

# PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF JAINISM

(AN INTRODUCTION)

**Acharya Mahaprajna**



**PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS  
OF JAINISM  
(AN INTRODUCTION)**

**Acharya Mahaprajna**

This is an edited version of the author's work — "Jain Darshan ke Mool Sutra." It has been translated by Prof. M. P. Lele under the guidance of Munishree Mahendra Kumarji and Munishree Dulahraji, Senior disciples of Acharya Mahprajna.

**© Adarsh Sahitya Sangh**

New Delhi

***Published by :***

Kamlesh Chaturvedi

Adarsh Sahitya Sangh

210, Deendayal Upadhyay Marg

New Delhi - 110002 (INDIA)

***Price : Rs. 200/-***

***Printed at :***

R-Tech Offset Printer

Delhi-110032

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE (to Hindi Version)

The search for origin of '*Bhāratīya Vidyā*', ancient India's tradition of knowledge and learning, takes one to the age, which is much earlier than the period, believed by some scholars as the dividing line between Pre-*Āryan* and Post-*Āryan* periods of Indian history. However, when we look at the literature and the other sources of history of the Post-*Āryan* period, it can be placed into two categories—(a) *Śramaṇa* and (b) *Brāhmaṇa*. Although the former has gone through substantial evolutionary phases over the past two millenium or so, what we see today of the *Śramaṇa* tradition belongs to two streams—Jainism and Buddhism. Buddhism travelled to distant parts of the world and so it is known world over. But the Jain tradition, though it also extended to areas across India, as we know today, yet basically it confined itself to the land of *Bhārata*, where it continued to be practised as a living tradition throughout. So, not much is known about Jain tradition in larger parts of the world. The message and Icons of Lord R̥ṣabha and Mahāvira, the Jain *Tirthaṅkaras* are not so familer to the people world over as they are of Buddha.

The philosophical tradition of Jainism has a lot to offer to the world. Concepts like *Anekānta*, *Ahiṃsā*, *Aparigraha* etc. could be of great help in containing the problems, that the humanity is facing today. Some scholars have done valuable research on Jain literature and philosophy and there seems to be a renewed interest in this area of study in recent times. This work is an attempt to present a broad outline of the subject to the wider sections of readership interested in Jain religion and philosophy.

Muni Dhananjaya Kumar and Muni Jai Kumara have helped in the editing of this (Hindi) volume.

Taranagar (Rajasthan)

Dated : 02.02.2002

*Ācārya Mahāprajña*





## CONTENTS

TITLES	PAGE NOS
1. <i>Bhagavāna</i> Mahāvira — Life & His Message	01-11
2. Jainism in Pre-historic Times	12-16
3. Jainism and the Indian Philosophical Tradition	17-20
4. Philosophical Exposition of Jainism	21-23
5. The World and Its Creator	24-27
6. <i>Sṛṣṭivāda</i> — the Theory about Creation of the World	28-32
7. <i>Niyati &amp; Puruṣārtha</i> (Destiny and Deeds)	33-39
8. <i>Pratyavavāda</i> and <i>Vastuvāda</i> (Idealism and Realism)	40-43
9. <i>Syādvāda</i> and <i>Anekānta</i> (Relativism and Non-absolutism)	44-47
10. <i>Parīṇāmi Nitya</i> (Transitory Eternity)	48-52
11. Doctrine of the Soul and Rebirth	53-57
12. Nature of the Soul	58-61
13. <i>Jīva</i> : its Form and Attributes	62-69
14. Relationship between Soul and Body	70-73
15. <i>Jīva—Pudgala : Bhoktr—Bhogyā Sambandhavāda</i> (Inter-relationship between the Consumer and the Consumed)	74-75
16. <i>Mūrtta Amūrttavāda</i> (Theory of Corporeal & Non-corporeal)	76-77
17. <i>Jīva Caitanya Saṃbandhavāda</i> (Relation between <i>Jīva</i> & Consciousness)	78-82
18. <i>Bhedābhedavāda</i> (Identity-cum-difference of Body & Soul)	83-86
19. Jain Philosophy and Scientific Quest	87-90
20. Problems and their Solutions	91-96
21. We ourselves are the Creator of our Pains and Pleasures	97-104
22. Truthful Living: (Credo of Jain Philosophy)	105-109
23. National Integration and Jainism	110-115
24. Religion and Morality	116-121
25. Benedictions of Jainism	122-133



# 1

## BHAGVĀN MAHĀVĪRA

### Life and His Message

“Bhārat” as is India known since time immemorial, had two kinds of political systems 2500 years ago. While there was monarchy in dynasties like Magadha, Baṅga, Kaliṅga, Vatsa, Awanti and northern Kośal, some others like Vaiśālī, Kapilvastu, Kuśinārā and Pāwā were ruled democratically and known as—Licchavi, Śākya and Malla Republics respectively. The king was supposed to be the incarnation of god in the monarchy, whereas in the democratically ruled states, he was a chosen one from among the representatives of people.

Lord Mahāvīra was born to the parentage of Kṣatriya Siddhārtha and Kṣatriyāṇī Trisālā on ‘Caitra Śuklā Trayodaśī, (30<sup>th</sup> March) 599 BC at a place called Kṣatriyakunḍ-grāma, which was a suburb of Vaiśālī Republic. Very little is known about his early life. At the age of 28, he lost his parents. Lord Mahāvīra then expressed his desire for becoming a ‘Śramaṇa’ (ascetic). But his elder brother Nandivardhan and his uncle Supārshwa counselled him to wait for some more time. Lord Mahāvīra was in great dilemma as he did not relish living a ‘Gṛhastha’ (householder’s) life. But he could not disregard the wishes of his family elders. He stayed with the family for next two years, but internally he practised aloofness from all ‘Vāsanās’ (desires) and worldly temptations. It is called ‘Videha Sāadhanā’ (i.e. even though



possessed of body, to remain detached to it). He who does not feel attachment to material things in life can live like an ascetic despite being surrounded by attractions of the physical world.

Lord Mahāvīra remained absorbed in the state of pure consciousness, where there is no feeling of the physical body or for that matter no taste whatsoever in what one eats. He observed complete silence during this period of two years that he stayed with his family. He then formally renounced the household life and broke all his worldly attachments. He, who submerges his personal interests into the wider interests of the humanity, has to leave the world of relationships and tread lonely in order to achieve his objectives. Lord Mahāvīra renounced his abode in Kṣatriyakunḍagrāma and went to the nearby forest where he got himself initiated into the monkhood – as a ‘Śramaṇa’.

### ***Sādhanā* (The Path of Spiritual Practice) for Twelve Years**

The first vow of his asceticism was to abandon all clothings, so as to be able to bear all kinds of weather and climatic extremities. He soon conquered the urges for food, thirst and sleep. He became fearless by totally eradicating the concern for his own life. This enabled him to progress towards his goal of perfecting non-violence, friendliness to all and attainment of the resultant peace. He who has ceased to harbour any concerns for his own body would not cherish violence, retaliation, or ill-feelings towards anyone.

Over a period of time, as his concentration in *Sādhanā* became intense, virtues like equanimity, truth, conquest over libido and detachment to the worldly matters manifested themselves in the ‘aura’ around his personality. Once, while he was practising meditation in the precincts of Kaṅkhal Āśram, a cobra popularly called ‘*Chanda Kauśika*’ attacked him and bit him profusely. But Lord Mahāvīra did not budge from his posture and due to his faith in non-violence and friendliness, he succeeded in changing the bestial nature of the reptile and pacified his rage. There were many such instances in Lord Mahāvīra’s life that

tested him during his period of *Sādhanā*. Once he was falsely charged for stealing cattle and brutally thrashed by people. Another such instance was, when a lewd woman accosted him to allure him from his vow of celibacy. But the Lord never succumbed to such temptations.

The basic feature of Lord Mahāvīra's *Sādhanā* was equanimity. He perceived that the root cause of all sorrow is man's own actions, which are due to the influence of attachment and aversion (*Rāga-Dveṣa*). Equanimity can be achieved only by remaining aloof from *Rāga-Dveṣa*. The Lord remained on fast during most of his *Sādhanā*-period of twelve years. He had no clothings, he was bitten by insects and attacked by wild animals, but he never lost his faith in '*Ahimsā*' and *Samatā* equanimity in all situations. This way he completed his *Sādhanā* for becoming a '*Videha*' i.e. he who has achieved complete annihilation of the feelings pertaining to the body and has attained '*Samatā*' (equanimity) in all situations. Thus he became a '*Kevalin*' — (Omniscient). His knowledge was pure as it was acquired out of his own deep perceptions and not through mere intellect or other sensory systems of the body. On accomplishment of his *Sādhanā*, the Lord propounded his Doctrine relating to the nature of Truth. He explained that in the then popular language known as — '*Prākṛta*', which the common folk spoke and understood in those days.

The 6<sup>th</sup> Century BC was an epoch-making century so far as the quest for spirituality and Truth was concerned. A good number of legendary persons like Lord Mahāvīra, Buddha (in India), Laotse, Confucius (in China) Pythagorus (in Greece) had been born in this century. They lived in the distant parts of the globe but their quest led them towards the same eternal Truth, which is not conditioned by any particular place or time.

In the 9<sup>th</sup> century BC, Lord Pārśvanāth, another very prominent Jain *Tīrthaṅkar* had lived. He preached that "Truth is relative." This was the time when '*Upaniṣadas*' were being composed and they were trying to describe the truth by saying '*Neti*

*Neti*— i.e. it is beyond description. This was being debated till Lord Mahāvīra emerged a couple of centuries latter. Lord Mahāvīra's view was that no absolute rule or dogma can be made about Truth. Latter Buddha said — “The truth is not a structured phenomena, which can be described in words.”

In Lord Mahāvīra's view, the Truth can encompass even mutually contrasting possibilities. In the material world, there is always coexistence of diametrically opposite possibilities i.e. ‘*utpāda*’ (origination) and ‘*vyaya*’ (extinction). For example, birth and death all go together. Truth can be realised only when fragments of truth are perceived in harmony. When seen through ‘*Abheda*’ (the synthetic) point of view, only the substance appears true. But if we look at it from ‘*Bheda*’ (the analytic) point of view, the changing modes are also true.

Lord Mahāvīra synthesized ‘*Dharma*’ (righteousness) and the ‘*Darśana*’ (philosophy), which is a product of rational thinking. He himself had perceived the truth, over which his philosophical doctrine was founded. He practised it assiduously for development of his ‘*Chetnā*’ (consciousness). The Lord said that mere knowledge, mere devotion or mere action in isolation, cannot lead to ‘*Mokṣa*’, the deliverance or emancipation of the soul. When knowledge (*Gyāna*), faith (*Darśana*) and conduct (*Ācaraṇa*) are integrated, they are able to relieve us from all the sufferings of life.

In practice, we see that our conduct is often not compatible with our knowledge. Even though we know certain truths, we do not act accordingly. It is the faith which binds knowledge and action together. It brings us closer to knowledge and then conduct automatically follows what knowledge has revealed. However, there seems to be come confusion on this point. Generally, people think that we should have faith in that about which we do not have credible knowledge. What Lord Mahāvīra said was quite opposite to it. He said—“Have faith only in that which you know and understand.” Faith will then result in the integration of

knowledge and actions. You can not develop faith without knowledge. The faith is there only when you know a thing for certain and then the faith translates the knowledge into action easily.

Lord Mahāvīra forthrightly rejected the belief that any ‘Śāstra’ (religious scripture) is God’s word. He said that knowledge is acquired only by one’s own experience or through pure perception. There is no ‘God’, distinct from our ‘Soul’ which itself is capable to transform itself into the ‘God-hood’, when it becomes free from all bondages. He said, “Truth has to be one’s perception; it cannot be based on a description given in any book.”

Lord Mahāvīra is known as ‘*Anekātmavādī*’ i.e. “believer in spiritual pluralism.” According to him, there are infinite number of souls or living beings in the world, operating totally independent of each other. All have their own individual consciousness and they are not fragments of any composite single soul or the Supreme Reality. No doubt these diverse souls manifest themselves in different forms — some in human, others in sub-human form and so on. Even in humans, there is natural diversity. They have different colours, as is seen among people living in different geographical areas. In Lord Mahāvīra’s time — the Indian society followed a classification based on ‘*Varṇa*’ (Genesis) and *Karma* (occupation) viz. — Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. Even though souls, when born as a living being in a particular species, are all equal, it was due to the flattened ego of the upper strata of society that they regarded the others ignoble or low. Lord Mahāvīra saw this folly in the social order and revolted against it. He exposed its arbitrariness. He preached the message of cultivating friendliness towards all, “You may have differences with others on account of certain natural traits, outlook or tastes. But you should cultivate forbearance and patience to enable you to make peace with every one, as, in reality, no one is absolutely different from you. No one is high or low on account of his birth.”

It is the ego of those having power and prosperity that makes



them consider others as inferior. There is, in fact, an intrinsic unity among mankind and therefore, peaceful co-existence between the diverse groups of mankind is the only way to sustain peace in the world.

### **Morality, Philosophy and Religion**

The natural outcome of philosophy is observance of righteousness in conduct i.e., morality. In the natural course, intrinsically the chain starts from philosophy and on to *Dharma* and then ultimately ends in morality. But outwardly it appears to be in the reverse direction. Lord Mahāvīra looked at it from the inner perspective. He said, “Only one who develops the right faith/view can become a ‘*Vratī*’ (who purifies his conduct by taking vows of abstinence from evils).” His “*Ahimsa Vrata*” (vow of non-violence) should reflect in his spirit of friendliness to all. A “*Satyavratī*” (observer of the vow of truth) would not be a cheat. An “*Achaurya Vratī*” (observer of the vow of non-stealing) would be honest in his dealings. A “*Brahmacharya-Vratī*” (observer of the vow of continence) would abstain from the consumption of luxurious goods and observe continence. An “*Aparigrahi Vratī*” (observer of the vow of non-possession) would put limits to his desires and urge for accumulation of wealth. Lord Mahāvīra said that *Dharma* cannot be devoid of morality and that it has to reflect itself in a person’s behaviour towards society as a whole. According to him, “*Dharma*” manifests itself in the world only through a pure soul and this purity can be achieved only through morality.

### **Basic Tenets**

The basic tenets of religion preached by Lord Mahāvīra, viz., the ‘*Tattva*’ — (Metaphysics). ‘*Dharma*’ (Righteousness) and ‘*Vyavahāra*’ (Ethics) are quite relevant even today. The philosophy based on his teachings can be highlighted through the following broad principles.

***Anekānta* (Non-absolutism) and *Syādvāda* (Doctrine of Relativity)**

(a) Perception or reality with a multi-angular view — is known as the doctrine of “*Anekānta*” and when the same is explained in relative terms, it is known as “*Syādvāda*”.

(b) Knowledge has no boundaries. There would always be something more to know, and therefore, one should never insist that what is known is the ultimate truth.

(c) Truth being a relative phenomena, all the alternative formulations should always be considered together.

**Non-violent Revolution**

The practice of *Ahiṃsā* makes a person free from attachment and aversion. It is equanimity towards all. When such a feeling manifests itself explicitly into actions of an individual or a community, non-violence becomes a revolutionary force. Lord Mahāvīra underlined the following for achieving that objective:

(a) Don't kill any being.

(b) Don't harbour enmity towards anyone, it is bound to start a chain of reaction.

(c) Cherish the spirit of friendliness towards all.

Lord Mahāvīra vehemently spoke against the custom of slavery, which was prevalent in his times. He said don't deprive the unprivileged as also the women of their individual freedom. He denounced the caste-system that was taking roots in the Indian Society. It is degradation of the humanity, he proclaimed.

(d) The Lord revolted against rituals, which prescribed animal sacrifices in order to gain reincarnation in the 'Heaven'. Instead, he said that the ultimate objective of humankind should be to attain salvation of the soul, so that one gets eternal peace. Any kind of violence, according to him, would lead oneself to suffering.

(e) Lord Mahāvīra cautioned against waging of wars as a

solution to the conflicts. He said — don't attack anyone, even the animals which are killed for hunting as a sport or for food.

### ***Aparigraha* (Non-possessiveness)**

'*Aparigraha*' means—not to develop attachment for any physical thing and never to crave for possessing it exclusively for oneself. '*Aparigraha*' is part and parcel of the virtue of *Ahiṃsā*. One should not deprive others from having their share of things. In practical terms that means:

(a) One should not develop attachment to one's mortal body or for any other material objects of this world.

(b) One should use proper restraint in consumption of goods and avoid unrestrained desire to amass wealth for himself.

(c) One should not ever try to grab what belongs to others by robbing them or through their exploitation.

### ***Pauruṣa* (Self-exertion)**

(a) Man himself is the maker of his own destiny. The Jain doctrine of karma propounds that the self (*ātmā*) itself is responsible for whatever action it does. Every action of his soul results either in binding of new *karma-pudgala* (i.e. cluster of karmic matter in the form of very fine sub-atomic particles or obliterating the effect of already bound *karma-pudgala*). Binding is of two types: auspicious and inauspicious, which respectively result in pleasure and pain when *karma-pudgala* come into rise, and give their fruition. It is the right type of self-exertion that results in annihilation of bound inauspicious *karma-pudgala*, and binding of new auspicious *karma-pudgala*. Ultimately, stoppage of actions results in inhibition of bondage of new *karma-pudgala*.

(b) No one — neither a king nor any other temporal head—is incarnation of the God. In fact, the concept of incarnation of God in any form is untenable.

(c) All religious books or scriptures are products of realisation

by humans, their thoughts and perceptions. So they have limitations. None is God's word.

(d) The universe (which is in existence from beginningless time and would continue to exist for endless time) is regulated by the cosmic laws which are self-propelling. It is not regulated by the will of any so-called imagined God.

(e) The Jain Philosophy holds that the universe is composed of six real substances as under:

1. *Dharma* (Auxiliary cause of motion)
2. *Adharma* (Auxiliary cause of stationariness or rest)
3. *Ākāśa* (Space)
4. *Kāla* (Time)
5. *Pudgala* (Matter and physical energy)
6. *Jīva* (Conscious being)

The first five of the above substances are *ajīva* (devoid of consciousness) while the last one only is *jīva*.

The Lord has explained the interaction of *jīva* and *karma-pudgala* through the following concepts:

1. *Punya* (Meritorious *karma-pudgala*)
2. *Pāpa* (De-meritorious *karma-pudgala*)
3. *Āśrava* (Cause of the influx of the *karma-pudgala*)
4. *Samvara* (Stoppage of the influx of the *karma-pudgala*)
5. *Nirjarā* (Separation of the *karma-pudgala* from the soul)
6. *Bandha* (Bondage of *karma-pudgala* with the soul)
7. *Mokṣa* (Emancipation of the soul from the *karma-pudgala*).

**Dharma Sangha (Religious Order)**

Lord Mahāvira prescribed the following guidelines so as to



ensure smooth functioning of the Jain monastic religious order:

1. Sharing with fellow-disciples will lead one to *mokṣa*.
2. Be gracious to accommodate the unprivileged.
3. Educate those who are initiated into the path of *Dharma*.
4. Be ready to serve all, particularly those who are suffering.
5. Be neutral and just in dealing with contentious issues. That is the only way to resolve problems.

### ***Dharma* (Righteousness)**

1. The real test of the auspicious *dharma* (leading to *mokṣa*) is that it is based on non-violence, penance and self-restraint.

2. The *dharma* which harbours lust, attachment, wealth and power is poisonous for the society; in fact, it is not *dharma*.

3. There is no place for violence or sacrificial rituals in *dharma*.

4. Everything that the religious texts or sectarian institutions say is not the embodiment of true *dharma*. So use proper discretion of your own before putting faith in any of the so-called religions and choose your own path. A corrupt and fallen soul cannot hide his own true self by clothing himself with any particular attire or dress, or by becoming a member of any well-known religious sect.

5. The real *dharma* would always lead you to the lasting peace. It is best engrained in the conduct that is guided by the right knowledge and not by the force of mere logic or scholarship.

6. Disciplining the self is the first step to create a social order. So the Lord said that the process of regulating the social order should start from disciplining your own self.

### **Attainment of '*Niroṇṇa*'**

Lord Mahāvīra breathed his last in 527 BC, while sitting in the

**‘Paryāṅkāśana’** (a Yogic posture of sitting cross-legged, practising meditation on the soul,) on the 30<sup>th</sup> day (dark night) of the month of *Kārtika* (November). That day has become the “*Jyoti Parva*” (the yearly festival of “*Dipāvalī*” i.e., Illumination) as was then celebrated by the Republics of *‘Malla’* and *‘Lichhavi’*.

—xxx—

## **J A I N I S M**

### **In Pre-Historic Times**

Today, we live in an age known as “Atomic Age”. The tremendous potential of the atomic weapons is capable to destroy the world a couple of times. But paradoxically speaking, this is also the age when man has once again started the search for peace through exploration of the power of non-violence.

The theory of relativity as discovered by Albert Einstein has revolutionised the field of science. On the other hand various political doctrines like Socialism, Communism, Capitalism have already been practiced and tested in various countries. Politicians belonging to different ideologies are preaching diverse theories about the welfare of mankind. In this context it would be quite interesting to study what Jainism could offer to the welfare of the mankind.

The Jain philosophy has not only preached non-violence as a principle, it has also proved that it could be a practical proposition as a way of life. Today in the United Nations, diplomats from various countries are constantly engaged in exploring the ways and means to achieve peaceful solutions to the problems of the disturbed world and to find ways for discarding use of deadly weapons, but the world seems to be proceeding in the opposite direction. In this context Jainism’s stress on non-violence and disarmament are very significant. It

was Lord Mahāvīra, who for the first time, as per known history, proclaimed that there should be a total ban on production of weapons and the mankind should follow the path of non-violence. The study of Jainism is, therefore a very relevant subject in the modern context i.e. when the world stands on the brink of catastrophe.

Naturally one would like to know who was the originator of Jainism and when did it originate. Lord Mahāvīra is known to be the propounder of Jainism, although about 250 years prior to him Lord Pārśvanātha had originally preached the basic tenets of Jainism. Both these names are historical figures. But traditionally, Jainism is believed to be conceived and practised much earlier than the period of the recorded history. The Jain tradition believes that there have been 22 *Tīrthaṅkaras* before Lord Pārśvanātha and the first among them was Lord Ṛṣabhadeva. He descended on earth in pre-historic times, thousands of years ago, when humans lived in forests. Organized community life was yet to take any shape. The civilization was in its cradle stage. People lived a very simple life and they survived solely on what the nature gave them of its own. Lord Ṛṣabhdeo in his young age worked assiduously for creating a social order to regulate the society. He also encouraged arts and crafts, promoted agriculture and commerce in order to make the man happy and prosperous. Having done that for the best part of his life, he became an ascetic and persued the spiritual course i.e. penance, meditation and other modes for realizing the “*Ātmika* self (i.e., the pure soul).” He then preached a religion, which was based on actual realisations rather than that which is conceived out of pure imagination.

The acid test for any religion is whether, what you preach, has first been realized by yourself. True religion is not based on mere lofty ideals which can be logically put forth. Between Lord Ṛṣabha and Lord Mahāvīra there is a tradition of 22 *Tīrthaṅkaras*. Thus Jainism has been evolved through the process of deep



contemplation and realisation of 24 *Tīrthaṅkaras*. All of them had a common pursuit — i.e. to explore the truth and to show the ultimate path to achieve peace. All of them realised that only through non-violence one can achieve the lasting peace.

In addition to these twenty-four '*Tīrthaṅkaras*', there is a galaxy of *Ācāryas* in Jainism. We must understand the difference between the two i.e. '*Tīrthaṅkaras*' and '*Ācāryas*'. While the former are the initiators of the tradition, the latter ones have been the temporal leaders of the faith, who guided the followers of Jainism in their respective times. *Tīrthaṅkaras* do not emerge by simply following a tradition set out by their forerunners. Having attained '*Bodhi*' through their own realisation, they preach the tenets of the *Dharma*. Thus there is a long tradition of *Tīrthaṅkaras* in Jainism, who are the initiators of the faith.

There is a famous aphorism in Jain Religion—

*'Je ya buddhā aikantā, je ya buddhā anāgayā,*

*Saṁti tesim paṭhāṇam, bhuyāṇam jagai jahā.*

"All the *Tīrthaṅkaras* have preached Peace in the world as the basic element of existence. It is like the mother Earth, that sustains the life." Today our biggest problem is lack of peace in the world. We are threatened by the deadliest arsenal of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, which are capable of destroying the world a couple of times. Hence, teachings of Jainism are much more relevant today for the survival of the mankind. It is pertinent to know that throughout the tradition, whichever period we refer to i.e. ancient age of Lord Rṣabha or the historical times of Lord Mahāvīra, Jainism reflects three basic features. It is based on Truth, it is '*Kaivalika*' and it promises to redeem the humans out of worldly sorrows. *Dharma* has to be realistic and not imaginary. A religion which motivates its followers through '*Bhaya*' (fear of hell) or '*Pralobhana*' (greed for heaven) is not at all *Kalyāṇakāri* (i.e., leading to the ultimate beatitude). Lord Mahāvīra has, therefore, been very aptly revered as the shining jewel among

‘*Nirvāṇavādis*’ or those who profess the doctrine of *nirvāṇa*, i.e., final emancipation (*Nivvāna vadi ṇiha nāyaputte*).

