

Anekāntavāda (Theory of Multiplicity)

Introduction

Modern day logic is defined as study of principles and method of argumentation. An argument in the system of logic is a set of statements.

Jain logic is ancient. Its roots can be traced to Holy Scriptures in which it states, "Non absolutism is the principal dogma of Jainism". Further more "every statement is to be accepted as relative truth".

Let us take an example. My name is Kirit. My father's name is Prabhudas, and my son's name is Amit. Now I am father and son at the same time. How can this be? From Prabhudas's perspective, I am a son and from Amit's perspective, I am a father. Thus, both statements are true from their own perspectives.

Soul is eternal as well as changing. How can these two conflicting statements be true? According to Jain logic, they are true statements in their own perspective. Soul is eternal from substantial point of view (Dravya). Soul is ever changing from modal point of view (Paryāya).

As five blind men touched an elephant, and came out with their own opinion that the elephant is like a pillar, python, drum, long rope, and huge fan, depending on the parts of the body that they touched. They could be right from their own perspective, but elephant is an elephant, and the person who sees knows an elephant as total. He also knows that elephant could be like a pillar, python, drum, long rope and a huge fan, from the perspective of the legs, trunk, abdomen, tail, and ears. Therefore, if you do not have complete knowledge, then the partial point of view is not right.

Thus, understanding of Jain logic helps a lot for tolerance. Nothing is wrong and nothing is right. All the statements are true in their own perspective. Because of our inability to know substance as a whole, we cannot have complete knowledge of a substance. Only omniscient lord has perfect knowledge, so He has complete knowledge.

The spoken and written language has limitations of expressions. So one has to understand the broader meaning of Jain logic and then try to understand the reality in that perspective. We should know all the angles of the substance and then present the partial point of view, and then we are right.

Presenting the partial point of view, and then considering it as a complete knowledge is wrong according to Jain logic. We also keep in mind, that when a sentence is spoken, then we should know from what angle it is spoken. If we understand it correctly, then our knowledge base increases. Literature is also written either in substantial point of view (Dravyārthik Naya), or modal point of view (Paryāyārthika Naya).

Thus to have complete knowledge, or organ of knowledge (Pramāna Jñān), we should also know partial point of views (Naya). The partial point of view becomes a pillar on which the building of organ of knowledge rests. of course, the true and complete knowledge of a substance is only possible with omniscience.

To know a substance, there are 4 different categories, which are described in scriptures.

Lakshana (Characteristics of a substance)

One should know the characteristics of a substance. The characteristics (Lakshana) should be such that it is present only in the substance and not in any other substance. For example, if we say that the soul is formless, and then this is not his absolute characteristic because there are other substances like medium of motion, medium of rest, space, and time, which are also formless substances. Nevertheless, if we say that, the soul's characteristic is to know, and then it becomes a true characteristic. Every soul starting with the lowest form of soul (Nigod) to the highest form of the soul (Siddha) has characteristics of knowledge. Touch, taste, smell and color are all characteristics of matter because none of the other five substances have these characteristics. Thus, a peculiar characteristic present in only one substance, and not in any other substance is known, as it's true characteristic.

Pramāna Jñān (Organ of knowledge-true knowledge)

To know a substance from all angles is called the organ of knowledge, or true knowledge. The knowledge that allows one to make decisions about the self or others (swa and para) is called the organ of knowledge or true knowledge. This knowledge is free from doubt, mistake, and uncertainty. The organ of knowledge consists of several different and apparently opposite points of views. Thus with the organ of knowledge, one gets equanimity, and becomes tolerant of different points of views. The

perception, which grasps the nature of a thing in a proper and conraindicated form, is called organ of knowledge.

Naya (Partial point of view)

The knowledge of a substance from one point of view is called partial point of view. The thought activity, which grasps only the aspect of an object with the aid of scriptures, is called partial point of view. He who possess' such knowledge is wise.

Total knowledge or organ of knowledge (Pramāna Jnān) is the sum total of all partial point of views. Thus to understand a substance in it's fullest form, one should have to have knowledge of seemingly opposite partial points of view.

Thus, as a religious person desires to attain bliss, without practicing religion, or a thirsty person desires to quench his thirst without water, similarly, the soul desires to determine the nature of substance without taking refuge in the partial point of views. There are several different classifications of partial point of views given in scriptures. We will see the one, which is more widely used in the later part of this chapter.

Nikshepa (Analysis of truth)

Analysis of truth can be done in precision and clarity in different ways. A substance has various attributes. Keeping in mind those attributes, the substance can be divided into four different ways.

01. Name (Nām) – it means to refer the object merely by its name. Our day-to-day activity becomes easier by giving name to an object. For example, a poor person's name is King. He is known as King by name, even though he is very poor.
02. Symbol (Sthāpanā) – it means referring a person through his image, idol, picture, painting, etc. These things contain in themselves, the symbol of an original object. E.g. looking at a marble idol at a temple, one says that this is Mahāvīr Swāmi.
03. Potentiality (Dravya) – here one refers to an object by mentioning it is past condition or future condition. For example, we refer to a person who is going to be king in the future as king now.
04. Actuality (Bhāv) – it means the name signifying the object is meaningful in its present condition. For example, the word Tirthankar

is used only after the soul attains omniscience and is now preaching and establishing four-fold religious congregation.

Please see the table for further details.

Conclusion

Logic means, "study of principles and method of argumentation."

Argumentation in the system of logic is a set of statements. Jains believe in non-absolutism. One should know a substance from all the angles and then present the partial point of view, and then one is right.

Tripadi – (Anekāntavāda)

Shraman Bhagawān Mahāvīr expounded and established the Jain philosophy and communicated it to his first disciple, Indrabhūti Gautam and ten other Ganadhars (Chief disciples) in three phrases, which constitute the foundation of the Jain philosophy; and lays down its essentials. These three phrases are known as Tripadi.

- Upanneyi Vā – There emerges a new phase of the matter: [This is called Utpād or Utpatti which denotes emergence of a new mode]
- Vighaneyi Vā – Old mode of the matter vanishes [This is called Vyaya or Lay which denotes disappearance of the old mode.]
- Dhuvēyi Vā – Original qualities of the matter remain constant. [This is called Dhrauvya, which denotes the permanence of matter.]

Though the matter may assume different forms at different times, it never loses its own essential qualities (Guna). The Jain term for such matter is sat (literally, being). This term denotes a matter that has three aspects: substance (Dravya), quality (Guna), and mode (Paryāya). The matter, while retaining its own qualities, undergoes modifications (Parinām) in the form of acquiring (Utpād) new modes (Paryāya or Bhāv) and losing (Vyaya) old modes at each moment. Production (acquiring new modes) and destruction (losing old modes) are endless processes. On account of these changes, the substance does not experience any loss in its original qualities (Guna).

Substance as Dravya remains permanent and not destroyable. Nevertheless, changes occur; old forms are destroyed and new ones come into being. For this reason, the Jainism does not consider any substance either as always permanent or as always transitory. The destruction of any thing, that we notice, is not the destruction of the substance. It is only a change of mode, the transformation.

