

PHILOSOPHY (Test Code : 571)

Name of Candidate	ABHJIT SHUKLA	Registration No.	2098
Schedule		Module	
Place	MUMBAI	Time	9:20 a.m.
Date	19/9/2014		
Classroom	☐	Distance Learning	☒
Classroom & Distance Learning		☐	

INDEX TABLE

Q. No.	Maximum Marks	Marks Obtained
1.(a)	10	
1.(b)	10	
1.(c)	10	
1.(d)	10	
1.(e)	10	
2.(a)	12.5	
2.(b)	12.5	
2.(c)	12.5	
2.(d)	12.5	
3.(a)	12.5	
3.(b)	12.5	
3.(c)	12.5	
3.(d)	12.5	
4.(a)	20	
4.(b)	15	
4.(c)	15	
5.(a)	12.5	
5.(b)	12.5	
5.(c)	12.5	
5.(d)	12.5	

Maximum Marks : 250

/250

Remarks:

Signature of Examiner

EVALUATION INDICATORS

1. Alignment Competence
2. Context Competence
3. Content Competence
4. Language Competence
5. Introduction Competence
6. Structure - Presentation Competence
7. Conclusion Competence

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Do furnish the appropriate details in the answer sheet (viz. Name, ID Number and Test Code).
2. Candidates should attempt answer to the part/sub-part of a question strictly within the pre-defined space. Any attempt outside the pre-defined space shall not be evaluated.
3. The candidate need not write anything in his/her answer that derogates the dignity of an individual or an organization.
4. Candidates should attempt all questions strictly in accordance with the instruction given under each question.
5. The candidate should respect the instructions, given by the invigilator.

103, 1st Floor B/1-2, Ansal Building, Behind UCO Bank, Dr. Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi-09

75, 3rd Floor, Old Rajinder Nagar Market, Near Axis Bank, New Delhi - 110060

Overall Macro comments / feedback / suggestions on Answer Booklet:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

All The Best

1. (a) According to Ramanujya creation is as much real as Brahman. Explain. 10
रामानुज के अनुसार जगत् ब्रह्म के जैसा ही सत् है। व्याख्या करें।

Ramanujacharya has given the theory of 'vishishth advaita' which believes in Brahman parinamvada or ~~is~~ that the world is real modification of Brahman.

The following reasons are given by him to prove that the world is as real as Brahman. Firstly, he says that if the world were not real then the infallible Vedas would also become unreal. Secondly, he interprets the Upanishdic statements in such manner that they point towards the real existence of the world. Thirdly, he also says that if the world were not real then our own existence would also become unreal. Finally, his subscription to the theory of Brahman parinamvada also proves that the world is real as it is real modification of Brahman.

A counter point to his theory

is the Brahman vivartavad of Shankaracharya which says that since Brahman is eternal and unchanging, any real modification of Brahman is impossible. Hence, the world must be an illusion.

1. (b) Compare Shankara's Maya and Sankhya's Prakriti.

10

आचार्य शंकर की माया और सांख्य के प्रकृति सम्बन्धी मतों की तुलना करें।

Shankaracharya's Maya and Sankhya's Prakriti have quite a few similarities as well as differences.

Firstly, both Prakriti and Maya are comprised of three gunas. Secondly, in both sattva is the predominant guna. Thirdly, both are instrumental in creation of the world as it is seen by us. Fourthly, both contribute to the bondage of the soul

to the world as Purusha mis-identifies himself with evolutes of Prakriti and atman considers the world created through Maya as real.

However, there are major differences between the two concepts. Firstly, while Prakriti is an independent principle in Sankhya, Maya is power of Brahman. Secondly, Prakriti is eternal without a beginning or an end but Maya is with ends with right knowledge of self-realization of Brahman. Thirdly, the world created by Prakriti is real (Prakriti parinamvada) but the world created by Maya is just an appearance (Brahman vivartavad).

Thus, Prakriti and Maya play pivotal roles in their respective philosophies.

1. (c) The Mimamsa view of comparison or Upamana differs from the Nyaya view. Explain. 10

मीमांसा की उपमान सम्बन्धी अवधारणा न्याय से भिन्न है। व्याख्या करें।

Both Nyaya and Mimamsa have accepted Upamana or comparison as a pramana but their interpretations are different. While Mimamsa accepts Upamana as the pramana ~~not~~ through which we know that the remembered object is the same as the perceived object, Nyaya's upamana ~~is~~ represents the relation between a word and its denotation.

E.g:- In Mimamsa - Suppose a man goes to a forest and sees a garaya. His ~~rember~~ remembering that the garaya seen now is like the cow at home ^{knowledge through} is upamana.