There seem to be two distinct streams in Indian Philosophical tradition—(a) ‘*Svargavādī*’ (professing the path to the heaven) and (b) ‘*Nirvāṇavādī*’ i.e., breaking of all worldly bondages and ultimately realising the purity of the soul. The former is related to gaining of matter (*padārtha*), which effects the *Jīva* through fear (*bhaya*) and greed (*pralobhana*). So the *dharma* related to that is not able to lift the follower from the material worldly plane.

‘*Nirvāṇavāda*’ means leaving behind all the feelings related to the matter. Therefore, it is effective in bringing about the desired change in the sphere of consciousness, which is beyond any physical matter. In that sense *dharma* lifts you to a higher plane of the soul, where there are no attachments to any feelings. Jainism is *Nirvāṇavādī* (believer in ultimate deliverance) and therefore it relates to a state higher than the heavenly pleasures. Naturally therefore there is no scope in Jainism for fears about hell or greed for heaven. The third attribute of any *dharma* is its power to alleviate the soul of all the sorrows that get attached to it. It shows the way to cut the chains of bondage.

Jainism is also known as ‘*Kaivalika*’, in the sense that it has been preached by only those who have experienced the kingdom of the soul. The logicians have questioned the veracity of the above statement by saying—“how is it possible for any one at any given time to know the truth in its entirety”? “Jain Ācāryas answered this” — yes, *Tīrthankaras* were ‘*sarvajña*’ (omniscient).

When and how such a religion was known as Jainism? The name might have been coined much later but the principles contained therein date back to the most ancient era of history. Jainism must have also been subject to many changes in its name and form over the long period of its history, though its foundation has always remained in “*Nirvāṇavāda*”. The name ‘Jainism’ was not prevalent in Lord Mahāvīra’s time. It was then known as

'*Nirgrantha Pravacana*' and prior to that Jainism was known as "Arhat Dharma" or "*Śramaṇa Dharma*".

In Jain literature, Lord Rṣabha was called—'Arhat', a term which continued to be in vogue till 'Pārśvanāth'. Lord Mahāvīra was known as 'Śramaṇa'. It is thus logical that Mahāvīra being the last of 24 *Tīrthaṅkaras*, a new pattern seems to have set in and its followers were thereafter called 'Jains'. It is quite possible that in the span of thousands of years between Rṣabha and Pārśva, there must have been numerous changes in language, idiom of presentation and the attire of Jain monks. What remained consistent was the message of Jainism i.e. "*Nirvāṇavāda*" or "*Yathārthavāda*" (i.e., realism).

## JAINISM AND INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITION

It is but natural that on any matter as complex as the Religion or Philosophy, there would be diverse view-points based on logic and realizations of the different masters. The great variety we find in the philosophical field is the result of that. We can categorize the Indian philosophical tradition in two broad groups—1. '*Brāhmaṇa*' (or Vedic) and 2. '*Śramaṇa*'. While '*Mīmāṃsā*' and '*Vedānta*' fall into the first category, the 'Jain' and the 'Buddhist' are related to the *Śramaṇa* tradition. '*Nyaya-Vaiśeṣika*' appear too far-off from the '*Brāhmaṇa*' tradition. '*Sāṅkhya*' appears to be treading the same path as that of the Jain philosophy, although traditonally speaking it is regarded to be in the Brāhminical category. A classification based on tradition only is, therefore, not very useful in tracking the evolution of the philosophical tradition. It would be more logical to group different philosophies according to their thought-content.

Jainism has developed a new philosophical doctrine called '*Anekānta*', which tries to look at different philosophical concepts through a multi-visionary angle. '*Anekānta*' tries to make an independent and holistic evaluation of any stream of thought. '*Anekānta*' adopts an approach that synthesises different modules of philosophical doctrines. None is condemned as undesirable or wrong nor any one is treated as a favourite. All aspects of an

issue are considered together in order to reach any conclusion with regard to the ultimate truth.

‘*Vedānta*’ has gone to great lengths so far as ‘non-dualism’ (*abheda*) is concerned, whereas the Buddhist philosophy has marvelled in analysing the nature of diversity (*bheda*). Jainism tries to establish a synergy between these two streams of thoughts known as ‘*bhedābheda*’. It maintains that ‘*bheda*’ (difference) and ‘*abheda*’ (identity) are relative to the way we look at any particular thing. The Jain philosophy declares that all the diverse view-points may appear to be correct in their own respective set-ups but the ultimate reality can only be explored when we look at them in a holistic fashion through ‘*Anekānta*’ vision. The soul has been described as ‘*kūṭastha*’ (absolutely unchangable) by ‘*Sāṅkhyas*’, where as the ‘Buddhists regard it as ‘*kṣaṇika*’ (momentary). The Jain philosophers have blended the two attributes and describe the soul as ‘*pariṇāmi-nitya*’ (persistence through change). Unfortunately the philosophers of the later period do not seem to have comprehended this true purport of ‘*Anekānta*’. Had it been so, it would have put to rest all the controversies in the philosophical arena and led to a more logical development of the philosophical thought to serve any meaningful purpose.

All the philosophical streams have laboured a lot to find solutions to the problems that we face in the real world. But none can claim that it has solved all the problems. The Jain philosophers adopted ‘*Anekānta*’ approach towards different philosophies, and therefore, it could serve as a bridge between them. This is the foundation on which it has built its major planks of the thesis on ‘*ahimsā*’ (non-violence) and ‘*maitri*’ (compassion). The root-cause of all the intellectual problems is that since we are unable to resolve our thoughts, they lead to agitation and ultimate friction in the real life. But when look at any issue through a multi-dimensional view-point, the differences dissolve into an organic whole and give us a holistic view.

Take for example any object. You will find that it has infinite attributes and to know them all it requires a holistic vision incorporating infinite points of views. Each one of them is only a partial truth. The whole truth can be comprehended only through an integrated vision. Further, it is also true that one can know the truth in its entirety, but it cannot be described in words, since all the vocal expressions are conditioned by the limitation of a particular stance or the direction of vision. Therefore, there would always be the possibility of divergent view-points or opinions on any issue. More often we get trapped into futile debates arguing for and against a view-point. This results at time into conflicts. In such wordy duals, one stream represents *anekānta* or '*sat ekānta dr̥ṣṭi*' culminating into '*ahiṃsā*' (non-violence) and the other, '*asat ekānta dr̥ṣṭi*' leading to '*hiṃsā*' (violence).

Each piece of the matter, though in itself is a replica of the whole, it manifests itself into many diverse states of existence which are infinite—'*ananta dharma*'. Even when we realise its basic integrity, it is difficult to express it due to the limitations of our fragmented etymological expression, which is relative to time, environment and the context. So every expression is a partial truth, based on which a particular doctrine is constructed. Such partial truths then start a chain of debates — pro and against. In the heat of the arguments, nobody bothers to take into account—when and in what context or sequence a particular expression was used to describe a certain thought. We may go on discussing endlessly since the ultimate truth would never be realized through the rubbing of part-truths against each other. The only way to success is through harmonization of the part-truths.

Lord Mahāvīra said—'Reality is relative' and therefore, it cannot be realised by a piece-meal approach. You need to contemplate on the relativity, that binds all the pieces together. So don't think that what you see or feel is the only truth or the whole of it. There should always be room to accommodate different view-points, and synthesize them into a comprehensive

truth. Lord Mahāvira preached—‘Do not be biased and reject any thought off hand, try to understand it through *Anekāntika* vision. Thus ‘*Ahiṃsā*’ starts at the very beginning of the thought process in Jainism.

—xxx—

## PHILOSOPHICAL EXPOSITION OF JAINISM

Since time immemorial the question—"What is truth?" is being asked and debated vehemently. We see an earthen pot. Its shape is a physical reality for some time, but some other day by accident or wear and tear it turns itself into soil of the mother earth. Now, what is the true state of it, which is the everlasting state of it—pot or clay? Jain philosophers have resolved this issue by suggesting that we look at each of the two states not in a fragmented way but as an integrated whole, which is possible only through *Anekānta* i.e., a multi-faceted point of view. There are two ways to look at a thing—(A) *Dravyarthika* or substantial (describing a thing only with respect to its ultimate substance) and—(B) *Paryāyārthika* or modal (description based on modifications or change of modes). In other words, the two are called '*Niścaya-dṛṣṭi*' (transcendental view) and '*Vyavahāra-dṛṣṭi*' (empirical view) respectively. When we correlate both views, we find that in both states, i.e., pot and soil, the '*paramāṇu*', which is the ultimate indivisible unit of the physical substance remains intact while the change takes place in the form only. The Jain philosophy believes that the '*pudgala*' i.e., the physical substance, which is the substratum of all physical objects, would always remain '*pudgala*' since no change in the substance itself would be possible. However, the process of transformation which goes on every moment in any substance enables it to take different forms.



The basic element in the matter and its changing states both remain and work in unison. Both co-exist. The former is realised by the '*Dravyārthika Naya*' and the latter by the '*Paryāyārthika Naya*'. The latter is concerned with the 'change' as the reality, while the former with the view which always catches only the 'permanence' as the reality. Buy to adhere to only one of them would be only a partial view. The two cannot be separated.

Now, regarding the lop-sided views, the Jain philosophers state that we can not manage the affairs of this world only on the basis of the lop-sided views. For, there are three aspects of our worldly affairs—'*Pravṛtti*' (indulgence)—'*Nivṛtti*' (abstinence) and '*Taṭasthata*' (neutrality). We indulge in any activity to attain happiness; we abstain from whatever is painful; we remain neutral if there is neither happiness nor pain. As this trinity of activity, non-activity and neutrality comprise our worldly affairs, so also creation, cessation and permanence cause happiness to one, pain to another, and neither of the two i.e., neutrality for the third one, respectively. An illustration would make the idea clear. Once three persons simultaneously approached a goldsmith. They wanted to buy a golden crown, a golden jar and pure gold in any form respectively. At that time, the goldsmith was busy in manufacturing a golden crown which he was moulding from the gold obtained from an old golden jar. When the three persons went there, the one who wanted the crown was very happy that the crown was being made; the second who wanted the golden jar was very sad to see that the jar was broken; the third one was interested only in buying gold irrespective of its form, so he remained neutral—neither happy nor sad. Application of this illustration is required to understand the trinity of creation, cessation and permanence.

If there is no change in the world we cannot survive and maintain the continuity of life. The Jain philosophy explained through the two *nayas* this phenomena in respect of the '*pudgala*', which changes its forms continuously but still maintains its identity as '*pudgala*'.

Any object or a thing has two attributes—first is its integrated state as a whole and the other is its ability to break into innumerable fragments. Comprehending the whole the synthetic view—that is ‘*Dravya Dṛṣṭi*’ and to look at things in piecemeal way is the ‘*Paryāya Dṛṣṭi*’. An earthen lamp burns continuously, although the flames come and go one after the other. So is the case with water flowing into a river. It is the theory of relativity which combines the two features—‘*Dravya*’ and ‘*Paryāya*’. We can thus explain the duality of ‘*Pudgala*’ alongwith its basic integrity, only by adopting the ‘*Anekānta*’, the multi-angular vision, which takes into account the relativity. Jainism proclaims:—

*“Je egaṃ jāṇai se savvaṃ jāṇai,  
Je savvaṃ jāṇai se egaṃ jāṇai.”*

“He who knows one, knows all and the vice-versa.”

Our world is united through various kinds of relationships. ‘*Vasudhaiva kuṭumbakam*’ means—the world is like a family. It is a great philosophical exposition. It can be realized only through a synergie of both view-points—physical and intrinsic. The Jain philosophers have described the two as ‘*Vyavahāra Naya*’ (practical view) and ‘*Niścaya Naya*’ (scientific view) respectively. When you merge the view-points which you get from both the ‘*Nayas*’, you can then comprehend the truth in its entirety. This is ‘*Anekānta*’—the all comprehensive view, through which the Truth is realised and expressed scientifically.

## THE WORLD AND ITS CREATOR

The nature of the world, that we live in is shrouded in mystery. Since time immemorial, the philosophers and the scientists of different schools and streams have tried their best to unfold this mystery. “Who created this world? Why? When? and How!”—these questions have been asked time and again.

If we subscribe to the view that the world is a creation, then the creator has to be somebody different than the world. A question would then be asked—“from where he came and is there another world”? There is a wide difference of opinion among the philosophers about the basic attributes of ‘God’, who is believed to be the Creator of this world. But if the Creator is regarded to be an embodiment of pure consciousness, how come his creation should have both the characteristics i.e., sentience as well as insentience? How come this dichotomy? Another vital question would surface then. In order to make something, the Creator has to collect some raw material. Did that come from this world or from some other one? Similarly, if we believe that the world is made out of God’s own properties, then it is not a new creation but only an extension or new modification of the original stuff.

The Jain philosophers did not wish to tread this futile path in imagining such questions and trying to answer them. They maintained that the world is not a Creation by anybody like God. It just exists there since infinity and would remain so for ever.

However one should not confuse between the cosmic world and the physical entities like earth, sun, moon or other galaxies. They come into being and also get liquidated in order to take a new form. The '*Jagat*' (World), as a philosophical terms, denotes that original entity which consists of both the living and non-living substances in cosmic sense of the term.

The Jain philosophers explained the above doctrine of '*Jagat*' through three statements:-

(1) There is duality since the world is composed of both living and non-living stuff.

(2) It is '*Pañcāstikāya*' i.e., it has five fundamental realities as under—

(A) Medium of motion (*Dharmāstikāya*)

(B) Medium of rest (*Adharmāstikāya*)

(C) Space (*Ākāśa*)

(D) Physical matter and physical energy (*Pudgala*)

(E) Soul (*Jīva*)

(3) However since '*Jagat*' is composed of six '*Dravyas*' (fundamental substances), so one more is added to the five *astikāyas* mentioned as above and that is '*Kāla*' (Time).

What we can see of this '*Jagat*' through our eyes is the manifestation or extention of only three of the six substances mentioned above. They are: the medium of motion, medium of rest and space, which are non-physical, and hence, imperceptible. But that does not mean that what we don't see is not '*Jagat*'. In fact, we see a mixed product comprising of *Jīva* (the soul) and '*Pudgala*' (the matter). We do not see either of them in its original form. The original form of '*Pudgala*' is '*Paramāṇu*' (atom). We can not see it, as it is beyond the capacity of reach of our sensory perceptive power. Similarly, there is no physical image of '*Ātmā*'—the soul, which is nothing but the pure consciousness.

The Jain philosophy believes that the '*ātma*' (soul) in its purest form is God. It does not take any human or physical form. Jainism does not recognise God as the Creator of this world. Being *Ātmā*, we all have the potential to become God and in that sense, all of us—the living beings, who have consciousness, are God in ourselves. Jainism can not, therefore, be placed in either of the two straight philosophical jackets—viz., 'Believers in God' or the 'Non-believers'. When '*Ātmā*' and '*Pudgala*' are in unison, they create vital energy—the '*Prāṇa*'. It is the '*Prāṇa*' which breathes, takes in food etc.. Neither '*Ātmā*' alone nor '*Pudgala*' alone can breathe, eat etc.. In that sense we are a composite existence of both—living and non-living substances. Our composite existence is not an independent entity. As far as the pure existence is concerned, both the '*Jīva*' and the '*Pudgala*' are independently existing entities. In that sense, they are at par.

The '*Vedānta*' philosophy recognises only the conscious or the living element. The '*Cārvāka*', speaks just the opposite of it, as it recognises only matter as the ultimate real substance. Even soul is nothing but a transformation of the matter, according to the Chārvāka. In that context, the Jain philosophy can be termed as 'dualist', as it recognises independent existence of both living and non-living elements (*Jīva* & *Ajīva* including *Pudgala*). It says that same importance may be given to both, as they belong to the same family and also work in perfect co-ordination with each other. The doctrines of '*Ahiṃsā*' (non-violence), '*Maitri*' (amity) and '*Samyama*' (self-restraint), which are the hallmarks of Jainism, emerge out of the recognition of one single aspect of substance viz., '*dravyatva*', consisting of both '*Jīva* & *Pudgala*'. One has to refrain from '*hiṃsā*' of both '*Jīva*' and '*Ajīva*': one has to practice '*samyama*' with respect to both '*Jīva*' and '*Ajīva*'. The Jain philosophers hold that not only the living beings but even non-living matter also form apart of this world. Since they work together in unison, they do not fight with each other as separate entities. There is bound to be harmony among different elements in the world, as they have to co-exist. So both independence and interdepen-

dence ~~simultaneously~~ work hand in glove and they bind us all into one family of existence.

Jainism pleads that one must try to know oneself. And to know that, he must know the world (*Jagat*) equally well. We are not only this physical body that we bear, but a combination of both—the physical matter and the consciousness. It is this consciousness which enables us to realise our ownself.

The Jain philosophical thought recommends adoption of a two-pronged strategy for self-realization: First to use the '*Jñā-parijñā*' (i.e., Supercomprehension) in order to acquire knowledge and thereafter to allow the 'known' to guide our actions through '*Pratyākhyāna-parijñā*', (i.e., Reasoning Power of Renunciation)—the wisdom that guides our actions. It means that you have to differentiate between what could be accepted and what has to be abandoned.

The God is not a separate entity than what we are. We have him within us. What is required is that we make an endeavour to realise him and thus we attain the state of '*Sat, Cit, Ānanda*' (Reality, Consciousness and Bliss).

## 6

### **SRṢṬIVĀDA** (Cosmogony)

As mentioned in the earlier chapter, from time immemorial, in the annals of human civilization, questions have been raised such as—who created this world, when and how it took its shape, what is the basic substance that it is made of and how does it remain elementally the same when there is the constant process of change and evolution? These cosmogonical questions have been constantly haunting man's inquisitiveness. Different philosophical schools have probed these questions and come out with their own theories. Jainism has also contributed its bit to explain the phenomena related to the creation of the world. Jain philosophers came to following conclusions:

(1) There is no Creator of this world. It is eternal.

(2) The world is made of two basic ingredients – *Jīva* (living being) and *Ajīva* (non-living entity). When these two intermingle, they take a certain form, which is this world.

(3) Existence of the world is a beginningless(*anādi*) phenomena. Nobody can assert when it came into being. Elementally or Substantially speaking, neither anything can be added to what exists nor anything can be subtracted from it. The world would remain so for ever. Thus there is neither any starting point nor there would be a final stage of dissolution. No

theory could, therefore, be derived out of logic or through philosophical acrobatics about the Creation of the world.

(4) How was the world formed? Jain philosophy holds that when the two ingredients *Jīva-Ajīva* get together, they set into motion a process of geometrical progression resulting in what we call growth or expansion, which is manifested in innumerable forms or shapes that we see in our world.

(5) What are the basic elements of the world? The answer to this question would be—both *Jīva & Ajīva* are basic elements. The world is their expanse. When the two ingredients get together in synthetic interaction, they generate an energy known as '*vyañjana paryāya*' (synthetic transformation). '*Paryāyas*' (transformations) are of two kinds i.e., '*svabhāva*' (natural spontaneous type of transformation) and '*vyañjana*'. The former creates new shapes out of its own independent process, whereas in the case of the latter, the change occurs due to the interplay of the substances of different nature coming together. For example, water is the result of interaction between oxygen and hydrogen. (Water is not a fundamental substance).

We see that the world is evolving every moment. This expansion manifests itself into varied forms, colours, shapes etc. It is due to the synthetic transformation—'*vyañjana paryāya*' of *Jīva & Ajīva*. The entire expansion of the world is synthetic; the fundamental substances we have innumerable things in this world. For example, a question may arise "what is a building?" It is clear that it is not a fundamental substance, but is a synthetic transformation of different substances as such as brick, stone, cement, iron etc.. Again, what is soil or earth? It is the synthetic transformation of some living organisms and some matter. In the same way, water, fire, air and vegetation—all are the synthetic transformation of some living organisms and some matter. The same is true for the insects etc. and even upto the human being. None of them are exclusively made of either living or non-living. This view of the Jain philosophy, that it tries to explain the creation



with only two factors—*Jīva-Ajīva*, is at variance with other commonly held philosophical doctrines. Most of them hold that the creation has five basic ingredients—earth, water, air, fire and space. As per Jain terminology, out of these five, the first four are part of the duo—*Jīva & Ajīva* and the last one i.e., ‘*Ākāśa*’ (space) has its independent existence. In nutshell, it can be said that the whole world is an explicit synthetic transformation of *jīvas* and *puṅgalas*—a play of *vyāñjana paryāya*. Again, let us understand it by another illustration. Cow-milk is a product of grass eaten by a cow. Now, if a question is asked—“From where milk has come?” Whether milk’s existence is in the cow? Or is it in the grass? If it is in the cow, it cannot be produced by the grass. If it is in the grass, then what’s the use of cow? It means that milk is synthetic product in which both are inevitable—the cow and the grass.

(6) The sixth crucial question is whether the synthetic world constantly undergoes absolute change through ‘*vyāñjana paryāya*’? The Jain philosophers say—“No”. Actually, there are three factors characterising every *Jīva* and *Ajīva*—‘*dhrauvya*’ (continuity), which works alongside the other two viz., ‘*utpāda*’ and ‘*vyaya*’ (creation and destruction). Everything is prone to change, there is one element that is not amenable to any change. It has been identified as the ‘*dhrauvya*’. The Vedic philosophers believed that when creation is destroyed, the residue goes back to the basic stuff, which they regard as ‘*Brāhman*’ or ‘*God*’. Perhaps the difference between the two expressions of the Vedic and the Jain is only the nomen-clature. Considered minutely, it is the same thing i.e., three factors, viz., ‘*utpād*’, ‘*vyaya*’ and ‘*dhrauvya*’ in Jain terminology have been described as creation and destruction, finally settling down in ‘*Brahma*’ (permanence) of Vedic terminology.

(7) The seventh question is—when did this world come into being? The answer is—it exists since the existence of ‘*Jīva—Ajīva*’. The cosmos is composed of innumerable galaxies and planets. Modern science has testified to all this. Similarly, life on earth has also undergone changes many a time. Creatures, who had

lived on our earth millions of years back have become extinct. The animal world must have undergone innumerable changes. Even the man must have undergone many changes before his present shape and size has been achieved. In Jain scriptures, we get description of some species which have bizaree shape and size. For example, at a particular place called “56 islands”, there were humans who had a partial body like a house with a tail, while the remaining portion like humans.

According to the modern science, matter is composed of molecules, which are made out of transmutation of atoms. According to the Jain philosophy a thing is created either by ‘*saṅghāta*’ (integration) or by ‘*bheda*’ (disintegration). The Jain philosophers have developed their own terminology to explain all these phenomena—such as ‘*anādi pāriṇāmika*’ and ‘*sādi pāriṇāmika*’. While the first denotes eternity as the continuous process of transformation, the second term means the transient nature of things, which takes a certain shape at a certain time. The first is ‘*viśva*’ (the universe) and the second is ‘*sṛṣṭi*’ (the creation).

The ultimate cause (*mūla hetu*) of all ‘*sādi-pāriṇāmika*’ creations could be covered in eight types of ‘*vargaṇās*’ (categories of matter) as under :

- (1) *Audārika* (Organic or gross body of creatures)
- (2) *Vaikriyā* (Protean body)
- (3) *Āhāraka* (Micro-telecommunication body)
- (4) *Taijas* (Bio-electrical energy)
- (5) *Kārmana* (Subtlemost body made of *karma pudgala*)
- (6) *Śvāsośvās* (Micro-matter useful for breathing)
- (7) *Bhāṣā* (Micro-matter useful for speech)
- (8) *Manovargaṇā* (Micro-matter useful for mental processes such as thinking, etc.)

Some Jain philosophers who in later periods wrote commentaries on the “Jain Āgamas” have given different counts about the number of ‘*vargaṇās*’ in their works like ‘*dhavḷā*’, ‘*Viśeṣāvaśyaka Bhāṣya*’ etc..

