

I-9. What Is in a Word?

Word representations facilitate experience. The dynamics of word usage animates language because a word evokes wide-ranging emotions modulated by its context as in: *You are stupid; Are you stupid? Keep it simple, stupid; It is economy, stupid; I am stupid; I am so stupid; I may be stupid but not dumb; when does stupid become dumb.* As we evaluate the resulting perceptions words also help in the evaluation of its conceptual potential.

We are prisoners of words. ‘Tusk. Tusk. Words mean what I mean’ decried the Queen in the Wonderland. We focus by naming names. At times a word, for example god or its cousins, gets out of the originally intended boundaries. In the Nay tradition, by the act of naming we are bound to the actions of the word that evolve through its usage. Words are not about just keeping the promise, although that is how we commit to a part of the observed and experienced reality. Use of words for communication is about the deeper levels intrinsic in the ways we share and use words to build perceptions. Often experiences, as well as insights and ideas, cohere around a word. As the analytical device to focus on the particulars in relation to the universals the word boundaries define parts of the explored concept space.

Representation is the first step in defining perceptions to be validated. For the development of shared knowledge we name entities as class in addition to their individual identities. Word representations communicate parts of the observed and experienced, yet a word does not necessarily confer or communicate reality. Words may be about figment of imagination which may or may not lead to an awareness or the

truth-value of the entity. Many words in the public domain are mere cliché, and boundary of even the commonly used concept words is lost in the rubble of the history. In short, as tool and device for communication words work on the principle of *garbage in garbage out*.

Conceptual tools, bits and pieces: Word communication works within the limitations of a boxed-in mind. At a very simple level, we name things to communicate what we see or experience, and others also see and experience in the same way. This is the first step in sharing the experience with others to thrash out the real from other that can not be shared and communicated. Words that communicate concept are also rooted in the physical and psychological reality. We construct the future from such bits and pieces that have an affinity for our minds. Often we also scramble to seek help of words loaded with our own perceptions. Strategy of breaking the observable into parts to conceptualize is like the divide-and-conquer difficult tasks, or refinement through trial and error. It also acknowledges the limitation of the human ability to see and communicate the "whole." Success of this strategy is clear from the widespread use of tools, alphabets, words, numbers and relations. Conceptualization is a critical step in the evolution of knowledge, and only the concepts rooted in shared reality can be shared.

Rearranging bits and pieces creates order, chaos, and disorder. This is also the case with words. In order to avoid confusion we seek words that provide a better grasp of experience. Appropriate and timely word constructs offer ways for systematic exploration. Even the intuitively obvious can only be communicated only with defined word boundaries.

The Prakrit term *anugam* characterizes the ways in which human develop and apply knowledge. The *anu-* prefix refers to microscopic constituents, parts, tools, devices, ingredients, and

later also for the components right up to the smallest components of matter. The *-gam* suffix refers to the conceptual drive for reasoning towards a purpose or goal. It related to reasoning through parts that includes reasoning in and about the parts. Thus anugam is the analytic approach based on the understanding of the parts (entities, criteria and relations). As a device for validation it is bi-directional, that is from the whole to the parts, and also from parts to the whole. Anugam is not after the fact analysis or post-mortem.

In the ancient Indian context, the after the fact approaches have been called (see II-4 and the Nay part): *tatpurvakam* by Gautam for in accordance with what has happened; *tark* or *tarki* for deduction by the Buddhist scholars; *vakyovakyam* in Upnishad; *aanvikhi* or *anuman* (estimate or guess) by the main branch of the later day Nyay scholars. Such attempts to "look back" (for example at the Vedic a priori) were widely used. They were denounced by the faithful as their own analyses of what happened in the distant past tended to degenerate into rationalizations. It was clearly recognized that such methods were inadequate for arriving at the knowledge of the present, and certainly of little use for diving into the future. In contrast, by acknowledging the human origins of the prior knowledge, the focus of the anugam approach always remains on the criteria-based practice to construct viable models.

What is the smallest part that can represent the whole? Looking for the smallest in the observed reality has created paradoxes of the infinite divisibility and also of infinite regress. In the anugam tradition the smallest is the unit that still represents the class in terms of the criteria for the representation of the class. For example, a grain (a unit) of wheat is the representative of a heap of wheat, no matter what its size. We can divide the heap in parts until we are left with a grain. However, to retain the integrity of

the unit of representation, validity of the division reaches a critical limit when the 'heap' of two grains is equally divided. At this point individual grains can not be characterized as a heap, but only as an entity. Also a further subdivision (*ardhacched*) would also destroy the identity of the entity. It is also unacceptable because a broken grain does not represent the entity of our concern. Of course, if one chooses to do so the concern would shift to the next level of hierarchy as the powdered grain. In short, a class can not be represented by only one entity, and if such a singular entity is postulated it is likely to be unreal and paradoxical.