Examples:

A bar of gold has its own original qualities. That bar can be converted into a chain. In that case, the shape of the bar is destroyed and a new shape (chain) has been produced. However, the qualities of gold remain unchanged. Now if we melt the chain and make a bangle (Bangadi) out of it, then we destroy the chain (an old form) and produce a Bangadi (a new form). Again, the inherent qualities of the gold remain unchanged. Therefore, the bar, chain and Bangadi are transient forms (Paryäya) while gold is the matter (Dravya) which remains constant.

A living being, through the process of growth, undergoes various changes, such as childhood, youth, and old age. These changes are the natural modifications of the living being. Childhood, youth, and old age are transient forms (Paryäya) of a living being. The soul of the living being is permanent substance (Dravya). Similarly, when we die, we will be born in another body. Therefore, the body is also a transient form while our soul is the permanent substance (Dravya).

A soul is a substance (Dravya) that has innumerable qualities such as knowledge (Jñän), bliss (Änand) and energy (Virya). The knowledge quality, for example, may increase or decrease, but there is never a time when the soul is without knowledge; otherwise, it would become, by definition, a non-soul, a lifeless material.

According to the Jainism, the numbers of substances existing at present existed in the past and will continue to exist in future. There cannot be any increase or decrease in that number. All the transformations take place according to their properties and potentialities; and in course of time, one form may get destroyed and cease to exist and another form may emerge. However, Dravya remains constant.

Dravya, Guna, and Paryäya

The Jain term for existent is 'Sat.' It designates an entity comprised of substance (Dravya), attributes (Guna) and mode (Paryäya). The qualities are free from qualities of their own and they invariably and continuously undergo modifications or changes. The substance and attributes are inseparable and the attributes being the permanent essence of the substance cannot remain without it. Modes, on the other side, are changing. There are modifications in the form of acquiring new modes and losing old modes at each moment. Thus a thing or the conception of being as the union of permanent and change brings us naturally to the doctrine of Anekäntaväda or what we may call relative pluralism.

In view of the fact, Jainism points out that both the permanent and the changing are the two sides of the same thing. Considering on one side the human limitations to acquire the knowledge of a thing with its all the infinite attributes and on the other side three characteristics of knowledge possessing the three characteristics of production, destruction and permanence, nothing could be affirmed absolutely, as all affirmations could be relatively true under certain aspects or point of view only. The affirmations are true of a thing only in a certain limited sense, and not absolutely. The claim that Anekäntaväda is the most consistent form of realism lies in the fact that Jainism has allowed the principle of distinction to run its full course until it reaches its logical terminus, the theory of manifoldness of reality and knowledge. The theory of non-absolutism clears that reality, according to Jainism is not merely multiple but each real, in its turn, is manifold or complex to its core. Reality is thus complex web of manyness (Aneka) and manifolds (Anekänta).

Pramäna and Naya – (Jain Logic)

Logic broadly means the study of the structure and principles of reasoning or of sound argument. In West, it also includes certain other meanings all related to different meaning of 'logos' a Greek word. Logic is of prime importance in Indian philosophy, to both philosophy and religion. The knowledge of logic is a must for one who wants to understand the religion and its philosophy.

“It has been held by most systems that no liberation is possible without knowledge and conduct.’ Thus the theory of knowledge, which includes its conception, sources and classification, becomes an independent branch of philosophy. Some scholars consider ‘logic’ a part of epistemology also. Whatever the case be but its importance and history both are since ancient period.

Jain logic is not only as the lump of all sciences but also helpful for practical affairs and the sustaining principles of religion (Dharma). After all, logic is not an end in itself but a means for this ideal life.”

The real and deep understanding of Jain philosophy of non-absolutism, the theory of manyfoldness and Nayavāda (standpoint) would mean unfolding the fact that in number of ways Jainism is not atheism but theistic in its implication and presuppositions. It being sound and scientific leads to such conclusions that bring us right into the inner core of Jainism, which is highly ethical, highly religious and therefore highly theistic.

History of Jain logic and Jain epistemology goes as back as its canonical literature. We find the doctrines and the discussions as well as reasoning on the doctrines even in the philosophical works by Umāsvāti and Kundakundāchārya. “The Nyāyavātāra by Shree Siddhasen Diwākar, as far as we know, is the earliest manual on logic composed for the benefit and training of the Jain authors who till his time studied Nyāya possibly from other sources available to them.’ Siddhasen Diwākar has been accepted as ‘the first Jain writer on pure logic’ who belonged to the Shvetāmbar sect. Some noteworthy Jain logicians, from Siddhasen to Yashovijayaji are Mallavādi, Haribhadra, Akalank, Virsen, Vidyanandi, Devsuri, Hemchandrāchārya, and Yashovijayaji. This is the period between 5th and 16th century.

Aim and Subject matter of Jain Logic

We can say that the chief aim is to understand the scriptures and the doctrine, which again is not possible without the correct knowledge of Pramānas (total view knowledge) and Nayas, (partial viewpoint knowledge). The subject matter of Jain logic includes all such topics as are resulting from the Jain theory of knowledge and reality. Apart from the Pramānas as sources for knowledge the ‘Nayavād’ and ‘Sapta-bhangi-vād’ the ‘Dravyastika’ and ‘Paryayastika’ views, the enumeration and

classification of Naya, are some of the quite interesting topics included in Jain logic.

Five Pramānas

Organ of knowledge-true knowledge (Pramāna Jñān) – to know a substance from all angles is called the organ of knowledge, or true knowledge. The knowledge that allows one to make decisions about the self or others (swa and para) is called the organ of knowledge or true knowledge. This knowledge is free from doubt, mistake, and uncertainty. The organ of knowledge consists of several different and apparently opposite points of views. Thus with the organ of knowledge, one gets equanimity, and becomes tolerant of different points of views. The perception, which grasps the nature of a thing in a proper and contraindicated form, is called organ of knowledge. Pramāna kind of knowledge comprises all the aspects of a substance. Pramāna includes every aspect; not as understood from any one aspect

Pramāna is of two kinds

01. Pratyaksha (direct)
02. Paroksha (indirect)

Pratyaksha Jñān or direct knowledge is that which is obtained by the soul without the help of external means. The Pratyaksha Jñān is of 3 kinds-namely Avadhijñān, Manah-Paryāya Jñān and Keval Jñān.

Paroksha Jñān means the knowledge that is obtained by the soul by means of such things as the five senses etc. Paroksha Jñān is classified into (1) Matijñān, (2) Shruta-Jñān.

Thus, there are 5 kinds of Pramāna: (1) Mati Jñān, (2) Shruta Jñān, (3) Avadhi Jñān, (4) Manah-Paryāya Jñān, (5) Keval Jñān

Modes of Pramāna can also be classified as follows for detail understanding

Pratyaksha	Direct
Practical	Samvyavahārik
Transcendental	Paramarthika

Indirect	Paroksha
Recognition	Smarana
Conception	Pratyabhijna
Induction	Tarka
Deduction	Anumāna
Authoritative	Āgam

Direct perception (Pratyaksha Pramāna)

Soul's knowledge of substance is pure. Soul's involvement is direct in obtaining this type of knowledge. It can be of 2 types.

