
UNIT 2 FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS AND PRINCIPLES

Contents

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Fundamental Notions and Principles (Western)
- 2.3 Fundamental Notions and Principles (Indian)
- 2.4 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.5 Further Readings and References

2.0 OBJECTIVES

Metaphysics is a science in so far as science provides us with sure and evident knowledge of things from their causes. Every science has its own fundamental notions and principles. Metaphysics, as a science, has also its own fundamental notions and principles. In this unit you are expected to understand:

- The most fundamental notions and principles (Western)
- The most fundamental principles (Indian)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A science is always a logically ordered system, i.e., the various parts of a science are logically coherent. One part is justified by another. Scientific statements are deduced from another. However, this process cannot go on to infinity. Ultimately one must arrive at premises that no longer are conclusions of a reasoning process within the limits of a given science, but have their truth established through direct observation by the senses or their foundation in another science. Somehow every science is bound to have fundamental principles that can serve as the foundation stones. In other words, the function of the fundamental notions and principles is to supply the basic premises necessary for further development of a science.

2.2 FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS AND PRINCIPLES (WESTERN)

Notion is vague and imperfect concept. Notions are of *simple* mental content. Principles are of *complex* mental contents. *Simplicity* is the absence of complexity and *complexity* is the union of distinct parts. Notions and principles are also the basic evidences to which thought must conform. *Principle is that from which something proceeds in any way whatsoever*. The definition implies two things: that the principle is *prior* to that which proceeds from it; and that there is a *special connection* between what is called the principle and that which proceeds from it, in virtue of which the former is the principle of the latter.

There are three basic notions: Notion of Being, Notion of Action or Operation, and Notion of Self. *Notion of Being*: Being is that which is in some way or

something. That which is in some way or something is always and immediately present in human experience. This experience of Being is as undeniable as the fact of the affirmation. Experience of Being signifies immediate knowledge, the immediate presence of the known to the knower. It is the original form of knowledge. An experience which is not an experience of Being would be an experience of nothing which is an impossibility. Nothing is clearer or simpler or more evident than Being pre-apprehended in my consciousness. Hence we cannot ask – ‘what is the essence or nature of Being?’ For essence and nature are already ‘ways of Being’. It is the ‘essence’ of Being not to have any essence as it surpasses and includes all essences. Thus it is impossible to construct, derive, reduce, or define Being in terms of anything other than itself. *Notion of Action:* It is in my experience of something I know that I *experience* the experience. I am implicitly and immediately conscious of the activity of experience itself. *Notion of Self:* In my experience of something I know, I experience the experience. I am implicitly and immediately conscious of my own self. The self is a fact of conscious experience which is both undeniable and inexplicable. When I wake up in the morning, I have to admit that my remembrance of previous knowledge or of my past belong to the very same self that I am now. This identity of the self is the reason why I can synthesize the past and present. But in itself it remains an unexplained fact, a simple datum of my personal experience. Furthermore, this identity did not always exist, because forty-two years ago I did not exist.

Principles of Truth and Affirmation: The principle of truth states that ‘*there is truth*’. Truth is conformity (correspondence) between the mind and the object. It is self-evident that truth exists; for even denying it would admit it. Affirmation is the assent of the mind to that which is. Affirmation is the primary form in which the principle of truth manifests itself to us in judgement. This affirmation can be expressed in several ways: ‘there is something’, ‘something is’, and ‘something exists’. The fact of such affirmation is undeniable. I cannot sincerely doubt the fact that I formulate judgments, or that I affirm. The opposite of affirmation is negation which ultimately rests on affirmation. Negation, as we know, is the absence of positive assent (dissent). Every negation implies four elements: *A positive foundation:* A positive foundation is an affirmation. In the example that Benson is not an angel, the positive foundation is that he is a man. *Proposal to the mind:* When we say that Benson is not an angel there is a proposal or question to the mind: Is he an angel? *Comparison:* There is always a comparison of the proposal ‘Is he an angel?’ with our previous knowledge that he is a man. *Rejection of the proposal:* Here the proposal ‘Is he an angel?’ is rejected by the mind.