Ācārya Kundkunda has made six divisions of the ‘*skandha*’ (aggregates of matter):

- (1) *Ati sthūla* (Super gross e.g. earth)
- (2) *Sthūla* (Gross e.g. water)
- (3) *Sthūla sūkṣma* (Gross-cum-minute e.g. shadow)
- (4) *Sūkṣma sthūla* (Minute-cum-gross e.g. Feeling created by 4 sense-organs other than the eye).
- (5) *Sūkṣma* (Minute e.g. *Kārmaṇa vargaṇā skandha*)
- (6) *Ati sūkṣma* (Super minute e.g. the ultimate atom of *paramāṇu*)

As per the modern science, all matter is corpuscular (composed of particles), while the energy is in the wave-form or undulatory in nature, that is, which is in the form of the waves like the waves in flowing water. Both can transform themselves into each other. According to the Jain philosophy, ‘*kaṇa*’ i.e. particle or ‘*skandha*’ is a mode of the *pudgala dravya* and therefore it is subject to change. In each substance, after a certain period, change is inevitable. Sometimes the change is the result of the external cause or the ‘*nimmitta*’ i.e. circumstantial, whereas at other times, it is just a natural phenomena. Through this process a myriad variety of forms and features are created in this universe.

## NIYATI & PURUṢĀRTHA

### (Universal Laws & Self-exertion)

Is the man totally independent in making his own '*Puruṣārtha*' i.e., self-exertion undertaken by exercising free will. That is to say—Has he got the freedom to decide what he may like to do? Or is he forced by the circumstances, or by the dictates of destiny or fate? In the Jain philosophical terminology, '*Niyati*' means Universal Laws that apply universally without fail. In common parlance, however, people understand "fatalism" or "destiny" by the word '*Niyati*'; but in Jainism, it is not so. '*Niyati*' or the Universal Laws (of Nature) do not subscribe to any kind of fatalism. This question has been discussed over a very long period in the philosophical debates. The Jain philosophy believes that '*Puruṣārtha*' and '*Niyati*' should not be placed as antithesis. They are, in fact, relative to each other. Each one has its limited scope and a specific role in man's life. Similar is the case in respect of Time (*Kāla*), Nature (*Svabhāva*) and *Karma*,\* which affect our deeds. So nothing can be said in absolute terms as to what is the main and what is subsidiary. The factors that govern our life are multiple and they have their own limitations and subjectivity. They operate not in isolation but in tandem with each

---

\* Karma is again a specific technical term of the Jain philosophy. Whereas, it connotes 'action' in other schools of thought, in Jainism, it stands for very minute *Pudgalas* which cling to *Jiva*, and bear fruits,

other. '*Puruṣārtha*' and '*Niyati*' are complementary to each other and operate in their own spheres.

'*Niyati*' means Universal Law which applies in all situations including life and death. But all laws of the nature are not universal and therefore, there would definitely be some scope for the man to act according to his own will. It is also seen that '*Puruṣārtha*' and '*Niyati*', while they operate in their own respective spheres, are complementary to each other. Jainism believes that '*Puruṣārtha*' is the key factor, through which a man can transform himself. It can also shape his '*Bhāgya*' or destiny and bring about circumstances, which affect his life. A lot of emphasis is, therefore laid by Jain philosophy on '*Puruṣārtha*', alongwith other factors like Time, Nature, *Karma* and '*Niyati*', all of which play their respective role in man's life. These five factors working together are known as '*Samavāya*'— the cumulative force. Jainism regards '*Puruṣārtha*' as the principal factor that shapes life. *Puruṣārtha* is also the motivation for *Karma*.

In relative sense, we may state that the Jain is the propounder of the Doctrine of '*Puruṣārtha*'. According to it, the '*Puruṣa*' (soul or man) is neither a toy in the hands of '*Niyati*' (Universal Law) or *Bhāgya* (Destiny or Fate); nor even everything is controlled by *Karma*. As stated above, it is the '*Puruṣārtha*' that builds the system of *Karma*. One should be very clear about the limitations of the power of *Karma* or '*Niyati*'.

Some people say: "Whatever is destined in *Bhāgya* (Fate) is bound to happen." Jainism however does not conform to such absolutistic statements. If we enthrone *Karma* or *Bhāgya* i.e., Destiny (Fate) on the seat of God, then what is sense in denying the theist conviction that man is a mere puppet in the hands of God or Almighty? Therefore, it would be absolutely wrong to believe that *Karma* is everything or whole and sole. *Karma* is not the Universal Sovereign.

The above stated concept would also raise a few questions: Who guides '*Puruṣārtha*'? 'What for it is done and to whom it is

addressed to?’ The Jain philosophy does not recognise the institution of ‘God’ as a supreme authority which rules over the world and its entire existence. In that case, one has to answer another question. In the absence of God who would that authority be to serve as the role model or icon to be emulated or followed by the worldly men? The answer lies in the following formulation. Although the Jain tradition does not subscribe to the view that ‘God’ is the Creator of this world, yet it regards ‘Him’ as a living model or an ideal icon in the form of ‘*Arhats*’, not only one but infinite numbers i.e. those who have attained perfection in their mortal lives. There is this famous adoration to *Arhats* in ‘*Namokār Mahāmantra*’—“*Namo Arhaṇtāṇaṃ*’. They are those who have attained total perfection in all virtues, knowledge and capabilities. They are the role models or ideals who manifest in themselves unlimited knowledge, wisdom, energy and bliss. Jains naturally try to emulate the ‘*Arhats*’ so far as ‘*Puruṣārtha*’ is concerned.

The Jain philosophy believes in synergy between knowledge and conduct. An *Ācārya* is the symbol of the right conduct, while an ‘*Upādhyāya*’ is an embodiment of knowledge. Knowledge and conduct together make the two-pronged strategy to reach ‘*Arhathood*’. A practitioner regulates his conduct and acquires knowledge through *sādhanā*. A ‘*Sādhu*’ is a symbol of *Sādhanā*. Jainism also lays special emphasis on ‘*bhakti*’ (Devotion) alongwith the faith.

‘*Bhakti*’ means complete surrender at the feet of our ideal, i.e. the *Arhat*, *Siddhas*, *Sādhus*, and also to the preachings of *Kevalis* (omniscients) who have attained total perfection in perception of knowledge. Jainism believes that through the process of transformation, a man turns himself into God. In that sense, Jainism is different from other religions, where devotees seek benevolence from the God who is the Almighty and the Creator of all.

There is, thus, full scope in Jainism for “faith” or “devotion” as well as “capacity of one’s own soul to get it evolved to perfection”, i.e., the scope for complete freedom or independence.

Both “dedication” and “independence” go together. Again, dedication does not mean complete merger into a greater entity. There is a world of difference in the beliefs of Jainism and other religions. ‘A “*nara*” (i.e., human being) transforms himself into “*nārāyaṇa*” (i.e., God)’,—is the doctrine of Jainism, which is quite different from others which believe that a *nara* gets himself merged entirely into *nārāyaṇa*.

The Jain philosophy believes that there are infinite number of souls in this world and all of them are independent of each other. All have the potential to develop themselves into God. This postulation of Jainism is different from the belief of many other religions in the sense that a ‘believer’ as per Jain terminology does not try to reach a particular God, treating him as a different entity than his own. It is through ‘*Puruṣārtha*’ that each soul can attain that highest state of perfection, which is signified by the term God. Those who devote their entire lives to reach that state are called ‘*Sādhus*’ (ascetic). The common men who can devote only a part of their attention in the pursuit of attaining the state of perfection are called ‘*Śrāvaka*’ (lay followers). They are the people who are involved in the varied chores of social life. Nevertheless they are devoted to the ‘*Arhat*’ as their ideal. Besides, each individual has his own measure of potential strengths, which he invests into his *Sādhana*. Similarly, he has limitations also, due to which he encounters impediments in his *Sādhana*.

Non-attachment to sensual objects is the key for such *Sādhana*. The main obstacles in *Sādhana* arise out of the cravings or desires for food, fear, sex etc., and possessions, anger, ego, attachment and greed. A *Sādhu/Muni* is supposed to overcome these follies in full measure, but for a normal household it is not possible to achieve that perfection.

A *Sādhaka* (spiritual practitioner) ought to develop non-attachment to the physical objects, with which he lives in the real world. Lord Mahāvira prescribed the practice of various

‘Anuprekṣās’\* such as *anitya* (transient nature of worldly things & relations), *aśaraṇa* (lack of protection or refuge in the world), *ekatva* (Solitary nature of soul), *anyatva* (separation of soul from everything external). They help to lessen the impact of the worldly factors that create bondages for the soul. Bharata Chakravarti attained that state of perfection (by practising *anitya anuprekṣā* and become a *kevali*).

The example of Bharat Chakravarti is very significant in the sense that here is a case where a man achieves ‘*kaivalya*’ without going through the formal course of practising asceticism. The secret lies in his ‘*nirlepata*’—internal non-involvement in the worldly objects. Lord Mahāvira says—“*Gārathā sanjomottara*”—“some ordinary and worldly men can achieve even higher state than the practitioner of ‘*Samyama*’ (self-restraint).

The Lord has prescribed *dharma* for the ‘*Grhasthas*’ as well as for the ‘*munis*’. For the layman, he advises—‘*pariṣkāra*’ (moderation) of ‘*icchā*’ (desire), ‘*parigraha*’ (possessiveness) and ‘*lobha*’ (greed). The practical form of the *pariṣkāra* is—

- (1) Purity of means of livelihood
- (2) Voluntarily limiting the consumption of things.

Similarly the internal practice of *parigraha* (non-possessiveness) is non-clinging to possessions; the practical *sūtra* is purity of means and self-restraint on consumption.

The Jain Philosophy has given us very valuable tips on ‘*ahiṃsā*’ (non-violence). The internal practice of *ahiṃsā* is—*bhāva-suddhi* (purification of emotions), and development of *maitri* (amity) and the practical *sūtra* is—shunning of avoidable violence. The Jain Philosophy lays great emphasis on control on desires and urges through self-restraint, which is the foundation of all spiritual development.

---

\* *Anuprekṣā* is a practical technique of concentration of mind on positive thinking to comprehend the eternal truths and become free from delusion etc.



Jainism believes that though opportunities are equal but it is not possible for all souls to attain '*kaivalya*'. For the householders, Lord Mahāvira preached that they should make their efforts for bringing about their own transmutation and should try to control the cravings and greed. A stage would then be reached when one would be able to discriminate between the good and the bad, and choose his means judiciously. Non-violence is another very important aspect of the code of conduct preached by Lord Mahāvira. It means purification of emotions, development of friendliness to all and shunning avoidable violence.

When the basic instincts that lead to violence are curbed, the potential power of self-restraint would manifest itself, and with its help, one can safely sail through the journey of '*dharma*'. Self-restraint is the key to attain many virtues like equanimity etc..

It is the lack of self-restraint among man, which has led to excessive consumerism, resulting in all kinds of tensions that afflict our lives today. Materialism and consumerism go hand in hand. The more intensified becomes the greed and sexual desires, the more intensified becomes the tension. If you allow your unrestraint to grow, you will necessarily increase your tension; if there is internal fire of greediness and lust, how could you keep your kind to remain cool and calm? The whole chain of psychosomatic diseases like hypertension, heart-trouble ulcer, or may be even cancer are the result of unrestraint.

Jainism stands on the foundation of spirituality. It puts faith in devotion towards the ideal, but does not believe in any kind of rituals. There are four *Puruṣārthas*—*Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* & *Mokṣa*, which have been mentioned in Indian philosophical literature. While *Artha* & *Kāma* (Money and Worldly Desire) may be necessary to a certain extent for sustaining the life, *Dharma* and *Mokṣa* are very important, as they are the auspicious ones and also have the capacity to regulate the former two. when the latter

two have the upper hand, they can do the *pariṣkāra* of the former two, which would ultimately result in the right unison of all the four *puruṣārthas*, and which in turn allow a smooth running of the life's vehicle.

Conclusively, we can say that let man make an endeavour—in the field of *dharma* to attain *mokṣa*, and in the field of *artha* and *kāma* by dominating them with *dharma* in such a way that the social life does not get disturbed by the problems, as well as the solutions to the problems are attained smoothly.

—xxx—

## PRATYAYAVĀDA & VASTUVĀDA ( Idealism & Realism )

As per Jain philosophy, we have two kinds of existence—one is *Parama Astitva* (Transcendental Existence) and the other is *Apara Astitva* (Empirical Existence). The idealist school of philosophers, particularly the *Vedāntins* and the Buddhists do not accept *Apara Astitva* as real. They regard that there is nothing else in existence other than the consciousness itself. The Western philosophers like Kant, Fichte, Shelling, Hegel, Green, James Ward etc. also hold the same view.

On the other hand *Vastuvādis* (Realists) regard physical existence as real. According to them, the empirical reality exists independently of the consciousness. Other Indian philosophies like *Sāṅkhya* and *Vaiśeṣika* hold the same view. The Western philosophers viz., Reed, Hamilton and Bertrand Russell and others also hold similar views.

On this issue, the Jain philosophers have followed a distinct line. They regard that there is only partial truth in both i.e. *Vastuvāda* and *Pratyayavāda* and both of them are true only relatively. The Jain philosophers suggest an amendment to the aphorisms formed by *Pratyayavādis*, by putting them in a slightly different way. Instead of saying that there is nothing outside consciousness, one can say that nothing exists beyond existence. The 'existence' is a unit combining both the living and non-living,

which is not the case with consciousness. Both *Jīva* and *Ajīva* can be parts of the existence, but the latter could not be a part of the former. By accommodating the both as parts of existence, the divergence between Idealism and Realism is automatically resolved. It would complicate matters if we say that the non-living is merely a reflection of the living. But if they are regarded as parts of existence, then there is no problem. Consciousness is the dividing line between *Jīva* and *Ajīva*, while existence is a compact formation and there is no duality left. This way, we can justify the views of Idealists (*Pratyayavādis*) too.

When put simply—"It (*sat*) exists", it denotes '*Parama Astitva*', whereas when we say—"a particular thing exists"—it is '*Apara Astitva*' (empirical existence). In the case of *Param Astitva*, there is no division between *dravya* (substance) and *paryāya* (its various modes). In case of *Apara Astitva*, there would always be divisions on account of various modes and their infinite numbers. In *dravya* (substance), there are two basic qualities—'*sāmānya*' (general) and *viśeṣa* (particular). One without the other cannot exist. The former maintains the existence of the substance, whereas the latter invests it with independent properties.

How certain things appear to our eyes is conditioned by our approach? If we adopt '*sāmānya darśana*' or generic view-point, and accept its general qualities, we see '*Param Astitva*'. But when we look at particular qualities through a particular view-point—*Viśiṣṭa Darśana*, it is *Apara-Astitva*. Such divisions are always there due to diversity in our approaches. There is partial truth in both the *Pratyayavāda* and *Vastuvāda*, but they are not contradictory to each other. The former is trying to prove that it is only the *caitanya* (consciousness), which is everlasting, whereas the latter is trying to say that *caitanya* (consciousness) and *vastu* (matter) are independent of each other.

According to the realists, the 'object of knowledge' (*jñeya*) and the 'knower' (*jñātā*) are two distinct entities and that is

why there is a relationship between them. Although the existence of *jñeya* depends upon the knowledge, yet we cannot say that it has come into existence only when the *jñātā* knows it; neither it is created when known, nor it ceases to exist when not known.

'*Pratyayavādis*' argue that if *jñeya* (the object to be known) is independent of the knower then it should look same to everybody. But that does not happen. Different people conceive or perceive the same thing in diverse ways and forms. This diversity is due to subjectivity of the knower.

This argument holds little water. Our knowledge is always relative, since it is conditioned by place, time, view, motion, subjectivity etc.. This explains the logic that has been used by *Vastuvādi* thinkers, who hold that the existence is not the product of our thought; it is there, of its own. Bertrand Russell has put this very succinctly—"If we conceive a tree in our mind, it is only a thought; its real existence is only in the external world."

Our mind represents the 'knower'. The object to be known is different from the knower and it is because of that only, that there can be relationship between the two i.e.,—'knower' and 'known'. F.C.S. Shiller concedes this view, although he is a *Pratyayavādi*—an Idealist. The *Anekānta* doctrine of Jainism has conceived the theory of '*Jatyantara*', which regards that identity or difference are not independent attributes of the substance. In fact, they are inter-related and therefore, inter-dependent. The basic source is existence. It is not dependent on knower's capacity. It is inter-relationship, through which we realize the existence of a thing. Any substance exists on its own, whether we know about it or not. The discovery of the Atom was achieved when the knowledge about it was developed, but its existence was there by itself and it was not dependent on our knowledge about it. The basic source is the same i.e. the existence. So far as both the knower and the thing to be known are concerned, any relationship between them is possible only if there is existence, and not otherwise.

In our world, we have not only *pudgala* (matter) but also the *cetana dravya* (the conscious substance). Since each soul (*Ātmā*), is independent of the other souls, it is both—the ‘knower’ and ‘to be known’. The soul is capable of having both the attributes—‘*jñāta*’ and ‘*jñeya*’. The renowned philosopher Kant has very aptly described this phenomena. “A thought should not be treated as a thing.” The same thing can be said about its opposite formulation. So by subscribing to ‘*Anekānta*’, we can analyse ‘*vicāra*’ (thought) and ‘*vastu*’ (thing) together in a relative perspective.

Shelling, even though he is a *Pratyayavādi* (Idealist), accepts that *Ātmā*, the soul, and *Anātmā*, (the physical matter), are complementary to each other. ‘*Anekānta*’ supports this view. The *Sat* (the real) must have an antithesis. The external and the perishable both are integral parts of the ultimate truth i.e. existence. Both Idealism and Realism in their absolute form are thus mere illusions. When they complement each other, they become the expression of Truth. If we adopt a relative approach, both *Vastuvāda* and *Pratyayavāda* seem to be speaking about the same truth. On one hand, there is the *Param Astitva* and on the other, there are ‘*Vastu*’ (things), which have diverse forms. Although both are interspersed, yet in order to analyse them we have to accept their independence. This is the theory of relativity in perceiving things, which is the corner stone of *Anekānta Darśana*.

If there is no antithesis, the thesis itself could not exist. In such condition, *Vastuvāda* is also a partial truth. Both *Pratyayavāda* and *Vastuvāda* would become parts of non-truth, if they are absolutist, and become parts of truth, if they are mutually relative. If we do not accept the *Parama Astitva*, we cannot explain the matter or *Vastu* and the fundamental root of its mutual relations. On the other hand, if we deny independence of *Vastu*, it would not be possible for us to explain its special attributes. Only by accepting the relativity of the independence of the *Parama Astitva* and *Vastu*, we can explain both of them consistently.

## SYĀDVĀDA & ANEKĀNTA (Relativism & Non-absolutism)

The Jain philosophy is essentially a realistic philosophy. It interprets the world on the basis of five '*astikāya*' (real extended existence). For explaining the concept of '*astikāya*', it has adopted the logic of '*Anekānta*' i.e., multifaceted approach, also known as 'Non-absolutism'. '*Syādvāda*' is the style of interpretation that is used by '*Anekānta*' in presenting its theory. In that sense, the end objective of both is the same, although they differ in functional approach.

'*Nayavāda*' (the doctrine of stand-point) is no doubt a partial view, but it does not oppose other points of views, and therefore, it serves as the foundation of '*Anekānta*'. Lord Mahāvīra used the concept of two *nayas* (stand-points) for explaining the concept of '*astikāya*' (real existence). They are '*dravyārthika naya*' (substantial stand-point) i.e., describing a thing with a view-point of its underlying substance and '*paryāyārthika naya*' (modal stand-point) i.e. the description of an object based on its modifications or changing modes. The '*astikāyas*' are eternal i.e., without a beginning or an end. But simultaneously they are constantly evolving and taking different forms, which again are subject to change. In order to accept this duality in the attributes of '*astikāya*', one needs to develop a synergy between different aspects. That is why we need to take recourse to '*anekānta*', as a philosophical doctrine.

Both the 'Jain' and the 'Sāṅkhya' philosophers believe in dualism. But 'Anekānta' does not stop there. It goes further in its exploration of the synergies between the two paradoxically opposite attributes. 'Syādvāda' is, in fact, the exposition of that holistic outlook of 'Anekānta'. Hence, Jainism could be termed in one sense, as the monistic philosophy. The philosophy of *Vedānta* believes in the ultimate state of *Brahma*. On the other hand 'saṅgraha naya' i.e. the generic stand-point of 'Anekānta' would call it 'existence', (*sat*), without making any division between living and the non-living. It is the sum total of both living and the non-living elements. 'Anekānta' works on the principle of relativity and accepts both the opposites like *Jīva* and *Ajīva*. 'Bhūtādvaitavāda' (Materialistic Monism) and 'Caitanyādvaitavāda' (Spiritualistic Monism) both recognise only living and non-living entities respectively. But the 'saṅgraha naya', (generic stand-point) while recognizing their existence, regards their difference as peripheral and not substantive. Therefore, it would not be correct to signify the possibility of alternatives in 'Anekāntika' view, by merely counting the numbers of such alternatives. According to the Jain philosophical tradition, the basic substances are two—*Jīva* and *Ajīva*. But one can not differentiate between them in all situations. This is the key to comprehend the integral uniformity that 'Anekānta' represents. The 'Syādvāda' illustrates the above principal in following ways:

'Syāt i.e., *kathancit*'\*—with respect to a certain view-point, there is difference between 'Jīva' and 'Ajīva'.

'Syāt i.e., *kathancit*'—with respect to another view-point, there is no difference between 'Jīva' and 'Ajīva'.

Renowned Jain philosopher Ācārya Akalanka describes the 'Jīva' as '*cetanā-cetanātmaka*' i.e. having sentience and non-sentience both. It means that the soul is sentient, but Karmas

\* *Syāt* is an *avyaya* in Sanskrit grammar, which means—*kethāncit* or 'with respect to a certain view-point'. It should not be misunderstood as "may be", which is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular of the potential of *√as*—'to be'. Thus, *syādvāda* is not a form of scepticism or an indication of uncertainty.



which are *paudgalika* are non-sentient. It is '*acidātma*' (non-sentient) due to its attributes like '*prameyatva*' (i.e., the objectivity) and '*cidātma*' (sentient) because of its '*caitanya dharma*'.\*

The term '*Syād*' has often been misconstrued in the philosophical parleys. Take for instance, the comments of the renowned Buddhist Logician, *Dharmakṛti*, about the Jain Doctrine of *Syādvāda*. He has lambasted it by saying that, "the camel and the curd have their own specialities, so they would look different; how could *Syādvāda* treat them as similar or alike?" Among others, even Shankaracharya has branded *Syādvāda* as '*Samśayavāda*' (scepticism). It seems nobody has tried to penetrate deep enough into the concept of '*syād*', which denotes infinite attributes of a '*dravya*' (substance). It does not mean that the *Syādvāda* is non-commitment to any definite view expressed, or in other words, it is shying away from taking a firm position on any issue. The expression *Syād* is used only for the sake of brevity in order to encompass the expanse of infinity in one single word. It is not at all symbolic of any doubt or uncertainty.

In that sense '*Anekānta*' is not the negation of '*Ekānta*', which is partial exposition of the existence.

*Anekāntopyanekāntaḥ.*

*Syadrādanayasadhanah..*

In relative terms *Syādvāda* is a novel expression developed by the Jain philosophers to express the infinite attributes of '*dravya*' (substance). There would always be the possibility for infinite number of alternatives and modes, that any '*dravya*' can adopt. While on one hand *Syādvāda* tries to see '*pratiśedha*' (negation) of other possibilities other than the present one in any one particular mode, on the other hand it also accepts the possibility for new alternatives which can happen in a future perspective. This has been called 'Uncertainty Principle' in

---

\* *Prameyatvādibhirdharmaracidātmā cidātmakah.*  
*Jñānadarśanatas tasmād cetanācetanatmakah..*

modern physics by Heisenberg. Had such scientific principle been existent before the logicians like *Dharmakīrti* in the middle ages, they would not have mocked at the highly philosophical doctrine of *Syādvāda* in crude terminology.

To conclude the argument, one can say that the absolute division between *Jīva* and *Ajīva* as separate entities in all situations does not appear to be a sound proposition. If that was the case, how could they intermingle at times and fall apart in different times? So the best description would be, to acknowledge their relative compatibility and variance, together as a whole.

## **PARIṆĀMI NITYA** (Transitory Eternity)

Nothing in this world is static or immortal. Everything is subject to the process of change or evolution. The Jain philosophers have given a deep thought to this phenomena and they have tried to explain it through a theory called '*Pariṇāmi Nityavāda*' (Concept of 'Persistence through Change').

