

THE METHOD OF ANALYSIS AND FALSIFIABILITY PRINCIPLE

Thant Zaw¹, Ththe Thet Saing², Khin Maung San³,

Abstract

This paper attempts to provide a solution as to why the method of analysis and falsification each on its own cannot be a satisfactory criterion of truth. Each fails to take into account the negative instances in putting forward a hypothesis. The tentative solution is that method of analysis has to be strengthened with falsification. The descriptive and evaluative method will be used to clarify that mere analysis into parts of thought or falsification alone is unable to take into account the negative instances in searching for truth. The research principle to be used will be the principle of reciprocity. This research contributes to enhance the vision that it is important not only to verify truth but also to look for negative instances since falsity is as important as truth in the search for knowledge.

Key Words: (1) Analysis (2) Falsification (3) Reciprocity (4) Truth

Introduction

One of the great philosophic problems, that puzzle classical western philosophers, is the problem of the nature of the universe. Classical philosophers were greatly interested to solve this problem and it was the first problem they attacked asking “what is the stuff from which all things come?” They were followed by the Pythagoreans, who asserted the fact that many things in the universe were related in a certain way that can be stated by numbers. Thus, for them, numbers are the stuff of the universe.

Heraclitus believed that change was the essence of all things whereas Parmenides stated that the universe was a solid mass which was unchangeable. Some philosophers like Empedocles agreed with Parmenides that there can be no change but he agreed with Heraclitus in holding that there is intermingling of things in the universe.

All the above thoughts paved the way for the atomists. Thus, classical philosophers worked with the problem of the nature of the universe. The western philosophers up to the present are keenly conscious that besides the universe that the scientists find real, there is the universe of the human mind. There are human hopes and fears, love and hate, dreams and defects. The philosophers find men as free but responsible for their actions.

¹Dr, Professor, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

²Dr, Professor and Head, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

³Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

As science philosophy follows the rules such as laws of thought of Aristotle which remained unaltered up to the 19th century, the insight of modern logician Frege (1848-1925) that all the unproven assumptions and rules of mathematics could be derived from most elementary principles of Logic.

The dominance of 'analytic' philosophy in the English-speaking world was launched by Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) and progressively more now in the rest of the world. Since mathematics was his chief interest, Russell studied mathematics first and then he tried to combine it with Philosophy.

Wittgenstein's later critique of analysis in the early logical atomist period of analytic philosophy, and Quine's attack on the analytic-synthetic distinction, for example, have led some to claim that philosophers are now in a 'post-analytic' age.

Analysis and Synthesis are philosophical terms. Denoting the processes of mentally breaking down of a whole into its constituent parts is called analysis. Analysis means seeking a deeper understanding of something by taking it to pieces. Synthesis is the opposite of Analysis. It means seeking a deeper understanding of something by putting the pieces together.

Modern philosophy starts with Rene' Descartes. Descartes' thoughts on mathematics and his thoughts on philosophy, although they come into view very different, indispositions, methods, and goals, they are dominant throughout all of modern philosophy and mathematics, and form a fundamental difference between classical and modern philosophies.

As Bryan Magee said in his book *"The Story of Philosophy"* Analytic statement is a statement whose truth or falsehood can be established by analysis of the statement itself Synthetic statement has to be set against facts outside itself for its determination of truth.

Historically G.E. Moore's conception of good as non-natural had great influence on the analysis of ethical statements undertaken by the logical positivists including A.J. Ayer. Ayer agreed with Moore that no natural property can be used to define an ethical predicate. By using method of analysis, Ayer elaborated and popularized Rudolf Carnap's theory that only mathematical, logical and empirical propositions are meaningful and that ethical propositions are not meaningful.

Falsification might be interpreted as such whenever the classical system of the day is threatened by the results of new experiments. In science it is the conflict over the aims of it. It is Popper's view who believes that scientific knowledge is permanently opened to revision in the light of experience. Those who share this attitude hope to make new discoveries which are newly created scientific systems.

Research Problem

This paper attempts to provide a solution as to why the method of analysis and falsification each on its own cannot be a satisfactory criterion of truth. Each fails to take into account the negative instances in putting forward a hypothesis. The tentative solution is that method of analysis has to be strengthened with falsification.

Research Method and Principle

In this research paper the descriptive and evaluative method will be used to clarify that mere analysis into parts of thought or falsification alone is unable to take into account the negative instances in searching for truth. The research principle to be used will be the principle of reciprocity. This research contributes to enhance the vision that it is important not only to verify truth but also to look for negative instances since falsity is as important as truth in the search for knowledge.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Analysis always involves breaking things down into less imposing elements, and understanding the connections between these elements; that is, analysis is the process of finding the structure of something. This “structurization” requires its own separate system for describing, things and event in mathematics, this purpose is served by the symbolic language of mathematics.

Both Spinoza and Kant at times used theorems, proofs, definitions, and postulates to force their logic to be sounder. The structure of Leibniz’s Monadology is different from it but his language is very reminiscent of Euclid’s. A comparison can be made between Leibniz's first point, “The Monad, of which we will speak here, is nothing else than a simple substance, which goes to make up composites and Euclid’s first definition,

There are many ways of applying the logical distinction between "analysis" and "synthesis". Some of the ways in which an over-emphasis on either analysis or synthesis has shaped the way some philosophers have developed their ideas. Most versions of the former have emphasized the importance of analysis, and most versions of the latter, synthesis, so much as to neglect or even explicitly reject the significance of the opposing trend.

The main elements of the philosophical movement which has dominated English-speaking philosophy in this century, is known as "linguistic analysis". The same way of philosophizing also goes by names such as "analytic philosophy", "linguistic philosophy", or

"philosophy of language", depending on the preference of the philosopher in question. The issues concerning the precise way in which (1) language ought to be analyzed, (2) the exact definition of what analysis is, and (3) even the proper delimitation of what counts as language, are the issues of open debate among

Many believe that in upholding this belief they are the true heirs of Kant's great limitation of human knowledge — to the extent that the notion of a "transcendental turn" in philosophizing is thought by many philosophers today to be identical to a "linguistic turn". The roots of linguistic analysis were planted in ground prepared by a mathematician named Gottlob Frege (1848-1925) who had an insight to overthrow the conception of logic. Frege instituted analytic logic, the implications of which are still in the process of being worked out by contemporary philosophers.

He regarded logic as virtually reducible to mathematics, and believed proofs should always be exhibited in the form of clearly expressed, deductive steps. More importantly, he believed logic could perform the tasks far beyond anything envisioned by Aristotle, provided logicians could develop ways of expressing linguistic meaning entirely in terms of logical symbols.

Frege also developed a new notation enabling "quantifiers", words such as "all", "some", etc., to be expressed in terms of symbols. One of the first philosophers to recognize the profound importance of Frege's new discoveries in logic was Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) who had been trained as a mathematician in Cambridge probably the best known English philosopher in 20th century. Russell, together with A.N. Whitehead, applied many of Frege's insights in writing what must be one of the most important books written in the century, *Principia Mathematica*.

Frege's view of linguistic analysis was followed by Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951). Wittgenstein's book, *"Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus"* (1921), which came to be treated as a manifesto for one of the earliest versions of linguistic analysis called "logical positivism".

Wittgenstein uses the same kind of mathematical form, numbering each successive paragraph in such a hierarchical order. This logical form reflects the overall aim of the book, which is to construct a set of analytic propositions that can be used as a framework for understanding all "facts" which Wittgenstein accepts as meaningful propositions about the world. The analytic focus of Wittgenstein's concern is evident when, for example, he states that each of these facts "can be the case" (+) "or not the case" (-).

Ayer's Principle of Verification

The most influential of Wittgenstein's follower was A.J. Ayer (1910-1989), who, at the age of 26, wrote the book, *"Language, Truth, and Logic,"* popularizing a positivist interpretation of Wittgenstein's ideas. Ayer in his book, *"Language, Truth and Logic"* maintained that the way to end the traditional disputes is to establish the purpose and method of a philosophical enquiry. His charge against the metaphysician is not the latter attempt to employ the understanding in an unprofitable field but that metaphysician produces sentences which fail to confirm to literal significance.

Ayer used the verification principle in order to cut away all such statements which have no literal significance. The discussion shows their difference with the pragmatists like William James and John Dewey. The difference with the pragmatists on the nature of philosophy is that the analysts avoid a philosophy of life of the kind one finds in both James and Dewey.

Ayer employs verification to discard most of what have traditionally been regarded as the most important areas of philosophical inquiry. Not only metaphysical propositions as such, but also most of the propositions of moral, religious, and aesthetic value are also explained as a mere expression of a person's emotional state which is irrational.

However, there is a serious problem with Ayer's program, as with any such attempt to establish on logical grounds a set of so-called "positive" limits to philosophical inquiry. The problem is that the very principle upon which this whole school of thought is based cannot pass the test of verification. He would be unable to point to evidence against the principle of verification because this principle is not merely a "logical tool", as Ayer thought. The principle itself is a metaphysical belief which he tried to discard as nonsense. Thomas Ellis Katen, in his book *"Doing Philosophy"* gives a remark that the empirical verifiability principle itself cannot be empirically verified.⁵

Hence the principle itself is meaningless or false so that the very foundation of logical positivism falls to pieces. Logical positivism had been supported by many philosophers during the 1930s and 1940s. However, by its very nature its basic claim is self-contradictory. Indeed, it became so evident that Ayer himself eventually stopped trying to defend such an extreme, positivist form of philosophy. Since it cannot be proved from within the system it supports, there would be no boundary lines in the system, and hence no knowledge at all.

At the turn of the twentieth century, G. E Moore, Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Rudolf Carnap and Whitehead and those who become more and more

interested in analysis, think of philosophy not as a rival of science but as an activity which is devoted to clarifying it, because most of them were mathematicians and scientists.

In addition to the principle of determining meaning, Wittgenstein suggested a number of other guidelines for how ordinary language ought to be investigated by philosophers. One of the guidelines is that just as different games have different rules, different languages have different ways of using them. Therefore, every language has its respective meaning or meaningfulness. The logical positivists have regarded science as the only admissible realm of knowledge. Nevertheless, science is now regarded by them as just one of many admissible realms.

The words used in non-scientific contexts, such as in moral reasoning, in forming aesthetic judgments, and even in constructing systems of religious belief, can be regarded as having legitimate meanings after all. In each case, though, man cannot understand such meanings from the outside, but must have participation in order to appreciate what is going on. For this reason understanding of the technique of a certain language is crucial for ordinary language philosophers.

Another guideline introduced by Wittgenstein was again based on an analogy — namely, that groups of words sometimes bear "family relationships" to each other and to other groups of words. The analyst in some of its forms has actually come to appreciate more fully the importance of synthesis — though still treating analysis as having priority. This emphasis on analysis has had the benefit of calling to the attention of philosophers the importance of clarifying language.

For this, the problem is the starting point of Popper's problem of demarcation. Thus the problem which I tried to solve by proposing the criterion of falsifiability was neither a problem of meaningfulness or significance, nor a problem of truth or acceptability. It was the problem of drawing a line (as well as this can be done) between the statements, or systems of statements, of the empirical sciences, and all other statements — whether they are of a religious or of a metaphysical character, or simply pseudo-scientific. Years later — it must have been in 1928 or 1929 — I called this first problem of mine the "*problem of demarcation*."

Popper had tried to draw a line between the statements of empirical sciences and all other statements of religion, metaphysics and pseudo sciences. For Popper, there would be no difficulty in giving instances and counter-instances of the term "philosopher." Everyone would agree that Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Locke, Hume, Kant, Hegel, and Mc Taggart were eminent philosophers.

Again, there would be no difficulty in giving instances and counter-instances of philosophical activities on the part of philosophers. One might also be wondered whether Galileo, though primarily a great physicist, made important contributions to philosophy. Similarly Einstein was merely doing mathematical physics when he enunciated first the special and then the general theory of relativity. Thus, he was not contributing to philosophy. Lastly, one and the same person may be equally eminent both in activities which are universally held to be philosophical and in others which are universally held not to be so.

It might be said that Hume and Hegel were certainly both philosophers because Hume was undoubtedly philosophizing in his analysis of causation and that Hegel was undoubtedly philosophizing in his attempt to prove by the dialectical method that the universe has a certain complicated kind of formal structure.

At the same time, it might be said that there is no single non-disjunctive characteristic, and no conjunction of such characteristics, common and peculiar to what Hume was doing and what Hegel was doing. To philosophize means to perform one or another or a mixture of at least two fundamentally different kinds of activity, one of which is exemplified by Hume's attempt to analyze causal propositions and the other by Hegel's attempt to establish the formal structure of the universe by dialectical reasoning.

This would need to be proved, and the proof would certainly be "philosophical" in some sense or other. One would also have to explain how it came about that the practicable and useful activity had been so intimately associated throughout the history of philosophy with the impracticable and spurious one. Thus there are two features which are together characteristic of all work that would generally be regarded as philosophical.

FALSIFIABILITY PRINCIPLE

The falsifiability principle is introduced by Popper. According to his central idea both the natural and the social sciences always start from problems. As in the case of the Greek philosophers they use to say that something inspires amazement in them. In order to solve the problems, the sciences employ the same method as the common sense man. That method is the method of trial and error. In order to find out the solution the false ones are discarded as erroneous. Many experimental solutions are made and one after another are eliminated after putting to the test. According to Popper, in this way men are able to learn through trial and error how a certain problem should be solved.

Popper presents the above kind of learning through trial and error in a model which has three stages. The first stage is the problem, the second is the attempted solution and the

third is the elimination. The first stage is the problem itself. It may appear that there is a problem which may appear single. Even so, as there may be many solutions, the solution may be plural which are subject to the process of elimination which may be taken place in the third stage. The third stage is the elimination of the mistakes. If the solution is eliminated the problem remains unsolved. Then the new attempted solutions have to be made. If an attempted solution is successful the solution is learnt. For Popper, learning means the dropping of unsuccessful solutions and the appearing of the successful attempt. This is the elimination procedure and the procedure depends upon many attempted solutions.