Direct perception in a conventional sense (Samvyavahārik Pratyaksha Pramāna)

The knowledge obtained by the soul in sensory knowledge and articulate knowledge, is called indirect knowledge, for two reasons: There is a need for senses and mind's involvement. The knowledge is called impure because the knowledge obtained from senses' and mind usually is for others and not for the soul. However, when the soul obtains right perception (Samyag Darshan) at that time, the sensory knowledge and articulate knowledge is used for the knowledge of the self. Therefore, this is called direct perception in a conventional sense. Here the knowledge is partially true (Ekadesh Spasta).

Transcendental knowledge (Paramārthika Pratyaksha Pramāna)

When the soul obtains the direct knowledge, without the help of any external causes (like senses and mind), then it is called transcendental knowledge.

- Partial perception (Vikal Paramārthika) – when the soul obtains direct knowledge of a formed substance, it is called partial perception.
- Clairvoyance (Avadhi Jñān) – clairvoyance refers to perception of things that are out of range of senses. Soul can perceive knowledge of a substance with form (Rupi Padārtha), which exists at great distance or time. In celestial and infernal souls, this knowledge is present since

birth. In human, and subhuman, this knowledge is obtained as a result of spiritual endeavors.

- Telepathy (Manah-Paryāya Jñān)– in this type of knowledge, human soul has capacity to comprehend others' thoughts. Great saints who have achieved high level of spiritual progress can possess this knowledge.
- Omnipercception – omniscience (Sakal Paramārthika)
- Keval Janna– omniscient lord having this knowledge, knows about all substances in the universe and, all of their modes of past, present and future at a given time. When a soul in his quest for purity destroys all four destructive karmas, then at the 13th stage of the spiritual ladder obtains this knowledge. This is perfect knowledge and stays with the soul forever. About 'Kevaljñān' Dr. Rādhākṛishnan writes: "It is omniscience unlimited by space, time or object. To the perfect consciousness the whole reality is obvious, This knowledge, which is independent of the senses, which can only be felt and not described, is possible only for the purified souls free from bondage."

Indirect perceptions (Paroksha Pramāna)

The knowledge that is impure, of others, and not of the self, is called indirect perception. Here we take the help of external means like, the five senses, and the mind. At this time, the soul does not have right perception (Samyag Darshan)

Sensory knowledge (Mati Jñān) – this knowledge is gained through the senses and/or mind. Reflection on what has been perceived, reasoning, questioning, searching, understanding, and judging are the variety of sensory knowledge.

Scripture knowledge (Shruta Jñān) – this knowledge refers to conceptualization through language. The knowledge is obtained by studying scriptures and listening to the discourses. Scripture knowledge consists in comprehension of meaning of words that are heard or derived from the senses and the mind.

Pramāna (Valid Knowledge) Conclusion

Pramāna is capable of making us accept the agreeable things and discard the disagreeable ones; it is but knowledge. The object of valid knowledge, according to Jains, is always a unity of number of aspects or characteristics, such as general and the particular, the existent and the nonexistent etc.

Valid knowledge or 'pure knowledge' is the total or partial destruction of ignorance. The fruit of Pramāna is of two sorts: direct and indirect, direct fruit of all Pramānas is the annihilation of ignorance. As regards the indirect fruit of the pure knowledge is (a spirit of) indifference. It is also said that, the immediate effect of Pramāna is the removal of ignorance; the mediate effect of the absolute knowledge is bliss and equanimity. While that of the ordinary practical knowledge is the facility to select or reject.

"The subject of all forms of valid knowledge is the self, as known by direct perception." The spirit (soul or Jiv) is the knower, doer and enjoyer, illumines self and others, undergoes changes of condition, is realized only in self consciousness, and is different from the earth etc. The soul as described in Jainism, is permanent but undergoes changes of condition.

With reference to theistic approaches, Jainism believes in soul and its liberation. Moreover, it accepts and agrees to the fact that no liberation is possible without the true knowledge of reality; and logic or Pramāna is the aid to such knowledge. What is theistic behind the logic is its use and purpose. This is neither an intellectual exercise nor a game of arguments to refute, but to know and sharpen the understanding for the spiritual progress.

On account of its knowledge, the soul is different from inert substances. As the cover over it goes on decreasing, its knowledge goes on increasing, and showing itself. Like a mirror that reflects everything, the soul can know anything that can be known. If there is no cover at all, it is natural that it can know all things. It is illogical to say that we can know only up to this extent, not more than this. Can we limit the flights of the mind? Therefore, a Kevaljnāni knows everything directly.

Only he who possesses this kind of knowledge can expound sound doctrines and only he is the supreme spiritual well-wisher. After that, even those who act according to his commands are well-wishers. For great Ganadhars, Agamas are the Pramānas, source of true knowledge.

Jainism asserts that knowledge attained is knowledge of real object. What is known is not all the aspects of the reality of an object, but only one or some. In Jainism, knowledge depends on experience and experience is always partial, in the sense that the reality in totality is never revealed. Under the circumstance whatever is known is known in relation to a standpoint and therefore "absolution is to be surrendered." This is the root of Nayaväd and Syädväda.

Theory of Nayaväda

According to the Jains, in order to have a complete and comprehensive judgment of reality one has to take into account the main substance that has the element to permanence and goes under the changes in various forms. In this process of change, the previous form dies away and new form comes into existence. The birth of the new form is called Utpäd, the death of the old form is called Vyaya and the substance, which remains constant during this process of birth and death, is called Dhrauvya. When one is able to comprehend all these three, one can arrive at a proper judgment about the thing in question. When the self takes the form of a human being, you can know it as a 'man' or a 'woman'. When it takes a form of the vegetable, you can describe it as 'grass'. All these descriptions are true from the standpoint of the forms that the self has assumed. So, when we recognize a thing from the point of view of the modification or change, it is called 'Paryäyärthika Naya'. Paryäya means modification, change. However, when we recognize that thing from the point of view of substance, it is called Dravyärthik Naya. The former considers changing aspect of reality while the later considers its permanent aspect.

Valid knowledge in Jain philosophy is divided into two modes: Pramäna and Naya. Both, Pramäna and Naya, are valid knowledge." Pramäna is knowledge of a thing as it is, and Naya is knowledge of a thing in its relation. Naya means a standpoint of thought from which we make a statement about a thing.' Siddhasen Diwäkar in Nyäyavatära writes. "Since things have many characters they are the object of all sided knowledge (omniscience); but a thing conceived from one particular point of view is the object of Naya (or one-sided knowledge)." It may be noted here that Naya is Pramäna because it gives us valid knowledge of its object. Naya being a particular standpoint determines only a part of its object. The Jain logicians, reply to a charge that Naya becomes a form of false knowledge as

it determines the knowledge not of an object but part of an object. They say that false knowledge is knowledge about something which is not a real object or in conformity to what it is, 'the part of an object and not non-object. The knowledge determined by Naya of an object is valid knowledge from that point of view. It does yield certain valid knowledge about the part of the object.