Looking into the viable parts. Dissection of reality through the medium of language is a form of reductionism. However a word string communicates the message that is lost as soon as the string is altered. Of course, common languages have built in redundancy. For example, a herd of cows can be divided until only one cow remains, however to say the least it is also the end of its genetic future. Also a cow can not be viewed as mere sum of its parts. Reconstruction of the viable whole from the identified parts necessarily requires more than a sum of the parts. It also requires bringing together the parts in a definite order and relations. To reconstruct a step in the hierarchy of part it is necessary to invoke synthesis. An understanding of how parts come together in the whole is critical for ascertaining the viability and validity of the entity. Until then it is prudent to entertain the possibility that we may not have all the necessary information about all the parts, or the conception of the way in which the whole is put together from the parts. Until the dawn of the genetic engineering we did not know how to get a viable seed of wheat from the flour.

The paradox of parts and whole is well captured in:

"The parts alone stand out, located thus an so,

But no part-less owner of them is understood at all."

In short, reasoning (*Nay*) is an analytical (*anugam*) guide for thought to discern viable parts of reality (*Satprarupana*) from the world of our concerns. Such interactions with parts also relate to the underlying order, relations, and relevance. For an appreciation of the intent and reach of the analytical processes consider the concept space of other terms with *anu* prefix:

Anubhag: a component part

Anubhav: experience or observed based on a part of the past happening or event.

Anugam: analytical and criteria based approach.

Anugrah: insistence or to make one feel at home.

Anukampa: empathy (not sympathy or pity) resulting from deeper understanding of the feelings behind an incidence or experience.

Anukaran: mimicry, ritual, doing the way it was done before

Anuman: Measure based on a valid part. (Inference based on evidence; estimate or educated guess based on measure of parts). The *ma* root is for measure as intrinsic in the words like *pariman* (outcome of intention) and *praman* (evidence).

Anumati: concurrence or agreement about a part of the plan.

Anupama: Appropriately measured (balanced) analogy or analog.

Anupat: Ratio and fraction (in relation to the whole).

Anuprekcha: Contemplation, or consideration of parts to arrive at a unified and valid conclusion.

Anurup: Relevant to the form (goal, object, means, device).

Anusar: In detailed accord.

Anushashan: Discipline through the parts (organization)

Anuvad: Paraphrased on the basis of the parts, from the basics, operationally.

Anuyog: device, relation.

Anveshan: probing into or through parts, investigation, research,

and exploration.

Anuvrat: Minor restraints on potentially harmful behaviors

Anuvriti: quirks of habit, tendencies that shape behavior.

Anuyogdwar: (aniyogdwar in #A5) criterion, consideration, or conceptual tool to "open doors."

Anviksiki: Upanishdic and skeptic concerns about the Vedic a priori. Such concerns operating within the Vedic priori are expressed in many narratives, hymns, parables and dialogs of the tradition (-700 to 100c).

The modern Hindi terms for atom (*paramanu*) and molecules (*anu*) have come out of the same concept root that relates to the analytic theme of going back to or coming from the basics or the parts. In the later Jain works the idea of atomic aggregates is developed as *skandh*.

The idea of compound words to convey more than just parts is clear from the range of anu-based words. A systematic construction of key words that relate to the analytic thought process is critical to convey conceptual meaning and nuances that is not always possible even with glossaries and standard encyclopedia.

The part-based or analytic approach appeals to the parts and rations that may not necessarily be independently viable entities and concepts. Also the approach may not necessarily lead to the identifiable unit of ultimate reality. The 'an(u)' root stands for the parts as in the elemental, basic, or microscopic component that has the distinguishing feature of the class. It is certainly not the one of the kind ultimate reality in the tradition of the supreme or omniscient. Also it is not the ultimately reality of the ideas in the Buddhist tradition. Also it can not be argued, as the ancients did, that anu can not exist because such a part-less entity could not stack with other anu. While invoking the idea of polarity to stabilize the conjoined, this argument clearly confuses the idea of spatial asymmetry with the asymmetry of the parts. In short,

individual acts add up to an action where a verb comes into play with reality.