Popper gave an example of the formation of the scientific theories by applying his model. Concerning Darwin's theory of evolution his model is applicable not only to the individual organism but also to the evolution of species. The problem is a problem of adaptation of species. The species can survive only through a change in its genetic structure. Changes occur again and again in the genetic structure.

According to Popper's theory or logic of science, science has arisen out of pre-scientific knowledge. Science is the continuation of commonsense knowledge. Hence Popper remarked that the point that the starting point of science is sense observation is fundamentally wrong because without a problem there will be no observation. From the point of view of evolutionary theory, senses are tools to solve problems. Observation or sense perceptions are important for solutions and they play the main role in the elimination. Eliminating one's mistakes or eliminating false theories is important for learning in science.

For Popper, the distinctive feature of science is the application of the critical method. In elimination of mistakes and false theories one has to apply the critical method. The critical method alone can explain the growth and the progress of science. In this work, "*All life is Problem Solving*" asserts that, "All pre-scientific knowledge, whether animal or human, is dogmatic, and science begins with the invention of the non-dogmatic, critical method."

The Essence of the Critical Method & Scientific Knowledge

The essence of the critical method is that the theories, the solutions and hypotheses can be formulated in language. The propositions, the predictions can be experimentally endorsed. At the same time they can also be experimentally disputed. Hence, according to Popper, the pros and cons should be weighed and discussed.

Scientific knowledge consists of propositions which are objective and are formulated in hypotheses and problems. Hence scientific knowledge does not consist of subjective expectations and convictions. According to Popper scientific method and approach

is the interest to involve in elimination. Thus, one should like to discover theories that are false and the scientist should destroy his hypothesis through criticism. Hence it is the method of falsification which distinguishes the scientific approach and method from the pre-scientific approach. Every theory and every solution must be tested. An examination is an attempt to discover the weaknesses of a theory or a solution. Accordingly, the testing of a theory or a solution is an attempt to refute or falsify it.

In order to distinguish genuine falsification from the illusory ones, rational scientific discussion is needed for a scientific theory according to Popper but there is no guarantee that every scientific discussion can be resolved. However the novelty of science and scientific method is its critical attitude and its attempt to criticize and falsify.

For Popper the characteristic of pre-scientific thinking is the dogmatic attitude whereas the characteristic of science and scientific method is falsification. Falsification leads to science and it governs the scientific method.

Since scientific progress consists in the replacement of earlier theories by later theories, scientific method is not cumulative as Bacon thinks. Popper believes that it is revolutionary. There is even significance of attempts at falsification. The new theories of science must be capable of solving all the problems of the old. Popper gives an example of Einstein that Einstein's theory is capable of solving the problem of planetary motion better than Newton's theory. Even so, Popper's scientific method starts from new assumptions and in its conclusion it even goes beyond and contradicts the old theory. The contradiction can distinguish the old from the new theory in the sense of falsification. For Popper such kind of falsification is a scientific success.

One is always learning things through falsification. In learning one learns not only that a theory is wrong but also why it is wrong and then one learns the starting point of a new scientific development.

In his elimination of scientific theory, Popper introduces four-stage model characteristic of scientific theory. Science as it is understood is perpetually growing. It is essentially dynamic. It is something which is never finished. There is no point at which it reaches the final goal. Science emerged through the invention of critical discussion.

Popper's point is that man is learning through falsification. He distinguishes empirical scientific theories from other theories. The difference is that possible experimental results can be described that would falsify the theory. Popper calls the problem of distinguishing empirical scientific theories from other theories – the "demarcation problem." His proposed solution is the criterion of demarcation. A theory is part of empirical science if

and only if it conflicts with possible experiences and is therefore falsifiable – by experience so he called this criterion of demarcation, the falsifiability criterion.

Discussion

Verifiability is the criterion of meaning which is the central core of logical positivists including A. J. Ayer. Logical Positivism which originated in the Vienna Circle is one of the most influential movements in 20th century. It has affinities with the empiricism of David Hume and the scientific conventionalism of Ernst Mach and Poincare. For them, an empirical statement is significant and meaningful if it is verifiable by experience. Moritz Schlick and other members insisted on this narrow sense of meaningful. At the same time, A, J, Ayer proved that it is too restrictive. Therefore, Ayer accepts a wider criterion which includes indirect as well as direct verifiability, verifiability in principle as well as in practice.

Hence general statements and historical statements about the past and statements which are not practically verifiable are meaningful in terms of Ayer's modified principle of verification.

By means of verification, logical positivists have investigated the formal and a priori aspects of knowledge. Both the achievements of modern mathematical logic and the techniques of linguistic analysis support the contention that a priori knowledge is analytical and tautological. Pure mathematics and Logic consist of such tautologies. By means of verification, Logical positivists have investigated the empirical or a posteriori ones. Hence all cognitively significant statements are empirically verifiable statements of facts or tautological statements. The philosophical consequence of verification criterion is that it rules out almost the whole of metaphysics. Those who use verifiability principle select statements of the classical philosophers almost at random to prove that metaphysics is nonsense.

Professor Thilly in his book "*A History of Philosophy*" gives a remark that a philosopher may formulate speculative generalizations of cosmology but his speculation may be derived from the factual evidence of the science of physics, astronomy and biology. Similarly conjectures with regard to the past history of the universe, the origin of life may be meaningful factual hypotheses which may be verifiable at least in principle. Their extremely dubious about the validity of cosmological theories left philosophy only the task of analysis of philosophical concepts and clarification of philosophical meanings.⁹

The history of philosophy reveals a rich source of conceptions of analysis. Analysis contributes to clarity of thoughts and helps man to understand complex ideas. Synthesis

contributes to see how the parts are related. It is necessary and helps critical outlook for social work and political thought to be clear when one philosophizes.

Falsifiability helps to control superstition, rigid thinking and discrimination, racial, religious and gender cases for problematic approaches. Falsifiability enables to identify very important negative instances.

Conclusion

In this age of information technology, classification of information is needed as what is true, what is wrong and what is useful. In this field of information, Ayer's analysis is an advantage for the purpose of the foresight of clear and alert thinking. Verification alone can lead to the misty, self-refuted, narrow specific sensed thought and double rejection of metaphysics, ethics, aesthetics and so on which is necessary for philosophy. Similarly, mere falsification which is not based on verification seems to point out another contradiction so that it can reach a neutral point of analysis in synthetic entities.

If one has to falsify the “the atom is indivisible.” he will get “the atom is not indivisible.” However, “the atom is not indivisible.” is equal to “the atom is divisible.” “The atom is divisible.” is accepted by science at present. If so, although the original theory can be falsified, the reversed theory is correct today as the disjunctive falsification of the primitive theory (“the atom is indivisible”). For example, “it is not both true that it is a circle and a triangle.” It can be falsified as “it is not both true that it is a circle and a triangle” is false is equal to “it can be both true that is a circle and a triangle”. In this sense, the practical and scientific entity of the statement cannot be possible.

The disjunctive falsification can be seen as possible in the statement, “the world is flat.” It can be falsified as “the world is not flat.” Today “the world is not flat” is correct but the world is not flat is not the same as “the world is round.” Because the world is not flat can be because it is a cylinder or parabola or square or ellipse or cone or snowball and soccer ball etc., according to the contrary relation though it is the implication of contradictory.

A certain thing can be falsified and though the falsification sense is proved to be false, that one thing may be either it is proved to be correct or right in the sense “it is the rightness of previous well established theory” or of “it is also independently rightness of the falsification of the original theory.”

Like theories appeared in the history of philosophy, the theory of verification and falsification may have some weaknesses and strengths. Instead, they run and do not ignore creative and speculative thinking of man's society. New ideas and the richest application for

the humane, humanity and all human beings can ever arise because of these theories are as long as the history of man.

Hence, the method of analysis and falsification each on its own cannot be a satisfactory criterion of truth. Each fails to take account the importance of negative instances in putting forward a hypothesis. The method of analysis has to be strengthened with falsification.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to express my gratitude to Rector, Dr. Tin Maung Tun and Pro-Rectors, Dr. Aye Aye Khaing and Dr. Soe Soe Aye, West Yangon University. And I wish to spread out my grateful thanks to my Mentors Dr. Kyi Kyi Hla, Vice-President, Myanmar Academy of Arts and Science and Dr. Tin Tin Tun, Professor and Head (Retd.), Department of Philosophy, University of Yangon. For the last, the persons by whom they may concern with this research, for their helps are fulfilled with my humble respect.

References

- A.J. Ayer. (1960). *Language, Truth and Logic*. (14th impression of the 2nd edition). London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Bryan Magee. (1998). *The Story of Philosophy*. Great Britain, Doring Kindersley Limited.
- Hilary Putnam. (1976). *Two dogmas' revisited*. In Gilbert Ryle, *Contemporary Aspects of Philosophy*. Stocksfield: Oriol Press.
- Jerrold J Katz. (1974). *Where Things Stand Now with the Analytical/Synthetic Distinction*. *Synthese* 28 (3–4): 283–319. doi:10.1007/BF00877579.
- John Hospers. (1953). *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Karl R Popper. (2001). *All Life is Problem Solving, tr. by Patrick Camiller*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.
- Lynette Reid. (1998). *Wittgenstein's Ladder: The Tractatus and Nonsense*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., USA.
- Rudolf Carnap. (1947). *Meaning and Necessity: A study in semantics and modal logic* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago. ISBN 0226093476. Google link to Midway reprint.
- Scott Soames. (2009). *Evaluating the circularity argument. 'Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century*, Volume 1: The Dawn of Analysis. Princeton University Press. p. 360. ISBN 1400825792. There are several earlier versions of this work.
- Stephen Yablo. (1998). *"Does ontology rest upon a mistake?"*. Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume 72 (1): 229–262. doi:10.1111/1467-8349.00044. "The usual charge against Carnap's internal/external distinction is one of 'guilt by association with analytic/synthetic'. But it can be freed of this association"

A STUDY OF THE PRACTICABLE MORAL CONCEPT IN BUDDHIST SOCIAL ETHICS

Thet Thet Saing¹, Thant Zaw², Tin Win Phyu³

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to investigate why Buddhist moral concepts play an important role in human society. The research methods which will be used are the descriptive method and the evaluative method. The research finding is that the practice of Buddhist moral concept will improve the individual conduct and social value in human society. Evaluation will be made in the light of the principle of reciprocity. This paper will contribute to the welfare and development of human society.

Keywords: Buddhist Moral Concepts, Individual Conduct, Social Value, Human Society

Introduction

Ethics, the study of moral theory is one of the branches of philosophy which contributes to the moral welfare of the individual in society. Ethics studies the moral aspect of man. However, there is a difference between ethics and morality.

Moral's lays down the rules and regulations of human conduct. Morals also set down ideal patterns of human character, society, inter-social relations, etc. Ethics critically estimates these moral rules and regulations, norms, ideals pattern, etc. Each social or tribal group develops its own moral code, which educate the individual as to what is right and what is wrong, as to what is good and what is bad, etc. Ethics attempts to analyze the fundamental moral concepts of terms. Moral judgments are passed upon volitions, characters, voluntary, actions, things and situations. The traditional conception of morality was individualistic with broader modern conception, moral judgments are passed on various kinds of groups also.

Social ethics is a normative study, the part of moral philosophy that concerns social action and individual involvement with society in general. Nowadays, the majority of the human beings are found to be prone to all kinds of misconduct, and thus there is no real peace and happiness in the world. One of the main reasons for this state of affairs may be the fact that there is too much focus on the individual his rights, his desires, his feelings and very little attention is paid to how the others think or feel. People have forgotten that action begets reaction and that there is reciprocity in human affairs and relations.

¹Dr, Professor and Head, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

²Dr, Professor, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

³Dr, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

In this paper, three main parts are analyzed necessarily. (1) Man and Morality, (2) Main Themes of Buddhist Moral Concepts and (3) Buddhist Perspective on Western Moral Concepts.

Research Problem

Research problem is to solve why Buddhist moral concepts play an important role in human society.

Research Method and Principle

In this research, the descriptive method and the evaluative method will be used. These methods are used to make clear that the practice of Buddhist moral concept will improve the individual conduct and social value in human society. The principle of reciprocity is utilized to cleanse the finding evaluation and will contribute to the welfare and development of human society.

I. MAN AND MORALITY

Morality is the value of quality of human actions by which we determine the actions as right or wrong and good or bad. In other words, morality refers to the rightness or wrongness of human acts. Man is a rational being as well as a social being. As a rational being, man is engaged in the process of building up a life of reason in that he has to use his reason and intellect for his survival to obtain food, clothes and shelter as well as to protect himself from all kinds of danger. As a social being, man has to live with others in a certain society or social group.

By living together with others in a certain society, man becomes to know rational performance and social experience day by day. Moral growth in human society is characterized by a process in which man becomes more rational, more social and finally, more conscious of his actions, his rights and duties towards others in society. This knowledge has been handed down from generation to generation. Human action is to be judged in terms of good or bad, right or wrong under the norms of society.

Every human action tends to obtain a certain consequence which is beneficial to some extent. Thus, an action is regarded as good and right if it begets beneficial result and is accepted by the society. Morality is essential for happiness. To be moral is to be happy. Here happiness is taken in a broader sense, not as mere physical pleasure. The ideal of greatest good for the

greatest number should guide us our day to day life. One of the reasons for the present crisis is that we are often tempted to sacrifice the greater good for narrow personal gains.³

Man cannot live alone, and thus he has to deal with other inevitably. By doing so, an individual becomes a social being under the binding force of a certain morality in a community. An individual then justifies his or her desires and choices in so far as to integrate social morality.