The greatest contribution that the Jains have made to the world of thought is by their theories of Nayavāda and Syādvāda. The word 'Syād' in Sanskrit means 'perhaps' but in Jainism it is used to show the relativity of a judgment and the word 'Naya' means 'Standpoint'. Truth or reality is always complex and has many aspects. If one is impressed by one of the aspects of a complex reality and begins to identify the reality, only by that aspect he is bound to make a wrong judgment about the reality. Therefore, the Jain seers exhort us to look at the complexities of life and knowledge, from every standpoint and from positive as well as negative aspects. They recognize that the apprehension of an ordinary human being is partial and hence valid only from a particular point of view, which cannot give a correct or even a nearly correct comprehension of the whole. The complex reality has not only infinite number of qualities but also infinite number of relations. Again, it may be looked at differently by different persons and under their different circumstances. It assumes different forms and appearances for which due allowance ought to be made. All this makes it difficult to form a correct judgment about it unless a systematic and logical method is found to identify it. This method is called Nayavāda. As Dr.S.Radhakrishnan observes

"The doctrine of Nayas of Standpoint is a peculiar feature of Jain logic. A Naya is a standpoint from which we make a statement about a thing. What is true from one standpoint may not be true from another. Particular aspects are never adequate to the whole reality. The relative solutions are abstractions under which reality may be regarded, but do not give us a full and sufficient account of it. Jainism makes basic and fundamental principle that truth is relative to our standpoint."

Thus 'Naya' can be defined as a particular view point; a viewpoint which gives only a partial idea about an object or view which cannot overrule the existence of another or even a contrary view about the same object. If an object or theory is judged only from one standpoint, the judgment is one

sided and it is termed as 'Ekānta'. 'Eka' means 'one' and 'Anta' means 'end'. Thus, Ekānta means one-sidedness. The Jains therefore ask us to judge from all aspects, which is called 'Anekānta'. This is the basic principle of Jain philosophy. Every fundamental principle of Jain philosophy is based on Anekānta. Throughout its approach, Anekānta has been to accept the different aspects or even contradictory aspects of the reality and to evolve a synthesis between the contradictory philosophical theories.

A Jain seer would say, both are correct from the standpoint from which they look at the problem, but both make their statements, which do not conform to the principle of Anekānta and hence do not give a correct judgment of the reality. Jains say that changes are as real as the original substance. A jug made of a clay substance cannot be used as anything, except as a jug and since the use is real, the form of a jug which clay has assumed, cannot be unreal. If the clay substance assumes some other form of an earthen vessel meant for cooking, that vessel could not be used as a jug even though clay substance remains the same. If this is so, how can we say that the form that the substance assumes at a particular time is unreal and only the substance is real? The substance of clay appears to be the only real thing to those who concentrate on substance and ignore the form. It is not correct to say that because there is a change in the form, the changing form is unreal. If it is real even for a moment, its reality must be accepted and recognized. If a comprehensive view of the whole reality is to be comprehensive perception of a thing, it is possible only when its permanent substance (Dravya) is taken into account along with its existing mode (Paryāya). As Āchārya Siddhasen puts it: "Anekāntātmakam Vāstu Gocarah", i.e., we can understand a thing properly by perceiving its various aspects.

Seven Classes of Nayas

Jain philosophers have given broad classifications of different aspects (Nayas) through which we can perceive a thing. They are:

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 01. Naigama Naya | Generic and Specific view or teleological view |
| 02. Sangrah Naya | Collective |

- 03. Vyavahār Naya Practical view
- 04. Rujusutra Naya Linear view
- 05. Shabda Naya Literal view
- 06. Samabhirudha Etymological view
Naya
- 07. Evambhuta Naya Determinant view.

There are hundreds of sub-classifications of these seven Nayas but without touching them, we shall presently discuss the bare outlines of these seven Nayas. Before doing so, it may be noted that first three Nayas are with reference to the identification of the main substance called 'Dravya' and hence are known as 'Dravyārthik Nayas'. The rest four refer to the standpoints, which identify the modes of the main substance and hence are known as 'Paryāyārthika Nayas'.

Naya can also be classified as following 2 types.

Absolute point of view (Nishchaya Naya)

Here one takes a substance. One picks up one of its attributes (Guna). Then analyzes one part of its attribute. This is called absolute point of view. E.g. to call a pot as a clay pot, as it is made out of clay. Here clay is a substance, and one of its attributes is represented in the form of a pot.

Practical points of view (Vyavahār Naya)-

The substance and its attributes are interdependent and can never be separated. To consider them as separate is called practical point of view. E.g. to know is an attribute of the soul. In addition, to consider knowledge in separate way from the soul is called practical point of view. In the practical point of view, one takes into account the association of a substance with another substance. To know a substance due to association with another substance is also called practical point of view. Even though it is not right, but day- to- day activities become somewhat easier this way. E.g. we use clay pot to hold water, so now we call this pot a water pot. Here the pot is not made of water, but clay. But because of water's association with the pot, we call it a water pot. The right way of telling will be that this is a pot made of clay, and we use it to store water. This absolute way of saying a sentence takes a long time. That is why we call it a water pot. It

conveys the meaning. The day-to-day activities become easier thereafter. Even though the soul and body are separate, we use the word interchangeably. We do call the body as living because of the association of the soul and body.

Naya can also be classified as follows

Dravyārthika Nayas (Substantial Point of View)

Substantial point of view (Dravyārthik Naya–) In this point of view, one considers the substance as a whole and gives its modes the subsidiary status. E.g. -while talking about the soul, one will consider the soul as immortal-was never created, nor will it ever be destroyed. This can be subdivided as follows

Naigama	Generic Or Specific Or Teleological
Sangraha	Collective Generic
Vyavahāra	Practical

Paryāyārthika Nayas (Modification Point of View)

Modification point of view (Paryāyārthika Naya–) In this point of view, one considers modes of a substance as a primary subject. The substantial consideration becomes secondary. One considers a substance with origination and perishing of its modes, e.g. while talking about soul, one will consider ever-changing modes of soul. One will consider the four realms of existence, birth, growth, decay, death of a living being, etc. This can be subdivide as follows

Rujusutra	Linear Point of View
Shabda	Literal Or Verbal
Sambhirudha	Etymological
Evambhuta	Determinant Point

Dravyārthik Nayas:

01. Naigama Naya (Generic)

Etymological meaning of the word 'Naigama' is the 'end product' or 'result'. Tattvārtha Sara' gives an illustration of a person who carries water, rice and fuel and who, when asked what he was doing, says he is cooking. This reply is given in view of the result, which he intends to achieve though at the exact time when the question is put to him he is not actually cooking. His reply is correct from the point of view of Naigama Naya, though technically it is not exactly correct, because he is not actually cooking at the time when he replies. The general purpose, for which we work, controls the total series of our activities. If some one passes his judgment on basis of that general purpose, he asserts Naigama Naya, i.e., the teleological viewpoint. These empirical views probably proceed on the assumption that a thing possesses the most general as well as the most special qualities, and hence we may lay stress on any one of these at any time and ignore the other ones

02. Sangrah Naya (Collective point of view)

We get this Naya (viewpoint) when we put main emphasis on some general class characteristics of a particular thing ignoring altogether the specific characteristics of that class. Such a view is only partially correct but does not give the idea of the whole, for it ignores the specific characteristics of that thing.

