

Philosophy and Critical Thinking
Prof. Gyan Prakash
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
IIT (ISM), Dhanbad
Week-12
Lecture 56: The Jaina Philosophy

Namaskar to all. Today I am going to talk about Jaina Philosophy. In last class, I have discussed a Jaina philosophy, their idea of theory of knowledge, where we have discussed how Jaina philosophy has talked about the valid source, pramāna, knowledge and so on and then also the invalid knowledge. Today I am going to discuss a very important idea that is an ontology. However, this class is important in the sense that today we are going to talk about Jaina philosophy idea of ontology first. But at the same time, I have prepared today lecture and asked many questions right. And through these questions, we are going to revise many things which we have discussed in different module. And similarly, Jaina philosophy idea of we have discussed theory of knowledge and then Anekāntvāda, Nayavāda, Saptabhaṅgīnaya. So, those things which we have discussed in the last class, Syādvāda will be again revising. And that is the reason that today's lecture is in a unique and different from the other lectures. What today I am going to present that is from Jadunath Sinha, the Indian philosophy as the explanation of this ontology what I found is very unique. And I was like forced to or I was like convinced to bring these ideas and this way of presentation in this class. Because this course is in a very basic level right which we are have been I have been saying that in the different modules that philosophy and critical thinking is where we discuss the western philosophy and Indian philosophy in basic level. So, we are in Indian philosophy, we are discussing Indian school of thought just to give an idea about this philosophy. However, we are trying to I am trying to cover this all the basic philosophy, but the same time not going in detail. So, today before starting this ontology, I would like to remind you there is one question about the substance and then attributes. So, which we have discussed in another module as well. And as I have argued in the last week when we are discussing about Sāṃkhya philosophy before that Buddhist philosophy and Vedānta philosophy we have discussed their substance and then attributes. These are a very important thing, so the way they are interpreting the way they are explaining this idea that matters a lot because through this explanation you will understand their philosophy. So, even you take the Khyātivāda or you take the cause-and-effect, theory of causation in different school of thought. So, if this string is in your hand like for example you know the theory of causation in all the Indian school of thought or the theory of error. For example, the rope is appearing as a snake. So, appearance of a snake is false or not false. So, even for a minute this rope appeared as a snake even for some time. But this appearance it was there. So, this appearance is real or it is unreal. So, that we are discussing those things and the way the different Indian school of thought has handled this theory that also reflects their main philosophy. Now, as I have been when I started Indian philosophy

argued that how all the Indian philosophy, philosophical system talked about the suffering and the solution of this problem. What are the paths to get rid of this problem? How to get rid of this samsara or the cycle of birth and rebirth? Jaina philosophy presented a very different aspect. In the last class as we have discussed the Syādvāda, we also had Anekāntvāda, that multi form of one reality. So, one reality is there. It does not have a single aspect, it is many aspects. So, when we see and when we understand an object, empirical level then it is just one aspect, it is a partial view, it is not a complete view. So, we are not able to see, I mean when you are like done with this karma or you are removing all these ideas, all these effects then we may see this all the object as it is. But for me, when I say that I understand, I see things as an object or I perceive, I understand, I know object, the knowledge of an object, it is just a partial knowledge. It is not a complete knowledge. Now, as I said before starting this, I would like to discuss one thing. For example, there is an object called T and then this is called let us say attributes or essence. So, even in the Plato, we have discussed this idea. In Aristotle, we have discussed. So, this idea is we have discussed in different module while discussing a different school of thought. So, for example, there is any object, we may take an example of table and chair. They are very simple examples which we can take and understand. Any object, example laptop, mobile. So, these are the examples and these are the objects and these objects we perceive and we have knowledge of this object for example table and chair. There is also the attributes of an object. So, this is how we perceive. So, suppose there is one object called T and T is attributes or let us say let us do not put this in a Jaina philosophy. Just we are not discussing in Jainism. Let us take it an independent concept. So, suppose there is an object called F or T. So, for example, this is fire and this is an essence of fire T. Object, then essence. Object and its qualities which you have discussed while discussing in western philosophy. Now, so there is an argument that when we are perceiving an object as we discussed in John Locke, we also have discussed in Hume, David Hume. So, we are perceiving an object. So, there is in a one argument that we can only perceive the qualities of this object. So, quality is an object so far and therefore what we see those qualities itself is not the substance, this object. Buddhism we also have discussed. So, where this object is, the substance is for example is not more than its quality. So, now this is what the question is, is this substance and its quality is same or different? For example, there is in a substance, and in its qualities. Now, we are talking about the quality and substance. So, for example, there is an argument that this object is not more than its quality. So, for us, when I am saying X is just in a bundle of its quality and that is what we are saying inheres, in this one thing that is called substance. The substance is a abode of all these qualities. So, now there is another way of saying that no this is not same, this is not different. Substance is different, the quality is different and so on. So, now it depends for example in Yogācāra idealism as we discussed that for example there is a blue object and blue object is not more than blueness and what is blueness? It is just in a consciousness. So, therefore, there is a no object outside the mind, an external world. Only consciousness is there, real. So, Gaudapāda said pure