When the ways of doing and acting common to a group in certain community are handed down from generation to generation, they are considered to be customs. Eventually, customs are found to become the ultimate criteria of all moral judgments. In a way, they turn into morality.

When a custom lasts a long time, and it is willingly accepted in a certain society, then the custom is recognized as tradition. Here it is to be noted that every custom or tradition cannot be termed morality. For example, slavery was an accepted tradition in many societies. Some went so far as to justify slavery as moral on the basis of force and intelligence. Only when a tradition or custom involves standards of moral judgment, then it becomes morality.

II. MAIN THEMES OF BUDDHIST MORAL CONCEPTS

Buddhism teaches us the way of liberation. This way consists of three aspects (Sila) Morality, (Sammadhi) Concentration and (Panna) Wisdom. Morality is the most basic principle in that no one can attain Liberation without good morality. Good morality can serve not only to obtain Liberation but also to achieve pleasure and harmony among human beings in daily life. If we are capable of driving out evil tendencies from our mind or hearts, and replace them with can we cultivate moral virtues.

In Buddhism (Sila) morality is the basic on which concentration and wisdom can be built up to attain Liberation. Thus sila or morality has been laid down such as the Five Precept, for the people to observe. These precepts are the Buddhist Moral Codes through which each and every individual can assimilate good morality. Then there are the Four Cardinal Values (Brahma – vihara) that are to be nurtured by all of us in Buddhist society by enhancing our thoughts, words and deeds. As a matter of fact Buddhism is the way to guide us to Liberation (Nibbana) which the professed good of every Buddhist.

Thus the Buddhist concept of morality is absolute, whereas customary or traditional morality is relative in that human actions, customs or traditions, change from time to time in accordance with new experiences and circumstances. Hence, the concept of morality is quite different from that of custom and tradition, and Buddhism recognizes this distinction. This

does not mean that standards of morality do not change in a society. To sum up morality can be expressed in the values of social as well as individual conduct. Morality was not only a social matter but also an individual concern and values are relative to times, place and conditions.¹

III. BUDDHIST PERCEPTIVE ON WESTERN MORAL CONCEPTS

Human actions judged according to whether they are good or bad are said to be moral or immoral. On the other hand, again there must be certain criteria of what is meant by good or bad. The ethical term, "good" is too hard to define because it can be expressed from various points of view. Thus, "good" can be taken as primary notion irreducible and indefinable. It can be considered as end, as ought, and as value. Thus, the term "bad" is although we all generally know that "bad" is contradictory to "good". However, there are two distinctive theories in the Western ethics, Consequentialism and Formalism.

Consequentialists hold that only the result is important whatever we do. If the intended result is good, then the action is acknowledged as good action. Otherwise, it is bad action. Thus their ethical criterion is found to be based upon "Obtaining the intended result". Hence in the West, some ethicists like the Utilitarian go to one extreme and maintain that an act may be considered right and good if it brings the greatest happiness to the greatest number. Happiness is the goal and if this happiness can be achieved then such behavior is to be considered moral.

On the other hand, in Kantian ethics the emphasis is on duty and good will. According to Kant, if a man acts through a good motive or good will, then the action is regarded as good even though the intended result does not follow, Kant said: "...and action is good not because it has good result, or because it is wise, but because it is done in obedience to this inner sense of duty, this moral law that does not come from our moral experience, but legislates imperiously and a priori for all our behavior, past, present and future. The only thing unqualifiedly good in this world is good will"

These two views are found to be extreme in that consequentialists emphasize the intended result whereas "good will" is given priority by Kant. We can compare these views with the Buddhist ethics. Intentional action plays an important role in Buddhist morality. Buddhism also emphasizes duty and good will. However, good will (good Cetana) as well as good result is taken into consideration in Buddhist morality. According to Buddhist morality, it is also believed that good action begets good result just a saying.

Thus, the criterion of Buddhist morality is not the same as that of consequentialism as well as formalism, in Western ethical views. It is a more comprehensive view that takes

into consideration both intention and results. Naturally, when man lives in society, there is a reciprocal relation between individual and society. An individual can make contribute to establishing a good society by means of his efforts. For instance, a good leader can enhance his society to a better situation through his morality, reason and intellect. Therefore, an individual has to control and train himself to be a better person in his society.

Conclusion

Human beings do not and cannot live alone in isolation. They have to live with others like themselves to live and survive. Man is a gregarious animal, a social animal. He has developed a cultural environment in cooperation with other human beings. The society of man has developed so amazingly that one does not need to go into detail. Moreover wise men and philosophers have tried to clarify the reasons, in other words, the underlying principles, to show that such rules of conduct are necessary.

This is one important piece of evidence which shows that each person according to the force of his emotions or level of his intelligence is free to choose, whether or not he or she shall abide by such moral and social rules of conduct. It also shows that each person is responsible for his or her conduct. He or she is free to choose to follow the social mores and moral rules of the social group to which they belong. Still, often the individual comes face to face with problems because of desires that conflict with those of others or with the rules of his group.

Thus, the Buddha, contrary to misrepresentations by some, was not against peace, prosperity and welfare of human society. What he preached was against greed and clinging. He also preached against indulgence and lust, not against social development, and to control greed, pride and anger. He gave us knowledge of the law of *kamma*.

In Myanmar society, we have our own traditional culture which controls our moral conduct. In fact, we cannot deny that Myanmar ethics is based on the essence of Buddhism. In Myanmar literature, many writers focus on moral conduct. Among them, we have the basic Buddhist moral code like the Five Precept, We believe that if each and everyone is able to observe these Five Precepts, not only our society but also the entire world will surely be peaceful and prosperous. Even if all social problems cannot be solved, there will be a containment of these problems to achieve a measure of peace and harmony.

References

- Bali.D.R.,(1997). *Introduction to Philosophy*. New Del.: Sterling Publishers Private limited.
- Durant, Will. (1965). *The story of Philosophy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gonsalves,M.A.,(1989). *Fagothey's Right and Reason*. Columbus: Merriall Publishing Company.

THE CONCEPT OF *KUSALA CITTA* IN BUDDHA'S HIGHER DOCTRINE

Khin Maung San¹, Thidar Win², Thant Zaw³,

Abstract

This research paper is an attempt to recognize the problem why we should apply to upgrade the consciousness from the common to the wholesome status in our daily lives. The tentative solution will be presented that if we all wish to encounter with fine situation overcoming the bitter crisis we must cultivate the charming lives by changing the turning point of charming acceptance of virtual consciousness to ourselves and others. It will contribute that the advancement of authentic establishment of the *kusala citta*, *wholesome consciousness* must achieve for a better life and to get rid of the false temper from individual life and then to stretch out the humanistic life of self-satisfaction for societal needs.

Keywords: wholesome consciousness, authentic establishment, self-satisfaction, societal needs

Introduction

The evolution of man has led our brains to become highly efficient at processing complex information, giving us a vast repertoire of possible thoughts. Consciousness is a very elusive subject. It is rather difficult to define consciousness, mainly because it is internal and is a subjective experience. Any experience is always from a given point of view; and it is hard to be objective about our internal experiences. This is particularly true in the case of consciousness where we cannot remove ourselves from the process.

The very notion of observing the mind with the mind appears enigmatic, for it does not allow for separation of subject and object. It is a legitimate concern. The other problem involved with describing subjective experiences is the use of proper language; these are quite considerable. The language we employ to articulate our subjective experiences have their roots in our unique cultural, historic and linguistic backgrounds. The terms employed by any school, be it oriental or western, have their own broader range of connotations covering not merely the realm of thought but also of emotions and beyond.

For instance, in the western languages one speaks in terms of consciousness, mind, mental phenomenon or awareness etc. In the Indian context one speaks in terms of *buddhi*, *manas*, *jnana*, *vijnana vidya* etc all of which can roughly be translated as awareness or intelligence or mental states. On the other hand, these terms have a wider range of connotation than their English equivalents. For instance the terms *manas* or *chitta* cover not

¹ Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

² Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

³ Dr, Professor, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

merely the realm of thought but also of emotions and much more. It is therefore, not easy to transport the meaning of a term from one system to the other accurately. The terms employed are ever subject to varied interpretations. The question of consciousness has attracted a great deal of attention in the Indian philosophical systems.

Buddhism developed rigorous methods for refining the attention, and applying that attention to exploring the origins, nature, and role of consciousness in the natural world. The earliest Buddhist texts viewed consciousness as an important factor in determining the course of human happiness and suffering; liberation and bondage. Yet, Buddhism did not “define” consciousness because it is nebulous; and difficult to pinpoint. In principle, Buddhism asserts it is possible to recognize experientially what consciousness is and identify it.

The Buddhist texts talk of consciousness in metaphors such as clear light-*prabhasvara* (implying clarity- all defilements being sort of infection), knowing, and cognizance flowing like a river. They repeatedly talk about consciousness as an ever changing stream. In order to understand the Buddhist theory of consciousness we have to get to know certain basic Buddhist concepts.

Research Problem

The problem is why we need to understand *Kusala Citta* for our lives and how it can be cultured into the beautiful mind of human being and why we should apply to upgrade the consciousness from the common to the graceful status in our daily lives.

Research Method and Research Principle

The evaluative method is used for the problem why we should apply *Kusala Citta* to upgrade the consciousness from the common to the graceful status in our daily lives. If it is really understood then we will get the enhancement of authentic realization: the graceful consciousness for a better life to eliminate mistakes from individual life, and to spring self-awareness. By using descriptive method the advancement of authentic establishment of the *kusala citta, graceful consciousness* is presented for a better life and to get rid of the false temper from individual life and then to stretch out the humanistic life of self-satisfaction for societal needs.

FIVE AGGREGATES AND HIGHER DOCTRINE

According to the Buddhist’s view, the individuals are not seamless continuum of an enduring essence such as Brahman or atman (soul); however, are actually composites of ever changing configuration of five factors or five aggregates – (Pali: *khandha*; Skt.: *skandha*). These relate to the physical form (*rupa*) – the body and all material objects including sense organs; the sensations or the feelings (*vedana*) – one’s emotional response to the phenomena

by way of desires and aversions in which the five senses and mind are involved; the third is the perception or recognition (*sanna or sanjnya*) of physical and mental objects; and, the fourth factor – *sankhara or samskara* – is variously called impulses or mental formulations or fabrications – these include volition and attention, the faculty of will, the force of habits etc. Lastly there is the faculty of *vinnana* or *vijnana* the awareness or consciousness, which encompasses mental events and what is generally called sub-consciousness in the West.

All the five aggregates are regarded as “empty of self nature” in the sense they are dependent on causes (*hetu*) and conditions (*paticca*); and are inter-related. In this scheme of things, consciousness too is conditioned and arises out of interaction with the other factors (physical or mental). In the Buddhist view, the difference between the plant, animal and the humans is in the level of intelligence; and all possess subtle consciousness. Any sentient being that can experience pain and pleasure is thought to possess consciousness. Therefore, the subtle consciousness is not uniquely human.

Consciousness Modification

An individual, according to Buddhist thought, is ever changing or rather a fleeting, changing assortment or a procession of various unstable interacting factors. Consciousness too is highly varied made up of myriad mental states. Those mental states are dependent on the five senses. Buddhist teachers suggest that through careful observation, it is possible to see consciousness as being a sequence of conscious moments rather as a continuum of awareness. Each moment is an experience of an individual mind-state: a thought, a memory, a feeling, a perception. A mind-state arises, exists and, being impermanent, ceases following which the next mind-state arises. Thus the consciousness of a sentient being can be seen as a continuous series of birth and death of these mind-states. In this context rebirth is simply the persistence of this process.

Consciousness is said to act like a life force which runs through the process and through life after life. However, consciousness, unlike atman, is subject to change every movement and influenced by the vicissitudes of one’s life. It is explained that one’s vocational actions produce karmas which influence the consciousness in a certain manner and determine ones rebirth.

The Key as Understanding

Due to ignorance of the true nature of reality, human beings make choices that drive them to suffering. Since the problem originates from lack of right understanding, the solution to the malady should be sought in gaining the right understanding. Therefore, the Buddha

said, one desirous of seeking liberation must discard mistaken ideas and acquire correct understanding.

In short, a person's bondage is caused by ignorance or incorrect understanding. Liberation too is, in effect, caused by understanding- but it is the proper understanding; and nothing more. Bondage is the wrong understanding that binds; while liberation is the right understanding that frees. In either case, it is a matter of understanding. All that is from an individual's point of view; Still, in absolute sense there is neither bondage nor liberation.

He evidently felt that such questions arose out of a false attachment to self, and that they distracted one from the main aim of eliminating suffering. Those who seek liberation, according to Him, must discard the belief in self. And that requires meditative training, which removes defilements like aversions, attachments, cravings and stress.

Practice of Meditation

One way of experiencing pure consciousness, according to Buddhism, is to practise meditation. The Buddha believed that if one wishes to avoid certain types of results, one needs to change the conditions that give rise to them. The effect lies latent in the cause; and that effect in turn seeds the next effect. He said, removal of a basic condition will remove its effect. Therefore, if one changes the conditions of one's state of mind, one can change the trait of one's consciousness and the resulting attitudes and emotions. It is in this context that the Buddha taught practice of mindfulness *anapana –sati*; *anapana* meaning breath and *sati* (snkt.*smruthi*) is non-forgetfulness, being aware of it.

The Buddha spoke of mind as being essentially pure, clear and peaceful. The distractions, dispersions, confusions and agitations are all apparent. Nevertheless, the appearances could be troublesome and stressful. They need to be cleared. The method he recommended for removing the disturbances is the mindfulness. He asked one to be aware of one's own breathing; in other words, to be mindful of breathing and of the body, feelings, thoughts, and other phenomena.

