JAINISM AND ITS PHILOSOPHY

Jainism is considered as Non-Brahmanic or Sramanic system. It is a heterodox system in the sense that it is non-Vedic, ascetic and monastic in character. The basic ideas of Jainism are radically different from those of the so-called traditional and orthodox Brāhmanism. It is quite independent of the Brāhmanical system. Jainism does not acknowledge the authority of Vedic tradition. It is a system, which believes in non-theistic. Many scholars attempt to describe it, as an atheistic religion discussing its origin and antiquity of Jainism. Jainism represents an important branch of Sramanic system of ancient India. Jainism is believed to be one of the oldest indigenous religions of India, probably to be a pre-Vedic religion. It is mentioned that “Jainas are referred to in early Vedic literature by the name of Vrātyas. They are identified as the members of Sramana cultural system, which is led by Jainas” (Bhaskar, 1972: 22).

2.1 ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF JAINISM

Jainism is a system of rational thought completely, quite distinct and independent from other system of Indian philosophy, purely of human origin, believes in pertaining of perfect knowledge and bliss. “It is an important, fully developed and well established religious and cultural system, purely indigenous to India. It still retains certain most primitive conceptions, and is the oldest living representation of that ancient Sramana current of Indian culture which was, in its origin, non-Vedic and probably non-Āryan and even pre-Āryan” (Jain, 1977: 1).

Many researchers and scholars of western and Indian had expressed their views and finding about the origin of Jainism. Some of the western scholars expressed conflicting view about the origin of Jainism. Though, these views are now considered as wrong understanding and erroneous. According to H. H. Wilson, W. S. Lily and Charles Eliot, Jainism has been considered as a mere offshoot of Buddhism. W. S. Lily writes: “Buddhism in proper survives in the land of its birth in the form of Jainism. What is certain is that Jainism came into notice when Buddhism had
disappeared from India" (cf Shah, 1932: xviii). S. Gopalan in his book *Outlines of Jainism* mentioned the observation of H. H. Wilson as “... Jainism came into existence only during the 8th or 9th century A.D. He observes: From all credible testimony, therefore, it is impossible to avoid the inference that the Jainas are a sect of comparatively recent institution who came into power and patronage about the 8th and 9th century: they probably existed before that date as a division of the Bauddhas, and owed their elevation to the suppression of that form of faith to which they contributed. This is positively asserted by the traditions of the south in several instances: the Bauddhas of Kanchi were confuted by Akalanka, a Jain priest, and thereupon expelled from the country. Vara Pandya of Madura, on becoming a Jain, is said to have persecuted the Bauddhas, subjecting them to personal tortures, and banishing them from the country. There is every reason to be satisfied, therefore, that the total disappearance of the Bauddhas in India proper is connected with the influence of the Jainas which may have commenced in the sixth or seventh centuries and continued till the twelfth” (cf Gopalan, 1973: 4). These kind of conflicting views were presupposed basing on similarities and resemblance between some of the doctrines and practices of Jainism and Buddhism. Charles Eliot maintains: “Many of their doctrines especially their disregard not only of priests but of Gods, which seems to us so strange in any system which can be called a religion, are closely analogous to Buddhism and from one point of view Jainism is a part of the Buddhist movement. But more accurately it may be called an early specialized form of the general movement which culminated in Buddhism” (cf Gopalan, 1973: 4-5).

H. Jacobi strongly opposed the view that Jainism is an offshoot of Buddhism and he made correction of this view with a thorough investigation into the historical and traditional records of the two traditions, commenting the fact that Jainism was an earlier and independent religion of India (Jacobi, 1946: 3-4). In 1884, the antiquity of Jainism was established by Jacobi for the first time as an independent and pre-Buddhist religion on the basis of the available from the Pāli Canon (Bhaskar, 1972: 22). H. Jacobi says: “In conclusion let me assert my conviction that Jainism is an original system, quite distinct and independent from all others; and that therefore it is
of great importance for the study of philosophical thought and religious life in ancient India" (cf Bhattacharya, 1957: ix). According to J.P. Jain, Jainism is one of the oldest living religions of India and certainly it is not an offshoot of any religion or in revolt to any religion (Shah, 1997: 41). Hermann Jacobi rightly believed that Jainism is not a mere offshoot of Buddhism. J. P Jain writes "Dr. Harmann Jacobi and others are also of the opinion that Jainism was related to the primitive philosophy of India, because of certain of its metaphysical conceptions, animistic belief, hero-worship in the form of worship as deities of perfected mortals, and of its being a very simple faith, be it in worship, rituals or morals" (Jain, 1977: 2). Regarding the origin of Jainism, S. Radhakrishna said "there is nothing wonderful in my saying Jainism was in existence long before the Vedās were composed" (Bhattacharya, 1957: xiv).

2.1 (a) Origin of Jainism based on Vedic background

The sixth century B.C. was a period of crises, of great ascetic upsurge and witnessed religious ferment in the society. It was during this period that there prevailed, in society, general, spiritual and moral unrest, and consequently, people started raising their voices against the existing religious order, and endeavored to reconstruct it on a new basis. For north India, the sixth century BC was a time of particular social, political and intellectual ferment. The older and more familiar tribal structure of society was disintegrating.

Under the influence of this religious ferment and upsurge, a large number of people in the society were leaving their homes to adopt the life of homeless. It was an age when people in India were disgusted with old philosophical dogmas and were striving for simple methods of worship and easier means of escape from the ills of this mundane existence. New leaders sprang into vigorous activities and gave a new orientation of life. It was also considered as an era of revolt against the old religious order. The revolt was against the standardization of social patterns, the excessive ritualistic form of religion, the absolute power of the priestcraft and the dead weight of a dead culture. The new philosophy of revolt was based on against anti-social discrimination anti-cast. It preached pure individualism and spiritualization. It
discarded the principle of social immobility, inequality and injustice; it upheld the sanctity of human intellect and its freedom. It stood for man and woman to achieve his or her salvation as human beings (Luniya, 1998-99: 91).

Some scholar believes that Jainism came into existence as a result of the revolt against the Brāhmanism. They maintained that Jainism was borne of discontent and hatred against Brāhmanism. Muni said, "The ascetic doctrines and practices of Jainism and Buddhism were believed to have had Vedic origin. In other words, Jainism originated as a protestant movement within the Vedic-Brāhmanic tradition" (Muni, 1984: 2).

Many scholars regarded Jainism as reformation movement of Brāhmanism, appealing to advocate a virtuous life and believed that it arose as a reaction against the extreme Vedic ritualism of sacrifice and killing of animals. There was a propensity of anti-ritualistic within the religion of Brāhmanism itself. It is believed that the Vedic religion tarnished its original purity by the sixth century B.C. The period from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC was a turning point in the intellectual and spiritual development of the whole world. In transition period, many people felt themselves adrift socially and morally. Religious confusion also arose as divergent streams of religious thought and practice came into contact and conflict. The killing of living animals as ritual ceremonies which advocated sacrifices to please God was one of the reasons to instill a feeling of revolt and contempt against such kind of activities among the people and started as a religious movement. The disapproval of Vedic authority and revolt against the ritualistic sacrifices of the Vedic religion has resulted to the emergence of Jainism as anti-theism. The social outlook of the Vedic system was based on the caste system. The lower communities like Sudra were not allowed to perform religious rites. People are fed of such kind of social discrimination. This led to reject the institutions of caste and animal sacrifices.

The ultimate aim of Jainism is the attainment of salvation or moksa from the chain of birth and dead, which is same as that of Brāhmanism or Hinduism. Jainism
believes the Hindu’s concept of karma and soul. It means that it follows the essential principle of Hinduism.

The concept of the Vedic origin of Jainism is mainly based on the following assumptions. These assumptions support this theory of the origin of Jainism.

- The Sramana thought (the ascetic stream of culture) was believed to be developed within the Vedic-Brāhmanic tradition and was a reaction to sacrificial ritualism of the Vedic Āryans.
- The earliest culture in India is the Vedic culture.
- Jainism and Buddhism are believed to be later than the earliest Upanishads and some of the Vedic sutra texts are also believed to be pre-Jinist and pre-Buddhist.

2.1 (b) Origin of Jainism based on Pre-Vedic background

While attempting to point out a brief sketch of the origin of Jainism, many difficulties have to be faced from the historical point of view; since there was almost non-existent of factual history in ancient times. Though, Jaina’s scholar rejected the above mentioned concept of the origin of Jainism, mainly based on Vedic background. They believed that Jainism is to be a pre-Vedic tradition of independent origin. There is no manipulation from any other religious systems. It is supposed to be one of the oldest and earliest religions of India.

Looking back to the archaeological evidences, there is probability to consider that the origin of Jainism is pre-Vedic. “The ruined cities of Harappa and Mohenjodaro reveal that before the Indo-Āryans arrived in India, a highly advanced and mature culture had been flourishing in North-West India. The pre-Vedic and pre-Āryan Harappan culture is much more ancient than the Vedic Āryan culture. The legacy of the Harappans has been acknowledged by several modern archaeologists. It is now accepted that several elements of our ancient thought and culture are of non-Āryan and pre-Āryan origin. The ascetic strand in Indian culture has been traced to non-Vedic Harappan culture complex. The reaction to Vedic sacrificial ritualism found in
the later Vedic texts, such as the old Upanishads, is now have been due to non-Āryan ascetic influences" (Muni, 1984: 3).

Rammisraj Shastri, Professor of Sanskrit College, Banaras says, “We are reminded of the antiquity of Jainism when we study the things obtained from the excavation at Mohanjodaro ancient inscriptions, caves and many ancient ruins... Jainism began when this world began; I am of the opinion that Jainism is much older than the Vedic Darsana” (cf Bhattacharya, 1985: xiii). John Marshall had demonstrated in detail the Harappan origins of the practice of yoga and dhyāna (Marshall, 1931: 48). Marshall brings to highlight his view and demonstration based on existing archaeological evidence. G. C. Pande in his book Studies in the origins of Buddhism mention that, “It has been held by many older writers that Buddhism and Jainism arose out of this anti-ritualistic tendency within the religion of the Brāhmanas. We have, however, tried to show that the anti-ritualistic tendency within the Vedic fold is itself due to the impact of an asceticism which antedates the Vedas. Jainism represents a continuation of this pre-Vedic stream, from which Buddhism also springs, though deeply influenced by Vedic thought. The fashionable view of regarding Buddhism as a protestant Vedicism and its birth as a reformation appears to us to be based on a misreading of the later Vedic history caused by the fascination of a historical analogy and the ignorance, or neglect of pre-Vedic civilization” (Pande, 1957: 317).

The Jainas believes that Jainism is one of the oldest living religions of India. It is incalculably old. They further believe that from the time of immemorial it had been continuously practiced by many Tirthankaras. Based on the continuous revelation of the Tirthankaras, the ascetic character and prevalence image worship in Jainism, the Jainas are of the opinion that the antiquity of Jainism back to pre-Vedic period. However, it is difficult to make certain the particular time of its origin.