Principles of identity and distinction: It is the fact of being one and the same. According to this principle everything is what it is. Whatever is, is; and whatever is not, is not. Everything is its own being. Everything is itself, but in a way proportionate to its nature. This principle is implied in all judgments. In the affirmative judgment I say that something is and that it is as it is. It is itself. I affirm the necessary identity of that which I affirm with itself. The particular judgment ‘this is’ or ‘I am’ contains a general judgment which embraces all judgments. *Whatever is, insofar as it is, is and is what it is.* This principle is not a mere tautology. It is not concerned with such an obvious repetition as $A=A$. For the predicate adds to the subject the mode of necessity which stems from the Being of being. The judgment about being as being reveals that Being is precisely Being, self-sufficient, self-explanatory, and not referring to anything else, and therefore unconditioned and necessary.

Distinction is the absence of identity. The principle means that every being is in some way distinct from the other. Most of our thinking implies distinctions. When we make an inference, for example, we draw a conclusion from premises. But in doing so we have to take many distinctions for granted: we have to presuppose the distinction between the premises and the conclusion we draw from them. We must also distinguish between the subjects and the predicates in both the premises and conclusions. All these are different distinctions. When we draw our conclusion, our attention is directly focused on the conclusion, and marginally focused on its relationship to its several premises. But a whole series of distinctions functions in the background. These distinctions are at work even though they are not being explicitly made at the moment we draw our inference. Indeed, just to say anything at all we have to take distinctions for granted.

Principles of non-contradiction and excluded middle: An affirmative judgment is a reply to a question regarding a proposed situation, a proposition. But a question allows two possible answers: connecting and separating, yes or no. The point is whether the judgment which affirms the connection includes a negation of the separation. The reply is that connection and separation of one and the same thing in the same respect, i.e., the same mode of Being, cannot go together; for only one of the two is true. This logical principle is based on the general ontological insight that *whatever is*, insofar as it is, *is not not*, i.e., it cannot not-be, and *is not what it is not*. This principle is based on the all-embracing nature of Being. Outside Being there is only non-Being, but non-Being cannot be. Therefore, Being extends to everything. It is impossible to predicate not-to-be of any being as being. Accordingly, the all-embracing affirmation implies the impossibility of the all-embracing negation. It is absolutely impossible that there would be nothing. Hence a thing cannot *be* and *not-be at the same time under the same respect*. The distinguishing mark of the principle is the phrase: *at the same time under the same respect*. It means: from the same standpoint, in the same circumstances, and under the same conditions. For instance, the statement, 'it is possible for rain to fall and not to fall' could be true if we refer to different localities, but it could not be true about the selfsame rain in the selfsame locality. It is also true that 'a boy can be a man', if we mean that he can be a man at a later period of his life; but a boy cannot be a man while he is still a boy. The validity of this principle is a pre-condition for all knowledge. However, the principle is not a mere negation. For in a genuine negation the subject is never the total unity of 'whatever is' but always a particular being. What is denied is not the Being of the subject in the absolute sense but always a particular mode of Being. I first affirm being as being and then judge that certain modes of Being are not included and perhaps even positively excluded. In this way there arises the distinction between the *one* and the *other*. Since negation always implies affirmation, human thought will be inclined to consider the principle of non-contradiction as its central principle. Just as negation implies affirmation and the quality of all-embracing, so also the principle of non-contradiction implies the principle of identity as prior 'in itself'.

The Principle of the Excluded Middle is expressed in different ways by different philosophers. It is an inference from the principle of identity and the principle of contradiction. If it is self-evident that Being is Being, and non-Being is non-Being; and if it is self-evident that a thing cannot *be* and *not be* at the same time under the same respect, then it is also self-evident that *there is no middle course possible between Being and non-Being*.

