

A QUARTERLY
ON
JAINOLOGY

VOL. XIV

APRIL 1980

No. 4

JAIN JOURNAL



॥ जैन भवन ॥

JAIN BHAWAN PUBLICATION

YOGA-TRIPLET

SUZUKO OHIRA

The word *yoga* ordinarily denotes the cessation of mental activities, but the Jainas use it in the technical sense of action committed by the media of mind-speech-body. And this *yoga*-triplet plays an important role in various fields of Jainism. For instance, it forms the so-called *trividham trividhena* along with *karaṇa*-triplet. It constitutes the content of *gupti*. It is the basic cause of *āsrava* in *karma* theory, and it is counted as one of the 14 *mārganāsthānas*. Beside all these, the concept of *upayoga* is surely involved with the concept of *yoga*, and even the series of atomic groups called sevenfold *vargaṇās* is formulated centered around the triplet of mind-speech-body. Since *yoga*-triplet expresses merely the divisions of action, it could not develop itself more than a technical concept as such. However, it is important enough to note that it came to exert its capacity in the wide range of fields in Jainism. Then how did this concept of *yoga* come into being in the Jaina school? This question may deserve a study in order to understand how it came to attract the Jaina theoreticians in various subject fields, which is attempted in the following.

The later so-called *karaṇa*-triplet, action committed by oneself, action committed by the other for his sake, and approval of the action committed by the other for his sake, makes its consistent appearance in the *Ācāra* I, wherein the later so-called *yoga*-triplet is marked by its absence. On the other hand the Buddhists considered *karma* or action in terms of three media of action by mind-speech-body, which makes its consistent appearance in the earliest Buddhist texts such as the *Suttanipāta*, *Dhammapada*, etc. The term *yoga* in this technical sense or the triplet of mind-speech-body minus naming it *yoga* starts to occur in the *Sūtrakṛta* I onwards, but the word *yoga* in non-technical sense frequently appear in the *Ācāra* I, *Sūtrakṛta* I, *Uttara* (early chapters) and *Daśavaikālika* which belong to the earliest canonical stage in due sequence. And the Jaina concept of *tivihenam karaṇa-joṇam* makes its first appearance in its full-fledged form in explaining five *mahāvratas* along with *rātri-bhojana-viramana* as the 6th vow in the *Daśavaikālika* IV. And this chapter which deals with the 6th vow and is composed

in prose is considered to belong to a slightly later stage.¹ All this implies that the Jainas formulated this concept of *yoga*-triplet after the Buddhist classification of *karma* in connection with *karaṇa*-triplet.

Mahavira promulgated that *anārambha* or non-violence to the six classes of beings is the pathway for liberation. And since his non-violence received from Parsva was based on the primitive animist position and *vaira* theory, any physical action committed by a being could not escape committing violence to the other visible or invisible beings. *Vaira* meaning anger, hostility, enmity, etc. is here understood as the principle of retribution that a victim emits at the slaughterer to return due revenge when violence is committed on him. Thus on the part of a convict, *vaira* is the very sin committed by himself.² Mahavira then proposed that the action committed without any intention of violence was free from guilt.³ At the same time he created a rule that a monk was responsible for his sinful action if it was directly committed by himself, if it was indirectly committed by the other for his sake, and if he approved the fact that it was indirectly committed by the other for his sake, for in these three cases he is the immediate agent of the intention of violence.

Since *vaira* is emitted by a victim when he is physically injured by a slaughterer, but not when there is the presence of mere intention of violence or verbal violence (speech was understood as material in the later canonical stage), it must have been considered that monk is responsible of his physical action committed by *karaṇa*-triplet. Mahavira's rules of practice exemplified in the early Jaina canon are therefore based on the prohibition of physical action harmful to the visible and invisible beings. However Mahavira clearly admitted that the presence of the intention of violence is the worst sin. Likewise he is described in the *Ācāra* 1.9 that he kept silence as far as possible, and he constantly taught his disciples to practise *samiti*, *gupti*, *samyama* and *samvara* (which are used in the synonymous sense in the *Ācāra* I and *Sūtrakṛta* I) to control themselves and their senses. This indicates that Mahavira himself never neglected the action committed by mind and speech. However, he did not obviously feel the need of expressing action by the three media as Buddha did.