Commenting on the archaeological evidence of Jainism, B. L. Guptā writes, “The ascetic character of the religion and nude images of Jinas in Kayotsarga posture led some scholars to believe that Jainism existed in India long before Mahavira and
Parsva. On the one hand its origin, theoretically, could be traced in the Sramanic tradition and on the other hand, practically the proto-form of Kayotsarga could be visualized in some of the images found from Mohenjodaro and Harappa. A few seals discovered from Mohenjodaro show human figures in a standing posture. For example on a seal found from Harappa we find in the upper register an ascetic in Kayotsarga posture in a jungle who is being worshipped by a lay follower seated beside a bull, and in the lower half again seven figures are standing in the same posture. This identification is taken to suggest the existence of Jainism in Harappan times. Besides this, a torso found from Harappa, nude and in standing posture lost in meditation, closely resembles the Jain images of Kusana period” (Gupta, 1981: 110-111). “As regards archaeological and epigraphical evidence, the Kayotsarga (dedication of body)-Yoga pose of setting and standing images engraved on the seals of Mohenjodaro, Harappa and Lothat are identified by some scholars as Rsabha (the first Tirthankara) images. The Hathigumpha inscription of king Kharavela, refer to an image of Jina, which was taken away to Magadha by king Nanda. Similar evidence is found with regard to other Tirthankaras, who, too, had been historical personages of immense reputation in philosophical and religious circles” (Bhaskar, 1972: 22).

The literary records mention about the existence of twenty four Jaina Tirthankaras. According to the belief of the Jainas, Rsabha was the first Tirthankara and Vardhamana was the 24th and last Tirthankara. Mahavira is not the originator of Jainism. The names of the twenty four Tirthankaras of Jainism are given below:

1) Rsabha or Vrsabha or Ādi-natha
2) Ajita-natha
3) Sambhava-natha
4) Abhinandana-natha
5) Sumati-natha
6) Padmaprabha or Suprabha
7) Suparasva-natha
8) Candraprabha
9) Pushpadanta or Suvidhi-natha
10) Sitala-natha
11) Sriyamsa-natha
12) Vasupujya
13) Vimala-natha
14) Ananta-natha or Anantajit
15) Dharma-natha
16) Santi-natha
17) Kunthu-natha
18) Ara-natha
19) Malli-natha
20) Suvrata or Muni-suvrata
21) Nami-natha
22) Nemi-natha or Aristanemi
23) Parsva-natha
24) Vardhamana or Mahavira

Jagmanderlal Jaini (1916) in his book entitled *Outlines of Jainism* and Asim Kumar Chatterjee (1978) in his book entitled *A Comprehensive History of Jainism* and have discussed about the details of the Jaina Twenty-four Tirthankaras which are enlisted as follows:

1. **Rsabha or Adhi-natha**: He is regarded as the first Tirthankara of Jainism and is uniformly described as belonging to Kosala (Kosalī). He is the son of Kulakara Nabhi (father) of Vinita (Ayodhya) city and Marudevi (mother). He belonged like Mahavira to the Kasyapa lineage. His height was 500 dhanusas (bow-lengths). He had two wives- Sumangala and Sunanda and hundred sons. Rsabha, after anointing his 100 sons as kings of various kingdoms, renounced the world and attain omniscience outside the town of Purimatala, which was near his home town. His first disciples were Rsabhasena and Bambhi. His sacred tree was *nyagrodha*. He died on the summit of Atthavaya, which has tentatively been identified with Kailash.
2. **Ajita-natha:** He is regarded as the second *Tirthankara*. Like Rsabha, he was also a Kosalan. Ajita was the son of Jitasatru of Ayodhya. The name of his mother was Vijaya. His height was of 450 dhanusas (50 dhanusas less than that of Rsabha). The sacred tree associated with him was *saptaparna*. He died on the summit of Parasnath hill (Sammeya). Sihasena and Phaggu were his first disciples. There is nothing to indicate that he was a historical figure.

3. **Sambhava-natha:** He is regarded as the third *Tirthankara* by the Jainas. He also belonged to Kosala. He was the son of king Jitari of Sravasti. His mother’s name was Sena. His height was 100 dhanusas less than that of Rsabha i.e., 400 dhanusas, 50 dhanusas less then that of Ajita. His sacred tree was *sala*. Like the second *Tirthankara*, he too, attained liberation on the summit of Sammeya hill. His prominent disciples were Caru and Sama.

4. **Abhinandana-natha:** He is the fourth *Tirthankara*. He was also a Kosalan according to the Jainas and was born at Vinita. His parents were Samvara and Siddhartha. His height was 350 dhanusas, less 50 dhanusas than that of Sambhava-natha, 150 dhanusas then that of Rsabha. Vajranabha and Ajita were his chief disciples. His sacred tree was *priyaka*. He attained liberation on mount Parasnath.

5. **Sumati-natha:** He is regarded as the fifth *Tirthankara*. He was also born at Vinita in the Kosala country. King Megha and Queen Mangala were his parents. His height was 300 dhanusas, 50 dhanusas less than that of Abhinandana-natha and 200 dhanusas than that of Rsabha. His sacred tree was *priyanga*. His chief disciples were Camara and Kasavi. On the hill mount of Sammeya he attained liberation.

6. **Padmaprabha or Suprabha:** He is the sixth *Tirthankara*. Unlike the first five he didn't belong to Kosala. He was not a kosalan. He was born in the adjoining Vatsa territory in the famous city of Kausambi. He was the son of king Dhara and queen Susima. His height was 50 dhanusas less than that of
his predecessor Sumati-natha i.e., 250 dhanusas, 250 dhanusa less than that of Rsabha. His sacred tree was Chatrabha. Suvrata and Rati were his disciples. He attained nirvāna on Sammeya.

7. Suparsva-natha: He is regarded as the seventh Tirthankara. He was born at Varanasi. King Pratistha and queen Prthvi were his parents. His height was 200 dhanusas, less 50 dhanusas then that of Padmaprabha, 300 dhanusas less than that of Rsabha. Vidarba and Soma were his chief disciples. Sirisa was his sacred tree. He died on the Sammeya Mountain.

8. Candraprabha: He is the eighth Tirthankara of Jainism. He is also known as Sasi. Candrapura was his birth place. His parents were Mahasena and Laksmana. He had the height of 150 dhanusas, 50 dhanusas less than that of Suparsva-natha, 350 dhanusas less then that of Rsabha. Nagavrksa was his sacred tree. Dinna nad Sumana were his chief disciples. He died on the Sammeya Mountain.

9. Pushpadanta or Suvidhi-natha: He was the son of Sugriva and Rama of Kakandi. He is regarded as the ninth Tirthankara. Kakandi is identified with kakan in the Monghyr district, Bihar. He is regarded as the ninth Tirthankara. He had the height of 100 dhanusas, 50 dhanusas less then that of the eighth Tirthankara, 400 dhanusas less than that of Rsabha. His sacred tree was mali or malli. His chief disciples were Varaha and Varuni. He attained Nirvāna on the Sammeya Mountain.

10. Sitala-natha: He was the son of Drdhathra and Nanda of Bhaddilapura. This place has tentatively been identified with Bhadila, a village in the Hazaribag district, Bihar. He is regarded as the tenth Tirthankara. His height was 90 dhanusas. His sacred tree was pilanka. Ananda and Sulasa were his chief disciples. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya.

11. Sreyamsa-natha: Visnu and Visna of Simhapura were the parents of Sreyamsa-natha. Simhapura was identified with Simhapuri near Banaras. He
is known as the eleventh Tirthankara. He was of 80 dhanusas height. His chief disciples were Gothubha and Dharini. He reached liberation on mount Sammeya.

12. Vasupujya: He is known as the twelfth Tirthankara. He was the son of Vasupujya and Jaya of Campa. He had a height of 70 dhanusas. His sacred tree was patala. Suhamma and Dharani were his chief disciples. He breathed his last at Campa.

13. Vimala-natha: He is regarded as the thirteen Tirthankara. He was the son of Kritavarman and Suramya of Kampilya. His height was of 60 dhanusas. His sacred tree was jambu. Mandara and Dharanidhara were his chief disciples. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya.

14. Ananta-natha or Anantaji: He is known as the Fourteen Tirthankara. He was born as the son of Simhasena and Sujasa of Ayodhya. His height was 50 dhanusas. Asvattha was his sacred tree. His first disciples were Yasa and Padma. He also breathed his last on mount Sammeya.

15. Dharma-natha: He is the fifteen Tirthankara. He was the son of Bhanu and Suvrata of Rayanapura. He had a height of 45 dhanusas. Dadhiparna was his sacred tree. Arista and Siva were his chief disciples. His death took place on mount Sammeya.

16. Santi-natha: He is regarded as the sixteen Tirthankara. This Tirthankara was the son of Visvasena and Avira of Gajapura (=Hastina-pura). He had a height of 40 dhanusas. His sacred tree was nandi. Cakkaha and Sui were his chief disciples. He attained liberation on Sammeya Mountain.

17. Kunthu-natha: He is known as the seventeen Tirthankara. He was the son of Surya and Sri-devi of Hastina-pura. He had a height of 35 dhanusas. Tilaka was his sacred tree. His chief disciples were Svayambhu and Amjuya. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya.
18. **Ara-natha**: He is regarded as the eighteen *Tirthankara*. He was the son of Sudarsana and Mitra Devi of Hastina-pura. His height was of 30 dhanusas. His sacred tree was mango. His chief disciples were Kumbha and Rakshiya. He attained liberation on mount Sammeya.

19. **Malli-natha**: Malli-natha is regarded as the nineteen *Tirthankara*. The parents of this *Tirthankara* were Kumbha and Pravbhavati of Mithila. Malli-natha was a woman, according to the Svetambaras; but the Digambaras do not agree. She was exceedingly beautiful and had a height of 25 dhanusas. Kings of six leading cities of Northern India, we are told, demanded her hand for marriage. When refused, they all attacked Mithila at the same time. But before long, they were all converted by her and became good jains. Her sacred tree was *asoka*. Indra and Bandhumati were her chief disciples. This woman *Tirthankara* died on mount Sammeya.

20. **Suvarata or Muni-suvarata**: He is recognized as the twenty *Tirthankara*. He was the son of Sumitra and Padmavati of Rajagriha. His height was 20 dhanusas. His sacred tree was *campaka*. Kumbha and Puspavati were his chief disciples. He died on mount Sammeya.

21. **Nami-natha**: He is regarded as the twenty-one *Tirthankara*. Like Malli, this *Tirthankara* also belonged to Mithila. He was the son of Vijaya and Vapra of Mithila. He had a height of 15 dhanusas. *Bakula* was his sacred tree. Subha and Amala were his chief disciples. He died on mount Sammeya.

22. **Nemi-natha or Aristanemi**: He is regarded as the twenty-two *Tirthankara*. He was the son of Samudra-vijaya and Siva-devi of Sauri-pura. According to the Jainas, he was an exact contemporary of the great Vasudeva Krsna. He had a height of 10 dhanusas. His sacred tree was *vetasa*. He attained liberation on mount Girmar.

23. **Parsva-natha**: He is regarded as the twenty-third *Tirthankara* of the Jainas. Parsva-natha is believed to have flourished 250 years earlier than Mahavira, as
Jaina tradition holds. This suggests eight century being the date of Parsvanatha. He hailed from Varanasi, as the son of king Asvasesa of Varanasi and queen Vama. He probably belonged to an aristocratic Ksatriya family. Varanasi is the cultural and religious centre of India from centuries. He had a height of 9 hands. He had a life 100 years. He led the life of a householder up to the age of thirty years. He attained Nirvana at the age of 100 years at a place known as Sammeta-sikhara (=Sammeya) in Bihar after preaching his religion for about seventy years. Sammeta-sikhara is called today the Parsvanatha Hill.

24. Vardhamana or Mahavira: He is the twenty-fourth and last Tirthankara. He was born after 250 years the emancipation of Parsva-natha at Kunda-pura in Bihar on Monday the 27th march 598 B.C. (Sogani, 2002: 68). He was the son Siddhartha who belonged to Ksatriyas of Jnatr clan. The name his mother was Trisala. She was the sister of Cetaka, the Licchavi chief of Vaisali. He had a height of 7 hands. He died at the age of 72 at Pava-Puri and reached Nirvana.