In collective point of view, the knowledge of an object is in its ordinary or common form. The special qualities of the object are not taken into account. E.g. there were 500 people in the hall. Here we are now considering only general qualities like people and not considering like how many were man, women, children, old, young, etc.

One considers the general attributes of a substance like a substance has existence and eternality. Now these attributes are common to all six universal substances. Here we are considering the general attributes of a substance and ignoring the specific attributes of each substance.

03. Vyavahār Naya (Practical):

If we look a thing from this standpoint, we try to judge it from its specific properties ignoring the generic qualities, which are mainly responsible for giving birth to the specific qualities. This amounts to the assertion of

empirical at the cost of universal and gives importance to practical experience in life.

This point of view sees an object in its special form rather than the common form. The special attributes of an object are taken into consideration.

On the basis of collective point of view, and after describing things in a collective form, it is necessary to find out their special characteristics. For example, when we utter the word "medicine" it includes all branches of medicine but when one says allopathic, osteopathic, naturopathic, homeopathic, etc. then we can understand its specialty. This can be further divided by its name, patent, quality, uses, etc. These divisions are examples of distributive point of view and have a tendency towards greater exactitude.

04. Rujusutra Naya (Linear point of view.)

It is still narrower than Vyavahār in its outlook, because it not only emphasizes all the specific qualities but only those specific qualities which appear in a thing at a particular moment, ignoring their existent specific qualities of the past, and future. The approach of the Buddhists is of this type. To ignore the specific qualities of past and future and to emphasize on only continuing characteristics of Reality is the fallacy involved here.

In this point of view, one considers ideas like reality, etc. as the direct grasp of here and now, ignoring past and future. It considers only the present mode of a thing. Ruju means simple, sutra means knowledge. Suppose a man was a king, and he is not a king now, thus his past is of no use in linear point of view. Similarly, a person will be a king in the future, but is meaningless in linear point of view. Only present mode is recognized in linear point of view, making the identification easier and scope narrower.

05. Shabda Naya Literal points of view

The Verbalistic approach is called as Shabda Naya. Shabda-Naya (the 'Verbal' standpoint): This standpoint maintains that the synonymous words convey the same meaning or thing, provided they are not different in tense, case-ending, gender, number, etc. In other words, it states that two synonymous words can never convey the same thing if they have different tenses, case endings, genders, and numbers.

Literal point of view uses words as their exact face value to signify the real nature of things. Each word has very particular meaning. In the literal view, even changing the gender, numbers, words ending or tense of a word is thought to change its meaning and therefore to change the object to which it refers. So it is not appropriate to use words in different genders, numbers, etc. to refer the same object or event. E.g. the words pot and pitcher signifies same meaning, but in the following sentence, the meaning gets changed, "why did you bring a pot? I only want a pitcher.

06. Samabhirudha Naya (Etymological points of view)

It is different from Shabda Naya, because it concentrates on the etymological distinction between the synonyms. If carried to the fallacious extent this standpoint may destroy the original identity pointed by synonyms.

A group of words even though basically they mean the same things but as individual words, they represent a special condition, e.g. hut and palace are places to live. However, in a hut, poor people live, and in a palace, king lives. In etymological point of view, it represents a specific quality or grammatical property of a word.

07. Evambhuta Naya (Determinant point of view:)

This Naya recognizes only that word which indicates the actual action presently attributed to the individual. In other words, among synonym words only that word should be selected which has a correlation with the action referred to.

In this point of view, the word of sentence, which further determines its characteristic property in its present state when, used. A word should be used to denote the actual meaning. E.g. The word thief is to be used only when a person is caught stealing and not because a person is a known thief. It represents a strict application of a word or statement.

Partial truth of Individual Naya:

As already noted the purpose of pointing out to this detailed classification of Nayas is to show how differently, different individuals can view the same object. However, these different aspects are only partially true and since they are only partially true, they are not capable of being wholly true. They, however, cannot be rejected as wholly untrue also. These different aspects can be illustrated by the reactions of some blind persons who were asked

to go to an elephant and give its description after touching and feeling it. One who touched its legs described it as like a pillar, one who touched the tail, described it like a rope and so on. Each one was right from his own standpoint because he could experience only a particular limb of the elephant and not the whole elephant. Each one of them was however, wrong because his description did not conform to the reality, which the elephant possessed. Only one who could see the whole could comprehend this reality.

Utility of Naya Theory

The analysis of Naya shows that every judgment is relative to that particular aspect from which it is seen or known. This is also called Säpekshaväd that means relativity of our particular knowledge or judgment to a particular standpoint. Since human judgments are always from particular standpoints, they are all relative and hence not absolutely true or absolutely false. Their outright acceptance as a sole truth or rejection as totally false would not be correct. This led the Jain seers to their famous doctrine of 'Syädväda', which means the doctrine of relativity.

Nayaväd reveals a technique to arrive at such an understanding. It teaches us that truth reveals to us only partially if viewed from a particular aspect. Even if one finds that a proposition is quite contrary to the conviction he had for whole life, hence the cause of great irritation to him, once he applies the principles of Nayaväd his irritation begins to subside. The simple reason being that he begins to realize the real cause for that contrary proposition.

Sapta -Bhanga or Syädväda (Seven Predications)

The term Anekäntaväda consists of three terms: 'aneka', 'anta', and 'Väda', The term 'Aneka', means 'many', 'Änta', means 'aspects', or 'attributes' and 'Väda' means 'ism' or 'theory'. In its simple sense, it is a philosophy or a doctrine. It is a theory of manyfold aspects. It has been described and translated by modern scholars variously. Prof. S.N. Dasgupta expresses it as 'relative pluralism' against the 'extreme absolutism' Dr. Chandradhar Sharma translates it as "doctrine of manyness of reality". Dr. Satkari Mookerjee expresses it as a doctrine of 'non-absolutism'. Closely associated to 'Anekäntaväda' is Syädväda. This is also expressed as a theory of 'conditional predication' or "theory of relativity of propositions." Since the

doctrine of 'Anekāntavāda' is opposed to absolutism or monism, (Ekāntavāda) we would prefer "doctrine of 'non-absolutism'" to convey the meaning of Anekāntavāda.

Let us now understand what, the theory of non-absolutism is the Jain theory of reality from its metaphysical point of view. The Jain approach to ultimate reality can be expressed in two words: realistic and relativistic. The universe is full of innumerable material atoms and innumerable individual souls. They are separately and independently real. Again, each thing and each soul possesses innumerable aspects of its own. A thing has got an infinite number of characteristics of its own. Thus according to the metaphysical presupposition of Jainism, a thing exists with infinite characters.