Principles of causality and relation: *The Principle of causality* states: ‘whatever happens or becomes must have a cause for its happening or becoming’. The expression ‘*whatever happens*’ means ‘whatever begins to be or to exist’; ‘*becomes*’ means ‘whatever passes from potentiality to actuality’. Hence the principle can be reformulated as follows: *Whatever passes from a state of non-existence into a state of existence must have an efficient cause for its existence.* *Principle of Relation:* Relation comes from the Latin word, *referre* which means bring back, the reference of one thing to another, and mutual inter-directedness. It is defined as *the bearing* (reference, respect, attitude, ordination) *of one thing to something else*. ‘To be is to be related’. Being is the Being of beings. As Being is the Being of beings, it is always related to beings and all beings are also simultaneously and radically related to Being (hence relative to Being).

2.3 FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS AND PRINCIPLES (INDIAN)

Principle of Truth (SATYA): *Satya* etymologically means something enduring. It is unchangeable, indestructible, eternal, and immutable. In this sense, only *Brahman* is *satya*. The principle of truth states that ‘*there is truth*’ and ‘*truth is triumphant*’. It is self-evident that truth exists; for even denying it would admit it. Truth is also triumphant (*satyamev jayathe*). It means that truth is always victorious. For even if someone claims that one has defeated truth, one must imply that ‘it is true that I have defeated truth’. Sankara recognizes three levels of *satta* or truth: *pratibhasika*, *vyavaharika*, and *paramarthika*. *Pratibhasika satta* appears momentarily in illusion and dreams. It is contradicted by normal waking experiences. The momentary appearance of a rope as a snake and mirage as water, is *pratibhasika*. *Vyavaharika satta* includes objects of normal waking experiences, the particular and changing objects, which form the basis of our practical life. *Paramarthika satta* is the pure existence which reveals itself through all experience. It is neither contradicted nor contradictable. It is attributable only to *Brahman*. The Madhyamika philosophers recognize two kinds of truth: *samvrti* (empirical) and *paramartha* (transcendental). The former is relative and the latter is absolute.

Theories of Truth: The Alambana / Pratibhasa Theory: *Alambana* means ‘foundation’ or ‘support’ or ‘objective ground’ of a perceptual sensory experience. The Buddhists name it as *pratyaya* (causal condition) on which the arising of a state of perceptual consciousness depends. For example, a visual perception depends upon the visible (*rupa*). My perception of red-colour depends upon red-colour as its *alambana*. As long as there is an appearance (*pratibhasa*), it must be rooted in an *alambana*. In fact *alambana* is *pratibhasa*.

The Pramana Theory: The *pramana* theory seeks to ground human knowledge in a mode of experience that is immune to failures such as error, illusion, and hallucination. From this point it is argued that what appears in every state of our consciousness is mind-dependent or internal to consciousness itself. The so-called external world is only a creation of the mind. The stuff of the world is made of consciousness alone. What is emphasized is the essential dependence of what ‘appears’ in a state of consciousness *upon* that consciousness itself. The world around us is the world within us.

The Universal Veridical Theory: According to this theory, advocated by Prabhakara *mimamsaka*, all perceptions are veridical. It is an error to think that there could be an error. The so-called perceptual error is a fusion or confusion of two different and distinguishable cognitive states. In the usual mirage-illusions, the appearance of water actually belongs to the memory-state, while the appearance of ‘this’ or ‘there it is’ belongs to the perceptual state. The water-appearance in memory is rooted eventually in the actual water experienced.

The *Paramanuvada*: In Buddhism, especially according to Buddhist atomism, the atoms are something like the data of sensory perceptual consciousness. If it is the datum of eye-consciousness based upon visual perception, it is given the name *rupa* (the visible). Similarly, the data of other sense-experiences are identified: smell, taste, touch, and sound. The material object is a fictional construction out of these sensory ‘atomistic’ data. The data are ‘substantially real’, whereas the material objects, such as the pot or table, are imagined to be real. This system is basically phenomenalist in the sense that the basic units (these atoms) are phenomenal elements rather than physical elements. The atoms are not the material atoms of the Vaisesikas.