The above mentioned tradition of Tirthankaras claims that Jainism is to be of a non-Vedic and pre-Vedic origin. On the basis of Tirthankaras tradition, the Jainism moves forward its antiquity back to pre-Vedic period. Jainism is indebted to the First Tirthankara, Rsabha. This ancient religion is said to have been invigorated and revealed by from time to time by the other twenty three Tirthankaras in continuous process. S. Radhakrishnan pointed out in his book 'Indian Philosophy, vol.1' that "There is evidence to show that so far back as the first century B.C., there were people who was worshipping Rsabhadeva, the first Tirthankara. There is no doubt that Jainism prevailed even before Vardhamana or Parsvanatha. The Yajurveda mentions the names of three Tirthankaras: Rsabha, Ajitanatha and Aristanemi. The Bhagavata Purana endorses the view that Rsabha was the founder of Jainism" (Radhakrishnan, 1927: 287). Mahavira inherited the legacy of his twenty three predecessors Tirthankaras and made systematization of it in a constructive form.
The belief in the existence of these twenty three Tirthankaras as predecessors of Mahavira indicates that the Jaina tradition is Pre-Mahavir existence and of early ancient time, which had no chance to make record fully. Nemi (or Aristanemi), who is regarded as the twenty second Tirthankara is connected with the legend of Krsna (Jacobi, 1946: 9). It can be regarded that the traditional account of the twenty two prior to Parsvantha and Mahavira belongs to mythology. There is no enough evidence of historical record of these Tirthankaras. However, considering from the standpoint of history, the historicity of the last two Tirthankaras, namely, Parsvanatha and Mahavira has now been confirmed and recognized. The detail of their life can be regarded wholly as historical facts, inspite of some controversies.

The teaching of Parsvanatha was called ‘Caujjamadharma or the fourfold doctrine’, which set to restraint from violence, falsehood, stealing and acquisition but to follow ahimsa (non-killing), satya (truthful speech), asteya (non-stealing) and aparigraha (non-possession of worldly goods). Mahavira recognized five vows one more than that of Parsvanatha. This is also proved by the fact that according to the famous Acaranga Sutra even Mahavira’s parents, who lived near Vaisali, were themselves followers of Parsva. The important of this statement of the Acaranga can hardly be overemphasized. This shows that Mahavira himself grew up under the umbrella of Parsva’s religion (Chatterjee, 1978: 12-13).

2.2 THE AGE OF MAHAVIRA

Mahavira is one of the great spiritual personages who practices and propagated the principles of peaceful coexistence. Non-violence is the fundamental basis of his philosophy. For social elevation and individual liberty, he fought against the economic exploitation and social coercion. His enthusiastic was for the social upliftment of the oppressed individuals. It was also a time of religious disturbance during the time when Mahavira flourished. Old Vedic was declining. The sacrificial ritualism of the Vedic Brähmanas had to face a strong challenge posed by the religion and philosophy taught by munis and sramanas. The ideological conflict between the Brahmanas of the Vedic tradition on one hand, and sramanas of the non-Vedic on the
other hand, is reflected in the earliest literature of the Buddhists and the Jainas (Muni, 1984: 11-2).

The Mahavira's addition of the fifth vow of celibacy to the four vows of Parsvanatha doesn't mean to establish a new creed borrowing from his predecessor. By clarifying and giving new orientation of the concepts already existed, he has improved the already existing religion laid by his predecessors, especially Parsvanatha. In the strict sense of the expression, Jainism was not a revolt against the existing Brāhmanical hierarchy. The creed had already originated and spread though it received a great momentum with the advent of Mahavira on the scene. The main opposition came from the Brāhmins who critisied the Jain philosophy and traditions as the Mahavira had taken the sensitive issue of caste but the opposition was only vocal neither violent nor bitter. Mahavira was prudent enough not to criticize the authority of the Vedas very strongly. This gave Mahavira a chance to preach the religion of Parsvanatha after a slender revision, as the social abuses indulged by the Brahmanism were large enough, to cater to a section of the society. His preachings allowed the common man to think and act for self dependent, to look not beyond himself for hope and aid. His teachings proved so effective that even a section of the Brāhmanas are said to have recognized him as a great teacher. According to C.V. Vaidya, "Intellectual Brāhmanas also joined the ranks of Jainas as of Buddhist from time to time owing to conviction as well as for honour, and contributed to the maintenance of his reputation of the Jainas for learning" (Thakur, 1964: 86-87). Jainism emerged as a strong protest against caste-privileges and steadily started spreading among the lower section and poor. Mahavira recognized the Brāhmanas and the Sudras, the high and the low, were the same in society. There is no difference between them on the basis of their origin, caste and family status. He recognized the Brāhmana not by birth but by proper action or qualification. Even a low-born Candala can enjoy the highest position in the society accordingly, if the Candala possess the requisite qualification. Like Brāhmanism, Jainism is also based on the same dogmas of the transmigration of soul and seeks for deliverance from the endless succession of rebirth. But it does not agree with the Brāhmanic penances and
abstinences to achieve it, while it aims at attaining, not union with the Universal spirit, but \textit{Nirvāṇa}, i.e., absolute release from all bodily forms and activities. This difference is, however, minor and, above all, it is distinguished by its relation to castes. Mahavira neither opposed them nor accepted every thing as it were. According to him, men are born in lower and higher castes, determined by their sins or good works in a former existence, but by life of purity and love, by becoming a spiritual man, every one may attain at once the highest salvation. In accordance with this doctrine caste made no difference to him and he looked for a man even in the Candala.

For Mahavira, the basic social values such as \textit{Ahimsā}, \textit{Aparigraha} and \textit{Anekānta} are the cause of social reconstruction. For him “... \textit{ahimsā} consist in recognizing the dignity of man irrespective of caste, colour and creed. Man is man and should be recognized as such without any hesitation. The dignity of man is sacred and it is our duty to honour this dignity. Every individual, whether man or woman, should enjoy religious freedom without any distinction. Mahavira bestowed social prestige upon the down-trodden individuals” (Sogani, 2002: 69). Caste-system, according to him, was just circumstantial and it is easy for a spiritual man to break the fetters of this system. The gift of supernormal vision was no monopoly of any order or caste or sex, and in this matter. He made no distinction between men and men or between men and women. Further, the Jaina belief has been that a Jina must always come from a Ksatriya or some such noble family. In other words, Mahavira though did not support the age-old caste-system, yet did not oppose it so vehemently as did the Buddha which provoked strong reaction from the \textit{Brāhmaṇas} and culminated in a bitter wordy duel for centuries which was ultimately responsible for the growth and development of Indian logic and philosophy.

During the age of Mahavira, it is believed that followers of Parsvanatha were flourished in east India. Magadha was one of important centre of their missionary activities. It was marked as an era of considerable changes in the cultural history of India. Politically, there were two main forms of government, one monarchical and the other republican. Magadha and Kosala represented strong monarchies which believed
in expansionism and imperialism. On the other hand, the Licchavis of Vaisali, Sakyas of Kapilavastu, the Mallas of Kusinagara etc., represent republican tradition. They loved their freedom and democratic institutions. There were frequent wars between the kingdoms and republics. King Ajatasatru of Magadha, for example, is reported to have been the enemy of the Licchavis of Vaisali. Likewise, King Vidudabha of Kosala is known to have attacked and harmed the Sakyas of Kapilavastu. Another important political event of the age was the Persian invasion of Punjab. This, however, had practically no impact on the history of Magadha and Kosala (Muni, 1984: 11).

2.3 METAPHYSICS

The basic metaphysical view of Jainism says- "Nothing is destructible, that is, nothing can be created out of nothing, or out of something, which does not at all exist in one form or the other" (Jain, 1977: 33). In other words, that which exists in the universe is not a creation of a supreme being. Everything that exists is independent and real. They are eternal, everlasting, without a beginning and without an end. The whole universe, the conglomeration of all that exists, is uncreated and real by virtue of its being existential. The universe has been in existence from all eternity. All that exist possesses an infinite number of individual characteristics of its own. The order of nature has always obtained from all eternity. The universe is perpetual and imperishable. The universe, as a whole, is conceived as having had no origin and as not going to have any end, although it is constantly undergoing change (Hariyanna, 1995: 62). It is subject only to its own laws and, in spite of the change undergone by its constituents, remains in its essential character unchanged. It is part of a universe which, without beginning and without end, passes through an infinite number of cosmic cycles, each divided into phases of ascent and descent.

The realistic approach of Jainism maintains that 'Existence is real' and 'Reality is existence'. Not only Jainism but also the other systems of Indian Philosophy considered Reality as the key concept in metaphysics. This metaphysics concept "... is considered as reflecting a 'world-view' of which the outlook on life around forms
an integral part” (Gopalan, 1973: 121). In general “... reality can be defined as any substantiality or existence that has the characteristic of persistence through change; i.e., that its fundamental nature (guna) is unaltered while its form (paryaaya) may alter” (Shah, 2004b: 39).

Jainism regards reality as multiple facets in its character. It is what changes almost perpetually or is dynamic, and yet keeps its identity throughout. Everything that exists has a general as well as a particular aspect. The both aspects of an object is taken as two as together consisting reality. They are distinguishable in thought, but are not separable in fact. The relation between these two aspects of an object is one in difference but as phases of the same substance, they are one. The two aspects are distinct but they belong to or characterise as one within the same object. The features of identity and difference of the object remain together as its existential nature of reality. Reality in Jainism is characterised by origination and destruction, as well as by permanence. The origination and destruction relate to the modes of reality; and permanence to their substratum.

According to Jainism, Reality is divided into two fundamental categories of consciousness and non-consciousness, both are exist as reality and uncreated. Here, consciousness means Jiva and non-consciousness means Ajiva. Everything exists by virtue of being existential with an infinite number of animate and inanimate distinctiveness phenomenons. The existence of both consciousness and non-consciousness indicates that the individual soul, matter, space, time and the principle of motion and rest that come into being in the universe are all constituted as real. They are respectively known as Jiva, Pudgala, Ākāśa, Kala, Dharma and Adharma. The last five are grouped together under the term Ajiva. The assertion that the individual soul, matter, space, time and principles of motion and rest found in the universe are all real is indeed a lucid indication that both the conscious and the non-conscious aspect of Reality do exist. Jiva is the conscious principle, experiencer of pleasure, pain and refer to that which is sentient, has life, is active and is characterized by the nature of consciousness, knowledge and purity. On the other hand, Ajiva is devoid of consciousness and is the object of enjoyment. Ajiva refers to
that which is material, insentient, lifeless, inert, passive, and which when conjoined to the \textit{Jiva} and in combination with it comprises all entities that we observe around us. Thus, according to Jainism, \textit{Jiva} and \textit{Ajiva} are the main principles constituting ‘Reality’. These two aspects of reality are also denoted by term \textit{dravya} (substance).

The entire universe is composed by these six substances or realities. All the six substances are existent and capable of assuming different modes and exhibiting varying qualities. However, substance is defined as “... that which persists in and through its own qualities and modifications. Substance and quality are inseparable. A thing is defined as that which has many qualities. Substance is one, the inherent essence of all things, manifests itself through diverse forms, has the three characteristics of creation, destruction and staying, and may be described by opposites” (Radhakrishna, 1927: 313). In Jainism, the knowledge of six substances is considered as necessary for liberation. The soul and matter forms the two principal Realities. Realities are devoid of empirical qualities; they cannot be seen, touched, smelt or physically apprehended. Substances have the capability to change their forms and states. In doing so, they can combine together without losing their separate identities or natures. Their functions are continuously active. To be active, the substance has to undergo modifications at every moment. They have a stationary wave motion. The stationary wave motion imparts information about the substance to the energy waves of other substances, when the energy wave pass through or come in contact with it (Shah, 2004b: 45).

