

# **INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY – A GENERAL OUTLINE OF INDIAN AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY.**

## **UNIT STRUCTURE**

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Nature of Philosophy
- 1.3 A General Outline Of Indian Philosophy
- 1.4 Western Philosophy
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Unit End Exercises
- 1.7 Suggested Reading

---

### **1.0 OBJECTIVES :**

---

- After going through this unit you will be able to understand
- The meaning and nature of philosophy
- The branches of philosophy
- The methods of philosophy
- The basic features of Indian and western philosophy

---

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION :**

---

Philosophy is the root of all knowledge. It is considered as mother of all sciences. Philosophy has interpreted man and his various activities in a comprehensive manner. It helps to coordinate the various activities of the individuals and the society. It helps us to understand the significance of all human experience. "It explores the basic source and aims of life. It asks and tries to answer the deepest questions to life. It clarifies life and the basic values of life. This clarity is very essential because it provides us with the wisdom to face the challenges of life. Wisdom is the supreme instrument in the hands of man in the struggle for his successful existence.

---

## 1.2 NATURE OF PHILOSOPHY :

---

**a) Meaning of philosophy:** The word 'Philosophy' involves two Greek words – *Philo* meaning love and *Sophia* meaning knowledge. Thus literally speaking, philosophy means love of wisdom. Man is a rational animal. Desire for knowledge arises from this rational nature of man. Philosophy is an attempt to satisfy this very reasonable desire. Philosophy signifies a natural and necessary urge in human-beings to know themselves and world in which they live, move and have their being. It is impossible for man to live without a philosophy. The choice is not 'between metaphysic and no metaphysic ; it is between a good metaphysic and a bad metaphysic'.

**b) The origin of philosophy:** According to Aristotle, philosophy arises from wonder. Man experiences rains and drought, storms, clouds, lightning. At times, he is greatly terrified. Then the events of life and death mystify him. He begins to reflect over the events. The sun, moon and the stars appear to him wonderful and beautiful. As a result of his reflection, he thinks that the events can be explained by powers akin to man. He proposes to control them by means of magical spells. This magic gives way to science, philosophy and religion in due course. Magic becomes science when natural events begin to be explained and controlled with the help of natural causes. Magic, again, becomes religion when the powers are taken to be super natural beings. The same magic flowers into philosophy when man makes an attempt to explain the world as a whole.

**c) The subject matter of philosophy :** Philosophy is the rational attempt to have a world-view. It endeavors to reach a conception of the entire universe with all its elements and aspects and their interrelations to one another. It is not contented with a partial view of the world. It seeks to have a synoptic view of the whole reality: it tries to have a vision of the whole. The different sciences deal with different departments of the world. Mathematical sciences deal with numbers and figures. Physics deals with heat, light, motion, sound, electricity and magnetism. Chemistry deals with chemical phenomena. Psychology deals with the phenomena of mental life. Sociology deals with the structure and growth of the society and its institutions. Economics deals with welfare and wealth of man. Politics deals with the structure and functions of the State and its various organs .

Thus sciences give us a sectional view of the world. But philosophy harmonizes the highest conclusions of the different sciences, coordinates them with one another, and gives a rational conception of the whole world. It investigates the nature of the fundamental concepts

of matter, time pace, life, mind, and the like and interrelates them to one-another. It enquires into the nature of the universe, its stuff or material, its Creator or God, its purpose, and its relation to man and his soul. It is the art of thinking all things logically, systematically, and persistently. It is the art of thinking rationally and systematically of the reality as a whole.

**d) Philosophical problems:** The basic problems of philosophy have been same in the East as in West. A general characteristic of these problems was that they were concerned with general and universal questions and not with the questions and not with the questions of particular nature. In this sense the philosophical problems are different from scientific problems which have their origin in particular questions. Some examples of philosophical problems are: What is knowledge? What is world? Who has created this world? Is there a God? Who am I? What is the aim of my life? Why should I live? What is the purpose of the world? etc.

**e) Main Branches of philosophy :**

**1) Epistemology :-** Philosophy is the search for knowledge. This search is critical. Hence, the first problem which arises before a philosopher is about the nature of knowledge and its limitation. Therefore, epistemology is the most fundamental branch of philosophy. It discusses philosophically truth and falsehood, validity of knowledge, limits of knowledge and nature of knowledge, knower and known, etc.

**2) Metaphysics :-** Metaphysics is the main branch of philosophy. It is the science of reality. Its main problems are; What is Reality? Is the world one or many? What is space? What is the purpose of creation? Is there a God? In brief metaphysics discusses the three aspects of Reality, viz, the world, the self, and the God. Its scope includes ontology, philosophy of self, cosmogony, cosmology and theology

**3) Axiology:-** This branch of philosophy philosophically studies value. It has been divided into the following three branches;

- i) Ethics: It discusses the criteria of right and good.
- ii) Aesthetics :It discusses the nature and criteria of duty.
- iii) Logic : It studies truth. The subject matter of logic includes the methods of judgment , types of propositions, hypothesis, definition etc.

**Check your progress :-**

1 Explain the meaning of philosophy.

---



---



---



---



---

2. Describe the nature of philosophy.

---



---



---



---

3. What are the various branches of philosophy.

---



---



---



---

### **1.3 A GENERAL OUTLINE OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY :**

In the early phases of human life on this planet when man was struck with wonder or the natural phenomena or when he found complex and conflicting phenomena in life and was filled with discontentment at the existing order of things, it was the beginning of philosophy.

**1.3.1 The Vedas :-** The origin of Indian philosophy may be easily traced in the Vedas. The Vedas are the earliest available records of Indian literature. The Upanishads are the foundation of Indian philosophy, which teach spiritual monism and mysticism. The systems of Indian philosophy are systematic speculations on the nature of the Reality in harmony with the teachings of Upanishads, which contain various aspects of the truth. They aim at the knowledge of the Reality with a view to transforming and spiritualizing human life. Philosophical knowledge does not aim at merely satisfying our theoretical and speculative interest, but also at realizing the highest truth in life

**1.3.2 Dars'ana or vision of truth: -** Indian philosophy is intensely spiritual and emphasizes the need of practical realization of truth. As philosophy aims at knowledge of truth, it is termed in Indian literature, 'the vision of truth' (dars'ana). The word 'dars'ana' means 'vision' and also the 'instrument of vision'. It stands for the direct, immediate and intuitive vision of Reality, the actual perception of Truth, and also includes the means which lead to this realization. 'See the Self' is the keynote of all schools of Indian Philosophy. And this is the reason why most of the schools of Indian Philosophy are intimately associated with religious sects.

**1.3.3 The schools of Indian philosophy:** The following are the major philosophical schools or systems (dars'anas).

- 1) The Nyaya system of Aksapada Gautama
- 2) The Vaisheshika system of Maharshi Kanada
- 3) The Samkhya system of Kapila muni

- 4) The Yoga system of Ptanjali
- 5) The Mimamsa system of Jaimini
- 6) The Vedanta system of Badarayana Vyas
- 7) TheBauddha system of Guatama Buddha
- 8) The Jaina system of Mahavira
- 9) The Carvaka system of Carvaka

#### **1.3.4 Classification of the Indian Philosophical Schools: Orthodox and Heterodox :-**

The schools or systems of Indian philosophy are divided into two broad classes, namely, orthodox (astika, Vedic) and heterodox (nastika, Non-Vedic). To the first group belong the six chief philosophical systems (popularly known as sad-darsana), namely, Mimamsa, Vedanta, Sankhya, Yoga, Nyaya and Vaisesika. These are regarded as orthodox (astika), not because they believe in God, but because they accept the authority of the Vedas. The Mimamsa and the Sankhya do not believe in God as the creator of the world, yet they are called orthodox (astika), because they believe in the authoritativeness of the Vedas. Under the other class of Heterodox systems, the chief three are the schools of the Materialists like the Carvakas, the Bauddhas and the Jains. They are called heterodox because they do not believe in the authority of the Vedas.

**1.3.5 Problems and Methods of Indian Philosophy:-** Though the basic problems of philosophy have been the same in the East as in the West and the chief solutions have striking similarities, yet the methods of philosophical enquiry differ in certain respects and the processes of the development of philosophical thought also vary. Indian philosophy discusses the various problems of Metaphysics, Ethics, Logic and Epistemology but generally it does not discuss them separately. Every problem is discussed by the Indian philosopher from all possible approaches, metaphysical, ethical logical and epistemology. There are distinctions in the methods of speculation, adopted by different schools

**1.3.6 Empiricism, Rationalism and Authoritarianism:-** The nine major systems of Indian Philosophy may be classified on the basis of sources of knowledge , ie., epistemology into three major groups- Empiricism, Rationalism and Authoritarianism.

**i) Empiricism :** Those who hold that perception is the only source of knowledge are forced to deny the existence of God , soul, rebirth, hell and heaven. This view is called Empiricism- Sense experience is the only source of knowledge. Charvaka holds this view.

**ii) Rationalism :** Those who hold that we are entitled to believe in what is not directly perceived but which can be inferred from what is perceived.

This view is called Rationalism.eg., from the perception of smoke we are entitled to infer the existence of fire though we do not see fire, on the ground that wherever there is smoke there is fire.

The Nyaya-Vaisheshika, The Samkhya-yoga and Buddhism are rationalist schools They accept perception and inference as the valid pramanas and regard inference as primary and sense perception as subordinate

**iii) Authoritarianism :** Perception and Inference based upon perception may be adequate to give us knowledge about the empirical world , but what about transcendent realities like souls, God, past birth, karma hell and heaven. These objects are not knowable by these two pramanas. But they can be known through supra-sensuous experience to the mystics, prophets, saints, sees directly and to us through scriptures which are the records of such experience or revelations This is called Authoritarianism. Of course, they accept other pramanas also. The remaining three schools of purva Mimamsa, Vedanta and Jainism belong to this category.

**Check your progress :-**

1 Give the classification of Indian schools of philosophy

---



---



---



---

**The Common Ideas in the System of Indian Philosophy**

i) **The Reality of the world:** All schools of Indian philosophy recognize the reality of the world. Even the Advaita Vedanta of Samkara regards the world as a mere appearance from the standpoint of the absolute. But it recognizes the empirical reality of the world-appearance.

ii) **The reality of the self :** The reality of the permanent self is generally admitted. Among the heterodox schools the Carvaka and Buddhist deny the reality of the permanent self.

iii) **The law of Karma :** All schools of Indian philosophy except the Carvaka believe in the law of Karma. As we sow, so we reap. There is no escape from the consequences of actions . Their fruits must be reaped in this life or in future life

iii) **Transmigration :** The idea of transmigration is common to all systems of Indian philosophy except the Carvaka school.

iv) **Initial Pessimism and Ultimate Optimism :** Indian philosophy is branded as pessimistic. Life is full of sufferings. But all kinds of pain can

be destroyed in the state of liberation. So, Indian philosophy is characterised by initial pessimism and ultimate optimism.

**v) Bondage:** Another common view held by all Indian thinkers except Carvaka school, is that ignorance of reality is the cause of our bondage and sufferings, and liberation from these cannot be achieved without knowledge of reality.

**vi) Liberation :** The idea of liberation is common to all the systems of Indian philosophy except the Carvaka school.

**vii) The means to liberation:** The different systems of Indian philosophy lay down the means to the attainment of liberation.

**viii) Pramanas:** Indian philosophy is not dogmatic and uncritical. Every system of philosophy is based on epistemology or theory of knowledge.

**Check your progress :-**

1 State the common Ideas of the different schools of Indian philosophy

---



---



---



---



---

## **1.4 A GENERAL IDEAS OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY :-**

Wonder is said to be the origin of philosophy. In the early human life on this planet, when man was struck with wonder at the natural phenomena or when he found complex and conflicting phenomena in life and was filled with discontentment at the existing order of things, it was the beginning of philosophy. While the philosophy of Vedas began in wonder, the philosophy of Gautam Buddha began in discontentment with the miserable world. In the West, the early beginning of philosophy was in wonder, while the modern Western philosophy had its origin in doubt. This wonder and doubt gave rise to several types of problems. Some examples of the philosophical problems are:

What is the real nature of man? . What is the end of this life? What is the nature of this world in which he lives? Is there any creator of this world. These are some of the many problems taken at random, which we find agitating the human mind in every land, from the very dawn of civilization. Western philosophy has removed more or less true to the etymological meaning of 'philosophy' in being essentially an intellectual quest for truth.

**1.4.1 The Development of Western Philosophy :** In the history of Western philosophy we find that as human knowledge about each of the different problems mentioned above began to grow, it became

impossible for the same man to study everything about every problem. Division of labour or specialization became necessary and a group of man devoted themselves to a particular problem or a few connected problems. There came into existence in this way the different special sciences. Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Anatomy, Geology and similar sciences took up each a part or aspect of the world of nature. Physiology, Anatomy and the other medical sciences devoted themselves to the different problems of the human body. Psychology began to study the problems of the human mind. The detailed study of many of particular problems with which philosophical speculation originally started became thus the subject matter of the special sciences. Philosophy then began to depend on the reports of the investigation made by the different sciences, tried to understand their meanings and implications critically, and utilized these results for understanding the general nature of the universe- man, nature and God.

**1.4.2 Divisions of Western Philosophy :** Historians of philosophy have divided Western Philosophy according to their convenience. We shall divide the Western Philosophy into Greek, Medieval, Modern, Post-Kantian, Metaphysicians and the 20<sup>th</sup> Century philosophy.

I. Greek Philosophy : Ancient Philosophy

It covers a period between 600-400 A.D. This period has three sections.

Section I. Pre-Socratic Philosophy

Section II. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.

Section III. Greco-Roman Philosophy

I. Medieval Philosophy 400-1500 A.D

II. Modern Philosophy (Bacon to Kant) Post-Kantian Philosophy.

III. 20<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy.

**1.4.2 Methods of Philosophy :** A method for any science is a necessity. Method in philosophy is a systematic and consistent way of attaining philosophical knowledge. What our method is going to be largely determined by our attitude to philosophy. Those who look upon philosophy as a universal science may think that a method of philosophy like a method of science is empirical. Others looking upon philosophy as an intellectual pursuit may treat a method of reason as the method of philosophy.

**The different methods of philosophy are as follows:**

**(a) Dogmatism.** This method of thinking consists in assuming certain “fundamental principles as self-evident and axiomatic, without explanation or proof, and deducing conclusions from these unproved premises”. It also carries on its investigations without a previous criticism

of uses. In other words without criticizing the quality of knowledge and without determining how we know things, it at once hastens to interpret the objects of the world. Hence in this method of thinking the mind is too busy with its objects to attend to itself. Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz may be mentioned as belonging to this line of thinking.

**(b) Empiricism.** According to Empiricism, all knowledge, whether scientific or philosophical, is entirely built up of sensations and materials derived from sensations. It holds that the mind of every man at the time of birth is like a blank sheet of white paper (a tabula rasa) on which the impressions coming from the outside are imprinted in the form of experience. Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Mill and Bain may be mentioned as the advocates of this school of thought.

**(c) Scepticism.** It results from carrying empiricism to its most extreme and consistent form. Because, if we once admit that we can have no genuine knowledge beyond what can be compounded out of the materials of sensations and feelings, it follows that we cannot have not only any understanding realities outside of and apart from our own sensations and feelings, but also any certain knowledge that such things exist as all. Hence, our idea of substances, mind, matter and God cannot be known for certain to correspond to realities, existing independently of our ideas. Not only can we know nothing about the real nature of such meta-physical or transcendental realities, but also we cannot even know for certain that they have any existence.

Hume, Mill, Bain, and Spencer are the advocates of this doctrine. In its extreme form, skepticism denies the certainty of all knowledge.

**(d) Criticism.** Criticism is the method which bases all philosophical speculation upon a critical inquiry into the nature, origin and limits of knowledge. According to this doctrine, the true philosophical method must be critical. Before we enter into philosophy, we must hold a thorough inquiry into the antecedent conditions of knowledge and the precise field and range of its operations. By thus ascertaining the scope of knowledge, criticism helps us in determining the range of philosophical investigations. Kant is a great advocate of critical method.

**(e) Rationalism.** It is a method which consists in showing that sensations and feelings can only give the materials of knowledge and that such materials do not constitute knowledge unless they are interpreted by reason. Hence, according to this method of thinking, knowledge is a product, not of experience alone, but of reason interpreting experience. Thus, this form of thinking gives a prominent place to reason, and a subordinate one to sensations and feelings in the structure of knowledge. The Criticism of Kant, then, is a form of Rationalism. Likewise some of the dogmatic systems may be regarded as forms of Rationalism.

**(f) Dialectical Method.** According to Hegel, the proper method for philosophy is dialectic. This is a natural method of philosophical thinking. It is a commonplace experience that when we think over a problem we arrive at certain positive facts. This is thesis. Now, after some time we come to know some facts which are contradictory to the thesis; this is antithesis. Thesis and antithesis cannot live together for long hence they are synthesized into a synthesis. This synthesis arrived through anti-thesis is more comprehensive than the original thesis. Thus, knowledge grows in a dialectical process through thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis.

**(g) Modern Methods.** The Pragmatists adopt the pragmatic method. The New Realists adopt the method of intellectual analysis. Bergson adopts the method of intuition in regard to life, and of intellect in regard to matter. The Logical Positivists adopt the method of linguistic analysis and empirical verification. The naturalists adopt the naturalistic methods of observation and experiment. Croce and Gentile adopt the historical method

**Check your progress :-**

1. What are the different methods of philosophy?

---



---



---



---



---

**1.5 SUMMARY :**

The meaning of the word 'philosophy' is 'love of learning'. It signifies a natural and a necessary urge in human beings to know themselves and the world in which they 'live and move in their being'. Western Philosophy has remained more or less true to the etymological meaning of 'philosophy', in being essentially an intellectual quest for truth. Indian Philosophy has been, however, intensely spiritual and has always emphasized the meaning of practical realization of truth.

**1.6 UNIT END EXERCISE:**

- Q1. What are the basic features of Indian Philosophy?  
 Q2. State the general outline of Western Philosophy  
 Q3. What are the basic features of Western Philosophy?

**1.7 SUGGESTED READING :**

1. Philosophy of education - Soti Shivendra Chandra, Rajendra K Sharma
2. Introduction to Philosophy – J. N Sinha
3. History of modern European Philosophy – Prof. Ratnakar Pati.

## METHODS IN PHILOSOPHY

### Unit Structure:

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Socrates
- 2.3 Descartes' Method
- 2.4 The Method of the Mimamsakas
- 2.5 Summary
- 2.6 Unit End Questions
- 2.7 References

---

### 2.0 – OBJECTIVES:

---

After going through this unit, you will be able to understand the philosophical methods used by different philosophers in their philosophical analysis and investigations. It is an attempt to understand three methods developed by three philosophers (two Western and one Indian).

In this chapter, the nature and importance of methods in philosophy will be briefly discussed. The students will be able to understand how different philosophers have adopted varied methods to get knowledge or to clarify ideas and evaluate concepts and thoughts critically.

---

### 2.1 – INTRODUCTION:

---

The term 'philosophy' is described and defined in different ways by different philosophers both in the West and the East. Generally it is described as a thinking view of things. But one thing is certain that it is an intellectual enterprise. Philosophers analyze the most general concepts and try to evaluate them. So it is both analytical and critical in its approach to concepts such as God, soul, world, causality, value, space, time etc. philosophy critically and reflectively clarifies and examines even religious beliefs, conventional morals, political ideas etc.

There is no one single method acceptable to all philosophers. Method is a kind of pathway to get at the truth or find out the solution to some philosophical issue. The term 'philosophy' was first coined by Pythagoras. When Pythagoras was called a philosopher he accepted his description as a philosopher; but he said, 'yes, I am a philosopher, because I am a lover of wisdom and therefore a sincere seeker of it'. It is wisdom about life and of the world as a whole. Of course term philosophy etymologically means love (philo) of wisdom (sophia). So it is not easy to answer the question about the nature of philosophical method. Methods are the ways of getting knowledge about anything. These methods are the way of knowing and thinking. We hold beliefs or opinions but how do come by these beliefs? In other words what are the sources of our beliefs? They may be based on experiences. Some of them are derived from tradition. A scientist may claim that they are based on experiments and so on and so forth. Broadly speaking, different philosopher talk of various methods such as authoritarian method, scientific method, intuitive or mystical method, exegetical and hermeneutical method, transcendental Method, phenomenological method, comparative method and dialectical method of Hegel etc. We are going to discuss Socratic Method, Descartes' method or method of doubt and exegetical method of Mimamsa philosophers of India. The concept of method implies that one is consciously searching for knowledge and truth.

---

## **2.2 – SOCRATES:**

---

Socrates was a great Greek philosopher. He had not given talks or lectures on philosophy. He did not write a single book on philosophy. Nevertheless he is rightly considered as great thinker of Athens. He selflessly taught people to think for themselves and take decisions and accept their responsibility. This he did by asking questions. Socrates also tried to arouse in youngsters the love of truth and virtue so that they could lead a good life. He is well known as a thinker who inspired Plato to do and dedicate himself to philosophy. One of the greatest contributions of Socrates to philosophy is his philosophical method. Socrates always insisted on making our ideas clear and defining correctly our concepts. Socrates professed ignorance in his discussions and debates. Nevertheless he defeated those who claimed to know. This is known as the Socratic irony. Socrates also argued that through sincere dialogues the participants can discover truths, make their ideas and their meaning clear. Socrates was not a speculative thinker. This approach was practical. He would go to the marketplace and ask questions regarding the moral and political notions used by the speakers

in their discussions. For instance people usually talk about politics but their ideas about politics are not clear. They are vague. They are not well-founded. He will so cross examine the participants that they felt the need to modify their ideas. Socrates would give relevant instances from day to day affairs and point out the incorrectness of the meanings of the notions or ideas of the participants. Of course this does not mean that Socrates explicitly formulated his method of philosophical enquiry. However historians of philosophy state that he put a philosophical method into practice. That is to say that his method of philosophising can be understood from his intellectual practice or rational discussions and debates. His thinking exemplifies a pattern of his philosophical procedure or method.

The Socratic philosophical method has the following five characteristics. They are:

**1) Socratic Method is sceptical.** It begins with Socratic profession of ignorance of the truth of the subject matter under discussion. It is an expression of intellectual modesty or humility and honesty on the part of Socrates. This skeptical approach is not final but provisional and tentative. 'Acceptance of ignorance' of the truth is the initial step in one's pursuit of clear and correct knowledge of concepts.

**2) It is conversational or dialogical.** Socrates believed that honest participation in a dialogue helped to clarify ideas and discover truths. Truth can be discussed or unfolded by question and answer technique. Participants in the discussion and dialogue can begin with popular conceptions or hurriedly formed ideas. In other words they can start with common sense beliefs and ideas. They may be borrowed from tradition or from the writings of poets and mythologists or preceding thinkers. When they critically analyze these ideas more correct or adequate conceptions emerge. This method, therefore, is known as maieutic method. It is the technique of intellectual midwifery. Just as a midwife (or nurse) helps a pregnant woman in the process of delivery. Likewise Socrates assisted the participants to bring their ideas to birth. He never claimed to impart knowledge to others. His mother was a traditional midwife. Socrates accepted this model and called himself an intellectual midwife who through questioning and cross examination helped others to clarify their ideas and develop adequate conceptions regarding different topics such as justice.

**3) Thirdly, Socratic Method is definitional and conceptual.** According to this method, the goal of knowledge is the attainment of correct definitions of social and ethical ideas such as justice, wisdom, courage etc. Socrates insisted on defining terms and ideas.

**4) Fourthly, Socratic Method is inductive or empirical.** Socrates always criticized provisional definitions by reference to particular examples or instances. In other words, tentative definitions and concepts were tested by reference to common experience.

**5) Lastly, Socratic Method is deductive too.** It begins with given definition or concept, deduces its implications and then tests them. This definitional and deductive aspect of Socratic Method, historians of Philosophy suggests inspired Plato's dialectical method and exerted considerable influence on the development of Aristotelian logic.

**Check Your Progress:-**

Q.1. Enumerate the characteristics of Socratic Method

---



---



---



---



---

**2.3 – Descartes' Method: Method of Heuristic Doubt :**

Rene Descartes (1596-1650) was a French philosopher. He is known as the father of modern Western or European philosophy. He was also a great mathematician. Mathematical knowledge is characterized by certainty. He wanted to develop a philosophical system which would be characterised by certainty and clearness. He took Mathematics as model of his philosophical method and tried to construct a philosophical system of thought which he thought would possess the certainty of Mathematics. Mathematical method is axiomatic. It begins with self-evident axioms and deduces theorems from these axioms with the help of logical rules of reasoning. So theorems are as certain as the axioms provided one does not make mistakes in his reasoning. Descartes assumed that if this method is extended to philosophy then there will be universally accepted philosophy which will be characterized by certainty. In mathematics, there is agreement on the axiomatic truths or the self-evident first principles.

In philosophy, we do not have such absolutely certain first principles or self-evident axioms from which we can proceed. Take up any principle as an axiom and it will be doubted. Descartes, therefore, devises a procedure of 'methodical doubt.' It is a heuristic device and not a final doubt. He formulated his method of doubt in his important books viz. Discourse on Method and in his Meditations.

