

Philosophy and Critical Thinking
Prof. Gyan Prakash
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
IIT ISM, Dhanbad
Week- 07
Lecture 33: Indian Philosophy

Welcome in lecture 33. We are discussing Indian Philosophy. Today, we are going to discuss the school of Indian Philosophy. In last class, already we have discussed about the Orthodox school of thought and Heterodox school of thought. Just let me remind you that this division is based on the acceptance of authority of Ved or rejection of authority of Ved. So, one group what they are doing, they are accepting the authority of Ved. So, whatever it is written in Ved is an authoritative and they are accepting it. And another group what they are doing, they are rejecting. This is what we have the traditional division of this Indian school of thought. Now what we are going to do is, today I will be discussing this school of thought in very brief. So, you will have an idea of all the school of Indian philosophy. My intention is to explain you because we are not going to discuss all the school of thought because that is not possible in the one week or four weeks. Therefore, just we have taken three to four schools so that we will have an idea of the Indian school of thought. This course is in a basic level of philosophy critical thinking which give you the idea of the western as well as the Indian philosophy. So Indian philosophy I have not included in all the school of thought in the syllabus. Now so let us understand the Orthodox school of thought in this group and already we have discussed in last class includes Nyaya by Gautama, Vaisheshika by Kanad, Sankhya by Kapil, Yoga by Patanjali and Mimamsa is Jaimini or Vedanta philosophy. In other hand, in Heterodox school of thought, Charvaka, Buddhist philosophy and the Jain philosophy. These are the part of this group. It is called Heterodox of school of thought, nastik or who rejects the authority of Vedas. Now so what we will do is, we will be taking this school one school by school and we will see there is some basic philosophy. So, first is the Charvaka.

Let me tell you that about the Charvaka. Charvaka is a Charu and Vaka is beautiful sentences. We have no idea or there is no direct evidence of the Charvakas philosophy. But we have our knowledge limited to secondary sources. So, as I have said that Indian philosophy are very critical to each other and they are critically examines other argument. They are rejecting their other arguments, other schools' idea and they are claiming for their own argument or position. So therefore, our knowledge is only limited to the secondary sources because while rejecting other ideas, many schools of thought have mentioned the Charvakian philosophy, and therefore, we know about the Charvaka. So, we do not have any direct source where we can understand the complete argument of the Charvaka. Now there are few things I would like to tell you here about the Charvaka philosophy. First one is the belief that perception is the only means of valid knowledge. We have been discussing about the valid knowledge or invalid knowledge and while discussing the epistemology, I

have mentioned that Indian philosophy talks about the valid source of the knowledge. Suppose there is one knowledge it is valid, then the next question is what is the source of this knowledge? And if the source is valid, the knowledge is valid. Not only in Charvaka, in all school of thought they are like discussing some of them, accepting one, some are going for two or more. Now when they are accepting or rejecting, they are also presenting an argument that in what basis we cannot accept other means of valid knowledge. So, all school of thought has talked about the knowledge and the source of knowledge. They also have talked how many sources are valid, means are valid. For example, Buddhism will talk about the two, the perception and inference. When we will start discussing the Indian philosophy, I will be discussing about this epistemological part that how and why they are accepting one, two and many. However, the Charvaka believe that only perception is the valid knowledge. So, through perception whatever you are getting as a knowledge is a valid knowledge. Now the Charvaka had rejected the idea of this causation, the cause and effect because he believes that the sequence of the two events perceived in the past or numerous occasions may fail in future under unforeseen circumstances. So, he argues that if there is an X and Y or any example taken of fire and smoke, this is a classical example in Indian philosophical system. So, there is a fire and a smoke, cause and effect relation. Now take any cause-and-effect relation and what they are saying that there is a cause and effect, the one event and the second event, sequence of the two events. So, we are perceiving this F and S and F, S and all the time. On numerous time we have seen this F and S. So therefore, what we are doing, we are establishing this relation between F and S. This is the F is cause and S is effect. In western philosophy also we have discussed this Humean idea of cause and effect, how he has talked about this is if you have seen many times these two events together, so this is our habit to see two things together. I would have to see if F then S. So, the moment I saw F, I am expecting S. So, Hume argued which we already have discussed that this is an as in a habit. In Indian system, Charvaka is saying that this is how it is possible because I mean you establish in a relation because you have seen in past or maybe many times the F and S. Is there any guarantee that S is going to or there is any event F and after that an S. So therefore, he argued that this is not possible. So, he rejected what the cause and effect. If there is no cause and effect, then inference also is not possible. So therefore, he rejected even the idea of inference. So just for you an idea like for example inference is another source of knowledge, means of valid knowledge. So, he rejecting the inference. He says no inference is not right source of knowledge. For example, you are in your room, you saw that there is smoke. From window you saw that an outside there is smoke, think there is a smoke, your knowledge is there is fire. Now what is the source of this knowledge that there is a fire, Inference. So, you saw smoke and you inferred what that is fire. So, the knowledge of fire is inference, source is inference. Now this inference and this analysis is based on where the theory of causation because you believe there is a relation between F and S. Because you believe there is a relation between cause and effect. So, you saw effect, you are now you have a knowledge of cause. Saw a smoke, now you

