. The many presentations he cannot yet know as so many individuals, for he cannot grasp single facts for their own sake. He only learns to recognise the type which persists through many presentations. He knows things by types, by universals. The one that persists through the many, he comes to recognise as the one, the universal, the type, the idea. As a mere theoretical thinker his progress has stopped and cannot go beyond it

The idea of individuality — how it develops?

But observe another side of his nature. He has a doll, and say, he loves it. He breaks it. Now offer him another doll as nearly as possible like the former one. Now will the child accept this as compensation? No. And what is the reason of this? It is this that the love for this toy is in its

AN EPITOME OF JAINISM.

the real and ultimate goal of all that live, move and have their being in the different abodes of the *Sansār*. Now do we not see that without immortality and re-birth of the *Jīva*—i.e., without the persistence and continuance of the *Kārman*-body through the ravages of time and the processes of metampsychosis the whole purpose of such life and individuality as manifest in the incessant struggling of the *Jīva* becomes absolutely meaningless !

From *Kalpa Sutra* M S (Life of Parshva Nath)



Mogul Period