The basic rule of his methodical doubt is that he would accept only those beliefs that appeared to him clearly and distinctly to be true. Clarity and distinctness means self-evidence. Simple mathematical

prepositions are accepted by all as true. For instance, two plus two is equal to four. Descartes said that such prepositions are indubitable. They cannot be doubted. How to get at philosophical axioms which we intrinsically incapable of being doubted? Descartes set himself to doubt anything which admitted of doubt. Sense reports do several times deceive us. So we can doubt the very existence of the external objects and the external world. One can even doubt the very existence of the one's body. Thus we can doubt the existence of God too. After doubting everything, can one doubt that one is doubting? Answer is 'no.' It is self defeating. Doubting is a kind of thinking. Descartes thus states in his famous dictum: I think, therefore, I am (cogito ergo sum). This truth is indubitable, certain, absolutely true. Descartes further said that this truth also gives us a criterion or a test of truth. Anything which is clearly and distinctly perceived is as true as self-existence. Self-existence is a self-evident truth which cannot be doubted at all.

### **Check Your Progress:-**

Q.2. What according to Descartes is methodical doubt?

---



---



---



---



---

## **2.4 – The Method of the Mimamsakas:**

The term 'Mimamsa' means inquiry or investigation. There are two Vedic philosophical systems which are known as Purva-Mimamsa or Mimamsa and Uttar-Mimamsa or Vedanta. The former is also known as Karma-Mimamsa or Dharma-Mimamsa and the latter as Jnana-Mimamsa or Brahma-Mimamsa. Sage Jaimini is the founder of Mimamsa system. Jaimini wrote Mimamsa Sutras. Shabarswami wrote a commentary on the Sutras. According to them, holy Vedas are impersonal texts. They are neither written by God nor by any human author. They are infallible authority in regard to obligatory duties. One of the presuppositions of this approach is that human mind is liable to error. We cannot rely upon individual minds. So they rationally try to justify Authoritarian Method. The special feature of Mimamsa philosophy is that it does not accept God as the revealer or author of Vedas or even as the creator of universe. It claims that the impersonal self existent intrinsically valid, authorless. Vedas are the only authority or verbal testimony in regard to religious duties, rites and ceremonial rituals. In other matters, Jaimini accepts perception and inference as sources of knowledge. Action is the final import of the Vedas which are intrinsically

valid. The Vedas stand for a form of uttered words and are self-existent. The relation between words and their meanings is natural and therefore necessary and eternal. Even language is not a creation of human or even of the divine mind. But reason is an important instrument for understanding the import of the Vedas. This needs interpretations of Vedic texts or Vedic sentences. They have given the following exegetical principles to interpret the meaning of the Vedic texts. They are:

Upakramopasamharau Abhyasa-Apurvata Phalam, Arthavada-upapattishca Lingam Tâtparya Nirnaye

The six-fold principles of the interpretation of a text:

- 1) The beginning and the end of the text.
- 2) The points which repeatedly stressed in the text.
- 3) Extraordinary nature of it or its newness or novelty.
- 4) Result or effort.
- 5) Arthavâda (declaratory, assertive statements)
- 6) Rational argumentation or reasoning.

In the light of these principles, the Vedic text should be interpreted. The main objectives of Mimamsa system are to establish the incontrovertible authority of the Vedas as the source of all knowledge about dharma (religion and ceremonial duties or rituals) and to explain the true meaning of these holy books. According to them Vedas are self-revealed texts and therefore authorless. Even the so called all powerful and all-knowing God is not the author of the Vedas. So Mimamsa philosophers accept other sources of knowledge of objects in the world, they accept the Vedas as the only source of knowledge about dharma (religious duties and ceremonial rites).

Naturally their philosophical method is exegetical or hermeneutical. The above mentioned six fold criteria of determining the import of the holy text or chapter in it is applied by Lokmanya Tilak in his Gita Rahasya, a commentary on Bhagavad Gita, to determine the true import of the Bhagavad Gita which is traditionally treated as a part of the triple textual foundation of Vedanta philosophy. The author of Gita Rahasya, has decisively shown that Karmayoga (philosophy of selfless action) is the main purport of the teachings of the Gita. This Tilak demonstrated in the light of the Mimamsa criteria viz. origin of Gita, what is repeatedly advised or asserted in it and its novelty etc. The Mimamsaka's thesis is that main import of the Vedic text is prescriptive. The Vedas are the embodiments of impersonal imperatives or injunctions (Vidhi-vakyas). Dharma consists of Vedic Do's and Don'ts, prescriptions and prohibitions. Positive Vedic injunctions ought to be obeyed and actions

prohibited by the Vedas. They ought not to be done. Dharma consists of Vedic commands only. There are declaratory or descriptive sentences in the Vedas but they are not given importance by the Mimamsakas. They are called Arthavadas i.e. mere glorifications or supporting sentences. Vedas are essentially injunctions or imperatives (vidhi-vakyas) concerning the performance of sacred rites and rituals. Mimamsa's principal aim is to explain these holy commands in regard to rituals and religious acts and the effects of their performance. Hence, their stress on Vedic authority and the exegetical method.

**Check Your Progress:-**

Q.3. Explain the Mimamsakas method of philosophy.

---



---



---



---



---

**2.5 – SUMMARY:**

Method is a kind of pathway to get knowledge or truth. It is also a way of analyzing, clarifying, and evaluating concepts and theories. Thus there is no single method in Indian or Western philosophy. The methods of two Western philosophers and one method from Indian philosophy are taken up for study. The Socratic method is dialogical, inductive, deductive and yet sceptical, while Descartes' method (Cartesian method) is sceptical. Jaimini and Sharbarswami are Mimamsakas. Mimamsa uses investigation. They mainly deal with the concept of Dharma whose source is the Vedas. So their method is hermeneutical and exegetical in nature.

**2.6 – UNIT END QUESTIONS:**

1. Mimamsa method in philosophy is exegetical and hermeneutical. Elaborate.
2. Socratic method is dialogical. Discuss.
3. Cartesian philosophical method is sceptical. Discuss.
4. Briefly discuss the nature and importance of method in philosophy.
5. State and explain Descartes' method of doubt.
6. Describe Mimamsa method of exogenesis (exegetical method of Mimamsa philosophers).

**2.7 – REFERENCES:**

1. Frank Thilly: *A History of Philosophy* (Revised). Henry Holt & Co. New York, 1951.
2. Shankaracharya: *Brahmasutra Bhasya*.

## A Brief Analysis of Pre-Socratic Cosmology: Ionians/Heraclitus/ Parmenides

### UNIT STRUCTURE

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 A brief analysis of pre-Socratic cosmology:  
Ionians/Heraclitus/Parmenides
- 3.3 Vedantic Philosophy 'Tat twam asi' – Shankara and Madhva
- 3.4 Vedantic Philosophy 'Tat twam asi' – Shankara
- 3.5 Vedantic Philosophy 'Tat twam asi' – Madhva
- 3.6 Unit end exercise
- 3.7 Suggested Readings

---

### 3.0 OBJECTIVES :

---

After going through this unit you will be able to understand

- Pre-Socratic cosmology
- The concept of 'Tat twam asi' in Advaiti and Dvaita Vedanta.
- The means of attaining liberation.

---

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION :

---

Greek philosophy begins in the sixth century before Christ. It begins when men for the first time attempted to give a scientific reply to the question, "what is the explanation of the world?" Before, this era we have of course, the mythologies, cosmogonies, and theologies of the poets. But they contain no attempt at the naturalistic explanations of things. They belong to the spheres of poetry and religion, not to philosophy.

#### **Greek philosophy falls naturally into three periods:**

**First.** The first period may be roughly described as pre-Socratic philosophy, though it does not include the Sophists who were both the

contemporaries and the predecessors of Socrates. This period is the rise of Greek philosophy.

**Second.** The period from Sophists to Aristotle which includes Socrates and Plato, is the maturity of Greek philosophy, the actual zenith and the culmination of which is undoubtedly the system of Aristotle.

**Third.** The period of post-Aristotelian philosophy constitutes the decline and the fall of rational thought.

The earliest Greek philosophy is naturalistic: its attention is directed to nature; The philosophers in naturalistic period were concerned with two interdependent problems regarding external nature. The first was the problem of substance: What is the basic substance- or – substances—of which the natural objects are constituted and from which they originate? The second was the problem of change: What is the nature of process by which the basic substance —or —substances change into the familiar objects of sense?.

### **3.2 A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF PRE-SOCRATIC COSMOLOGY: IONIANS / HERACLITUS / PARMENIDES**

**IONIANS :** Philosophy in the Western world is traditionally traced back to ancient Greece, particularly to the region of Ionia, which includes Attica (especially Athens), Samos, Miletus, Ephesus and the islands strung along the Aegean Sea from southeastern Greece to the western coast of Asia Minor. The three men regarded as the first philosophers were Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes. Since they lived in Miletus, these philosophers and their followers became known as the Milesian school. They were known as Ionians because they were all men of Ionia, i.e. to say , the coast of Asia Minor. They were interested in cosmology.

Cosmology is that branch of metaphysics which deals with the nature or essence of the orderly universe- the cosmos. The Ionian philosophers set for themselves the task of ascertaining the nature of substance of cosmic matter, of the very stuff out of which the entire universe is composed.

**Thales (624-526 BC) :** The first Greek thinker is said to be Thales who belonged to Miletus in Asia Minor. He is said to have flourished about 624-526 BC.

The chief aim of Thales was to account for the fundamental stuff of which the universe is made. Hence according to him the universe is fundamentally water because admits of being vaporous, liquid and solid. When water is heated, it assumes the form of vapour; when chilled it becomes solid and when it is allowed in its natural course then it is a flowing stream. Hence water succeeds in explaining all the possible

states of being solid, liquid and vaporous. For this reason, water can be said to be the fundamental stuff of the universe. Even the earth, acc to Thales , is a disc floating on water.

Aristotle , the biologist conjectured that Thales chose water to be the ultimate stuff, for food is always wet and this liquid flood flourishes the body. Even the generating seeds are wet.

The most important thing about Thales is that he gave birth to scientific way of thinking. It is said that he predicted the eclipse which is said to have ccured in 585BC . According to Russel, Thales discovered how to calculate the distance of a ship at sea with the help of observations taken at two points and how to calculate the height of the tree or pyramid from the length of its shadow.

No doubt the philosophy and science of Thales will appear to us to be very crude, but he laid down the foundation of scientific worldview in the sense that his speculation was wholly naturalistic. It was neither anthropomorphic nor theocentric.

**Anaximander (611-547 BC) :** Anaximander was a cosmologist like Thales. However, for him the primary matter was 'boundless something' – a formless, infinite and eternal mass not yet parted into particular kinds of matter. In posting 'boundless mass' as the fundamental stuff of which the world is constituted, he indirectly lays down an important principle, namely, a formless general principle can account for the particulars, but not vice-versa. For example, formless earth mass can be converted into particularized things like pitchers, bricks, tiles etc. But the earthen pitchers cannot be directly shaped into tiles or goblets. In order to give rise to tiles or bricks, the earthen pitcher has to be reduced again to the formless mass of earth. Anaximander appears to have stated that the world is governed by the opposites like hot and cold, wet and dry. It is by working of the opposites that the world goes on. In this context it can be said that the earth, air, water and fire cannot be the ultimate stuff of the universe, for they have opposite characters. For ex. Fire burns and water dampens. If any one of them be allowed to work unfetteredly then the world would either be dry or watery; and the world as such would cease to be.

According to Anaximander, the world has evolved in due course. At one time, there was water everywhere. There were only watery creatures. By drying up of water, land appeared and creatures of the sea were left on the dry land. Those creatures from the sea which could adapt themselves to the dry land alone have survived. One can easily see the germ of organic evolution in the speculative adventure of Anaximander.

Anaximander held that earth is cylindrical in shape and moves freely in space. This position of earth moving freely in the space is once again a foreshadow of the theory of gravitation.

### **Anaximenes (588-524 BC).**

Like Thales and Anaximander, Anaximenes belonged to Miletus. Anaximenes regards 'air' as the primary stuff of the universe. Anaximenes paid more attention to the living than to any other things. Here breath, i.e., air is the predominant thing. Therefore for Anaximenes air is the fundamental stuff of which the world is composed.

Anaximenes chose air as the first thing because of its mobility, changeability, and inner vitality. As a matter of fact, air was considered to be the breath of the universe. Hence this breathing universe was considered to be a living organism.

For Anaximenes, this primary air is regulated by the opposed principles of condensation and rarefaction. Condensation simply means compression of the air in a narrow space and rarefaction means expansion of the air in greater space. By rarefaction air assumes the form of fire, and by successive condensation it gives rise to water, earth and stone.

Anaximenes accounts for all the important elements and states of material things through this fundamental stuff of air. The two principles of condensation and rarefaction are important steps in developing the scientific thinking about the universe.

**3.2.2 HERACLITUS :** The main teaching of Heraclitus is that everything is constant flux. Rivers and mountains and all seemingly permanent things are in constant flux. All is flow and becoming. No one can step into the same river twice, for when a man enters into a river, then he meets one stream of water and the next moment the other stream passes away, yielding a newer stream of water. One can easily see that no man can ever remain the same for even two moments. Blood stream changes and also the mental stream. Man keeps on changing from moment to moment.

For Heraclitus, not water or air is the primordial stuff. Process alone is reality and is best symbolized by fire. Hence fire is ever changing entity which constitutes reality. Fire keeps on changing every moment, burning fuel into ash and that ash too changes.

There is an abiding order in the ever-changing fire. All things come from fire and return to fire. There is the downward way and also the upward way. According to the downward way, through condensation fire changes into water and earth. And again according to the upward way, through rarefaction, water and earth give way to fire. This order of

succession produces the illusion of permanence. For Heraclitus, senses give us wrong information about what is permanent. Men wrongly sense the mountain and river as abiding. Reason will convince them that all is flux. This distinction of sense and reason remains influential in Plato and other subsequent thinkers.

**3.2.3 PARMENIDES :** Parmenides was a contemporary of Heraclitus. For Heraclitus, reality is change, flux and becoming. According to Parmenides, reality is one, eternal and unchangeable Being.

The reflection of Parmenides takes its rise from observation of the transitoriness and changeableness of things. The world, as we know it is a world of change and mutation. All things arise and pass away. Nothing is permanent. The truth of things cannot lie here, for no knowledge of that which is constantly changing is possible. Hence, the thought of Parmenides becomes the effort to find the eternal amid the shifting, the abiding and ever lasting amid the change and mutation of things. And there arises in this way the antithesis between Being and Not being. The absolutely real is Being. Not being is the unreal. And this Not being he identifies with becoming, with the world of shifting and changing things, the world which is known to us by the senses. The world of sense is unreal, illusory, a mere appearance. It is not being. Only Being truly is for Parmenides the sole reality, the first principle of things is Being. Wholly unmixed with Not being. The character of Being he describes for the most part, in a series of negatives. There is in it no change, it is absolutely unchangeable and imperishable

In Parmenides, there emerges for the first time a distinction of fundamental importance in philosophy, the distinction between Sense and Reason. The senses are the sources of all illusion and error. Truth lies only in reason.

For Parmenides, reason and sense are opposed. This was maintained by Plato and many other thinkers. Leibnitz and Kant have tried to reconcile their mutual claims in modern times.

**3.2.4 SUMMARY :** Early Greek thinkers were free thinkers. They tried to explain things according to natural causes like earth, water, fire and air. Acc to Thales, the world arises from water and returns again into water. Acc to Anaximander, the ultimate stuff of universe is the boundless something and undifferentiated mass. Anaximenes held that air is the fundamental thing underlying the whole universe. For Heraclitus, everything is flux and ever changing and fire is the ultimate symbol. For Parmenides, the sole reality is Being. These thinkers did not take the help of supernatural gods. Hence Greek philosophy is called scientific in spirit.

**Check your progress :-**

1. What according to Thales is the ultimate reality?

---



---



---



---

2. Explain the nature of the basic substance of which the world is composed, according to Anaximander

---



---



---



---

3. What according to Alaximenes is, the fundamental stuff of which the universe is made?

---



---



---



---

### **3.3 VEDANTIC PHILOSOPHY 'TAT TWAM ASI' – SHANKARA AND MADHVA :**

**3.3.1 INTRODUCTION :** The Vedas are probably the oldest (1500-800 BC) scriptures in the recorded history of man. They are the source of sacred knowledge and wisdom of orthodox Hinduism in its various forms. Veda is etymologically related to 'wit', meaning knowledge. The Vedas are regarded by Hindus as divine in origin and not the work of Human authors; accordingly they are looked upon as timely and eternal.

'Vedanta' literally means 'the end of Vedas'. Vedanta is originally the name given to Upanishad because they are the end of vedic literature and also because they impart ultimate form of vedic knowledge. The word 'Upanishad' is derived from the root 'sad' which means (i) to sit down (ii) to destroy and (iii) to loosen. 'Upa' means 'near by' and 'ni' disciple near his teacher in a devoted manner to receive instruction about the highest Reality and it is used by the Upanishads in this sense (rahasya or guhya vidya). The Muktikopanishad gives the number of the Upanishads as 108. But ten or eleven Upanishads are regarded as important and authentic, on which Shankaracharya has commented. These are: Isha, Kena, Katha, Prashna, Mundaka, Mandukya, Taittiriya, Aitareya, Chhandogya and Brhadaranyaka. The teaching, being the highest, was imparted at private sittings only to qualified disciples.

The problems of Upanishads are: What is the Reality from which all things originate, by which all live and into which all dissolve when destroyed? What is that by knowing which everything can be known? What is that by knowing which one can attain mortality?. What is Brahman? What is Atman? As the very nature of these questions implies, the Upanishadic mind was already steeped in the belief that there is an all pervasive reality underlying all thing which arise from, exist in and return to it; that there is some reality by knowing which immortality can be attained. The name given to this Reality is sometimes Brahman (God), sometimes Atman (Self), sometimes simply Sat (Being).

Many scholars like Shankara, Ramanuja, Madhva, Vallabha have written commentaries on Vedanta philosophy which are now regarded as distinct philosophical schools.

### **3.4 VEDANTIC PHILOSOPHY 'TAT TWAM ASI' – SHANKARA :**

**Advaita Vedanta of Shankara:** Shankara (788-820 AD) was born of brahman parentage in Kaladi, a village in the present Kerala state. He was a disciple of Govindapada. He was the greatest philosophers among the Indian thinkers in intellectual eminence. He wrote commentaries on the principal Upanishads, the Brahmasutra, and the Bhagvad Gita.

The system of Vedanta philosophy as advocated by Shankara is called Advaita or Non-dualism. The system of Advaita Vedanta may be summarizes in half a verse which runs as follows: Brahman is the only Reality; the world is ultimately false; and the individual soul is non-different from Brahman. Brahman and Atman are synonymous terms. The world is the creation of Maya. The individual selves on account of their inherent Avidya imagine themselves as different from Brahman and mistake Brahman as this world of plurality, even as we mistake a rope as a snake. Avidya vanishes at the dawn of knowledge- the supra-relational direct and intuitive knowledge of the non-dual self which means liberation.

**Brahman :** According to Shankara, ultimate reality is Atman or Brahman which is Pure Consciousness or Consciousness of Pure Self which is devoid of all attributes and all categories of intellect. Brahman is the only reality. It is absolutely indeterminate and non-dual. It is beyond speech and mind. It is indescribable because no description of Brahman can be complete. The best description of Brahman is through the negative formula of 'neti neti' or 'not this, not this'. The moment we try to bring this Brahman within the categories of intellect or try to make this ultimate subject an object of our thought we miss its essential nature. Then it no more remains Unconditioned Consciousness, but becomes conditioned as it were. This Brahman reflected in or conditioned by Maya is called Ishvara or God or Saguna Brahman . Ishvara is the personal aspect of

impersonal Brahman. This is the celebrated distinction between God and the Absolute which Shankara, following the Upanishads, makes.

**Ishvara or God:** Ishvara or God is the Sat-Chit-Ananda, the Existence-Consciousness-Bliss. He is the Perfect Personality. He is the Lord of Maya. He is immanent in the whole universe which He controls from within. He is also transcendental, for in His own Destroyer of this universe. He is the Creator, Sustainer and Destroyer of this universe. He is the source of everything. He is the object of devotion. He is the inspirer of moral life.

**Jiva or Individual self :** The jiva is non-different from Brahman. Jiva on account of ignorance has false notion of 'I' and 'Mine'. Ultimately there is no difference at all between jiva and Brahman. Only so long as the jiva does not discard Nescience leading to duality and does not realize its own true nature , he remains the individual self. Slumbering in ignorance, when he is awakened by the shruti, he realize that he is not the body , senses, or mind , but is the non dual universal Self—— tat tvam asi(that thou art) I

**Bondage:** Shankara holds that man's state of bondage and suffering is due to ignorance ( avidya ). Owing to ignorance, the soul erroneously associates itself with the body, gross and subtle. This is called bondage. In this state it forgets that it is really Brahman. It behaves like a finite, limited, miserable being which runs after transitory wordly objects and is pleased to get them, sorry to miss them. It identifies itself with a finite body and mind ( anthakarana) and thinks 'I am stout', 'I am lame', 'I am ignorant'. Thus arises the conception of the self as the 'Ego' or 'I'. This limited ego opposes itself to the existence, which is thought to be different from it. The ego is not, therefore, the real self, but is only an apparent limitation of it.

**Moksha or Liberation :** Shankara declares in many passages that the nature of the liberation is a state of oneness with Brahman. Moksha is nothing foreign to us but only the realization of our own true or real nature. Liberation is not the production of anything new, it is the realization what is always there even in the stage of bondage, though not known then. The attainment of Liberation is therefore, compared by Shankara to the finding of the necklace on the neck by one who forgot its existence there and searched for it here and there. Liberation is not really the absence of misery . It is a state of positive bliss and Ananda.

**The meaning of Tat Tvam Asi or That Thou Art. :** Shankara believes in unqualified monism. All distinctions between objects and objects, the subject and the object, the self and god are the illusory creation of maya. Man is apparently composed of the body and the soul. But the

body which perceive is, like every other material object, merely an illusory appearance. When this is realized, the reality that remains is the soul which is nothing other than the God. The saying, 'That Thou art', means that there is an unqualified identity between the soul, that underlies the apparently finite man, and God.

According to Shankara the upanishadic saying Tat Tvam Asi, That Thou Art, means 'That' and 'Thou' are identical. It means there is an identity between the soul and God. We have to understand therefore, the word 'Thou' to imply pure consciousness underlying man and 'That' to imply also pure consciousness which forms the essence of God. Between these two complete identity exists.

**Knowledge is the means of attaining Liberation :** According to Advaita Vedanta, Moksha is attained through Jnana—Yoga. Shankara repeatedly asserts that the absolute can be realized through knowledge alone; Karma and upasana are subsidiary. They may help us in urging us to know Reality and they may prepare us for that Knowledge by purifying our mind, but ultimately it is Knowledge alone which, by destroying ignorance, the root cause of this world, can enable us to be one with the Absolute.

According to Shankara Ignorance or Avidya is the root cause of Bondage. Shankara says that just as light is opposed to darkness and light alone can dispel darkness in the same manner. Knowledge is opposed to ignorance. So knowledge alone can destroy ignorance, which is the root cause of bondage. According to Shankara the study of the Vedanta helps man to destroy ignorance completely. According to Shankara Knowledge is not possible without a Guru. So one who aspires for liberation should first go to a Guru who has realized Brahman.

Advaita Vedanta recommends the fourfold discipline as a practical aid to the aspirant to moksha. The discipline consists of Samanyasa, Shravana, Manana, and Nidhidhyasana.

**a) Samanyasa :** It consists in cultivating in one self the following qualities  
**Firstly**, one should be able to discriminate between what is eternal and what is not eternal.

**Secondly**, he should be able to give up all desires for enjoyment of objects here and hereafter.

**Thirdly**, he should control his mind and develop qualities like detachment, patience, power of concentration.

**Lastly**, he should have an ardent desire for liberation

**b) Shravana :** Shravana is listening to the teacher's instruction and studying the vedantic texts. Through shravana one learns the sole reality of Brahman and the identity of atman and Brahman ( That Thou Art ).

**c) Manana :** it is the stage of the reflection , in which the disciple subjects to systematic analysis and investigation what he learned from his guru and works of the sages . He examines the teachings and weighs them in the light of reason—— arguments, counterarguments, analogy from everyday experience, etc——and becomes intellectually convinced of their truth.

**d) Nidhidhyasana :** The aspirant now undertakes Dhyana (Nidhidhyasana ) on the central Advaitic truth That Thou Art'. Through prolonged and intense meditation he comes to see in a flash of intuition that he is indeed Brahman , the sole reality. Liberation ( mukti ) is thus attained

**Jivanmukti and Videhamukti :** Shankara believes in Jivanmukti and that is liberation can be attained here and now when one is alive. It is possible even while the soul is associated with the body. But the liberated soul does never again identify itself with the body. The world still appears before him, but he is not deceived by it. He does not feel any desire for the world's objects. He is, therefore, not affected by the world's misery. He is in the world and yet out of it. When the body, gross and subtle, perishes, the jivan- mukta is said to attain the disembodied state of liberation (videhamukti).

**3.4.1 SUMMARY:** The Vedanta deals with the nature and knowledge of Brahman. Its central concept is Brahman. It systematizes the teachings of the Upanishads. The school of Advaita Vedanta was founded by Shankara. He advocates absolutism or spiritualistic monism. He regards the indeterminate Brahman or the Absolute as the ontological reality, and God, the individual souls and the world as phenomenal appearances which have only empirical reality. According to Shankara Bondage is due to ignorance. Knowledge is the means of attaining liberation. Shrivana , Manana and Nidhidhyasana are necessary for liberation.