have knowledge of fire. So, you are claiming there is a fire, so he rejected this idea, this causation and therefore inference also is not possible. The reason is if you want to establish this relation this F and S, M and Z any cause and effect let us say. You have to make sure that in all the situations, I mean all the situation is all the time past, present and future F is going to produce S. Since we cannot do that I mean we have seen many times but all the past event, all the present event and all the future event it will be difficult for us to check and therefore we cannot establish the relation between F and S and therefore inference will not be possible. So, this is how he presented an argument and argued that how theory of causation rejected, again he rejected the inference and he argued that only perception is the only means of valid knowledge. Again, he argued that soul is identical with the body indeed with the consciousness. Basically, he is arguing any eternal soul. So, this is the first life, so your birth is a starting point and your biological death is the final end. So, the Charvaka what is soul is an apart. Now the question arises that how it comes is produces consciousness. Human may ask answer he gives an answer of that when is four elements coming together it is producing consciousness. As I said he does not believe in the next life. So, this is the first and the last life. As I have said in the last class while talking about common feature of Indian philosophy the all Indian philosophical school of thought has addressed the basic problems or basic concept like for example the nature of God, nature of soul, life after life and so on. So, this is how he is presented and he argued for his concept.

Now next Indian philosophy is Jain philosophy and the founder of Jain tradition is Rṣabh. There are 24th Tithankara who attained the liberation and Rṣabh was the first and Vardhamāna 599 BC to 527 BC was the last Tithankara. The philosophical literature of Jain philosophy was written in Prakriti and then Sanskrit. The Vardhamāna was contemporary of Gautam Buddha. So, Buddhism, Buddhist philosophy, the Jain philosophy. Now the Jain philosophy again is a very important philosophy and present very good arguments about many beings and which one is one I like and will be discussing at this Jain philosophy because this Jain philosophy is part of our course where we will see that their argument about the knowledge and we have talked about the idea of knowledge in Socrates and many other philosophers. But Socrates sometimes we feel that it is a very important philosopher in Western philosophy. Jain also has an argument, present an argument which argues that knowledge of anything is not possible. So, we will be discussing that this Jain philosophy, how the Jain philosophy has argued for that. Just for a small idea, he argues that knowledge of or let us say complete knowledge of any object is not possible. So, when you are perceiving an object, basically you are perceiving one aspect of this reality. The knowledge of real, complete knowledge of this reality is not possible. So, when you are saying I know this reality that is in a one way, one aspect of this reality. Now the question is, is there any significance of this idea? Yes, it is. When this Jain philosophy is arguing this, it also has a lot of meaning. I believe that basically even you are going to claim that I know this, it means only you mean to say a new knowledge

is not welcome. So, when you are saying that you have seen this one aspect, obviously you are going to or you have, you wanted to know the other aspect actually. Therefore, you are always open for a knowledge, the personality if you see the western side. So, Jain philosophy in that sense is a very significant and also has presented a very fine argument. So, since this also is a part of our course, so we will be discussing this Jain philosophy in detail. In Jain philosophy, there are two sects, Svetambara and Digambar. We will be discussing about these two different sects from Jain philosophy.