\textbf{The six constituent of the existence of Realities}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soul or Consciousness</th>
<th>Jiva</th>
<th>Living Substance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Pudgala</td>
<td>Non-living Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Åkāsa</td>
<td>Non-living Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Kāla</td>
<td>Non-living Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle of motion</td>
<td>Dharma</td>
<td>Non-living Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle of rest</td>
<td>Adharma</td>
<td>Non-living Substance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substance is that which exists as the substratum of attributes and modes. It is characterized by the simultaneous origination, destruction and persistence. It is a dynamic reality, an identity which changes. The substance refers the entity’s core existence, which has innumerable qualities. The substance with its qualities undergoes modification acquiring new and shedding old forms. Existence implies change and permanence from the viewpoint of experience. As it is concerned, “Permanence signifies persistence of substance along with attributes, and change refers to fluctuating modes along with the emergence of the new modes and the disappearance of the old ones at one and the same time” (Sogani, 1967: 16). In other words, it means that substance is subject to changes and modifications, possesses qualities and performs functions. Things are permanent as substance and change in regard to their accident features.

Jainism is of the opinion that reality changes, gain new qualities and loses old ones. Substance is always together with its qualities and persists in and through its qualities and modifications. It is unity in differences. It is dynamic and maintains identity in the midst of changes. Qualities (guna) inhere in the substances. The Jaina philosophers maintain that the persistent or enduring aspect of substance is quite evident from the very attempt at understanding the change that take place in a thing since the attempt presupposes that the thing itself persists in spite of changes. The changing modes are referred to variously as appearance and disappearance, origination and decay, modification, becoming, difference, discreetness, plurality, manyness and manifoldness. Now we have seen that there is no difference between substance and reality. Reality is substance and substance is reality. Therefore the essential criterion of Reality is Existence. And which exist is real. From this point of view and discussion of the Jaina concept of reality, it can be articulated that “All is one because all exist” (Gopalan, 1973: 125).

Jiva: As Hiriyana points out “The notion of Jiva in general corresponds to that of ātman or purusa of the other schools of Indian thought. But as implied by the etymology of its name- what lives or is animate-the concept seems to have been arrived at first by observing the characteristics of life and not through the search after
a metaphysical principle underlying individual existence. It would therefore be more correct to take the world in its original significance as standing for the vital principle than the soul" (Hiriyanna, 1973: 157). "A *jiva* is a conscious substance. Consciousness is the essence of the soul. It is always present in the soul, though its nature and degree may vary. Soul may be theoretically arranged in a continuous series, according to the degrees of consciousness” (Chatterjee and Datta, 1984, 92).

Jainism states that “. . . soul as either atomic or omnipresent, and therefore as never changing its size. Knowledge or sentience is its very essence; and empirical knowledge, in its diverse forms, is a manifestation of it under limitations caused by the *Ajiva* or inanimate nature- a sort of blinker put upon it during its mundance existence” (Hiriyanna, 1995: 61).

Soul, in this universe is of infinite number and every living body has a soul. It is invisible and has no form or shape. It cannot therefore be experienced by the senses. By any sort of combination, arrangement or composition, it cannot be produced in any form because it is an element exhibit on its own. It is eternal and lasts for ever. From time to time, worldly soul has been abiding in different organisms through which it manifests itself. However, “There is an infinite number of soul; the whole world is literally filled with them. The souls are substances, and as such eternal; but they are not of a definite size, since they contract or expand according to the dimensions of the body in which they are incorporated for the time being. Their characteristic mark is intelligence, which may be obscured by extrinsic causes, but never destroyed” (Jacobi, 1946: 20). Every soul is an aggregation of infinite space-point. According to the size of the body, the soul occupies any size of body by its ability of expanding and contracting. No soul is there in unoccupied space. In the body, the soul manifests itself in terms of its distinctive qualities.

As a substance soul is absolute and permanent, perfect and all powerful. According to Jainism, in its pure state, the soul is is possessed of infinite perception, infinite knowledge, and infinite bliss. But through its impure state, conditioned by karma, the soul identifies with matter. The Jaina system maintains that *Jiva* has no form. It is real, uncreated and indestructible. It is, by itself, indiscernible, because of
its formlessness. As a distinguishing characteristic of its possession of consciousness, the Jiva may be theoretically arranged in a continuous series according to its degree of consciousness.

The Jiva has the faculty of knowing and perceiving of sensing pleasure and pain. It is the soul that knows things, performs activities, enjoys pleasure, suffers pains and illumines itself and other objects. The soul is eternal spiritual substance, incorporeal, immaterial, but it also undergoes, change of states. It is different from the body and sense-organs and its existence is directly proved by its consciousness of itself (Chatterjee and Datta, 1984: 92). Jiva is that which are growing, decaying and changing. These qualities appear to be present in Jiva, when it enters a physical body. Jiva remains the same, though it varies according to the different states of existence it acquires due to karmic-matter. It does not confined to human only. It goes to subsist in any of the four states of existence- human, animals, celestial being and hellish beings. These four states of existence indicate that there is continuity of consciousness from the lowest of animate being to the highest stage of perfection.

Ajiva: Ajiva is the inanimate substances. It is the reality, which has the characteristic of being unconsciousness. Lack of life and consciousness is its main distinctive feature. It neither experiences pleasure or pain, nor has any conscious activity. It may or may not be perceptible to the senses. It can be touched, tasted, seen and smelt. “The physical world in which souls live is constituted by the material bodies that the souls occupy and the other material objects that form their environment. But in addition to these material substances, there are space, time and the conditioned of motion and rest, without which the world and its events cannot be fully explained” (Chatterjee and Datta, 1984: 92). The Jaina system used the term Ajiva to denote the following five categories.

a) Pudgala: Those inert substances, which can be perceptible by the senses, the sense organs, the physical body, the mind, the karmas and all other material objects, are known as Pudgala. It includes all physical objects. It is one of the kinds of Ajiva, which has form and made up of atoms which
are without size and eternal. This term denotes the matter in Jaina philosophy. The term *Pudgala* is derived from the combination of words- 'Pud' and 'Gala'. *Pud* means to integrate or fill or conjoin and *Gala* means disintegrate or decay or disjoin. Etymologically, it means that which has the accountability of the process of integration and disintegration. Matter has the characteristic of experiencing by the five sense organs and also the characteristic of integration and disintegration. From these two views of its characteristic, we can derive the definition of *Pudgala* as the material substance, which can be experienced by the sense organs and which can undergo modification by integration and disintegration of its atoms. As S. Radhakrishnan points out, "... sound, union, fineness, grossness, shape, division, darkness, and image, with luster and heat, are modifications of the substance known as *pudgala*. Matter is an eternal substance undetermined with regard to quantity and quality. It may increase or diminish in volume without any addition or loss of particles. It may assume any form and develop various qualities. It is the vehicle of energy which is essentially kinetic or of the nature of motion. This motion belongs to the substance *pudgala*, and is of two kinds, simple motion, or *parispanda*, and evolution, or *parināma*. *Pudgala* is the physical basis of the world. Matter itself is said to exist in six different forms of different degrees of fineness and visibility. The quality of touch, taste, smell, colour, and sound are associated with *pudgala*. The Jains argue that everything in the world except souls and space is produced from matter" (Radhakrishnan, 1927: 317). The existence of matter into two states can be distinguished as gross matter and subtle matter. Gross matter is of the things which we perceive consists, see around us. And subtle are those which are beyond the reach of our senses such as the karmic matter at different degrees that contaminates the essentially pure *jiva*. All material things are ultimately produced by the combination of atoms, which are formless, infinitesimal, having no beginning, middle or end, subject to mutual attraction. "The formation of
different substances is due to the different geometrical modes of the combination of atoms, the diverse modes of their arrangement, and different degrees of interatomic space. Some of these atomic combinations may be traced to simple mutual contacts at two points, but others may be due to active points of atomic force which attract each other. Two atoms form a compound, and compound combine with other compounds to produce the gross matter”. (Bibhu and Minakshi, 1998: 86-87). Thus, gross matters are produced by their various kinds of combination and are subject to attraction and repulsion.

b) Ākāśa: In Jainism Ākāśa “... is the subtle entity, which spreads over both the mundane universe and that transcendent region of liberated souls, which allows the subsistence for all other substances. It is not a mere negation and absence of veil or obstruction, or mere emptiness, but a positive entity which helps other things to interpenetrate.” (Dasgupta, 1957: 198). To give space is the characteristic of ākāśa and accommodating everything is its nature. S. Gopalan writes “This is space and is considered to be objectively real, and as being possessed of an infinite number of space-points, and the latter are imperceptible. Space is considered to be eternal and uncreated” (Gopalan, 1973: 144). Substances which are extended can have the responsibility to extend because of space only. Space is the requirement for a substance to be extended. However, “It is inferred as the condition of extension. All substances except time have extension and extension is afforded only space. Space itself is not an extension; it is the locus of extension” (Sharma, 1987: 64). It is an independent substance, which devoid of touch, taste, smell and colour. It has no form. It accommodates the infinites number of material objects. It offers area to other substances to exist. Other substances exist by their own nature, but they require some area to exist in. Ākāśa is the universal container. Space stretches over the whole universe but also beyond it. The Jain philosophy distinguishes ākāśa into two divisions as lokākāśa and
alokākāsa (Chatterjee and Datta, 1984: 97). Lokākāśa is the part occupied by world of things, where soul and other substances live. And alokākāśa is that part of empty space beyond the world, where nothing exists, which is absolutely void.

c) Kāla: It is an incorporeal eternal reality, uni-dimensional in nature, which pervades the whole universe of life and its successive movement in the form of single, independent, innumerable minute particles that never mix with one another to form a composite entity, but which help the happening of the changes and modifications in all substances. It is not extended spatially, but it is constituted of distinct units. Kāla goes on assisting the substances to undergo changes and transformation. But it does not mean that kāla brings changes of qualities in things, it helps the action of the transformation of new qualities in things. As Radhakrishnan points out, “Time or kāla is sometimes recognized as quasi-substance. It is an all pervading form of the universe on which are strung the successive movements of the world. It is not a summation of a series of discontinuous changes, but a process of persistence, an enduring from the past into the present” (Radhakrishnan, 1927: 316). The real substances, which constantly change imply a time-duration, in which changes take place. Kāla is the necessary condition of duration, which aids to make possible the continuity, modification, movement, activity, and transformation like newness and oldness of substances. A thing cannot endure or continue to exist, if there is no time. So it becomes a necessity for a thing to exist. Modification or change of states also cannot be conceived without time. For a necessary condition or practical purposes, kāla is divided into limited periods such as seconds, minutes, hours days, months, and so on. In this aspect, kāla is time that perceived as moments, and is called samaya. Kāla also allows its own modifications in terms moments, hours, days, months, and years.
d) Dharma: It is the special sense of conditions of movement or motion used in Jain philosophy. It is inferred as the condition which helps motion. Dharma has no qualities of touch, taste, smell, colour and sound, experienced by the sense organs. It is a necessary condition “. . . just as the movement of a fish in the river, though initiated by the fish itself, would not be possible without the medium of water, which is therefore, a necessary condition, similarly the movement of a soul or a material thing requires some auxiliary condition, without which its motion would not be possible. Such a condition, is the substance called dharma. Dharma can only favour or help the motion of moving objects; it cannot make a non-moving object move, just as water cannot make a fish move” (Chatterjee and Datta, 1984: 99). It is the indispensable and necessary condition of motion of objects in the universe, which are movable. Dharma itself does not move nor does it charge with power of mobility from outside. It is just only the medium of motion. Soul and matter are helped by this medium of motion. It is a passive cause of motion. It acts as a catalyst. “It pervades the whole world, and is continuous because of inseparability; has extension because of coextensiveness with space” (Radhakrishnan, 1927: 315). It is the principle of motion, the accompanying circumstance or cause which makes motion possible (Dasgupta, 1957: 197).