**Check your progress :-**

1 Disinquire between Brahman and Ishvara in Shankara's Philosophy.

---



---



---



---



---

2 Discuss the four fold discipline of samanyasa, shravana, manana and nidhidhyasana in Shankara's Philosophy

---



---



---



---



---

### **3.5 VEDANTIC PHILOSOPHY 'TAT TWAM ASI' – MADHVA:**

**Madhva's Life :** Shri Madhavacharya was born in the year 1238 A.D. in a village about three miles from Udipi in coastal Karnataka. Madhva began his philosophic studies under Achutyapreksha. But, dissatisfied with his teacher's non-dualistic interpretation of Vedanta, Madhva left Achyapreksha. After several years of independent study and reflection, he produced his own interpretation of Vedanta which developed into, the school of Dvaitya Vedanta. He was the author of thirty-seven works, among which the most important are Madhvabhasya and Gitabhasya, commentaries on the Brahma-sutras and the Bhagvad-Gita, respectively. Consistent with his unremitting dualism, Madhva's religion is personalistic theism. He holds that God who is HARI, Vishnu, Narayana or Vasudeva can be known only by the scriptures. He worshipped Brahman in the form of Visnu and founded the sect of Sad-Vaisnavism, also known as Brahma-Vaisnavism. Madhva traveled widely teaching his philosophy and religion and debating with his opponents. Among his converts was his former teacher. Madhva died in 1278.

**Dvaita Vedanta :** The system of Vedanta philosophy as advocated by Madhva is known as Dvaita Vedanta. He is a staunch advocate of dualism. He upholds thorough going dualism between the world and Brahman. Madhva recognizes two kinds of reality, independent and dependent. God is the independent reality. Individual souls and the world are dependent realities.

Madhva advocates the reality of five-fold differences between soul and God, between soul and soul, between soul and matter, between God and matter , and between matter and matter.

**God :** For Madhva, reality, then, consist of three eternal, absolutely real, and irreducibly distinct entities, namely , Brahman , selves, and matter, although the last two are absolutely dependent on the first. Madhva regards Samkara's Nirguna-Brahman not as reality but as an empty and absurd concept and takes Samkara' Saguna(qualified) –Brahman as ultimate reality. That is, Madhva's Brahman is Samkara's Saguna Brahman. Madhva teaches that Brahman is God, the creator, the sustainer and the destroyer of the world (selves and material objects) and is the Lord of Karma. God creates the world only in the sense that

by this will he brings into existence the world of variety and multiplicity. At the time of dissolution of the world, God transforms all material objects into homogenous primordial matter and selves into disembodied intelligences. It is important, however, to note that even in the state of dissolution, there remain the distinction between selves, matter and God. God, according to Madhva, is a person, whose essence is reality, consciousness, and bliss. He possesses all the positive qualities in infinite perfection. He is both transcendent and immanent

**The Jiva:** The soul is eternal; its birth and death are due to its connection with and separation from its body. The individual soul (jiva) is the knower, enjoyer and doer. It is subject to happiness and misery. The soul is dependent on God. Though the soul is dependent on God, it is an active agent, performs right and wrong actions and acquires merits and demerits. It freely adapts means to its ends and adopts various methods to achieve liberation. But its free activity is controlled by God. It has no absolute freedom. It is not an absolute agent. It is allowed relative freedom by its divine master. God guides the free actions of the jivas.

There are three kinds of souls: (1) eternally free souls, like Lakshmi; (2) liberated soul like gods, rsis, fathers and men (3) the bound. Among the bound souls some are eligible for liberation, some are beyond to samsara for ever and others are intended for hell.

**The meaning of 'Tat twam asi':** The jives are different from God. There are absolute identity between them. God is the worshipped master. The jives are his worshipping servants. The Deity and the devotee are different from each other. God is omniscient, omnipotent and perfect. The jiva has finite knowledge, limited power and is absolutely dependent on God. God dwells in the soul. But he does not experience its joys and sorrows. He enjoys bliss only arising from its good actions. God is real; the soul is real; their difference is real.

The text 'Tat twam asi' does not convey identity of the soul with God. It means that the soul has similarity in essence with God. Madhva reads 'Sa atma tat twam asi' as 'Sa atma atat twam asi'. 'That atman, thou art not'. The soul is not identical with God. The jiva and God are always different from each other. The knowledge of difference between them liberates a person. He is the refuge of all liberated souls. They enjoy his companionship and bliss. He is their abode. He is their final goal.

**Bondage:** Selves are eternal and atomic; consciousness and bliss are intrinsic to them. But owing to their past karma, selves become entangled with bodies and suffer pain and misery.

**Bhakti is the only means of attaining liberation:** Madhva recognizes total devotion and self-surrender to God as the only means of salvation.

Accordingly, bhakti-yoga is the sole path to liberation. According to Madhva, Bhakti is defined as Eternal Love for God with full sense of His Greatness.

Liberation is attained through knowledge of the excellence of the qualities of God. It cannot be attained through knowledge of its identity with God. It can be attained through the knowledge of its difference from and inferiority to Him. The Jiva gets released through the grace of God. It cannot be achieved without His grace. When a devotee surrenders himself to and takes refuge in God, He grants him saving knowledge of difference and liberates him. Devotion, knowledge, performance of duties are the means to release. Truthfulness, study of scriptures, charity, benevolence, compassion, desire for God, meditation, righteousness, faith, devotion and worship of God should be cultivated. Yogic practices also are enjoined.

**Difference of the liberated soul from God:** For Samkara, salvation consists in the loss of personal self and individuality in the impersonal Absolute. For Madhva, salvation does not result in the loss of self or its individuality. On the contrary, the liberated self retains its individuality and consciousness and enjoys eternal bliss in the infinite glory of God. According to Madhva, the liberated self is only partially similar to God.

Madhva emphasizes the difference of the liberated soul from God. The soul becomes similar to God in some respects when it is liberated, yet even in these respects it is much inferior to God. It does not enjoy the full bliss of God. The bliss enjoyed by the redeemed souls is four-fold: residence in the same place with God; nearness to God; having the external form like that of God; and entering into the body of God and partially sharing His bliss with Him.

When the soul casts off its inessential forms, and is restored to its pure spiritual essence, it attains final release. Until the karmas accumulated in the past births are completely worn off, the body continues. When they are exhausted, final release is attained.

**Check your progress :-**

1. Explain the concept of soul in Madhva's philosophy.

---



---



---



---



---

2. Explain the meaning of 'Tat twam asi' in Dvaita Vedanta.

---



---



---



---



---

### **3.5.1 SUMMARY :**

---

The school of Dvaita Vedanta was founded by Madhva. Madhva's philosophy is a philosophy of difference. He recognizes five fundamental and absolute distinctions. Selves are eternal and atomic; consciousness and bliss are intrinsic to them. But owing to their past karma, selves become entangled with bodies and suffer pain and misery. Bhakti-yoga is the sole path to liberation.

---

### **3.6 UNIT END EXERCISE :**

---

1. Give a brief analysis of pre-Socratic cosmology.
2. What is the only means of realization according to Shankara?
3. What is the concept of Moksha according to Shankara?
4. Explain the concept of 'Tat twam asi' in Advaita Vedanta.
5. Explain the concept of 'Tat twam asi' in Dvaita Vedanta.
6. What is the only means of liberation according to Madhva?
7. Explain in detail the concept of liberation in Dvaita Vedanta.

---

### **3.7 SUGGESTED READINGS:**

---

Fundamentals of Indian Philosophy – R. Puligandla  
 A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy – C.D.Sharma  
 A Critical History of Greek Philosophy – W.T.Stace  
 History of Philosophy – William S. Sahakian.

## **SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE: REASON AND EXPERIENCE**

**A: Descartes and Locke**

**B: Nyâya and Cârvâk**

### **Unit Structure**

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Controversy between Rationalism and Empiricism
- 4.3 Rene Descartes
- 4.4 John Locke
- 4.5 Nyâya System
- 4.6 Cârvâk System

---

### **4.0 – OBJECTIVES:**

After studying this unit, the students will know the role of reason and sense-experience in human knowledge. They will be acquainted with two main theories in this regard: Rationalism and Empiricism. They will understand the contribution of some Western and some Indian philosophers in this context.

---

### **4.1 – INTRODUCTION:**

Epistemology is one of the main and basic branches of philosophy. It studies the nature of human knowledge, sources of human knowledge, and the extent and limits of it. It also investigates the criteria of the validity of knowledge. Two main sources of human knowledge are sense-experience or perception, and reason or inference. Modern Western philosophy is characterized by the controversy between Empiricism and Rationalism. Advocates of both schools tried to break with the past and to think afresh. According to Empiricists, sense-experience is the necessary source of knowledge. According to Rationalists, reason or intellect is the source of knowledge. Locke advocated Empiricism, while Descartes stood for Rationalism

The source of knowledge is an important epistemological problem. Generally two sources of knowledge are acceptable to the majority of thinkers—reason and experience. The term experience in this context

stands for sensational and perceptual experience. On the other hand, the term reason indicates reasoning or inference, which is the function of the human intellect and mind. Both Descartes and Locke advocated a break with the traditional authoritarian method and verbal testimony. One has to think for oneself. Descartes and Locke tried their best to develop new theories of knowledge. Knowledge is objective and universal. According to Descartes, reason is the source of such knowledge. While according to John Locke, sense-experience is the source of simple ideas and with the help of them the mind actively develops complex ideas or knowledge. During Medieval Europe, the authority (Bible, Biblical tradition, and the Church) were considered the source of knowledge.

---

#### **4.2 Controversy between Rationalism and Empiricism:**

According to Empiricism, perceptual experience or sense-experience is a necessary basis to all human knowledge. Empiricists claim that all knowledge requires empirical premises based on empirical data. Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and J.S. Mill are classical example of this type of empiricism. According to Rationalism, reason or intellect is the source of all human knowledge. Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, and Wolff are classical examples of this kind of rationalism.

There is the central question at issue between these classical philosophical rationalists and philosophical empiricists. That issue is about the doctrine of innate ideas, or *a priori* concepts (17th century). Advocates of innate ideas claim that there are some ideas which are not derived from sense-experience. It is fundamental to empiricist claims to deny the existence of such ideas. The rationalists accept the mathematical model, while the empiricists admire the model of rational sciences such as physics. Both schools of thought reject authoritarianism or the authoritarian method of traditional philosophy. In this unit we are mainly concerned with some philosophers' view regarding the sources of knowledge. We are not concerned with the recent developments in this context.

---

#### **4.3 – RENE DESCARTES (1596-1650):**

Descartes is well known as the Father of modern European or Western Philosophy. He was born in France. His three discourses, which contain the *Discourse on Method*, published in 1637 are considered as the first great philosophical work to be written in French. In 1641, he published his *Meditations*. Descartes was not only a philosopher but also a natural scientist who was interested in physics and physiology. Above all he was a great mathematician. He treated mathematics as an instrument of science. This thought profoundly influenced Descartes'

philosophical thinking. He thought that mathematics gave a paradigm or model of certain knowledge and of the method of attaining such knowledge.

What is the reason of certainty in mathematical knowledge? Mathematical knowledge is based on self-evident axioms, or first principles. They are clearly and distinctly pursued as self-evident truths. In other words, they are indubitable. That is to say that it is hard to doubt them. They are intrinsically valid or self-certifying. Once we have such self-evident first principle or truths, then with the rules of reasoning or logic, theorems can be validly deduced from them. If axioms are characterised by certainty, then the theorems validly deduced from axioms are also characterised by certainty. Descartes wanted to apply this method to philosophy. In mathematics, there is no appeal to the sense-experiences or the reports of sense-experiences. Human reasoning is the sole source of mathematical knowledge. In this sense, Descartes claimed that by pure reasoning, we can achieve knowledge. Rationalism thus is a philosophical theory which claims that reason, and not empirical experiences, are the source of human knowledge. Rationalism is therefore opposed to Empiricism, which believes sense-experience is a necessary basis to all human knowledge.

Descartes accepted mathematics as the model of his philosophical method and tried to construct a system of thought which would possess certainty. Such knowledge cannot be attained from traditional authoritarian methods or scholastic philosophy since there are many different opinions on one and the same subject. Even today, every subject in philosophy is still being disputed. Therefore, we ought to follow the method of mathematics.

In order to find out the body of certain and self-evident first principles or axiomatic truths, Descartes begins with a method of methodical doubt. It is not a position of scepticism but a method of doubt to get at the indubitable starting point which will be the unshakable foundation of the edifice of knowledge. We should not be influenced by traditional beliefs and prejudices. We also cannot rely upon our sensations because they often deceive us. So Descartes argues that we must begin doubting whatever beliefs we have received from traditional scholastic systems or from our teachers and parents. Any belief can be doubted. But one thing is certain that I cannot doubt that I am doubting. Doubting is a kind of thinking. I cannot doubt that I am thinking when I am doubting different beliefs and thoughts. Thus to doubt means to think and to think means to be. This led Descartes to his famous dictum: *Cogito ergo sum* – I think, therefore I am.

This is the first and foremost certain knowledge that occurs to anyone who thinks methodically. Self-existence is an indubitable, self-evident truth. It cannot be doubted. It is self-defeating to doubt it. There is no appeal to empirical psychological act or fact. There is no appeal to reasoning or inference either. It is a kind of intuitive truth that everyone has to accept. The act of doubting implies a doubter. The act of thinking implies a thinker. This truth is immediately perceived. According to Descartes, this principle also gives us a criteria or a test of truth. Any proposition which is clearly and distinctly perceived like it is true. Thus Descartes' methodical doubt leads to the self-evident truth, viz. self-existence is absolutely certain.

Since 'self' is a thinking substance according to him, Descartes tried to analyse the contents of this thinking substance (*Res Cogitans*). He found that we think by means of ideas. Among them some ideas are innate, e.g. one as the same thing cannot both be and not be, the same proposition cannot both be true and false at the same time (Law of Non-Contradiction). We need not discuss here what he deduced from this self-evident truth.

#### **Check Your Progress:-**

Q.1. "Descartes was a rationalist." Discuss.

---



---



---



---



---



---

#### **4.4 – JOHN LOCKE (1632-1704):**

John Locke studied philosophy, natural science and medicine at Oxford. He was not happy with the scholastic methods of instruction. He obtained a medical degree in 1674 to practice medicine. His interest in philosophy was mainly aroused and strengthened by the study of Descartes' books. He was influenced by the writings of Descartes but he was not satisfied with the doctrine of innate ideas.

Human knowledge consists of ideas or operates with ideas. Locke's first task is to investigate the origin of knowledge. In other words, it means to investigate the origin of ideas with which knowledge operates. Ideas are something or anything of which we can think. Idea means whatsoever the human mind directly apprehends. In other words, an idea is the immediate object of perception, thought or understanding.

Locke first directs his critical enquiry against the doctrine of innate idea. Innate ideas are supposed to be inborn ideas. They are there in the human mind since man's birth. They are neither created by us nor

derived from or acquired through our experiences. Sometimes it was claimed that the idea of God or the ideas of moral laws and principles are innate. According to Locke, this is not so. This can be shown by examining children, idiots, savages and illiterate persons. There is no simple idea of God. Even moral principles of different communities differ. Hence it is necessary to minutely investigate the development of ideas in the human mind. This he did in his treatise, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, published in 1690.

Locke begins with this task of examination of the human mind. According to him, the human mind is a *tabula rasa*, a blank white sheet of paper without any content or ideas, i.e. without any characters. There are no inborn ideas in the mind. Ideas denote the content of human mind or consciousness. All ideas spring from experience. All knowledge is formed as and ultimately derived from external sensation or inner reflection. Some ideas come from sense-perceptions (outer experience), some come from reflection (inner experience), and still others spring partly from sensations and partly from reflection. Thus the human mind is passive in receiving these ideas. By means of sensation the effects of external objects are received. By means of reflection or internal experiences, we perceive our inner states and activities. This perception—inner or outer—is immediate and passive. According to Locke, ideas acquired through sensation and reflection are simple ideas. The mind has the power to reject, compare and combine them to then form complex ideas. The simple ideas are the material of the mind or consciousness. The mind elaborates them in different ways and thus knowledge is developed. The simple ideas are thus produced in the mind by the outer things through external experiences. However, they may not resemble the qualities of outer things. Primary qualities, such as extension, figure, etc., belong to objects. Secondary qualities, such as colour, taste, etc., do not belong to the objects. But simple ideas contribute material with which the mind develops complex ideas. It compares, contrasts and combines simple ideas and thus complex ideas are formed, e.g. ideas of relations, ideas of space and time, abstract ideas. The senses of touch and sight help us form the complex idea of space. Reflection (inner perception) gives us direct knowledge of the succession of ideas. Thus the complex idea of time is formed. The idea of substance is a complex idea. Substance is conceived as different from the qualities. So the complex idea of substance or a thing is an idea of bearer or support of qualities. Causal relation is the idea of relation of cause and effect. The ideas of material substance, of soul, and of God are all also complex ideas.

Validity of knowledge is an important topic. Simple ideas possess validity. They agree with the reality from which they proceed. The secondary qualities do not belong to the objects. Yet they correspond to the objects because they are their constant effects. But complex ideas are derived ideas. They are the result of active combination and comparison on the part of the human mind. They are not copies of things. The concept of substance is the concept of an unknown bearer of qualities.

In this sense, knowledge is the perception of the agreement and disagreement of ideas. Empirical knowledge of external things is probable and the knowledge of God is demonstrative and not perceptual. Surprisingly, Locke himself has accepted the truth that substance is something which he did not know. This is true in regard to both material substance (matter) and spiritual substance (God). When he was asked what matter was, Locke's reply was simply, "I know not what." Locke's empiricism does not give the guarantee that the complex ideas of material and spiritual substance correspond to the objectively existing entities because they are formed by humans by comparing and combining simple ideas.

In short, the materials of human knowledge are supplied to the human mind by external sensation and inner reflection. Mind is passive in receiving these materials; but it is active in acting upon them and making complex ideas. Thus all human knowledge is gained by means of ideas. Knowledge is intuitive if we grasp it directly. For example, white is not black, and a circle is not a triangle. Such knowledge is self-evident and immediate. Knowledge of one's existence is intuitive. Mediate or rational knowledge is demonstrative. It is found in mathematics. It shows the limits of human knowledge. It cannot reach further than our ideas. If there are no ideas, then there is no knowledge. Simple ideas represent external things. The case of complex ideas of substances and relation is different. The substances remain the unknown bearer of certain qualities.

### **Check Your Progress :-**

Q.2. "Locke was an empiricist." Discuss.

---



---



---



---



---

### **4.5 – SUMMARY:**

Descartes was a rationalist. According to him, reason is the source of knowledge which is objective and universal. Descartes was unhappy

with differences of opinion on all philosophical issues. He wanted to apply the mathematical model to gain certain philosophical knowledge. Math begins with certain self-evident axioms. Theorems deduced from them are also equally certain.

Locke was an empiricist. According to him, sense-experience is the source of knowledge. There are no innate or a priori ideas. All simple ideas spring from outer perception and inner perception (reflection). Mind is an empty cabinet. It passively received ideas and then actively compares and combines them to form complex ideas.

---

#### **4.6 – UNIT END QUESTIONS:**

---

1. What is the mathematical model?
2. Descartes tried to apply the mathematical model to philosophy. Discuss.
3. Discuss Locke's views on the human mind.
4. Elaborate on Locke's criticism of the doctrine of innate ideas.

---

#### **4A.0 – OBJECTIVES:**

---

After going through this unit, students will know about some Indian rationalists and empiricists. Gautam accepts four sources of knowledge which can be brought under three categories: 1) sense-experience, 2) reason, 3) authority. Charavaka accepts only one source of knowledge and that is perception.

---

#### **4a.1 – INTRODUCTION:**

---

Epistemology in Indian philosophical tradition is highly developed. Indian philosophers have thoroughly discussed the issues regarding the nature of knowledge (*pramā*), the means or sources of knowledge (*pramānas*), objects of knowledge (*prameya*), the knower of knowledge (*pramâtâ*), and the extent and limit of human knowledge. They have also critically discussed the problem of error in human knowledge. There are nine main Indian philosophical systems. They are traditionally classified into two groups, the *âstika* and the *nâstika*. *Âstika* systems accept the authority of the Vedas as the source of traditional knowledge. They also accept other means of knowledge, especially Nyâya. *Nâstika* systems do not accept the authority of the Vedas as a source of any kind of knowledge. Thus *Âstikas* are Vedic systems and *Nâstikas* are non-Vedic systems of philosophy. We need not discuss different sources of knowledge accepted by different schools of Indian philosophy. Here we are mainly concerned only with two views: the Nyâya view of sources of knowledge and that of the Charavakas.

---

## 4A.2 - NYÂYA SYSTEM:

---

The Nyâya system of thought is one of the Vedic systems of Indian philosophy. It was founded by Gautam (2nd century B.C.) or Aksapâda, who wrote the Nyâya-Sutras. Nyâya is also known as the Aksapâda system and Nyâya-vidyâ. Gautam is also well-known as the founder of ancient Indian logic. So Nyâya is also called Tarka-Sâstra (the science of reasoning) and Anviksiki (the science of critical study). The Sanskrit term 'Nyâya' is commonly understood as meaning 'argumentation' or 'reasoning'. It shows that the Nyâya system followed a predominantly intellectualistic and analytical method in its philosophical investigations. It is also known as Hetu-vidyâ or the science of causes or reasons. Vatsyayana (4th century A.D.) has written a commentary on the Nyâya-Sutras of Gautama. There are also commentaries upon commentaries written by other Nyâya philosophers.

The Nyâya system is divided into two schools: 1) Prâcina Nyâya (ancient school), and 2) Navya Nyâya (modern school). Gangesh (10th century A.D.) is the founder of the modern school. He wrote Tattvacintâmani. Gautam's Nyâya deals with 16 philosophical topics. The first category is *Pramâna* (sources of knowledge). Nyâya accepts four ways of knowing: 1) perception (*Pratyaksha Pramâna*), 2) inference (*Anumâna Pramâna*), 3) verbal testimony or authority (*Sabda Pramâna*), and 4) comparison (*Upamana Pramâna*). The Nyâya system is realistic. According to it, objects of knowledge exist independently of the knower, knowledge or mind, while ideas and feelings depend upon the mind. Like light, knowledge is the manifestation of objects; it reveals objects by removing darkness.

Knowledge is broadly divided into presentative cognition (*anubhav*) and representative cognition (*smriti*). Valid presentative knowledge is *Pramâ*. If it is invalid, it is called *Apramâ*. Doubts and errors are forms of invalid knowledge. Valid knowledge is definite and unerring (*Yathârtha*) and non-reproductive experience of an object. Knowledge is true if it corresponds to facts; otherwise it is false. But the test of truth is successful practical activity. True knowledge leads to successful and fruitful activity (*Pravritti Sâmarthya*), while false knowledge ends in practical failure (*Pravritti Visamvâda*).

### 1) Perception (*Pratyaksha Pramâna*):

It is immediate cognition. It is produced by sense-object contact. It is true and definite cognition of objects. So it is defined as a definite cognition produced by sense-object contact and is true or unerring. If one sees a table, this is a contact of one's senses with the table and one is sure that the object is a table. It is characterized by directness or

immediacy. This is true of direct cognition of the feelings of pleasure and pain.

Perception is differently classified. It may be ordinary (*laukika*) or extraordinary (*alaukika*). In the former, there is a sense-object contact. In the latter, there is no sense-object contact. Secondly, perception may be external (*bâhya*) or internal (*mânasa*). Thus there are six types of ordinary perception: visual, auditory, tactual, gustatory (taste), olfactory (smell) and the mental (*mânasa*).

**Extraordinary perception is of three kinds:**

1. Samanya-laksana: perception of classes. The sense by which we see an object also gives us knowledge of the class (universal) of that object.
2. Jnana-laksana: complication. E.g. ice looks cold, the stone looks hard. Modern psychologists like Wundt and Ward have accepted perception by complication.
3. Yogaja: intuitive perception of the Yogis. Perfect yogis intuitively perceive all objects and even past objects.

According to another perspective, there are two modes of perception. They are:

1. Nirvikalpaka Pratyksya: indeterminate and indefinite. It is a kind of bare sensation. Something is sensed but what is it? If one fails to say anything definitely, it is indeterminate perception. Nothing is said about its character.
2. Savikalpaka Pratyksya: determinate perception. In this, the character of an object of perception is cognized. Indeterminate perception precedes determinate perception.

**2) Inference (Anumāna Pramāna):**

The Sanskrit term *Anumāna* consists of two words, viz. 'Anu' means infer and 'Māna' means Pramāna or knowledge. So it is knowledge or a means of knowledge which follows some other knowledge. Perception precedes inference. Inference is defined as a process of knowing something not by perception, but through the instrumentality or medium of a mark (Linga) that is invariably related to it. There are two types of inference: 1) inference for oneself (*Swârtha-anumāna*) and 2) inference for others (*Parârtha-anumāna*). The former does not need any formal statement of inference. Inference for others involves stages or steps. According to Nyâya philosophers, it must be stated in the form of five propositions. It is called the five-membered syllogism (*Panchavayavi Anumāna*). It can be illustrated as follows:

1. There is fire on the hill (*Pratijnâ*).

2. Because there is smoke on the hill (*Hetu* or *Linga*).
3. Where there is smoke, there is fire. E.g. kitchen (*Vyapti*, universal proposition and instance).
4. There is the same type of smoke on the hill (Upanaya, or application).
5. There is fire on the hill (*Nigamana*, or conclusion).

Fire is not seen and smoke is perceived. It is the reason for the assertion of the first proposition. Universal proposition indicates the connection between the reason (*Hetu*) and the asserted fact (*Pratijna*). It is supported by known instances and then the conclusion is stated. While the syllogism in Western logic or Aristotelian logic is deductive, the Nyâya syllogism is inductive-deductive.

Nyâya philosophers have also discovered the fallacies which one may commit in making inferences. Inference was considered as a source of knowledge. The subject matter of logic was thought and not the mere linguistic forms in which it is expressed. In a sense it combines the two sources of knowledge, viz. experience and reason. At this stage, we need not discuss the classification of inference and fallacies of inference.