The *Arthakriya-samvada* (theory of the function of the object): The *Sautrantika* develops this concept, in order to distinguish the veridical perception from the non-veridical ones, as in the case of the perception of a gem on the floor: Well, perceiving a gem on the floor, I may rush to pick it up, but if it is a false perception (illusion), I will never be able to pick it up. In one case there is accord with the ‘function of the object’ (*arthakariya*), in another there is discord; thus non-veridical perception is distinguished from the veridical one. But the *Yogacara* is unimpressed by such a ‘pragmatic’ theory of truth. For him it begs the question. It is like the Johnsonian way of proving that a stone exists by kicking it.

The *Yogacara* Theory: The *Yogacara* assimilates the concept of *arthakriya* into its own system. For if the concept is coherent (or the potentiality to be so) with the expected behaviour pattern that invariably follows the cognitive state, then it is possible for veridical perception to meet this requirement even if it is not assumed that the object is external to consciousness. This is also the *Yogacara* criterion of distinguishing a veridical perception from a non-veridical one; the former has *arthakriya*, while the latter does not. The difference between a true perception of a gem and a perceptual illusion of it is like the difference between a real gem and a fake one. One can trade only the real gem for money, and not the fake one. The difference is due to the causal history of the origin of the real gem and the fake one. In the same way, the difference between the causal history of a veridical perception and that of a non-veridical one accounts for the differences in what follows in either case, i.e., there is coherence with the expected behaviour pattern in one case and the lack of it in the other. If the real gem and the fake one agree in all conceivable patterns of behaviour, then there is little point in calling one real and the other fake, unless one is already prejudiced with the idea that one of them is certainly real and the other is not. In other words, one disqualifies oneself to judge the real from the unreal since one is already prejudiced. If, however, one is already familiar with the causal history of both which determined the issue, then the issue is already resolved, and one does not need a further arbiter of truth

Principle of Causality (*karana*): The principle of causality means that every event has a cause; whatever happens is made to happen by a cause. This is the view of all the systems of Indian philosophy. According to all orthodox systems, the belief in causation is almost a human instinct. But there are different views among the different systems. These views are upheld by the following important theories of causation which figure prominently in Indian philosophy, viz., (1) the theory of unreal or apparent production of the *Advaita-Vedanta* (*vivartavada*); (3) the theory of dependent origination (*pratitya samutpatvada*) of the Buddhists; and (4) the theory of emergent production (*arambhavada*) or the theory of non-existence of effect in 'cause' (*asatkaryavada*) of the *Nyaya-Vaisesika*. *Satkaryavada* or *parinamavada* means that the effect is only an explicit manifestation of what was implicit and latent in the cause. *Asatkaryavada* or *arambhavada* holds the view that the effect is a new creation without any prior existence in the cause. The effect is a new beginning, an *aramba*. According to *vivartavada*, the effect is only an appearance of the cause.

Samkhya Theory of Parinamavada: The *Samkhya* view is found in the famous words of the *Gita* (2.16): "There can be no existence of the non-existent and no non-existence of the existent." According to this view, an effect is not a new entity; an effect is already contained in its cause in an unmanifested state, and the production of an effect merely means its manifestation. Since an effect exists in its cause in an unmanifested state even before its appearance, it is considered to be ever-existent (*sat*), and hence the *Samkhya* theory of causation is called *Satkaryavada* (the theory of ever-existent effect). As the manifestation of an effect is brought about by a change in the cause, which is conceived as a real change, it is called *parinamavada* or *vikarvada*, i.e., theory of transformation or evolution from the cause. However, there is an abiding substance which runs through the causal series. For example, when a gold vessel is broken and changed into a different form, the change occurs only in the arrangement of gold but not in the substance, i.e., gold. Production means the modification of the form of the cause. The fundamental stuff which runs through the causal series is neither produced nor destroyed as it is eternal. Thus, the *dharmin* (*dravya*) does not change; only the *dharma*s (*bhava*s) change. The two are in fact identical. If it were not so, anything could arise out of anything. In that case, it would be impossible to make any selection of a particular material for the production of a particular effect. From these considerations, one can conclude that all the effects have a previous existence in potential forms. The world-process does not bring into existence anything new, as it is a process of transformation of the potential (*avyakta*) effects into actual (*vyakta*) effects. The whole world, except the individual soul, is the modification of the primordial matter, the '*prakrti*'.