In Nyaya - A man learns from a trusted source that a garaya looks like a cow. Then he goes to the forest and sees an animal like a cow and realizes that it is a garaya based on comparison with cow.

This is knowledge through comparison as per Nyaya.

The Mimamsakas have criticized Naiyayika view by saying that their view of jñanamana can be explained through perception and memory alone and does not require a separate pramana.

1. (d) Anyathakhyativad is logically better than Vipritkhyativad. Examine. 10
अन्यथाख्यातिवाद विपरीतख्यातिवाद की तुलना में अधिक तार्किक है। परीक्षण करें।

Anyathakhyativad is the Naiyayika theory of error which explains error on the basis of jñana lakshana pratyaksa. In this theory, error is caused due to the perception of an object which is elsewhere within a subject which is otherwise. Ex- when we see a rope as a snake, a snake is elsewhere while a rope is otherwise.

On the other hand vipritkhyativad

is the theory of error of Bhatt Mimansakas. It explains error on the basis of wrong attribution of subject-object relationship based on lapse of discrimination. Ex- This rope is a snake. In this statement both rope and snake are real but due to wrong discrimination a subject-object relationship is established which leads to wrong action.

Both the theories of error are logical but the theory of anyathakhyativad is more appealing as it directly describes the actual psychological happening in case of an erroneous judgement.

1. (e) Write notes on-

10

टिप्पणी लिखें:

Prayanama and Pratyahara

प्राणायाम और प्रत्याहार

Patanjali has given the path of ashtang yoga for the liberation of self. Pranayam and pratyahara are important steps in the process which comprises of the following:

1. Yam 2. Niyam 3. Asan 4. Pranayam
5. Pratyahara 6. Dharana 7. Dhyana
8. Samadhi

Pranayam is the method of control of vital processes. It is practised when one becomes proficient in moral practices (yam and niyam) and physical culture (asana). Control of vital processes gives stability to the mind and makes it ready for further spiritual discipline. It also keeps the body fit for spiritual practice.

Pratyahara is the fifth of the eight steps of ashtang yoga. It is the

control of senses. Senses represent the portals through which external stimuli reach the mind. Hence, it is essential to control them to become prepared for further spiritual practice which requires attention (dharana).

Both pranayam and pratyahara represent important stages in the process of realization through yoga.

2. (a) The Nyaya Vaishesika are allied system's of Philosophy. How are they allied? Do they differ in some way? If so how? Explain. 12.5

न्याय वैशेषिक दर्शन सामान तन्त्र हैं। वे एक-दुसरे इससे किस प्रकार भिन्न हैं ? यदि वे भिन्न हैं तो कैसे? व्याख्या करें।

The Nyaya - Vaishesika philosophies have a number of similarities in their general outlook which makes them allied systems of philosophy.

The major similarities that pervade the two philosophies are -
Firstly, both believe in liberation being the ultimate goal of life and base their philosophical development with this end in mind. Secondly, both

are rooted in logical vigour and their study is believed to sharpen logical faculties. Thirdly, both believe in ~~atomistic~~ theory of creation where the world is created by God and are both theistic in this respect. Fourthly, their treatment of pramanas common to them (pratyaksa and anumana) is quite similar. Fifthly, both are orthodox and believe in Vedas.

Despite the above similarities there are also differences in the two systems. While Nyaya believes in four kinds of pramanas - perception, inference, verbal testimony and comparison; Vaisheshika believes in only the first two. Also, the two philosophies have different treatment of categories. Nyaya philosophers treat categories as 16 philosophical topics like samasya, prayojana etc but Vaisheshikas treat it as 7 types of padartha - dravya, guna, samvaya etc.

2. (b) Some arguments have been given against the proofs for the existence of God by Udayan but there are objection to God. Discuss. 12.5

उदयन ईश्वर की सिद्धि के लिए कुछ तर्कों को प्रस्तुत करते हैं, लेकिन इनकी आलोचना की जाती है। चर्चा करें।

Udayana has given a number of arguments to prove the existence of God in his Kusumanjali. These include karyat, ayojnat, dhrtiyadeh, adrsat, shruteh, padat, vakyat, sankhya vishesat etc. However, these arguments have been criticized in various ways by later philosophers.

Firstly, many philosophers have criticized the ayojnat argument by claiming that the order or non-order in the universe is only apparent to one's view of the universe and doesn't necessarily imply the existence of an intelligent creator. Secondly, Buddhists believe that law of karma is an impersonal law which is a law of nature and it doesn't require an arbiter for fruits of action. Thirdly, it has also been pointed out that there is a circular

fallacy in Udayana's arguments - god's presence is proved by Vedic statements and god is believed to be creator of Vedas. Fourthly, god cannot be accepted as the highest reality as there are other realities like atoms, manas etc. which are eternal and not created by him.