consciousness is only reality. So, this idea of the substance and its quality, this is a very important type. I mean how the different Indian school of thought has addressed this question. For example, Shankaracharya will say that both are same. It is not different because for him this Brahman is real, everything is Brahman. So, it depends in a school to school how they have addressed it. Now, today what I am going to do is going to talk about the Jaina philosophy and Jaina philosophy position. I mean I will be asking questions and then we will be answering from Jaina perspective. But at the same time, we also will be arguing or rejecting other concepts or the philosophical concept or argument of other Indian school of thought. So, as we have discussed in the last class, Jaina except Anekāntvāda, the multi form, therefore, he refuted, it means that he refuted the one-sided position. So, he talks about the Anekāntvāda. One object has a multi form aspect. So, aspect is multi form. Now, so we will understand the Jaina position one by one. We will ask the question and then followed by the answer from Jaina perspective. First question is, is existence is unreal? For example, we are saying that there is an object which is outside of the mind or we are talking about an object is a real or unreal. There are a lot of questions. Some are saying no, this existence is unreal. Buddhism or Yogācāra idealism will say no, this everything is unreal, just projection of mind. So, this existence is just not more than your consciousness. Gaudapāda will say, it is a pure consciousness. Jaina philosophy will argue that if existence is not real, then perception, the cognition will not be possible. Inference will not be possible. How we can perceive without any object? So, therefore, this existence is real, is not unreal. So, this is real. So, existence is real. If we are talking about the world, then object, it is quite real. Now, second is, is non-existence unreal? Abhāva. Now, what is a non-existence? That we need to understand. So, there are here four kinds. First is prior non-existence. For example, there is the substance and its qualities, attributes and its modification. So, there is a changing, it is modifying the other thing. It is modification of X and Y. So, what it was past that is non-existence. For example, milk and curd. Now, it is curd. So, the prior is, it is milk, that is a non-existence. Now, next is the Posterior non-existence. The next one, the future is non-existence. For example, milk, curd and then going to be both. So, next modification is non-existence from the present time point of view. Third one is Mutual non-existence. For example, there is a soul, there is a matter. Soul is not matter and matter is not soul. So, this is a mutual non-existence and something is an absolute non-existence. Like, matter is not in soul, that is an absolute non-existence. So, therefore, Jaina argued that, that an object is in both, existence and non-existence. It depends on the perspective. So, it is *sat* and *asat* from different perspective. Now, the next question is, the substance real apart from its attributes or are attributes real apart from its substance? So, as we have discussed, like for example, F and then A, A is attribute, F is an object. Now, both are like different. What Jaina philosophy argues that both are not substances. Jaina philosophy argues that substance is abode of these attributes. So, Jaina tradition argues that substance is neither devoid of attributes nor is conglomeration of attributes. So, substance and attributes both are real and if you talk about the relation of the