Vedanta Theory of Vivartavada: According to this theory, the essence of an effect is identical with the essence of its cause. The difference between cause and effect consists in the difference between the two forms of the identical stuff. In a causal process, the form of a cause is changed into a new form without involving any change in the essence of the causal stuff. Now, unless there is change in the essence of the causal stuff, there cannot be any real change even in the form of that stuff itself. The Advaitins, therefore, hold that what is considered as the real modification of the causal stuff is only an appearance. The manifold world of different forms and names is not the result or the real modification of *Brahman*, the abiding eternal substance, but only an appearance generated by the beginningless '*avidya*'. Thus, the '*parinamavada*' of *Samkhya* logically leads

to the *vivartavada* of Sankara, according to which there is no real production of the effect.

Buddhist Theory of *Pratityasamutpatvada* (dependent origination): According to this view, a cause is completely annihilated without leaving anything behind it, and the effect arises after the annihilation of the cause. The relation between cause and effect is one of antecedent to a consequent. In the objectively real world the occurrence of one moment means the death of the preceding moment. The empirical world is governed by the causal principle: '*Asmin sati idam bhavati*' (this being that arises) and '*asmin asati idam na bhavati*' (this not being that does not arise). It means that the effect arises depending on the cause, and if cause ceases the effect also ceases. Causation is thus simply dependent arising. A certain kind of effect invariably comes into existence following upon or as the result of the existence of a certain set of relevant causal conditions.

Nyaya-Vaiseshika theory of *Asatkaryavada* or *Arambhavada*: The basic principle of the *Nyaya-Vaiseshika* metaphysics is the theory of *dharmadharmibheda*, i.e., the differentiation is essence between the substrate and their properties. There is an absolute difference between a cause and its effect. A cloth, in order to be real, must have an essence different from that of the threads. From the existent (cause) comes into being an effect which was non-existent before. Cause, defined by Udayana, is an invariable antecedent of an effect which is unconditional or necessary. If an unconditional antecedent, which is always present when an effect is present and absent when an effect is absent, were not regarded as its cause, then the effect would be uncaused. Hence, the first essential characteristic of a cause is its antecedence to the effect (*purvavratti*). The second is its invariability; it must invariably precede the effect (*niyatapurvavrtti*). The third is its unconditionality; it must unconditionally or necessarily precede the effect (*ananyathasiddha*). Unconditional antecedence is immediate and direct antecedence. There is no destruction of the cause prior to the emergence of the effect. The cause continues to exist even after its effect is produced. An effect is never produced out of its cause. The cause is a substance which does not transmit its essence to the effect. Though the effect has nothing in common with the cause, yet the former can reside only in the latter. The effect arises in the cause and resides only in the latter. The effect arises in the cause and resides therein by the relation of inherence (*samavaya*) which itself is an entity. Thus, while it relates the effect to the cause, it also serves as a wedge and does not let the one merge into the other.

Principle of Knowledge (*Jnana*): According to this principle the experience of human knowledge is an undeniable fact. I know that I know. If I do not know that I know, then I must at least admit that I know that I do not know. In any case, I must admit that I know at least something.