c) Adharma: Like dharma, it is eternal, formless, non-moving, which acts as a passive cause and inactive agents or medium for the other substances to stop, but it pervade the entire world-space. It can be regarded as the necessary counterpart of dharma, which serves as the principle or medium of rest. This is the auxiliary cause of rest to the soul and matter. Bodies in motion are enabled to enjoy the state of rest because of this principle and pervasive entity. No substance can remain at rest if there were no adharma. It aids to maintain the unity of the microscopic and macroscopic worlds. It does not itself initiate rest, but if soul and matter come to rest, it
inferred as the conditions which helps to facilitate the state of rest. It only does favour the state of rest as earth supporting things which rest on it.
2.4 (a) Anekantvada: Anekāntvada is one of the main contributions of Jainism to its philosophy. It is developed through a realistic approach to any fundamental philosophical problems. The doctrine of Anekāntvada is so central to Jain metaphysics, epistemology and logic. This doctrine teaches us how to realize truth in its varied aspects. The entire Jain system becomes to be known as the Anekānta Darśana. The Jaina thinker developed the metaphysical concept of anekāntvada as a way of thinking about existence as simultaneously both being and becoming (Koller, 2000: 400). This doctrine presents an original contribution to both ancient and modern thought, especially to the issue of how a pluralism of points of view can be held together in some kind of unity. In term of distinctive metaphysical position, Jainism ultimately rested upon the peculiarity of the concept of dravya (substance) and depends on a corresponding theory of truth, faces the problem of how to describe the various, theoretically infinite, changing qualities and modes of dravya in a definite and truth-functional way. The problem is how to describe consistently something that is permanent being and, at the same time the non-being of change, the very negation of permanent being.

Anekāntvada described the whole world as manifold, an ever-changing reality, an infinite of view points depending on the time, place, nature and state of the one who is the viewer and that which viewed. Literally, the term Anekāntvada means the doctrine of the many sided nature of reality. In its ontological nature, it holds that reality has manifold aspects or characteristics, even opposite ones, according to which every object possesses indefinite aspects. Reality is both permanent and changing, one and many, etc. The word Anekāntvada is made up of three terms, ‘Aneka’, ‘Anta’ and ‘Vada’. The term ‘Aneka’ means ‘many’ and ‘Anta’ means ‘having attributes and characteristics’. The term Vada stands for statement or description. Therefore, the word Anekāntvada is used in Jaina philosophy to mean the description of various attributes. The doctrine of Anekāntvada describes the Jaina view of “many sidedness” of existence; means that many sided view point is perfect and real. One’s view that
looks at the truth from only one view point is not perfect and real. This is what the doctrine of Anekāntvada highlighted.

Truth can't be grasped from any particular view point alone. Truth is the sum total of all different view points. Truth is to be understood in a very comprehensive way through observing the different views of reality in their proper perspective, and analyzing the primary and secondary standpoints, giving them due consideration. Anekāntvada emphasizes that the truth is many sided. Reality can be looked at from various angles. Anekāntvada consists in a many-sided approach to the study of the problems of knowledge of reality. It emphasizes a catholic outlook towards all that we see and experience. Intellectual tolerance is the foundation of this doctrine. It arose as an antidote to the one-sided error and absolute approach to the study of truth and reality. It arose out of the intellectual confusion of the conflicting views of the different people and religious men on the problem of the nature of reality. It presents a complete and synoptic picture of reality from multiple points of view. The doctrine of Anekāntvada affirms that the different facets of reality have to be observed from various points of view by the predications of affirmation, negation and indescribability in order to understand it in all its completeness and true comprehensive way.

Surendranath Dasgupta expressed Anekāntvada as the theory of relative pluralism against the extreme absolutism of Upanisads. He has made a significant observation, explaining the Jaina standpoint on this doctrine. He writes:

"The concept of being as the union of the permanent and change brings us naturally to the doctrine of Anekāntvada or what we may call relative pluralism as against the extreme absolutism of the Upanisads and the pluralism of the Buddhists. The Jains regards all things as anekānta (na-ekānta), or in other words they held that nothing could be affirmed absolutely, as all affirmations were true only under certain conditions and limitations. Thus speaking of a gold jug, we see that its existence as a substance (dravya) is of the nature of a collocation of atoms and not as any other substances such as space (ākāśa), i.e. a gold jug is a dravya only in one sense that it is
a collection of atoms and not a *dravya* in the sense of space or time (*kāla*). It is thus both *dravya* and not a *dravya* at one and the same time. Again it is atomic in the sense that it is a composite of earth-atoms and not atomic in the sense that it is not a composite of water-atoms. Again it is a composite of earth-atoms only in the sense that gold is a metallic modification of earth, and not any other modification of earth as clay or stone. Its being constituted of metal –atoms is again true in the sense that it is made up of gold-atoms and not of iron-atoms. It is made up again of gold-atoms in the sense of melted and unsullied gold and not as gold in the natural condition. It is again made up of such unsullied and melted gold as has been hammered and shaped by the goldsmith *Devadatta* and not by *Yajnadatta*. Its being made up of atoms conditioned as above is again only true in the sense that the collocation has been shaped as a jug and not as a pot and so on. Thus proceeding in similar manner the Jains says that all affirmations are true of a thing only in a certain limited sense. All things (*vastu*) thus possess an infinite number of qualities (*anantadhārmatmakam vastu*), each of which can only be affirmed in a particular sense. Such an ordinary thing as a jug will be found to be the object of an infinite number of qualities from infinite points of view, which are all true in certain restricted senses and not absolutely" (Dasgupta, 1957: 175-176).

S. Gopalan described *Anekāntvāda* as indicating the complex nature of reality. "The idea of complexity of Reality is discernible first in the Jaina acceptance of many Reals, even though they may be classified under the one or the other of the two categories, viz., the conscious Real (*jiva*) and the non-conscious Real (*ajīva*). This distinction is a fundamental one, argues a scholar and he elaborately and forcefully holds that once the principle of distinction is accepted, the theory of reality as manifold (*anekkānta*) cannot but be reached. Once the duality of mind and matter (or the material world) is conceded and the operative principle of distinction is allowed to run its full course, the theory of manifoldness of Reality and knowledge has to be reached as its logical terminus . . ." (Gopalan, 1991: 28, 32-33)

The Jaina philosophers seem to argue that the very fact that the two descriptions made from two different points of view but of the same object might well indicate
(especially since the two descriptions are reciprocally related to each other) that they all coexist and cohere in the same object. The idea of persistence, they seem to argue, does not entail the rejection of the idea of change (in modes and qualities)

2.4 (b) **Syadvada**: In Jainism, there is also another aspect of reality other than *Anekāntvada*, and that is its relativistic pluralism. Both *Anekāntvada* and *Syādvāda* are complementary two aspects of the same reality. According to Jainism, the comprehensive of reality can't be achieved by merely formulating certain simple, categorical propositions. As reality is of so complex in its structure; any simple proposition fails to express the nature of reality in its totality. All our judgments are relatively or partially true, and not absolutely. Therefore, Jaina thinkers developed *Syādvāda* as a unique virtue of being a liberal relativistic epistemology against the absolutist theory of knowledge. The doctrine of *Syādvāda* in Jainism is known as the theory of relativity of propositions or theory of relativity of judgements. It states that all actual and possible assertions in regard of a particular object are relative and, therefore conditionally true or false. No judgment can be absolutely true, or absolutely false. How a person gives his judgment about a thing or what he judged may be valid from his own standpoint. A standpoint is circumscribed by the point of time and the sense in which it occurs. Thus, when one makes an assertion about something, one’s assertion is as true as, or as false as, any other assertion. No judgment is final, no predication is wholesome, and no description is complete so (Sinari, 1969: 59).

The term ‘*Syādvāda*’ is made up of two terms ‘Syad’ and ‘Vada’. The word ‘*Syad*’ is derived from the Sanskrit root as ‘to be’, being its form in the potential mood. It means ‘may be’, so that *Syādvāda* may be rendered in English as ‘the doctrine of may be’. It signifies that the universe can be looked at from many points of view and that each view-point yields a different conclusion (*anekānta*) (Hiriyanna, 1973: 163). It also means as ‘perhaps’, or ‘probable’, ‘somehow’, ‘relatively’ or ‘in some respect’. S. Radhakrishnan pointed out that, “Every proposition gives us only a perhaps, a may be or a *syād*. We cannot affirm or deny anything absolutely of any object. There is nothing certain on account of the endless complexity of things. It
emphasizes the extremely complex nature of reality and its infiniteness. It does not
deny the possibility of predication, though it disallows absolute or categorical
predication. The dynamic character of reality can consist only with relative or
conditional predication. Every proposition is true, but only under certain conditions,
i.e., hypothetically” (Radhakrishnan, 1927: 302). Since the truth of every proposition
or affirmation is relative and conditional, each proposition or affirmation, in order
that it may not be misunderstood as absolute, should be qualified by the term ‘Syat’ or
‘Syad’. Syādvāda suggests that every statement must be prefaced by ‘Syar’ or
‘relatively’. The term ‘Syat’ denotes uncertainty, a sort of ‘may be ness’, and
attributes to the statement in which it is used limited truth or relative validity.
Syādvāda views that every judgment as relative and rules out categorical or absolute
predication as erroneous. Hence, every standpoint (naya) in order to become a valid
judgment (pramāna) must be qualified by “relatively speaking” (syāt) to ignore is to
expose oneself to unwarranted absolutism, which is directly contradicted by
experience. For example “... say when we describe the earth ... that relatively
speaking it is round, relatively speaking it is flat, relatively speaking it is elliptical,
and so on” (Sinari, 1969: 59).

So, every statement may be true from one single point of view and untrue from
another; each statement mirrors one aspect and misses all other aspects. By extending
the same argument to our knowledge of the universe, the Jains argue, we have to say
that, there being an infinite number of views and statements the universe offers itself
to, no finite number such views and statements could embrace a complete knowledge
of the universe. All knowledge is incomplete, piecemeal, and valid up to a point, in a
sense true and in a sense false, a series of Syāt or ‘may be’ assertions (Sinari, 1969:
59).

In this connection, Chandradhar Sharma has made a significant observation,
explaining the term Syādvāda as “... is sometimes translated as the theory of
probability or the doctrine of the may-be. But it is not in the literal sense of
probability that the word syāt is used here. Probability suggests skepticism and
Jainism is not skepticism. Sometimes the word ‘syāt’ is translated as ‘somehow’. But
this too smacks of agnosticism and Jainism, again, is not agnosticism. The word ‘syät’ is used here in the sense of the relative and the correct translation of Syādvāda is the theory of Relativity of knowledge. Reality has infinite aspects which are all relative and we can know only some of these aspects. All our judgments, therefore, are necessarily relative, condition and limited. ‘Syāt’ or ‘Relatively speaking’ or ‘Viewed from a particular view-point which is necessarily related to other viewpoints’ must precede all our judgments. Absolute affirmation and absolute negation both are wrong. All judgments are conditional. This is not a self-contradictory position because the very nature of reality is indeterminate and infinite complex and because affirmation and negation both are not made from the same standpoint. The difficulty of predication is solved by maintaining that the subject and the predicate are identical from the point of view of substance and different from the point of view of modes. All judgments are double-edged. Affirmation presupposes negation as much as negation presupposes affirmation. The infinitely complex reality (anantadharmakam vastu) admits of all opposite predicates from different standpoints. It is real as well as unreal (sadasadātmakam). It is universal as well as momentary (nityānityasvarupam). It is permanent as well as many (anekamekātmakam). Viewed from the point of view of substance, it is real, universal, permanent and one; viewed from the point of view of modes, it is unreal, particular, momentary and many” (Sharma, 1987: 52).