The Jain term for existent is Sat. It designates an entity comprised of substance (Dravya), attributes (Guna) and mode (Paryāya). The attributes are free from attributes of their own and they invariably and continuously undergo modifications or changes. The substance and attributes are inseparable and the attributes being the permanent essence of the substance cannot remain without it. Modes, on the other side, are changing. There are modifications "in the form of acquiring (Utpād) new modes (Paryāya or Bhāv) and losing (Vyaya) old modes at each moment." Thus, the conception of being as the union of permanent and change brings us naturally to the doctrine of Anekāntavāda.

In view of the fact, Jainism points out that both: the permanent and 'the changing, are the two sides of the same thing. Considering on one side the human limitations to acquire the knowledge of a thing with its all the infinite attributes and on the other side three characteristics of knowledge" possessing the three characteristics of origination, destruction and permanence, nothing could be affirmed absolutely, as all affirmations could be relatively true under certain aspects or point of view only. The affirmations are true of a thing only in a certain limited sense, and not absolutely. The claim that Anekāntavāda is the most consistent form of realism lies in the fact that Jainism has allowed the principle of distinction to run its full course until it reaches its logical terminus, the theory of manifoldness of reality and knowledge. The theory of non-absolutism clears that "reality, according to Jainism is not merely multiple but each

real, in its turn, is manifold or complex to its core. Reality is thus complex web of manyness (Aneka) and manifoldness (Anekānta).

Syādvāda

The theory of Anekāntavāda is the metaphysical theory of reality. Then Jainism brings out another aspect of reality and that is its relativistic pluralism. While Anekāntavāda explains the reality metaphysically, Syādvāda explains it epistemologically. Both are the two aspects of the same reality. We have already seen how human knowledge is relative and limited which ultimately makes all our judgments relatively or partially true, and not absolute. Syādvāda is also called Sapta-bhangi Naya (seven-fold judgment) Syādvāda is known as the theory of relativity of propositions or theory of relativity of judgments. Some critics call it theory of relativity of knowledge. We can say that Syādvāda is the epistemological explanation of reality; Sapta-bhangi Naya is the method or the dialectic of the theory of seven-fold judgment. It is the logical side of the theory.

“The doctrine of Syādvāda holds that since a thing is full of most contrary characteristics of infinite variety, affirmation made is only from a particular standpoint or point of view, and therefore it may be correct or true. However, the same assertion may be wrong or false from some other standpoint or point of view. Thus, assertion made cannot be regarded as absolute. All affirmations in some sense, are true, and, in some sense are false. Similarly, all assertions are indefinite and true in some sense, as well as indefinite and false in some other sense. Assertions could be true, and false and indefinite. Thus, Jainism proposes to grant the non-absolute nature of reality and relativistic pluralism of the object of knowledge by using the word ‘Syāt’ (or Syād) before the assertion or Judgment.

The word ‘Syāt’ literally means ‘may be’ It is also translated as ‘perhaps’, ‘some how’, ‘relatively’ or ‘in a certain sense’. The word ‘Syāt’ or its equivalent in English, used before the assertion makes the proposition true but only under certain conditions i.e. hypothetically. What is to be noted is that the word ‘Syāt’ is not used in the sense of probability leading to uncertainty. Probability again hints at skepticism and Jainism is not skepticism. Since reality has infinite aspects, our judgments are bound to be conditional. Thus, Syādvāda is the theory of relativity of knowledge. The Jains quoted quite a good number of parables, which are conventionally

used by Jain writers to explain the theory. The most famous one for the grip over the core of the theory is the famous parable of six blind men who happened to come across an elephant. Each one was sure and asserting about one's own description alone to be correct. However, each one was correct, though contrary to each other, from his point of view. Thus the Jains hold that no affirmation or judgment is absolute in its nature, each is true in its own limited sense only. The affirmations will tell either about the existence, or non-existence or about the existence and non-existence, or about the inexpressible. Combining these again the first three with the fourth we derive the seven alternatives technically known as Sapta-bhang-Naya or the seven-fold Judgments.

Theory of Seven Predications (Sapta-Bhanga)

To clarify the above approach of ascertaining the truth by the process of Syādvāda (Anekānta) the Jain philosophers have evolved a formula of seven predications, which are known as Sapta-bhang. 'Sapta' means 'seven' and 'Bhanga' means 'mode'. These seven modes of ascertaining the truth are able to be exact in exploring all possibilities and aspects. For any proposition, there are three main modes of assessment, namely, (1) A positive assertion, (2) A negative assertion, (3) Not describable. However, for greater clarity four more permutations of these three are added as under: 'Asti-Nāsti', 'Asti-Avaktavya', 'Nāsti Avaktavya' and 'Asti-Nāsti Avaktavya'. The word 'Syāt' is prefixed to each of these seven predications to prevent the proposition from being absolute.

All these seven predications are explained with reference to an ethical proposition that 'It is sin to commit violence'. With regard to this proposition, the seven predications noted above can be made as under:

Asti	It is sin to commit violence with an intention to commit the same
Nāsti	It is not a sin to commit violence on an aggressor who molests an innocent and helpless woman
Asti-Nāsti	It is sin to commit violence in breach of moral and social laws, but it is not sin if violence is required to be committed in performance of

	moral or social duties
Avaktavya	It is not possible to say whether violence is sin or virtue without knowing the circumstances under which it is required to be committed
Asti-Avaktavya	Violence is indeed sinful under certain circumstances, but no positive statement of this type can be made for all times and under all circumstances.
Nästi Avaktavya	Violence is not indeed sinful under certain circumstances, but no positive statement of this type can be made for all times and under all circumstances
Asti-Nästi Avaktavya	Violence is sinful, but there are circumstances where it is not so. In fact no statement in affirmation or negation can be made for all time and all circumstances

All these seven modes can be expressed with regard to every proposition. The Jain philosophers have applied them with reference to self, its eternality, non-eternality, identity and character. In fact, this approach of Anekānta permeates almost every doctrine, which is basic to Jain philosophy. S.Gopalan quotes Eliot in this connection, as saying:

"The essence of the doctrine (of Syādvāda): So far as one can disentangle it from scholastic terminology, seems just, for it amounts to this, that as to matters of experience it is impossible to formulate the whole and the complete truth, and as to matters which transcend experience, language is inadequate."

At no time in the history of mankind, this principle of Syādvāda (Anekānta) was more necessary than in the present.

This is the general view of the method of the Jain dialectic. Only this type of dialectical method can represent Syādvāda. The theory of sevenfold predication, is treated as synonymous with Syādvāda owing to the fact that, the number of possible or alternative truths under the conditional method of Syādvāda are seven only."

Syādvāda: Critical Evaluation

Jains admit that thing cannot have self-contrary attributes at the same time and at the same place. What Jainism emphasizes is the manyness and manifoldness of a thing the complex nature of reality. Dr. Rādhākrishnan says, "Since reality is multiform and ever-changing, nothing can be considered to be existing everywhere and at all times and in all ways and places and it is impossible to pledge us to an inflexible creed."