All the things in this world bear two attributes. The first is permanency of existence (*dhrauvya*) and the other is — its capacity to change (*pariṇāman*). So the cycle is—*utpāda* (origination), *vyaya* (extinction) and *dhrauvya* (persistence). What remains as the constant factor in the process of any change is the unifying force. It maintains the originality of the existence in spite of the continuous cycle of creation and extinction or destruction. The belief of those who have caught hold of only this view is called the theory of '*kūṭastha nitya*'. On the contrary, some other philosophers see in this cycle the prominence only of 'continuous succession of changes' like the waves in the ocean. Their view is termed as '*Kṣaṇikavāda*' (fluxism). The Jain philosophers have tried to reconcile both these attributes i.e. '*kūṭastha nitya*' and '*Kṣaṇikavāda*', by propounding the theory of '*Pariṇāmi Nityatva-vāda*'—Theory of persistence through Change.

Lord Mahāvira explained each related issue on the basis of '*Pariṇāmi Nityatva-vāda*' when he was asked whether '*ātmā*' (the

soul) and *pudgala* (the matter) both are eternal, he said that existence never ceases 'to be', in the sense that both are '*nitya*' (eternal). However, since the cycle of their modification never ends, so they are '*anitya*'. In a comprehensive sense, therefore, they are neither '*nitya*' nor '*anitya*'. So call them '*nityānitya*'. No substance ever ceases to exist and it is also true that there is a constant process of change and therefore transformation from one form/shape to another is also a fact. Any element has two '*dharmas*' (attributes)—(1) '*sahabhāvi*' (persisting) and (2) '*krama-bhāvi*' (successive). The former is called '*guṇa*' and it implies that the '*dravya*' (substance) is the eternal substance. The latter is called '*pariyāya*', which denotes movement or capacity to change.

'*Dravya*' is the basis of '*pariyāya*'. What we perceive through our senses is only the '*pariyāya*' and not the basic element of anything, because we know a thing based on what we see, hear or touch through our senses. Thus there are infinite varieties of '*pariyāya*' that we encounter in this world without ever coming across the '*dravya*' in its elemental form. There is an eternal element (*dravya*) in which the process of transformation takes place. It is not outside that element.

When we consider *pariṇamana* (the process of change), we find that either it is caused by its own nature or by the external intervention, in which case the cause and effect relationship works. '*Pariṇamana*' is a continuous process correlated to 'Time' which is the intrinsic factor governing the changes in modes. Some of them are microscopic and we cannot perceive them through our senses. Some philosophers believe that our world is God's Creation. But on this issue, the Jains believe that it is the outcome of inter-relationship between '*jīvana tattva*' (living or conscious element) and the *pudgala* (physical matter). Whatever manifests to us, whether it is creation, development or the destruction, is the effect of this relationship between conscious element (*Jīva*) & the physical matter (*Ajīva*), which is effected by *kāla* (time). What

is manifested through changing modes or situations is influenced by the external causes also. The entire phenomena of change that is the one which is manifest or non-manifest is encompassed into the existence as a single entity.

*Pariṇamana* (Process of change) happens on both levels— (1) individual and (2) collective, e.g. (i) when you pour sugar in water, it becomes sweet (ii) certain atoms associate together in space and the clouds are formed. Some changes accrue out of the existence of *dravya* itself. Since they happen to be the products of *dravya*, they have their individuality. Out of five realities (*astikāyas*), three i.e. the media of motion, rest and space are amenable to natural change only. While the remaining two viz. *Jīva* & *Pudgala* are amenable to both kinds of change i.e. individual and collective. Whatever is manifested in the world is the result of interaction of *Jīva* and *Pudgala*. The visible world consists of the bodies of the *Jīva* whether they are living bodies or the dead ones.

Every reality has an extension in space—it is a conglomeration of *pradeśas* (i.e., indivisible units). Out of the five realities (*astikāyas*), only the *pudgala* has the capacity to divide and unite; the rest four neither unite nor divide. The phenomenon of association and dissociation of *paramāṇus* goes on in *pudgala*. The world that is manifested is the result of the collective process of association and dissociation of *paramāṇus*, which happens only in *pudgala*, although the living element also contributes to that process. Thus, we can conclude that the *astitva* (existence), which is an eternal substance also has the potential to change, which inter-alia gives it the energy to maintain itself over the infinite period of time i.e., upto the eternity. The spontaneous changes within all realities have different degrees, varying from the slightest upto the infinity. Without this, any reality cannot maintain its existence.

The *Astitva* (existence) has infinite *dharma*s (attributes). Some of them are manifested, while others are not. When we see

milk, the curd or *ghee* (which are milk's transformations) can be a possibility but not a reality as far as we can see at a given time. Such a possibility exists even in the grass that the cattle graze. (It is the grass that later on gets transformed into milk, curd or *ghee*). Each *dravya* has two kinds of potential powers—(1) *ogha* (potential energy) and the other (2) *samucita* (kinetic energy). The former is the controlling power—*niyāmaka śakti*, while the second is only situational i.e. what we see or sense only at a given time. Thus if one asks: “Is there *ghee* in grass?”, the answer will be yes (from the point of view of *ogha* energy) and not from the point of view of *samucita* energy.

The energy is produced through the process of change. Albert Einstein, the legendary scientist found out that matter could be transformed into energy and the vice-versa. The Jain philosophy has tried to explain this principle through *Pariṇāmi Nityatvavāda*. The ‘*dravya*’ (substance) whether it is ‘*pudgala*’ or ‘*jīva*’ has infinite potential to sustain itself and that is why its existence is eternal. This potential power manifests itself through the process of change—*pariṇāmana*. All the scientific exploration and experiments that are carried out happen in the realm of *pudgala*, which is in the form of matter and which can be transformed into energy.

In nutshell, the Jain philosophy has tried to explain ‘*jagat*’ (the world) through both the view-points—‘*dravyārthika*’ (based on substance) and ‘*paryāyārthika*’ (based on modifications). The first is ‘*abheda dr̥ṣṭi*’—holistic view and the second is ‘*bheda dr̥ṣṭi*’—differential view, through which we can comprehend this world with all its distinctive features.

Whatever we see in this world is nothing else but only ‘*paryāya*’—one of the many modal forms. We don’t encounter the ‘*dravya*’ in its basic elemental form. Acharya Hemachandra has put this very succinctly in the following couplet:

“*Aparyayaṃ vastu saṃśyamāṇaṃ*  
*Adravyaṃ etat ca vivicyamāṇaṃ.*”

—“If we look at the world through the ‘*abheda*’ (synthetic) view-point, we get only ‘*dravya*’ and lose all its distinct modes, and their complex varieties. But when we consider this through ‘*bheda*’ (analytic) point of view, we can see only *paryāya* along with their expanse and variety as manifested in the world.

Both *jīva* and *pudgala* are subject to the law of transmutation, but the variety of forms and shapes that we see in the world is due to the unlimited capacity of *pudgala* to transform itself. So *pudgala* is the main element in all the manifest modes—‘*vyakta paryāya*’.

—xxx—

## DOCTRINE OF THE SOUL AND RE-BIRTH

Philosophy means metaphysical realization of the essence of Truth. Since soul is the essence of all that is living, he who knows the soul, knows all. Philosophy rests on the foundation of realization and logically speaking it uses intelligence to arrive at a conclusion. Philosophy is the science of fundamental concepts, which requires help from logic and intelligence of the thinker. Philosophy is a quest in areas beyond the knowledge and is realization of the quintessence of that knowledge. Philosophy uses logical formulations, while it deals with subjects like soul, God and cycle of birth etc. Through critical analysis it tries to formulate its concepts.

There appears to be a great divergence in views on the questions like existence of the soul, re-birth etc. Philosophers of the Orient as also the Occident have contemplated a lot on these questions. Three views have come forth:

- (1) there is soul and re-birth
- (2) soul and God exist but no question of re-birth
- (3) soul does exist, but no proof to accept God and rebirth.

The Jain Philosophy accepts the existence of the soul which takes numerous different forms. It holds that soul is eternal. Christianity and others hold a slightly different view. They accept soul and the God and yet do not believe in re-birth. The third group led by the 'Cārvāk' philosophy and others concedes that there is a



thing like soul, but it is not eternal. According to them, the body itself is the soul. There is no cycle of births for the soul and that there is no God.

Even if one accepts the existence of soul, the question remains—where from it has come into existence? What was it, before its existence now? Even if one accepts that there is something like the soul which has eternal existence, the next question crops up—from where has the *jīva* arrived in this birth, what was it before? On this Mahāvira said that all the *jīvas* do not possess the same amount of capacity to know about their previous life. Most of them do not possess intuition about the direction from which they have come to the present life. These two concepts viz., ‘intuition’ and ‘direction’ must be understood correctly. The former is derived out of memory (*smṛiti*). It also means feeling. In *Ācārāṅga Nirvyukti*, *Bhāva Sanjñāna* is mentioned to be of two types—(1) *Jñāna Sanjñā* (knowledge through intellect) and (2) *Anubhāva sanjñā* i.e. feelings which are based on the realization of the effects of one’s own karma after it reaches the fruition stage.

Lord Mahāvira said that although the nature of the soul is re-incarnative, yet many people do not know who were they in their last birth or who they are going to be in their next birth. In this context, some of the explorations of modern science are very valuable. According to science, there are three states of matter—solid, liquid and gas. Two more were added later—plasma and protoplasm or bio-plasma, which is known in Indian philosophical terminology as ‘*Prāṇa Śakti*’. A Soviet physicist, Mr. V. C. Grishchecov, has found that there are independent electrons and protons in the bio-plasma, having no connection with the nucleus. They have tremendous speed and have the power to intercept their message into other living beings. This is some thing like telepathy. This force is condensed in the spinal cord of the human beings. It has the power to interpret its message into other living beings.

After the intensive research on this subject, the Soviet scientists have reached some conclusions. They are as under—

- (1) The basic source or seed of plasma is in the mind where it is stored in high density.
- (2) Bio-plasma is mostly operational in the spinal cord and in the neurons.
- (3) It is concentrated more in the various nervous centres of the body.

This proves the real existence of bio-plasma, which is quite similar to the concept of the 'subtle body' as mentioned in the Indian Philosophy.

Protoplasm is immortal, but the body is mortal. (After death, the protoplasm does not perish). When we breathe, the protoplasm enters the body and through its property of nucleus it gives energy to the body. When the nucleus and its carrier agent protoplasm are weakened, we loose *Cetanā* (our living force).

After death this protoplasm leaves the body and gets merged into the environment. It then travels further through vegetation and finally enters new bodies through nutrition. It finally transforms itself into DNA and gets a new life through birth.

This nearly proves that 'Re-birth' is a possibility as is indicated by the results of the scientific analysis. Dr. W. J. Killer, a well-known physician in London, has carried out many experiments on the patients on their death-bed. He has documented in his book "The Human Atmosphere" that there is something like a cluster of light which remains intact even after the clinical death of the body.

The Soviet scientists have now endorsed the philosophical doctrine of 'Re-birth' (or Re-incarnation) or the cycle of births. They assert with certainty, "There exists a subtle energy or an invisible body in the form of a cluster of light, which covers the physical body in all living beings. We have obtained a proof for that." Such a cluster of light was observed through an electron microscope. Through it, they saw something as a discharge from the dying living being, which was seen only by clairvoyants earlier. Even in the living body, they could see the reflection of the same type of light.

The same reflection gets absorbed into the electromagnetic fields: such is special structure of the invisible body. However, it is not exactly the philosophical soul, which is certainly a much subtler concept that what is conveyed by the '*sukṣma śarīra*' (the subtle body). Let us compare and contrast the concept of protoplasm with that of the subtle body. Both the subtle body as well as protoplasm do not perish—the former takes the rebirth, the latter gets changed into 'genes' in the new body. The subtle body is neither liquid, nor gas, nor solid.

Protoplasm is also neither of the three. The subtle body is not visible to eyes. So also is the protoplasm which is observed only through microscope. The subtle body is perceived by a clairvoyant or a person having extra-sensory-perception. Thus, protoplasm is not the soul, but akin to the subtle body. Experiments in this field are continuing. The scientists are yet to reach the stage when they can explain 'soul' in precise scientific terms.

Lord Mahāvīra has said that in order to know about your earlier births, they are three means—the first is that you have to sharpen your *smṛti* (memory). The second is that you may ask others who have attained extra-sensory perception. The third is that you may know your birth through a third person who has known about it from a direct perceiver.

'*Smṛiti*' is stored in the '*sukṣma śarīra*'. When it is awakened, we call it '*jāti smṛti*'. The bio-sciences as also the para-psychology have found that when the protoplasm is activated in a child's brain, it may start awakening his memory of the earlier births. The Jain philosophy has found that it is the awakening of the memory stored in the subtle body, through which one could recall his previous births. It is realized through concentration and purification of '*citta*' (psyche) by means of '*īha*' (speculation), '*apoha*' (reflection), '*margaṇā*' (investigation) and '*gaveṣaṇā*' (search). Deep contemplation or sometimes even accidental injury may activate this faculty.

Lord Mahāvīra has described the soul as—"I have come to the present life from a particular direction. What I am today is a

continuation of many births and re-births 'So (a) haṃ' (which means 'I am that') is thus the realization of the eternal existence of the soul travelling through various births and forms." According to the Jain philosophy, each one of us is a distinct soul which carries forward to his next birth its own *tejaśa śarīra* or the bio-electrical body (subtle body) and the *kārmaṇa* body (the subltmost body); both of them are eternal. Since they never die, they continuously carry on their journey along with the soul. Thus, it can be said that the concept of protoplasm supports the philosophical truth of rebirth.

The sum total of the exposition as mentioned above could be summarized as under:

*Ātmā* (soul) is '*traikālika*' i.e., eternal. It is set in cyclic formation with earlier birth and rebirth. The protoplasm or the subtle body always accompanies the worldly soul. It is believed by the Jain philosophy that although that is not the soul itself, yet it is the subtle body that is the primary cause of new birth or the cycle of rebirth.

## NATURE OF THE SOUL

The Jain philosophy is essentially focussed on the belief in the existence of the 'soul'. It has not only expounded the existence of the soul, but described in detail its nature and properties too. The 'Āyāro' (*Ācārāṅga Sūtra*) is one of the most ancient Jain philosophical treatises that Lord Mahāvīra is known to have produced. It deals mainly with the nature of the soul. Therein, Mahāvīra says—"Ātmā (i.e., the soul) is that which knows. The definition that the soul is the knower is based on the substantial standpoint, which integrates *Chetanā* (sentience) and *Upayoga* (conscious activity). Another definition of the soul is—"The soul is that through which one knows." It is a differentiative definition, for it accepts both the aspects of the soul, i.e., (a) soul is subject of the quest itself and (b) it is also the means to know it.

The above definitions eventually result in the aphorisms such as—"Caitanyalakṣaṇo jīvaḥ," "*Upayogalakṣaṇo jīvaḥ*"—Here *upayoga* means 'to know' about anything and *upayoga* subsists in *cetanā* (consciousness) which is a kind of energy and *upayoga* is its utilization. The state in which the soul becomes the knower is the state of *upayoga*—(*Yaśca vīgyātā padārthānām parichedakaḥ—“upayogaḥ”*). This definition of the soul is with respect to the nature of the mundane soul. There is another category of the soul, which we can term as the liberated soul.

In the *Upaniśadas*, the *Brahma* is described as incomprehensible in terms of knowledge. This is called *Ajñeyavāda*—the

doctrine of incomprehensibility. It has resemblance with the attributes credited to the *mukta ātmā*—which is the liberated soul of the Jain philosophy. In the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra*, delineating the nature of the liberated soul, it is said—‘*Savve sara niyattanti*’, i.e., ‘all the articulations fail to describe it’. Similar is the expression in the *Upaniśads*—‘*Yato vacho nivartante aprāpya manasā saha*’—“‘*Brahma*’ or ‘*Ātmā*’ are beyond the reach of mind and speech.” When the ‘*Ācārāṅga Sūtra*’ calls it *ajñeya*, it implies that the soul is beyond the power of the words to express, it is neither comprehensible through logic, nor it could be reached through intellect. The *Upaniśads* also support the ‘*netivāda*’. The *Bṛhadāranyaka* says—‘*Athāta adeśo neti neti*’.

Explaining the attributes of the liberated soul, Lord Mahāvīra says—It is ‘*oja*’—isolated and devoid of attachment and aversion, which means it is totally detached and free from all sorts of interactions or dependence with others. All the souls retain this virtue and are, therefore, independent of each other. Here lies the basic difference between the ‘*Vedānta*’ and the Jain perception. As per the ‘*Vedānta*’, all souls ultimately rest in peace in *Brahma*, whereas Jain and Sāṅkhya philosophies regard each *Ātmā* (soul) as having its own independent existence.

A liberated soul—‘*mukta ātmā*’ has no form and it does not stick itself to any place. It is pure consciousness. It has no colour, smell or form which is the characteristic of *pudgala* and which gets manifested into infinite varieties of shapes and features. “*mukta ātmā*” is beyond the cycle of birth and death, since it is free from bondage created by karma (*pudgala*). The worldly soul has its association with *pudgala* and therefore it is afflicted by bondage.

A question would then spring up—how do you comprehend and describe the state of a liberated soul? The ‘*Āyāro*’ says that there is no simile through which one can describe it—‘*Uvumā na vijjai*’. It is pure consciousness (*Cetanā*), which is in the form of ‘knower’. In all dimensions, it is full of consciousness.

In the *Nyāya Śāstra* (Logic), two kinds of *vyāpti* (concomitance)

are mentioned—(A) *Antar Vyapti* (Inner), (B) *Bāhir Vyapti* (External). The internal comomittance is that in which the concomittance has the coherence between the *sādhana* (i.e., the evidence) with the *sādhya* (i.e., that which is to be proved) only in the proponent's statement, and not anywhere elsewhere. The soul does exist, because it has the quality of consciousness. Its concomittance is as follows: wherever there is consciousness, there is soul. This concomittance takes care of the subject in entirety. There is no other thing with identical attribute; therefore, it is not possible to use any illustration for describing it.

In the external one, we get the concomittance between the *sādhana* and the *sādhya* in addition to even the proponent's statement. For example, kitchen can be an illustration for the statement that 'where there is smoke, there is fire'. All other places where the fire burns are its corollary. Space is infinite. It has its own entirety, which can not be matched by any other entity. Similarly, the soul too cannot be described by any other simlie. The soul has an imperceptible existence. Hence, it is beyond the scope of vision.

The soul is non-verbal. No word can describe it. "*Apayassa payaṃ nathi*"—this applies to all substances; there is no exception to it. This implies corelation between word and its meaning. The liberated soul is the realisation produced by *antar vyāpti*. It cannot be traced outside its existence with the help of any clue.

There has been a great debate in the philosophical parlays on the relation between the word and its meaning. Totally divergent views have been expressed. The Buddhist philosophers regard them as absolutely separate entities. According to *Vedānta*, '*Omkāra*' (or *Praṇava*) is regarded to be the symbol of God Himself. It is that basic drone, out of which all other sounds have emerged. The belief of *Śabda Brahma* has its root in '*Omkāra*'. The Jain philosophy believes that there is a dual relationship between the word and its meaning, described as—'*bhedābheda*' i.e., (identity-cum-difference). As explained above, the soul is non-verbal. The Jain philosophy states that the *ātmā* does exist, but the word *ātmā* (or soul) is only subjective.

In fact, every object is non-verbal. A word cannot be synonymous with the soul or any other object. The expressions such as 'the soul exists', 'this exists' or 'that exists' are all subjective. Moreover the Jain philosophy does not subscribe to the belief that the entire world is an evolution out of the symbolic sound like *Oṃkāra*, and as such the question about its relationship with *ātmā* does not arise.

The soul is unknowable, imperceptible and non-corporeal existence. Sound, colour, smell, taste and touch—none of them is a synonym, denomination or the nature of the soul. The soul transcends all similies.



## JĪVA (SOUL) : ITS NATURE AND LAKṢAṆA\*

As said earlier, the Jain philosophy is dualistic, since it accepts independent existence of *Jīva* (Soul) as also of the *Ajīva* (non-soul). Temporally, both of them have neither beginning nor end. It is the consciousness which draws an eternal dividing line between them. *Jīva* has consciousness whereas *Ajīva* does not have it. The independent existence of *Jīva* is definitely due to the consciousness.

There are two kinds of *tattva* (metaphysical reality) viz., in the world—‘*mūrta*’ (corporeal)—one which manifests itself into colour, smell, taste, touch and shape (*varna*, *gandha*, *rasa*, *sparśa* and *ākāra*) and *amūrta* which does not have all these. All of these attributes exist in the *paramāṇu pudgala* i.e., an atom of matter. That is why it is *mūrta tattva*. *Jīva* is an *amūrta tattva* because it is devoid of them. The *amūrta tattva* is imperceptible. Whatever is *mūrta* is not necessarily perceptible. But whatever is perceptible is always *mūrta*. The *mūrta* substances which have a subtle form are not accessible to sensory perception. Only that substance becomes perceptible which has a gross form. As the soul is *amūrta*, it cannot be perceived or known by the senses, mind and intellect. Its attribute is consciousness, which too is beyond the reach of perception. It (consciousness) can be known only through its function, but it cannot be directly comprehended through sensory perception. The denial of the existence of the soul may chiefly be attributed to its imperceptibility. It is pure

---

\* *Lakṣaṇa* is the characteristics of particular object, which is always found in it and is absent in any other object.

consciousness. It can only be known by what it does and not known or felt through its physical form. Bhṛigu Purohit,\* illustrating the denial of soul, said to his sons, “The soul is created from the body, in the same way as the fire from the *araṇi* (a special kind of wood), the butter from milk and oil from oilseeds. The soul does not have any independent existence. Had it been independent, we would have seen it directly in some form or shape of its own. The sons refuting this argument of their father said, It is not because of its non-existence, but because of it being *amūrta*, that we are not able to comprehend it in its original form.”

## Consciousness is Comparable to Sun

The soul illuminates itself as well as others. It is capable of knowing itself as well as the objective world. Its sentience generally exists in covered-cum-uncovered state. Sentience is like sun. The sun, which, even though overcast by the clouds, retains the power to reveal its appearance. In the same way, the consciousness in the form of knowledge, which exists in the soul, cannot be overshadowed by the veils (of karma). Some of the rays of the development of consciousness continuously remain manifest. If they do not manifest themselves, it would not be possible to draw a dividing line between the *Jīva* and *Ajīva*.

The process of knowledge does not continue in the state of covered-cum-uncovered sentience, when it is non-active (*anupayoga*). At that time, its knowledge remains only in ‘existence’. Therefore, when the sentience of the soul is active, the soul makes an effort to know. At that time, it knows the object of knowledge. On the basis of this fact, two states of the soul do emerge :-

Covered-cum-uncovered sentience in non-active condition= Knowledge of the object to be known does not occur.

Covered-cum-uncovered sentience in active condition= knowledge of the object to be known occurs.

---

\* The Jain scripture—*Uttarājīhayānāṇi* narrates the event of one *Brāhmin*, named *Bhṛigu Purohit*, and his two sons.

On reaching the climax of its own development, the soul becomes completely free from all the veils of knowledge-obscurating karma. In that state, the form of sentience is as follows:

Uncovered Sentience—Continued Activity—constant awareness of the *jñeya* (object to be known).

So consciousness is eternal. Any veil around the *Jīva* is temporary, since it is '*paudgalika*', i.e., *karma pudgala* surrounding the *Jīva* only for a while, like a wave in the ocean. *Jīva* is ultimately able to redeem itself from that '*paudgalik*' shell. But this happens only with human beings and does not relate to other living creatures.

### **The Soul : without a beginning and without an end**

With respect to time, the soul is without any beginning or end. It is neither created nor produced and hence, it has no beginning. It is uncreated and imperishable. Consciousness is its fundamental characteristic or nature. Hence, it has no end. Therefore, it is too without beginning or end. From *Anekānt* point of view, each thing that exists is triune—*utpād* (origination), *vyaya* (cessation) and *dhrauvya* (persistence). All the three in an integrated form is the characteristic of substance (*dravya*) 'Persistence' is the natural attribute of the substance, related with the eternal aspect, whereas 'origination' and 'cessation' both are its natural attributes related with the transitory aspects. That is why every substance is eternal as well as non-eternal. As the existence of a substance never ceases, it is eternal. As it undergoes a continuous transformation, it is non-eternal.

*Caitanya* (consciousness or sentience) is an eternal characteristic of the soul, but its veil is a non-eternal aspect. It is, in fact, *paudgalika*, i.e., it is essentially material or physical in nature; it is antagonistic to the real nature of the soul. The veil comes as an influx and goes away after the expiry of its duration. The veil can be removed by resorting to appropriate measures.

We can see the veil in two forms:

- (1) The veil over knowledge, which is beginningless and endless (because of the lack of proper endeavour).
- (2) The veil over knowledge, which is beginningless but with end (because of the administration of proper means).

The last one is the only eternal factor in *dravya*. The substance never ceases to exist; from this point of view it is eternal. It continuously undergoes transformation ; from this point of view it is non-eternal. *Chaitanya* is eternal, but the veil is its non-eternal aspect. The process of removal of the shell of such bondages could be seen in varying degrees among different *Jīvas*. Total unveiling is possible only in case of humans.