### **3) Verbal Testimony (Sabda Pramâna):**

It is testimony of a trustworthy person (*Âptavacana*), i.e. one who knows the truth and communicates it correctly. The communicator or the speaker must be both competent and honest. According to Nyâya, the Vedas are the valid source of suprasensible or extra-empirical knowledge because their author is the all-knowing God. Nyâya philosophers try to justify their belief in God on rational grounds. Testimony may be *Vaidika* (Scriptural) or *Laukika* (ordinary person) but the *Vaidika* author is infallible, while secular authorities may be true or false.

### **4) Comparison (Upamana Pramâna):**

Its scope is narrow but practically it is useful. It is generally about the connection between a name and a thing or being signified by that name. One has not yet seen a gavaya (wild cow). One is told that it is an animal like a cow with which one is acquainted. One then goes to the jungle and sees the gavaya and knows that it looks like a cow but is not a cow. Therefore, it must be a gavaya.

The above considerations regarding Nyâya views on sources of knowledge show that this philosophical system accepts both reason and experiences as sources of knowledge. The term experience is used in a wider sense. It also accepts the extraordinary experiences of the yogis and sages.

**Check Your Progress :-**

Q.3. Explain the Nyâya concept of perception.

---



---



---



---

**4A.3 CÂRVÂK PHILOSOPHY:**

Cârvâk philosophy is also known as Lokâyatika. Historians of Indian philosophy assert that no systematic work on the Cârvâk system of philosophy is available. Works written by philosophers of different systems, Vedic and non-Vedic, contain attempts to refute Cârvâk views. The Cârvâk system stands for materialism and consequent hedonism. There are two etymologies of the term Cârvâk. '*Charu*' means to eat or to chew. Thus it preaches the doctrine of "eat, drink and be merry." According to the second etymology, '*charu*' means nice, sweet and '*vâk*' means word, speech. So Cârvâk is one whose words are pleasant and nice. Some say that Brhaspati is the founder of materialism in Indian philosophical tradition. We need not go into the details of the story of Cârvâk philosophy. In this unit, we are mainly concerned with the Cârvâk views on the sources of knowledge.

Cârvâk philosophy stands for empiricism in its theory of knowledge. Perception is the only dependable source of human knowledge. It is very critical about the other sources of knowledge. Both reason (inference) and verbal testimony fail to give certain knowledge according to Cârvâk. Inference is an uncertain leap from the known or the observed to the unknown or the unobserved. The smoke is perceived on the hill. From this perceived smoke, we take a leap to the unperceived fire. Logicians point out that inference is based on a universal relation between Hetu (reason) and the Sadhya (fire). But it is not beyond doubt. Universal relation of invariable concomitance cannot be established conclusively. We do not have knowledge of all the cases of fire and presence of fire. We see some cases of smoke and presence of fire. How can we pass from some cases to all cases?

Even causal relations cannot be established by means of perception. Validity of inference cannot be based on some other inference. Even validity of verbal testimony depends upon inference. But since inference itself is not a source of valid knowledge, how can we accept verbal testimony as a source of valid knowledge? So testimony supported by inference or reasoning is as uncertain as inference.

---

**4A.4 – SUMMARY:**

---

The Nyâya philosophy accepts four sources of knowledge—1) perception, 2) inference, 3) verbal testimony or authority, and 4) comparison. Gautam is the founder of this system and also of ancient Indian logic. His concept of sources of knowledge is broad-based. It accepts reason and experience as important sources of knowledge. Truth is defined in terms of correspondence with facts and the test of truth is pragmatic, i.e. fruitful activity.

The Cârvão philosophy stands for Indian materialism. It accepts perception as the only source of knowledge. It is a form of gross empiricism. It rejects both inference and verbal testimony as sources of human knowledge. It is also a form of Indian hedonism.

---

**4A.5 – UNIT END QUESTIONS:**

---

1. Elaborate the Nyâya concept of inference.
2. State the Nyâya view of syllogism.
3. Discuss the Carvaka's critique of inference.

## GOD AND EVIL

### Unit Structure:

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Statement of the Problem of Evil
- 5.3 St. Thomas Aquinas' Explanation of Evil
- 5.4 Shankaracharya's Views on Evil
- 5.5 Shankaracharya's Solution to Evil
- 5.6 Summary
- 5.7 Unit End Questions
- 5.8 References

---

### 5.0 – OBJECTIVES:

---

To study the problem of evil especially in relation to the belief in God, who is all-powerful and all-good.

Students will study the problem of evil as a theological issue. Two prominent philosophers' view—one Western, one Indian—will be briefly analysed and discussed.

---

### 5.1 – INTRODUCTION:

---

In ordinary language or according to common sense, evil is the opposite of good. So it is to be understood in relation to the meaning of the term 'good.' If 'good' means happiness, then evil means unhappiness, pain, and sorrow. Therefore, evil is suffering in the world. If health is good, then disease is evil. If a 'good' man means a morally upright man, then an evil-doer means a wicked man who causes harm to others. So in one line, the problem of evil is the problem of sorrows and sufferings built up in the world. It is a serious problem for those who accept a benevolent and all-powerful God as the Creator of the universe. Creationists and theistic theologians are at pains to reconcile the goodness or benevolence of God with His omnipotence. Some say

that this problem is unsolvable by human intelligence. Zoroastrians accept two gods, viz. one God for the good and another God for the evil in the world. Evolutionists assert that there is no problem of evil when we recognize the conditions out of which humanity has evolved or emerged in the course of time. So it is basically the problem for those who accept an all-good and all-powerful God as the Creator of the universe. If He is all-powerful, then the existence of evil in the world indicates that He is not all-good. If He is all-good, then the presence of evil in the world suggests that He is not all-powerful. Therefore, it is the crux of belief in God, who is the Creator of the universe and yet there is the presence of the evil in the world. Thus, it is basically a theological issue.

---

## **5.2 – STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM OF EVIL:**

---

Buddhists believe that all existence is evil. The world is full of suffering. Life is full of suffering. Some others argue that the world is good and there is no evil as such. The optimists agree with the English poet Browning, who said, “God is in heaven and all is right with the world.” Nature is created by God, who is both benevolent and omnipotent. It is so structured and ordered that the highest good can be attained in this universe. On the contrary, the pessimists are of the view that the universe is indifferent to human values. It is even hostile to human values. Thus, evil is more dominant than the good in this world. Extreme pessimism implies satanic atheism. All theists and religionists have to face the problem of evil. Most of the atheists have been against theism on account of the existence of evil in the world. Evil deeds mean morally cruel or wicked acts on the part of the sinners or evil-doers. An evil life is a harmful life, i.e. life which causes harm to others. So the problem of evil is a problem for the believers who believe in an all-good and all-powerful Creator God and have to face the existence of evil in the form of natural disasters and calamities such as, earthquakes, floods, and epidemics and wicked deeds of the evil-doers. These facts show that evil is not imaginary or trivial. It is a real and serious matter.

Is God, the all-good Creator of the universe, helpless in removing evil from this world? If He is all-powerful, then why does He not eliminate evil from the world? Does it show that He is not necessarily all-good and kind and merciful? The advocates of Creationism, Theism, and even Absolute Idealism have to find out solutions to the problem of evil. The universe contains not only good, but evil as well. It was within God’s power to create a universe without evil. Since He did not do so, He is responsible for the existence of evil in the world. So God cannot be both omnipotent and benevolent or all-good and all-powerful. Hence,

evil has been called ‘the atheistic fact’. And thus it is said that there is something essentially wrong with the universe created by the all-powerful and all-good God. Whether we like it or not, whether we will it or not, we must reckon with this fact. It is also a fact that the majority of them do not like to be told that the world is good and beautiful. The sympathy of the people is always with those who usually speak of the sorrows and sufferings in and of the world than of its pleasures and joys. Consequently, the problem of evil is both a theological and a practical problem.

**Check Your Progress:-**

Q.1. What is the problem of evil?

---



---



---



---

**5.3 ST. THOMAS AQUINAS’ EXPLANATION OF EVIL :**

**St. Thomas Aquinas (1226 to 1274):**

He was the greatest of the schoolmen of the Middle Ages. He was a great Christian saint and theologian. He got his doctorate in Theology in 1257, but he did not become an archbishop. Rather, he accepted a professorship at Naples. He wrote his magnum opus *Summa Theologian*, which is the official theology of Catholic Christianity. After his death in 1323, he was canonized and in 1567 he was given the title of ‘Doctor of the Church’. Among his followers and companions he was known as the ‘Angelic Doctor’ because of his firm and authoritative voice.

He accepted two main sources of knowledge, viz. the Holy Bible and Church tradition, and human reason. There is no necessary conflict between faith and reason. Faith begins with God and proceeds toward the world. On the other hand, reason begins with the empirical world and proceeds toward God. Thus reason is complementary to faith or Holy Scripture. He tried to prove the existence of the Creator God on the basis of experience of the world.

God, according to him, is pure form, pure actuality. We know God by faith. But we can also know Him by rational arguments. Such knowledge is indirect or mediate. In knowing Him by reasoning we pass from the known to the unknown. We also pass from the effect to the cause or from the Creation to the Creator. He is the first and the final cause (purposive cause) of the universe. In addition, He is absolutely actual and absolutely perfect in goodness, knowledge, and power. God

did not create the world out of nothing. He is the cause of both the matter and the form, and thus creates the world out of matter and form. However, He created the matter out of nothing. God's will is determined by the good. He has therefore, chosen this world as the best of all possible worlds. He reveals Himself in the universe in all possible ways.

It will be both interesting and enlightening to know St. Thomas Aquinas' view on evil in the universe, which is created by the perfect Supreme Being, or God.

What is evil? According to St. Thomas Aquinas, evil is privation of good or the negation of good. St. Augustine's (353 to 430 A.D.) privative theory of evil states: Evil is a defect. St. Augustine also said that evil is not good but it is good that there is evil in the world. The shadows in a picture contribute to the beauty of the whole picture. Likewise, evil in the world enhances the glory of the world. Evil is not possible without the good. It can be used as a means of serving the good in the world. To a great extent, St. Thomas Aquinas follows the Augustinian line of

St. Thomas Aquinas also regards evil as privation of good. Everything has good-nature. If everything acts according to its nature, it cannot cause evil. Evil can be divided into two kinds, viz. 1) Natural evil and 2) Moral evil. Evil may be due to the defective action on part of the cause (form) or to the defective state of matter (effect). Natural calamities such as earthquakes, cyclones, floods, volcanoes, etc. can cause immense harm to the people who are affected by them. So it is said that Nature is cruel or at least neutral.

Moral evil is evil created by human beings. In the case of moral evil, the defect lies in the will of a man or a group of human beings. Man enjoys freedom of will. When it does not abide by the rule of reason or laws of God, he does wrong actions. Everything aims at good. Man also strives for good. Whatever man strives for is regarded as good by him or her. Suppose 'X' is evil. Man does not desire or strive for it because it is evil, but because he or she views it as good. This is done by man erroneously. So it is the improper use of reason or intellect. It is man who is responsible for moral evil. God cannot be held responsible for moral evil. Certain persons do misuse or abuse freedom of will and do evil deeds. God allows such people to do it and be ready for the punishment or painful consequences. God does not abolish man's freedom of will. Even God's grace can act in man and with the cooperation of his or her will. St. Thomas also accepts the doctrine of original sin. Adam, the first man, disobeyed God. This resulted in the corruption of the nature of man. Adam realised this and felt guilty.

Adam's sin is transmitted to future generations. Only God can redeem man and save him or her. Natural man must prepare himself or herself for the 'spiritual man'. The latter is one in whom God's grace operates and thus can achieve higher levels of perfection. This, Aquinas asserts, is not possible for an Aristotelian man in whom God's grace does not operate. Aristotle's God is not the redeemer or savior God. This concept of God is the idea of God who is away from and indifferent to what happens in the world. He is the unmoved mover who is indifferent to human affairs.

**Check Your Progress:-**

Q.2. How does St. Thomas Aquinas explain evil?

---



---



---



---



---

**5.4 SHANKARACHARYA'S VIEWS ON EVIL :**

---

**Shankaracharya (788-820 A.D.) :**

He was a very great Indian philosopher. He was an advocate of Advaita Vedanta (non-dualism) based on the triple-texts viz. Upanishads, Brahmasutras, and the Bhagavad-Gita. He wrote commentaries on these texts. Several thinkers have commented upon his commentary on Brahmasutras. This commentary is called Shariraka Bhasya. He was a great critic of other Vedic and non-Vedic Indian philosophical systems.

Indian philosophers, by and large, identify evil with three kinds of suffering (*dukkha*). They are:

1. Adhyatmika suffering: Psycho-somatic sufferings
2. Adhibhautika suffering: Physical sufferings due to external things and beings
3. Adhidaivika suffering: Supernatural sufferings

Adhyatmika sufferings are mental and physical sufferings. They are due to bodily disorders such as headache, stomachache, etc. Mental suffering is due to mental tensions and agitations due to passions and emotions.

Adhibhautika sufferings: These are physical sufferings due to animals, birds, reptiles (snake-bites), humans, etc. They include homicides, wars and riots (social evils).

Adhidaivika sufferings: They are due to supernatural events such as, earthquakes, cyclones, sun-strokes, heat and cold, floods, droughts, etc. They cause immense suffering to human beings.

Each individual has to face the problem of these miseries because he or she is a bound soul. This bondage is due to congenital ignorance (*Avidya*). Ignorance is not mere absence of knowledge. There is wrong knowledge. The individual, due to ignorance, identifies itself with the body, bodily organs, mind, intellect, and ego. Mind, intellect, and ego constitute what is called the internal organ (*Antahkarana*). Shankara advocates that the individual self devoid of ignorance is essentially one with the Ultimate Reality, which is of the nature of Pure Existence, Pure Consciousness, and Pure Bliss. When the bound soul is liberated, it experiences itself as one with the Infinite Self. There is absolute cessation of sorrows and suffering and achievement of Supreme Bliss. Secular pains and pleasures are modes of the mind and not attributes of the True Self, which is transcendental, non-phenomenonal and trans-empirical. Consciousness and Bliss constitute its essence. It does not enjoy or suffer like an empirical self.

From the cosmic point of view, the Ultimate Realty is called God, who is immanent in this world as the Inner Self of all things and beings. He is not responsible for the sufferings of the people. Each empirical self enjoys freedom of will. He is a doer, knower, and enjoyer. So he has to reap the fruits of his good or bad actions. God creates the world in view of each one's merits and demerits. God is the common cause (*Sadharana Karana*) of this world. Shankara compares God to the rainfall. Rainfall is the common cause of the growth of plants. But the plant owes its uniqueness to its seed. Since seeds are different in kind, they grow into varied plants bearing different fruits. Bound souls have to reap the good or bad fruits of its actions. God presides over these actions and plays the role of the directive cause of the world. So the charge of partiality and cruelty cannot be leveled against God.

**Check Your Progress:-**

Q.3. Explain Shankaracharya's concept of evil.

---



---



---



---



---

---

## 5.5 SHANKARACHARYA'S SOLUTION TO EVIL :

---

Liberation (*mukti*) of an individual soul is not an achievement of something. It is self-discovery. A liberated soul is free from sorrows and sufferings of different kinds, because it realises its infinite and divine nature. Its bondage was due to ignorance of its divinity. Intuitive knowledge is the remedy to self-ignorance (*Jnana* and *mukti*). Such knowledge is the only means of liberation. But work done dedicatedly, disinterestedly, and effectively helps to purify the mind, which is necessary for the attainment of intuitive knowledge. It should not be actuated by egoism and egotism and must also be devoid of the sense of 'I' and 'Mine'. Work done in this spirit for the good of mankind and without the desire for fruits definitely purifies the seeker's mind and promotes the growth of knowledge that liberates. Desire for property, wealth, and enjoyment here and hereafter must also be totally eliminated from the mind of a spiritual aspirant.

Dedication or devotion to God also helps to expand a seeker's mind so that he or she can extend his or her horizons. For instance, a spiritual seeker is asked to selflessly work for the universal purposes and become god-like in love, compassion, and altruism. Shankara's concept of evil can be compared with Spinoza's idea of evil. Spinoza equated the idea of evil with ignorance which is the inability to see Reality from Transcendental or Divine Perspective. Owing to ignorance, the correct understanding of the world and oneself is distorted. Hence, the problem of evil. Only correct perspective can dispel ignorance and consequent evil.

### Check Your Progress:-

Q.4. How does Shankara resolve the problem of evil?

---



---



---



---



---



---

## 5.6 – SUMMARY:

---

Evil stands for sorrow and suffering in the world. Its existence is both a theoretical and practical problem. But theoretically it is a theological issue. How far is the existence of evil in the universe compatible with the belief in the existence of an all-good and all-powerful God, who is the Creator of this Universe. St. Thomas Aquinas, a 13th century European medieval philosopher, thinks that evil is ?? the privation of good or negation of good. Thus God is not responsible for it. Adi

Shankaracharya, a medieval Indian philosopher, also discusses the problem of evil. According to him, God, like rainfall, is the common cause of the phenomena in the night. Each event has its own special cause. Trees bear different fruits. Their differences are to be traced to their roots as seeds and not to the rainfall.

---

**5.7 – UNIT END QUESTIONS:**

---

1. What is evil?
2. What is the problem of evil?
3. Is the existence of evil in the world compatible with the belief in the existence of an all-powerful and all-good God? Discuss.
4. What is St. Thomas Aquinas' solution to the problem?
5. Can God be charged with partiality and cruelty? Discuss Shankaracharya's views on this.
6. Is the existence of evil in the universe a challenge to Theism?
7. How does Shankaracharya resolve the problem of evil?

---

**5.8 – REFERENCES:**

---

1. S. Radhakrishnan: History of Indian Philosophy
2. Frank Thilly: A History of Philosophy (Revised). Henry Holt & Co. New York, 1951.
3. Shankaracharya: Brahmasutra Bhasya.

## **BASIC CONSTITUENTS OF REALITY :**

**(a) PLATO (IDEAS) AND LEIBNITZ (MONADS) ;**

**(b) VAISESIKA AND SAMKHYA THEORY OF EVOLUTION.**

### **UNIT STRUCTURE**

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Basic Constituents of Reality ; Plato( Ideas)
- 6.2 Leibnitz (monads)
- 6.3 Vaisesika
- 6.4 Samkhya Theory of Evolution
- 6.5 Unit End Excercise

---

### **6.0 OBJECTIVES :**

---

After going through this unit you will be able to understand

- The characteristics of Ideas
- The nature of Monads
- The creation and dissolution of the world
- The nature of Purusa, Prakrti and the evolution of the world

---

### **6.1 BASIC CONSTITUENTS OF REALITY ; PLATO(IDEAS) :**

---

**6.1.1 INTRODUCTION :** Plato was born in 427 BC. He studied music, poetry, painting and philosophy. He became a pupil of Socrates in 407 BC and remained with him till his death. Socrates became for him the pattern and exemplar of the true philosopher.

Plato was the first person in the history of the world to produce a great all-embracing system of philosophy, which has its ramification in all departments of thought and reality. The problem of the meaning of human life, human knowledge, human conduct and human institutions depended for their complete answer on the solution of the problem of the meaning of reality. It was Plato, the greatest pupil of Socrates, who set himself to this task. He developed not only a theory of knowledge, a theory of conduct and a theory of the state, but crowned his work with a theory of the universe. The central and governing principles of his philosophy is the theory of Ideas. All else hinges on this, and is dominated by this. In a sense his whole philosophy is nothing but a theory of Ideas

and what depends upon it. Dialectic or logic or the theory of Ideas is Plato's doctrine of the nature of the absolute reality.

The theory of idea is itself based upon the theory of knowledge. According to Plato, knowledge is neither perception nor opinion. What is it? Plato adopts, without alteration, the Socratic doctrine that knowledge is knowledge through concepts. A concept is the same thing as definition. A definition is formed in the same way as a concept namely, by including the qualities in which all the members of the class agree and excluding the qualities in which the members of the class differs. e.g.; we cannot define man as a white-skinned animal because all men are not white- skinned. But we can define man as a rational animal because all man are rational.

Plato's theory of Idea is the theory of the objectivity of concepts. That the concept is not really an idea in the mind, but something which has a reality of its own, outside and independent of the mind- this is the essence of the philosophy of Plato.

**6.1.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF IDEAS** : According to Plato, the characteristics of Ideas are as follows ;

**(a) Ideas are substances** – Substance means, for the philosopher, that which has its own whole being in itself, whose reality does not flow into it from anything else, but which is the source of its own reality. It is self-caused, and self-determined. It is the ground of other things, but itself has no ground except itself. In this technical sense the Ideas are substances. They are absolute and ultimate realities. Their whole being is in themselves. They depend on nothing, but all things depend on them. They are the first principles of the universe.

**(b) Ideas are Universal** – An Idea is not any particular thing. The Idea of the horse is not this or that horse. It is the general concept of all horses. It is the universal horse.

**(c) Ideas are not *things* , but *thoughts*** – There is no such thing as the horse-in-general. If there were, we should be able to find it somewhere, and it would be a particular thing instead of a universal. But in saying that the Ideas are thoughts, there are two mistakes to be carefully avoided. The first is to suppose that they are the thoughts of a person, that they are your thoughts or my thoughts. The second is to suppose that they are thoughts in the mind of God. Both these views are wrong. They are not subjective ideas, that is, the ideas in a particular and existent mind. They are objective Ideas, thoughts which have reality on their own account, independently of any mind.

**(d) Each Idea is a Unity** - The Idea of man is one, although individual men are many. There cannot be more than one Idea for each class of objects.

**(e) The Ideas are Immutable and Imperishable** – A concept is the same as a definition. And the whole point in a definition is that it should always be the same. The object of a definition is to compare individual things with it, and to see whether they agree with it or not. A definition is thus something absolutely permanent, and a definition is only the expression in words of the nature of an idea. Consequently the Ideas cannot change. It is eternal, unchangeable, and imperishable. The Idea of man is eternal, and remains untouched by the birth, old age, decay, and death, of individual men.

**(f) The Ideas are the Essence of all things** – The definition gives us what is essential to a thing. If we define man as a rational animal, this means that reason is of the essence of man.

**(g) Each Idea is an absolute Perfection** – Its perfection is the same as its reality. The perfect man is the one universal type-man, that is, the Idea of man, and all individual men deviate more or less from this perfect type. In so far as they fall short of it, they are imperfect and unreal.

**(h) Ideas are outside space and time** – If they were in space, they are outside space is obvious. If they were in space, they would have to be in some particular place. We ought to be able to find them somewhere. A telescope or microscope might reveal them. And this would mean that they are individual and particular things, and not universals at all. They are also outside time. For they are unchangeable and eternal. But their immutability is not a matter of experience, but is known to thought. It is not merely that they are always the same in time, but that time is irrelevant to them. They are timeless.

**(i) Ideas are Rational** – The Ideas are rational, that is to say, they are apprehended through reason. The finding of the common element in the manifold is the work of inductive reason, and through this alone is knowledge of the Ideas possible.

**(j) Pythagorean Numbers** – Plato identified the Ideas with the Pythagorean numbers.

### **Criticism of Plato's Theory of Ideas**

- (i)** Plato's Ideas do not explain the existence of things. To explain why the world is here is after all the main problem of philosophy, and Plato's theory fails to do this.
- (ii)** Plato has not explained the relation of Ideas to things. Things, we are told, are "copies" of Ideas, and "participate" in them. But how are we to understand this "participation".

- (iii) Even if the existence of things is explained by the Ideas, their motion is not. The Ideas themselves are immutable and motionless, so will be the same world which is their copy. Thus the universe would be absolutely static. The world, on the contrary, is a world of change, motion, life, becoming. Plato makes no attempt to explain the unceasing becoming of things.
- (iv) The world consists of a multitude of things, and it is the business of philosophy to explain why they exist. By way of explanation Plato merely assumes the existence of another multitude of things, the Ideas. But only effect of this is to double the number of things to be explained.
- (v) Ideas are supposed to be non-sensuous, but they are, in fact, sensuous. There is, in fact, no differences between the horse and the Idea of the horse, between the man and the Idea of the man, except useless and meaningless “in-itself” or “in-general” attached to each object of sense to make it appear something different.

**Check your progress :-**

1) What is Plato's theory of Ideas ?

---



---



---



---



---

**6.1.3 SUMMARY :**

The philosophy of Plato is best known as “Theory of Ideas” or “Theory of Forms”. This is due to the fact that according to Plato, over and above the world of sense-perceptions, there is a transcendent world of Ideas or Forms. Whereas, the transcendent world is ontologically real, the sensuous world lacks the originality and is dependent upon the transcendent for its reality. Plato has tried to explain in detail the characteristics of ‘ideas’.

**6.2 LEIBNITZ (MONADS) :**

**6.2.1 Introduction :** Modern philosophy may be said to begun early at the seventeenth century with the work of the continental Rationalists, the first of whom, Descartes, initiated a long series of attempts to construct comprehensive, integrated systems of philosophy.

Leibnitz is the founder of the German philosophy of the eighteenth century. He was born in 1646, at Leipzig where his father held a professor's chair. He studied law, philosophy and mathematics at the universities of his native city, Jena, and Altdorf.

The system of Leibnitz arose out of the inadequacy of cartesianism and spinozism. Descartes holds that extension is the essence of matter and consciousness or conscious thought is the essence of mind or soul, and thus acknowledges the existence of two distinct and diametrically opposed substances. But Leibnitz, on the other hand, opposes to this Cartesian dualism of extended or unconscious substance and inextended or conscious substance, his theory of monads or inextended and more or less conscious substances. According to Descartes, extension is the essence of matter, but Leibnitz rejects this view and holds that not extension, but force is the essence of matter.