These arguments and their replies have further enriched Indian philosophical system.

2. (c) Kumarila Bhat admits anupalabdhi as the independent pramana but Naiyayika and Prabhakar reject it. Discuss. 12.5
कुमारिल भट्ट अनुपलब्धि को एक स्वतंत्र प्रमाण मानते हैं, लेकिन नैयायिक और प्रभाकर इसका विरोध करते हैं। चर्चा करें।

Kumarila Bhatt and Shankaracharya have accepted anupalabdhi as a separate pramana to know the ~~existence~~ of about something from the absence of its counter-entity. Ex- we know about absence of sun at night through anupalabdhi. However, it has been rejected by Prabhakar and Naiyayikas as an independent pramana.

Kumarila Bhatt has proved that

anuplabdhi is a separate pramana through arguments. He says that absence of an entity cannot be proved through perception as the absent entity cannot be perceived. He further says that the absence cannot be inferred as there is no such vyapti from which such an inference can be drawn. Furthermore, the knowledge of absence is also not gained through testimony or comparison. Hence, it should be accepted as an independent pramana. He has also added that the observation of such absence should be under normal conditions of perception to obtain the right knowledge.

Thus, Bhatt Mimamsakas accept anuplabdhi as an independent pramana.

2. (d) Compare the syllogism of Gautama with Aristotelian syllogism. Which of these do you prefer? Assign reasons for your preference. 12.5

गौतम के न्याय की तुलना पाश्चात्य न्याय से करें, आप इसमें किससे प्रति सहमति रखते हैं। अपने पक्ष में तर्कों को प्रस्तुत करें।

Gautam's syllogism comprises of five statements while Aristotelian syllogism comprises of three statements only. In a typical Aristotelian syllogism we move from universal to particular but in a Gautam's pararthanuman we move from particular to universal to particular. It has the following five steps:

1. Pratijna - This hill has fire
2. Hetu - Because it has smoke.
3. Udahara - Where there is ^{smoke} ~~fire~~ there is fire. E.g. - an oven
4. Upanaya - This hill has smoke which is invariably linked with fire.
5. Nigamana - Therefore, this hill has fire.

The preference for one over the other depends on the usage. Gautam's syllogism is more illustrative and

can be more useful in convincing an opponent of one's opinion as its name suggests (*svarth farathanumana*). It can be also useful when there is a lack of time to elucidate one's Aristotelian syllogism can be useful for one's own use, for presenting one's opinions in brief or for presenting an opinion when time is scarce.

3. (a) What is the place and nature of God in yoga Philosophy.

12.5

योग दर्शन में ईश्वर का क्या स्वरूप और महत्व है?

Yoga philosophy is sometimes called as theistic Sankhya because while it ascribes to general background of Sankhya, it also accepts God as a reality.

God has been accepted in Yoga based on law on continuity which believes that there should be a continuity from finite to infinite, imperfect to perfect etc. Thus, there should be an infinite and perfect reality called God. Yoga's acceptance of God is also

based on Vedic statements. Yoga has also accepted God to overcome the philosophical problem of conjunction of an unconscious, unintelligent Prakriti with an inactive Purusha.

However, the God of Yoga is not the Supreme creator, preserver and destroyer. He is only a special Purusha. Devotion to him can remove obstacles from the path of spiritual practice but he cannot grant liberation to a devotee.

Thus, it can be seen that Yoga has maintained Sankhya's cosmology while preserving the need for individual effort for liberation but removing philosophical problems by incorporating in itself the notion of God.

3. (b) Explain the Yoga argument for the existence of God.

12.5

योग के द्वारा ईश्वर के अस्तित्व की सिद्धि के तर्कों की व्याख्या करें।

Yoga has accepted god as a special Purusha and not as the supreme being in a more traditional sense. Following arguments have been presented to prove the existence of god:

Firstly, the law of continuity says that logically we must move from finite to infinite, imperfect to perfect, limited to unlimited. Thus, there must be a being which must be infinite, perfect and limitless. This being is god. Secondly, the testimony of Vedas also points towards the existence of god. Thirdly, it is necessary to accept god as a reason that makes the conjunction of an unconscious and unintelligent Prakriti possible with an inactive Purusha. Fourthly, the existence of god

is necessary to purify the chitta and remove obstacles from the path of sadhana.

Based on the above arguments Yoga has accepted the existence of god.