Next is the Buddhist philosophy. Again, this Buddhist philosophy is the part of this course and we will be discussing this Buddhist philosophy in a very basic level. So, while discussing this Buddhist philosophy, we will be discussing a different school of thought of Buddhist philosophy. So, Gautam Buddha was the founder of Buddhist thought. As we have discussed in this week about the Ved and Upanishads, we also have discussed that how Upanishads is the eternal Atman, the idea of soul. And it argued that this alone is real. I mean, this Atman alone is real, and it is identical with Brahman. Gautam Buddha is arguing that everything is impermanent. So, if you see, there is a thought where they are arguing that there is a soul and soul is eternal. There is another side or there is another stream, it is called Nihilism or Charvaka who rejects this idea of soul, eternal soul. He says that soul is an identical body, soul is an identical to body. Now what Buddhism is or what Buddha did, so Buddha argued that nothing is permanent, everything is impermanent. So, one side is saying that it is an eternal, other's team is saying that there is nothing, I mean there is no soul. Buddhist or Buddha is using what? Madhyam-Pratipada, the middle part, saying everything is impermanent. So, we will be discussing this Buddhism well in detail. Again, Buddhism is a very interesting school of thought, and in Buddhism, there are a different school of thought and all of them has presented a very fine argument. We will be discussing this school in a very basic level. For Buddha, the law of causation is subservient to the moral law. It is the law of karma and law of righteousness. The idea is Buddha has talked about the law of karma and based on this law of karma, he had argued about the morality. So, there was an argument that can we talk about the morality without the God, without the notion of God. So, there is one way of arguing that okay, through law of karma and Buddhist idea of law of karma is very strong, where you will find that how he is talked about the morality just based on the law of karma. He has given importance to law of karma and this thing has been discussed by the law of karma. We will be discussing that in this school of thought in our one of the week. Again, Buddhism argues that all is impermanent, becoming flow and flux. For those we will be discussing that.

Next is the Nyaya by Gautama or Aksapāda was the founder of the Nyaya philosophy. This school of thought is not a part of our course. We will not be discussing this philosophy. But this again Nyaya philosophy is full of argument as I have argued in the last class that how all the Nyaya school of thought has presented very fine argument and that is also very interesting. So, this Vatsayayan call this philosophy science of reasoning or the science of critical reasoning in harmony with the perception and the spiritualist testimony. So, the

Nyaya is primarily concerned with epistemology and logic and secondly with ontology, psychology, ethics and theology. Now two things I would like to just mention here. This is from the Nyaya philosophy but also this is a very important to know. First concept is called Pramāna. It is the way to knowing anything truly. It gives us true knowledge. That is called Pramana. And second is Prameya, literally means a knowable or an object of true knowledge. Because these two words comes frequently in the Indian system. We talk about the pramana, valid source of knowledge where the same perception, inference, comparison and so on, testimony and so on. So just to know my intention is to introduce these two words. So, you will have an idea of this two-word Pramāna and Prameya. We will be discussing this pramana and prameya in the different school of thought. So, the pramana is the way of knowing anything truly, truly is the valid knowledge. It gives us true knowledge, this pramana. So pramana is the source of the valid knowledge called pramana. Prameya is the knowable or any object of true knowledge. So, source of knowledge and the object of the knowledge. So, this Nyaya philosophy had argued for both right. What are the pramanas and what are the prameya. Just for an idea, however we are not going to discuss in this class. It is not possible. And again, since we do not have this Nyaya philosophy part of this course, so we will not be discussing again Nyaya philosophy. So just for your idea, so if you are interested you can read. Let me tell you this Nyaya philosophy is a very interesting philosophy and has presented a very important and fine argument. So, Nyaya deals with the sixteen topics, the instrument of valid knowledge, the object of valid knowledge. We just we have discussed about the Pramāna and Prameya, doubt, motive, an example called dr̥ṣṭānta, Siddhant. This Nyaya philosophy is talking about all the nature of these things, doubt, examples, the tenet, Siddhant, the member of the Syllogism, Hypothetical reason, Ascertainment, Discussion, Wrangle, Cavil, Faulty reason, Quibble, futility and ground of defeat.