**6.2.2 THE DOCTRINE OF MONADS :** Substances had been regarded by Leibnitz predecessors merely as extended or inert matter, whereas he considered it to be a vital, dynamic activity comprising immaterial and nonspatial force; for Leibnitz space and time were merely phenomenal things and not genuine realities. He called the ultimate entities monads, the ultimate stuff out of which even the atoms were made.

The term **monad** is a name “given by Leibnitz to simple unextended substance ie a substance which has the power of action, active force being its essence”. The monads of Leibnitz are the original and independent forces, simple, indivisible, immaterial and indestructive in character. According to Leibnitz, the world of bodies is composed of an infinite number of dynamic units or immaterial, unextended, simple units of forces or monads. Leibnitz says that these monads can be well conceived of after an analogy to our own selves. We discover such a simple, inextended and immaterial force-unit as the monad in our own inner life. The soul is such a substance, and what is true of it will also be true of all monads. Thus reasoning by analogy, he interprets the monads as so many spiritual or psychic forces like our souls. Just as the human soul has the power of perception and the conation or will, so also the monads are endowed with perception and desire or appetite. Thus all the monads of all stages, whether lower or higher, whether lowest or highest, whether the most imperfect or the most perfect, or souls. The same principle that expresses itself in the mind of man is also active, in body, plant and animal. There is force everywhere, there is no vacuum anywhere. Every particle of matter is like a garden of plants; all matter is animate, alive, even to the minutest parts.

**Perception and Appetition :** Monads being spiritual have two important characteristics of perception and appetite. By the virtue of its perception each monad mirrors the whole infinity of existence. The more developed monad in the series has a clear perception and the less developed monad has confused perception. The infinite gradations

in the monads correspond to their infinite series of perceptions. Even in the same monad, according to its own stages of development, there are different degrees of perception. Because each monad is a force, therefore, it has appetite by virtue of which it tends to become the whole. Again, by virtue of its appetite by virtue of its appetite each monad tends to pass from obscure to clear perception. If an action is done from very obscure perception then it is known as impulse and if it is done from clear perception, then it is known as will. Thus the activity of the low monads is purely random and impulsive, but in the higher monads the activity is prompted by will and desire. However the distinction between impulse and desire is one of degree and, not of kind.

**Kinds of monads :** Leibnitz distinguishes between three principal grades of monads corresponding to three principal grades of perception. Lowest stand the simple or naked monads, which never rise above and consciousness perception and, so to speak, pass their lives in sleeping state or swoon. Next stand the monads called the souls in which the perception rises into consciousness feeling accompanied by memory and highest stand those monads which are called spirits and in whom perception rises into self-consciousness and reason by virtue of which they acquire the knowledge of universal truths.

Leibnitz pictured each monad as a living and perpetual mirror of all the other monads since each represents the entire universe; therefore to know one monad thoroughly is to know the world. Inasmuch as the monads are self-contained, each cannot lose any of its inherent force nor gain force from outside itself.

**Check your progress :-**

1) What are monads?

---



---



---



---

2) What does Leibnitz mean by saying that monads have 'appetition' and 'perception'?

---



---



---



---

**6.2.3 Summary :** Leibnitz used the term monad to denote the activity of force constituting the essence of substance. Each monad exists in its own right as an independent being unlike all other monads in the universe ; hence in this sense Leibnitz was an Individualist philosopher. He held that the monads, as the ultimate real elements of the universe, are infinite in number, a theory which made him a Metaphysical Pluralist. These independent monads are always active, but they do not contact or affect one another . They are individual, conscious, active, alive, and range in quality from the lowest type through the higher types up to highest of all.

---

## **6.3 VAISHESIKA :**

---

**6.3.1 INTRODUCTION :** Kanad is the founder of Vaishesika philosophy. The term Vaishesika is derived from the term visesa which means particularity or distinguishing feature. The Vaishesika philosophy is pluralistic realism which emphasizes that diversity is the soul of the universe. According to it , the entire universe is reduced to seven padarthas.

The Seven Padarthas – Padartha literally means ‘the meaning of a word’ or ‘the object signified by a word’. All objects of knowledge or all reals come under padartha. Padartha means an object which can be thought and named. Originally the Vaishesika believed in the six categories and the seventh, that of abhava or negation, was added later on. All that is real comes under the object of knowledge and is called a padartha. The seven padarthas are : (1) substance (dravya), (2) quality (guna), (3) action(karma), (4) generality (samanya), (5) particularity (vishesa), (6) inherence (samavaya), and (7) non-being(abhava).

The Nine Substances – SUBSTANCE or dravya is defined as the substratum where actions and qualities inhere and which is the coexistent material cause of the composite things produced from it. The Vaishesika philosophy is pluralistic and realistic but not materialistic since it admits spiritual substance. The nine substances are : (1) earth (prithvi), (2) water (Ap), (3) fire (tejas), (4) air (vayu), (5) ether (akasha), (6) time (kala), (7) space (dik), (8) spirit (atman) and (9) mind or the internal organ (manas).All of them are objective realities. Earth, water, fire, air, and manas are atomic and eternal. The first four produce composite things; manas does not. Earth, water, fire, air and ether are the five gross elements. These and manas are physical. Soul is spiritual. Time and space are objective and not subjective forms of experience. Ether, space, time and soul are all-pervading and eternal. Atoms, minds and souls are infinite in number. Ether, space and time are one each.

**Check your progress :-**

1) What do Vaishesika mean by padartha ?

---



---



---



---

**6.3.2 THE VAISHESIKA THEORY OF ATOMISM:** The atomic theory of the Vaishesika explains that part of the world which is non-eternal, i.e. subject to origin and destruction in time. The eternal constituents of the universe, namely, the four kinds of atoms, and the five substances of akasa, space, time, mind, and soul, do not come within the purview of their atomic theory, because these can neither be created nor destroyed. On the other hand, all composite objects, beginning with a dyad or the first compound of only two atoms, are non-eternal. So the atomic theory explains the order of creation and destruction of these non-eternal objects. All composite objects are constituted by the combination of atoms and destroyed through their separation.

**(a) The world is composed of four kinds of atoms** – All the finite objects of the physical world and the physical world itself are composed of the four kinds of atoms in the form of dyads, triads and other larger compounds arising out of these.

**(b) The atoms are said to be of four kinds** – of earth, fire, water, and air. Ether is not atomic. It is one and all pervading and affords medium for the combinations of the atoms. The material objects of the world are composed of parts and are subject to production and destruction. They are divisible into smaller parts and the latter are further divisible into still smaller parts. By this logic we have to accept the minutest particle of matter which may not be further divisible.

This indivisible, partless and eternal particle of matter is called an atom. All physical things are produced by the combinations of atoms. Creation, therefore, means the combination of atoms in different proportions and destruction means the dissolution of such combinations. The material cause of the universe is neither produced nor destroyed. It is the eternal atoms. It is only the atomic combinations which are produced and which are destroyed.

**(c) The atoms differ from one-another both in quantity and quality**– Each atom has a particularity of its own and exists as a separate reality. The atoms of earth, water, fire and air differ in qualities also. Their qualities too are eternal. The atoms of air are the finest of all and have the quality of touch. The atoms of fire possess touch and colour.

The atoms of water possess touch, colour and taste. The atoms of earth possess touch, colour, taste and smell. Besides these all atoms have velocity, number, distinctness etc. The qualities of compositive products are due to the qualities of the atoms. The atoms possess the primary as well as the secondary qualities. They are said to be spherical or globular. They are co-eternal with the souls and are the material cause of the world.

**(d) Motion of atoms** – Atoms are inactive and motionless in themselves. During dissolution, that remain inactive. Motion is imparted to them by the Unseen Power of merit and demerit which resides in the individual souls and wants to fructify in the form of enjoyment or suffering. They are supra-sensible. The atoms combine in geometrical progression and not in arithmetical one. They increase by multiplication and mere addition. When motion is imparted to them by the Unseen Power, they begin to vibrate and immediately change into dyads. A dyad is produced by the combination of two atoms. The atoms are its inherent cause; conjunction is its non-inherent cause; and the Unseen Power is its efficient cause. An atom is indivisible, spherical and imperceptible. A dyad is minute, short and imperceptible. Three dyads form a triad which is great, long and perceptible. And so on by geometrical progression till the gross elements of earth, water, fire and air arise.

**(e) Creation** – According to Vaisheshika, the starting point of the process of creation or destruction is the will of the supreme Lord who is the ruler of the whole universe. The Lord conceives the will to create a universe in which individual beings may get their proper share of the experience of pleasure and pain according to their deserts. The process of creation and destruction of the world being beginningless, we cannot speak of a creation of the world. In truth, every creation is preceded by a state of destruction, and every destruction is preceded by some order of creation. To create is to destroy an existing order of things and usher in a new order.

**(f) Destruction** – Creation is followed by destruction. The created world runs its course for many years. But it cannot continue to exist and endure for all time to come. Just as after the stress and strain of the day's work God allows us to rest at night, so after the trials and tribulations of many lives in one created world, God provides a way of escape from suffering for all living beings for sometime. This is done by Him through the destruction of the world.

The process of the world's dissolution is as follows: When in the course of time Brahma, the world-soul, gives up his body like other souls, there appears in Maheshvara or the supreme Lord a desire to destroy

the world. With this, the creative adrastra or unseen moral agency in living beings is counteracted by the corresponding destructive adrastra and ceases to function for the active life of experience. It is in contact with such souls, in which the destructive adrastra begins to operate, that there is motion in the constituent atoms of their body and senses. On account of this motion there is disjunction of the atoms and consequent disintegration of the body and the senses. The body with the senses being thus destroyed, what remains are only the atoms in their isolation. So also, there is motion in the constituent atoms of the elemental earth, and its consequent destruction through the cessation of their conjunction. In this way there is the destruction of the physical elements of earth, water, light and air, one after the other. Thus these four physical elements and all bodies and sense organs are disintegrated and destroyed. What remains are the four kinds of atoms of earth, water, light and air in their isolation, and the eternal substances of akasa, time, space, minds and souls with their stock of merit, demerit and past impression.

The periods of creation and destruction make one complete cycle called kalpa which has been repeating itself eternally. The theory of cycles or recurring periods of creation and destruction is accepted by most of the orthodox systems of Indian philosophy.

#### **Check your progress :-**

- 1) Explain the nature of atoms according to Vaisheshika ?

---



---



---



---

**6.3.3 Summary :** According to the Vaisheshika thinkers, all the composite objects of the universe are composed of the atoms of earth, water, air and fire. Hence the view of the Vaisheshika concerning creation is called atomism or paramanuvada. The eternal category of substances namely, ether, time, mind, space, earth and physical elements are neither created nor destroyed. The world is created and destroyed by God according to the moral deserts of individual souls and for the proper realization of their moral destiny.

---

## **6.4 SAMKHYA THEORY OF EVOLUTION :**

**6.4.1 INTRODUCTION :** Samkhya is undoubtedly one of the oldest systems of Indian philosophy. Kapila is the founder of this system. The word 'Samkhya' is derived from the word 'samkhya' which means right knowledge as well as number. The system is predominantly intellectual and theoretical. Right knowledge is the knowledge of the separation of the purusa from the prakrti. Yoga, as the counterpart of the Samkhya,

means action or practice and tells us how the theoretical metaphysical teachings of Samkhya might be realized in actual practice. Thus Samkhya Yoga forms one complete system, the former being the theoretical while the latter being the practical aspect of the same teaching.

Dualism – Samkhya is dualistic realism. It is dualistic because of its doctrine of two ultimate realities : Prakrti (matter), and Purusa(self, spirit). Samkhya is realism. in that it holds that both matter and spirit are equally real. With regard to the self, Samkhya is pluralistic because of its teaching that purusa is not one but many.

**6.4.2 PRAKRTI :** We experience the world of a manifold of objects. According to Samkhya, prakrti is the ultimate (first) cause of all objects, including our body senses, mind and intellect. It is both –the material and the efficient cause if the physical world. Being the ultimate cause, Prakrti itself is uncaused, eternal, and all pervading; and being the subtlest and finest, Prakrti cannot be perceived, but can only be inferred from its effects.

Prakrti is the non-self and is devoid of consciousness and hence can only manifest itself as the various objects of experience of the purusa, the self. According to the Samkhya, prakrti is constituted of three gunas, namely, sattva, rajas, and tamas. The term guna ordinarily means quality or nature. But in the context of prakrti, guna is to be understood in the sense of constitute. Sattva is the component whose essence is purity, fineness, subtlety, lightness, brightness, and pleasure. It is sattva which is most closely associated with ego, consciousness, mind, and intelligence. It should be emphasized, however, that sattva is only a necessary but not a sufficient condition for consciousness is exclusively the purusa. Rajas represent the principle of activity and motion. In material objects rajas is responsible for motion and action of objects. In many rajas is the cause of activity, restlessness, and pain. Tamas is the constituent which manifests itself in material objects as heaviness as well as opposition and resistance to motion and activity. In man it is the cause of ignorance, coarseness, stupidity, laziness, lack of sensitivity and indifference.

**Check your progress :-**

1) Explain the nature of Prakrti according to Samkhya ?

---



---



---



---



---

**6.4.3 Purusa :** The second type of ultimate reality admitted by the Samkhya is the Purusa, the principle of Pure Consciousness. Purusa is

the soul, the self, the spirit, the subject, the knower. It is neither body nor senses nor brain no mind nor ego nor intellect. It is not a substance which possess the quality of Consciousness . Consciousness is its essence. It is itself pure and transcendental Consciousness. It is the ultimate knower which is the foundation of all knowledge. It is the pure subject and as such can never become an object of knowledge. It is the silent witness, the emancipated alone, the neutral seer, the peaceful eternal. It is beyond time and space, beyond change and activity. It is self-luminous and self-proved. It is uncaused, eternal and all-pervading. It is the undubitable real, the postulate of knowledge, and all doubts and denials pre-suppose its existence.

**Check your progress :-**

1) Bring out the nature of purusa ?

---



---



---



---

**6.4.4 EVOLUTION OF THE WORLD :** The evolution of the world has its starting point in contact between purusa and prakrti. There can be no evolution unless the two become somehow related to each-other. The question is : How can two such different and opposed principles like purusa and prakrti co-operate? What brings the one in contact with the other ? The answer given by the Samkhya is this : Just as a blind man and a lame man can co-operate in order to get out of a forest, so the non-intelligent prakrti and the inactive purusa combine and co-operate to serve their respective interests.

**a) This contact disturbs the original equilibrium of prakrti :**With the contact between purusa and prakrti, there is a disturbance of the equilibrium in which the gunas were held before creation. One of the gunas, namely, rajas, which is naturally active, is disturbed first, and then, through rajas, the other gunas begin to vibrate. This produces a tremendous commotion in the infinite bosom of prakrti and each of the gunas tries to preponderate over the rest. There is a gradual differentiation and integration of the three gunas, and as a result of their combination in different proportions, the various objects of the world originate.

**The course of evolution is as follows :**

**(b) Mahat or Buddhi :** The first product of the evolution of prakrti is mahat or buddhi. Buddhi arises out of the preponderance of the element of sattva in prakrti. Mahat is the basis of all our intellectual modes. It is thus the faculty by which we discriminate, deliberate, judge, and make

decisions. It is by mahat that we distinguish between the subject and object, self and non-self, experiencer and experienced.

**(c) Ahankara or Ego :** Ahankara or Ego is the second product of prakrti, which arises directly out of mahat, the first manifestation. The function of hankara is the feeling of 'I and mine'. Ahankara is said to be of three kinds, according to the predominance of one or other of the three gunas. It is called vaikarika or sattvika when the element of sattva predominates in it, taijasa or rajasa when that of rajasa predominates, and bhutadi or tamasa when tamasa predominates.

**(d) Five Sense-organs, Five Motor-organs and Mind(manasa) :** The sattvika ahankara produces the five sensory , the five motor organs and mind. The five sense organs are the senses of sight hearing, smell, taste and touch. These perceive respectively the physical qualities of colour, sound, smell , taste and touch. The five motor organs are located in the mouth, hands, feet, anus and the sex-organ. These perform respectively the functions of speech, prehension, movement, excretion and reproduction. The mind is the central organ which partakes of the nature of the organs of both knowledge and action. Without the guidance of the manas neither of them can function in relation of their objects.

The mind, the ego and the intellect are the three internal organs, while the senses of sight, hearing, etc. and the organs of action are called the external organs. The three internal and the ten external organs are collectively called the thirteen karanas or the organs in the Sankhya philosophy.

**(e) The Five Subtle essences and the Five Gross Elements :** Tamas Ahankara produces the five subtle essences (Tanmatras). The five tanmatras are the subtle essences of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell.

**The five gross elements arise from the tanmatras as follows :**

From the essence of sound arises the element of ether together with the quality of sound. From the essence of touch combined with the essence of sound, arises the element of air together with the qualities of sound and touch. From the subtle essence of colour or sight combined with those of sound and touch, arises the element of fire or light together with the qualities of sound, colour and touch. From the essence of taste combined with those of sound, touch and colour, arises the element of water together with the qualities of sound, touch, colour and taste. And lastly, from the essence of smell combined with those of sound, touch, colour, and taste,arises the element of earth together with the qualities of sound ,touch ,colour taste and smell

Evolution is the play of these twenty-four principles which, together with the purusa who is a mere spectator and outside the play of evolution, are the twenty-five categories of Samkhya. Out of these twenty-five principles, the purusa is neither a cause nor an effect; Prakrti is only the cause and not the effect.

**Check your progress :-**

1) State the ten external organs as it is given in the Samkhya philosophy?

---



---



---



---



---

**6.4.5 SUMMARY :** The Samkhya recognizes only two kinds of ultimate realities namely, purusa and prakrti. The history of the evolved universe is a play of twenty-four principles, of which prakrti is the first, the five gross elements are the last, and the thirteen organs and the five tanmatras are the intermediate ones.

**6.5 UNIT END EXERCISE :**

- Q1 Discuss Plato's Theory of Ideas?  
 Q2 Explain the characteristics of Ideas according to Plato?  
 Q3 Explain and discuss Leibnitz's theory of monads?  
 Q4 Explain in detail the Vaisesika theory of Atomism?  
 Q5 Give an account of the Samkhya theory of evolution?  
 Q6 Discuss the concept of evolution in Samkhya system?

**6.6 Suggested Readings :**

A Critical History of Greek Philosophy- W.T.Stace  
 A Critical History of Western Philosophy- Y.Masih  
 Outlines of Indian Philosophy- Jadunath Sinha.

## INDIAN AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

a)Theories of Truth

b)Theories of Error.

### UNIT STRUCTURE

7.0 OBJECTIVES

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.2 THEORIES OF TRUTH

7.3 THEORIES OF ERROR

7.4 SUMMARY

7.5 QUESTIONS

---

### 7.0 OBJECTIVES :

- 1) To understand the significance of the concepts – “Truth” and “Error” in knowledge.
- 2) To understand the meaning of Truth as interpreted by Idealist and Pragmatic thinkers.
- 3) To understand the comprehensive meaning of Truth
- 4) To understand the stages in the process of knowing, which lead to Error
- 5) To understand the contribution of Indian thinkers to the theories of Error.

---

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION :

Philosophy is the search of knowledge. When knowledge of a thing is attained, human intellect feels compelled to inquire whether the knowledge, so attained is true. Thus search of knowledge is closely connected with the nature of truth and error.

The problem of truth is connected with the problem of reality. The nature of the connection between truth and reality is understood differently by realist, idealist and pragmatist thinkers. The realist and the idealist thinkers concentrate on theoretical aspect of the problem of truth where as the pragmatist thinkers concentrate on practical aspect of the problem of truth.

In the theoretical aspect truth consists in revealing the knowledge of an object as it is. This is the Realist position which advocates the correspondence theory of truth.

In the theoretical aspect, truth is also understood as formal consistency among ideas. This is the Idealist position which advocates the coherence theory of Truth.

In the practical aspect, truth consists solely in practical satisfaction of will and desires. It consists in acting upon knowledge. This is Pragmatic theory of Truth.

The problem of Error too, is connected with the reality. We become conscious of error when the demands of ideal past are not met by present. Indian philosophers provide psychological analysis of error on the basis of epistemological and metaphysical views. Different schools of Indian philosophy put forward different theories about illusory perception i. e. Error. These theories differ from one another on ontological, and epistemological views. The Madhyamika school of Buddhism advocates Asatkhyati, The Nyaya School advocates Anyathakhyati and the Purva – Mimansaka Prabhakar advocate Akhyati.

---

## **7.2 THEORIES OF TRUTH :**

---

- 1) Man is a rational animal. Truth seeking is already present in human nature. The quest for Truth raises two questions –
  - 1) What truth is i.e. the meaning of Truth.
  - 2) How to know Truth i. e. the criterion of Truth.

The problem of Truth does not arise in the case of our implicit thoughts. It arises when we express our thoughts through words. A sentence is a meaningful combination of words. Sentences are the means of communication. They express our emotions, thoughts desires, wishes, doubts, commands, requests questions and information. The problem of Truth is related with informative sentences only.

The informative sentences are directed towards what does or does not exist. They are related to what we believe or what we judge. The assertive or declarative sentences are either true or false. The such informative sentences are called as statements. A statement is a sentence which is either true or false.

In this way only declarative or indicative sentences which are either true or false express knowledge. Knowledge is a set of statements. So truth of knowledge is truth of statements which are declarative in nature. The question about truth does not arise

in the case of interrogative, optative, imperative or exclamatory sentences.

As per our syllabus, we are going to study the Coherence theory of idealism and the Pragmatic theory of Truth.

**7.2.1 THE COHERENCE THEORY OF TRUTH :** 1) Idealism advocates the Coherence theory of Truth. Idealism is a view that the object of knowledge depends upon the perceiving mind for its existence. Knowledge consists in the ideas of the perceiving mind. Truth is the consistency among the ideas. The Idealist thinkers like Berkeley, Leibnitz, Spinoza, Hegel, Bradley, Bosonquet, Shankeracharya, advocate the Coherence theory of Truth.

For Idealist thinkers, Reality is rational. There is only one comprehensive and harmonious system of knowledge. Truth is coherence or harmony of one statement with another statement. An isolated and alone statement does not have truth value of its own.

Different statement of one system are logically connected with one another. Every statement or proposition is in harmony with the rest propositions. Non – contradiction among these statements is truth and contradiction or in consistency among these propositions is falsity. Truth is an internal relation among statements. Truth consists in complete coherence among all the statements of a system.

Truth of a statement can be known only with its relation to the whole system. That is why any proposition is partly true. Knowledge is a coherent whole of propositions. Every statement in it has it's own definite place. Every statement contributes to the coherence of the whole system. A complete system can be wholly true. Truth is extensive and all inclusive.

Human intellect is finite. It can conceive the statement in the limited sphere Eron any error is partial truth. From the absolute stand point there is no error at all.

There are different branches of knowledge, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, botany. The statements of one branch should be consistent with another. They must also be coherent with the statements of another branch of knowledge. In other words the different systems of knowledge must be consistent with one another. All branches are the parts of one comprehensive unique system of knowledge.

Truth consists in the rational unity of all the systems of knowledge. The principle of comprehensiveness resolves the inconsistencies among these constituent systems and manifests the reality as one organized harmonious whole. Truth is neither made nor determined by human intellect Truth is in reality.

**CRITICISM** : The Coherence theory of Truth faces the following difficulties -

- 1) The Coherence theory believes that no statement is absolutely true. As truth depends upon the consistency between propositions, the propositions will be more or less true. One statement which is more consistent with other statement may be more true other statement. It seems absurd. The Coherence theory thus advocates degrees of Truth.

The idealist thinkers try to resolve this difficulty. They argue that the inherent limitations of human intellect lead to the conception of degrees of Truth.

- 2) The Coherence theory presupposes truth. Statement B is true because it is consistent with statement A. The theory presupposes the truth of A. Even if we seek another coherent statement for the truth of statement A, the process will be endless.
- 3) The Coherence theory presupposes the truth of laws of logic. The laws of logic themselves can not be tested by Coherence theory. We need something else outside the scope of this theory.
- 4) It is very difficult to attain a completely coherent theory, in empirical science. In the case of empirical sciences, we have to think of correspondence with facts.
- 5) The Coherence theory can not explain the meaning of truth. It provides the criterion of truth i. e. Coherence of one statement with another is the test of truth. The nature and criterion of truth coincide in the coherence theory.
- 6) The criterion of consistency can help us to discover the falsity of a proposition. It is not sufficient to establish the truth of proposition. There can a completely false but logically consistent and harmonious system. Many science fictions are good examples of such a consistent but false system.

- 7) The question arises, why should we believe in only one coherent system? There can be many compatible systems. Philosophy itself believes that

**7.2.2 THE PRAGMATIC THEORY OF TRUTH :** For Pragmatism, Truth is the workability and fruitful consequence of our ideas. The thinkers like Peirce, William James, Schiller, John Dewey advocate Pragmatic theory of Truth.

Pragmatist thinkers believe that there is no Absolute or Eternal Truth as such. Truth is empirical. We observe the changing world. It is obvious that our understanding of the world also changes. Truth is that which survives in the course of time. Truth goes through the process of verification. The process of evolution points out the survival of the fittest.

Truth consists solely in practical satisfaction of will and desire. Our knowledge about the path of IDE is true if we really reach to the institute. The Perception of mirage in a desert is false because it does not quench our thirst.

Truth is an adventitious feature, added to knowledge when successful practice follows it. According to William James, Truth is the name of whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief." There can be different, equally correct approaches towards reality. Truth is the successful adjustment between our purposes and the world. A true idea is that which leads to successful consequences whereas a false idea is that which leads to unfruitful consequences.