¹ Dixit, K.K.: "The Problems of Ethics and Karma Doctrine as Treated in the Bhagavati Sutra", in *Sambodhi* II-3, p.4

² Dixit, K.K.: *Ibid.*, p.6

³ *Acara* I.5.4.301, *Sutrakṛta* I.1.2.52, etc.

But soon the Jainas take up the problem of *bhāṣā samiti* in the *Daśavaikālika* beside *eṣaṇā samiti* which is already dealt in the *Ācāra I-Sūtrākṛta I* to a certain extent. Then the topic of *vinaya* makes its appearance in the *Uttara I* and *Daśavaikālika IX*. And the *Ācāra II* takes up four *samitis*, i.e. *eṣaṇā*, *bhāṣā*, *iryā* and *vyutsarga*, excluding *ādāna-nikṣepa samiti*. These *samitis* and *vinaya* which constitute the primary routine of monks' daily activities necessarily demand monks to be disciplined in their mental, vocal and bodily activities. Here it seems that the Jainas began to realize the convenience of expressing action by three divisions as the Buddhists used to do, and came to formulate *yoga*-triplet.

The word *yoga* in non-technical sense is employed in the following ways in the texts belonging to the earliest canonical stage. 'kāyam ca jogam ca īriyam ca' in the *Ācāra* 1.8.7.436, 'āyāṇasoyam-ativāyasoyam jogam ca' in its 9.1.476, 'āyata-jogayāe' in its 9.4.516, 'āyata-jogam' in its 9.4.522; 'urālam jagato jogam' in the *Sūtrākṛta I* 4.9.84, 'samāhi-jogehim' in its 4.1.16, 'jhāṇa-jogam' in its 8.26, 'jayayam viharāhi jogavam' in its 2.1.99, and 'bhāvanā-joga-suddha-ppā' in its 15.5; 'samjamo-joga-santi' in the *Uttara XII* 44, 'sāvajja-jogam' in its XXI.13, etc.; 'acchaṇa-joeṇa' in the *Daśavaikālika VIII* 3, 'jogam ca samaṇa-dhammammi' in its VIII.43, 'giha-jogam' in its VIII.21, 'samjama-jogam ca sajjhāya-jogam ca' in its VIII.62, etc.

The word *yoga* above is employed in the sense of "endeavour" or "effort" as in the case of the early Buddhist usage collected in the *Pāli English Dictionary*. Then, when mental-vocal-bodily activities were formulated as the content of *yoga*, the word *yoga* must have meant a soul's endeavour or effort expressed by these three media of action. The Buddhists considered that an agent's *cetanā* is expressed by these three media of action. The Jainas thus followed the Buddhists in formulating the concept of *yoga*. This Buddhist concept that *karma* or action is the expression of *cetanā* is said to be implied in Buddha's 12 interdependent originations wherein *cetanā* is placed before *nāma-rūpa* (i.e. the objects of *cetanā*) derived by *āyatana* (i.e. six senses) which is placed after *nāma-rūpa*. But the earliest arguments that the vocal and bodily activities are also originated in the agent's *cetanā* as in the case of mental activity, therefore mental activity weighs most important among the three against the Jainas who weigh bodily activity most heavily, are said to occur in the *Madhyama Nikāya* 56, 111 and 136.⁴

⁴ Funahashi, Issai: *Go no Kenkyu (A Study of Karman)*, pp.32 ff.

It is difficult to ascertain the age of these texts in the *Madhyama Nikāya*. However, from the facts that the word *yoga* in both non-technical sense and technical sense occurs in the *Daśavaikālika*, and that the full-fledged exposition of *vratas* by *yoga*-triplet and *karāṇa*-triplet in proper way occurs for the first time in the *Daśavaikālika* IV, it is safer to conclude that the concept of *yoga* was formulated by the time of *Daśavaikālika* IV. *Yoga*-triplet must have been thus established in connection with *karāṇa*-triplet in order to express the range of a monk's responsible action.