This is clear from the statements destined by the term ‘Syāt’, to signify that the doctrine of Syādvāda in Jainism served as an apologetic against absolutist claims that endangered the Jain perception of truth. What is significance here is that the doctrine of Syādvāda does not appear to make a dogmatic claim. In this context, Hiriyanna points out that “The doctrine indicates extreme caution and signifies an anxiety to avoid all dogma in defining the nature of reality” (Hiriyanna, 1973: 163). It is the Jaina system of asserting that all statements or propositions are from a particular view and that only a synthesis of many perspectives is adequate since reality is complete in its structure. It reveals the certainty regarding any problem and not merely the possibility or probability.
A different aspect of a particular thing is reflected in all the statements given in regard of the thing. An aspect of a thing is something, which an individual attain exclusively from his view of entering encounter regarding the thing. The statements with regard to a given thing represent a partial cognition, a partial knowledge of reality. All should have the metaphysical foundation of the multiple phase of reality. There is infinite number atoms and souls, each one of which is real and open to limitless perspectives. It is beyond the possibility of an individual to grasp all perspectives. The total acquisition of human intellect is bound to remain always inadequate. What man actually knows about reality is only a fragment of what is. Restricted to the nature of his perspective, leads to commit the fallacy of a particular view taking as the absolute. To avoid such misleading notion, Jainism holds that one has no access to the knowledge of a thing.

The Jaina doctrine of *Syādvāda* is the system of safeguards which aims at maintaining the proper consistency in metaphysical thought. It proceeds to unravel the theory of contradiction and points out that contradictory speech is resolvable ultimately in seven limbs or forms, as follows:

1) Affirmance (of a proposition)
2) Denial (of a proposition)
3) Indescribability (simultaneous affirmance and denial)
4) Affirmance + denial
5) Affirmance + indescribability
6) Denial + indescribability
7) Affirmance + denial + indescribability

These are all the possible forms of contradiction that can occur in thought. They may be contradictory in reference to one another or their own contents, as is the case with the compound forms, especially the seventh. It will be noticed that the first three of these forms are simple judgments or predications, and the remaining four, their compounds, or combinations, formed by combining the simple statements in different ways.
The nature of reality is determined in Jainism by referring to the matter, place, time and state. However, “Everything exists from the point of its own substance, space, time and form and it does not exist from the point of view of other’s substance, space, time and form” (Sharma, 1987: 53). The Jaina visualizes the nature of reality by seven-fold predication. This seven-fold predication of syāt is known as Sapta-bhangi or a theory of seven-fold predication. It is a system of predications, seven in all, that can be employed to describe an entity with respect to some predicate. According to the Jainas, each predication expresses only one aspect of the truth about the entity being discussed. The seven predications taken together, however, provide an exclusive and exhaustive list of the correct ways of speaking about the entity. It expresses the conviction that every predication inevitably involves four factors— a specific being, a specific location of that being, a specific time of that being, and a specific state of that being. Thus, all the predications are conditioned by these points of reference and what may be affirmed from one perspective can not be the whole truth since its contrary may be affirmed from a different perspective. Since each predication is relative, they qualify each by the term syāt. According to this system, there are seven possible forms of a statement about a thing or its attributes. They are stated as below:

1. May be, a thing is — Syāt asti
2. May be, a thing is not — Syāt nāsti
3. May be, a thing both is or is not — Syāt asti nāsti
4. May be, a thing is indescribable — Syāt avaktavyah
5. May be, a thing is and is indescribable — Syāt asti cha avaktavyah
6. May be, a thing is not and is indescribable — Syāt nāsti cha avaktavyah
7. May be, a thing is, is not and is indescribable — Syāt asti cha nāsti cha avaktavyah

Of these seven possible forms of a statement about an entity, which shows seven possible ways of describing an entity or its attributes, the first two are the most important and radical modes of predication. The first two modes represent the statement of simple affirmation or being characters about an entity with regard to its
own form, own matter, own place and own time, and the statement of simple negation or non-being character about an entity with regard to other form, other matter, other place, and other time. All things are existent as well as non-existent, because a thing is a positive entity in relation to itself, but a negative entity in relation to another. The third is a combination of both being and non-being. When we combine both these statement of affirmation and negation - affirm the two different standpoints successively – we get the third statement, that a thing in one sense is and in another sense is not (i.e., in two difference senses, a thing is both real and unreal). But if we affirm or deny both existence and non-existence of a thing simultaneously – assert or negate the aspects of being and non-being together – we make a statement about its indescribable (i.e., either both real and unreal at the same time or neither real nor unreal): this is the fourth statement or judgment. The first three formal points of view combine, together or separately, with the fourth possibility (that of indescribability or unspeakability) to give us the remaining three standpoints. It is very clear to be generated that the theory of Sapta-bhangi is consist of simple and complex judgment. The first two and the fourth predications are consequently the assertions of simple judgments; and the remaining four are of complex type judgments.

This system of Sapta-bhangi is formulated on the basis of three fundamental postulates- affirmation, denial, and indescribable, and their permutations and combinations. Each of these seven modes of predication contains one alternative truth while altogether contains the complete truth. What is suggested by these seven predications is that nothing can be asserted as absolutely existence or absolutely non-existence, absolutely describable or absolutely indescribable. Thus, every judgment is conditional and superficial. The Jainas believes that these seven modes of predications together each dealing with a particular aspect yield an adequate description of reality. These modes are interrelated, presuppose and imply each other.

2.5 ETHICS OF JAINISM

To govern the conduct of man in the society, ethics is emphatically considered to be a very important code of rules by all the great religions of the world. Ethics is the
foundation of all religions indicating the relationship between man and the universe, and his goal in life. “Buddhism and Jainism have got their independent ethics according to which ignorance about the nature of causation as well as about conscious soul is the root of error and bondage of life” (Joshi, 2000: 12). The study of the Judgments of value or what ought to be in one conduct and action forms the main characteristic of ethics. It is essentially an enquiry into the notions of good and bad, right and wrong. It is concerned with the regulative principles of conduct which is related to motive of one’s action and its value. From religious point of view, it is an effort of the individual for achieving progress and perfection. It shows the path of self-knowledge and self-discipline.

Jaina ethics is not merely only a way of thought but also away of life. It forms the general basis among the basic principles of Jaina philosophy. The central problem in Jaina ethics is liberation from misery. It finds greater emphasis among the religions of India because of their peculiar doctrine of Karma. Jainism believes that moral effort is sufficient for human progress. It doesn’t consider personal God as necessary to fulfil all the desired demand of morality. The necessary is the isolation of the soul from the bondage of Karma. Therefore, in Jainism ethics assumes an over-riding importance over all other aspects of the religious life.

Ethical discipline is considered as the most glorious part and occupied an essential aspect in Jainism. In Jaina ethics, there is no conflict between man’s duty to himself and society. It gives more important stress to make an individual a worthy social being, who can live as a responsible person with well-behaved within its environment and outside. To institute the highest good society is the highest good accomplishment of the individual. Man’s good conduct to the society is the normal field of ethics. According to Jainism, the soul has to be evolved to the duty of helping others. This is the relation of man and his goal in life. This ethical doctrine is well graded in Jainism to suit the ability and environment of an individual.

Elaborating the Jaina ethics in great detail and depth on the basis of metaphysical background, it can be viewed that there is the self (jīva) and the nonself (ajīva); that
there is flow of karmic matter (āśrava) from the nonself into the self, thus causing bondage (bandha). This flow must be checked (samvara) and the already collected karmic matter must be shed to attain liberation (moksa). Thus, the formulation of Jaina ethical theory is stranded in Jaina metaphysics. The Jaina metaphysical outlook is known as Anekāntavada or non-absolutism. However, ... Jaina convicts that absolutism in philosophy is subversive of ethical speculation. Samantabhadra’s observation in this regard is very significant. In his view, the concept of bondage and liberation, Punya (virtue) and Pāpa (vice) lose their entire relevancy, if we exclusively recognize either permanence or momentariness as constituting the nature of substance. A little reflection will make it clear that the concept of Ahimsā belonging to the realm of ethics is a logical consequence of the ontological nature of things” (Sogani, 1967: 32-3). Both Punya (virtue) and Pāpa (vice) bind the soul by affecting the inflow of karmic matter. Stopping the karmic flow and shedding of such karmic matter as many already be accumulated by the soul is necessary. Thus, the Jaina ethics is one of the “transcendental moralities” beyond good and evil. Punya (virtue) is an action that brings peace to the mind, such as giving food to the deserving, water to thirsty, clothes to the poor etc. And pāpa (vice) is inflicting injury or suffering or violence. Untruthfulness, dishonesty, unchastity are also papa (vice) or sins.

According to Jainism, the ethical enquiry derives its meaning from the metaphysical speculation. Our conduct and behaviour are conditioned by our metaphysical pre-supposition. Going to prove the metaphysical dependence of ethics, Samantabhadra argues that the conceptions of bondage and liberation, Punya and Pāpa, heaven and hell, pleasure and pain and the like lose all their relevancy and significance, if we exclusively recognize either permanence or momentariness as constituting the nature of substance. This statement clearly points to the dependence of ethics on metaphysics (Sogani, 1967: 13). However, it is to be noticed that Jaina ethics is not only depending on the background of metaphysics but on epistemology also. According to Jainism, the universe is uncreated and real by virtue of its being existential and is, therefore, eternal everlasting, with a beginning and without an end.
It is neither created nor sustained by a supernatural being. Instead it has existed eternally, and operates in term of natural law. The epistemological dependence of ethics defines that "The cosmos constituents are themselves capable of explaining the diverse phenomena by their functioning and interaction" (Jain, 1977: 33). Jainism gives its strong consideration that everything is to be 'real' terming that everything exists independently and brings the whole universe under two categories of *jiva* and *ajīva*, i.e., the conscious and the unconscious respectively. In its unliberated form of state, the *jiva* is constituent of body and soul. This *jiva* is that part of reality characterized by consciousness, animation or life. When liberated the *jiva* becomes pure spiritual being free from all kind of karmic substances or forces. The inborn and original nature of every *jiva* is perfect knowledge and peace, perfect potential and power. In its perfect condition, *jiva* becomes perfect knowledge and all knowledge is in it. It is the condition to which the bound *jiva* seeks to return. Owing to the association of the karmic forces the purest glory of the *jiva* becomes tainted. The karmic forces are made up of subtle particles of matter, which permeate the soul, and are obstacle in the way to the perfection of the soul. If an individual attain *Jhāna*, the *jiva* shines in its purest form and glory. The purpose of practicing the Jain ethical discipline is to remove the matrix association of karmic forces and made the *jiva* pure, perfect and blissful. It is like giving a bath to the *jiva* and restoring it to its original form of purity.