Scientific Consciousness

The classical western theory (among other theories) appears to be that consciousness is an emergent property of a complex organization or of the matter called brain. The science thinks of consciousness as arising out of matter because no other explanation seems plausible. It rightly argues that the human emotions, visual perceptions or psyche cannot arise in the absence of the brain or the appropriate faculty. They all arise because of a certain level of brain and nerve-cell complexity. In other words, the nerve cell complexity of the brain is the seat of consciousness. Thus consciousness is a kind of physical process that arises through

the structure and dynamics of the brain. When the brain is dead, when it decomposes or when it is no longer capable of functioning as brain, the properties of the brain-based consciousness also vanish. That is the end.

Alan Wallace the noted scholar teacher in his essay “*A Science of Consciousness: Buddhism (1), the Modern West (0)*” observes the West presently has no *pure* science of consciousness and it also lacks an *applied science* of consciousness that reveals means for refining and enhancing consciousness.

Francisco Valera, the renowned Biologist who dedicated his life to the studies of ‘biology of consciousness’, opined that if the scientific study of consciousness is to grow to a full maturity-given that subjectivity is a primary element of consciousness – it will have to incorporate a fully developed and rigorous methodology of first-person empericism. He felt, there was a tremendous potential in this area for contemplative traditions like Buddhism to make a substantive contribution to science and its methods.

The other problem is that it is very hard for the scientists to refuse the possibility that consciousness may not merely be a phenomenon of the brain. HH the Dalai Lama in his book *The Universe in a Single Atom* admitted that such disquiet is entirely understandable given the dominance of the third-person scientific method as a paradigm for scientific investigation. Moreover, yet trying to bridge the two systems, he explained that the Buddhist approach to the study of consciousness is based on the understanding of functions and modalities of the mind and their casual dynamics – and this is precisely the area that the Buddhist understanding can most readily intersect with scientific approach because, like that of science, much of the Buddhist investigation of consciousness is empirically based.

Path of Purification in Morality and Consciousness

The *Visuddhimagga* divides kamma, according to its functions, into four kinds: generative kamma, supportive kamma, counteractive kamma and destructive kamma, which all may be either wholesome or unwholesome.

Amongst these four kinds, the "generative" (*janaka-kamma*) generates at rebirth, and during the succeeding life-continuity, corporeal and neutral mental phenomena, such as the five kinds of sense-consciousness and the mental factors associated therewith, such as feeling, perception, sense-impression, etc.

The "supportive" (*upatthambhaka-kamma*), however, does not generate any kamma-result; thought as soon as any other kamma-volition has effected rebirth and a kamma-result been produced, then it *supports*, according to its nature, the agreeable or disagreeable phenomena and keeps them going.

The "counteractive" (*upapilaka-kamma*) also does not generate any kamma-result; as soon as any other kamma-volition has effected rebirth and a kamma-result been produced, then it *counteracts*, according to its nature, the agreeable or disagreeable phenomena and does not allow them to keep going on.⁵

Again, the "destructive" (*upaghataka-kamma*) does not generate any kamma-result; as soon as any other kamma-volition has effected rebirth and a kamma-result been produced, then it destroys the weaker kamma and admits only its own agreeable or disagreeable kamma-results.

Analyzing and Practicing Wholesome Consciousness

The whole of the Buddha's teachings may be summed up in three words: morality, mental concentration, and wisdom, *sila*, *samadhi* and *pañña*. This is the threefold division of the Noble Eightfold Path leading to deliverance from the misery of Samsara. Of this Eightfold Path, right speech, action and livelihood are included in morality, or *sila*; right effort, mindfulness and concentration in mental concentration, or *samadhi*; right understanding and thought in wisdom, or *pañña*.

Of these three stages, morality constitutes the foundation without which no real progress along the Eightfold Path to purity and deliverance is possible. The two higher stages, concentration and wisdom, are brought to perfection by that which in the West usually, but rather ambiguously, is called "meditation." By this latter term, the Buddhist Pali term *bhavana* is usually translated.

The word *bhavana* is a verbal noun derived from the causative of the verb *bhavati*, to be, to become, and therefore literally means "the bringing into existence," i.e. producing, development. Thus the development of mind is twofold: (1) Development of mental concentration (*samadhi-bhavana*), or tranquillity (*samatha-bhavana*) and (2) Development of wisdom (*pañña-bhavana*), or clear insight (*vipassana-bhavana*).

In this popular exposition I only wish to give a general idea of the authentic method of this twofold mental culture will be studied and not much into details. It is to be regretted that in Sri Lanka one very rarely meets with laymen, or even monks, who are earnestly devoting themselves to these two higher stages of Buddhist life. In Burma and Siam, however, the other two strongholds of original Buddhism, we still find quite a number of monks and hermits, who are living in the solitudes of deep forests or in caves, and who, detached from all worldly wishes and anxieties, are striving for the goal set forth by our Master, and are training themselves in tranquillity and insight. Undoubtedly, for the real development of higher life, solitude, at least temporarily, is an absolute necessity.

Mental tranquillity (*samatha*) is the unshakable state of mind gained through the persevering training in mental concentration. Tranquillity, according to the Commentary *Sankhepavannana*, bestows a threefold blessing: auspicious rebirth, bliss in this very life, and mental purity and fitness for insight.

Insight (*vipassana*) is a name for the flashing forth of the light of wisdom and insight into the true nature of existence, i.e. into the impermanency, suffering and egolessness (*anicca, dukkha, anatta*) of all corporeality, feelings, perceptions, mental formations and consciousness.

The first Sutras were written on palm leaves in **Pali** and **Sanskrit**, ancient Indian languages. They have been gathered together in a collection called the **Tripitaka**, which means 'three baskets'. It is divided into three parts.

Sutra Pitaka~Sutras and their explanations, Vinaya Pitaka~Rules for monks and nuns and Abhidharma Pitaka~The psychology and philosophy of the Buddha's teachings. The **Abhidhamma Pitaka** (abhidhammapitaka) is the last of the three pitakas constituting the Pali Canon, the Scriptures of Theravada Buddhism. The Abhidhamma Pitaka is a detailed scholastic reworking of material appearing in the Suttas, according to schematic classifications.

Nature of Abhidhamma

Abhidhamma has been variously described as philosophy, psychology, and metaphysics. L.S Cousins says that the Abhidhamma methodology looks at things in terms of occasions or events instead of sequences or processes.

Scholars, however, generally date the Abhidhamma works to originating sometime around the third century BCE, 100 to 200 years after the death of the Buddha. Therefore, the seven Abhidhamma works are generally claimed by scholars not to represent the words of the Buddha himself, but those of disciples and scholars.

The Abhidhamma Piṭaka consists of seven books: Dhammasangani, Vibhanga, Dhātukatha, Puggalapannatti, Kathavatthu, Yamaka and Patthana. In Abhidhamma the terms used are of ultimate realities and not of convention. These realities are taught in many different ways. The realities, those that are accepted as realities, are four in number. In Abhidhamma, mind and matter are minutely analyzed. A person is composed of mind and matter. Mind is again composed of Citta which is translated as consciousness, and Cetasikas which is translated as mental factors. What we call mind is a group of two things — Citta and Cetasika.

There are 89 or 121 types of Cittas. Citta is divided into 89 or 121 types of consciousness. Mental factors are divided into 52. Mind is minutely analyzed and described in Abhidhamma. Matter is also treated in detail. There are 28 material properties taught in Abhidhamma. Their number or enumeration, their causes, and how they are grouped together in groups, how they arise, how they disappear in one given life — all these things are taught in Abhidhamma. In Abhidhamma what are ultimate realities is taught, that is, consciousness, mental factors, matter and Nibbāna.

The Kusala Cittas

There are many different types of citta which arise in our life and they can be classified in different ways. When they are classified by way of four “jātis” (jāti means “birth” or “nature”), they are:

Kusala cittas (wholesome cittas), Akusala cittas (unwholesome cittas), Vipākacittas (cittas which are result), Kiriya-cittas (cittas which are “inoperative”, neither cause nor result), Sobhana cittas, cittas accompanied by sobhana (beautiful) cetasikas, Asobhana cittas, cittas unaccompanied by sobhana cetasikas

Akusala cittas and ahetuka cittas are asobhana cittas, they are not accompanied by sobhana cetasikas. As we have seen, there are twelve types of akusala cittas. They are:

8 types of lobha-mūla-citta (cittas rooted in attachment), 2 types of dosa-mūla-citta (cittas rooted in aversion), 2 types of moha-mūla-citta (cittas rooted in ignorance)

Ahetuka cittas are cittas without roots and unaccompanied by **sobhana cetasikas**, and thus they are asobhana. As we have seen, there are eighteen types of ahetuka cittas. Summarising them, they are:

10 dvi-pañca-viññāṇas, which are ahetuka vipākacittas (the five pairs of seeing, hearing, etc.), 2 sampaticchana-cittas, receiving-consciousness, which are ahetuka vipāka cittas (one akusala vipāka and one kusala vipāka), 3 santīraṇa-cittas, investigating-consciousness, which are ahetuka vipāka cittas (one akusala vipāka, one kusala vipāka, accompanied by upekkhā, and one kusala vipāka, accompanied by somanassa), 1 pañca-dvārāvajjana-citta, five-door-adverting-consciousness, which is ahetuka kiriyacitta, 1 mano-dvārāvajjana-citta, mind-door-adverting-consciousness, which is ahetuka kiriyacitta, 1 hasituppāda-citta, an ahetuka kiriyacitta which can produce the smile of an arahat

Thus, there are thirty asobhana cittas: twelve akusala cittas and eighteen ahetuka cittas.

The kusala cittas which perform dāna, observe sīla or apply themselves to bhāvanā are cittas belonging to the lowest plane of consciousness, the “sense sphere”; they are kāmāvacara cittas. Kāmāvacara cittas are the cittas we have in daily life, when, for example, we are seeing, thinking or wishing for something. Sometimes kāmāvacara cittas arise with

sobhana hetus (beautiful roots), sometimes with akusala hetus, and sometimes without any hetus. Dāna, sīla and bhāvanā is performed by kāmāvacara kusala cittas; these kinds of kusala kamma can be performed in daily life, where there are sense-impressions. Kāmāvacara kusala cittas are called mahā-kusala cittas (“mahā” means “many” or “great”).

For those who attain jhāna (absorption, developed in samatha, tranquil meditation) there is at that moment no seeing, hearing or any other sense-impression; then the citta is not kāmāvacara citta, but it is of a higher plane of consciousness. The jhānacittas can be rūpāvacara cittas (rūpa-jhānacittas) or arūpāvacara cittas (arūpa jhānacittas). However, while one is developing samatha the cittas are mahā-kusala cittas before one attains jhāna.

When enlightenment is attained and the citta experiences nibbāna, the citta is of the lokuttara bhūmi, the “supramundane” plane of consciousness (bhūmi is plane). However, lokuttara kusala cittas, magga-cittas, are preceded by mahā-kusala cittas in the process of cittas during which enlightenment is attained.

We would like to have kusala cittas more often. We may think that the circumstances of our life or other people hinder the arising of kusala citta, but this is not so. The real cause that kusala cittas seldom arise is our lack of development of what is wholesome. If we know the conditions for the development of kusala, there will be more kusala cittas in our life.

Through the study of the Dhamma we will learn how to develop kusala. If we have not studied Dhamma we may think that we are performing kusala while we have, on the contrary, akusala cittas. For example, we may think that when we give something away, there are only kusala cittas. However, lobha-mūla-cittas may also arise. We may give something to friends and expect them to be kind to us in return. This is not kusala but lobha, attachment. When we study Dhamma we learn that the pure way of giving is giving without expecting anything in return. When we perform wholesome deeds our aim should be to have less selfishness, and this is beneficial both for ourselves and for others.

People have different accumulations and these are conditions for the arising of kusala cittas and akusala cittas. For example, when people visit a temple and see others presenting gifts to the monks, they may, because of their accumulations, react in different ways. Some people may appreciate someone else’s good deeds; others may not be interested at all. If one would know the value of kusala and realize that appreciating the good deeds of others is a way of dāna, one would use more opportunities to develop kusala.

We all have in our daily life opportunities for dāna and sīla. As regards bhāvanā, this comprises samatha and vipassanā, and the studying of Dhamma or explaining it to others. Not only the monks but also laypeople can study and teach Dhamma. We read in the Mahā-

Parinibbāna-sutta (chapter III, 112, 113) that the Buddha told Ānanda that Māra, the Evil One, had said to the Buddha after his enlightenment that it was now the time for him to pass away. The Buddha said:

And when he had thus spoken, Ānanda, I addressed Māra, the Evil One, and said:- “I shall not pass away, O Evil One! Until not only the monks and nuns of the Order, but also the laydisciples of either sex shall have become true hearers, wise and well trained, ready and learned, carrying the teachings in their memory, masters of the lesser corollaries that follow from the larger doctrine, correct in life, walking according to the precepts-until they, having thus themselves learned the doctrine, shall be able to tell others of it, preach it, make it known, establish it, open it, minutely explain it and make it clear-until they, when others start vain doctrine easy to be refuted by the truth, shall be able in refuting it to spread the wonder-working truth abroad! I shall not die until this pure religion of mine shall have become successful, prosperous, widespread, and popular in all its full extent-until, in a word, it shall have been well proclaimed among men! The fact that we are able to perform wholesome deeds in our lives is due to conditions, it is not due to a self. We read in the Dialogues of the Buddha (III, no. 34, Tenfold Series, chapter IV, 276) about factors which are helpful conditions for kusala:

As regards a favourable place of residence, living in a Buddhist country can be a helpful condition for kusala cittas. Then one has the opportunity to visit temples and listen to the preaching of Dhamma. The Dhamma can change our life, it is the condition for the performing of wholesome deeds, for dāna, sīla and bhāvanā. As regards association with the good, this means association with the right friend in Dhamma. If one, even though living in a Buddhist country, does not meet the right friend in Dhamma who can help in the search for the truth, one lacks the condition which is most helpful for the development of wisdom and the eradication of defilements.