## The Soul and the Body

Each worldly *Jīva* has three kinds of bodies—

1. *Audārika* Body (gross body) or the physical body
2. *Taijas* Body (subtle body) or the electromagnetic body
3. *Karmic* (or *Kārmaṇa*) Body (subtler body) or the karmic body.

The first one is built by the soul at the time of birth and ceases with death. It is built in correspondence with the ‘Karmic’ body and therefore, all the centres of ‘Karmic’ body which are responsible for the development and obstruction of *chetanā* (sentience) have their corresponding centres in the physical or gross body. The ‘Karmic’ body controls attitudes, behaviour and conduct of a person. The ‘*Taijas*’ and the ‘Karmic’ bodies continuously accompany the *Jīva*, even between the intervening period i.e., the death and the next birth, which is called the ‘*antaral gati*’—transmigratory motion. The re-incarnation of the soul and building of the new physical body is possible due to them. In the case of the super-normal attainments or highly developed spiritual faculties, there are two extra type of bodies viz., ‘*Vaikriya*’ and ‘*Āhāraka*’. The former is the protean body, which enables the ‘*Jīva*’ to take different forms at will. The latter

one '*Āhāraka*' which enables the *Jīva* to communicate his thoughts with the omniscient souls to quench the curiosity regarding any difficult subject. However, the '*Vaikriya*' body can also be found in the *Jīvas* like gods, infernals and air-bodied beings. Such body is built into their life-system itself.

### ***Prāṇa* : A Bridge**

'*Prāṇa*' (vital energy) is a bridge between the soul and the body. It is the *Prāṇic* energy which directs actions, speech and emotions of the living body. The *Prāṇa* can be divided into ten kinds based on the different functions that each of our limbs perform. In the first five, the *Prāṇa* is related to the sense-organs. The other five are responsible respectively for the activities of physique, respiration, speech, mind and the duration of life-span. In nutshell, all our activities are directed by the '*Prāṇaśakti*'.

### **Classification of *Jīva* on the basis of the material of the body**

In physiological terms, the '*Jīva*' is classified with respect to six kinds of material used to build the body:

1. *Prthvikāyika* (earth-bodied)
2. *Apakāyika* (water-bodied)
3. *Taijaskāyika* (fire-bodied)
4. *Vāyukāyika* (air-bodied)
5. *Vanaspatikāyika* (vegetation-bodied)
6. *Trskāyika* (mobile-bodied)

Generally, people consider only the '*Traskāyika*' *Jīva* as the living being due to the mobility of its body. Some people consider plants as also living. But, the Jain philosophy says that even the earth, water, fire and air are the forms of '*Jīva*'. (Plants are also *Jīva*. According to Jainism, the whole of the physical or the gross world which is perceptible to us is created by the *Jīva*. The visible world consists of either the body of the *Jīva* which is living or that of a *Jīva*

which has died i.e., has left the body, making it devoid of life. In other words, the physical world is nothing but a mixture of living bodies as well as dead bodies of the *Jīvas*. No such element of the physical world is a visible object which has not been transformed into a body of the *Jīva*.

Among the six kinds of *Jīvas* enumerated above, the ‘*Vanaspatikāya*’ is an unexhaustible store-house of *Jīvas* which are infinite\* in number. It is from this stage that further evolution of any life-form takes place.

### ***Jīva* and *Ātmā***

In the *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, *Jīva* has been described through 23 synonyms such as *Prāṇa*, *Bhūta*, *Jīva*, *Satva* etc.. Literally, *Jīva* means ‘one who has life’ and *Ātmā* i.e., soul denotes the ‘spirit’ which experiences various states of consciousness. However, in mundane terms, both *Jīva* and *Ātmā* are treated to be totally synonymous. (The nuance is important when the soul is a liberated soul).

As said earlier, the ‘*Jīva*’ is of two types—‘*Baddha*’ (bonded) and ‘*Mukta*’ (liberated from the bonds of Karma). In the former case, it is prone to birth and rebirth and in each birth, it is influenced by the external factors like Karma, environment and circumstances, which modify its form. Sometimes, it takes the human form; at other times, it may be an animal, and so on. Sometimes, it undergoes evolution and sometimes, it undergoes devolution. The descent from a developed into an undeveloped state and the vice-versa—both are due to the free will of consciousness itself. Internally, the *kaṣāya* (passions) are responsible for that. The laws that govern the non-living physical matter are not binding on pure consciousness. On the other hand, the ‘*nuukta ātmā*’ is free from all such bondages and it remains eternally in its pure elemental form. In the mundane state, there is both evolution and devolution, whereas in the liberated state there is neither of two, since all the attributes of soul like

---

\* Infinity is a mathematical term in Jainology. It is comparable with ‘ $\infty$ ’ in modern mathematics.

knowledge, intuition, bliss and power have attained the irreversible and supermost stage of infinity.

## Dual Personality

The psychologists believe that the brain of some persons has two layers. Sometimes, when only one of them works, or at other times, when the other one works, you can notice the difference in one's behaviour in accordance with the state of brain. According to the Jain philosophy, in the life of a '*Jīva*', sometimes the '*karma pudgala*' are active while other times they are dormant. The former stage reflects the '*audayika*' personality, whereas the other is known as '*kṣāyopasaṃika*'.

- (1) Lack of capacity to know and perceive,
- (2) Infatuation due to the impulses of anger, fear and libido.

In the *Audāyika* one, the karma are in the state of rising, in the *kṣāyopasaṃika*, they are in the state of elimination-cum-subsidence. There are seven characteristics of the *Audāyika* personality:

- (3) Experience of powerlessness.
- (4) Experience of pain or pleasure.
- (5) Experience of high or low status.
- (6) Experience of auspicious and inauspicious things.
- (7) Experience of life and death.

There are four characteristics of the *Kṣāyopasaṃika* personality:

- (1) Capacity to know and see things
- (2) *Amūrchā* (freedom from infatuation), *Abhaya* (fearlessness) and *Ananda* (bliss).
- (3) Experience of powerfulness and
- (4) Freedom from experiencing (pleasure and pain).

The symptoms of *Audāyika* and *Kṣāyopasaṃika* personalities are just the opposite of each other. When the *Jīva* settles down in

the state of '*Chaitanya*' i.e., pure consciousness, its dual personality fades out and one attains a truly '*Kṣāyika*' (emancipated) personality due to total annihilation of all the Karma.

## Soul With and Without body

The *Jīva* in the mundane state has a form, and a body—the *Jīva* has the extension in the body equivalent to its size—'*dehāparimāṇa*'. The *jīva* acts through the nervous system and the '*nāḍi sansthāna*' thus reaching out to the entire body. In the first moment of '*mukti*' (Liberation or Emancipation) the *Jīva* becomes free from body. At that time even, it does not become ubiquitous, but it occupies the space which is equivalent to  $\frac{1}{3}$  of his body's size. There, it attains the final stage by becoming totally free from '*Pudgala*' and rests in pure '*Chaitanya*' and that is the Etenal Bliss—ever free from physical effects.



## RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JĪVA & BODY

In the ancient Jain literature, the word '*pudgala*' has been used in many contexts so as to convey different shades of meaning. In one sense, it means mass. It is, therefore, used for all material substances possessed of mass. In the ancient Buddhist literature, it has been used to denote the soul (*ātmā*). Similarly, the '*Sūtrakṛtāṅga*' which is a Jain canonical text also refers to the soul as '*uttama poggale*'. Even in the '*Bhagavati Sūtra*', another Jain canonical text, one of the synonyms of *Jīva* is *pudgala*. Another meaning of '*pudgala*' is non-living matter. When it is used in the sense of *paramāṇu*, '*pudgalī*' could also denote '*Jīva*'. In the present chapter, we use *pudgala* in the sense of physical existence.

The question is—what is the inter-relationship between the '*Jīva*' and '*Pudgala*'; in the words, that which is possessed of consciousness and what which is devoid of it. However, they cannot be totally independent, since they not only co-exist but intermingle with each other. *Jīva* is identified through the function of the sense-organs, which are active in the body of the *Jīva*. Out of the five sense-organs 'touch' is most important, since it is the largest in size and present in all parts of the body of the living organisms. The rest of the sense-organs have their specific centres in the body. All the sense-organs have their own physical structure, made of special *pudgala*. A '*Jīva*' becomes '*Pudgalī*' in the context of sense-organs. The liberated souls are not *Pudgalī*, since they do not possess a body or the sense-organs.

Neither *Jīva* can be transformed into *Ajīva*, nor *Ajīva* into *Jīva*. Only a *Jīva* which is bound with an *Ajīva* can become perceptible to us; otherwise a *Jīva* which is entirely free from its association with *Ajīva* is not perceptible to the sense-organs. The manifestation of *Jīva* in the worldly existence is only through the medium of *Ajīva*. The doctrine of the relationship between '*Jīva*' and '*Śarīra*' (body) has been an important topic for discussion in Indian philosophical parleys—known as '*taj-jīva taccharīrvāda*'. It means—'that which is *Jīva*, is identical with its body'. Now, if '*Jīva*' and body are one, where is the need to seek interrelationship between them? This is the view of *Advaitvādins* i.e., monists. But the dualists hold tht *Jīva* and *Pudgala* are not the same. The question therefore is—what could be their relationship and how it is established?

The *Bhagavati Sūtra* says, Do the souls and the material bodies, O Lord, exist bound with each other, in contact with each other, pervading each other, stuck with each other through mutual attraction and mutual identification?

Yes, they do.

For what reason, O Lord, is it said that the souls and the material bodies exist bound with each other, in contact with each other, pervading each other, stuck with each other through mutual attraction and unified with each other through mutual identification?

Gautama, suppose there is a lake that is full, full to the brim, overflowing, ever swelling and evenly full of water like a pitcher.

Now, some person floats a giant boat with hundred inlets and hundred pores. In such a situation, O Gautama, does the boat, with water constantly flowing in through the inlets and the pores, become full, full to the brim, overflowing, everswelling and evenly full of water like a pitcher?

Yes, it does so.

For this reason, Gautama, it is said that the souls and the material bodies exist bound with each other, in contact with each

other, pervading each other, stuck with each other through mutual attraction and unified with each other through mutual identification.

Certain terminology conveys this relationship, e.g., ‘*ogāḍha*’—*parasparareṇa lolī bhāvaṃ gatā* i.e., a state where two independent substances such as fire and iron become so well integrated that when heated at very high temperature, it is difficult to distinguish between their separate identities. This kind of relationship proves integration of *Jīva* and body.

There is a term *sineha* used in the above passage in the *Bhagavati Sūtra*. It has several meanings, out of which the one which is relevant here is—the power of attracting. It should not be confused with the popular meaning—‘oilness’. The *sneha* unites the *Jīva* and *Ajīva*.

‘*Snigdha rukṣadvā vidyut*’—which means that when the positive (*snigdha*) and the negative (*rukṣa*) energies meet, they join together to produce lightening. The *Jīva* has positive energy whereas *Ajīva* is negative. The above stated philosophical aphorism indicates their interaction.

In the Encyclopaedia Britannica, electricity has been accepted as the interaction of the negative and the positive electric charges. It accepts that the Hindus were the first to know this fact and corroborates it with the quotation from the Jain text—*Tattvārtha Sūtra*. *Snigdha* and *rukṣa* are philosophical terms of Jain philosophy. Although, the literal meanings of these words have been in vogue, but have they are irrelevant. Technically, they are positive and negative electricity or energy.

The Western philosophers like Descartes, Spinoza, etc.—have raised a very interesting question—“what is the relationship between body and mind?” This question has been dealt with in Psychology as well, where ‘*mana*’ (mind) denotes ‘*Jīva*’. Both *Jīva* and body are affecting each other. We can explain the human behaviour and attributes through this relationship. The medical science has proved that any disorder that starts from mind manifests

itself into the body. (This is termed as psychosomatic disorder). The '*Nandī Sūtra*'—a Jain treatise says that '*Bhāva*' (emotions) is the starting point of many a diseases. For example, if there is any disorder in liver (or spleen) in the body, the nature of a person would become irritative, and if there is any emotional disorder, it might cause the corresponding disease in the liver (i.e., the body). Both the 'psyche' and 'body' are thoroughly interconnected. If we consider the '*Jīva*' from the holistic outlook, the discussion about it is equally useful in diverse disciplines like philosophy, psychology, medical science etc.. So, although *Jīva* (consciousness) and the physical body are distinct elements, yet they get intermingled with each other closely.

## JĪVA—PUDGALA :

### *Bhoktr Bhogyā Sambandhavāda*

The world around us is composed of two fundamental categories of substances—*Jīva* and *Pudgala*, the former being *sachetana*—the existence having consciousness and life, the latter being *achetana*—the physical existence devoid of consciousness and life. Both of them work in unison. Now the question is : Who is the consumer and what is that which is consumed or used? Or in other words, who is the master and who is the subordinate? According to ‘*Sāṅkhya*’ philosophy ‘*Puruṣa*’ is the *bhokta* (the consumer). The *Puruṣa* uses the ‘*Prakṛti*’ (the *pudgala*). It is only the ‘*Jīva*’ which can consume or make use of the material resources of the *Prakṛti*. Although the ‘*Prakṛti*’ may be medium for causing happiness, sorrow etc., but the one who experiences these feelings is no one else than the *Puruṣa*. If the body gets hurt, it pains. But who experiences that—none else than the *Jīva*.

When the question under discussion was put to Lord Mahāvīra, he said, “It is the ‘*Jīva*’, the *sachetana*, which consumes the physical substance *pudgala* (*Ajīva*). The ‘*Jīva*’ first appropriates the *Ajīva* (*pudgala*) and then consumes it. The process of consumption is in the form of five *śarīras*, five sense-organs, mind, speech, body and breathing. The *Jīva* uses these powers selectively. It is the consciousness in the ‘*Jīva*’, which uses *pudgala* as the raw material for consumption. Only the ‘*Jīva*’ has these faculties. As per the

‘*Sāṅkhya*’ philosophy, *Prakṛti* (physical substance) does not have *caitanya* (consciousness), although it is an active agent, while the *Puruṣa*, despite having consciousness is non-active. In contrast to this idea, the Jain philosophy holds that the ‘*Puruṣa*’ in spite of being a *amūrta ātmā* is also active. However, despite this difference, which is confined to reasoning only, there is similarity in the perceptions of the Jain and the *Sāṅkhya* philosophies so far as the status of ‘*bhoktā*’ (consumer) and ‘*paribhogya*’ (consumable stuff) is concerned.

The process of consumption has three stages—‘*grahana*’, ‘*pariṇamana*’ and ‘*utsarga*’ i.e., to acquire, to transform and to abandon. To start with, when any category of *Pudgala* is acquired, the transformation takes place in the same category. For example—if the *pudgala skandhas* are in the form of *bhāṣā vargaṇā* (i.e., physical structure which has the capacity to be used as speech), after their transformation, the *utsarga* (abandonment) would also be in the same form, which is then communicated as a spoken language.

To sum up, we can say that the ‘*Jīva*’ has both the capabilities—*sacetanatā* (consciousness) and *grāhakatva* (capacity to acquire), whereas the *pudgala* is non-conscious but has the properties to get attracted (i.e., *grāhyatva*). This is the key to understand the inter-relationship between the *Jīva* (the *bhoktā*) and the *pudgala* (the *bhogya*).

## MŪRTĀAMŪRTAVĀDA

### The Doctrine of Corporeal & Non-corporeal Substances

The *Jīva* is *amūrta* i.e., non-corporeal, and hence, not perceptible to eyes, whereas the body is *mūrta*, i.e., corporeal, and hence, it is visible. So what relationship could be there between them?—Such questions have been subject of intense discussions in the philosophical parleys. The *Bhagavati Sūtra* (a Jain canonical text) tries to answer these questions. Once Gautama asked Mahāvīra—“Does a celestial being who possesses the protean powers has the capacity to create the non-corporeal objects?” Lord Mahāvīra replied—‘No’. Gautama again asked—‘why can’t he produce a formless object, if he has the power to adopt any shape that he chooses?’ The Lord said, “I know this for certain, through my own realizations, that a corporeal *Jīva* can not produce anything which is non-corporeal.”

‘*Sāṅkhya*’ regards *Jīva* as absolutely non-corporeal, and therefore, the manifestation in any shape is supposed to be the attribute of *Prakṛti*. But Jains do not accept this theory. They believe that *Jīva* is *mūrta* as well as *amūrta*. It is *mūrta* (corporeal) because it is associated with *karma*, *rāga*, (attachment) *moha* (delusion), *leśyā* (psychic colour), *śarīra* and *veda* (libido). *Jīva* is also associated with *pudgala* and so it has *varṇa* (colour), *gandha* (smell), *rasa* (taste) and *sparsā* (touch), which are the attributes of *pudgala*. The fact that attributes like colour etc. can be found even in the *Jīva*, which is by

nature non-corporeal, can be explained by the philosophy of *anekānta*. This is not possible in any other philosophical view except Jainism, for *anekānta* is not acceptable to other philosophical views. On the basis of *anekānta* only, the Jain philosophy accepts that there are many attributes which are identical in *Jīva* and *pudgala*. It is only on the basis of this fact, that *Jīva* and *pudgala* can influence each other and also they can interact with each other.

In '*Leśyā Dhyāna*' (which is a meditational technique) colour visualization is used, since colour in its very subtle form is found in the *Jīva*, its psychic centres (*Chaitanya Kendras*) and the soul-units. These colours have different effects on our body-physique and psyche.

There is non-absolutistic identity as well as difference in *Jīva* and *pudgala*. Hence, the *Jīva* possesses both attributes *sarūpa* as well as *arūpa*. A question would naturally arise how can *sarūpa* get itself transformed and become *arūpa*? The answer is that this transformation takes place through the process of '*saṃvara*' (inhibition of new bondage of karma) and *Nirjarā* (annihilation of the accumulated karmas). The *arūpa Jīva* become *sarūpa* only because of its association with karma).

Modern Psychology has also grappled with this paradoxical question—if body and mind are separate entities, how do they interact? Once again, it is only through the doctrine of *Anekānta* that such riddles could be resolved. *Anekānta* says '*Jīva*' is '*Mūrtāmūrta*'. It is non-corporeal by nature, but when *Jīva* (soul) is in bondage, it does adopt a shape. So both attributes do apply to the soul.



## JĪVA CAITANYA SAMBANDHAVĀDA

(Doctrine of Relation between *Jīva* and Consciousness)

Quizzing has been a popular form to interpret philosophical riddles e.g., a question like—Is a *Jīva*, '*Jīva*'?—Once Gautam asked Lord Mahāvīra—“*Jīve naṃ bhante! jīve? jīve jīve?*” The Lord replied—Goyama! *Jīve tāv niyamā jīve jīve vi niyamā jīve.*” Here both the question and its answer have been put as a riddle. In the Jain Āgamas, this style has been adopted at many a places. The direct reply to the above question would be—“*Jīva* is naturally (*niyamataḥ*) a *jīva*.”

Here the word '*jīva*' has two shades of meanings: *Jīva* is 'a living being' in one sense, while it is 'pure consciousness' in the other. The former means '*dravya*' (substance), the latter is '*guṇa*' (attribute). Many philosophers regard that *dravya* and *guṇa* are absolutely identical, where as the *Naiyāyika* and the *Vaiśeṣika* schools say that they are different in all respects. They may have relationship through '*samavāya*' (universal adherence). This leads us to the '*ekāntika*' view, i.e., absolute *abheda* or *bheda* between *Jīva* and *ceṭnā*. Acharya Hemachandra calls for adoption of non-absolutistic outlook in dealing with such issues.

The Jain philosophy holds that *Jīva* and *caitanya* are inseparable. They have '*avinābhavi*' relationship. They cannot exist without each other. One is *dravya* (substance) and the other is *guṇa* (attributes). This interpretation is '*Anekāntika*'. You can reach the truth both ways through '*bhedātma*' (analytical) or '*abhedātma*'

viewpoints. This way the integration of *dravya* and *guṇa* can be achieved. This is *Anekānta* view-point.

The *Bhagvatī Sūtra* has raised a very important question—“Is *ātmā* (soul) identical with *jñāna* or is it identical with *ajñāna*?”

The answer is—“*Ātmā* is identical with both *jñāna* and *ajñāna*,” but *jñāna* (knowledge) is *ṇīyamataḥ* (necessarily) *ātmā*. *Caitanya* (conscious-ness) has also two states—one is the state of *jñāna* and the other is the state of *ajñāna*. So, knowledge and soul are not one in all respects, for *jñāna* is the state of ‘*kṣayayopaśama*’ (destruction-cum- subsidence) of the knowledge-obscuring karma, while *ajñāna* is the state of *kṣayayopaśama* of the person who is also having the rise of ‘*darśana mohaniya*’ (view-deluding) karma. Only a person who is free from the rise of view-deluding karma or, in other words, whose, view is right can have *jñāna* as the state of his consciousness, but *ajñāna* as defined above is the state of a person who is undergoing the rise of the view-deluding karma. The difference between the two is due to difference in the ‘*pātra*’ (the person). *Jñāna* is also differentiated in two states on account of the *pātra* who possesses it. If soul has ‘*samyak darśana*’ (right view), what is known is ‘*jñāna*’ (knowledge); and if it has ‘*mithyādarśan*’ (perverted view), it is ‘*ajñāna*’ (ignorance). This is the basis on which “*bheda* (difference)-*abheda* (identity)” between *jñāna* and *caitanya* could be explained. If we say that the two are absolutely identical in all situations, there could not be two shades like *jñāna* and *ajñāna*.

### Jīva and Jīvātmā

In Indian philosophy, two terms have been frequently mentioned ‘*jīva*’ and ‘*jīvātmā*’. According to ‘*Vedānta*’, the original *ātmā* is *jīva*, which is *Brahma*. It is all pervading and is cumulative of all. Those souls which live in separate bodies are ‘*pratyag ātmā jīvātmā*’. ‘*Vedānta*’ says that it is only *jīvātmā* which can get involved into wicked acts, not the original *ātmā*, which is *Brahma*. The use of the term *jīvātmā* aims at resolving the discrepancies which might come in the belief that *jīva* (or *Brahma*) is absolutely pure and ubiquitous. Thus the *ātmā* which indulges in evils is actually *jīvātmā*

and not *jīva*. As the *jīvātmā* is an embodied one or possessed of body, it indulges in evils. The *jīva* (or *Brahma*) has nothing to do with it.

In *Syādvādamāñjarī*, (a treatise on Jain Logic), Acharya Hemchandra has critically examined the above assertion. He contends that “where you get the attributes of a substance (or a thing), there only you also get the thing itself. For example, where you get the attributes of a pot (or earthenware), the pot also will be there, it cannot exist anywhere else. This is a truth beyond any controversy. Still, there are some philosophers who have become deluded on account of their pervert metaphysical doctrine. Hence, they do not accept such evident truth and try to establish the existence of reality of soul as something outside the body.”\*

The Jain philosophy has very clearly put forward its metaphysical belief in this context. When Lord Mahāvīra was asked whether the *jīva* and the *jīvātmā* were two distinct realities which were different from the attributes like great vow, intellect, knowledge, self-exertion, life-form, karma, psychic colour, belief, perception, activity, sentience etc., right forth rejected such statement as illogical and asserted that—*jīva* and *jīvātmā* were one and the same. It is a very important philosophical truth. Those who believe in the doctrine of pantheistic monism of Soul will be confronted with the problem viz., ‘if the Soul is pure and *Brahma*, then why would be there so many vitiations?’ Again, ‘if the Soul is one, how is this possible?’ Actually, in order to resolve this problem, they have coined a new word—*jīvātmā*.

All the philosophers who are *Ekātmavādi* (Pantheistic Monist), base their contention on ‘*Pratibimbavāda*’ (theory of reflection). In the ‘*Upaniśadas*’, it has been said—‘*eko ghaṭaḥ nānā rūpeṇa pratibimbitaḥ*’ i.e., the same pot is reflected in various replicas. In the Jain canonical text, *Sūtrakṛtāṅga Sūtra*, we get a reference to this theory as follows—“Just as the same cluster of soil is perceived in

\* *yatraiva yo dr̥ṣṭagūṇaḥ sa tatra kubhādivara niṣpratipakṣametad.  
tathāpi dehātbahirātmamatvatvamatatvavāḍopahatāḥ paṭhanti..*

the various forms, so also the same cluster of sentence (knowledge) is perceived in various forms.”

Although the above reference supports the Pantheistic Monism, but the Jain philosophers have expressed their doubt about such a theory. (They say that the mirror would reflect only those features which are there in any particular thing and not from any other thing).