And even when the Jainas formulated *yoga*-triplet, they continued to weigh physical action most heavily as the Buddhists criticized, because the Jaina way of non-violence was primarily based on the primitive theory of *vaira*. This attitude of the Jainas underwent a revolutionary change in theory when the *karma* doctrine developed in the later days, because the action of violence was here reduced to be a partial cause in attracting the eightfold main types of *karma*. These threefold activities of *yoga* then came to express themselves with equal weight as the basic cause of *āsrava*, for the moment mental action or vocal action is committed, it is supposed to attract *karma* matter as in the case of bodily action. This shows that the Jainas finally sloughed off the primitive belief in *vaira* theory. The pathway for salvation is here advocated by the removal of *karma* from the soul in the place of the old position that non-violence constitutes the sole path way for liberation. The practice of *dharma*, *anuprekṣā* and *dhyāna* occurred in the late canonical stage may also evince the due weight given for the mental and vocal activities.

Yoga-triplet conveniently expresses the totality of action expressed by the three media of a being. Therefore once it was formulated, it came to be used independently in various fields, particularly in the field of *karma* doctrine as mentioned just now and in the field of ethics wherein action plays the main role. Thus the triplet of mind-speech-body became the content of *gupti*, which however seems to have occurred in the considerably late canonical age. Because the *Sūtrakṛta* II.2.662 relevant to *īryāpatha kriyā*, which is the concept formulated in the late canonical age in the context of *karma* theory, thereby this treatment here is the later interpolation, enumerates mind-speech-body as the content of both *samiti* and *gupti*, beside listing the formal content of *samiti*. A similar treatment of the content of *samiti* and *gupti* occurs in the *Bhagavatī* II.1.91 which also belongs to the late canonical period. All the five *samitis* do not occur yet in the four old *Chedasūtras* (i.e. *Brhatkalpa*, *Vyavahāra*, *Daśā* and *Niśītha*) and the *Ācāra* II. Thus it took

some time for *gupti* to be separated from *samiti* after the content of *samiti* was established.

The classification of mind-speech-body developed meanwhile in the field of ethics (mind-speech) and in the field of *jīva* (body). And this came to be a convenient *anuyogadvāra* to be posed on each class of the beings to find their behaviours and characteristics, which is precisely so found in the *Prajñāpanā* XVI called “*Prayogapada*”. *Yoga* came to be thus included in the list of 14 *mārganāsthānas* in the *Saṅkhaṇḍāgama*.

As we have mentioned already, *yoga* is the soul’s endeavour or effort expressed by the activities of threefold media that are of material composition. *Upayoga* (*upa* is an affix meaning direction towards) must be the soul’s conscious and unconscious source that is directed towards or transformed into the form of endeavour or effort. And when this endeavour or effort takes place, the external sense data are received by a soul through the activities of these three media that constitute six senses in the field of cognition of the external world.⁵ And when this endeavour or effort takes place, the soul’s conscious and unconscious content including will, cognition, instinct, emotion, etc., is expressed through the three media of action in the field of expression of the internal world. In the case of a liberated soul, who is free from the physical entity thereby without *yoga*, *upayoga* consists of *ananta jñāna-darśana*. But in the case of an embodied soul, *upayoga* consists of conscious and unconscious content, which therefore functions as the source of cognition of the external world as well as the expression of the internal world. *Upayoga* is identified with *jñāna-darśana* in the canonical texts, for instance in the *Prajñāpanā* XXIX, possibly because this is the common feature in both liberated and embodied souls, and it is the most distinct feature of the soul.

When the system of *pudgala* developed, the Jainas came to consider that *pudgala* consists of 7 *vargaṇās*, i.e., 1) atom, 2) gross body, etc., 3) speech, 4) fiery body, 5) respiration, 6) mind, and 7) *karma*. All these *vargaṇās* consist of atoms by different number thereby differing in their density. Excluding the case of respiration and atom itself, the rest of the *vargaṇās* consist of mind-speech-body. When the functions of mind, speech and body in various types were postulated, the Jainas must have come to realize that their material constitutions should differ one from the other. And by adding to them respiration which has

⁵ See *Tatvarthasutra* II.19

different function from the rest thereby endowed with different constitution, the Jainas must have established this series of atomic groups, of which speech, respiration and *karma* behave in a similar way by being attracted to the body and ejected from the body constantly.

Yoga-triplet primarily expresses the division of action of a being. It is thus an important concept in the theory of *kriyā*. And *kriyā* is the root cause upon which the ethical principles and doctrinal theories of the Jainas were developed. It is therefore not surprising that the Jaina theoreticians tried to use this *yoga*-triplet in various fields. At the same time we should realize that this way of applying one concept or its content to all sorts of fields was a peculiar and habitual tendency of the Jaina theoreticians in the canonical age.