Perfect adjustment of oneself is “adjusting oneself” with kusala, becoming established in good qualities. There are many degrees of kusala. If one develops the wisdom of the eightfold Path in being mindful of nāma and rūpa, there will be less clinging to the concept of self. If there is mindfulness of nāma and rūpa while performing wholesome deeds, one will come to realize that no self, no person performs these deeds. In that way kusala kamma will be purer and eventually defilements will be eradicated with beautiful consciousness.

The accumulation of kusala in the past is the fourth factor which is helpful. The kusala kammās which were accumulated in the past are the condition for us to go to the right place and meet the right people. It is kamma which causes one to be born in a Buddhist country or to live in a Buddhist country. The kusala accumulated in the past conditions our

study and practice of the Dhamma at the present time. If we consider the factors in our life which are the conditions for kusala we will understand more clearly that it is not self who performs good deeds beautiful (sobhana cittas).

Discussion

In the Abhidhamma we learn that there are eight types of mahā-kusala cittas, kusala cittas of the sensuous plane of consciousness. Why isn't there only one type? The reason is that each type has its own conditions for its arising. If we know about these different types and if we can be aware of them when their characteristics present themselves, it will help us not to take them for self. Four types of mahā-kusala cittas arise with somanassa (pleasant feeling) and four types arise with upekkhā (indifferent feeling). We would like to have kusala cittas with somanassa, because we cling to somanassa. However, we cannot force somanassa to arise. Sometimes we perform dāna with somanassa, sometimes with upekkhā. It depends on conditions whether somanassa or whether upekkhā arises with the mahā-kusala citta.

Four types are accompanied by wisdom; four types are not accompanied by wisdom. We may, for example, help others without paññā or with paññā. When we realize that helping is kusala, or when we are aware of the nāma or rūpa appearing at that moment, there is paññā arising with the mahā-kusala citta. Four types are asaṅkhārika (unprompted, spontaneous, not induced by someone else or by one's own consideration) and four types are saṅkhārika (prompted, by someone else or by oneself). The eight types of mahā-kusala cittas are the following:

1. Accompanied by pleasant feeling, with wisdom, unprompted (Somanassa-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-sampayuttaṃ, asaṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
2. Accompanied by pleasant feeling, with wisdom, prompted (Somanassa-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-sampayuttaṃ, saṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
3. Accompanied by pleasant feeling, without wisdom, unprompted (Somanassa-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-vippayuttaṃ, asaṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
4. Accompanied by pleasant feeling, without wisdom, prompted (Somanassa-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-vippayuttaṃ, saṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
5. Accompanied by indifferent feeling, with wisdom, unprompted (Upekkhā-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-sampayuttaṃ, asaṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
6. Accompanied by indifferent feeling, with wisdom, prompted (Upekkhā-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-sampayuttaṃ, saṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
7. Accompanied by indifferent feeling, without wisdom, unprompted (Upekkhā-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-vippayuttaṃ, asaṅkhārikam ekaṃ),
8. Accompanied by indifferent feeling, without wisdom, prompted (Upekkhā-sahagataṃ, ñāṇa-vippayuttaṃ, saṅkhārikam ekaṃ)

Mahā-kusala cittas are not the only kind of **kāmāvacara sobhana cittas** (beautiful cittas of the sensuous plane of consciousness). Mahā-kusala cittas are cittas which are cause; they can motivate kusala kamma through body, speech or mind which is capable of

producing results. There are also mahā-vipākacittas, which are results of kusala kamma performed with mahā-kusala cittas. ***Mahā-vipākacittas are sobhana cittas too, arising with sobhana cetasikas.*** There are several types of mahā-vipākacittas because the kusala kammās which produce them are of different kinds.

Conclusion

People's deeds are not the same and thus the results cannot be the same. People are born with different paṭisandhi-cittas (rebirth-consciousness). Paṭisandhi-cittas are vipākacittas; they are the result of kamma. As a human being can be in many events his various lives can also be born with a paṭisandhi-citta which is ahetuka kusala vipāka (and in this case they are handicapped from the first moment of life), or with a ***paṭisandhi-citta which is sahetuka vipāka, accompanied by sobhana hetus.*** In the case of human beings, and of beings born in other sensuous planes of existence, the paṭisandhi-citta which is sahetuka vipākacitta is mahā-vipākacitta, the result of kāmāvacara kusala kamma (kamma performed by mahā-kusala cittas, kusala cittas of the sensuous plane of consciousness). Apart from mahā-vipākacitta there are other types of sahetuka vipākacitta which are not the result of kāmāvacara kusala kamma but of kusala kamma of higher planes of consciousness.

There are eight types of mahā-vipākacittas. They can be accompanied by somanassa or by upekkhā, they can be with paññā or without paññā, they can be unprompted, asaṅkhārika, or prompted, saṅkhārika. They are classified in the same way as the eight types of mahā-kusala cittas mentioned above. The bhavanga-citta (life-continuum) and the cuti-citta (dying-consciousness) are the same type of citta as the first citta in one's life, the paṭisandhi-citta. If the paṭisandhi-citta is mahā-vipākacitta, the bhavanga-citta and the cuti-citta of that life are the same type of mahā-vipākacitta. In that case the functions of paṭisandhi, bhavanga and cuti are performed by mahā-vipākacitta.

When we see a beautiful visible object or experience pleasant objects through the other sense-doors, the citta is kusala vipākacitta, the result of kusala kamma; however, that kind of vipākacitta is ahetuka vipāka (arising without hetu), it is not mahā-vipāka. The functions of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and experiencing tangible object through the bodysense, and also the functions of sampañicchana, receiving, and santīraṇa, investigating, cannot be performed by mahā-vipākacittas, they are performed by ahetuka vipākacittas. Tadārammaṇa-citta, a vipāka-citta which may arise after the javana-cittas and which performs the function of tadārammaṇa, registering or retention, can be ahetuka vipākacitta or mahā-vipākacitta (83).

There are still other kinds of kāmāvacara sobhana cittas: the mahā-kiriyacittas (84). The arahat has mahā-kiriyacittas instead of mahā-kusala cittas. Since he has no conditions for rebirth he does not accumulate any more kamma. He has mahā-kiriyacittas (inoperative cittas) which perform the function of javana in the sense-door process and in the mind-door process. When we experience a pleasant object lobha may arise and when we experience an unpleasant object dosa may arise. The arahat has equanimity towards pleasant objects and unpleasant objects, he has no more defilements. The arahat can have mahā-kiriyacittas which are ñāṇa-vippayutta, not accompanied by wisdom. Arahats can have mahā-kiriyacittas which are ñāṇa-vippayutta, because paññā does not necessarily accompany the mahā-kiriyacittas when they are not preaching or discussing Dhamma.

The arahat has kiriyacittas which are sobhana cittas and also kiriyacittas which are asobhana cittas. The five sense-door-adverting consciousness, pañca-dvārāvajjana-citta, the mind-door-adverting consciousness, mano-dvārāvajjana-citta, the hasituppāda-citta, smile producing consciousness of the arahat which can perform the function of javana, are asobhana kiriyacittas. These types of citta are not accompanied by sobhana cetasikas, they are ahetuka.

There are eight types of mahā-kiriyacittas in all. They are accompanied by somanassa or by upekkhā, they are accompanied by paññā or not accompanied by paññā, they are asaṅkhārika or sasaṅkhārika. They are classified in the same way as the eight types of mahā-kusala cittas.

Altogether there are fifty-four cittas which are kāma-bhūmi (85), or kāmāvacara cittas, cittas of the sensuous plane of consciousness. They are:

24 sobhana cittas, 30 asobhana cittas, 12 akusala cittas, 8 mahā-vipākacittas, 18 ahetuka cittas, 8 mahā-kusalacittas, 8 mahā-kiriyacittas

Thus, there are thirty asobhana cittas and twenty-four kāma-sobhana cittas (sobhana cittas of the sensuous plane of consciousness).

There are also sobhana cittas which are not kāma-sobhana cittas, namely: the sobhana cittas which are rūpa-bhūmi (rūpāvacara cittas, for those who attain rūpa-jhāna), the sobhana cittas which are arūpa-bhūmi (arūpāvacara cittas, for those who attain arūpa-jhāna), the sobhana cittas which are lokuttara bhūmi, (lokuttara cittas for those who attain enlightenment)

Only kāmāvacara cittas can include both sobhana cittas and asobhana cittas. ***Cittas which are rūpa-bhūmi, arūpa-bhūmi and lokuttara bhūmi can only be sobhana cittas.*** Those who do not attain jhāna or attain enlightenment cannot know the cittas of other

bhūmis, but they can verify the truth of the Buddha's teachings as regards the kāma-bhūmi, the cittas of the sensuous plane of consciousness.

We can find out for ourselves whether it is beneficial to perform dāna, observe sīla and apply ourselves to bhāvanā. We can find out whether the development of these ways of kusala helps us to have less akusala cittas. Sometimes it is the right moment for dāna, sometimes for sīla or for bhāvanā. Vipassanā, right understanding of realities, can be developed at any time, no matter whether we perform dāna, observe sīla, study or teach Dhamma.

Right understanding can also be developed when there is no opportunity for dāna, sīla or other ways of kusala. Through mindfulness of nāma and rūpa we come to know the different types of cittas which arise, also akusala cittas and eventually there will be less attachment to the concept of self. In being mindful we can verify the truth of the Buddha's teachings.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Tin Maung Tun, Rector and Dr. Aye Aye Khaing and Dr. Soe Soe Aye, Pro-Rectors, West Yangon University. And I would like to thank Professor Dr. Thant Zaw, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University, for his kind motivation and guidance doing my research paper smoothly.

References

- Cohen, Joan Lebold. (1969). *Buddha*. New York: Delacore Press. Cox, Collett (2003). "Abidharma", in: Buswell, Robert E. ed. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, New York: Macmillan Reference Lib.
- Gethin, Rupert (1998). *Foundation of Buddhism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Goleman, Danies. (2004). *Destructive Emotions: A Scientific Dialogue with the Dalai Lama*. NY: Bantam Dell.
- Rhys Davids, Caroline A. F. (2003). *Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics, of the Fourth Century B.C.*, Being a Translation, now made for the First Time, from the Original Pāli, of the First Book of the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka, entitled Dhamma-Sangaṇi (Compendium of States or Phenomena). Kessinger Publishing.
- Rhys Davids, Caroline A. F. (1914). *Buddhist Psychology: An Inquiry into the Analysis and Theory of Mind in Pali Literature*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
- Takakusu, J. (1905). *On the Abhidhamma books of the Sarvastivadins*, Journal of the Pali Text Society.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. (2012). *Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma: The Abhidhammattha Saṅgaha of Acariya Anuruddha (PDF ed.)*. Pariyatti Publishing.

A Comparative Study of Imitation Theory and Emotional Theory in Aesthetics

Thida Win¹, Khin Maung San², Thant Zaw³

Abstract

In aesthetics theories, imitation and emotion theories are very distinct and popular. The imitation theories are basic theories in aesthetics as well as emotion theories are very impressive in modern periods. The problem of this paper is that why the imitation and emotion theories are distinct and popular in aesthetics. The tentative solution is that Plato's simple imitation theory and Aristotle's imitation theory of essence are influential not only in the ancient but also up to the present times. Similarly, emotion theories are influential in modern period of fine art, literature, music and poems. Some scholars conceive that art without emotion is looked like curries without salt. In this paper, comparative and evaluation methods are used and the principle is reciprocity. This paper will contribute to the knowledge that art, imitation and emotion theories are interrelated and without them knowledge of art, art criticism and aesthetics is incomplete.

Key terms: Imitation, Emotion, art criticism.

Introduction

Man is a rational animal as well as emotional animal. Reasoning and emotion are two basic functions of mind. Due to reasoning knowledge, science and technologies are developed. Similarly due to feeling and emotion art and literature have been advanced. The two functions of mind bring about the progressive and development of culture and civilization. In a culture custom, language, costume, dietary, religion, art and literature are included. It means that art and literature are one of the essential components of a culture. Without art and literature there cannot be a culture and they are measurements of status of a culture. Therefore So, there is a saying that if a man wants to know the depth of a lake, he can enquire the length of its water lilies; similarly if a level of a certain culture is to know, its art and literature must be examined.

Art is not only one of the components of a community since the culture and civilization have been developed but also it had been one of the subsidiary elements at the human beings primitive age. According to Ernst Fischer, art is the reflection of reality and art has been necessary for human beings. In this paper, the imitation theory and emotional theory

¹ Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

² Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

³ Dr, Professor, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

of art which seemed to be fundamental roots of art are presented and compared. Imitation theory of art is the oldest and simplest one which is still dominating on present creation of art such as painting, culture and movies. The founders of imitation theory, Plato and Aristotle though they emphasized on imitation of imitation and imitation of essence they did not left the role emotion. It is because Plato had defined the art in two kinds such as (1) art is imitation and (2) art is imagination. The latter definition refers to emotion which is attached with the concept of Inspiration. Plato obviously said that art is being based on emotion, not reason the artists must be restricted.

Aristotle also said that by enjoying the tragedy the audience could feel the sympathetic emotion of the player of the drama and it produces the **Catharsis** function of mind. In modern period, emotion and function of art are not separate. Some scholars say that in the field of art and literature, without emotion is pseudo art only and proper art. Thus, the two theories of Imitation and Emotion are vital in artistic atmosphere.

Research Problem

The problem of this research is that why the imitation and emotional theories are distinct and popular in aesthetics. Similarly, emotion theories are influential in modern period of fine art, literature, music and poems.