Principle of Meaning (*Sphota*): For this principle every letter, word, or sentence is a single meaningful, eternal, and formal symbol called *sphota*. The articulated sounds are merely means by which this single meaningful, eternal, and formal symbol is revealed. The term '*sphota*' is derived from the root '*sphut*' which means 'to burst forth', and thus it is defined as one from which meaning bursts forth. The theory of *sphota* (*sphotavada*) was developed and systematized by Bhartrhari in his work *Vakyapadiya*.

Principle of Negation (*Abhava*): Thought starts with negation or negative judgment in actual life. If life runs unobstructed, there would be no thought and philosophy. When there is obstruction, either thought must arise or life must become extinct. But life resists extinction, and hence thought is produced.

Principle of Assertion or Affirmation (*Pratipada*): Principle of Assertion or Affirmation states that every refutation and negation implies some kind of assertion or affirmation on which negation rests. For, pure negation cannot be the final end or the ultimate limit. Negation must always have some locus or basis to stand on. It can never be *in itself*. When we negate some kind of being, we always have some other kind in hand. If we negate every determinate content or object, we cannot thereby claim to have negated the objectivity as such. Even if everything is claimed to be negated, how can the negating subject itself be negated? One may claim to negate even this subject. But that would mean a further retreat to that form of consciousness which is aware of the negated subject. No amount of negation can dethrone Being from its position and secure the place of the latter for itself. Hence it is not the non-being which is the limit, but the ever unnegated and unnegatable Being which is the limit, the absolute ground, the affirmation and presupposition of all, on which negation rests.

Principle of identity (*tattvamasi*): It does not mean the identity of a thing with itself but the identity of the individual self with *Brahman*.

Principle of distinction (*bheda*): Three types of distinctions are made by the Vedantins: *Heterogeneous Distinction (*vijatiya bheda*)* by which one being is distinct from beings of other groups, e.g., a cow is distinct from a horse. *Homogeneous Distinction (*sajatiya bheda*)* by which a being is distinct from other members of its own group, e.g., one cow is distinct from another cow. *Internal Distinction (*svagata bheda*)* by which one part of being is distinct from its other parts, e.g., the distinction between the tail and leg of the same cow. Ramanuja denies heterogeneous and homogeneous distinctions in God, but maintains internal distinction in Him with conscious and unconscious substances.

Principle of contradiction (*virudha*): The principle states that a certain doctrine having been accepted, the probans contradictory to it is contradictory. Contradictory probans is that which is contradictory to that which has been admitted. The definition means ‘that which contradicts or sets aside an admitted fact, and that which is contradicted or set aside by an admitted fact’. Contradiction is taken to hold in all those cases where two or more sentences cannot be true together. ‘This table is red’ and ‘this table is not red’ cannot both be true at the same time. These sentences are regarded as contradictory not because red and not-red are opposed to each other, but because these two sentences are used with regard to the same object under the same respect.

Principle of exclusion (*apoha*): A word expresses its meaning by excluding all its opposites. For example, the word ‘elephant’ excludes all beings that are not elephants.

Principle of fullness (*purnam*): The principle of fullness states that fullness comes from fullness. Fullness minus fullness equals fullness (*Isa Up*-Invocation)

Aum
That is fullness
This is fullness

From the fullness, the fullness has come out. When this fullness is taken from that fullness, what remains is fullness.

Aum, peace, peace

Principle of order (*rta*): This principle enunciates the fact that we have an ordered universe by *rta*. *Rta* literally means ‘the course of things’. It is the immanent law of things. The whole universe is founded on *rta* and moves in it. It is the inviolable moral order of the world.

Principle of presumption (*arthapatti*): It consists in the assumption of some unperceived fact in order to explain apparently inconsistent facts. For example, from the facts of ‘John is alive’ and ‘he is not present in his house’, we presume that he is elsewhere.

Principle of momentariness (*kshanika*): Everything changes from moment to moment. Existence in the world is continuous birth, decay, and death. The world is in constant flow, and the objects of the world are subject to change and decay. All things change. There is nothing human or divine that is permanent (*sarvam kshanikam*).