Truth has practical bearing. It must satisfy individual needs. Scientific truths keep changing from time to time. Truth is constructed in the course of our experiences. The fruitful consequences of our action reconstruct the concept of Truth. Our ideas or statements or judgements are not valid in themselves. They are validated by the satisfaction of the purpose.

John Dewey's theory is called as instrumentalism. He believes that thinking process is closely connected with our life. Thought is a function among other functions originating from the needs of life.

Knowledge helps us to survive through the struggle of life. It helps us to lead good life. Our thoughts, beliefs and ideas are working tools i. e. instruments to live the life in a better way. Truth is relevant to a specific situation and valuable for a purpose.

For Instrumentalism, true knowledge is an instrument of successful life. The belief which leads to promotion of life is true.

Truth serves the purpose of survival. It is the fittest possible response in the struggle of life. A wrong response may cost even the life.

Truth is tested in practice. There is no ultimate truth. Truth must be constantly revised and reconstructed. Truth is made by different events. It is still in the process of making and awaits the parts of its completion from the future. John Dewey believed that social reforms and changes in educational set up can lead to better life. Such changes bring about fruitful consequences.

We know that the problem of Truth is closely connected with the problem of reality for pragmatist thinkers, there is no ultimate reality as such. Ultimate Reality is shaped in accordance with the purpose of the individual. Human 'intellect' can offer many equally plausible alternative solutions to the same problem. Human 'will' chooses the alternative that results in greatest satisfaction. Thus for pragmatist conative satisfaction or utility becomes the criterion of truth.

**CRITICISM** : The Pragmatic Theory of Truth faces the following difficulties.

1. Pragmatists reject the concept of Absolute Truth. They make Truth subjective and relative.
2. Every belief or idea which works is not necessarily true. A cancer patient may live a better life, if he does not know about his mysterious disease.
3. Many false or incorrect ideas lead to fruitful consequences in human life. Using unfair means in examination may lead to success but it does not justify nor does prove the truth of unfair means.
4. The ideas often work because they are basically true. Truth of our judgements leads to success of our activities.
5. Pragmatism reduces Truth to a personal and private affair. What works for one man may not work for another man. Even the idea which is useful at one time.
6. There are many ideas whose truth can never be denied, though none of these ideas lead to successful consequences e.g. knowledge of starvation on the part of a man of broken legs, can not lead him to any fruitful activity to fetch food.
7. The Pragmatic thinkers make truth to be a species of Good. For these thinkers truth is valuable for a purpose. However, Truth is as fundamental as Good and Beauty. None of Truth, Good or Beauty is subordinate to other.

8. The Pragmatic theory of Truth also gives us the criterion of truth. It does not explain the meaning of truth. This theory signifies “fulfillment of purpose” as the test of Truth.

**Check the progress :-**

Q1 Theoretical aspect of the problem of Truth?

---



---



---



---

2. Which theory does focus on the practical aspect of the problem of Truth?

---



---



---



---

3. What is truth, according to Pragmatic theory?

---



---



---



---

4. What is truth, according to Coherence theory?

---



---



---



---

**7.2.3 TRUTH IS UNANALYSABLE :**The Coherence Theory of Truth or the Pragmatic theory of Truth can not give satisfactory answer to the question. “What is truth?” The question still remains. Whether we really do not know what truth is?

Many times we know with certainty what truth is. We surely understand truth. We have direct apprehension of truth. The difficulty arises when we want to explain what truth is. When we try to express What truth is, it results in verbal confusions and disputes. We can not explain the meaning of truth properly.

We have to admit that truth is indefinable it does not mean that we do now know what truth is. It simply means that we can directly and immediately know what truth is. Truth is intuitively known but can not be expressed in words.

True statements must have correspondence to the external world. These statements must be consistent with one another to form a comprehensive system of knowledge. Finally, truth must have a cash value. It must work and lead to success. Thus, truth is an unanalysable relation between the proposition and fact.

---

### **7.3 THEORIES OF ERROR :**

---

The human quest for knowledge has a feature of truth seeking activity. That is why human intellect inquires into the ways and means by which knowledge can be assimilated and can be developed. Error is adventitious feature of knowledge. Right knowledge is to be distinguished from erroneous knowledge.

Error arises when there are some defects in the conditions of perception. Illusory perception depends upon a wrong operation of the sense organs with regard to their objects. Error can arise from subconscious impressions.

The theories of Error or Khyativada is the unique feature of Indian Philosophy Literally the word khyati means knowledge. However in “Khyativada” the word Khyati is used in the restricted sense. i. e. “Illusory knowledge”.

All schools of Indian Philosophy investigate into the nature, the means and the criteria of validity, of knowledge. The detailed analysis of erroneous knowledge is the contribution of Indian thinkers in epistemology. These thinkers analyse “error” in knowledge from psychological, epistemological and metaphysical standpoint. Such a minute description of the stages in illusion, develops keen insight into metaphysical problems.

As per our syllabus, we are going to study, the theories of Asatkhyati, Anyathakhyati and Akhyati.

**7.3.1 ASATKHYATIVADA :** Asatkhyati is the theory of Error advocated by Madhyamika school of Buddhism. The word ‘Asatkhyati’ literally means the knowledge of non – existent object.

For the Madhyamika three constituents of cognition viz. the self (the knower), the object (the known) and the knowledge are interdependent. If any one of them is unreal, the other two become unreal. When we see a ‘snake’ in the rope, the object known ‘snake’ is false, then the apprehension and the perceiving mind too, become false. Right knowledge consists in the apprehension of object that is real. In correct knowledge consists in the apprehension of object that is unreal. The object of an illusion does not exist.

According to Nagarjuna (the advocate of Madhyamika school of Buddhism) all that we perceive within or without, along with their perception and percipient mind, are illusory like dream objects. In an illusory cognition, the object that is manifest in consciousness does not exist that time.

Nagarjuna gives the example of the dream of a maiden. In her dream of the maiden delivers a son and in the dream itself her son dies. The maiden becomes happy by the birth of son and she becomes sad by the death of her son.

Nagarjuna says all our empirical experiences are as unreal as the dream experiences of the maiden. Even the cognition of snake in the rope, the apprehension of silver in the shell, indicate, knowledge of unreal objects.

For the Madhyamika our knowledge of empirical world is unreal. All our perceptions of internal or external objects are erroneous. We are dreaming even when we are awake. When nothing is real, there is no possibility of misunderstanding.

#### **CRITICAL REMARKS :**

1. Asatkhyativada is the very first theory of error in Indian Philosophy. It evoked the polemics over the problem of erroneous knowledge, among the schools of Indian philosophy.
2. Asatkhyativada is the foundation stone of the metaphysical theory of Shunyavada. Shunyavada of Buddhism holds that the Ultimate reality is Shunyam. Neither the external world nor the inner world of ideas is real. By 'Shunyam', Nagarjuna means indescribable nature of Reality.
3. If Asatkhyativada means cognition of non – existent, the question arises what is the nature of non-existence? An absolutely non – existent object can never appear in consciousness. So there can not be any illusion or error. If non – existence means, absence in a particular time at a particular space; the theory no longer remains Asatkhyati, it becomes theory of Anyathakhati.

**7.3.2 ANYATHAKHYATIVADA :** Anyathakhyati is the theory of Error advocated by Nyaya School of Indian philosophy according to this theory. Error consists in the apprehension of an object as a different object.

Nyaya thinkers advocate Realism. For them, the worldly objects their own independent existence. What does not exist at

all, can not be perceived. A non-existent thing can not produce any cognition.

For Naiyayikas, Error is the apprehension of an object as other than what it is. Error consists in misapprehension of object as another e.g. we see a white object, take it to be a silver, pick it up and we find it to be a shell. Error consists in the apprehension of silver shell, the object in which silver does not exist. Error is due to wrong synthesis of presented and represented objects. Error lies in the cognition and not in the object.

Nyaya thinkers advocate that even error has a complete objective basis in reality. Erroneous cognitions are not possible without real objects. In other words, the incorrect apprehension of silver is not possible without a real piece of shell. No wrong apprehension is entirely baseless.

The error of perceiving silver in a shell can be analysed in the following manner –

We have past experience of silver – we perceive a shining object – we perceive only the common qualities of silver and the present object of apprehension – the perception of similarities revive the memory of peculiar qualities of silver – the reproduction of silver in memory produces the present perception of silver – so we have an illusory perception, “This is silver”.

So long as the illusion lasts, there is actual perception of silver. Silver does not exist in shell, it exists in some other time and place. By true knowledge, wrong apprehension is set aside.

#### **CRITICAL REMARKS :**

1. In Anyathakhyati the object of erroneous cognition exists in some other place and time. However it does not explain the existence of object in the present cognition e. g. illusion of snake in rope – we perceive the snake here and now. But the theory of Anyathakhyati holds that snake exists in some other place & time.

The Nyaya thinkers explain illusory perception by extra – ordinary perception. The Naiyikas accept Jnanalakshana (Complication) as a type of Alaukika (extra ordinary) perception. Due to complication we can see a hot cup of tea.

2. The object of our cognition i.e. the rope and object of illusion snake both are real simply these objects exist in different

place and time. If these two objects are real, then why is their inter relation erroneous?

**7.3.3. AKHYATIVADA :** The theory of Akhyati is advocated by Prabhakara of Mimamsa School of philosophy. Akhativada denies the existence of illusory knowledge. Prabhakara exempt all knowledge from error.

Mimansakar are realists. For them, there is no knowledge which does not point to a corresponding object outside it. Cognition is immediate apprehension. Prabhakara holds that whatever is manifested to consciousness must be the object of that consciousness. An illusory perception can never take place as there will be no corresponding object manifested in the perception. All knowledge is self evident. To experience is to experience validity.

The error in knowledge, arises from the defect in the means of knowledge or from the incompatibility with subsequent experience. Error is nothing but partial truth. It is imperfect knowledge. Erroneous knowledge does not have any corresponding object it arises from within.

Error is not a unit of knowledge. It is a composite of two cognitions. Illusion is the mixture of two different kinds of knowledge i.e. the perception of one object of immediately followed a memory or by another perception. For example "This is a snake".

"This" is the perception of a long tortuous object and "snake" is the memory of our previous experience. Error arises when we over look the fact that present cognition is complex perception of two cognition. We also fail to notice the separateness of their respective objects.

Similarly, a white crystal placed by the side of a red flower may be wrongly regarded as a red crystal. The knowledge of red crystal arises from the perception of a crystal without its true colour and the sensation of redness alone, of the flower.

In the above mentioned examples each of the cognitions (i.e. a long tortuous thing, the crystal, the redness the snake in memory) is separately true, but each cognition is a partial knowledge. Error lies in the contiguity of the objects.

**According to Akhyativada there are two elements in an illusory cognition**

1. The positive element consists in the presence of two cognitions which partially reveal their objects. It is imperfect knowledge, of the objects presented to consciousness.

2. The negative element consists in overlooking the distinction between two cognitions and their objects. These two cognitions may be both perceptions may both be memories or may be a perception and a memory.

The negative element consists in the failure to note the discrimination between two cognitions. We mix up the presentative (perceived) and representative (perceived or remembered) elements in one single psychosis. Prabhakar mentions the example of Alatchakra i.e the circular movement of a torch with two ignited ends. The non discrimination of two elements (Vivekagraha) is the cause of error.

In Akhyati or erroneous knowledge the two elements are not discriminated from one another so long as the illusion persists. A sublating cognition simply recognizes the discrimination between two elements i.e. the presentative and the representative elements (this long object and the snake) The lack of discrimination is due to obscuration of memory (smrutipramosha)

For Mimansakas. Error affects our activity rather than knowledge. In the illusion of “This is snake”, we behave towards the rope as we should behave towards a snake. Our behaviour is erroneous and not the cognition. The error in behaviour is due to non – apprehension of the difference between the presented and represented elements.

### **CRITICAL REMARKS :**

1. It seem unintelligible that two cognitions can blend together to form one single psychosis. How can also physical things (i. e. a rope and a snake) can blend with each other ?

### **Check your progress :-**

1. What is meant by Khyativada?

---



---



---



---



---

2. State Asatkhyativada.

---



---



---



---



---

3. What is meant by Anyathakhyativada?

---



---



---



---

4. What is Mimansaka Prabhakara's view of error?

---



---



---



---

#### **7.4 SUMMARY :**

Philosophy is the search of true knowledge. Knowledge is a set of statements. Statement is a declarative sentence. The problem of truth has two aspects – theoretical and practical. Idealism advocates the Coherence theory of truth from theoretical aspect. The Pragmatic theory of truth concentrates on practical aspect of truth.

The problem of Truth as well as the problem of Error is closely related with the problem of Reality.

According to the Coherence theory of truth "Truth is the consistency between statements" Idealism aims at a completely coherent system of knowledge. It views reality as a rational whole. Pragmatism relates truth of statement with human action. Pragmatism holds that truth is the workability and fruitful consequence of our ideas. Instrumentation holds that knowledge is a means of successful life.

The problem of error has been discussed threadbare by every Indian school. The problem of error is discussed from, psychological epistemological and metaphysical stand points.

Madhyamika school of Buddhism is the very first school of Indian Philosophy to discuss the problem of error. Their theory evoked the polemics over the problem of error. Asatkhyativada is advocated by Madhyamika school. This theory holds that all our empirical experiences are as unreal as dream experiences.

Nyaya School of philosophy advocates Anyathakhyativada. This theory holds that error is otherwise or incorrect knowledge. Error is due to a wrong synthesis of the presented and the represented objects.

Prabhakara of Mimansa School advocates Akhyativada. According to this theory, error is due non – discrimination between the presented and the represented objects.

For Nyaya School the presented and represented objects are real but the relation between them leads to error. For Mimansakas too the objects are real but the non – apprehension of the discrimination leads to error. For Madhyamika School, the presented and the represented objects are unreal. The reality itself is indescribable.

---

### **7.5 QUESTIONS :**

---

1. Critically examine the coherent theory of Truth.
2. Discuss the pragmatic theory of Truth.
3. Explain in details the Nyaya Theory or Error.
4. Explain the features of Akhyativada of Prabhakara.
5. Write short notes.
  1. Instrumentalism
  2. Asatkhyativada

## **LIFE AFTER DEATH: RESURRECTION AND TRANSMIGRATION OF SOUL**

### **UNIT STRUCTURE**

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Resurrection
- 8.3 Transmigration of Soul
- 8.4 Unit end Exercise
- 8.5 References

---

### **8.0 OBJECTIVES :**

---

After going through this unit you will be able to  
 Understand the concept of Rebirth in Hinduism  
 Understand the concept of Resurrection in Christianity.

---

### **8.1 INTRODUCTION :**

---

Granting that the soul continues to exist after the death of the body, the question is in what form it exists. In what form does it enter into another body? Does it come back to the earth in a different body?. If so, how and in what way?.

OR Does it continue to exist in a different world without a body?. Different answers are given by different religions to these questions.

The doctrine of transmigration of soul, rebirth, reincarnation (resurrection) has been believed since earlier times and is continued to be believed in. Belief in rebirth is wide-spread in the East and in the West.

---

### **8.2 RESURRECTION :**

---

**8.2.1 INTRODUCTION :** Of all the Sematic religions, Christianity has proved to be the most influential and has dominated a large population of the world. Christianity is a monotheistic religion believing in one and only one God. God has consciousness and will and is of the nature of

Pure Spirit. Jesus, regarded as the son or sometimes the Messiah of God is the founder of religion of Christianity. According to Christianity, there is only one God. God has many metaphysical and ethical attributes. God is the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the world. Man is created by God in the latter's own image and so potentially man is great. But he has degenerated into same by misusing the free will granted to him by God. Nevertheless, God being essentially kind and loving wants man's redemption and it is for this purpose that he sent Jesus on earth to educate people on proper lines. Thus Jesus is the redeemer of man.

**8.2.2 CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY :** The resurrection theory is accepted by Christianity. In general sense, resurrection means revival or coming back to life. Christianity believes in the immortality of the soul. The death of the body is not the death of the soul. Soul is immortal. As the soul in man is immortal, death is not the total and final end of man. There is an after life too. The main ingredients of Christian eschatology are- The Final Day Of Judgment, Resurrection of the Dead, and The Assignment of Heaven or Hell to people in accordance with their good or bad deeds on earth. The after life account of Christianity is not basically different from that of Judaism or Islam or even of Zoroastrianism to a great extent. However, the details are not identical.

The day when the world comes to its final end is called The Final Day Of Judgment. When exactly this end of the world will take place, is known to God and God alone. It depends upon His will. On this Day of Judgment, there is resurrection of the dead. On this Day of Judgment, all souls are united within their bodies will be brought before God for the final assessment of the value of their deeds done by them during their earlier lives. Those whose deeds are in accordance with the teachings of Jesus are sent to heaven, and these who have been unrighteous and sinful are sent to hell. Hell is a place or state of eternal punishment and eternal separation from God, while heaven is the state or place of eternal happiness through communion with God. It is a state of perfect and unceasing joy.

**8.2.3 UNIVERSAL AND PARTICULAR JUDGEMENT :** The question that arises is: what happens to the individual soul in the intermediary period, i.e. during the period between the death of an individual and the final day of judgment?. Where does the soul lie during this period? To answer this question Christianity seems to believe in two kinds of judgment. The universal judgment is the final judgment made at the end of the world which is applicable to all. But before this final or universal judgment there is a particular judgment, i.e judgment in case of a particular individual immediately after his physical death. There is the

idea that if a person dies in the love of God and his fellow-beings, he is taken unstained and is “straightaway received into heaven”. And again the soul of the man who has lived a sinful life quite in disobedience of God’s will straightaway go down to hell. Those souls which although have been stained by sins, but have shown sincere repentance and have undergone penance etc are first sent to Purgatory for purification and then sent to heaven. Purgatory is deemed in Christianity as a place (or a state) in which the souls of those who have been stained by sin but have died in repentance are detained for purging or cleansing, so that they may be rendered fit for the company of God. After this act of purging, they are sent to heaven.

**8.2.4 KINGDOM OF GOD :** Thus in Christianity eternal life or immortality actually means eternal fellowship or communion with God. In other words, it consists in achieving the membership of the kingdom of God. But what does this “Kingdom of God” mean? Where is it situated? Is it to be here in this world itself or in a world beyond it? Christian belief in the reality of heaven and hell, leads one to believe that the kingdom of God really lies in heaven, a realm beyond this world. And, therefore, salvation or eternal life really consists in attaining the membership of heaven. It is only in heaven that one is to attain eternal nearness to God.

**8.2.5 SUMMARY :** Christianity is a monotheistic religion, believing in one God. He has consciousness and will and is of the nature of Pure Spirit. Redemption or liberation is ultimately the fruit of Gods’s grace. Christianity believes in the immortality of soul and therefore it believes in a life after death also. The final day of Judgement, resurrection of the dead on the final day and also allotment of heaven and hell in accordance with the earth1ly deeds of men are the chief ingredients of Christian eschatology.

**Check your progress :-**

1. Explain the concept of Resurrection in Christianity.

---



---



---



---



---



---

### **8.3 TRANSMIGRATION OF SOUL :**

---

**8.3.1 INTRODUCTION :** Hinduism is perhaps the oldest of all the religions. It has neither any definite date of its origin nor has it any definite founder associated with it. It is called Sanatana Dharma, a religion coming down to people through eternity. It is thus a unique religion in one very

important sense. Some of the important religious texts of Hinduism are the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas, the DharmaSutras and DharmaShastras, the Ramayana, the Mahabharat and the Bhagvad Gita. The Vedas are the earliest available records of Indian literature. The origin of Indian philosophy may be easily traced in the Vedas.

Hinduism believes in immortality of soul, law of karma, transmigration or rebirth and theory of karma.

**8.3.2 IMMORATLITY OF SOUL:** The souls are eternal. They are neither born nor destroyed. Their birth is association with bodies. Their death is disassociation from bodies.

Hinduism firmly believes that the essential nature of man is spiritual. In Hinduism, man has been given a very high status. He is not only the highest creature of the world; he is often given a status equal to God. The concept of Nar-Narayan (Man-God) in Hinduism amply speaks of the godly status that man has been given. Although outwardly, man is a psycho-physical being, in the inner core of his being, there is a soul which is really the spark of the Divine within him. So man is essentially divine in nature. This soul in man is immortal. Nothing can destroy it. Even death can do nothing to it. The Bhagvad Gita says, "It (the Atman) is never born, nor does it die at anytime, nor having once come to be will it ever cease to be. It is unborn, eternal, permanent and primeval. It is not slain when body is slain." Then again "Weapons do not cleave this self, fire does not burn it, water does not make it wet, nor does the wind make it dry. It is uncleavable, it cannot be burnt. It can be neither wetted nor dried. It is eternal, all – pervading, unchanging and immovable. It is the same for ever."

All schools of Indian philosophy except the Charva believe in the reality of the self. The Buddhist denies the reality of permanent self and regards it as a series of momentary ideas.

**8.3.3 Transmigration/Rebirth:** Hinduism believes that life of man does not end with his physical death. The immortal soul of man endures even after the death of his body. But what happens to the soul after the death of the body?. In what form or state does it endure after the physical death of man?. To these questions Hinduism has an answer which is very different from the answer given by Semitic religions. According to Hinduism, the soul , after the death of the present body, has to enter into some other new body in accordance with its past deeds. It undergoes trans-migration from an old body to a new one. It has to be reborn. The Bhagvad Gita says, "Just as a person casts off worn- out garments and puts on others that are new, even so does the embodied souls casts off

worn out bodies and take on others that are new.” This doctrine of rebirth is really a very important feature of Hinduism.

**8.3.4 Theory of Karma:** The idea of rebirth in Hindu faith is essentially bound up with the idea of Karma. Belief in Karma, implies that, as one sows so he reaps. One has essentially to undergo, the consequences of whatever actions one performs. No action goes waste or undone. It does produce its fruit sooner or later and the performer has to reap his fruits without fail. If one does not undergo the consequences of his actions in this life, he has to undergo them in a life after death. Rebirth is therefore a necessary consequence of the actions done in ones previous life, the consequence of which he has not been able to undergo. So as long as one does not exhaust the fruits of his actions, he has to be bound in a continuous chain of birth and rebirth. Karmas generate samskaras which force a soul to be born. The soul migrates from one body to another with all he samskaras of his past karmas. And the state of rebirth is conditioned by the nature of actions one has done in his past life. The happy or undesirable life that one has in his present birth is to be explained in terms of good or bad actions performed by him in his past life. Only niskama karma (Action without attachment) does not generate any samskara and therefore a performer of those actions has not to take rebirth. He attains Moksha or relief which is a pure spiritual state of perfection. All actions done with attachment cause the soul to migrate from one body to another and the chain continues so long as one is engaged in such actions. Only when one fully exhausts the fruits of one’s such karmas that one becomes free from the chain of birth and rebirth and attains the final release or Moksha.

Moksha is life eternal in which soul becomes free from all worldly sufferings and attains its original ,pure, spiritual nature. Moksha is possible by adopting any of the three paths.- The path of knowledge , the path of disinterested or unattached actions or the path of devotion to God.

**Check your progress :-**

1) Explain in brief the law of karma ?

---



---



---



---



---

**8.3.5 Summary :** Hinduism is a complex religion admitting of vast differences of beliefs and practices amongst its followers. Hinduism believes in the transmigration of soul. This transmigration of soul from one body to another is not, however, taken as something desirable in Hinduism. It is a sign souls bondage which begets continued suffering. Liberation from this cycle of birth and rebirth is the real goal of man.

---

**8.4 UNIT END EXERCISES:**

---

1. How does Christianity explains life after death?
2. Examine concept the of resurrection in Christianity
3. How does Hinduism explains life after death
4. Explain the concept of rebirth in Hinduism

---

**8.5 REFERENCES FOR FURTHER READING :**

---

Kedarnath Tiwari "Comparative Religion"- Motilal Banarsidas  
Swami Sivananda "World's Religions" - The Sivananda  
publication league Rishikesh  
John Hick "The Philosophy of Religion"

## **TWENTIETH CENTURY PHILOSOPHY :**

### **i) LOGICAL POSITIVISM (ALFRED AYER)**

### **ii) RADICAL HUMANISM (M.N.ROY)**

#### **UNIT STRUCTURE**

- 9.0 Objectives
- 9.1 Logical Positivism (Alfred Ayer)
- 9.2 Radical Humanism (M.N.Roy)
- 9.3 Unit End Exercise
- 9.4 Suggested Readings

---

#### **9.0 OBJECTIVES :**

---

After going through this unit you will be able to understand

The aim of logical positivist.

The arguments stated by the logical positivists against metaphysics.

The concept of humanism.

Roy's view's on philosophy, science, religion, ontology, nature of human being, ethics, democracy, education and revolution

---

#### **9.1 LOGICAL POSITIVISM (ALFRED AYER) :**

---

**9.1.1 INTRODUCTION :** Logical Positivism is the most recent trend in philosophy. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, logical positivism came into existence with the establishment of Vienna circle. The Vienna Circle was a group of philosophers of science with philosophic inkling who met of and on under the Chairmanship of Moritz Schlick, who, at that time, was holding the chair of philosophy in the University of Vienna. In addition to Logical Positivism, other names have been applied to the views of the Vienna Circle, such as Scientific Empiricism, Neo Positivism and Logical Empiricism. The period between 1930 and 1939 was a golden age of Vienna Circle. During this period logical positivism was riding the high crest of philosophic tidal wave. Many top intellectuals of the world joined the movement in these years. Though logical positivism has made sufficient progress since then, the Vienna Circle had begun disintegrating

during Second World War. The best known members of this group were A.J.Ayer, M.Schlick, R.Carnap, F.Weismann, O.Neurath, Feigl,F.Kaufmann, H.Hahn,K.Menger and Kurt Godel.