Research Method and Principle

In this research, comparative and evaluative methods are used to examine the most suitable type of imitation and emotional theories in aesthetics. These theories are interrelated and without them knowledge of art, art criticism and aesthetics is incomplete. And the principle of reciprocity is used for this research paper.

The Nature and Scope of Imitation Theory

Imitation is a kind of art which copies the original things and phenomena. Its artistic norm is similarity; the more it is looked like the more it is artistic. This art theory is the oldest and simplest one, which is revealed by Plato. Plato's theory is the first, the simplest, the oldest and the most widely theory of art in Western thought. Plato translated art as technique or craft. According to him art is closer to craft. Plato divides craft into acquisitive craft (such as money making) and productive craft or creative craft. Productive craft can be sub- divided into human craft and divine craft. Art is included in divine craft.

Plato's Theory of Art and the definition of art

According to Plato, art is mimesis (imitation), Mimesis or imitation is a stronger notion of copying. Thus for Plato, the most important thing about art is **VERISIMILITUDE**, which means looks like. In this way, art is defined as the faithful literal duplication of the objects of ordinary experience. This definition is chiefly concerned with such art as painting and sculpture.

His theory of art is based on his Metaphysics. In it, he divides the world as the world of reality (world of ideas) and the world of appearance (world of senses). In the world of reality there are many ideas. In the world of appearance there are particular things. These particular things are mere faint copies of the ideas of the real world. They can be known by perception. When an artist makes a work of art he imitates a particular thing which is the imitation of the idea. Hence, Plato said that “art is the imitation of imitation”. The more the picture resembles with the object imitated, the real the work of art is.

Another definition given by Plato is “art is imagination”. This definition is closely connected with music and poetry. According to Plato, art is not knowledge. It cannot be praised for its truth. Its subject is not the concept. Art is not opinion for it cannot be praised for its utility. Its object is not the percept. Its rightful name is imagination. Plato said that when the poet writes, he is out of senses. He works in a mad state with the irrational parts of his soul. The artist composes by a certain genius and inspiration. They received this inspiration from the gods. Hence in Plato's point of views, inspiration being a godly gift is not to be considered as a normal qualification. As a result, when Plato talks about poetry, he introduces the term of inspiration.

The View of Beauty

Art is embodied in various degrees of the quality of beauty. The beauty of concrete things may change, or disappear, may appear to some, but not to others. Plato said that “Behind these temporal embodiments there is an external and absolute form of beauty, not seen with the eyes, but grasped conceptually by the mind alone”. This is a single transcendental form of beauty. The artist is the imitator of the beautiful things. Accordingly, the artist must try to get the knowledge of beauty.

Art and Society

According to Plato, the artist is irrational because he does not know what he is saying or why he might be right or wrong. The artist works in a mad state. Thereupon, it is very important to study carefully the effect good and bad that art may have upon the citizen. For the final evaluation of any work of art, the statesman's decision must take into account. Hence, statesman in his role of legislators and educator must inquire into the works of art. The legislator must supervise the works of art. The poet must submit his works of art to censor and obtain their approval. Art is too serious to be left to the artist. Therefore the artist must be censored and restricted. For that reason, Plato placed the arts on the lowest level.

On the other hand, Plato holds that the work of art has its power to do good, to contribute to the health of society. Music, poetry and dancing of the right sort are indispensable means of education. Music can make us better man. Art also has its social responsibilities and its rational place in the whole scene of the citizen's life.

Stolnitz in his "*Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art criticism*" calls Plato's theory, the theory of simple imitation, to distinguish it from other forms of imitation theories. It is the oldest and first systematic discussion of the nature of art in western thought. Simple imitation is too narrow as a theory of art. It misconceives the nature and value of art. Both from the standpoint of the artist and of the aesthetic spectator, Plato's theory of art is very inconsistent. Its inconsistencies are to be found in his views on the definition of art, on beauty and the function of art.

However, Plato's Simple Imitation Theory of art has weakness. It is concerned only with static material objects. In the case of dynamic movements his art theory cannot portray them. Because of that Aristotle created new kind of theory of art based on his teacher Plato's theory. Aristotle's theory of art is, "Imitation of Essence". According to Aristotle art is not imitation of man but his essence or his actions.

Aristotle's Imitation of Essence

Aristotle is a student of Plato. He accepted the imitation theory of art. But However, his theory is "*Imitation of Essence*." Our knowledge of Aristotle's aesthetic theory comes chiefly from the little collection of lecture notes known as "The Poetics". In this little book, Aristotle had discussed the nature of art and literary problems and also the nature of tragedy. With regard to the nature of imitation, Aristotle claims that the works of art are different from one another in three respects. These are:- (1) Means of imitation, (2) Objects of imitation and (3) Manner of imitation

Aristotle also makes this suggestion that imitation is natural to man and the recognition of imitation is natural to man and the recognition of imitation is pleasurable. Melody and Rhythm also come naturally to man and so on enjoyable. Like Plato Aristotle accepts imitation theory. However Aristotle formulates a wholly different version of the imitation theory.

For Aristotle, art is imitation of universals or essences shared in common by all members of a certain class. For example it is accidental whether he is a particular man, tall or short, dark or fair, Greek or American. However, he is still human, if he possesses the essence of man. It is essential for a being to be rational, if he is considered as a man. Anything that is not rational, it is not human. Aristotle says that imitation is selection and creative. Poetry is more philosophical and a higher thing than history. Poetry tends to express the universals, history the particular. The poet's job is not to tell what has happened, but the kinds of thing that can happen.

The view on Tragedy

Aristotle aims to present a systematic theory of tragedy. He defines tragedy as "an imitation of an action that is serious complete and of certain magnitude with the incidents arousing pity and fear". The values of tragedy are fearful and pitiable and also arouse emotion of fear and pity in the audience.

Every tragedy must have six parts namely: (1) Plot (2) Character (3) Thought (4) Diction (5) Scenery and (6) Song. Among these, plot, character and thought are objects of imitation. Diction and song are means of imitation. Scenery is manner of imitation.

The plot is the first principle and the soul of tragedy. The poet must at least understand human nature or he cannot even produce a good plot. Character holds the second place. The harmony between time, place and action is required for the unity of the plots.

Tragic plot must not be irrational. Tragedy reveals what is truly universal in human experience. In this respect, the tragic hero is the man like us. What happen to him happens to many people and for the same reason. Tragic hero embodies every man and so we can see ourselves in him. There are four things: (1) It must be good, (2) the second thing to aim at is propriety, (3) Thirdly character must be true to life and (4) It must also be consistent.

Aristotle suggests that the work of art should be judged in terms of its inherent aesthetic effectiveness. In Aristotle's account of tragedy, the famous concept of catharsis must be considered. Catharsis means through pity and fear, effecting the proper purification of these emotions or release of emotion. Therefore, tragedy by arousing these emotions has

some sort of effect upon the audiences' mental health. So Aristotle emphasizes the inherent significance and value of art. As a result, tragedy has found greater significance than simple imitation.

Generally Aristotle's theory can be call as the "Theory of Imitation of Essence". Aristotle never uses the term "fine-art". He is chiefly concerned with tragedy. The term 'fine-art' is known to Aristotle and the Greeks. Imitation of essences is not an adequate definition of all fine arts. It is not a sufficient condition of artistic value.

This theory makes clear the inadequacies of "simple imitation". because it shows us that the work of the artist is far more creative than mere copying. Although this theory has in the late two centuries largely receded, it still persists contemporary ways of thinking and speaking about art.

According to Aristotle, of all the arts drama is the most "life like" for it depicts human beings speaking and performing actions. Drama may be comedy or tragedy. According to Aristotle, *tragedy* is the supreme form of drama. He defines "*tragedy*" as an imitation an action that is serious with incident arousing pity and fear.

Every tragedy must have six parts which determine its quality. These parts are, plot, character, diction (articulation), thought, scene (display), and song. According to Aristotle the plot is the essence of tragedy. The whole (beginning, middle, and end) must have unity. The unity of a plot is the criterion to judge the quality of tragedy.

For Aristotle tragedy is the limitation of life of a noble and virtuous man. Though the person as noble he may be weak in some respects because no man is perfect. One day this noble man will suffer a punishment for his weakness. However the punishment is very much cruel for his weakness. The suffering such punishment is not fair. A tragedy is the imitation of life of such a person. The audience feels pity and fear when they identify themselves with that person. Moreover, the audience feels not only pity and fear but something comfort also. This something comfort is called catharsis by Aristotle.

Catharsis is the value of tragedy

Imitation theories of both simple imitation theory and imitation of essence are emerged in ancient Greek period. Since cultures and civilization had been changed the different thoughts and visions on society and environment had been changed consequently. After Greek civilization, Roman civilization had been occurred. Then the Medieval age had passed through the history of civilizations. After the Medieval age, age of enlightenment had

followed. In that period, the ancient Greek and Roman cultures had been revealed in new versions which is called Neo-classicism.

In 19th century Romanticism and Romantic Movement had occurred and they revolted the Neo-classicism. The movement demanded the freedom of artist and free expression of art. The movement claimed for three elements in art. They are (1) The artist should be under the influence of emotion. (2) He should display his own individual character and (3) He should be sincere. With the movement of Romanticism, emotional art theories were followed. Emotionalism reveals explicitly that emotion is the most important thing to create works of art. The main essence of Emotionalism is that emotion is the most essential and basic element for creating arts. Emotionalism can be divided into two kinds. The first one is "Theory of Expression of Emotion" and secondly "Theory of communication of Emotion". The former theory is revealed by Eugene Veron, R.G. Collingwood, and the latter Leo-Tolstoy.

The Nature and Scope and the Sources of Emotion Theory

According to Painter Corot, one of the emotionalist of nineteenth century, said: "A work of art is to be guided by feeling alone...[follow] your own convictions. It is better to be noting than an echo of other partners. If you have really been touched, you will convey to others the sincerity of your emotion." It means that in creating a work of art, it is to be guided and moved by the artist's feeling which arose from his belief and conception. When an artist is led by his emotion, he may express his feeling to the other what and who he has felt honestly.

The source of Emotionalism is Romanticism which is arisen in modern period challenging the neo-classicism. The Romanticists were rejecting neoclassicism. "They were fighting to throw off the restraints imposed by neoclassicism on the creative artist. Specifically, neoclassicism discouraged emotional effusiveness in art. Moreover, the neoclassical thinkers considered emotion to be "subjective" and only characteristic of the individual because they evaluate art as "good taste" for every common people only if this art can reflect or mirror back his feeling."

Emotion Expression Theory of Eugene Veron

Veron defines arts as an activity in which an agent expresses his feelings by means of medium. He protests against the imitation theory. He says that the artists are not the copying machines. According to Veron, there are two kinds of symbols. They are –

- (1) Cognitive symbol and
- (2) Expressive symbol.

A cognitive symbol express what one knows or believes. It deals with right or wrong. An emotion symbol expresses what one feels. Thus emotions and mental response are expressed by using emotive symbol. Emotive symbol is used in creating art.

Veron also emphasizes the importance of personality. He takes personality to be something quite different. In personality it includes the artist's ideas and thoughts as well as his sentiments and style. Style is the way in which the person basically is. Artistic style is the reflection of the artist's personality.

According to Veron works of art must express the feeling or emotion. This primary claim enabled Veron to distinguish between (1) Decorative art, and (2) Expressive art. Decorate art is based upon beauty due to pleasure to interest the human being. It has no serious meaning. It is therefore classified into the category of Pseudo art. Another famous emotional art theory is R.G. Collingwood's view.

R.G. Collingwood

According to Collingwood art is Expressing Artist's Emotion but not Arousing Emotion. He said the business of his book was to answer the question, 'what is art?'. For him, there are two kinds of answer to this question. They are, (1) Giving the answer to this question by distinguishing the art from non-art etc, and this is art, that and that and that are not art. (2) Giving the answer to this question by defining the art.

Collingwood said that the artist-aestheticians distinguish the art from non-art, they can discriminate things that are art from things that are pseudo-art. The` philosopher-aestheticians' define the term art. According to him these two kinds of answers alone are not sufficient, if they are alone. Hence, it must be necessary to reconcile these two kinds of answer.

Art and Craft

Collingwood said that in order to define the term art it is necessary to distinguish the art proper from non-art including pseudo art and craft. He believed that art is not craft. Since art and craft have different nature and characteristics respectively, they are not identical. So he said that in order to take the first step towards a sound aesthetics, it is necessary to separate the notion of craft from that of art proper.

According to Collingwood, the chief characteristics of craft are: (a) in craft there is a distinction between means and end. (b) In craft there is a distinction between planning and

execution. (c) There is a distinction between raw material and finished product and (d) there is a distinction between form and matter.

Collingwood said that the characteristics of art are different from those of the craft. Therefore it is an error to be said that art is a kind of craft. For him art is not craft. According to Collingwood, the theory that art is some kind of craft is called Technical Theory of Art. on the other hand he did not accept this theory.

(b) Art Proper and pseudo Art

Collingwood held that the art which has no emotional expression is pseudo art and the art in which there is emotional expression is 'art proper'. He said emotional expression is the quality of art-proper. However, pseudo art is often incorrectly supposed as proper-art. There are several kinds of pseudo art; these are (a) Amusement Art, (b) Advertisement Art, (c) Propaganda Art, (d) Representative Art and (e) Art as Instruction.

Collingwood accepted that art proper is the art of emotional expression. He believed that technique and skill are not necessary in the process of creating art. These are the qualities of craft and not of art proper. Only emotional expression is the quality of art proper. In this way, he distinguished the art proper from the pseudo art. After that Collingwood defined art as expression of emotion. He indirectly explained his definition of art from the negative standpoint. (1) Expression of emotion is not arousing emotion. It means that the artist does not intend to arouse the other's emotion. (2) Expression of emotion is not describing emotion.