Explaining the concern of ethics in Jainism, S. Radhakrishnanan writes, "Jainism is opposed to all theories, which do not emphasis ethical responsibility. The ethical interest in human freedom is the determining consideration. The theories of the creation of the world by God, or its development out of *prākīt* or its unreality, are criticized on the ground that they cannot account for either the origin or the cessation of suffering. Moral distinctions lose their values on the hypothesis of the passivity of the soul. To say the soul is in safe in its eternity and the events of the world are the results of the mechanical combination and separation of the elements of existence would take away the initiative from the soul and make moral responsibility meaningless. The fatalist theory that all things are fixed by nature obviously leaves no
room for individual efforts" (Radhakrishna, 1927: 312). From the Jain metaphysical point of view, reality is characterized by origin, decay and permanence. It has been considered as permanent and changing. Reality is characterized by change such as birth, growth and decay, on the phenomenal or accidental level; but permanence characterizes it in its essence. The body, for instance, is made up of matter, comes into being, exists for a while and then goes out of existence; but the soul is eternal and unchanging. It becomes encrusted with karmic matter when in its bound state. According to Jainism, reality maintains its identity and permanency through the continuous process of changes consisting of origin and decay, identity in the midst of variety, and permanency through change. Neither the permanency nor the process of change can be separated from each other. Each is indispensable to the other and hence cannot be separated in reality, though one may be differentiated from the other in thought and speech.

Jainism asserts that reality is dynamic, vitalistic, filled with life. It is illuminated with consciousness. This view is shown its implication on the doctrine of *Ahimsā*, which do not seek to exploit or harm reality; instead, try to harmonize with it. Jainism believes the realistic and pluralistic view of reality. Its pluralism is reflected in the view that reality is manifold and complex, made up of innumerable souls and objects consisting of unlimited combinations of atoms. And its realism is reflected in the Jaina’s assertion of universal ethical principles such as *Ahimsā* and the metaphysical principles of cause and effect- “All living beings owe their present form of existence to their own karman,” and “All men must suffer in due time the fruits of their work.” (Rao, 1975: 99).

2.6 THEORY OF SOUL

The concept of soul has an enormous influence upon all the religious systems. It has become a curious important philosophical analysis in the history of human thought. In this section I attempt to discuss how the concept of soul holds a central core in Jainism too and how it is the most fundamental of its metaphysical aspects. However, according to Jainism, soul is an undeniable reality. It is pure consciousness,
that is to say, in other words, an embodiment of infinite knowledge, and a totally
different kind of substance from matter. It is the faculty of knowledge, the partless
substance, whose function is conscious perception. The soul is identified as the agent
of cognition, because the mind and the sensory organs cannot function in the absence
of soul. Cognitive faculty is active consciousness – knowledge and perception. It
initiates activity.

Jainism believes in plurality of soul. It means that every living being has its own
individual soul. Not only human beings and animals, even trees, plants, bacteria and
microscopic organism have souls. According to Jainism, the differentiating
characteristic of a living being is its being a substratum of the faculty of cognition,
which is only a manifestation of consciousness. All living beings, whether big or
small, has a soul. “The soul is not an exclusive possession of human beings,
according to Jainism. It allows the soul principle to extend to all the living things of
the universe” (Joshi, 1965: 229). “All souls are equal. Every soul from the lowest to
the highest possesses consciousness. The degrees of consciousness may vary
according to the obstacles of karma. The lowest souls which inhabit material atoms
appear to be lifeless and unconscious, but in fact life and consciousness are present in
them though in a dormant form. Purest consciousness is found in the emancipated
souls, where there is no shred of karma. All souls are really alike. The degrees of
consciousness are due merely to the karmic obstacles” (Sharma, 1987: 63).

Jainism believes that the soul is absolute and permanent. It is the soul which
suffers or enjoys the fruits of its deeds. It performs different kinds of action, it reaps
the fruit of those actions, it circles round returning again. In consequence of the
karma it has acquired, the soul goes through the succession of rebirth. The soul has
the capability to obtain freedom elevating upwards to liberation through the
destruction of its karma. “It is these souls in plasma that lie scattered in every nook
and corner of the universe and each is the doer of good or bad deeds to reap the
consequences of which each takes the repetition of births and deaths according to the
merits of its own karma, and thus traverse through the various grades of Samsāra”
(Nahar and Ghosh, 1917: 279).
The Jains consider soul as endowed with cognition, conation, and feeling. Uncreated, and hence indestructible, the souls manifest in physical bodies in this concrete world, and thus imprisoned they have to depend on the sense organs to acquire knowledge from the objective world. In this way the soul becomes the enjoyer of the fruits of its good and evil actions, and remains entangled in the cycling of samsāra, creating a karmic body which does not leave it until the final liberation of the soul from the bondage of births and deaths. At the end of life the body dies, but not the soul. The soul transmigrates to another life. It moves from life to life and expands or contracts according to the size of the body of the living being. The soul thus keeps on transmigrating from life to life, unless and until it liberates itself from the cycle of birth and death. When it attains liberation it has never to enter again into the cycle of birth and death.

The most important characteristic of soul is the possession of consciousness. Thus, consciousness is the essential quality of soul. The soul consists in consciousness and consciousness is cognition of all things having forms or no forms. Consciousness is the attribute, which distinguishes the living form from the non-living and the Jaina has no difficulty in admitting, in principle that “... even the state of deep sleep is not without consciousness, for, if it is not admitted, the pleasant experience of a comfortable and sound sleep recalled in the subsequent waking state would be impossible” (Mehta, 1955: 31). The possession of consciousness enables the soul to acquire both the indeterminate and the determinate kinds of knowledge. In its original state, the soul knows everything; it commands the knowledge of existence in all its various aspects, and at all times, past, present and future. The soul is the doer of acts and none else, but the same soul is to reap the fruits of its deeds. So, it is said that soul is the doer and enjoyer of its deeds. Doing and enjoying presuppose knowing, it is in this sense that consciousness is the essential quality of the soul. However, “Its peculiar attributes are perception and knowledge. It is, of course, different from karma or matter; therefore it must be immaterial. It has identified itself with matter; therefore it assumes a body, which it must fit. It is responsible for its karmas, because it has the power to get rid of them all. It must reap the harvest of all
seeds that it has sown; and therefore must remain in the field of *samsāra*, or cycle of existence. And still all these evils are self-assumed; and in its pure condition the soul is *siddhu*" (Jaini, 1916: 18).

Consciousness presupposes the various aspects of the soul and also the corresponding functions. "Soul does not refer to the human soul alone. It refers to the principle of consciousness in general. Consciousness is discernible in four different states of existence (*gati*) according to Jainism. The different levels of consciousness representing the various states of existence are that of the animals, the humans, the infernal beings and the celestial beings. The *svastikā* sign which we constantly see in the Jaina books and in the Jaina temples signifies the four different states of existence of the soul.

Leaving the *Nāraki* stage out of account for the moment it may be pointed out that the other stages represent the progressive steps through which the *jīva* passes before attaining perfection. These various stages of the *jīva*'s evolution are referred to as the ‘modes’ or *paryāyaḥs*. In every one of these stages the *jīva* undergoes real changes, though its identity itself is not lost. The changes are seen in the facts of birth, growth and death" (Gopalan, 1973: 134).
Every soul in its essence and inherent nature possesses four infinities. These infinities are infinite knowledge, infinite intuition, infinite bliss and infinite power. Under some conditions, these characteristic are obscured by karma. Jainism, with its explicit beliefs that soul is potentially pure in its inherent form. The following are the qualities of soul in its pure state (Glasenapp, 1942: 2-3).

1) The faculty of omniscience (Kevala-jñāna)
2) The faculty of absolute undifferentiated cognition (kevala-darśana)
3) The superiority over joy and grief (āvyābābha)
4) The possession of complete religious truth (samyakta) and irreplaceable moral conduct (cārita)
5) The possession of eternal life (aksayasthiti)
6) Complete formlessness (amūrtatva)
7) Complete equality in rank with other jivas
8) Unrestricted energy (virya)

In the impure state, the soul is associated with karmic matter and it becomes chained in the wheel of birth and death. The purity of consciousness is shrouded due to association of karmic forces. In the impure state of soul, the following properties are associated (Jaini, 1916: 17-19).

1) It lived in the past, is living now, and shall live forever.
2) It has perception and knowledge.
3) It is immaterial, i.e., has no touch, taste, smell, or colour.
4) It is the only responsible agent of all its actions.
5) It completely fills the body, which it occupies, e.g., that of an ant or an elephant
6) It enjoys the fruits of all its karmas.
7) It wanders in samsāra.
8) It can become in its perfect condition siddha.
9) It goes upward.
According to Jainism, there is infinite number of souls in the universe. The Jainas believe that each body possesses a different soul. It is held that one body can be occupied by more than one soul, but one soul cannot occupy more than one body. The soul is graded into five levels according to which form it takes in its earthly existence. They are:

- **Lowest level**: Those souls possess only one sense – ‘the sense of touch’, are grouped in this level. These include the elements themselves, earth, water, air, and fire and vegetable kingdom.

- **Second level**: Those souls of possessing two senses – ‘the sense of touch and taste’ are grouped in this level of soul. These include worms and shell creatures.

- **Third level**: Those souls which are having three senses – ‘the sense of touch, taste and smell’ are put under this level of soul. These include ants, bugs and moths.

- **Fourth level**: Those souls which are having four senses – the sense of touch, taste, smell and sight are put under this level. These include wasps, locusts and butterflies.

- **Fifth level (Highest level)**: At the lowest highest level are the souls having all five senses – the sense of touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing. These include four types of creatures – infernal beings, higher animals, human beings and heavenly beings.

The journey of soul from one level of consciousness to another, and from one grade to another, up or down the scale, depends on the inexorable law of Karma.

In Jainism, the soul is classified into two broad different types – i) worldly souls, and ii) liberated souls. They are shown in the following diagram.
**Worldly Soul:** Worldly souls are the embodied souls of living beings in the world, associated with karmic matter and so it interacts with other entities of the universe. They undergo or subjects to the cycle births and deaths, and experience the fruit of Karmas. The worldly soul possesses consciousness but only to a limited extent. It also possesses the capacity for apprehension and comprehension. It has the capacity to take different states of existence through life, and to act. It has freedom of the will. It has no corporeal form, yet associated with a karmic body. It is always associated with a karmic body. It has life with all the life principles (Gopalan, 1973: 135). The
worldly souls are further divided into two classes — moving \((\text{trasa})\) and non-moving \((\text{sthāvar})\). This division of worldly souls is based on the number of sense organs present in the living beings. Not to injure any living being is highest moral duty of an individual. This is the main principle of Jainism to be observed. So, it becomes incumbent to know the various forms, which life may assume. Of these two classes, moving \((\text{trasa})\) is considered to be many-sensed souls. It is again divided into four classes, according to the possession of two or more of the five senses of touch, taste, smell, sight, and hearing.

They are given as below:

1) \textit{Dvi-indriya Jivas}, i.e., those which have the first two senses of touch and taste

2) \textit{Tri-indriya Jivas}, i.e., those which have the first three senses of touch, taste and smell

3) \textit{Chatur-indriya Jivas}, i.e., those which have first four senses of touch, taste, smell & sight

4) \textit{Pancha-indriya Jivas}, i.e., those which have five senses of touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing

The other type, non-moving \((\text{sthāvar})\) are considered to have only one-sensed souls. It possesses the tactual sensation alone (the sense of touch). It is also divided into five kinds. (Mehta, 1954: 31-2). They are given below:

1) \textit{Prthvikāya}: It is the non-moving souls having only one sense but those living in bodies of earth.

2) \textit{Apkāya}: It is the non-moving souls, which have only one sense but those living in the bodies of water.