For the sake of argument, even if it is accepted that all action which is not in the original (*bimba*) could get reflected in the image. If the sun is unclouded, its reflection in water would also be like it, how can it be “a clouded sun”?

The doctrine of multiplicity of souls is directly perceived. One cannot deny that all individuals are separate. If we consider the multiplicity of souls as the reflection, then whatever is there in the original object should be there in its reflections. If there is neither good acts nor evil acts in the original Soul (*Brahma*), how they would get appeared in the reflection? From where they would crept in there?

The Jain philosophy accepts independent existence of each of all different souls. Every soul has its own ‘substance’. There is, therefore, no need for the Jain philosophy to invent a new theory of reflection. *Jīva* and *jīvātma* are one and the same. Although we find use of both words, their meaning is the same.

If we hold that non-attached *ātma* and the one which is attached to matter through Karma are different, we would also fall into a philosophical trap—for, if there are many individual souls, each *ātma* is to be considered as pervading the whole *śarīra* (body) and is therefore, *anitya* (impermanent). Now, no limited substance can be permanent—this is an accepted theory. That is to say, whatever is unlimited is eternal, but whatever is limited cannot be so. Then God also would become *anitya*. The *Vedānta* had to take recourse to *ekātmavāda* (Monistic Doctrine of Soul) in order to come out of this trap of *anitya*. So it had to create the concepts like *jīvātma* in order to

explain '*nānātmavāda* and *pratyag ātmā*'.

This way the Jain philosophy avoids the zig-zag of creating the web of *nānātmavāda*, *ekātmavāda* and *bimbapratibimbavāda*.

—xxx—

**BHEDĀBHEDA-VĀDA**  
**(Doctrine of Identity-cum-  
 Difference of Body & Soul)**

Jainism affirms that there is a relation of *bhedābheda* i.e., 'identity-cum-difference' between the soul and the body. The view that the soul is identical with the body is based on the fact—"Kāyena kṛtasya anubhavanāt"—"All our worldly actions are experienced by the soul through the body." Thus, the body is the medium to feel and to experience the fruits of what we do. In that sense, there is 'abheda' (identity) between the two viz., soul and body. But since soul remains intact even when the body vanishes, the two i.e., soul and body are different. When our soul rests with our body that it occupies, it is the governing unit which gives commands for all our actions. In that sense the soul and the body work in unison. It should also be understood that the soul is an indivisible whole since the soul is not divisible in fragments resting in different parts of the body.

But the body's parts are divisible. Suppose, if a part of body is severed or cut off from the body, that part will become separate from the body and that will become senseless, i.e., without the capacity to experience or have any sensation, but the remaining body will still have the capacity to have sensation. It means that the soul has become contracted in the remaining body; but the soul can never be cut into two or many parts. Similarly, if a hole is created in

the body, the soul does not have the hole in it. Thus, the soul is separate from the body.

In absence of soul, the dead body cannot have the sensation or experience of pain etc. If however both are considered to be absolutely identical, then when the body is cremated then the soul also would get burnt, and if it really happened so, then there would not be the next worldly existence of the soul. It would amount to the denial of the doctrine that the soul is non-inflammable, or incumbstible, non-piercable and non-divisible. Even if we look at this relationship from other angle, we reach the same conclusion i.e., '*bheda-cum-abheda*'. When we analyse the subtler body (*Karma-śārīra*), the soul and body appear to be integrated. On the contrary, if we analyse the gross body (*audārika śārīra*), the two look quite distinct. This interpretation however is not so strong as the former one.

Some Western philosophers have also pondered over the above subject. The '*Nāstikas*' (non-believers in existence of soul) among the philosophers hold the view that the soul and the body are one and the same. On the contrary '*Ātmavādins*' (believers in the real existence of soul) say that the body and the soul are different realities. Lord Mahāvīra said that the ultimate truth lies in neither of these two opposite view-points. At best, they are partial truths. We can understand the distinctness as also their oneness or identity only through a relative perspective or vision.

If they are absolutely distinct from each other, then no interaction or impact is possible between them. We get the illustration of the relation of 'rain' and 'the sun' with the sky. If the sky is one and the same with rain and sun, then there cannot be any interaction between them, and if on the other hand, they are absolutely different, then they cannot have any relation with each other. So, Lord Mahāvīra said—'Both are identical as well as different'.

Now, the question may arise whether the body is corporeal or non-corporeal. The answer is that it is both—the karma-body is

non-corporeal, for it is not perceptible. The gross body is corporeal, for it is visible. Just as the protoplasm is very fine and hence, it is not visible through eyes, so also the karma-body is imperceptible.

The question whether the body is animate or inanimate can also be answered thus—it is animate as well as inanimate. The body of a living being is animate, while that of a dead creature is inanimate.

The etymological meaning of the word *jīva* is—“*jīvati prāṇān dhārayati iti jīvaḥ*.” It means, that which is living or which sustains the *prāṇa* i.e., vital energy, is *jīva*. We (human being) are *jīva* with physical body (*audārika śarīra*). But it is different from the *karma*-body, in which the soul transmigrates between two successive births.

‘*Muktātma*’—the liberated souls do not enter this cycle of births. We, the mortals, are alive due to ‘*dravya prāṇa*’ (physical life-force) filled in our bodies. But the liberated souls, though they are also called *jīva*, they exist as pure souls without any physical life-force. Their existence rests on ‘*bhava prāṇa*’ which is non-physical.

‘*Ajīvas*’ also may have the body. A photograph of a person or his statue is nothing else but *ajīva*, which has the body. Thus, both *jīva* and *ajīva* can have the body.

There is relationship between *jīva* and body, *jīva* and *mana*, *jīva* and speech. The second and third relationships are not long lasting but the first one is of lasting nature.

The word *kāya* means body. It remains for a longer time, and hence it is called *kāya*. The etymological meaning of body is—“*kāyājja śarīra*”. It is the state of continuous collection—*cīyamāna*.

When *jīva* bears a body, there is continuous process of metabolism, which goes on till death. This has been described as the state called ‘*chīyamāna*’. In our body, every moment there is influx of new particles of matter and also outflux of older ones. To understand this process, let us take the example of sand being



collected in a fist. Quite a great number of particles are dropped from it. The metabolic process of the body is like this.

—xxx—

## JAIN PHILOSOPHY & SCIENTIFIC QUEST

The present age is the one of the dominance of science, and hence, one feels exalted by calling one's own religion as a "scientific" one. It is easier to consider Jainism as a scientific religion in the tone of exaltation. But I do not want to do so. I feel that Jainism qualifies itself to be placed in the category of a science due to its spirit of scientific inquiry. It explores the truth through scientific mode and does not stop till that truth is fully realized.

### Human Being as the Authority

The first count, on the basis of which we can justify Jainism as a science is its dictum—"*appaṇā sacca mesejjā*"—"Everyone has to do his own search in order to reach the truth". According to Jainism, any human being cannot reach truth by the grace of some unexplainable power, but one's own '*sādhana*' is a must for its attainment.

According to Jainism, "Human being is the authority—the highest source of revelation of truth." It is the "human being" who can be considered as the authority on truth; he is himself an *Āgama* or a scripture. Jainism does not regard any scriptures as the unquestionable authority on the truth. One who accepts the philosophy of Jainism becomes a follower of some person, and not that of a "book".

Truth has infinite angles or aspects. Every real substance (*dravya*) is constantly changing and always incorporating infinite

number of modes—ever new modes come into existence and the older ones cease to exist. That is why the reality could never be in a static condition. Every moment, it takes a new form; there are as many forms as the moments. In order to know the ever new modes and ever new forms of reality, we must continuously pursue our search for finding out the ultimate truth. Each one of us has the right to do so.

## Two Inevitable Aspects of Truth

A sage, who realizes the truth in its entirety is known as ‘*Sarvajña*’ (omniscient one) or ‘*Kevali*’ in the Jain parleys. But due to the limitations of the speech, language, lxicography and life-span what the *Kevali* has realised as truth can not be communicated in its entirety despite best of articulation. Hence, the doors of search for truth is open for everybody and it must go on and on. This is the reason why authority of any *grantha* (scripture), howsoever authoritative it be in logic or arguments, cannot be accepted.

Since our world is constantly changing, the truth also has two aspects viz., (1) eternal and (2) ever-changing. Both are inevitable. The Jain philosophy has accepted both change and non-change as the two aspects of truth. Any philosophy which would try to explain the change without explaining the non-change and vice versa cannot be accredited as a scientific philosophy.

‘*Anekānta*’ which is encompassing both the aspects of each *dravya* is the logical way to comprehend the truth in totality through a multi-angular vision.

## Matter is a Reality too

Acharya Hemachandra wrote—“O Lord! Although the heretics could deny your supernatural powers, but how can they deny to accept the “Realism” (propounded by you)?” In the realistic philosophy, the real (objective) existence of matter cannot be denied.

The Jain philosophy concedes the of both—the soul as well as the matter, since both of them have their independent existence.

Matter is directly perceived by us, and hence, it cannot be denied. It is too complicated to believe in mere subjective existence of matter. Hence, the independent existence of matter becomes logical and natural.

The acid test of any scientific religion is whether it concedes the accountability of a person towards the fruits of his own actions. Often some people do not hold themselves responsible for their own action, but by considering the circumstance or the God Almighty as solely responsible for things that happen due to their own actions; they try to prove themselves free from the responsibility of evils they do.

### Acceptance of Independent Action

Their line of plea is: "I have not indulged in such and such (evil) action, but the circumstances have compelled me to do so"; or "I did not do it because of my own will, it is the will of the Almighty, which has compelled me to do so"; or "According to our philosophy, not even a single leaf can shake itself without the will of the Almighty (God), then how can I claim myself to be responsible for such and such action?" and so on. This attitude is a big obstacle in the development of independent *chetanā* (consciousness) of human beings, which is the felt need of our times.

In absence of independent *chetanā*, many mental illusions have cropped up, which hinder the real development of soul. One who lives in such illusory beliefs cannot free his soul from the mechanical consciousness.

### Karma is not Almighty

The theory of Karma is another real test of the scientific spirit of any religion. Many of the known religions subscribe to the cause and effect theory about Karma but sole dependence on Karma makes the argument mechanical and lopsided. This is not, in fact, desirable. No doubt, Karma is an important factor affecting the *chetanā* and yet it is not the whole and sole authority; as a matter of fact it has to work along with *Kāla* (Time-factor), *Svabhāva* (Nature), *Puruṣārtha*

(Self-exertion) and *Niyati* (Universal Laws). It is always a combined operation. All these do have their effect on soul; yet, the soul is to some extent not effected by them. If the soul would not have the capacity to remain unaffected to some extent, it could not have preserved its independent existence. One needs *Anekāntic* vision to understand and analyse such complex processes having multiple dimensions.

The explanation of the multi-faceted character of human being and diversely manifested actions of him is possible only through a conciliatory approach, which in fact, is the scientific nature of religion. It is the one-sided view which renders religion unscientific. Fortunately, relative (non-absolutistic) and harmonious approach has been considered as a holy trend in the present-day scientific view, and it is only through such *anekāntika* approach that one can fathom the bottomless depth of the ocean of Truth.

The best course, therefore, as per Jainism, is to seek the truth through one's own realizations by following a process where *Kāla*, *Niyati* etc., and *Puruṣārtha* operate simultaneously and in a complementary role.

## SAMASYĀ AUR MUKTI

### (Problems and their Solutions)

It is true that we have innumerable problems in this world. However, before we think of their solution, we must first find out what does a problem mean or what is the ultimate problem. According to Jain philosophy, the ultimate problem is known as 'āśrava' (influx of Karmas) and the solution is 'śamvara' (stoppage of the influx of Karmas). Let us dwell upon them. Every person has a particular world-view (*dr̥ṣṭikona*) which may either be right or perverted. When we consider the sequence of problems, we find that :—

There is a chain of catalyst factors, which creates the problems, individually or in combinations. The first is '*mithyā dr̥ṣṭikona*' (perverted world-view). It, in turn, triggers multiplication of problems. The second in the chain is '*Tṛṣṇā*' (cravings for worldly desires); it is a kind of thirst which, when we try to quench it, becomes more and more intense. We go on aspiring for new objects of consumption, their list becomes endless.

This insatiable thirst for indulgence and various objects of pleasure is illustrated by a parable in the Jain Literature:

A wood-cutter used to go everyday to a forest and manufacture coal by burning the wood. Once, it was a very hot day of summer. He worked in the sun and stood beside the furnace. In the afternoon, he got thirsty. He had only a little quantity of water left with him,

which he drank away, but he could not satiate himself. He thought, "If I will remain awake, I would feel myself more thirsty, and hence, let me sleep sown." Thinking so, he went to sleep, during which he had a dream. He saw that he was thirsty, standing near a very vast tank. In the dream, he drank all the water from the tank, and still could not quench his thirst. Further, in the quest of water, he rambled everywhere and drank away all the water of all the rivers and tanks he came across, still he remained thirsty. Thereafter, he went into search of water, and saw a small pool which was nearly dried up, but still there was some mud in it. He threw dry straws of grass in the mud to make them wet and then tried to squeeze water from the wet straws into this mouth to quench his thirst.

Now the question is : Is it possible to quench the thirst which does not get quenched even after drinking all water of all the rivers and tanks, by a few drops of water? Obviously not.

In the same way a perverted world-view generates so much desires in the mind of a person that even the objects of the whole world cannot quench his thirst. It is the second thing in the chain—the cravings or *tr̥ṣṇā*.

The *tr̥ṣṇā*, in turn, gives rise to the third member in the chain—'pramāda' (remissness) which creates mental disorder—'unmād' i.e., violent outburst or infatuation; it includes intoxication. Under its influence, man cannot know or see or hear in spite of knowing, seeing or hearing. It creates a quite strange condition which stupifies one and makes him extremely engrossed in the sensuality.

The *pramāda*, in turn, gives rise to the fourth member of the chain, viz., *kaṣāya* or *āveśa* i.e., passions or impulses. They madden man all the more and he may lose his temper and get enraged over even trivial matters, or become conceited, or indulge in deceit and fraud, or create a feeling of jealousy and malice or contempt in him towards others, and so on. They follow each other like a big family of vices and negative emotional drives.

They produce the fifth member of the chain, viz., agitation of

mind, speech and body. This in itself is a very great problem. Man is then unable to see his own self (soul).

When man ceases to see (and know) his own self, myriads of problems crop up, and there is an endless chain of problems. Although the problem of poverty, housing, clothing etc. are there, but they are in fact not the main problems, they are rather the offshoots of the main problems. The root causes and the subsidiary causes are to be distinguished. When we go into deep analysis, the root cause is only one—man cannot see (or know) his own soul, his own basic identity. The above five causes viz.,—

1. Perverted world-view — *mithyā dr̥ṣṭikona*
2. Unrestrained desires — *asaṃyama*
3. Remissness — *pramāda*
4. Passions (*kaṣāya*)
5. Agitation (of mind, speech and body)

form the basis of the root cause viz., self-ignorance.

According to Jain philosophy, the above five *āśrava* are the fundamental problems. They constitute, in fact, sufferings in the worldly existence. The vicious circle of worldly sufferings is due to the above chain of problems. Unless it is broken, we cannot resolve the social, mental and even economic problems we are facing.

Let us ponder over one of the economic problems.

It is a common sight that many among the wealthy class of people are dishonest and immoral in their dealings. Why is it so, when they already have all the worldly resources at their disposal? The question arises: For a rich person, when there is not provocation or compulsion due to which a poor or unprivileged person suffers and which forces him to abandon the path of honesty, then why should he become dishonest? On the contrary, a poor cannot become so immoral as a dishonest rich. So poverty is not the reason for this problem. It is the greed. The problem of greed is a major one.



Unfortunately, instead of addressing this problem, only the problem of poverty is tried to solve; and we see that the problem is not resolving; poverty exists; some people are becoming too rich, while some are rendered too poor. The mountain and the pit are formed simultaneously. Again, a question arises : Can this disparity be dissolved? I think it is not impossible, but untill we pay attention to the problems at root, we can not hope for the solution.

The Jain philosophy prescribes a single-point solution to this problem. You can sort out such problems through the theory of the influx of Karmas and inhibition (*saṃvara*) thereof. The redemption from the ill effects of Karmas lies in the five-fold strategy of *saṃvara* as follows:—

- (1) '*Samyak dr̥ṣṭikōṇa*' (Right world-view) : Attainment of the right world-view is necessarily accompanied with the development of the spiritual qualities like compassion, peace of mind, spirit of renunciation, i.e., detachment from the material objects of consumption etc., which would lead one to become free from *tr̥ṣṇā*.
- (2) Reduction in greedness, which would lead to *apramāda*.
- (3) Non-remissness, which enhances one's alertness.
- (4) Freedom from passions means curbing of vices such as anger, conceit, deceit, greed, feeling of enmity, fear etc. Such a person is also free from jealousy, for jealousy is mainly due to greed for material possessions and pleasures. Ultimately, this would lead to the fifth *saṃvara*.
- (5) The ultimate stage is stoppage of all agitations—mental, vocal and physical. It creates peace of mind and cultivates the habit to perceive the self.

Conclusively, we can say that five *āśrava*s are the problems and five *saṃvara*s are the solutions.

The Jain Acharyas have combined the three attributes—*samyak jñāna* (right knowledge), *samyak darśan* (right vision), *samyak cāritra* (right conduct) into ‘*Ratnatrayī*’ (trinity of gems), which is the grand path to reach the ultimate emancipation. It means—first have knowledge, then have faith in it, and then observe right conduct—put into practice what is right. This trinity also constitutes the path of solutions to the problems.

*Samyak darśana* (right world-view) means ‘experiencing’ the truth. It is much more than mere ‘knowing’. In absence of “inner experience of truth, the knowledge is incomplete.

The right world-view means—first to develop faith in the truth, which is known through the inner knowledge and then experience it or have a direct perception of it.

The third attribute is *samyak ācarana*. It means putting into practice the truth you have realized by right knowledge and inner experience. The three jewels together pave the path towards the ultimate emancipation, which is freedom from the karma *saṃskāras*, passions and the cessation of all *Āśravas* i.e., the influx of Karmas.

Jain philosophy maintains that it would be rather a one-sided statement to say that emancipation is achieved only after the last death. He who does not achieve freedom from passions in one’s life-time cannot attain *mukti* even after the death. That is why the present moment is very valuable. There are two ways to achieve the state of *mukti*: first is ‘*saṃvara*’ (stoppage of influx) of Karmas and second is *nirjarā* (dissociation of Karmas). Through *nirjarā*, one tries to exhaust the bondages incurred in the past, and simultaneously through *saṃvara*, one does not indulge oneself in actions creating new bondage, and ultimately, through these two means of cleansing the soul, one reaches the purest state which is “*mukti*”. One of the media of *saṃvara* and *nirjarā* is the practice of ‘*dhyāna*’ (meditation). In ‘*Prekṣā Dhyāna*’, the Jain system of meditation, the practitioner tries to live only in the present. In this state of mind, there is neither any thought nor any dilemma; the *chetanā* becomes free even from any ‘*bhāva*’ (emotions). The soul

absorbed in meditation makes a very strong and effective effort to shed off the *sanskāras*.

Lord Mahāvīra, therefore, stressed that—“Go to the basic cause of all your problems and destroy them. When you achieve the state of *saṃvara*, all your problems will automatically fade out.”

The path shown by Jainism not only helps to sort out problems related to the spiritual domain, it can also be an effective method to solve our social, economic and political problems. The key to solution is that the problems are contained at their grass root level.

An incident of Tolstoy’s life is useful to understand this point: Once a beggar approached Tolstoy, and begged money. Tolstoy said him, “It is not good to beg; you should do labour yourself and earn your bread.” The beggar said, “Sir! I don’t have any means to do labour.” Tolstoy, instead of giving bread or money to the beggar, gave him some equipment like an axe by using which he started earning his daily bread and gave up begging.

## WE ARE THE CREATOR OF ALL OUR HAPPINESS AND SUFFERING

There are two kinds of feelings : Happiness and suffering. All of us experience both; you cannot find a single man who has not experienced both. Still, we all want to get happiness and get rid of suffering. As long as it is the case relating to the former, we are not bothered, but no sooner when we encounter grief or sorrow than our mind starts searching the source or the cause of that. The answer is that there is a single source for both happiness and suffering—pain and pleasure, and it is none other than our own ‘Soul’.

As the door is the same for all to enter in, whether the comer is a man, or a dog, or a donkey. In the same way, the source is the same through which both happiness and suffering enter into our soul, and it is the soul itself which is responsible for both happiness and suffering.

Then, again the question would arise : If all of us aspire happiness and pleasure, why should we get suffering and pain? The fact is that our action is responsible for both. In spite of aspiring happiness, our action is such that it results in suffering. We cannot impose the responsibility on anyone else, not even on God.

Another question is : Why Jainism does not believe in God as the Creator? To this, Jainism’s solution is as follows: — Whatever is the fundamental existence can have no creator. Soul is a *mūla tattva*

i.e., fundamental existence itself, and hence, it cannot have a creator. So also, *paramāṇu* (the ultimate atom) or *pudgala* (physical reality) itself is a fundamental existence, and hence, it cannot have any creator. Modes have creator. All the modes of soul are created by the soul itself and all the modes of *pudgala* are created by *pudgala*. Soul can create its modes through volition, *pudgala* has no volition, so the modes of *pudgala* are created by laws of nature.

The modes of soul are happiness and suffering or pleasure and pain. Even “human being” is a mode of soul. House, cloth, utensil—all objects are the modes of *pudgala*, the *paramāṇu* being its ultimate cause. But because soul and *pudgala* are *mūla tattva*, there is no one to create them.

Now, soul is the creator of all its states including happiness and suffering. The action of soul is due to its volition. If it desires happiness, it creates happiness; if it desires suffering, it creates suffering. Then a question arises as to how anyone can desire suffering. Jainism has deeply pondered over this question. It says that one who desires for happiness also desires for suffering; one who desires for life also desires for death. You cannot separate happiness from suffering, life from death—they are inseparable. You can’t desire for one only. If you desire for one, automatically you desire for both. If you do not desire at all, you can remain free from desire of both. So, a person who desires for happiness necessarily desires for suffering.

When Gautama Swami (the chief disciple of Lord Mahāvīra) asked him—“O Lord! who is the creator of suffering?” Lord Mahāvīra said—“*Ātmā* (soul) is the creator of all its *paryāyas*. It creates both pain and pleasures for itself.” Thus, Lord Mahāvīra propounded the ‘*Ātma-kartṛtvavāda*’ (theory of creation by the self). In matters of pleasure and pain, the worldly soul is solely responsible for them, as it does all its actions consciously. Both pleasure and pain are elementally one and the same, they being the two sides of the coin. When you ask for happiness, unconsciously you invite sorrow; you have no choice.

Is it not strange that when something good happens, and if someone concerned with it is asked as to who has done that, generally the reply is—"I have executed it," but when something wrong or evil is indulged in, the answer would be, "I don't know or I have not done it." It seems to be the human psychology that one wants to take the honour of everything good but disowns anything wrong or evil. It means that for good, you are responsible, but for bad, you throw the responsibility on others. This is not fair, nor it does justice. According to Jainism, your soul is responsible for both good and evil. Neither God nor anybody else nor any object is responsible for them. This is the gist of Jain doctrine of "*ātmakartṛtva*".

This doctrine helps us to develop a new avenue of our own consciousness, and that is to refrain from accusing others and confess one's own responsibility for doing anything wrong, or consider one's ownself as responsible for suffering or pain instead of accusing others. One has to distinguish between the two causal factors—the direct involvement as a doer of action and an instrumental cause. There may be many instrumental causes of happiness and suffering. For example, if there are favourable circumstances, a person becomes happy, while if there are adverse circumstances, a person becomes unhappy. The circumstances are only instrumental, but they cannot create the sensation of happiness and suffering. It is the person himself who experiences happiness and suffering. The person himself causes either happiness or suffering.

On the basis of anatomical science, there are two layers in our mind—one is responsible for sensation of happiness, while the other for suffering; one is the stimulating force and the other is that of inhibition. Suppose there occur the external circumstances for causing anger. The stimulative system makes man think—"I should be angry." But the inhibitory system may ask him not to do so, but to wait or watch. Out of the two systems, sometimes one has the upper hand, sometimes the other. If inhibitory system would not be there, man would lose his control over himself. It is only due to this inhibitory system that man could exercise his control.

Explaining the above phenomenon, the science of Karma also gives a similar picture. According to it, two opposite systems of *āvaraṇa* (the veil of Karma) and *anāvaraṇa* (the removal of the veil of karma) go together. There is the *āvaraṇa* over *jñāna* i.e., knowledge and we can not have knowledge, but at the same time there is partly *anāvaraṇa* which allows knowledge to occur. The same is the case with *darśana* (perception).