In the process of expressing emotion, the artist does not need to classify the kinds of emotion; the artist does not need to classify the kinds of emotion. To classify the emotion means to generalize the emotions, and expression of emotion is not general, it is merely individual.

(1) Expression of emotion is not betraying emotion

Betraying emotion is that if a person is afraid he turns pale and stammers; if he is angry he turns red bellows. Expressing emotion does not mean betraying emotion.

(2) Expressing emotion is not selecting emotion.

Any kind of selection, any decision to express this emotion and not that, is in artistic. For until that work is complete one does not know what emotion one feels. Thus it is not possible to pick and choose and give one of them preferential treatment.

The Artists and social life

According to Collingwood, there are two different kinds of artistic experience. They are an inward experience and outward experience. Inward experience is one for the person can enjoy it. The inward experience is related to the outward. For the artist the inward experience may be externalized into a perceptible object. For the audience the outward experience comes first and this is converted into the inward experience.

Collingwood believed that there will be something more than mere communication of emotion from the artists to audience. That is which he called collaboration between the audience and the artist. He said that there is no different kind of emotion between the artists and audience, if art is an activity of expressing emotion, the reader is an audience as well as the writer.

Tolstoy's Theory of Emotion Communication

Tolstoy (1828-1910) was a distinguished world famous Russian novelist. In his book "what is art?" published in 1889 had solved the problem of art. Tolstoy's aim is to define art correctly.

In order to define art, he first of all rejects order definitions of art. Tolstoy says that art is not only the expression of man's emotion by external signs. It is not the production of pleasing objects. It is not a means to pleasure. However it is a means of union among man, joining them together is the same feelings and indispensable for the life and progress towards the well being of individuals and of human life.

According to Tolstoy, "Art is a human activity consisting in this that is man consciously by means of a certain external signs, hands on to others feelings he has lived through, and that others are infected by these feelings and also experience them. Art is one of the means of communicating between man and man. By words a man communicates his thoughts and experiences another. By art transmits his feeling. The feelings with which the artists infect others may be most various; very strong or very weak, very important or very significant, very bad or very good."

It means that art is the product of human creation consciously by using a medium of some kinds. Those activities are result of his feelings which are arisen from his life experiences and they are infected by the other persons. Thus, art is one of the means of communicating human's emotions among people. On the basis of the degree of infection of art its level of artistic quality can be evaluated. Tolstoy criticizes the definitions of art which

were emerged before him. He said that they all are based on merely beauty and pleasure as the essential character of art.

Art and Beauty

According to Tolstoy, art is not the production of pleasing object. It is not a means to pleasure. Still it is a means of union among man, joining the human beings together. For him, art is required for the people, and society must be filled with operas, galleries, and trained musical virtuosos, etc. Therefore, it seems reasonable to ask: what is good art? What is Art? and What is good art?

The usual answer to the first question says Tolstoy, is that art is what produces beauty. To this, we must ask: what is beauty? And to the most are wildering and confusing variety of answers has seen given.

To define art in terms of beauty is to define it in terms of pleasure; and judge art by its beauty is to judge it by the pleasure it affords. On the other Hand, this is a completely mistaken way of going about the understanding of art.

If we say that aim of any activity is merely our pleasure and define it understands that the satisfaction of our taste cannot serve as a basis for our definition of the merits of food.

What, then, is the real function of art? According to Tolstoy, just as speech is a medium for communicating thoughts, so art is a medium for communicating feelings. Communication is "infection" – making the perceiver share the feelings of the creator, and making different perceivers share each other's feelings, by arousing the same feelings in each. "Infection is a sure sign of art".

This infection may occur in various degrees, or it may fail; and the factors that are required for it are three. The degree of the infectiousness of art depends on their conditions. They are,

- (1) On the greater or less individuality of *the feeling transmitted*.
- (2) On the greater or lesser *cleanness* with which the feeling is transmitted.
- (3) On the *sincerity of the artist*, that is on the greater or lesser force with which the artist himself the emotion he transmitted. Of these three conditions sincerity is the most important.

The various degrees of these three conditions decide the merit of a work or art as art. The absence of anyone of these conditions excludes a work from the category of art. If all these conditions are present, even in the smallest degree, then the work, even if a weak one is yet a work of art."

Kinds of art

Leo Tolstoy divides the art into three kinds; they are- (1) Religious art; (2) Peasant art, and (3) Upper-class art. According to Tolstoy Religious art is good art because it has the quality of uniting all men in one common feeling.

Peasant art also is good art, because it has individuality, clearness and sincerity. Upper-class art and modern art are bad arts, because they lack in sincerity and are produced by artists actuated by person, aims of consciousness of variety. According to Tolstoy, Communication is “infection” -making the perceivers share the feelings of the creator, and making different perceivers share each other's feelings, by arousing the same feelings in each. Hence Tolstoy's proposed definition. Art is a human activity consisting in this, that one man consciously by means of certain external signs, hands on to others feelings he has lived through and that others are infected by these feelings and also experience them.

Comparison and Discussion

The Imitation theory and Emotion theory are different as well as there is a relation. The difference is that imitation theories emphasize to copy the objects and men's behaviors. The artistic norm of simple imitation theory is to be similarity between the original object which is copied and the copy. It means that the more it looks like the more it is artistic. However, Plato defined art into two kinds.

One kind of definition is similarity but another kind is ‘Imagination’ based on ‘Inspiration’. Due to that definition, art is related with emotion and Plato definitely said that since art is based on emotion instead of reasoning the artists must be restricted. Plato had applied the art in promoting the development of spirit and moralities.

Aristotle had modified imitation theory by its, “Imitation of Essence”. The essences of human beings are more demonstrated and appreciated by drama than other art of painting, sculpture, and etc. In dramas, Aristotle favored tragedy which produces the cathartic functions of the audiences. By tragedy, the players and audiences can enjoy the sympathetic emotion. It means that Aristotle did not left the role of emotion in art.

Both imitation theories had been emerged since the ancient Greek period. In that period the concept of ‘aesthetics’ had not been used. The word ‘aesthetics’ had been used by the product of Baumgarten's book in which he used the term ‘aesthetics’ at 1750 A.D. In modern period, the artists and aestheticians opposed the imitation theories and they substituted the Emotion Theory of Art. The fore runner theory of emotion is ‘Romanticism’ which opposed the neo-classicism.

In Emotion theories, there are two kinds which are 'Expression of Emotion' and 'Communication of Emotion'. The former is accepted by Veron and Collingwood and the latter is held by Leo Tolstoy.

There is a difference between Plato's concept of 'Inspiration' and that of modern emotionalists. Plato said that the inspiration is achieved by the gift of the god but the modern emotionalists accepted that it comes not from outside of the artist but within the artist's mind. Both the classical view and modern view held the emotion in art and artistic activities.

In the perspective of Tolstoy, he considered the role of the audience which was left before him. However Aristotle had considered its role by using the sympathetic enjoyment in tragedy. These are the elements of differences and similarities between the two theories of imitation and emotion. The main difference is that imitation theories are the products of ancient Greek but it still influences up to the present. The emotion theory is the modern key concept of art. The modern scholars accepted that "art without emotion" is like a curry without salt.

Conclusion

By studying the above presentations of Imitation Theories and Emotion theories in the history of aesthetics, it can obviously be known how they take parts in the aesthetic experiences and art creations.

Plato's simple theory of imitation is the oldest and it also influences in the aesthetic appreciations, art creations and artistic criticisms. In painting, sculpture, drawing and architecture and even movies it is involving as an essential components. It is said that the more it looks like the more it is life-like. In movies, the actors have to wear the clothes and decorate themselves to be fitted and relevant to the directed themes of a drama. In dialogues, the actors have to behave like the characters of given themes. It means that if it is a drama of poor farmer, the actor has to wear the clothes of the farmer who usually dresses and dialogues have to imitate like the usual farmer talks.

In his another definition of art, which is concerned with imagination, Plato used the concept of Inspiration which is still applied in art creations. That concept had been carried from classical Greek period to the Renaissance period and to modern period. Still, in modern period of emotion in art, that concept of inspiration has not come from outside of the artist, god but from his inner mind that came up automatically while the artist is in deep feeling.

Aristotle's imitation of essence especially in tragedy is also deniable. Aristotle created a concept of Catharsis function of mind that makes mental health. On the other hand

Aristotle's imitation of essence is not applicable in all kinds of art but only in drama. However, Aristotle firstly considered the role of audience which was also revealed in Tolstoy's emotion-communication theory. Aristotle's classification of tragedy in 6 parts such as, (1) Plot, (2) Character, (3) Thought, (4) Diction, (5) Scenery, and (6) Song are very updated. Today scholars of drama have to recognize and acknowledge them.

In modern period, Romanticism and emotionalism challenged the neo-classicism and claimed for freedom and artist and freedom of expression of his individual emotion. Up to the present day to differentiate modern art, contemporary art present art are arguing and debating in Myanmar art atmosphere. Some Myanmar scholars hold that to differentiate modern is to be measured by three principles which had been held by the Romanticists, they are – (1) The artist should be under the influence of emotion. (2) He should display his own individual character and

Artist should be sincere. Though some Myanmar scholars accept them they ask how will differentiate Modern art and Present day art and contemporary art? This research does not involve with the above debate but the writers want to describe how emotional theory of art has been impacted on the present day artistic outlooks.

In emotional art theories, Tolstoy's emotion-communication may be said as the most influential one. It is because most of the artists prefer his motto of art theory, “The more art is infectious the more it is artistic”. This paper also prefers his theory; though Tolstoy's theory is not flawless. Out of his classification of three kinds of art, he praises the religious art which produces most infection of emotion. Therefore ,it can be concluded that “Imitation Theories and Emotion Theories” are most influential in aesthetic appreciation, artistic creations and art criticism.

References

- Aylmer Mande. (1969). *"What is art?" and Essays on art*. Oxford University Press, London.
 Monroe C. Beardsley.(1962). *AESTHETICS* – from classical Greece to the present; Macmillan Company, New York, London.
 Jerome Stolnitz. (1959). *Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art Criticism*. Houghtonn Mifflim Company, Boston.
 Morisweitz. (1970). Problem in Aesthetics, second edition, the Macmillan company, Landon.

A Study of Rationalist Views on Mind and Matter in Western Thought

Tin Win Phyu¹, Thet Thet Saing²

Abstract

This paper attempts to show the three rationalist views on the relationship between mind and matter. The research question is why they all accept the notion of God but their views of mind and matter are different. It is because their ontological views concerning substance which is different. The evaluation will be made using the principle of ontology. To resolve the research question the descriptive method, the comparative method and the evaluative method will be used. This paper will contribute towards people's understanding of the true nature of mind and matter, which will free them from dogmatism.

Key words: Mind, Matter, Ontology, God, Substance

Introduction

Philosophers throughout the ages have discussed the nature of reality, the ultimate nature of the world. This is what philosophers call an ontological study, that is, essentially the study of what is most real. Some people hold that the most real entities are bodies and people. Some say that what is most real are those things discovered by science. Other people take a more spiritual approach and rank God highest, along with soul. However, there are some people who say that nothing is real. For them, the existence of our mind is the only thing that is real. They do not believe in the external world at all.

Since ancient time, thus philosophers have debated on the problem of mind and matter. The earliest people experienced their bodies as composed of matter, but they were vaguely conscious that this mass of matter was animated by something which was distinct matter. The earliest beliefs regarding Mind and matter were tied up with beliefs about the soul and the body. Early man believed that all the universe had the soul. The

¹ Dr., Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

² Dr., Professor and Head, Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University

rock, the tree, the river, all had soul as well as bodies. Later, with the development of humanity, the idea of mind as a peculiar human possession and distinct from matter became clearer. In Greek philosophy, each thinker suggests some basic principle or substance of which the universe is composed.

Thus, questions are asked: what is the ultimate substance that makes up the universe? Is there more than one such substance? Philosophers have long debated these questions and once such substance? Philosophers have long debated these questions and their implications on the difference between the mind and matter. The mind and body problem concerns the extent to which the body are separate or the same thing. The mind is about mental process, thought and consciousness. The body is about the physical aspects of the brain –neurons and how the brain is structured.

However this paper is an attempt to show that rationalist views on mind and matter in western thought. Although there are many views on mind and matter in East or West only three views of western rationalist, Rene Descartes (1596-1650), Baruch Spinoza (1632-77) and G.W Leibnitz (1646-1716) will be presented in this paper. It is noted that this paper is a philosophical study of ontological ground in rationalism.

I.Mind and Matter in Descartes' Philosophy

Descartes held that mind and matter are two finite substances depending on God, the infinite substance. Both mind and matter are created by God but they are totally different from one another. Each has its own attribute. Attribute refers to the essential properties or qualities of the substance and qualities of the Substance cannot conceivably exist. Moreover, the attribute can manifest itself in different ways of modes, but modes cannot be conceived without substance and attribute while substance and attribute can be conceived without modes. For instance, figure cannot be conceived without extension, although extension can be conceived without figure. The substance cannot change its attribute, but it can change its modes. Thus a body will always be extended, but its figures need not remain the same.

Moreover, attributes are qualities which can be perceived clearly and distinctly. According to these characteristics, Descartes accepted extension as the attribute of body, but other qualities like sound, color,

taste, smell, heat and cold are not attributes of body because they are confused. The essence of matter, consequently, is extension. Extension is a spatial continuum of three dimension, length, breadth, and thickness, and everybody is limited spatial magnitude.