3. (c) According to Vaishesika, What is 'Samanya' Vaishesika's Samanya compare with realism conceptualism and nominalism. 12.5
वैशेषिक के अनुसार 'सामान्य' क्या है? सामान्य वस्तुवाद, सम्प्रत्ययवाद और नामवाद से भिन्न है।

Vaishesika's samanya is a bhava padartha or a category used to explain the commonness of the members of a particular class. Different philosophies have accepted it. It is of three types - par, apara and parapara. Par is the highest samanya (ex- beingness) and apara is lowest (ex- jariness). Parapara is in between the two (ex- thingness).

Different philosophies have accepted

different views of samanya. Buddhists have accepted the nominalistic view according to which samanya is not a reality and is only a similarity of name. Jainas and Vedantins have accepted the realist conceptualistic view according to which samanya is a reality but it has no independent existence and it exists only within the members of a class.

Vaisheshika view is different from these. Vaisheshika believes that samanya is an independent category. It is one but exists in many objects (anekanyugata).

Thus, through the idea of samanya, Vaisheshika has provided a solution to the problem of universal.

3. (d) Vaishesika atomism is not only materialism but also religious, ethical and spiritual. Explain? 12.5

वैशेषिक परमाणुवाद न केवल भौतिकतावाद है बल्कि धार्मिक, नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक है। व्याख्या करें।

Vaishesika's atomism is also called nitya-formanu-karan-vada or that the world was created from eternal atoms through combinations that did not exist in the atoms prior to creation.

The cause of this creation is to give fruits for the actions of beings (adrsta). In this sense, the Vaishesika creation is ~~not~~ teleological and not mechanical. ~~There~~ The beings whose actions are provided with fruits are eternal souls. Thus, there is an element of spiritualism to the theory. It is also ethical as it is based on law of karma. ~~or~~ ~~from~~ The creator of the world is God who is a supreme arbiter of joys and sorrows and moral governor of human actions as well as its directive cause. This

gives the Vaiseshika theory a religious dimension.

Therefore, the Vaiseshika theory of creation can be called a religious, spiritual and ethical theory.

4. (a) Acharya Shankar's Conception of God is different from Nyaya Philosophy. Explain. 20

आचार्य शंकर ईश्वर की अवधारणा न्याय दर्शन से भिन्न है। व्याख्या करें।

Shankaracharya's conception of God is that of an impersonal God while Nyaya believes in a personalistic notion of God. Hence, the two ideologies are bound to differ. Though there are still some differences between the Naiyayika's God and Shankaracharya's *apara* Brahman.

Shankaracharya's philosophy is called *advaita* Vedanta or non-dualistic

Vedanta where Brahman is the absolute reality ("Brahman satyam, jagat mithya Jivo brahmaiva narah")

This highest reality is impersonal in nature and indescribable (neti, neti) as it is devoid of all qualities. He is avangomanasgochara. ~~and pure~~ Naiyayikas, on the other hand, have accepted a god who is defined by six kinds of perfections like almighty, all glorious, infinite knowledge, infinite beauty, perfect detachment etc. Pure consciousness is his quality but not his essence. He is a personalistic god who unlike advaita's Brahman is creator, preserver and destroyer of this world as well as the supreme arbiter of joys and sorrows. He is ^{only} the efficient cause of the world unlike Shankaracharya's Brahman who is the efficient as well as material cause (Brahman vivartad).

Despite these differences there is some similarity between the two notions. Shankaracharya has also accepted an idea of *apara* Brahman who is a *vyaharik sat* (practical reality). He is the personalistic aspect of impersonalistic Brahman. He is *saguna* (full of qualities) and can be considered as creator, preserver and destroyer of world and being a personalistic god devotion to him results in rewards. This notion is like the Naiyayika's god but it is not the highest reality of *advaita*.

These differences in notions of gods are an important underlying factor in differences of world view of the two philosophical systems.

4. (b) Real nature of Brahman is (Sat-Chit-Anand) but Acharya Shankar believes in Tatastha lakshan also, why? 15

ब्रह्म का वास्तविक स्वभाव स्वरूप लक्षण है, परन्तु आचार्य शंकर तटस्थ लक्षण में भी विश्वास करते हैं। क्यों?

4. (c) The advaitavada of Shankara's has no place for ethics, Discuss.
शंकर के अद्वैतवाद में नैतिकता के लिए कोई स्थान नहीं है।

15

Shankaracharya's advaita vedanta believes in non-dualism where the ultimate reality is Brahman and there is no difference between the seeker and the sought. This leaves little room for ethics, or so it appears at a cursory glance.