On account of the rise of pleasure-feeling karma we experience happiness and pleasure, while if the suffering-feeling karma rises, we would undergo suffering. When one rises, the other becomes dormant. In the same way, when the deluding karma rises, there is ‘*mūrchā*’ (infatuation), but when it subsides, there prevails alertness.

Deluding karma plays a very important role in our conduct, behaviour and action. There are two states of deluding karma—one is that of rise and the other is that of subsidence. When it is in the latter state, our conduct is good; but when it is in the former state, our conduct becomes evil. There is another Karma viz., *nāma karma* which is also of two types—auspicious and inauspicious. When the former comes into rise, all the material things we get are good and auspicious, but when the latter is in rise, all of them are bad or negative. The former one helps us in getting honour and good reputation, the latter one is just the opposite—it makes us defamed, we have bad reputation.

Thus there is duality everywhere—in our mind, in our personality, in our body, in our brain—and sometime the negative one. In the same person, the dual personality of a saint and a scoundrel is found (or say, Mr. Jackal and Dr. Hyde). Sometimes, one is manifest, the other is veiled and the vice versa. But, in reality, it is the soul itself responsible for both—saintliness and wickedness. So also, the soul itself is responsible for its own happiness and suffering; the soul is both—the creator of happiness and the creator of suffering.

A man has at his disposal three means to perform any activity—mind, speech and body. Activities may be good or evil. If

mind, body and speech are themselves good, the activity will also be good, and if they are vitiated, the activity will also be evil. Thus there is good mental activity, good vocal activity and good physical activity because of the auspicious mind, speech and body. If, on the other hand, these are inauspicious, there will be evil mental, evil vocal and evil physical activities.

The result of the activity is new bondage of *pudgala* and formation of new *saṃskāras*. The nature of bondage and *saṃskāras* is according to the nature of activities—that is, if the mental, vocal and physical activities are good, the new bondage (of karma) will also be good and so also will be the *saṃskāras*; and if the former are not good i.e., if they are vitiated, then the new bondage and the *saṃskāras* will also be evil. The good *saṃskāras*, when they ripe up, again make us to undertake good activities of mind, speech and body, while the bad or evil ones forces us to indulge in evil activities of mind, speech and body. This cycle goes on and on. The positive or negative *saṃskāras* or forces create the kind of *pudgalas* (material stimulants), which, in turn, produce a sort of chemical energy. This is the genesis of our emotional system, which is reflected into our behaviour—good or bad.

Even the same principle is accepted in behavioural science based on our body-chemistry, according to which, the bio-chemicals (hormones etc.) are produced in the body; in accordance with them, the emotions and attitudes are produced in our mind and again in unison with them are made our conduct and behaviour. Take for example, a person indulges in violence. He does so on account of the bio-chemical secretions, for, according to modern science, the hormones are responsible for one's behaviour.

If we consider the Jain view, there are deep inside this physical body the subtle (*sūkṣma*) and the subtler (*sūkṣmatara*) elements which carry programmed software for guiding the actions of the body. They are called the *saṃskāras* and serve as the sole guiding power for all our actions. This is the Universal Law.

Let us understand the whole phenomena—The *saṃskāras* are



inside the subtle elements from which they have their influence on the subtle body which, in turn, effect the physical body. Everything goes on according to the Law; there is, however, nobody to govern. The Laws themselves work and the whole phenomena takes place. We know how the Law works even when there is rain—the rain falls on the fertile soil and we see that the grass grows up. The Law of electrical phenomena works when the electricity is produced because of the two opposite charges—negative and positive. In the lightening, there is no one to govern the production of electricity; it all happens according to the Law, when negative and positive charges in the clouds associate. All cosmic phenomena go on according to the Universal Laws.

There are two kinds of Laws—(1) Universal Laws (2) Man-made Laws. The latter ones are only applicable to limited things, but the former ones are applied everywhere. The search of truth means the search of Universal Laws. The modern science has developed itself on the basis of such research. If finds out the Laws and a new secret is revealed. The philosophical search for truth is nothing else than the realization of these Eternal Laws. Same is the objective of science, which explores these Laws through experiments and observations.

Similarly the Law of 'cause of effect' is also not applicable in all cases. There are cases, which are covered by the phenomena of nature and caused by the *mūla tattva* themselves. These *mūla tattvas* are not caused by something. *Mūla tattvas* are, in fact, not an effect, and hence, they are not caused by anything. Their existence in itself is uncaused. Similarly, there are certain changes which take place only because of nature or they happen as an effect of the passage of time. For example, ageing is such a change. Man becomes old only due to the time-factor. New things also become old. Here, the cause of change is time. So, somewhere we find that changes are caused by time, somewhere by nature and somewhere it is brought about by somebody's action. Everywhere, we cannot apply the same Law.

Now, when we talk about the fate of man, Jainism says that in

ultimate analysis, the man (soul) is the creator of his own fate. Nobody else could be held responsible for that.

In creation of fate, many things of the external world become instrumental cause. Substances, place, time, and thousands of other factors may assist in materializing the fate, but the principal cause is one's own soul.

A person is enraged, because sometime someone has abused him or at other time someone has criticized him or somebody else has not obeyed him, and so on. There may be myriads of such instrumental causes, but after all, it is the man who is responsible for his anger. In spite of the external instrumental causes, a man may be able to control his anger, if he wants. That is why Jainism says that you are the creator of your own fate. It asks one not to depend upon others for creation of his own fate. He should neither beseech someone as a helpless person, nor should he accuse anyone for his ill-fate. He should always bear the responsibility on his own-self and create his fate. Only one who has understood this principle quite thoroughly can stand on his own feet. Then he pays attention to his own conduct or behaviour and becomes so careful as not to indulge in evil, or do something which would make his own fate blurred or blackened; on the contrary he would always endeavour to shape his future bright and golden through right conduct and right behaviour.

Thus, the control of fate is in our own hands. That is why Lord Mahāvīra says—"Be vigilant, don't be '*pramatta*'. The sword of fear hangs on your head if you are '*pramatta*'. This is the key with which you can handle the laws of nature. This is the formula by which you can write your own destiny. It is achieved by arresting the negative postulates of '*Karma-bandha*' and by creating the auspicious ones."

## **Summary**

We may summarise the above discussion : We ourselves (the soul) are the creator of our pleasure and suffering; we ourselves are the designer of our own fate; none else—not even God—is the

creator, none else is the governor of our fate. Of course, there are laws or principles of happiness and suffering, viz., what causes happiness and what causes suffering. We have to know and understand these laws.

The first law is : “What produces happiness and suffering” is ‘*āśrava*’.” When the *āśrava* is auspicious, it results in bondage of ‘*punya*’ (auspicious karma) and when it is inauspicious, it results in the bondage of ‘*pāpa*’ (inauspicious karma). *Punya* subsequently brings happiness, *pāpa* subsequently brings suffering.

The second law is : The opposite of ‘*āśrava*’ is ‘*saṃvara*’.

When the *saṃvara* occurs, there is no bondage either of *punya* or of *pāpa*; there is neither happiness nor suffering. It is a pure state when our consciousness becomes awakened and developed.

Just like the laws of *āśrava* and *saṃvara*, there are the laws of *bandha* (bondage), *punya* (auspicious karma), *pāpa* (inauspicious karma), *nirjarā* (shedding off of karma) and *mokṣa* (emancipation).

An insight into these Universal Laws enables us to become quite vigilant against incurring bondages. We come to know how to become free from the malevolent *saṃskāras* already incurred and how to develop new benevolent *saṃskāras*. On the whole, the laws of self-creationism and self-control have to be understood to understand all other laws and ultimately to go forward in the direction of one’s own beatitude.

## TRUTHFUL LIVING (Credo of Jain Philosophy)

Philosophy is not an imaginary flight nor it is something like building the castles in the air or daydreaming of a nitwit ever living in a fool's paradise. It is something very real and has application in the practical life. In applied sense, it means—one should live truthfully. Lord Mahāvira exemplified that in his life. What he preached was the real experience of his own life. Such a state is achieved through '*vītarāgatā*' (freedom from all attachments), when there is no gap in what you preach and what you practice.

In fact, the eternal result of philosophy is the establishment of complete harmony between precepts and practice. This is possible only if one is entirely free from all kinds of attachment or infatuation and aversion. If one's life is fraught with impulses of attachment and hatred, there would be discrepancy between what he says and what he does. The more a person draws himself nearer to the state of *vītarāgatā*, the more the discrepancy is dissolved. Thus, the criterion of a true *vītarāga* person is the perfect agreement between what he professes and what he practices.

### Meaning and Significance of Faith

The first duty of those who profess faith in Jain philosophy should be move towards to *vītarāgatā* which means equanimity. Whether he is a '*muni*' or a '*śrāvaka*' (a lay follower), he has to

introspect and see if he has made sufficient progress in the practice of *vītarāga*.

The more a person would live a truthful life, the more equanimous he would become. This is exactly the significance of faith in Jainism. The applied Jain philosophy means to lead a truthful living.

### **Ingenuousness and Truthfulness**

When somebody asked Lord Mahāvīra, “O Lord! where does the *dharma* (in its true sene) reside?”, Lord Mahāvīra said that the true *dharma* rests only in an unblemished soul, a soul which has ingenuousness and purity, and which is truthful to the core. He identified truthfulness with ingenuousness. He also said that one, who expressess ingenuousness through his physical, vocal and emotional activities, and whose action complies with his utterings, is in fact a truthful person.

### **Truth (Right View) should precede the Vow**

Some critics have said that in Jainism, the vow of ‘non-violence’ has been given the foremost position, sidelining other virtues like truthfulness etc.. Perhaps this comment has been made looking at the dualism and hypocrisy that certain people show in their lives today. They could be Jains or non-Jains. Intrinsically, it is not there in any religion. Lord Mahāvīra has prescribed the discipline of *vrata*, in which ‘*ahiṃsā*’ is also a ‘*vrata*’ (vow) in his philosophy.

But, at the same time, he has given truth, i.e., the right world-view, the first and foremost place in his philosophy. The place of *vrata* (including *ahiṃsā*) is second. According to Mahāvīra’s philosophy, whatever is truth is right view, and vice-versa. Without truth or right world-view, the practice of the vow of *ahiṃsā* is not possible. It means that one cannot practice ‘*Ahiṃsā Vrata*’ unless he is truthful. So truth is naturally the super objective.

### **Right Knowledge should precede Right Conduct (*Sajjñānaṃ Prathamam Dharmam*)**

‘*Ācāraḥ prathamō dharmah*’ (conduct is the first among religious virtues)—it is a well-established aphorism, found in the discourse of many religions. Lord Mahāvira has put it little differently—“*Paḍhamam nāṇam tao dayā*”—*Ācāra* (conduct) should follow *jñāna* (knowledge)—“*Nāṇassa sāra māyāro*”—the quintessence of knowledge should reflect in the conduct.

According to Jain philosophy, such knowledge does not mean merely knowing the facts and happenings; the real knowledge is that which is guided by *samyak darśana* (right world-view).

Knowledge which emerges within the framework of perverse world-view is always tainted by some sort of attachment and aversion, and hence such knowledge is termed as *ajñāna* in the Jain philosophy. According to Jainism, the true knowledge is that which ultimately makes one unattached to material objects, and makes one’s mind set in perfect equanimity and a sense of spiritual friendliness towards all is developed in him. That is why the Jain philosophy prescribes the trinity of right world-view (*samyak darśana*), knowledge (*samyak jñāna*) and conduct (*samyak ācāra*).

In this trinity, the first place is given to *samyak darśana*, the second to *samyak jñāna* and the third to *samyak cāritra*. Hence, without *samyak darśana*, one cannot have *samyak jñāna*, and without *samyak jñāna*, one cannot have *samyak cāritra*. Now, if we take *samyak jñāna* as identical with *samyak darśana*, then we can frame a new aphorism—“*sajjñānam prathamō dharmah*”. It believes in harmonizing various aspects of any issue with due consideration of their relativity.

## Heresay Vs. Truth

The Jain philosophy is neither merely *jñānavādī*, i.e., one who believes that it is only through knowledge (*jñāna*) that one can attain the *mukti*, nor merely *kriyāvādī*, i.e., one who believes that it is only through conduct (*kriyā*) that one can attain the *mukti*. But it accepts the utility of combination of both—*jñāna* as well as *kriyā*. One without the other is incomplete. It is only the right confluence of both of

them that can enable one to attain final emancipation.

Non-violence is a kind of conduct. Now, there is a heresay that Jainism gives more stress on *ahiṃsā* (i.e., *kriyā*). But reality is quite different from this. As Jainism is non-absolutistic philosophy, it gives relative value to each ingredient. It cannot emphasize only one. That is why it has given the same emphasis on both—*jñāna* and *kriyā*. It has maintained the balance between the two just like the two pans of the weighing machine.

### Root of Detachment

When the right world-view is not developed, man identifies his 'self' with the body and considers the material objects as his own. Such ego and possessiveness intensifies the attachment, which becomes the cause of the vicious circle of suffering. On the contrary, when the right world-view gets developed, first of all the illusion that I am body gets dissolved, and one comes to know the truth that, "I am soul, I am consciousness, I am not the body which is a physical substance devoid of consciousness." When such comprehension of distinction between the soul (self) and body becomes clear, then the roots of attachment get shakened.

Thus, the root of detachment is—*bheda-vijñāna* i.e., the real knowledge of the separation of soul from body. It is not merely a term, but it connotes the real (inner) experience. The more intense such experience is, the more intense the detachment becomes. The perverse belief that the material objects belong to me melts away when the real experience of *bheda-vijñāna* occurs. The body and the material objects become instrumental in augmentation of attachment, but when their separation from the self is internally experienced, it makes the gates to truth open.

### Let the *Bheda-vijñāna* be Strengthened

One meaning of truth is to know any reality in its true form. The value of such truth is only in the field of epistemology, not in that of ethics. The complete truth however is that which has both values—epistemological as well as ethical. In absence of the right

world-view, the development of the former truth is possible, but that of the complete truth is not possible.

A person who has attachment to some material object may be able to know a partial truth. For example, he knows that the thing to which he is attached so much is not salutary for him, yet he cannot become detached to him, for he is devoid of the experience of *bheda-vijñāna*. Therefore, inspite of knowing that something is harmful for him, he cannot renounce it.

The Jain philosophy, being an applied philosophy, can be actually observed or followed in life, only if the right world-view is strengthened and the knowledge of *bheda-vijñāna* is made very mature.



## PRINCIPLES OF NATIONAL INTEGRATION EMBEDED IN JAIN PHILOSOPHY

Before we come to the main topic, let us try to understand firstly the role of *dharma* in our life, and in this context, secondly, which aspect of Jain philosophy is relevant with national integration.

Every person is imperfect. What we mean by imperfectness here is the imperfect development of one's consciousness. Potentially a man may be able to develop his self perfectly, but if that potentiality remains undeveloped, he remains imperfect. *Dharma* is the medium or means to march forward from imperfectness to perfectness. In the Jain philosophy, only such *dharma* is considered as the most auspicious one.

The Jain philosophy regards that only that religion is auspicious (*maṅgala*), which enlightens you to shed impurity and helps developing full potential of the devotees. '*Ahiṃsā*' (non-violence), '*saṃyama*' (restraint) and '*tapa*' (penance) are the three basic foundations of a free and perfect religion. The opposite of that is—pleasure-seeking or convenience-seeking attitude, which creates problems for the society.

Lack of self-restraint and hedonistic tendencies tend to produce divisive and disintegrating forces in society. In order to prevent them, what is needed is the development of *anekānta* view which is also, in fact, the right world-view. This comprises the first principle of national integration. Its application would be in the form of

relativistic and harmonious behaviour. '*Anekānta*' helps to build a synergy between the two paradoxes and to bring about the unanimity in different views. It is a process by which you reach conclusions based on harmony through a relative analysis and not based on any absolute dogmas. The philosophy of '*anekānta*', when it settles deep into man's heart and his thinking processes, ultimately helps to subside feelings such as selfishness and divisiveness in society, nation and even in the international field.

### **Relativistic Approach as the Principle of Unity**

The first and foremost element of *anekānta* is the relativistic approach (*sāpekṣatā*). If someone considers his view as right, it is so only if he adopts a relativistic approach and considers that his view is right only relatively; at the same time, he has to create harmony with the views of others, which may be even quite opposite.

For example, if we take the question of basic necessities of life, it can be said that water is the first basic need of life; without it, life is impossible. Now, this view is true relative to the nourishments or aliments taken in. But when we consider the in-take of air, it can be said that the prime necessity of life is air, while water is second to it. Thus we have to bring in relativity everywhere. In the same way, for walking the right and the left legs are brought in front alternately. When the right is brought in front, the left, of course, has to stay behind, and vice-versa. The same relativistic approach, in which one becomes relatively prominent, others are made secondary and so on, is to be adopted in context of the social system as well as the national integration.

### **Adamancy is a Hindrance**

Adamancy is a hindrance in both progress and development. Insistence on a particular language, province etc. give rise to adamancy. '*Anekānta*' philosophy has no room for adamancy about any particular view-point, which causes friction in the society on silly matters such as those based on sectarian interests of certain groups of people. We can accept relative importance of a particular

language or a particular caste in context of a particular situation, but by giving absolutistic importance to it, we cannot maintain the national integration or humankind's unity. When '*anekānta*' sets itself into the thought process of men, then there is no scope for divisive tendencies.

## Relativity in Inter-national Relations

Jainism believes that the entire humankind is one race. Of course, there could be some divisions or classifications in society based on certain norms such as individual capabilities, profession, etc., but that should not lead to the stratification of society. Utilitarian outlook may be allowed only to that extent that it does not violate the fundamental principle, but if it transgresses its limit, it would become irrelevant. There is utility of the separate entities of nations, but peace in the world could only be there, if they all are held together in a relationship of inter-dependence and internal unity. This inter-dependence is so inevitable that no nation can remain completely aloof or independent. The embassies are the symbols of this inter-relatedness.

## The First Step in the Direction of Non-violence

Once we accept the virtue of relativity (*sāpekṣtā*), all relationships would reflect the intra-dependence among people and the commonality of their interests. Consequently, one would then adopt the attitude of '*samanvaya*' (harmony). That is the first milestone towards journey to '*ahiṃsā*'. It is true that violence appears to be a short-cut solution to conflicts in practical life. But it cannot be the lasting solution. In fact, if we make an evaluation in broader perspective, we would find that it (violence) has created more problems and it is the most pernicious element for the humankind. Lord Mahāvīra, Lord Buddha and other great souls like Mahatma Gandhi, therefore, focussed on the need to cultivate '*ahiṃsā*' as an important ingredient of social conduct. But we do not seem to have taken this advice seriously. As a result, there is chaos all over the country due to unwanted violence in all spheres of social and political life. The national disintegration is also one of the burning sparks

from the fire of violence.

## The Problem of Violence

“The whole humankind is but a single race”— this is a theoretical principle, but in practice, what we see is a wide-spread diversity among the human race. It is due to varying perceptions based on—beliefs, faiths, thought processes, views, tastes, the age-old practices of their social behaviour and so on. These can surely be synthesized through unbiased dialogue and mutual understanding, without resorting to violence. In fact, it is not the differences such as those mentioned above, which cause divisions in the human race. The real problem is one’s ego and the agitation in mind, which turns itself into violence. There is no exception, in so far as this tendency is concerned, between illiterates and the intellectuals.

In fact, intellectuals are more responsible for making the ethnic, racial or religious differences the cause of violence, because of their strong impulses of anger etc. and certain rigidity in their beliefs such as fundamentalism.

The natural diversity in human beings is a probelm for non-violence ; this, in fact, is taken advantage of by violence. Our misfortune is that we can mechanically uniformize the lifeless physical objects and make them exactly equal if we want, but we cannot do so in case of the living human beings who are possessed of consciousness. Still, there is one means of uniformization of human beings, and that is the “practical training”.

In order to arrest the above malady, we shall have to correct the psychic imbalances in our behaviour. This can be achieved through inculcating certain desirable value systems in our mental make-up through proper training and regular practice. Men, who are oriented into *ahiṃsā* and the spirit of *anekānta* will help to build a society, which is comparable to ‘*Yaugalic Samāja*’ i.e., a society, which came into being in pre-historic age, and its members by nature, had little passions such as anger, ego, deceit and greed.

The human psychology then was not obsessed by impulses of all these passions. Consequently, it was a non-violent and non-acquisitive human society. In the present society, the intensity of fourfold passions has, in fact, complicated the problems of violence and acquisitiveness.

## The Basic Principle of National Integration

Now, let us not fight shy in accepting the fact that on one hand we desire that the development of non-violent and non-acquisitive society should take place, while on the other hand the passions are allowed to be intensified. Then, it is impossible that the desired development could take place in intensified passions. So also the application of *anekānta* would not be possible in intensified passions. The basic principle for development of *anekānta*, *sāpekṣatā*, *samanvaya* (harmony), *ahiṃsā* and non-acquisitiveness—all these virtues—what is needed first is to develop control over the intensification of passions.

This is also the basic principle of emotional or national integration.

There is a very famous aphorism in Jain philosophy—‘*Kaṣāya-mukti kila muktireva*’—‘*Mukti* (liberation) consists essentially in freedom from passions’. If you get rid of *kaṣāyas* i.e., passions etc., you can achieve *mukti* (i.e., liberation) both in realising the ultimate truth by attainment of liberation from karma as well as by getting freedom from the problems while living your worldly life. You develop an effective mechanism inside your system, which helps you to control the bouts of emotional crisis. This is possible if we start this process by training our children and help them to develop these inner strengths built by nature into their psyche itself.

Even while deliberating over the issue of emotional integration, we have to pay attention to the training in restraint over passions, to be introduced in the education.

Jainism has always paid attention to the fact that instead of sprinkling water into the main roots, if it is sprinkled on the flowers

and leaves, no ultimate aim could be achieved. So, while deliberating over “national integration”, it is imperative to tackle the very base by planning the root-policy of training in “restraint over passions”.

—xxx—

## DHARMA & MORALITY (NAITIKATĀ)

While deliberating over the Jain Dharma, the following four prominent topics should be discussed Metaphysics, Ethics, Mathematics and Parables. On the basis of these four topics, the Jain canonical literature can be divided into four categories as under:

*Dravyānuyoga (Tattva Mimāṃsā)* — Metaphysics

*Charaṇakarmānuyoga (Ācāraśāstra)* — Ethics

*Gaṇitānuyoga* — Mathematics

*Dharmakathānuyoga* — Parables

Out of the above, the most important one from the point of view of its influence on society is the ‘*Ācāraśāstra*’—ethics. Its impact is clearly visible on the society. Metaphysics remains in the background, while the social conduct and behaviour are directly related with the ethics. Lord Mahāvīra prescribed a model code of conduct to serve as a nucleus for harmonious social relationship. It was this basic formulation, on which ‘*Aṇuvrat*’ was later conceived. ‘*Ahiṃsā*’—non-violence is on top of that code. Mahāvīra’s *sūtra* is—‘*Ahiṃsā*’ is *dharma* in itself.

Hence, violence cannot be perpetrated for the cause of *dharma*. In fact, it is only through the practice of *ahiṃsā* that you can protect *dharma*, and hence, no violence is allowed to protect *dharma*. Lord Mahāvīra proclaimed—the whole humankind is but one race. To discriminate on the basis of caste, colour, creed or to practice

untouchability or to show hatred towards any particular section of the society is nothing short of violence.

There is no scope whatsoever of all such discriminations in the *ahiṃsā-dharma*. Any kind of discrimination if practiced in the society shall ultimately prepare the ground for violence. *Dharma* is well protected by '*Ahiṃsā*'. It is not proper to resort to violence with excuses like violence for protecting the *dharma*.

According to Lord Mahāvīra, there are three basic characteristics or virtues, that govern the '*dharma*'. They are '*ahiṃsā*' (non-violence), '*saṃyama*' (self-restraint), and '*tapa*' (austerities). All these virtues are both spiritualistic in character (related to the purity of soul) and purely individualistic i.e., related with the person and not with the society. The conduct which is the product of the practice of the three virtues of *dharma* constitute the morality.

The consciousness free from *rāga-dveṣa* (attachments and aversions) in fact constitutes *ahiṃsā*. This is nature of pure (i.e., spiritualistic) *dharma*. The spiritual aspect of *dharma* ordains the followers to abide by a set of vows such as not to indulge in killing, falsehood, stealing and also to observe the vows like continence, non-possessiveness etc.. These are moralistic aspects of *dharma*. Our conscience, only when it achieves freedom from attachments and aversions (i.e., when it becomes *rāga-dveṣa-mukta*), reflects the true spirit of the spiritualistic *dharma*. That is the dawn of real spirituality.