Now next is Vaisheshika philosophy by Kanad, it is in a 300 BC. Vaisheshika philosophy lays trace on particularity of the eternal substances. Vaisheshika philosophy emphasizes the clarity and distinctness of physical things and finite soul. The Nyaya and Vaisheshika are allied system. So, if you see this Indian system, especially in orthodox school of thought, so Nyaya-Vaisheshika is an allied and Sankhya-Yoga is another allied system. So, the Vaisheshika philosophy, it focuses on comprehensive conception of Padartha or object as that which is denoted by a word, its classification of objects and its atomic cosmology. So that way this Vaisheshika philosophy is very important.

Now next is Sankhya philosophy by Kapila and again the Sankhya philosophy is on a part of this course and we will be discussing Sankhya philosophy in a very basic level. Now Sankhya means number and it enumerates the metaphysical principle of reality. Just for your information that Sankhya Karika of IswaraKrishna's 200AD is the earliest available work of in Sankhya system. So that is the Sankhya philosophy but what we have the Sankhya Karika is the as a first text. Now this Iswar Krishna was disciple of Pañcaśikha. That is a very interesting and again, the Pañcaśikha was disciple of Asuri and Asuri was

disciple of Kapila. So, but we have the first complete system of Sankhya Karika by the Iswar Krishna. The Sankhya system it advocates the ontological dualism of Prakriti and Purusa or individual souls. It rejects the Nyaya-Vaisheshika category and theism. Sankhya philosophy, we will be discussing in detail how they have talked about the Purus and Prakriti, and they also explained this world in terms of these two substances like Purusa and Prakriti. And again, this Sankhya philosophy is a very interesting philosophy and talks about the creation how this world is and nature of world and so on. Now as I have said this Yoga is an again allied Sankhya philosophy. So, Nyaya-Vaisheshika one and this yoga Nyaya-Vaisheshika is one and Sankhya-Yoga is the second one.

So, yoga adopts the Sankhya metaphysics and included the concept of God on it. So, he is including what the idea of God in this philosophy. Yoga is a very important philosophy in the sense that he has argued about Yoga as an important method of realizing the spiritual truth of Indian philosophy. Now Patanjali was the author of Yoga-Sutra however there are argument about this statement about Yoga Sutra. He systematized the yoga concepts in it. This yoga philosophy talks about the Ashtanga Yoga, Yama-Nima which we have discussed in the last class we are talking about the basic features of the Indian philosophy and Yama as I said that is in a five and the, Yama Nima is also five. Asana, we know that this is in a body different body posture. Pranayama, the Pratyahara right Pratyahara. Pranayama we know that Pratyahara is withdrawing your senses from the object. Dharna is an attention. Dhyan is meditation, and the Samadhi is final concentration. So, this is how he has talked about ashtanga Yoga. Again, this is a very important yoga talks about the mind and its Vritti afflictions and he argued that through yoga we can remove the afflictions. Afflictions is a very important concept and many Indian philosophers has argued that how this affliction is responsible for the many actions. So how to remove this Vritti that is a very important and Yoga will tell you the very practical aspect of this solution. It will tell you how to achieve that state. So, in Yoga psychology they have talked about the mind and this Vritti. So, and how to remove this Vritti that is what you may get into this philosophy, Yoga philosophy.