3) \textit{Tejaskāya}: It is the non-moving souls, which have only one sense but those living in the bodies of fire.

4) \textit{Vāyukāya}: It is the non-moving souls, which have only one sense but those living in the bodies of air.

5) \textit{Vanaspatikāya}: It is the non-moving souls, which have only one sense but those living in the bodies of vegetable.
Liberated Souls: Liberated souls enjoy the attributes of pure souls. They do not interact with any other entities of the universe. Liberated souls are absolutely pure and free from any material alloy. The liberated souls possess perfect and unlimited consciousness. Apprehension and comprehension are developed to the fullest extent and they are considered to become identical with each other. They enjoy perfect sovereignty and transcendent bliss. They have a complete mastery over karma. Spiritual nature is fully realized. They are completely devoid of corporeal form. They are the souls having destroyed the karmic body. The liberated soul is completely free from karma.

The concept soul in Jainism is understood in terms of consciousness. The soul association with the body brings consciousness to it and the dissociation of the soul brings about the absence of consciousness in the body. This shows that consciousness is the essential characteristic of the soul. The Jaina idea of consciousness can itself be comprehended by considering the concept of soul. According to Jainism, there is continuity of consciousness from the lowest animate beings to the highest stage of perfection in which the purity consciousness is regained, the stage which is clearly far above the ordinary human level. The Jaina theory of consciousness, in keeping with its logic of continuity of consciousness insists on reverence of life. The result is that a strong foundation is laid for a stern and a necessary ethics of ahimsā, which is the basis of Jaina philosophy Gopalan, 1973: 139).

2.7 THEORY OF KARMA

The theory of karma is a distinguishing feature of Indian philosophy. It is the application of the law of cause and effect in the moral sphere. “All phenomenon of the universe are linked together in the universal chain of cause and effect. No event can occur without having a definite cause behind it” (Mehta, 1954: 133). The process of cause and effect in the physical world leads to the emergence of the theory of karma in Jainism. Every individual is the sole responsible for bearing the fruit of his/her own actions. They will receive the price for whatever they have done. It is the fact of nature and universal acceptance that what you sow is what you reap. One can
achieve happiness according to his or her good deed, and on contrarily sorrow or pain will knock at his door as a result of the evil actions done. It is believed that “Actions performed in this life are causes of a future life, and the present life is the result of action performed in a previous life. Thus, the chain of life is connected in the series of actions and their realized effects” (Kalghatgi, 965: 229). Most of the systems of Indian philosophy give stern important in theory of karma in order to explain the problems of suffering and happiness in one’s life. In brief, “The supreme important of the doctrine of karma lies in providing a rational and satisfying explanation to the apparently inexplicable phenomena of birth and death, of happiness and misery, of inequalities in mental and physical attainments and of the existence of different species of living beings” (Sangave, 1990-www.jainaworld.com).

The word ‘karma’ literally means action or deed. Any action either good or bad, that is, whatever is done is called karma. The word action or deed does not mean only physical. It includes the functions of body, speech and mind. The law of karma states that “. . . good deeds bear good fruits and evil deeds bear evil results. The law of karma conditions the course of transmigration and influence of the state of life in each existence. Theoretically, there is no escape from the results of karma” (Muni, 1984: 94). In its extended sense it refers to moral action, action which is intentional and purposive (Kelkar, 2002a: 155). Most of the systems of Indian thought accept the doctrine of karma and understand karma to denote action or deed. But they used to analysis the term karma in different ways, views and standpoints depending on the basis of their philosophy.

In terms of a philosophical view, the term karm means not only action or deed but also its actual potential possessions. From this point of view, “The Jaina philosophers give a strict materialistic interpretation to the term karma. Karma, according to the Jaina philosophers, signifies an aggregate of extremely fine matter, which is imperceptible to the senses” (Gopalan, 1973: 166). Thus, it is asserted in Jaina Philosophy that karma does not here mean ‘deed, work’, nor invisible, mystic force (adrsta), but a complexus of very fine matter, imperceptible to the senses, which enters into the soul and causes great changes in it” (Glasenapp, 1942: 3).
The soul attracts the extremely fine matter, which is subtle from the surrounding and is converted into karma. Jainism believes the material nature of karma. The effect of karma is material in nature. It is matter in a subtle form and a substantive force, which produces certain conditions in the soul and binds the soul with the consequences of actions. Souls are tainted by karma, which is a foreign element. “The inherent capacity of the soul for self realization is obstructed by the veil of karma. It is subjected to the forces of karma, which express themselves, first, through the feelings and emotions and, secondly, in the chain of very subtle kinds of matter invisible to the eye and all ordinary instruments of knowledge” (Kalghatgi, 1965: 230). The soul and the karmic matters become associated together. The union of soul and karmic particles subjected to the suffering from the shackles of birth and death from the beginningless times. This Jaina concept of the beginningless association of the soul and karmic particles means that the soul can be purified and freed after removing the karmic particles. The soul is not pure and free before association. Pure soul cannot be affected by the karmic particles. State of worldly existence is determined by the nature of karmic matter associated with the soul and the further nature of karmic matter is determined by the nature of passions, which again is determined by the nature of the karmic matter. This mutual determination has no beginning in time and this explains the apparent difficulty of the first beginning of the process (Nathmal, 1951: 226).

Once when the karmic matter entered into the soul it causes a range of effect of various kinds on it. The karmic matters held together with the soul are root cause of pleasure, pain, and sorrow; and subject to the wheel of births and deaths. It is impossible for the karma to produce any kind of effect if it is not coupled with the soul. It indicates that karma is only an instrument cause while the principle of all our actions is the self. (Muni, 1984: 64). Jainism states that “Mundane souls are not perfect because their knowledge, energy etc. are found to be restricted. They are not perfectly free to enjoy complete knowledge and unrestricted bliss” (Mehta, 1954: 134). Therefore, the Jainism maintains that karma is the cause of bondage. Jainism has adopted the idea of polluting the pure nature of soul due to karma. “The entire
cosmos is full of that kind of fine matter, which can become karma. Through the actions of body, mind and speech, the fine matter gets into the soul and is tied to it according to the modifications of consciousness consisting of Kasāyas, i.e., anger, pride, deceit, and greed. Therefore, first of all there is an influx of karmic particles and then there occur certain activities of mind, which are for the actual bondage" (Mehta, 1954: 135). The ultimate aim of Jaina philosophy is to attain liberation, free from the obstacle of karma. The Jainas believes that the only way to get rid of the soul from the bondage of karma is self effort. Liberation of soul from the karmic obstacle is the attainment of its pure form. According to Jaina Philosopher “... the best way to get rid of bondage is not to act in a particular way but it is to restrict one’s activity in such a manner that there is no more chance of inviting the flow of karmic matter. It is to minimize the actions to such an extent that no himsā is possible” (Kelkar, 2002a: 160).

The particles of karma affect the soul in its physical nature and cause certain activities of mind for the actual bondage of karma. The Jaina tradition makes distinction of karma into two aspects:

- The physical Aspect – dravya karma
- The Psychic Aspect – bhāva karma

The first aspect signifies the pollution of soul with the particles of karma, i.e., the influx of karmic matter into the soul. It comprises those particle attached themselves to the soul. The second aspect signifies the mental states and various conscious activities of mind, body and speech. In one hand, the psychic aspect is defined as “... the mental states and events arising out of the activity of mind, body, and speech – they are like the mental traces of the actions, since we experience the mnemic traces long after the experienced conscious states vanish” (Kalghatgi, 1965: 231). In other hand the psychic aspect is defined as the “... immediate proximity to the soul in comparison with the physical aspect of karma. The physical aspect is obscurer while the psychic aspect is of imperfection” (Shah, 2004b:65). The both aspects of karma are “Mutually related as cause and effect. The distinction between the physical aspect
and psychic aspect of karma is psychologically significant, since it presents the interaction of the bodily and the mental due to the incessant activity of the soul” (Kalghatgi, 1965: 231).

It is important to note that the karmic particles influence the soul’s purity of consciousness extremely in limitation. The assimilation of soul with karma has obstructed the liberation of soul. In every course of time, new matter accumulated the soul. Certain means is required to be employed in order to liberate the soul. It is possible for the total release of the soul from the negative influence of karma by self controlling, penance and practicing *Ahimsā*. All obstacles, which impede the manifestation of its true nature, are then automatically overcome, because it is released from the domination of karma (Mehta, 1954: 135). As Mohan Lal Mehta writes, the bondage of soul to karma is of four kinds (Mehta, 1954: 135-136):

1) According to its nature (*prakriti*)
2) According to its duration (*sthiti*)
3) According to its intensity (*rasa* or *anubhāga*)
4) According to its quantity (*pradesas*)

**Nature:** It has eight different types of karma (Mehta, 1954: 136). They are given below:

1) Knowledge-obscuring karma (*jñānāvaraṇa*): The karma, which obscures the knowing faculty of soul and right knowledge, is known as knowledge-obscuring karma.
2) Intuition-obscuring karma (*darsanāvaraṇa*): It is the type of karma that obscures the faculty of right intuition such as indeterminate perception, indistinct knowledge and undifferentiated cognition etc.
3) Feeling-producing karma (*vedanīya*): The karma, which produces affective states such as emotion, feeling of pleasure and pain is known as Feeling-producing karma.
4) Belief and conduct-obstructing karma (*mohaniya*): This kind of karma is the karm, which deludes true faith and right conduct.

5) Age-determining karma (*āyus*): This is the karma, which determines the duration of life of the individual.

6) Personality-determining karma (*nāman*): It causes the individual diversity of souls. It produces various circumstances collectively making up an individual existence, such as the body and other special qualities of individuality.

7) Status-determining karma (*gotra*): This type of karma destines the hereditary rank occupied by an individual through birth. It determines family surrounding and social status of the individual.

8) Power-hindering karma (*antarāya*): It hinders the power and ability of the soul. It is that kind of karma, which obstructs the inborn energy of the soul and prevents the doing of good actions.

These eight types of karma mentioned in the above are *darvya karma* and further divided into a number of subclasses. “Of the eight types of karma the four-*jñānāvaraṇa, darśanāvaraṇa, mohaniya, antarāya* are called *ghātis* because they have an effect on spiritual faculties and capacities. The rest four types are known as *aghātis* because of their do not damage or obstruct spiritual qualities. They have effect in body and physical condition only not on the essential nature of the soul” (Shah, 1997: 94).

The law, which regulates the action of karmas, is based upon the principle of cause and effect (Jain, 1915: 876). In other words, “The law of karma is based upon the moral principle of causality. It is based on the series of acts and effects in which each act is followed by its effect. As there is the law of nature that govern the processes taking place in the physical world, there is also internal law, which govern the lives of all living being in this world. Jainism explores this law that governs the lives of living being and gives an explicit description of the mechanism which is inherently operates in every living being. When the karmic forces are completely destroyed becomes emancipated, attaining its liberation with all its potential...
possessions. Jainism asserts that the emancipation of soul from the karmic obstacles entirely depend on one's effort not on the favour of some natural supreme beings. The total annihilation of karma is the only means to reach the state of bliss, which is term as freedom from suffering, is possible only through the total renunciation of karma.

For the attainment of the state of liberation of soul, which is the ultimate aim of human life, the tradition of Jainism has strongly suggested to avoid all types of action that involve the violations of the essence of truth and non-violence, physically, mentally and verbally. As the karma is matter by its nature, the physical, mental or verbal action attracts the flow of karma and enveloped the soul by it. Violent actions invite the flow of karma. In order to renounce the karma and prevent the flow of karma, non-violent action should be employed avoiding the violent actions.