A.N. Upadhye writes that Syādvāda has supplied the philosopher the catholicity of thought. It also convinces that Truth is not anybody's monopoly with tariff walls of denominational religion, while furnishing the religious aspirant with the virtue of intellectual toleration, which is the part of that Ahinsā which is one of the fundamental tenets of Jainism." Lastly in the words of Dr. Y. J. Padmarajah "Anekāntavāda is the heart of Jain metaphysics and Nayavād and Syādvāda (or Sapta-Bhangi) are its main arteries. Or, to use a happier metaphor, the bird of Anekāntavāda flies on its wings of Nayavād and Syādvāda."

Through Anekāntavāda and Syādvāda, Jains bring a solution to the age-old controversy between the absolutism and nihilism or between the one and the many or the real and the unreal.

Theistic Implication of Syādvāda

Thus, the spirit to understand the other and other's standpoint and to learn to tolerate the conflicting or contrary situation helps a lot towards the higher development of right conduct. It broadens the mind and makes person quite objective and open in his thinking. Such a person, like Jain monks, read extensively the treatises of other schools. It proves to be a good training "to identify extreme views and to apply the proper corrections. Thus, here also, we find Syādvāda a great help towards right knowledge, and right conduct. Syādvāda by molding a person towards better conduct and higher knowledge proves to be of great theistic significance.

One of the aims of life is to make the earth, a better and worthier world, Syādvāda in spite of "its dry dialectic and forbidding use of logic is not without a lesson for the practical men of the world.

Pt. Dalsukhbhai Malvania, an authority on Jainism in one of his essays on Anekāntavāda explains that the most of Anekāntavāda is Ahinsā and that is

the prime reason that Jain philosophy is based on Anekāntavāda. The very idea of not to hurt the others but to be kind sympathetic towards others' views and thus to be friendly, is the logical outcome of Ahimsā. Ahimsā in its positive concept becomes love and compassion. A perfect theism, not in its narrow rigid sense, but in the sense where broad religiousness, deep spirituality and high knowledge are thought of for the soul's ultimate liberation from the bondage, required Syādvāda as its valid approach to have an objective vision of truth, to be tolerant, to be synthetic and to have an attitude of impartiality. Without all these, no theism in its actual practice is possible. Syādvāda shapes a personality into a theistic one.

Moreover, subjective attitude and past recollections towards the same of similar objects play a decisive role in judgment. At the same time prejudices and predilections, social upbringing, environmental necessities and politico-social taboos also play a very decisive role, in a judgment about an idea.

In fact, every object and every idea has infinite characteristics and is required to be judged from varieties of standpoints. What should be our reaction towards a thing if we are convinced that everything in this universe has infinite characteristics and with limited knowledge, a human being is not capable of apprehending all these characteristics? Certainly, if our approach were objective and unbiased, we would not rush to take an absolute view of that thing or thought, keeping in mind the limitations of our knowledge. Our judgment based on limited data is likely to be wrong. We would, however, not have actual perception. Therefore, in our prudence, we would say that the judgment, formed about actually perceived things is 'likely' to be true. While saying so, we would not rule out the possibility that it may turn out to be untrue if looked at from any other perspective. This is the approach of Syādvāda, which implies that each and all knowledge is relative. What we know by the analytical process of Nayavād, we express by the synthesis of Syādvāda. As already noticed the etymological meaning of the word 'Syād' is 'Perhaps'. However, it is used to suggest a relative truth. The theory of Syādvāda is based on the premise that every proposition is only relatively true. It all depends upon the particular aspect from which we appreciate that proposition. Since all propositions are related to many circumstances, our assertions about them depend entirely upon the particular circumstances through which we are

viewing them. Since our view has a limited aperture, we cannot see everything, and hence it is appropriate to avoid our absolute assertion.

For instance, when we say that a particular thing weighs 5 lb., our statement about the weight is related to the magnetic force exerted on that thing by our planet, the earth. The same thing may not weigh anything if removed out of this magnetic field or may weigh differently in a different planet. The same can be said about our statements relating to time and space and about every human experience. It is the matter of our daily experience that the same object, which gives pleasure to us under certain circumstances, becomes boring under different circumstances. Scientific truths are, therefore, relative in the sense that they do not give complete and exhaustive knowledge of the objects under study and contain elements that may be changed with further advance in knowledge. Nonetheless, relative truth is undoubtedly useful as it is a stepping -stone to the ultimate truth.

Is Self-Permanent or Transitory?

In the field of metaphysics, there has been serious controversy about the real nature of 'Self'. While Vedantists believe that everything that is found in this universe is 'Brahma', the super self, permanent, and the material things, which are found, have no reality as they are transitory in nature, the Buddhists would say that everything in this universe including the super-self is transitory and constantly changing. These are the two extreme views as they concentrate only on particular aspects to the exclusion of other aspects. The Jains say that both are relatively correct from the viewpoint through which they see the thing, but both are incorrect in as much as they fail to take the comprehensive view of all the aspects involved. The Jains would say that from the point of view of substance, self is permanent, but from the point of view of modifications, it is transitory. Since substance and its modes should be taken as an integrated whole in order to comprehend it properly, both the attributes of permanence and transitoriness should be taken into account. Both to the Vedantists as well as to the Buddhists the Jain seer would say 'Syād Asti', i.e., "From one aspect you are right" and applying his 'Anekānta Naya', i.e., looking at the problem from different angles, would come to the above conclusion. Thus the doctrine of relativity, which is the practical application of the theory of multifold aspects (Naya-Vāda), is nothing but the doctrine of metaphysical

synthesis. This doctrine has a great value in our day- to- day individual and social life

Importance of Anekāntavāda

The importance of this comprehensive synthesis of 'Syādvāda' and 'Anekānta Naya' in day- to- day life is immense in as much as these doctrines supply a rational unification and synthesis of the manifold and rejects the assertions of bare absolutes.

Mahatma Gandhi's views about the Jain theory of Anekānta are as under:

It has been my experience, wrote Gandhi in 1926, "that I am always true (correct) from my point of view, and often wrong from the point of view of my critics. I know that we are both (myself and my critics) right from our respective points of view."

"I very much like this doctrine of the manyness of reality. It is this doctrine that has taught me to judge a Mussulman from his standpoint and a Christian from his...From the platform of the Jains, I prove the non-creative aspect of God, and from that of Ramanuja the creative aspect. As a matter of fact we are all thinking of the unthinkable describing the Indescribable, seeking to know the unknown, and that is why our speech falters, is inadequate and been often contradictory."

History of all conflicts and confrontations in the world is the history of intolerance born out of ignorance. Difficulty with the man is his egocentric existence. If only the man becomes conscious of his own limitations! Anekānta or Syādvāda tries to make the man conscious of his limitation by pointing to his narrow vision and limited knowledge of the manifold aspects of things, and asks him not be hasty in forming absolute judgments before examining various other aspects-both positive and negative. Obviously, much of the bloodshed, and much of tribulations of mankind would have been saved if the man had shown the wisdom of understanding the contrary viewpoints.