Now another philosophy is the Mimansa philosophy by Jaimini, it is in 400 BC. This Mimansa philosophy is not part of our course, and Mimansa philosophy is again a unique philosophy in the sense that it focuses on only the ritualistic part of the Vedic culture. So, Mimansa is which can be divided to I mean divided sense that is called like Purva Mimansa and Uttara Mimansa. So Purva Mimansa is by Jaimini and I will be discussing now and the second one is Vedanta is called Uttara Mimansa. So this Purva Mimansa let us say it deals with the ritualistic part of the Vedic culture and it believes in the reality of external world, the reality of the individual soul and the law of karma. As I said this is a Kumaril Bhatt is the founder of Bhatt school of Mimansa and there another person is a philosopher is Prabhakar Mishra in 700 AD is a founder of Prabhakar school of Mimansa. So, in Mimansa or in this Purva Mimansa, there are two school of Bhatt school and Prabhakar school. Remember that this deals with the ritualistic but again this Mimansa also is important for

philosophy of language. So that way this Mimamsa philosophy is a unique philosophy in Indian system. Again, the Mimamsa support ritualism mainly by giving a methodology of interpretation of texts which removes the apparent contradictions among them and harmonize them with one another. So, interpretation of text is a way where they are removing these contradictions and through this ritualism is giving another methodology and second is philosophical justification of the belief underlying ritualism. So, this is what the main focus of the Mimamsa philosophy is and that stands this Mimamsa philosophy different from the other school of thought.

And the last school of thought and the last in the scenes that for this today for coordination the Vedanta philosophy and Vedanta philosophy is a very important philosophy again because the Vedanta philosophy is not only one philosophy. This is a very much part of this course and we are going to start with the Vedanta philosophy. So next class we will have on Vedanta philosophy and Vedanta philosophy is an important the sense that in Vedanta we have many scholars or philosophers who talked about a different school, and have a different idea. However, we will be discussing only two philosopher one is Shankaracharya and second is Ramanujacharya. So first we have taken two so that you will have an idea of Vedanta philosophy of in the sense that discussion in the Vedanta philosophy. All school of Vedanta is based upon the Upanishads. Next is the Vedanta Sutra is in a manual of Vedanta and the final one is what I have mentioned here. Vedanta is literally means the end of Vedas the last part of Vedas. It is a philosophical part which we have discussed in the previous classes that how the last part of Vedas is philosophical part and Vedanta is all about that. So, this is from the Vedanta philosophy and we will be discussing that Vedanta philosophy well in basic level but we have taken a two philosopher Ramanujacharya and Shankaracharya. So next class we will be discussing this Shankaracharya idea of Vedanta where he talked about the Advait Vedanta. So, this was the idea of Vedanta philosophy has again presented a very fine argument about this world and then individual soul and it is very interesting to read the Vedantian argument. So, as I have been like arguing that Indian system presents a very fine argument and reading this their arguments which is our main focus in this course just to understand their argument but their arguments are very fine and reading that those arguments are again is very interesting. So in conclusion as I have mentioned all the school of thought Indian school system just a little bit an idea about the different school of thought and we have in this course we have Vedanta philosophy and two philosopher from Vedanta we also have Buddhism we have Sankhya philosophy or we have Jaina philosophy. So, they are the part of this course and we will be discussing basically to know little more about these philosophers or philosophy their philosophy right. So, we will try to understand their argument and as I have argued even the last class that how this Indian schools is you know the full of arguments. So, when you are going to read this philosophy this, we are going to we will come to know about their fine argument right. So, thank you and this lecture was

based on these two books the Outlines of the Indian philosophy and Introduction to Indian philosophy. So, thank you so much thank you for your kind attention. Thank you.