**9.1.2 THE AIM OF LOGICAL POSITIVISTS** : If we make a close examination of logical positivism, we find it in two strains, one positivists and other negativist. On the positivist side, the aim of these philosophers was to make the foundations of the science, to rid it of the pseudo concepts of metaphysics and to lay its foundation on strictly empirical principles. On the negativist side, their aim was to prove the futility and the barrenness of the traditional philosophy and condemn metaphysics as meaningless, invalid and misleading.

**9.1.3 THE VERIFICATION PRINCIPLE** : The main features of Vienna Circle from which Logical Positivism originated were two: on the one hand, an extreme respect for science and mathematics; and on the other hand, an extreme distaste for metaphysics. It devised the criterion of verification – principle by which the scientific (and mathematical) statements were proven to be acceptable and metaphysics by contrast was condemned. The verification principle laid down the following:

A statement is meaningful, only if, there is a way in which it could be verified or tested to be either true or false.

What a statement means is shown by the method of its verification. Verification must always terminate, according to the logical positivists, in empirical observation or sense-experience. A special exception was made in case of analytic formulae of logic and mathematics which do not require to be empirically verified at all. But the alleged statements of metaphysicians and theologians were condemned by the positivists to be meaningless since these cannot be empirically verified.

**Check your progress :-**

1 What is Logical Positivism?

---



---



---



---



---

2. State the Verification principle of Logical positivists.

---



---



---



---



---

#### 9.1.4 LOGICAL POSITIVISTS' DENIAL OF METAPHYSICS :

Metaphysics is the main branch of traditional philosophy. Metaphysics is the science of existence or Reality. Its main problems are: What is Reality? Is the world one or many? What are the fundamental characteristics of creation? What is space? What is time? What is matter? What is relation? What is cause and effect? What is the purpose of creation? Is the world progressing? Is there a God? Is change real or unreal? In brief, metaphysics discusses three aspects of Reality: i.e. the world, the self and the God. Its scope includes ontology, philosophy of self, cosmogony, cosmology and theology.

The logical positivists are extreme empiricists and therefore very critical of metaphysics. According to them metaphysics cannot be a subject of study because metaphysical statements are meaningless, According to them metaphysics is impossible not because our intelligence is limited but because *metaphysics itself is meaningless*. They arrive at the result using '**verifiability-principle**' for which they have become famous in contemporary philosophy.

The contemporary Logical Positivists deny the possibility Metaphysics by showing that metaphysical propositions are meaningless. Ludwig Wittgenstein holds that every elementary proposition represents some facts of experience. What makes a proposition true is a fact. A proposition which does not refer to a fact of experience is meaningless. To be meaningful, it must, at least, refer to possible facts of experience. It should be amenable to verification by experience of facts.

The Logical Positivists divide propositions into two kinds; 1) analytical propositions; and 2) empirical propositions. The propositions in mathematics and formal logic are analytical and tautologous. Empirical propositions are verifiable by experience. They are meaningful. Empirical propositions are meaningful, if they correspond with the facts of experience in time and space. They are meaningless if they do not correspond with facts of experience. They are false if they are unverifiable by experience. Experience means sense-experience. "It is raining." This empirical statement is directly verifiable by experience. "There are mountains on the other side of the moon". This statement is indirectly verifiable by experience. It is not directly verifiable. Historical statements are indirectly verifiable. Empirical statements which are directly or indirectly verifiable are meaningful. Metaphysical propositions about transempirical entities (e.g., self, God, future life , etc) are non-sensical or meaningless, because they are beyond experience. Such propositions are neither directly nor indirectly verifiable by experience. "The world is an effect". "Therefore, God is the cause of the world." Both the

propositions are non-sensical, because they are not analyzable into parts, which are facts of experience. The world as a whole is not experienced; nor is it experienced as an effect, God also is not experienced; nor is He experienced as the cause of the world. So these are non-sensical propositions. Similarly other metaphysical propositions are not verifiable by experience. They are not really propositions at all, because they assert the existence of trans-empirical realities, which are not verifiable by experience. They are not verifiable in principle. Therefore they are non-sensical or meaningless.

Propositions regarding the structure of the world, atoms, heat light etc fall within province of science. Philosophy is not the unity of sciences. It does not synthesize the results of the sciences. The task of philosophy is to analyze philosophical concepts and clarify their meanings. Its method is linguistic analysis . The Logical Positivist denies the possibility of Metaphysics of superphenomenal reality, because it is not empirically verifiable, and , consequently, meaningless. So, metaphysics is impossible.

#### **9.1.5 CRITICISM OF LOGICAL POSITIVISM :**

**First**, Logical Positivism denies Metaphysics of transempirical realities, because they are not empirically verifiable. This position is extremely unsatisfactory. Man is a rational being, and , as such, cannot stifle his philosophical impulse. Every person has some world view, and is an incipient philosopher.

**Secondly**, Logical Positivism makes too much of empirical verification. Empirical verification is verification by experience. By experience it means sense- experience. But there are other types of experience, e.g., aesthetic experience, moral experience, religious experience. These are important types of experience, by which we apprehend beauty and ugliness, right and good, and God. They should not be discarded.

**Thirdly**, experience is not the only source of knowledge. Reason is another important source of knowledge. Sciences make use of reason in explaining, co-coordinating and harmonizing the facts of experience. They cannot make any advance without the aid of reason. Logical Positivism adopts empiricism and suffers from its defects.

**Fourthly**, the Logical Positivists continually modify the meaning of empirical verification. Some propositions are not amenable to direct empirical verification. Or, they may be empirically verifiable in principle. The Logical Positivists do not clearly define the meaning of empirical verification.

**Lastly**, the Logical Positivists do not advocate any metaphysical position, materialism or idealism, atheism or theism, and the like. They do not regard even empirically verifiable propositions as certain, but only probable. Hence, Logical Positivism is not satisfactory philosophical position.

It is not possible to eliminate metaphysics. Metaphysics will always be there so long as there are men who can philosophize, ask ultimate questions about the world and seek answers. We do not have a choice between metaphysics and non-metaphysics. We only have a choice between good metaphysics and bad metaphysics.

**9.1.6 SUMMARY :** Logical positivism is a variety of neo-positivism which has originated in the 1920s with the Vienna circle. According to Logical Positivism a genuinely scientific philosophy is possible only as a logical analysis of the language of science. The function of this analysis is, first, to get rid of metaphysics, and on the other hand, to investigate the logical structure of scientific knowledge, in order to determine the empirically verifiable content of scientific concept and assertions.

---

## **9.2 RADICAL HUMANISM (M.N.ROY) :**

---

### **9.2.1 MEANING OF HUMANISM :**

**a) Etymological meaning:-** The English word humanism has been derived from the latin term 'Homo' which means human being. Thus, literally speaking, humanism is the philosophy in which man occupies a central place.

**b) Concept of Humanism:-** Humanism is the philosophy according to which man is central in the scheme of things. Man is the only worthy object of knowledge. Humanism is the criterion to solve the controversies arising in human life. Ever since reason dawned in man, thoughtful persons have been in search of someone or the other criterion of reality to solve the controversies arising in human life.

According to humanism, man is the essence of reality. There is no other super human ontological reality beyond him. He is the proper object of knowledge and whatever human faculties help us in knowing anything are faculties of knowledge. All truth is human truth and there is no truth beyond man. Humanism is obviously against all types of super naturalism or super humanism. It cannot consider any man to be essentially greater than other human beings. In it the term human welfare means the welfare of ordinary human beings. Whatever has been found to be useful for human welfare has been attached with the concept of humanism such as the idea of social welfare, scientific attitude, progress of democratic institutions etc. It does not aim at superman but only at man. Its central standpoint is faith in the dignity of man. Since man is the

creature of this earth, humanism is this- worldly and against all types of other- worldly theories. The humanist ethics is not governed by any religious faith other than faith in human dignity. Since each human being is important for the humanist, humanism is against all distinctions among human beings on the basis of country, nation, race, class, caste, sex, religion, economic status, scholarship and abilities. As a human being no human being is lower than the other.

**Check your Progress :-**

1.Explain the concept of Humanism

---



---



---



---

**9.2.2 M.N.ROY'S LIFE :** ManavendraNath Roy was born on 27<sup>th</sup> march 1887, in a small village called Arabalia, in the 24 Pargana district of Bengal. At that time various groups of revolutionaries were trying through violent means to oust British from India. Roy joined one such group in his adolescence, giving up education at the school level.

M.N. Roy is regarded as one of the greatest and most remarkable thinkers of modern India. The reason behind this is the richness of his experience as a revolutionary philosopher and a political thinker. Roy became a controversial personality in Indian politics, mainly because his political ideas passed through three distinct stages of evolution. He was a nationalist, Marxist and a humanist. In the last sage of his political career he came to the conclusion that our basic need is not just to eastablish a political system relevant to man's needs and rights but to see whether and what extent man enjoys freedom.

According to Roy, freedom is the highest value. His philosophy developed through his various struggles for freedom. His confirmed opinion was that any struggle, any movement or revolution be it even for freedom will remain selfish and shallow, if it does not have a sound philosophical basis. Roy's philosophy of New Humanism is formulated to give a comprehensive philosophical foundation to man's struggle for freedom.

New Humanism or Radical Humanism or M.N.Roy did not arise in vacuum. His humanism was an outcome of his dissatisfaction with many kinds of humanistic approaches which had been put forth in different sorts of intellectual climate. Roy had taken considerable pains and spent many valuable years of his life in studying, interpreting and evaluating different varieties of humanism. He has learnt a lot from the philosophies and social experiments that took place before, viz., socialism,

communism, totalitarianism, liberalism, anarchism, fascism, democracy, nationalism, ideas of welfare states, various industrial revolutions, Gandhism, and so on.

Roy's view underwent drastic changes twice in his life. From his initial staunch nationalist positions, he became an ardent communist of international standing. Then from 1948 onwards, he became a radical or a New Humanist. With each change, his outlook became broader and deeper. At the nationalist stage, Roy had struggled to free India, from foreign domination; at the communist stage, he had tried to free the entire proletariat class from bourgeois exploitation; but at the humanist stage he had tried to free the individual from being swallowed up by the totalitarian tendencies of the societies, the production-machine, the mob, the nation, the state and the religion. Hence we are concerned with only the last stage of his outlook, i.e., the New Humanist outlook,

New Humanism is a comprehensive philosophy, touching almost all the important aspects of our life. Roy's philosophy is not a mere theory. He, in fact, wanted to effect a social revolution through his philosophy

### **9.2.3 THE PROMINENT FEATURES OF ROY'S PHILOSOPHY: NEW HUMANISM OR RADICAL HUMANISM**

**Philosophy, Science and Religion:-** According to Roy, man is a questioning animal; to ask questions is natural to man and philosophy is the result of this innate human tendency. Both philosophy and science are the result of human quest for better explanations; yet, important differences exist between them. There is an important difference between the two regarding their outlooks and the nature of the knowledge they possess. Scientific knowledge is mostly a proven and true knowledge; it is usually a well-integrated body of proven knowledge. The outlook of science is a positive one, assessing the data only on a true-false scale but with philosophy, the matter is quite different. There are no proven facts of a universal nature. For example, there is no proven knowledge regarding the beginning, meaning, purpose or end of the universe; so also there are no proven criteria of an ideal society or an ideal political, religious, moral or economic system. These are all wide-ranging enquiries, and answers to them can only be of a hypothetical and tentative nature. It is only such answers that are the content of philosophy. Naturally, then, while science is the same all over the world, this is not the case with philosophy; there are innumerable philosophies in the world.

Religious explanations, too, were the result of human tendencies to ask questions. Religious explanations originated in the insecure conditions of life and during the infancy of human knowledge. The present

day orthodox people continue to live in the very conditions (now mental) of insecurity of life and infancy of knowledge.

There is so much emphasis on the element of faith in religions that very often religion is called faith. This leads to intellectual stagnation and even dishonesty. Roy feels that faith and knowledge do not go together. The primitive man's way of thinking and his beliefs are followed by the religious people even in these days of modern science and technology. For them, God is like a father, a big person and living a lavish life in heaven. He too possesses emotions, feelings and even human weaknesses. Religious morality literally becomes only a prescriptive type of morality telling people to do (or not to do) as told, not to doubt the scriptures, priests and the prophet and that the doubters will perish, the believers alone will benefit, and so on. Instead of developing self-confidence, the believers are urged to develop humility. Instead of revolting against injustice, they are asked to believe in God's plan and wait for His mercy all the while praying to Him.

He concludes that since to ask questions is natural to man, science and philosophy are natural human pursuits, but that is not the case with religion, since it asks human beings just to believe, to develop faith and to totally surrender to prophet and the priest. Then again, science and philosophy are based essentially upon the rational aspect of man, while religions are based mostly upon the non-rational elements in us, i.e., elements like emotions, sentiments, faith, superstitions etc. Since, religion is thus, based upon the irrational elements in man. Roy finds it a matter of small wonder that the religious people mostly behave in irrational ways. Obviously, then, criticism of religion is the starting point of all criticism and liberation from God is the beginning of all liberation.

**Ontology, Physical Realism:-** As a humanist, Roy rejects all the supernatural entities. He believes that since experience is the foundation as well as the ultimate verifier of all our knowledge. With such an outlook only a materialistic ontology becomes logically possible. Roy, too, is a materialist, yet, he prefers to call his ontology: Physical Realism.

Roy does not accept the existence of such supernatural existence as God, the soul, heaven-hell and so on. God is not at all necessary to explain the universe. The so-called proofs given for the existence of God are no proofs at all. If everything needs a creator, then God too needs a creator. Why should the causal chain of creation stop at God? God as the uncaused First Cause is inconsistent with the concept of possession. If God can be self-existent, so too can matter. Moreover, the way the world is going can hardly be a proof of its having been created by an omnipotent, omniscient, and kindly God. There is so much

evil in the world that it would be more appropriate to say that it was created by the devil. God was created by the primitive man during the infant stage of human knowledge. Thus the position is: Not that God has created man but that man has created God. In Bible it is said that God has created man in his own image but, according to Roy the fact is that man has created God in his own image. The life of God in heaven is very much like that of a spend thrift, absentee landlord of some huge estate. All this is nothing but superstition and the sooner we give it up the better it will be for us. We should learn to be moral not for fear of God but because of evident rational grounds; this will be a true morality truly higher than the one based upon the prescriptive morality of the scriptures.

#### **Nature of Human Being:**

**a) Man has emerged from biological evolution :** Roy was a staunch materialist. He maintained that life came out of inanimate matter and man is the highest product of the process of evolution. Man's intelligence and emotion also has a physical basis, Roy maintained that materialism was also a hypothesis but it was better than metaphysical or spiritual force. This is mainly because if man believes in the supremacy of God then the idea of human freedom would be ruled out. Roy said that human nature is not constant, it changes. In spite of changes, there are certain common factors. In the philosophy of human nature Roy emphasized two basic traits; rationality and freedom. Reason is the biological category. All phenomena are regulated by laws. Man is a part of it. Reason is a simple instinctive notion.

**b) Rationality is the basis of morality :** In Roy's opinion man is moral because he is rational. From experience one learns to differentiate between right and wrong, good and bad – and generalize it. Man requires society as an outlet for his potentialities. So social norms are formed for man's benefits. Such rational considerations makes man moral, not because of any compulsion, but his own volition.

**c) Man is the maker of his values :** In Roy's opinion, man is a maker of his values. Man is the measure of everything. Human preference makes things valuable. But the point to be noted here is that according to Roy, the capacity to create values is inherent in man as an individual, and not as groups, societies or mobs. Someone gives a new vision , a new outlook on matters and thus creates new values; subsequently they are accepted by society. It is wrong to think that Nature or God is the source and the repository of values. Had it been so, values would never have changed. But the common phenomenon of new values coming up in place of the old ones, can be satisfactorily explained only if we consider man to be the creator of values. Values change because men change.

**d) Man is the maker of history :** As a rational being, man is the maker of history. Before the advent of man, things changed or rather evolved; but due to his ability to make rational, conscious and planned efforts, it is the nature of man to make revolutions. According to Roy, human beings are revolutionaries by their very nature. This fact should not be forgotten.

**e) Man is the maker of his own fate :** The type of life man will have depends largely on man himself, upon the nature of the efforts put in. But human powers are also limited; moreover, there are environmental and physical limitations to what man can accomplish. Yet, man can carve out a desirable future through his meaningful efforts.

**f) Man is the archetype of society :** Man as an individual comes prior to society. With regards importance too, the individual is primary and society is secondary. Man is the ideal of society. If we take away the individual members nothing remains of society. Individuals should never be sacrificed at the alter of society, the state, the nation or God. Our social reconstruction should be such as will free the individual and thus enable him to attain his maximum all-round growth. It is in the very nature of man to co-operate with other man. It is because of this characteristic of man that he has been able to build co-operative of various sorts.

**g) Man has an inherent urge to be free :** The last but the most important characteristic of man, is his inherent tendency to be free. Everyone wants to be more free than what he already is; no one likes bondage or slavery as to how much free we will be depends upon what types of effort are put in to attend freedom. Freedom means the progressive disappearance of all restrictions on the constructive and creative potentialities of individuals. According to Roy, freedom is the highest value and if we wish to assess the progress of any society, we should note the extent of freedom enjoyed by individuals in that particular society i.e., we should observe as to how much free the individuals are

#### **Ethics:-**

**a) Ethics and morality should be free from religion :** Religion was born in the time when man lived in insecure conditions of life. Even now whenever insecurity increases etc, people suddenly become religious. The priests deliberately paint our lives to be full of insecurity, misery, fear etc; so that people continue to be religious.

In a religious background, ethics comes to be nothing better than obeying the commands of God/prophet/scriptures. Linking morality to religion restricts the moral field. It then means that where religion is not involved, as in politics, economics, etc., you can be immoral, and that too, with a clear conscience. Roy does not agree with this. He feels that moral considerations must be supreme everywhere. Roy faults the

religious type of morality also on the count that instead of improving the world, religious morality diverts our attention to the Church, God, prayer, scripture-study, and so on. In fact, most of the religious people will shirk their responsibility of removing the pain, misery, disease, injustice, foolishness, wickedness, illiteracy, inequality etc rampant in the world that everything is decreed by God or that all our suffering is due to our own fate. Many religious people consider evil to be only an illusion. Roy considers such an attitude to be an escape from the hard work necessary for improving the world. Hence, he feels that in-fact real and lofty ethics is possible only under materialism and atheism.

Another harmful effect of religion and religious morality is that all questioning and doubting are suppressed there. Thus a very suffocating atmosphere is created for men who are innately inquisitive. Finally this gives rise to blind faith and fanaticism. Due to blind belief in the destiny and in God's inscrutable ways, people get resigned to their even miserable lot; and they do not even think of revolting against it.

Roy feels that ethics and morality should be freed from religion; they should be based instead on the innate human rationality. Every rational person will think that whatever is good (or bad) for himself will be the same for every being like himself. This is the basis of morality. Given this approach, Roy feels that all problems can be satisfactorily solved. Conscience only means an awareness of our responsibility towards society. Since the inherent rationality in us will be the basis of morality, it will be a morality of one's own choice and not an imposed morality. Man is the creator of all values including the moral rules. In such a context, man is likely to be moral by his own choice; man will be moral because he likes to be moral. Roy feels that religious morality becomes a utilitarian morality through preaching that if you want heaven, be good, if you wish to avoid going to hell, be good. Roy does not like such utilitarian approach. He wants people to be moral by their own choice and liking.

**b) The three intrinsic values :** According to Roy, freedom, knowledge and truth are the three intrinsic value. Among these, he considers freedom to be the highest value. Knowledge and truth are parts of rationality. Quest for freedom and search for truth are innate urges of man. Hence these can be called universal and absolute values. Since these are based upon innate human urges, they will always remain as values for man. Hence, Roy does not accept the view that values can be relative. He fears that relativity of values may lead to even nihilism of values.

**c) No absolute knowledge :** By knowledge, Roy only means the various information regarding the world and worldly objects. Various

sciences give us this information. There is no such thing as absolute and infallible and infinite knowledge. And yet the knowledge – process is surely infinite since there are infinite number of objects to be known about. Whenever our information or belief corresponds with reality it is true, otherwise it is false. Knowledge is to be taken to be true until proved false. Thus, our approach should not be fanatical or dogmatic. The scientific attitude must prevail everywhere. Truth is the content of knowledge. Our knowledge may be less true or more true, but it is never absolutely true.

**d) Freedom is the highest value :** Among freedom, knowledge and truth, Roy considers freedom to be the highest value. Freedom has only a mundane connotation. It means minimizing the various obstructions upon the creative and constructive faculties of the individuals. These obstructing factors may be subjective or objective. Ignorance, foolishness, prejudices and a closed-minded approach are some of the subjective obstructions and the wrong type of social, political, economic, educational and other institutions, the wrong type of atmosphere at home, at the work-place, at the club, etc., want, disease, insecurity, inequality, exploitation, poverty, repression, etc., are some of the objective type of obstacles. Liberation is to be achieved by suitably changing the subjective factors as well as the objective ones. It is an infinite and comprehensive process requiring patience and intelligence. Freedom is to be experience and enjoyed by the individual members of society.

Roy does not want even the struggle for freedom to be waged through immoral means. From the study of history, Roy has learnt that even good causes like justice, equality and freedom can get defeated if immoral means are used to achieve them. Roy feels that it is illogical to argue that bad means can also produce good ends. He feels that the type of means used will decide the type of ends we achieve.

Moral progress and social progress are one and the same. Roy feels that moral crisis has always been the real issue. According to him, freedom is the highest value. Naturally, the amount and type of freedom enjoyed by individuals in a particular society can be the sole and the most important criterion, to judge the progressive character of that society. One more thing is to be kept in mind, i.e., that freedom or enlightenment is not a fullstop, but is an ongoing process; hence, the journey is infinite, as are the possibilities. Nothing is predestined, neither bright future nor dark future. The answer to the question as to whether or not in future, man will be more free, depends upon the type of efforts he puts in.

## Social Philosophy

Roy feels that our present social life is faulty on numerous counts; hence we find that these days individuals are getting more and more powerless, helpless, disorganized, atomized, insecure, oppressed, frustrated and exploited. Even according to Roy, wealth-concentration is a great evil, but he points out that power-concentration is an even greater evil. Both these and such other evils should be removed. Hence, Roy has suggested the creation of new and revolutionary type of social institutions which will retain the sovereignty of the individual citizen. His suggestions, when followed, will not only retain the freedom and sovereignty of the individual, but will also help in the realization of the humanist values of liberty, equality, fraternity, rationality, cooperation, social justice and fellow-feeling. His suggestions towards this end, are as follows :

We must radically change our outlook regarding the individual and his relation with society. He feels that man has created society and other institutions to serve his purpose. So the individual is of primary importance, the individual has intrinsic value. Society and the various social institutions must work for the good of the individual. According to Roy, society is for the individual, and not vice versa.

**a) Roy's view on democracy :** Roy thought of rationalizing politics. The experience of Russian Revolution brought about a radical change in Roy's political outlook. He thought that the political system which subordinates man cannot be a suitable means for attainment of freedom.

The problem of power and the relation between state and individual were important for him. Roy never said that power itself is evil concentration of power in the hands of few people plays a negative role. According to him, power should be distributed to different institutions. Roy said that society and state are nothing but the creation of man for maintenance of law, order and social life. Therefore individual freedom must have priority over social organization.

Roy having a firm belief in human freedom believes in Direct Democracy and criticizes Representative Democracy. By 'Direct Democracy he meant a small unit which he called as "Peoples Committees." They would nominate candidates, who would be responsible to the committee and would try to solve the problems of the people. This in turn would serve the purpose of making people conscious of their rationality, freedom and morality.

**b) Roy's view on education :** Education plays an important role in ushering in the new-humanistic revolution. Roy wants that education should cater for all the aspects of human life; physiological, mental,

moral, aesthetic, spiritual, individual, social and so on. Roy feels that if a person has academic degrees, but is insensitive to human misery, has no aesthetic sense and is spiritually enslaved, such a person should not be called educated. He wants especially the critical, constructive and creative faculties of the individual to be encouraged. Education should usher in the process of spiritual liberation of the person. In this way, Roy wants a new type of social institutions to emerge so that a happy, harmonious, enriched and a spiritually liberated society, consisting of happy and spiritually liberated individuals, will emerge.

### **New Humanist Revolution**

**a) Roy's concept of revolution :** Roy wishes to usher in a humanist revolution . He desires to create a radically different type of society, consisting of a radically different type of individuals, individuals who are self-confident, happy, healthy, intelligent, well-adjusted, and who progressively enrich society with their creative and constructive type of contributions. He wishes that a total revolution should take place in our life. But it is of importance to note that Roy's connotation of the term revolution is also radically different from its generally-accepted connotation. Normally, revolution refers to a sudden change of political rulers, brought about through sudden, secret and violent means. The revolution is complete when the old rulers are overthrown, banished, jailed or killed. It is believed that the purpose of the revolution is served with the change in rulers. This much is not what Roy means by revolution. Roy first wants the people to change themselves, and then to change their rulers democratically. Roy's concept of revolution is as follows. Revolution must bring a total change in society; and in the individuals as well; it should not stop with a mere change in the political life, the social, ethical, economic, and academic spheres of life must also change; thus a revolution must be comprehensive and total. Roy's opinion is that the revolution must begin from below, i.e., from the masses. Subsequently, the masses will change the rulers through the democratic process. Every such revolution must be preceded by a philosophical revolution, i.e., by new awakening; the new thoughts must permeate the whole society. Roy's concept of revolution is that instead of it being a sudden and violent change, it will be a slow and peaceful change. It will be a revolution brought about through education and mutual consent. There will be no need of any kind of secrecy ; everything will be discussed openly, and decisions taken accordingly. Violence, hurry, deceit , etc., have no place in bringing about the revolution. Cool and rational activities rather than emotionally charged ones, will dominate the process of revolution. Naturally, hate and revenge will have no place in Roy's concept of revolution.