Descartes identified matter with extension and he regarded it as passive. Body is conceived as mere extension is passive and cannot move itself. However, all variation of matter depends on motion that is the action by which a body passes from one place to another and it is a mode of the movable thing, not of a substance. Hence, it is necessary for Descartes to give a new conception of motion so that the physical world can be explained in terms of mechanics. Then he asserted that motion was communicated to matter by God from the beginning and it is always constant. The physical magnitude for motion in Descartes' philosophy is known as momentum or quality of motion in science.

Descartes held that dualistic conception of the world consisting of two completely different realms, mind and matter. As regard their essence, mind is conscious and matter is extended. Thus all that can be experienced is a species either of spatial or of conscious beings. Spatiality or the quality of filling space and consciousness are the ultimate, simple, original attributes of reality. What is spatial is not conscious and what is conscious is not spatial. The self-certainty of mind is only that of the personality as a conscious being. Bodies are regarded as real far as they have in themselves the qualitative determinations of spatial existence and change and of extension and motion. All things are either bodies or minds and substances are either spatial or conscious. Thus in Descartes' philosophy there was a problem of how these two entirely different things mind and matter or mind and bodies related to one another.

“The mind was completely independent of bodily influences. The Supreme Substance, namely God, had, he held created two substances, mind and matter; the essence of mind is thought, the essence of matter extension or occupancy of space.”¹

According to Descartes there is no causal relation between mind and body because mind is immaterial whereas body is material and mind can think but body cannot think. Moreover mind is unextended but body is extended and therefore no causal relation is possible between them. They cannot possibly interact and there cannot be any effect of mind upon body

¹ C.E.M.Joad .(1948). *Guide to Philosophy*. London: Victor Gollancz .p.502

or that of body upon mind. They are two completely different realms, so his philosophy is called dualism. Accordingly mind and body proceed on two parallel lines. It is found in Descartes' Philosophy that mind and body are so arranged by God.

Moreover, by substance it is meant for that which stands by itself without depending on any other thing. Still, Descartes took mind and body to be substance, although they are dependent on God. The relation between these two, mind and body, was not clearly described.

II. Mind and Matter in Spinoza's Philosophy

To understand Spinoza's view on mind and matter is to understand his three levels of knowledge. Spinoza distinguished three different levels of knowledge namely obscure and inadequate knowledge, Adequate or Scientific knowledge, and Intuitive knowledge. His three levels of knowledge are necessary for understanding of mind and body as well as God. Spinoza conceived God as consisting of infinite attributes. Of this infinite number of attributes, only two are accessible to man and these two are extension and thought or body and mind. Man himself is a physical and mental being. These two attributes must be present wherever the substance is present. Moreover, the two attributes are absolutely independent of one another and there is no interaction between them. The mind cannot influence the body and vice versa. When two things have nothing in common with one another, the one cannot be the cause of the other.

Mind and body do not act upon each other, because they are not other, they are one. "The body cannot determine the mind to think, nor the mind determine the body to remain in motion or at rest, or in any other state," for the simple reason that the decision of the mind, and the desire and determination of bodyare one and the same thing.¹

With regard to the relation between mind and body or thought and extension, Spinoza conceived them as of equal importance. One cannot be explained in terms of another as the materialist and idealists thought. Then Spinoza accepted theory of parallelism with respect to the relation between mind and body. He conceived the human mind as a particular modification of God's or Nature's infinite power of thought. The mind is a

¹ Will Durant. (1967). *The story of Philosophy*. New York: Washington Square Press, Inc. p.176

complex mode consisting of its thoughts, feelings and volitions which correspond to the bodily processes. Interactions between one body and others external to it are necessarily reflected in the ideas of the body which constitutes the mind. Every bodily change is a mental change and vice versa, since there is only one nature which expresses itself under the two attributes namely thought and extension. On the other hand, mind and body do not influence one another. There is no interaction between them. The mind and its body are processes of one and the same thing expressed in two different ways. All things are modes or forms of matter and mind.

The order and connection of ideas is the same as the order and connection of things. The order and connection of actions and passions of the body coincide with that of actions and passions of the mind. Nothing can happen in the body unless there is a corresponding mental state. Thus, whatever happens in the human body is perceived by the mind. The mind has no way of knowing the body itself, except through ideas corresponding to such modifications of the body. In the same way, mind knows the existence and nature of other bodies because its body is affected by them. Such knowledge is perceptual knowledge, which is not clear and distinct according to Spinoza. It is the lowest and common level of human knowledge. The mind at this level consists of such ideas of the imagination or of vague experience and it is also passive. Knowledge at this stage corresponds roughly to knowledge derived from sense-perception, and it is called opinion. It represents neither the true nature nor essence of the body nor the true nature of the external objects. The second kind or level of knowledge consists of adequate ideas. According to Spinoza, some ideas or notions, which are the common to all men, exist and these are called common notions. Common notions are the foundations or starting points of our genuine reasoning and scientific knowledge.

Intuitive knowledge is the highest level of knowledge. According to Spinoza, the human mind does not stand still. It has to pass through higher levels of knowledge by substituting adequate idea for inadequate ones. If knowledge is knowledge of self-evidently true ideas which represent the relation between essences. An absolutely true and adequate idea of the single comprehensive system is revealed only in intuitive knowledge. The mind at the highest level of knowledge moves solely among eternal truths which are applicable to the universe as a whole. In short, it is found that infinite reality, God or Nature or Universe can be

understood only by intuitive knowledge.

Spinoza's metaphysical system started defining the concept of substance and it was well set out in geometrical order. Moreover, concerning his metaphysics, it is important to understand the concepts such as Substance, Attribute, Mode and God. Substance is in itself and is conceived through itself and the conception of which does not depend on the conception of another thing which must be formed. An attribute is what the intellect perceives as constitution of the essence of a substance. Mode is the affection of a substance which is in something else through which it may be conceived. God is a being absolutely infinite, that is a substance consisting of infinite attributes each of which expresses eternal and infinite essence.

According to Spinoza, God and Nature are the same. God or Nature necessarily exists and is self-caused. All other things or aspects of reality must be explained as attributes or modes of God or Nature. God is not the transcendent cause and it is the immanent principle of the Universe. God does not create in the sense of producing something that is external to him and that can exist apart from him. God or Nature is the permanent substance or substratum or essence in all things. Thus, his ontological ground is that although God is an infinite reality, God and Nature are one and the same.

III. Mind and Matter in Leibnitz's Philosophy

Leibnitz tried to reconstruct the idea of substance both spiritual and material. Like Spinoza, Leibnitz wanted to synthesize these three separate factors of mind, body and God. Thus he began his thought by defining 'substance'. Descartes' conception of matter as having mere extension was un acceptable to Leibnitz. He substituted power of resistance as the essential quality of matter for extension. Hence the notion of passive matter is replaced by what is essentially the modern scientific conception of matter as energy, or force. Motion is not mere change of position, but something real, something produced by a force; this concept of force, impetus, is the basic of Leibnitz physics and metaphysics as well.

Moreover, extension is divisible and it is of composite nature and therefore it cannot be the primary principle. On the other hand, force is simple in nature and it is indivisible, and therefore it is the primary

principle. Thus, for Leibnitz, force is the source of the mechanical world; the mechanical world is the sensible appearance of force. There is a force in the body that precedes all extension. A body appears as impenetrable and limbered, or as matter, because of the force of resistance in it. Each and every force is a particular, individual substance. Simple substance or forces are called metaphysical points, formal atoms, essential forms, substantial forms, monads or units.

Monad means unity. For Leibnitz, the universe is constituted by monads and his doctrine is widely known as Monism. The monads are basic substances which are simple. They are not made up of parts and so they are strictly indivisible atoms. They are extended, in as much as extension is always divisible. These monads are the real atoms of nature, the elements of things. Furthermore, these elemental monads cannot decay or perish through disintegration, nor can they be built up from parts. The Monads are said to be “windowless” and nothing could come in or go out of a monad. However, Leibnitz asserted that the monads must have some qualities, otherwise they would not even be existing things. Thus, the monads possess some qualities and are different from one another.

Moreover, Leibnitz admitted that every created being, and consequently the created monad is subject to change, and that this change is continuous. ‘The natural changes of the monads come from an internal principle, since an eternal cause can have no influence upon their inner being’. The changing of a monad is not extrinsic; rather it is the unfolding of the monad’s internal possibilities. Each monad is force of representation and it can actively represent or reflect the entire universe from its own perspective. Leibnitz also insisted that all simple substances or created might be called Entelechies, for they have in them certain perfection .

Thus, they have a certain self-sufficiency which makes them the sources of their internal activities. Such is the nature of the monad as conceived by Leibniz. The number of monads is also infinite because each monad perceives or represents the universe from its own perspective. If the number of monads is limited, it would not be possible to represent the whole universe from every perspective and the universe would be imperfect. Hence Leibnitz conceives the universe as a hierarchy of individual beings, called monads.

“He saw the points of propensity for activity that constitute matter as being like dots of consciousness occupying points in space. He called these “monads”, and believed that everything was made up of them. Although he saw all monad as space less within themselves he also saw them as differing widely in intensity, from those that go to make up inorganic matter at the lower end of the scale to human minds, each of which is a monad, and them on to God, who is also a monads. Each monad is a point of view in relation to the rest of reality –its own world. In this respect monads do not interact.”¹

Thus, in the explanation of not only mind and body, but also God Leibnitz used “monad” as energy, as matter, as consciousness and as God. Moreover, Leibnitz held that God is sufficient reason of all the variety of particulars which are connected together in one system. There is only one God is sufficient.

God has power which is the source of all also knowledge whose content is the variety to the ideas and finally will which makes changes or products according to the principle of the best. For him, this actual universe is created by God and it is the result of a free choice of God amongst all possible universes. It is not the arbitrary choice but a choice according to reason. God chooses as the actual universe that whose compassable elements admit of the greatest amount of perfection or reality. Thus the actual universe is the best of all possible worlds. Monads which have both perceptions and desires are called souls. Memory provides the soul with a kind of consciousness which resembles reason but which is to be different from it.

The self-conscious monads are the rational souls which have perception and reasoning. However, intuitive knowledge can be obtained by God only. It is clear that all kinds of knowledge are explained in terms of monads that are ontologically accepted. Moreover, energy, monads are used not only for mind and matter as well as other aspects of Universe but also for God. Thus, ontologically, energy or monads are and it cannot be separated from God. It is also found that although monads are ontologically real, the most prominent, important in fundamental reality is God because God alone has intuitive knowledge.

¹ Bryan, Magee.(1998) . *The Story of Philosophy*. London: Dorling Kindersley limited. p.99

Conclusion

The above mentioned views of mind and matter are based on their ontological ground and rational point of view because Descartes, Spinoza and Leibnitz are rationalist. "Rationalism, in Western philosophy, the view that regards reason is the chief source and test of knowledge. Holding that reality itself has an inherently logical structure, the rationalist asserts that a class of truths exists that the intellect can grasp directly."¹ According to the rationalists, there are certain rational principles especially in logic and mathematic, and even in ethics and metaphysics.

In the seventeenth century, a central philosophical issue concerned the apparent causal relations which hold between the minds and the body. This issue was discussed by Descartes, with the context of substance dualism-mind and body are different kinds of substance. Leibnitz opposed to dualism. He held that there is only one type of substance in the world, and thus that mind and body are ultimately composed of the same kind of substance (a version of monism). On the other hand, he also held that mind and body are metaphysically distinct. For Spinoza, the substance is the eternal, infinite, the cause of itself and necessary principle of things, it is called God or Nature. Thus, his conception of God is different from that of Descartes.

For Descartes, God is the creator standing a part from his creation. However, for Spinoza the God cannot be creator who is distinct from his creation. According to Descartes, Sentient being is composed of extension (body) and consciousness (mind) which are attributes of the ultimate or infinite reality (God). Mind is separated from matter by Descartes who accepted that there is no causal relation between mind and body. Still, interaction between mind and matter, at the pineal gland of men. Thus according to ontological ground of Descartes, only God and Substance are real. Regarding ontological ground of Spinoza, he denied the dualistic view of mind and matter in Descartes' philosophy. Mind and body are two different ways of describing the same reality. That is God or Nature. This means that the same existent entity is seen under two different aspects such as mind and body. To him God is not outside the world nor he inside the world. Traditionally, it is said that God and Nature or the Universe are one and the same. Concerning

¹ <https://www.britannica.com>> topic

ontological ground of Leibnitz, everything and God are made up of monads. For him, all matter is reducible to energy which is non-material. Therefore, the word “Energy” can be used for both matter and consciousness, and monads can be regarded as energy (mind, body) and God. However, he classified monads into different groups or levels; “man” is the best example for the explanations of mind and matter as well as their relations.

Lastly, for rationalists’, views on mind and matter cannot be separated from the role of God, though Spinoza and Leibnitz introduced the terms, “Nature, Energy, Monad. For Descartes as stated earlier, the mind and body are in parallel, and God is accepted as ontological ground. For Leibnitz, energy, monad and God are intermingling one another. Accordingly, their views on mind and matter are different depending on their ontological ground. For the western rationalist, mind and matter are finite realities which can be regarded as relative realities, and their ontological ground is the God. Therefore they accept the notion of God but their view on mind and matter are different.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my special thanks of Dr. Tin Maung Tun, Rector, West Yangon University, Dr. Aye Aye Khine, Pro-Rector, West Yangon University, Dr. Soe Soe Aye, Pro-Rector, West Yangon University, for permitting me to write this research paper and Dr. Thet Thet Saing, Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy, West Yangon University, for suggesting me to write this research paper.

References

- Durant, Will. (1967). *The story of Philosophy* ; New York: Washington Square Press, Inc.
- J.R Frost. (1957) . *Basic Teachings of the Great Philosophers*. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc.
- Joad, C.E.M.(1948). *Guide To Philosophy*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Magee, Bryan. (1998) . *The Story of Philosophy*. London: Dorling Kindersley Limited.

Online Reference

1. <https://www.britannica.com>>