The doctrine of Syādvāda also clarifies the metaphysical doctrine of 'Self' - envisaged by the Jains. The proposition 'Syād Asti' is positive in character and points out to the positive attributes of the thing in question. These are individual attributes, which belong to and inhere in the thing in question. Therefore, when the proposition 'Syād Asti' is applied to 'Self', it conveys that 'Self' is justified in its existence only from the point of view of its own

individual attributes, modes, space and time. However, when the other proposition of the doctrine namely 'Syät Nästi' is applied to it, it means the 'Self' does not possess the attributes, modes, etc. which do not belong to it. It is just like a pot that can be identified as a 'pot' only if it carries the attributes of a 'pot' but it cannot be identified as a pot if it carries the attributes, which are foreign to it. So the negative identification of 'Syät Nästi' when applied to 'Self' would mean that if the self tries to adopt the attributes of Pudgal (matter) which are foreign to it, it is not the 'self'. In other words, Syādvāda teaches us that 'Self' can be identified positively as 'Syād Asti' only if it is viewed from its own attributes, and negatively as 'Syād Nästi' to show that it is not Pudgal, etc., if it is viewed from the attributes, foreign to it.

Thus, the doctrine of Syādvāda gives clarity to the real character of the 'Self' and by the same process of reasoning, the real character of 'Pudgal', i.e., non-sentient things.

Anekāntavāda and Ahinsā

However, the important aspect of Syādvāda is, , the subtlety with which it introduces the practice of Ahinsā (non-violence) even in the realm of thought. The moment one begins to consider the angle from which a contrary viewpoint is put forward, one begins to develop tolerance, which is the basic requirement of the practice of 'Ahinsā'. Origin of all bloody war fought on the surface of this earth can be traced to the war of ideas and beliefs. Syādvāda puts a healing touch at the root of human psyche and tries to stop the war of beliefs, which lead to the war of nerves and then to the war of bloodshed. It makes all absolutes in the field of thought quite irrelevant and naive imparts maturity to the thought process and supplies flexibility and originality to human mind. If the man-kind will properly understand and adopt this doctrine of Syādvāda, it will realize that real revolution was not the French or the Russian; the real revolution was the one, which taught the man to develop his power of understanding from all possible aspects.

Five Samavāya- (Five Causes)

Introduction: Who is responsible for the actions taking place in this world? Hegel said it is history. Marx said it is system. Freud said it is sensual feelings and teachings of parents.

Believers in God's grace think that whatever happens, is as per God's wish. They think that a) God has created the universe, b) God manages the universe and c) God decides who gets what.

While Jains believe that:

- Nobody has created the universe. Six basic substances of the universe are: soul (Jivāstikāya), material atoms (Pudgalāstikāya), the medium of motion (Dharmāstikāya), the medium of rest (Adharmāstikāya), space (Ākāshāstikāya) and time (Kāl)]. They are indestructible and cannot be created. As such, soul also is indestructible. Therefore, it cannot be created. If, God has created the universe, he has to have a desire to create. The desire makes the God imperfect and he cannot be imperfect. Therefore, he could not have created the universe.
- Nobody manages the universe. Everything in the universe takes place in accordance with the laws of nature.
- Nobody decides who gets what. Every individual gets appropriate consequences (or retribution) in accordance with his/her own Karma.

Samvāya: Samavāy is the name given to the connection between action and causes. Without a cause, no action can take place. There are five causes that have a deep connection with everything taking place. According to the Jain philosophy, there are five Samavāys (group of factors functioning simultaneously):

01. Time (Kāl),
02. Own-nature (Svabhāva),
03. Fate (Niyati)
04. Nimitta (External Substances and Karma)
05. Self-effort (Purushārtha)

These all are responsible for all events (changes – positive or negative) in the universe. Only by means of these five, every event in the universe takes place.

Some give importance to one of them and ignore others. From the multiplicity of view- points (Anekāntavāda), the comprehensive vision of the Jain philosophy rejects this absolutely one-sided view or the way of viewing things from a single angle. The Jain philosophy views and reveals the importance of every Samavāy from the multiplicity of viewpoints (Anekāntavāda); and considers these five Samavāys as the causes for any action or reaction. Without these five, nothing can take place.

Kāl – (Time):

Time gives the sequence to whatever happens in universe. If we sow seeds today, they do not give fruits right away. It requires some time. It takes certain amount of time before sprouts, buds, branches, leaves and fruits appear. We were born on a certain date. In summer, we have hot weather. In winter, we have cold weather. The fruit of Karma also appears at the destined time.

Svabhāva- (Own-Nature):

Time is not everything. Even if the right time arrives, certain seeds do not sprout. Why are the thorns sharp? Why most flowers have beautiful colors? Why some animals are cruel? Why some of the animals are clever and capable of rapid movement? Why does a dog bark? A single answer to all these questions is, it is their nature (Svabhāva). For example, to bark is dog's nature. The chain of gold will not have the characteristics of silver. You will not be able to grow mangoes on a lemon tree. In matters like these, own-nature is considered as the main cause.

Niyati – (Fate or Destiny):

This means destiny or fate. Everything is pre-determined. Whatever has been destined will take place. In this matter, neither time nor nature has any effect or influence. Whatever has to happen keeps happening. In this process, change cannot be made despite the best efforts. For example, even if we make all possible efforts, we cannot prevent the aging process or may not be able to save some one's life. If someone were going to hit our car from behind, he/she would do, despite our best efforts.

Nimitta (External substances and Karma):

The results that we get depend upon our actions. All the strange things, all the sad things we witness; all the happy things we experience, and all the varieties we see in the life are due to Karma. A mother gives birth to two

children together (twins). Still one turns out to be different from the other. This is because of one's own-Karma. Rich becomes poor, poor becomes rich, rich becomes richer and poor becomes poorer. This is also because of own-Karma. Every one has to experience both the good and evil consequences of Karma.

Purushārtha- (Self-efforts):

Purushārtha or self-effort has its special place. A person cannot progress if he/she depends on Time or Nature or Destiny or Karma and if he/she does not put forth efforts. The human race has progressed because of the efforts and initiatives. It is not possible to improve any thing without self-efforts.

One in Our Control: Which one is the most important of these five? Which is the most effectual? The controversy regarding these questions is not of today; but it has been there for centuries. Countless arguments and refutations have been made for and against one or another proposition. One who supports one view disagrees with other causes. However, Jain philosophy does not consider these five from a single point of view; nor does it consider anyone of them as the only right one. The Jain philosophy considers their collective effect as valid and right. Whole truth can be understood only if all the five are considered as existent. In addition, the Jain philosophy puts more emphasis on self-effort (Purushārtha), because the self-effort is the only one in our control. The self-effort can change one's Karma. The self-effort can eradicate the Karma. Purushārtha of past is Karma of present and Purushārtha of present is Karma of future. If we continue to put self-effort to shed our Karma, our destiny will improve, it will get desirable nature, and that can happen sooner depending upon the eradication of Karma. However, we must understand that it takes all the five causes for any action to take place.

Summary:

Jainism puts most emphasis on the Purushārtha (to rely a great deal on one's own efforts and initiatives) since it is the only one in our control and can make impact on other Samavāys in future. No progress can be made if one depends on only fate or Karma. Individual's self-effort (Purushārtha) can help in shedding the Karma and in purifying his/her consciousness. Believing in these five causes is the beginning of the theory of multiplicity of views (multi-faceted truth or Anekāntavāda).