Such *dharma* is not for the sake of anyone else or is least related with others. It is solely soul-centred. But non-killing etc. as the practice of moral vows are all centred round the conduct or behaviour involving others, and hence, they are all ethical or moral conduct. But, they all emanate from the spiritualistic *dharma* only, and that is why they cannot be antagonistic to *dharma*. Some of the modern thinkers, like Herbert Spencer and Thomas Huxley, who are known for their Naturalism or Humanitarianism, held the view that religion and morality are two separate streams. But, in our opinion, this is not correct.



As a matter of fact, the conduct or behaviour which is justified from the view-point of spiritualistic *dharma* can never be unjustified from the view-point of moralistic *dharma*. The only difference between the spiritualistic and moralistic *dharma*s is that the former is soul-centred or self-centred, while the latter is centred round others. But they cannot be so much poles apart that the same conduct (or behaviour) may get support of spiritualistic *dharma* and opposition from moralistic *dharma* simultaneously.

Some sociologists however have distinguished *dharma* from *naitikatā* on the basis of the *dharma* prescribed in the *smṛti* literature (like *Manu-smṛti*). (But such *dharma* cannot be considered as spiritualistic *dharma*). On the basis of such *dharma*, it is possible to distinguish *dharma* from *naitikatā*. In such cases, the conduct prescribed by *dharma* may be anti-moralistic. But it is evident that such *dharma* would be only a ritualistic conservative religion to prescribe social codes of conduct which would justify certain actions despite their follies, in the name of religion. Such practices have ultimately led to hippocratic behaviour among men and have obstructed the natural process of development of the society.

We may conclude that the spiritualistic form of *dharma* is soul-centred, while that of the moralistic has a broader application in society. Thus, *dharma* has two dimensions, but both of them, being fundamentally based on the eternal truths, are not amenable to any fundamental change. On the contrary, *dharma* depicted in the books of *Smṛti*, which prescribe only a social code of conduct, is based on the utilitarian approach in relevance to place and time. Therefore, it is amenable to change. But, unfortunately, when such changeable *dharma* is accepted as an eternal one and followed *in toto*, several social evils in the name of *dharma* crop up and the sociologists give a call against such *dharma*.

*Ahiṃsā* is the foundation of the society as a “system”, and hence, it is inevitable in social relationships. It means development of ‘*abhaya*’ (freedom from fear), and ‘*anākramaṇa*’ (non-aggression). We cannot have laws of the jungle in a civil society. *Abhaya* and

*anākramaṇa* are the two basic requisites for social harmony.

Even when the war between two or more nations come to an end, it is ultimately followed by “non-aggression treaty”, and sometimes even in time of peace, nations sign such treaties. The treaties in which people agree not to do aggression on each other or not to kidnap (or hijack) anyone and so on, stand as a guarantee for peace in society. So, development of the spirit of non-aggression and freedom from fear become the cornerstone of peace. That is why Lord Mahāvīra has prescribed *ahiṃsā* as the first principle in the code of conduct designed for the lay followers.

For the people, leading a householder’s life and observing social obligations, a gradual process of development of code of practising *ahiṃsā* has been prescribed.

There are three stages of *hiṃsā* (violence) which require a gradual renunciation for a lay follower—

- (1) *Āraṃbhajā hiṃsā* — the violence perpetrated during agricultural or professional activities such as commerce, industry etc.
- (2) *Virodhajā hiṃsā* — the violence perpetrated for defense against aggression.
- (3) *Saṅkalpajā hiṃsā* — the violence perpetrated in intentional activities for entertainment etc.

For a social being (i.e., a lay follower), it is not possible to eschew the first kind; it would not be impossible but quite difficult to get rid of the second kind; but it is quite possible to renounce the third kind; of course, gradually minimise it.

First, he should shun all thoughts leading to wilful violence—‘*Saṅkalpajā hiṃsā*’, coming to his mind out of frustration or anger. The second stage is ‘*Virodhajā hiṃsā*’ i.e., to keep his mind cool even when provoked and to respond to that without resorting to counter-violence. The last step is ‘*Āraṃbhajā hiṃsā*’—to avoid by all means resorting to violence at any cost towards any being including

nature and environment in general.

‘*Ahiṃsā*’ is a fall out of spirituality, yet it is equally effective in promoting social harmony. ‘*Hiṃsā*’ (violence) does not mean only killing people or other beings; worldly duals that hurt the sentiments of others is also ‘*hiṃsā*’. All sorts of quarrels, false allegations, back-biting, defaming others etc., are also subtle forms of *hiṃsā*.

Immorality in one’s actions in social conduct or in economic sphere also falls into the first stage of violence, i.e., *saṅkalpaja hiṃsā*. All these must be given up, if we want to create a healthy society. The first small vow called ‘*Ahiṃsā Aṇuvrat*’ is an effective instrument for creating a healthy society. Lord Mahāvīra experimented with this idea in his own times.

A social organisation of people, talking the vows, called “*Vratī Samāja*” was conceived. The society which is not *vrati*, i.e., which does not duly accept the vow to renounce *hiṃsā* and *saṃgraha* (limitless accumulation of wealth etc.), cannot be expected to remain free from the evil effects of *hiṃsā* and *saṃgraha*; it will necessarily be haunted by the problems due to the limitless desires (cravings) or accumulation of wealth giving rise to violence, and the ever new problems generated thereof. Nearabout five lakh followers of Mahāvīra’s principles in his times pursued spirituality through the vows of ‘*Aṇuvrats*’. Alongwith *ahiṃsā*, they practised *aparigraha aṇuvrata* limited (non-possessiveness).

In the concept of *Vratī Samāja* of Mahāvīra, there was equal stress on the vow of limited consumption to strengthen the practice of *aṇuvratas* of *ahiṃsā* as well as *aparigraha* (i.e., *asaṃgraha*). For, without the required restraint over the consumption, it is difficult to confine oneself to earn money through only the moral means (or pure means), and subsequently, the problem of immorality could not be solved. This lifts one to the higher plane of spirituality. Today, we should once again subscribe to the vows of *aṇuvrat* and pursue the path of *ahiṃsā* and *aparigraha* as prescribed by Lord Mahāvīra. The relevance of the concept of “*Vratī Samāja*” even after 2500 years in the present age is quite meaningful. It is hoped that every step in

the establishment of such ideal society would bring new light to an individual as well as society at large.

—xxx—

## BENEDICTION OF JAINISM

To evaluate a particular school of religion or faith on the basis of the numerical strength of its followers would not be the right way to do so. Instead, if it is evaluated by the merits of its doctrines in the term of its effectiveness on and acceptability by the people at large, it would be more justified. So also, if Jain religion is also evaluated on the basis of the number of its followers, it would not be the right or the justified way of evaluation. It is, however, necessary to evaluate Jainism by finding out the fact as to how much Jainism has influenced the people's mentality through its tenets and also to what extent the present age mentality or trends can be influenced by them.

When we consider what Jainism has to offer to the world in the present times, a few highlights come to mind which can be put in sharp focus as under—

### 1. Doctrine of *Naya*

The voice of “conciliation” or “harmony” is being given every importance in the present age trends. Even a common man talks of “conciliation” and desires it. From where has come this voice? The doctrine of *naya* (*nayavāda*) propounded by Jainism is a special characteristic of Jain philosophy, which may be regarded as the source of this demand in the present age. The *nayavāda* is a great contribution of Jainism to the world. Its wider outcome is that all shades of opinion are exposition of the truth, when considered

relatively. The *nayavāda* propounds that every statement or every thought represents truth. So we should not reject anyone outright by considering it false. On the basis of this doctrine, every school of philosophy gets recognition; this, in fact, is what Jainism has already done. This is megnanimity of Jainism. It believes that every philosophy, every thought, every sect or every view is true, if it is interpreted relatively but if anyone of them is in absolutistic form, it would become false. Thus, acceptance of all views as true is a great doctrine, and it can be regarded as a speciality of Jainism. Perhaps, there is no other philosophy which accepts so magnanimously that every other philosophy is also true.

The effort should be to reconcile even diametrically opposite view-points. The '*nayas*' help us to look at things holistically. This way, Jainism does not reject any other philosophy, which may have its own particular views different from what the Jain philosophy accepts or holds. On the other hand, the spirit of '*anekānta*' endeavors to find a common ground among all divergent view-points.

## 2. Universalization of *Dharma*

Now, the second peculiarity of Jainism is the acceptance of "*sārvabhauma dharma*", which does not confine *dharma* to a particular sect only; this non-sectarian character of *dharma* makes it "universal". The Jain philosophy has propounded *dharma* which is acceptable for whole of the humanity. Whereas many of the religions believe that "if you come in our fold or join our creed or faith, then and only then you can get salvation, otherwise not." No religion allows one to join other religion. In other words, it is not acceptable to other religions that the followers of other religions could attain salvation without coming into their fold.

According to Jainism, *dharma* is above a sect or a fold. In fact, one has to distinguish *dharma* from the sect. A sect is not *dharma* per say. There can not be an alliance of a sect with *dharma*. A person may belong to any sect, but if his psyche is pure, sacred, free from attachment and aversion, then he is a follower of *dharma*. This is the

doctrine of universal *dharma*. Herein, the sect is not connected with *dharma*. It gives recognition only to *dharma* and not to any sect.

The *dharma* has to be one and same for all. Lord Mahāvīra said—evaluate the man not by the sect he belongs to or by the lable of his religion, but judge him by his virtues. This outlook of Jainism provides great relief in the present turmoil in the field of religion, which is the product of cross sectarianism. The Jain philosophy clearly demarcates between ‘*dharma*’ and ‘*saṃpradāya*’ (sect). ‘*Dharma*’ embraces all the humanity where as a sect means a group of persons holding certain views and engaged in particular rituals or particular kind of worship. ‘*Dharma*’ is not a theoretical dogma. It is enshrined in living a virtuous life.

One may not be a follower of Jainism, or a Jain by birth, but if there is a person whose conduct and behaviour are infused with righteousness and high conduct, whose mind is free from attachment and aversion, then definitely he is a follower of *dharma* leading to salvation, truly he is entitled to attain the ultimate emancipation. Indeed, such great was the concept of *dharma* given by Lord Mahāvīra.

The present age is the age of non-sectarianism. Although there is no dearth of sectarists or fundamentalists even today, yet the enlightened thinkers today are not at all in favour of any kind of sectarianism. They are, in fact, in favour of *dharma*. They are dead against the fundamentalism or religious fanaticism. We may say that the characteristic of the present age is “non-sectarian” outlook. It may be unfortunate that such attitude free from narrow sectarianism has not become wide-spread in masses, that people at large are still reeling under the sectarian narrow-mindedness, even then it is beyond doubt that in the field of enlightened consciousness, the “non-sectarianism” is given utmost importance.

If research is being done in the history of thoughts and philosophical ideas, it would probably be found that it is Jainism which is the pioneer in the field of non-sectarian *dharma* or *sārvabhauma dharma* and that it was Lord Mahāvīra who first of all

gave such magnanimous concept.

There is a technical term in Jain philosophy—‘*asoccā kevalī*’ (Skt. *aśrutvā kevalī*). It means that even a commoner, who has not studied religious books of Jainism or any other faith, who has not formally joined any particular religious sect or accepted someone as his *guru* and does not follow any prescribed religious practices can reach the summit of spiritual attainment and become a *kevalī* i.e., an omniscient one, free from attachment and aversion and passions (*kaṣāya*) like anger, conceit, deceit and greed, if he is possessed of virtues of true *dharma* like modesty, tolerance etc., by nature or by cultivating them through righteous conduct. The *asoccā kevalī* has been given the same status of *kevalī* in Jainism, which is attained by the duly initiated ascetic in Jain tradition through meticulous performance in Jain ascetic practices. There is absolutely no difference in the status of *asoccā kevalī* and other *kevalī*. Is it not a great acceptance of grand *sārvabhauma dharma*? It implies that the space is an universal existence, which can not be kept confined to bounded limits. In the same way, the true *dharma* or truth also cannot be confined within a sect or sects. We can say that the concept of non-sectarian *dharma* is indeed a characteristic peculiarity of Jainism.

### 3. Spiritualistic Doctrine of Equality

The third characteristic peculiarity of Jainism is the *ādhyaत्मika sāmyavāda*—the “Spiritualistic Doctrine of Equality”. Jainism is well known for its emphasis on the principle of equality. In fact, the name of religion propounded by Lord Mahāvīra is “*samatā dharma*” or “*sāmāyika dharma*” (i.e., religion of equality). Even there is historical evidence that in past *sāmāyika dharma* was the name of Jainism. In ancient Indian literature, there have been three traditions (1) Vaidika—based on Vedas. (2) Laukika—based on secular tradition related with popular beliefs and (3) *Sāmāyika*—based on *samatā dharma*. The whole *śramaṇa* tradition and Jainism belong to the last category. ‘*Samaya dhamma mudāhare muni*’—Lord Mahāvīra propounded the *dharma* of *samatā*. Thus, one can find in Jainism the basic features of spiritual socialism.



It propounds that all living beings or souls, irrespective of their development, are equal. It means that right from the least developed souls of earth-bodied beings upto the highly developed human beings, all are equal as far as the element of 'soulhood' is concerned. This is not only a theoretical principle, but it is the base of applied *samatā dharma* in practical life.

Jainism has considered the doctrine of casteism (*jātivāda*) as *atāttvika* (i.e., without any metaphysical base). It has thus denied that anyone born in a particular caste should be regarded high or low according to the social status given to the caste. In times of Mahāvīra, the brahmanism (or the Vedic religion) recognised *jātivāda* as *tāttvika*—it believed in low or high status of the caste in which one was born. And, on that very base, one was considered touchable or untouchable. Such caste-system based on "birth in a particular caste" was in vogue, which had its roots in *varṇa-vyavasthā*. (The four *varṇas* such as *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya* and *śūdra* form the four classes in the society). But, today the thought and voice of the present age has undergone a change. It has accepted that in Indian social context, casteism has done a lot of harm to our society. Thus, it is dead against the casteism. Isn't that the influence of Jainism? Also, Buddhism has contributed to it. Jainism has always been fighting against it. Lord Mahāvīra preached that man does not take birth with a particular caste label as such. Therefore, classification could only be based on what he does, what is his karma (action), and not by his birth.

*"Kammunā bambhaṇo hoi, kammunā joi-khattiyo,  
kamunā vaiso hoi, suddo havai kammunā."*

It means —

"It is by karma that one is *brāhmaṇa*;

it is by karma that one is *kṣatriya*;

it is by karma that one is *vaiśya*;

it is by karma that one is *śūdra*."

Thus, before Mahāvira, there prevailed a social system of four *varṇa* (classes). Mahāvira, said, “It should not be based on birth in a particular caste; it should be based on karma i.e., present action or profession.” The same person who is employed in defense services today may become a businessman tomorrow—today he is a *kṣatriya*, tomorrow he may become a *vaiśya*, or even he may be employed in teaching services, then he would become a *brāhmaṇa*. The same person may belong to all the four *varṇas* (or *jātis*) by employing himself in different services. Thus, *jātivāda* is *atātvaika*—it is arbitrary. It should not be based on birth, but on karma. On the basis of this only, no one should be considered high or low on the basis of his birth. Hence, Lord Mahāvira gave directives to his disciples—“Don’t discriminate between man and man on the basis of casteism. If, say, a slave or a servant of a sovereign king is initiated first into asceticism, and his master happens to get initiated later, then it is incumbent upon the sovereign to pay obeisance to his former slave (who is now senior to him in tenure of asceticism); now he should not have the conceit that he was the sovereign king. One who gets initiated in *śamātā dharma* has to observe the code of conduct prescribed for *śamātā dharma*, and therefore, conceit is to be given up by him, for it is against the code.

The Lord himself initiated a *chāṇḍāla*, who was then considered an untouchable. In Jain religion, people from all castes and classes were given ‘*dikṣā*’ (initiation). Harikesha Muni ( who was a *cāṇḍāla*) came from a very low class of social strata. But considering his virtuous life, all other *munis*, who came from upper class of society, bowed to him in reverence. That was recognition of his virtues such as penance, conduct without blemish and the sense of equality.

Bhagavān Mahāvira insisted on giving equal status to all after being initiated into his order; he asked his disciples to refrain from all kinds of distinctions made on the basis of *jāti*. In case of Harikesha Muni, Lord Mahāvira said, “See, O my disciples! the reverence given to Muni Harikesha even by the ascetics who belonged formerly to the high castes like *Brāhmaṇa*; it is the direct

evidence of truth that it is the penance which is important and not the *jāti*.” Thus, in Mahāvīra’s philosophy, the false concepts like untouchability had no place whatsoever. He strongly suggested that no man could be hold untouchable or despicable. Lord Mahāvīra vehemently attacked social curses like untouchability and special privileges that were granted on social classification based on birth (*janma*).

He asserted that one who considers anyone despicable or keeps hatred towards anyone binds the deluding karma, as a result of which his soul is engrossed by stark delusion.

In ancient times, for quite a few centuries, the male dominated the human society. His counterpart, i.e., the female, was considered an inferior specie. For thousand years in the human society, man has meted with women various sorts of cruel, atrocious and wanton behaviour, the account of which is extremely shocking. Lord Mahāvīra was probably the first person in Indian history to have given an equal status to man and woman. He initiated women into this ‘*dharma saṅgha*’ (religious order) and drew up a very effective code of conduct, that has worked without blemish throughout the long history of Jain religion over 2500 years.

In no religions tradition before Jain religion or Lord Mahāvīra, we find that women were duly initiated in ascetic life. He was a pioneer in allowing women to be initiated as nuns in the religious order and creating a well organised congregation of nuns.

Initially, Lord Buddha was against the entry of women in his *dharma saṅgha*, fearing about the problems related to breach of fidelity, but he was later persuaded to accept it. When, for the first time, Buddha was requested by Ananda to initiate Gautami in his monastic order, he said to Ananda, “Well, it would not be all right or proper to do so”, and he rejected his proposal. But, after that, Ananda insisted too much on his request, and at last Buddha agreed to his request, but at the same time, he commented, “Ananda! I am conceding to your request, but do you know that initiation of nuns in my monastic order would curtail its life by five hundred years, it

would make it crippled.” And the history bears testimony to the fact that on account of the nun’s initiation, the Buddhist monastic order became hobbled much earlier, the reason being lack of discipline.

Lord Mahāvīra had already initiated nuns in his order, but he was too cautious to allow any laxity in discipline. Lord Mahāvīra was quite precise and clear in his enunciation of the rules and regulations pertaining to monks and nuns. He was equally meticulous and strict about their mutual relations in the order.

In the period of 2500 years of Jain religion after Mahāvīra, thousands of nuns got initiated in the *saṅgha*, but no indiscipline crept in the order. Thus, Mahāvīra succeeded in establishing equality of sexes in the *saṅgha*, but at the same time his organisational capacity allowed the discipline to be kept intact. He proved that gender equality and organisation (or discipline) are not antagonistic. It would be rather wrong to conceive that you can save either of the two, and not both. In absence of strict organisation (and discipline), equality also could not be saved. Lord Mahāvīra was thus a true revolutionary in the sphere of religion.

We have seen that Lord Mahāvīra put woman at par with man. The trend of modern age has also been moving in the same direction today. I do not want to exaggerate my statement, but I feel that if we really go deep into deliberations, we shall find that the way of Mahāvīra’s working, dealing with problems and his trend of thinking—all of these are in unison with that of the present age. We hear the echo of Mahāvīra’s thoughts in the present age trends of thinking. May be, 2500 years ago, the then age did not understand the thoughts of Mahāvīra properly or could not digest them. But it is a fact that no good idea would go barren. It seems that it remains floating in the space for ever, and that when the opportune moment comes, even after several thousand years, some genius is able to catch it from the space-records and give it a proper shape. In this context, we can safely conclude that the trend of the present age or the age-consciousness is reflecting or echoing the same thinking

presented by Lord Mahāvīra 2500 years ago.

#### 4. *Anekānta*

The fourth speciality of Jainism is its philosophy of ‘*Anekānta*’—adopting a multi-faceted view to look at anything. ‘*Anekānta*’ also means acceptance of the phenomena of constant change, co-existence among opposite views and the spirit of reconciliation instead of confrontation. This goes very well with the principle of democracy, which is the hallmark of modern political thinking.

In the age of democracy, we see that a person who gets prominence today becomes mediocre at other times, and vice versa. Even the President of a country today would be a common citizen tomorrow, and so on. In *anekānta* too, the same thing can happen. An attribute which is under consideration is given more prominence, while other attributes are made subsidiary; at other times, the opposite may happen.

Another illustration which explains the theme of *anekānta* is that of “churning” process used in extracting butter from the buttermilk. In this process, while one hand is pushed forward, the other one is pulled backward and vice versa so that the churning rod is continuously set in motion which results in separating butter from the buttermilk. If both the hands used in churning are placed in front or both are held back, churning cannot be materialized. *Anekānta* is also like churning, in which the principal attribute at one time is made subsidiary at others, and vice versa.

Again, the same thing can be understood through the process of walking, in which when the right leg is put forward, the left leg put behind and vice versa, but we cannot simultaneously take both the legs forward. This way, by giving relative importance to both, we can walk, otherwise not.

Now, let us understand what exactly we mean by *anekānta*. When we want to describe about a thing or a particular attribute of a thing, what is needed is to take into consideration the importance

of other things or other attributes also. We can make the one under consideration the principal one, and keep others as secondary, and then do the vice versa. Then, we can describe the truth. But, instead, if we make all principal or all secondary simultaneously, we can not get the truth, or the “butter”. The principle of co-existence, in fact, is developed only on such relativistic approach. At present, this principle has been accepted as the “thought of the age”. Similarly, the concept of democracy is also given the same status. The emergence of U.N.O. would not have been possible without such principles. It is only because of these concepts (which are nothing but the application of *anekānta*) that both communist and capitalist nations share the same platform and negotiate on the problems of world. It is, in fact, the implementation of the principle of *syādvāda* and co-existence. All such concepts of reconciliation and relativistic value are nothing but the corollaries of the universal principle of *anekānta*.

We may say that the theoretical concept of *anekānta* was given by Lord Mahāvīra, and the practical application was formalised 2500 years after him.

## 5. *Aparigraha*

The fifth principle of Jainism is ‘*Aparigraha*’ (Non-possessiveness related to material objects).

The trend of the present age is also in favour of *aparigraha*. Perhaps, one would think that it is quite a paradoxical thinking. But, actually it is not so. We agree that in the present age, the *parigraha* has increased manifold. But at the same time, in the post-Marxist period, there is a strong voice in favour of non-possessiveness. It means that there is a consensus in favour of limiting the individual possessions. Even the capitalists have started to feel the importance of such notions. The voice of economic equality has become so much powerful that it cannot be neglected.

Although there prevails autocracy and dictatorship in some of the nations, yet people there cannot give up democracy or even

they want to project themselves as favouring democratic system. In the same way, even the capitalists talk of economic equality and feel dignified in doing so. It means that the idea of non-possessiveness has become more powerful—the philosophical or theoretical concept of Mahāvīra's *aparigraha* has become more deep-rooted.

## Conclusion

I have presented here the five fundamental principles of Jainism. The question may arise whether I am speaking in the terminology of the modern age or that of the ancient Jainism. A medicore modern thinker would think that whatever I have given here are nothing but the generally accepted best ideas of the modern age. But what I have really spoken of are the ageless tenets of Jainism, which are well substantiated, neither arbitrary, nor manipulated ones. Their strong bases are available in scriptures; they, however, have now been accepted widely and taken the form of age-consciousness or the foundation of modern thinking world over. It proves the universal and perennial character of Jain tenets.

Once, when Acharya Tulsi visited Jodhpur, he was asked, "When the Jain tenets are so excellent, why the number of Jain followers is so small?" Acharya Tulsi said—"I don't believe that in reality, the Jains are so small in number as you believe." The reply was quite surprising. Acharya Tulsi clarified it—"Lord Mahāvīra's religion lives not in any credoes or dogmas but in the faith and practice of its virtuous followers. The appeal and relevance of such a religion transcends time and space. The basic tenets of Jain *Dharma* are—*Ahimsā*, *Aparigraha*, *Anāgraha* and *Anekānta*. Jainism is not a sectarian bunch of certain beliefs or a particular way of life. Its real spirit lies in the faith and virtues, which is the foundation for the well-being of humanity as a whole for all times to come. So, I am not speaking about the number of Jains by birth, but that of people at large, who have faith in the Jain tenets and also who try to put them into practice, even though they are not Jain by birth. The number of such people is definitely not so small as you think."

When sugar is put into milk, it dissolves and disappears, but the whole quantity of milk becomes sweet. So also, even if the Jain *Dharma* is not so prominently seen in the present age, it has definitely coloured the whole modern trend of thinking with its ageless tenets, and this impact is so great that it seems as if the they have merged into one.