Roy's concept of revolution knows no fullstop; it is almost an infinite process, bringing in more and more welcome changes in the individual and in the social institutions. Normally, the leaders of revolution become the future rulers of the country; but this concept of revolution. Leaders of Roy's concept will be the spiritually-enlightened, saintly type of people, who will be the guardian-sages of public morality and public life. They will keep themselves away from the power-struggle and such other petty matters. That the new humanist revolution should be total is to be understood in one more sense, i.e., that it should spread to the whole of humanity, and not remain restricted to just this or that country. Obviously, such revolution s to go on for generations and generations. Hence, progress is to be assessed in terms of going in the right direction, be it even one step.

**b) Roy's concept of the revolutionary person :** In keeping with this revolution, Roy's concept of the revolutionary person is also different from its popular concept. Roy's revolutionary is not the fire-brand type of person, plotting secretly for this or that violent upsurge. The revolutionary of Roy's concept is a spiritually enlightened person, confident of changing the society through his efforts. The world with its existing ideologies, vested interests and lethargies is so very unwieldy that no revolutionary should think too highly of his ability to change the world, nor should the others expect miracles from him. Yet, he must be continuously active in fighting against dictatorship, totalitarianism, social injustice, parochialism, misery, ignorance, blind beliefs, disease, inequality, exploitation, fanaticism, etc. while at the same time spreading knowledge, freedom, justice, cooperation, the scientific outlook, morality, and encouraging constructive and creative types of activities. A relentless fight against all types of tyranny, especially tyranny in the spiritual field, must be carried on. Obviously, not achievements, but the right type of efforts must give satisfaction to the leaders of revolution.

**Check your Progress:-**

1. What, according to Roy, are the characteristics of human beings?

---



---



---



---



---

**9.2.4 SUMMARY :** These days, man is mostly considered to be only an economic- political being. Roy pointed out that such thinking is fallacious. Instead, he pointed out that man is essentially a rational, moral, and cooperative being and that quest for freedom and search for truth are his innate urges. Roy wanted new society to be built on this new, scientific and rational foundation. Naturally such a society will be radically different from the present one which is unsatisfactory in many ways.

---

**9.3 UNIT END EXERCISE :**

---

- Q.1 Elaborate the arguments of Logical Positivists for the denial of metaphysics.
- Q.2 Critically discuss the arguments stated by the Logical Positivist against metaphysics.
- Q.3 Explain the views of M.N Roy on Radical Humanism.

---

**9.4 SUGGESTED READINGS :**

---

1. Philosophy of Education – Soti Shivendra Chandra, Rajendra.K.Sharma.
2. Introduction to Philosophy – J.N.Sinha.

## **VALUE OF PHILOSOPHY:- RUSSELL AND VIVEKANANDA (PRACTICAL VEDANTA)**

### **UNIT STRUCTURE**

- 10.1 Objectives
- 10.2 Value of Philosophy – Russell
- 10.3 Vivekananda (Practical Vedanta)
- 10.4 Unit End Exercise
- 10.5 References

---

### **10.1 OBJECTIVES :**

---

After going through this unit you will be able to

- Understand the value of philosophy.
- Usefulness of philosophy
- Describe the Philosophy of Life of Swami Vivekananda
- Explain his concept of Liberation and means of attainment of Liberation.
- Explain his views on Karma Yoga, Jnana Yoga, Bhakti Yoga and Raja Yoga.

---

### **10.2 VALUE OF PHILOSOPHY - RUSSELL :**

---

**10.2.1 INTRODUCTION :** Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) was one of the greatest British philosophers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. His book, "The Problems of Philosophy" was published in 1912. This book deals with problems concerning the origin, the scope and the limits of knowledge. In the end, Russell brings out the value of studying Philosophy.

**10.2.2 THE VALUE OF PHILOSOPHY :** It is more necessary to consider the value and usefulness of philosophy because most people have quite misleading conceptions of philosophy. Under the influence of science or practical affairs, they think that philosophy is an innocent but useless activity and nothing more. It consists of hair-splitting distinctions, and controversies on matters concerning which knowledge is impossible.

There are two reasons for this misconception of philosophy.

**a) A wrong conception of the ends of life:** A wrong conception of life according to which the needs of the body must be supplied but mind does not need any food. According to it, science has value because it benefits not only students but the mankind in general; Philosophy has not such a utility. It is not realized that besides the needs of the body, there are needs of the mind. It is not generally realized that even in the existing world the goods of the mind are at least as important as the goods of the body. If all men were well off, and ills like poverty and disease were reduced to the minimum, there still would remain the need to produce a valuable society. The value of philosophy is to be found exclusively among the goods of the mind. Only those people who are not indifferent to the goods of the mind can be convinced that the study of philosophy is not a waste of time.

**b) A wrong conception of the aim of philosophy:** There is wrong conception of the kinds of goods which philosophy tries to achieve. Philosophy, like all studies, aims primarily at knowledge but with a difference. It aims at two kinds of knowledge: one which gives unity and system to the body of the sciences and the other which results from a critical examination of the grounds of our beliefs, convictions and prejudices. But it cannot be maintained that philosophy has had any very great measure of success in its attempt to provide definite answers to its questions. If we ask a mathematician, a mineralogist, a historian, or any other man of learning, what definite body of truths has been discovered by his science, he would narrate the definite achievements of his science. But if we put the same question to a philosopher, he will have to confess that his study has not achieved positive results such as have been achieved by other sciences.

**This is so for two reasons:**

Whenever science has a definite answer to a problem, the problem ceases to belong to philosophy and such a discipline is setup as a separate science. For eg. What was once “Natural Philosophy”, is now “Physics” or what was “Philosophy of Mind” has now established itself as “Psychology”. This also means that the uncertainty of philosophy is more apparent than real.

The uncertainty of philosophy also results from the fact that uncertainty of philosophy raises questions that man cannot solve unless his powers of knowing drastically change enabling him to acquire definite answers to his questions, say concerning the purpose of the universe, nature of evil, reality of space, time and so on. Naturally, then, different philosophers come out with different answers none of which can be

regarded as certain. But philosophy persists, because by considering these questions, it makes us aware of their importance and the need to consider the various approaches to them. This keeps alive our speculative interests in the universe about which there is so much to know and so little can be known because we are not as well equipped as we could wish.

### **10.2.3 REASONS FOR THE VALUE OF STUDYING PHILOSOPHY**

**a) Keeps our sense of speculation and curiosity alive :** Philosophy keeps our sense of speculation and curiosity alive by making us aware that most of our prejudices, customs and convictions are not rationally defensible. A man who has no tincture remains imprisoned in his common sense prejudices and his habitual beliefs of his age or nation and convictions which have grown in him without the consent of his deliberate reason. To such a man the world appears definite, finite, obvious. Common objects arise more curiosity in him and unsuspected possibilities are rejected by him. The moment we begin to philosophize the most ordinary things we used to take for granted lead to problems to which only very incomplete answers are possible. Philosophy raises all such doubts and, though it is unable to provide definite answers to them, suggests many possibilities, thus enlarging our thoughts and freeing us from the tyranny of customs and snug beliefs. This uncertainty may be taken as first value of studying philosophy because it removes dogmatism and arouses the spirit of curiosity by showing unsuspected possibilities.

**b) Life becomes calm and free:** The chief value of philosophy lies in freeing man from narrow and personal aims through the greatness of the objects philosophy contemplates. The life of the instinctive man is shut up in his own world and takes note of only that which helps or hinders his self-interest. He lives a feverish, confined life. In comparison, philosophic life becomes calm and free by escaping the prison of private life torn between the insistence of desire and the powerlessness of will. Philosophy does not divide the world into two camps; friends and foes, helpful and hostile, good and bad etc, but tries to enlarge the self through impartial examination of our problems.

**c) Strength of emotion:** A resultant value of philosophic contemplation may be mentioned. The mind which has become accustomed to the freedom and impartiality of philosophic contemplation will preserve such freedom and impartiality in his emotions and actions. In conduct, he will be just and in emotions a symbol of love because of his habit to view his purposes and desires as parts of the whole and not as a closed world of his own self-interest.

The value of philosophy may be summed up in Russell's words :

“Philosophy is to be studied, not for the sake of any definite answers to its questions, since no definite answers can, as a rule, be known to be true, but rather for the sake of questions themselves; because these questions enlarge our concept on of what is possible, enrich our intellectual imagination, and diminish the dogmatic assurance which closes the mind against speculation; but above all because, through the greatness of the universe which philosophy contemplates, the mind also is rendered great and becomes capable of that union with the universe which constitutes its highest goal.”

**10.2.4 SUMMARY :** Most people think philosophy to be a useless activity and a waste of time in answering problems impossible of solution. Philosophy is not mere hair-splitting about impossible problems. Whenever philosophy has a definite answer to a problem, the problem ceases to belong to philosophy and is set up as a separate science. Physics and Psychology were, not long ago, a part of philosophy. Thus at any given time what remains in philosophy is vague and uncertain. But the uncertainty of philosophy has a second source too. It result from the fact that philosophy raises questions that man cannot solve unless his powers of knowing drastically change enabling him to acquire definite answers to his questions, say , concerning purpose of the universe, nature of evil, reality of space, time and so on. Naturally, then different philosophers come out with widely different answers none of which can be regarded as certain. But philosophy persists, because by considering these questions, it makes us aware of their importance and the need to consider the various approaches to them. This keeps alive our speculative interest in the universe about which there is so much to know and so little can be known because we are not so well-equipped as we could wish.

**Check your progress :-**

**Write the answers in the space given below**

1. Why is it necessary to consider what is the value of Philosophy

---



---



---



---



---

2. Why is philosophy viewed as a useless subject?

---



---



---



---



---

3. What kind of knowledge does philosophy aim at?

---



---



---



---

4. Has philosophy been able to achieve any great success to provide definite answers to its questions, and if no, why?

---



---



---



---

### **10.3 VIVEKANANDA (PRACTICAL VEDANTA) :**

**10.3.1 SWAMI VIVEKANANDA'S LIFE :** Swami Vivekananda, a philosopher, a scholar, a saint, a prophet, a revivalist of Indian culture, an apostle of Practical Vedanta was born in Calcutta , on 12<sup>th</sup> January 1863 . His original name was Narendra Dutta. He made a thorough study of Indian scriptures as well as western thought. In 1881, he happened to meet Sri Ramkrishna Paramahansa and that proved to be a turning point in his life. He accepted him as his friend, philosopher and guide. Ramkrishna convinced him that religion is a matter of experience; it is not a matter of dogma & faith. Swami Vivekanada founded the Ramkrishna Mission and started the work of social service and social reform.

He travelled extensively in foreign countries and spread the greatness of Indian Philosophy and Hinduism, through his powerful and inspiring lectures. His favorite themes were Raja Yoga, Karma Yoga, Jnana Yoga and Bhakti Yoga.

**10.3.2 PRACTICAL VEDANTA :** Vedanta is the wisdom of vedic sages. It was in books. It was confined to the mutts. Swami Vivekanada made it practical. According to Swamiji, the teachings of vedanta lead us to peace and happiness.

Vivekananda is a Neo-Vedantist . Some of the basic ideas of his philosophy are derived from the Vedanta i.e.; the Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita. His philosophy resembles Advaita Vedanta of Shankaracharya and also reminds us of the theism of the Bhakti cult.

According to Vivekananda, the ultimate reality is Brahman or God. Like Shankaracharya he identifies the true nature of Atman with Brahman alone. He describes the true nature of man as Atman or soul. He therefore asserted: Every man is potentially divine. This soul in man is immortal. Nothing can destroy it.

**Liberation:-** According to Swamiji, Liberation means freedom from the cycle of births & deaths, freedom from suffering. It is a state of joy and bliss, state of enlightenment, state of realizing the true nature of one's self i.e. the realization of immortality of self. He believes in Jivanmukti i.e. liberation can be attained here and now when one is alive.

**Means of Attaining Liberation:-** According to Vivekananda liberation i.e. realization of immortality of self is the highest goal of human life. Self or Atman same as Brahman or God. So Self realization or God realization is the highest goal of human life.

According to Vivekananda, there are different paths or ways for attainment of liberation. They are:

- A) Karma Yoga - The Path of Action
- B) Bhakti Yoga – The Path of Devotion
- C) Jnana Yoga – The Path of Knowledge
- D) Raja Yoga – The Path of Meditation

These four different ways are recommended because men differ in their temperaments, dispositions and capacities. Vivekananda feels that one can choose the path he likes to reach the goal.

In this way, Vivekananda has made Vedanta easy and practical.

### **A) KARMA YOGA – THE PATH OF ACTION**

Vivekananda says, “Karma-yoga...is a system of ethics and religion intended to attain freedom through unselfishness and by good works. The Karma-yogi need not believe in any doctrine whatsoever. He may not ask what his soul is, nor think of any metaphysical speculation. He has got his own special aim of realizing selfishness, and he has to work it out himself. “ Such a description of karma-yoga shows that it emphasizes firstly the importance and value of action, and secondly of unselfishness.

The first emphasis shows that it does not recommend asceticism or a flying away from the world. Man has to remain in the world, in the midst of evil and good. and the pain and suffering. And he has to work, - has to keep on working as well as he can.

The second emphasis is still more important. The Karma-yogi has to selflessly work for the betterment of people. It means his work has to be non-attached. Vivekananda seems to be very much impressed by the Gita-ideal of Niskama-karma. The secret of action is that one must not expect anything in return of the action done.

Vivekananda very reverently takes the example of the life of Lord Buddha, who, after attaining Nirvana, kept on working throughout his life. His work can be taken as the ideal of non-attachment. He did not fly

away from the world. He remained in the world, kept on working for the good of all and expected no returns. Vivekananda says, "He works best who works without any motive, neither for money, nor for fame, nor for anything else; and when a man can do that, he will be a Buddha, and out of him will come the power to work in such a manner as will transform the world. This man represents the very highest ideal of Karma-yoga."

Immortality is the realization of oneness of everything; it is complete freedom from all kinds of bondage. A continuous doing of selfless work or constant practice of non-attachment in all actions of life enables a man to rise above his self, and to have a feeling of oneness with everything. Thus through selfless work one's mind becomes pure and he is able to identify himself with all. This is the realization of Immortality.

**Check your progress :-**

**Write the answers in the space given below.**

1. What do you mean by Practical Vedanta

---



---



---



---

2. Explain Swami Vivekananda's views on Karma-Yoga

---



---



---



---

**B) JNANA YOGA – THE PATH OF KNOWLEDGE**

Jnana yoga is based on the realization that bondage is due to ignorance. Ignorance according to Vivekananda, is the ignorance of real nature of things, it is the inability to distinguish between the real and unreal. Knowledge alone can help to distinguish between the two. Self-Knowledge, knowledge of the Brahman, knowledge of the unity of everything – all these are different names of discriminatory knowledge. Such discriminatory knowledge cannot be had merely through the study of Scriptures, but through serious efforts at self-realization. This requires the practice of concentration.

Concentration is not an easy process. It requires that the self should direct his entire energy on the object of concentration. The energy of the soul is wasted through its body-activities, through the senses and the motor organs. Energy must be withdrawn from them so that it may be utilized for the purpose of knowledge. That means that the senses and the body have to be kept in control. Even the mind must be brought

under control. This is what can be called as Renunciation. Vivekananda says that renunciation is necessary stage in the practice of Jnana -Yoga. Renunciation demands getting rid of all selfishness and controlling the mind, the body and the senses. This is called vairagya. But, according to Vivekananda, there is a positive side of renunciation also and i.e there is longing to know the Brahman. Divine characters or images can be used for concentration initially. In course of time this concentration will become intenser and the individual may attain the stage of complete concentration or Samadhi in which all kinds of distractions would melt away, in which even the distinction between the self and the Brahman will not remain and will have a realization of oneness, of perfect unity.

**Check your progress :-**

**Write the answers in the space given below.**

1.Explain Swami Vivekananda's views on Jnana-Yoga

---



---



---



---



---

**C) BHAKTI YOGA – THE PATH OF DEVOTION**

Bhakti stands for intense love for God or devotion of God. Devotion or love, according to Vivekananda, is natural to man. The only point is that ordinarily the object of our love is the finite object which is transitory, perishable and, in the last analysis, unreal. Love, in this sense, is not pure love but attachment. The Bhakti-Marga is the way of pure love in which the object of love or devotion is not the finite or the limited, but the Supreme. This love will be universal love, love for all, because this will be based on the realization of oneness of everything. The important characteristic of Bhakti-Yoga is to see God in everything and to surrender everything to God. Vivekananda says, "The strong emotions have the capacity to awaken and activate the potential powers of man." Bhakti-Marga deals with that kind of divine love and supreme devotion.

**Stages of Bhakti**

Vivekananda gives the steps through which the Bhakti Yoga progresses towards the realization of the Supreme.

- a. The first stage is the stage of external worship. In this stage, idols and images, representations of God and Goddesses, incarnations- even prophets and God-men – are all objects of devotion and worship.

- b. In the next stage, prayer and repetition of God's name, chanting of religious hymns and singing the songs of God's glory would become prominent.
- c. The third stage consists of silent meditation. Vivekananda says that there exists for the devotee nothing but God.
- d. In the final stage, even this distinction vanishes; the devotee becomes almost one with the Supreme. This is a kind of inner realization - a vision of the only present God. It is a feeling that there is nothing besides Him.

**Check your progress :-**

**Write the answers in the space given below.**

1. Describe briefly Bhakti-Yoga as suggested by Vivekananda

---



---



---



---

**D) RAJA YOGA – THE PATH OF MEDITATION**

Raja Yoga is the way to the realization of immortality by controlling the mind and the body. This control is not like the control recommended by Jnana Yoga. Here, the mind and the body are subjected to certain physical and mental disciplines. Patanjali laid the foundation of such a Yoga in his yoga-sutras. According to some, Raja Yoga is the surest-the most direct and the quickest method for attaining salvation. That is why they call it Raja-Yoga, the king of all Yogas.

Raja Yoga is the way of physical and mental discipline. It is based on the pre-supposition that bonding is due to the distracting activities of the body and the mind. They waste the energy of the soul and dominate over it. Therefore they must be brought under control so that the energy wasted by them may be saved and directed towards the Supreme. But, to control the body and the mind, a direct and forceful method has to be adopted. That is why in Raja-Yoga a plan of physical and mental disciplines has to be worked out. That would involve certain yogic exercises of the body and the mind.

**Raja Yoga consists of eight steps. They are:**

- Yama – Non violence, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence, non-covetousness
- Niyama – Cleanliness, contentment, austerity, self-study, devotion to God.
- Asana or Posture

- Pranayama or Breath control
- Pratyahara or Sense control
- Dharana or Fixing of the mind
- Dhyana or Meditation
- Samadhi or Super consciousness

Yogic exercises enable the yogi to acquire extra-ordinary powers, and finally the yogi is able to practice complete concentration leading to the realization of unity with the Divine or the realization of ones True-Self.

As such Vivekananda says, one can choose any path as he likes. If one follows any one of these paths with sincerity and earnestness, he will be able to reach the final goal. In this way, Vivekananda has made Vedanta easy and practical. He also made Vedanta service-oriented. Since the Divine dwells in all, one must serve the God in man. The motto of Ramkrishna Mission is : “For the Liberation of yours and for the good of the world.”

### **Check your progress**

**Write the answers in the space given below.**

1. List the steps of Raja-Yoga .

---



---



---



---

**10.3.3 SUMMARY :** Like a true Advaitian, Swami Vivekananda identifies the true nature of Atman with Brahman. He believed in the law of Karma. Our action produces some tendencies or Karma, which determine the future of our life. As such the soul is not bound, but we perform our actions out of ignorance. We forget our true nature i.e.; Atman and get identified with the body. Immortality is the ultimate truth about the soul. In order to understand this, one must contemplate on one’s own self. The process can be described as Yoga. The four elements namely philosophy, mysticism, emotion and work are equally present in full in the mind. This is the idea of perfect man. The ideal of religion is to become harmoniously balanced in all the four elements, which could be attained by Yoga. The man who seeks after this is a Yogi. To a Karma Yogi, being a worker, it is between himself and the whole of the community. To a Raja Yogi, it is the union between his lower self and higher self. To the lover, the union is between himself and God i.e; Bhakti Yogi and to the philosopher, the unity of all existence- Jnana Yogi. Various

yogas do not conflict with each other. Hence his understanding of the philosophy is simple and practical.

---

#### **10.4 UNIT END EXERCISES :**

---

1. What is the value of Philosophy? Why it should be studied?
2. Assess the value of studying Philosophy.
3. What are the means of realization acc to Swami Vivekananda?.
4. Explain the nature and importance of Karma-Yoga as suggested by Vivekananda.
5. Explain the different stages of Bhaki-Yoga.
6. Explain in detail Swami Vivekananda's views on Raja-Yoga.
7. Explain the nature of path of knowledge (Jnana-Yoga) as suggested by Vivekananda.
8. Discuss Swami Vivekananda's Practical Vedanta.

---

#### **10.5 REFERENCES FOR FURTHER READING :**

---

Bertrand Russell – “The problems of Philosophy”.

Basant kumar Lal. “Contemporary Indian Philosophy”- Motilal Banarsidas.

Swami Adishwarananda “The Vedanta way to peace and happiness” – Jaico Publishing house.

Swami Bhaskarananda-”The essentials of Hinduism”- Shri RamKrishna Math.



## CONTENT

1.	INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY – A GENERAL OUTLINE OF INDIAN AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY.	1
2	METHODS IN PHILOSOPHY	11
3	A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF PRE-SOCRATIC COSMOLOGY: LONIANS/HERACLITUS/PARMENIDES	18
4	SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE: REASON AND EXPERIENCE A: Descartes and Locke B: Nyâya and Cârvâk	32
5	GOD AND EVIL	44
6.	BASIC CONSTITUENTS OF REALITY : (a) Plato (Ideas) And Leibnitz (Mondas) (b) Vaisesika And Samkhya Theory Of Evolution	52
7	INDIAN AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY UNIT – 7 a) Theories of Truth b) Theories of Error.	66
8	LIFE AFTER DEATH: RESURRECTION AND TRANSMIGRATION OF SOUL	80
9.	TWENTIETH CENTURY PHILOSOPHY : i) Logical Positivism (Alfred Ayer) ii) Radical Humanism (M.N.Roy)	86
10	VALUE OF PHILOSOPHY :- VIVEKANANDA (PRACTICAL VEDANTA) AND RUSSELL	102

**Dr. Vijay Khole**  
Vice Chancellor

**Dr. Dhaneswar Harichandan**  
Professor cum Director, IDOL  
University of Mumbai

**Dr. Arun D. Sawant**  
ProVice Chancellor

**Programme Coordinator : A.R. Bankar**

Lecturer- cum-Assistant Director  
IDOL, University of Mumbai.

**Course Coordinator  
&Writer**

**: Dr. S.G. Nigal**

Retired Head Dept of Philosophy,  
B.N.N. Collge, Bhiwandi  
At present Reader in Vallabh Vedanta  
Academy & Research Centre, Dept of  
Philosophy, University of Mumbai.

**Writer**

**: 1) Prof. Vimla Chaubey**

Head, Department of Philosophy,  
Mithibhai College, Vile Parle(w.),  
Mumbai

**: 2) Prof. Saraswati Dube**

Lecturer, Department of Philosophy,  
Govt. of Maharashtra  
Ismail Yusuf College, Jogeshwari (E),  
Mumbai- 60

**June, 2009: S.Y.B.A. Paper- III-Indian and Western Philosophy**

Published by : Professor cum Director,  
Institute of Distance & Open Learning  
University of Mumbai,  
Vidyanagari , Mumbai-400 098.

DTP Composed by : VARDHA OFFSET & TYPESETTERS  
ANDHERI (WEST)

PRINTED BY :



**S.Y.B.A.**  
**Philosophy**  
**Paper - III**

**Indian and Western**  
**Philosophy**

# Syllabus

## S.Y.B. A Paper III - Indian and Western Philosophy

### Section I

#### **Unit I**

- 1 Introduction to philosophy- a general outline of Indian and Western philosophy.
2. Methods in philosophy : (i) Socrates (ii) Descartes (iii) Mimamsa.
- 3 a) A brief analysis of pre-Socratic cosmology: Ionians/Heraclitus/ Parmenides  
b) Vedantic philosophy : Tat twam asi' - Shankara and Madhava

#### **Unit II**

- 4 Sources of knowledge- Reason and experience  
(a) Descartes and Locke;  
(b) Nyaya and Charvaka
- 5 God and evil : (a) The problem of evil.  
(b) The views of Shankara and St. Aquinas.

### Section II

#### **Unit III**

- 6 Basic constituents of reality:  
(a) Plato (Ideas) and Leibnitz (Monads);  
(b) Vaisesika and Samkhya theory of evolution
- 7 (a) Theories of truth : (i) Coherence, (ii) Pragmatic,  
(b) Theories of error : Akhyati, anyathakhyati, asatkhyati.

#### **Unit IV**

- 8 Life after death: Resurrection and transmigration of soul.
- 9 Twentieth century philosophy:  
(i) Logical positivism (Alfred Ayer);  
(ii) Radical Humanism (MN Roy)
- 10 Value of Philosophy : Russell and Vivekananda (Practical Vedanta)