Principle of indescribability (*sunya*): The word ‘*sunya*’ ordinarily means void or empty. According to Madhyansikar, *sunya* means indescribability (*avachya* or *anabhlabya*) as it goes beyond the powers of the intellect. It transcends all the four well-known categories of the intellect: *asti* (existence), *nasti* (non-existence), *ubahya* (both) and *nabhaya* (neither). It also means that there is a transcendental reality about which nothing positive or negative can be asserted.

Principle of creative-power (*maya*): It is the real power-principle by which the world is created. It makes the indeterminate *Brahman* determinate. It is the principle of determination of *Brahman*. It is different from *avidya* or ignorance by which an individual identifies oneself wrongly with the evolutes of *prakriti* – body, senses, mind, etc.

Principle of indeterminate and determinate (*nirvikalpaka evam savikalpaka*): Ordinary perception is of two kinds: *nirvikalpaka* and *savikalpaka*. The perceptual knowledge immediately resulting from sense-object contact is of the nature of mere acquaintance (*alochana*) with the object, and is called indeterminate perception (*nirvikalpaka*). Immediately after arises the determinate perception of the object (*savikalpaka*). Indeterminate perception is a simple apprehension in which one has a mere experience of ‘something’. It is a judgment without words. Determinate perception is the predicative knowledge of an object in which the knowledge gained by the indeterminate is analyzed into universal and particular, and the two are related by way of predication. The relation of subject and object is involved in a determinate perception.

Principle of liberation (*moksha*): Thinking results in attachment. Attachment results in desire. Desire results in anger. Anger results in delusion. Delusion results in confusion. Confusion results in loss of discrimination, which enslaves one. Hence, all beings are oriented towards liberation. That being is liberated which realizes itself to be *Brahman*, detached from all things, when one has the experience of being identified with *Brahman*: *Aham Brahm asmi*.

Check Your Progress

Note: Use the space provided for your answers.

- 1) Explain briefly the fundamental principles from Western perspectives.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
- 2) Describe the fundamental principles from Indian perspectives in your own words.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.4 LET US SUM UP

We have just reflected on the most important fundamental notions and principles. The most important notions are the notion of Being, notion of action, and notion of self. Notion is a vague and imperfect concept. Notions are of simple mental content. Principles are of complex mental contents. The main fundamental principles are the principles of truth and affirmation, identity and distinction, non-contradiction and excluded middle, and causality and relation. These different fundamental notions and principles, looked at from both the Western and India perspectives, are all complementary and not contradictory.

2.5 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.

Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. (In: *Commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle by Thomas Aquinas*.) Tr. John P Rowan. Vol. I. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1961.

Bittle, Celestine. *The Domain of Being*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1950.

Coreth, Emerich. *Metaphysics*. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Goel, Aruna. *Indian Philosophy*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Ltd., 1984.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Tr. John Macquarrie. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Jha, Ganganatha *The Nyaya-sutras of Gautama*, Vol.1 Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1984.

Lonergan, Bernard. *Insight*. New York: Longmans, 1965.

Loux, Michael J. *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Maritain, Jacques. *A Preface to Metaphysics*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1943.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna *Perception: An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Pandeya, Ramachandra *Indian Studies in Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1977.

Panthanmackel, George. *Coming and Going: An Introduction to Metaphysics from Western Perspectives*. Bangalore: ATC, 1999.

Peters, John A. *Metaphysics*. Louvain: Duquesne University Press, 1963.

Raju, P. T. *Introduction to Comparative Philosophy* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas Publishers, 1992).

Singh, B.N. *Dictionary of Indian Philosophical Concepts*. Varanasi: Asha Prakashan, 1991.

Upadhyaya, K.N. "Indian Tradition and Negation" *Philosophy East and West* Vol.38.No.3 (July, 1988).