Ethics is the science of conduct where human actions are segregated in right and wrong, fair and unfair and so on. But this segregation is itself a kind of duality and it cannot stand in a world whose actual reality is non-dualism. If Brahman is the one, ultimate reality then it makes ~~a~~ little sense in separating parts of him as good and others as bad as everything is Brahman. Thus, it seems that ethical conduct is an impossibility in this framework. However, Shankaracharya has

accepted the world as a vyaharik sat (practical reality) besides Brahman as the paramarthik sat (ultimate reality).

He has also accepted saguna Brahman as moral governor of the world. So, within the confines of this world we are expected to act morally and be devoted to saguna Brahman (or Isvara) to purify our chitta.

Therefore, it can be said that though a non-dualistic world makes moral discrimination difficult, advaita's acceptance of the ^{dualistic} world at a practical level makes enough room for ethical consideration.

5. (a) Explain the relation between God and jiva (Ramanuja)
ईश्वर और जीव के सम्बन्ध की व्याख्या करें।

12.5

Ramanujacharya has accepted aprthksiddhi sambandh to explain god-jiva relation.

He has rejected bhedavad or difference between god and jiva as it fails to explain unity of the world. He has also rejected abhedavad or ~~same~~ sameness between god and jiva as it cannot explain diversity. Bheda-abhedavad has been rejected by him as it ~~is~~ leads to contradiction.

He accepts abheda as primary and bheda as secondary character of god-jiva relation. Brahman and jiva have an organic unity like part and whole. He has therefore called this relation aprthksiddhi or inseparable relation. According to him jiva is anu (or atomic) while Brahman is vibhu (or all pervading). This ~~distin~~ relation flows from

his acceptance of vishitha advaita ~~or~~ or qualified monism where Brahman is qualified by chitta and achitta.

5. (b) Madhva's jagat is completely different from Shankar's and Ramanuja's jagat. Explain. 12.5

मध्य का जगत् सम्बन्धी सिद्धांत शंकर और रामानुज के जगत् विचार से भिन्न है। व्याख्या करें।

Madhvacharya has given the conception of a dualistic world ~~where~~ whereas Shankaracharya's and Ramanucharya's world view is non-dualistic and monistic respectively.

Madhavacharya's world is made from achitta which is a separate ~~it~~ from Brahman but dependent on ~~it~~ him. Thus, there is external difference at the level of Brahman. Madhvacharya

has accepted this difference because in the world we see change and negativity. If ~~this~~ such a world is accepted to be a part of Brahman then Brahman will also change and will have negativity. World is real.

As opposed to the above views Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya have accepted no external difference at the level of Brahman. In advaita philosophy jagat is mithya as it is contradicted by later knowledge. In vishitha advaita, it is taken to be real but it is created from achitta which is only an attribute of Brahman and not separate from him.

This difference in world views have led to different prescriptions for liberation by the three thinkers.

5. (c) Difference between 'Adrst' and 'Apurva'

12.5

'अद्रष्ट' और 'अपूर्व' में क्या अन्तर है।

Adrst is the cosmic balance of actions of the being due to which good or bad fruits accrue to an individual. It is a cosmic law but is an unintelligent principle and needs an intelligent ~~gov~~ governor to decide the fruits of actions. It is the cause of creation of this world by god as accepted by Vaiseshikas because ~~human~~ beings need fruits of their actions. Thus despite being ~~an~~ guiding principle it is not an independent principle.

Apurva or Prakriti is accepted to be one of the two independent realities of the world. It is also an unintelligent principle and a cause of the world like adrst but it is different from adrst. It is material in nature unlike adrst. It is independent, does not require a god

to set itself in motion and is the ever active material cause of the world unlike adrst.

5. (d) Liberation in and of nature and not simply from nature.

12.5

प्रकृति में तथा प्रकृति के मोक्षत्व का प्रयत्न है मात्र प्रकृति से मोक्षत्व का नहीं। व्याख्या करें।

Liberation in Yoga can be seen as an attempt to free oneself from the wrong identification of self from not-self (or Purusha from Prakriti). As a seeker aims to liberate himself, he tries to end his wrong identification from Prakriti it can be said to be liberation from nature. But this does not represent the complete picture.

Prakriti is one of the two eternal

and independent realities as per Sankhya and yoga. Liberation from Prakriti can not mean that the annihilation of Prakriti. It has to be liberation in Prakriti or nature. It can also refer to the possibility of *jeevan-mukti* or liberation & while being in the world.

Also, liberation of Purusha would mean dissolution of ^{world} Prakriti because the cause of creation of the world is liberation of Purusha through attainment of right discrimination (*kairalyartham*). This would entail liberation of Prakriti from the cycle of ~~so~~ evolution. &

Therefore, liberation is not only from nature but also from and in nature.