substance and its attribute, substance is abode of attribute, partial is identical, partial is different, because substance is one and attributes is changing. So, attributes is depends on the substance. The next question is real thing. Now, next question is, is a real thing one or many? Jaina tradition argues that, as a substance is a one but as an attribute is a many. Now, next question is, is the non-dual alone real? Non-dual is like for example, we have discussed in Vedanta philosophy, Advaita, non-dual. So, if there is one thing is real, now one thing is real means, is an eternal. Then there will be no talk about, I mean, this is not, if the non-dual is alone is real, then we cannot talk about the good and bad, we cannot talk about the merit and demerit. Those things will not be possible. So, if one thing is non-dual is alone is real, then we will not be talking about this dual thing. The next question is, is distinctness alone real? If for example, we are perceiving the cognition, we are perceiving the object. Now, as we have discussed in the last class, while discussing the theory of knowledge from Jaina perspective, there is an argument that when we are perceiving an object, first we perceive a very generic, and then its particular *viśeṣa*, and then we are cognizing that, this is X, this is Y, this is Z and so on. It is determinate perception. Now, if distinctness alone is real, then it will be difficult to perceive a general. So, when there are, it will be difficult to perceive an object in generic things. Now, the question is, is reality eternal? If reality is eternal, then there will be no change. Eternalism is what? This is beyond, as we have been discussing in western philosophy, beyond the change. So, there is no change. Now, what does it mean, is there is no change. For eternal means, an object, a thing, which is there is no, for example, there is no change. For example, Shankar notion of Brahman, Nirgun Brahman. So, this Nirgun Brahman is eternal. Now, eternal only means that there is no change. So, there is no activity. Now, it only means that there will be no anything, say for example, cause and effect, everything will be over. So, Shankaracharya says that, no, this appearance is unreal. So, but ontologically, one thing is real and eternal. So, Jaina philosophy has not supported this idea that reality is eternal. So, Jaina tradition argues that reality is not in that eternal. For example, the Sāṃkhya philosophy talks about the Puruṣa and prakṛti and that evolution where it argues the modification of prakṛti. We are going to talk about the Jiva and the transmigration of soul in the next life and so on. So, all these things will not be possible when you are going to argue that reality is eternal. Now, next question is, is reality is momentary? Again, if it is a momentary, then we may not be able to talk about many things. For example, the personal identity. So, if the things are changing continuously, for example, there is no person and it is changing, it is momentary, self is momentary. So, self is momentary only means that he will be not responsible for his previous acts. So, he performed acts and then changed. So, then we cannot argue that I am the same person who performed the last action and therefore, I am not supposed to face the impression of that acts. And, therefore, reality cannot be momentary. Buddhist philosophy, in Buddhist philosophy, we have discussed that how they have defended this momentaries. So, however, Jaina philosophy argues that this reality is not momentary. Now, the question is next is, is generality entirely different

from particularity? So, generality and particularity depend on each other. So, both are unreal apart from each other. So, generality and then particularity. So, the last of both questions is neither different nor identical. This is how Jaina philosophy argues. This discussion was basically for just to understand the Jaina ontology. Now, the last question is, is this reality is subjective or objective? Are cognitions alone real or external objects alone real? As we started first question about the world. So, there are no world and then external world, the object and external world is real or not real? So, Jaina philosophy says that, see the cognosome will not be possible without any real object. The next question arises that, that if the world is real, I mean the objects are real, does it mean that is an objective? Does it mean that these external objects are alone real? Jaina philosophy has a very different position. And this is how I believe this is a unique philosophy. Jaina philosophy says that both are real. Both are real in the sense is the cognition and the rational object. Buddhist philosophy argues that only cognizance and the consciousness is real. Gaudapāda says the only consciousness is real, not the object. Here, Jaina philosophy has a different position. He says that both are real. Now, what is the both are real means? So, the object is real there. So, there is an object outside the mind, but at the same time, it manifested by consciousness. So, consciousness is like, it is at least knowledge. So, it is like a lamp, take an example of lamp. So, it illuminates everything. So, therefore, both cognition and external object, both are real. So, this is how Jaina philosophy argues about his ontological principles. And it is an important and significant lecture in this series because it also accepts a rejection of many school of thought. So, he is presenting his view Jaina philosophy same time arguing against and giving kind of a problem, presenting a problem and other concept. So, if there is a concept, for example, only reality is eternal or reality is subjective or reality is objective, how Jaina philosophy is presenting argument that there is a problem if you are going to hold this position. And Jaina philosophy has talked about his own position. However, you have to understand that Jaina philosophy or in Jaina tradition, one object has a multi form. So, when we see things, when we have a knowledge of an object, it is a partial knowledge, *naya*. This is what we had discussed in the last class.

So, thank you. And this lecture is based on, as I said in the starting the first slide that based on the Indian philosophy by Jadunath Sinha. And the second book also is an important or a basic reading for this English school of thought or Jaina philosophy. So, thank you so much for your kind attention. Thank you.