Politics of Parts

In August 1624 by the French Parliamentary order Etienne de Clave was arrested and convicted for proposing a non-Aristotelian theory of elements. It was not about science or the nature of the universe. By invoking that the whole could be broken into parts, those who were in power felt that the idea could be applied to analyze and scrutinize all forms of higher order. So the conviction was about preserving the status-quo of the ideas that empower the authorities. It was not a struggle for “truth” but about the dogmatism of the omniscience to limit the latitudes of human thought.

A critical conceptual insight emerges from the technique of systematic search from the roots, basics and parts. It follows from the curiosity to inquire whether the whole is sum of the parts as such, or if there is an emergent relationship through a hierarchy. Insight lies in the fact that additional properties and behaviors emerge when parts are rearranged and made to work together. This is the idea behind the tools of languages, thoughts, theories of modern science, and machine tools.

Anugam versus Agam. *Anugam* is a directed search for the parts and relations that make up the whole. There is tendency to confuse *anugam* with *agam*. A tradition (*purv* or *puvva*) may precede *anugam*, and *agam* may follow from the *anugam*. *Agam* may have the historical continuity, but *anugam* is about continuity of thought. The distinction is important for contemplation of how integrity of the thought processes is necessary to realize the potential of the prior knowledge. Take a

simple example. If you show a pencil to somebody, with prior (*agam*) knowledge of such an object, this person may immediately recognize it as a pencil. However, this person may not know how to use a pencil, or to use it effectively, or to use it in the most appropriate way to realize its maximum utility as a tool for writing and drawing. A person with knowledge may lack skills to use its tools, criteria, and devices. The problem goes deeper:

(1) Utilitarian criteria for practice of knowledge are critical for its viability and evolution. We may not know that the pencil is useful for writing and drawing on a variety of surfaces, or may not know that there may be other objects that do the job better. Also a pencil could be used for other purposes. Chinese use pencil like objects are used as chop-sticks to eat. Japanese use pins for hair-do. Such uses do not follow or evolve from repetitive (ritualized) practice.

(2) We often explain away things by mindlessly repeating words. Naming and attribution of functions or parts is not enough. Do we know more about a flower if we regurgitate its botanical name or recall names of its parts? Prior knowledge often comes to us in such linear reduced and consolidated forms. For its deeper understand we have to reconstitute it for our own use.

(3) A tradition of scholarship is important. However, to break new ground it has to break away from mere book-keeping or a prescribed path. Incremental improvements come from search along a grid of possibilities as well as from the out-of-box thinking. Ability to break the glass-ceiling (that keeps mind within a grid) comes from a jump in the understanding demanded by practice. For example, an understanding (measure) of quality through classification can be used to develop criteria for specifications to assure the quality.

Take another example to consolidate the argument. It is correct to say that all the living beings are made up of a certain number of molecules (genes) that are genetically predetermined. It

is an established prior knowledge (*agam*) taught in high-schools. We are beginning to genetically tailor living beings. With all the available information we still are far from putting together a living being from the physical parts. What we lack are conceptual parts about what is desirable in a tailored or reconstituted organism. The record of humans is not very good in making such choices. At the present these choices are being made by the market place. I am not sure if we can even agree on what traits make an apple desirable, let alone a human being. It was too late by the time Midas found it out after being turned in gold. In short, we have evolved to change our focus when if necessitated by chance.

Historical uses of the term Jain

The term Jain is clearly mentioned in Sad Darshan Samucchay (ca 500 CE, available on this site) as one of the six prevailing philosophical view points. A book of mathematics (Ganit Saar Sangrah by Mahaveerachary, ca 830 CE) contains many examples and problems of practical interest. In one of the examples it refers to the practitioner of the anugam of Jin as "*jin-anugam-ami*." According to the Sanskrit grammar it can be shortened as *jin-anu-gami*. I believe this is a proper term that goes to the root of the process. *Anugam* is not about belief or faith, but about the practice of the process to find ones own way through shared knowledge. In 1045 CE Jinbhadra used the term Jain for the "followers" of the *Jinver* monks that carried the tradition from Parshvnath (ca. 850 BCE) to Mahaveer and thereafter.

Other terms have also been used which reflect views and beliefs of others. The Vedic hymns call the followers as Arhat. The Aryan migrants called them *nigganth* or without the book. Plurality of the Hindu thought treats Jains as the jin-anuyayi or the "followers of the code proffered by jin." After the integration

of Islam in the Indian culture, the preferred term became *jin-mat-
ablambi*, the adherents of the opinion of jin. With the Christian
world-view of the British Raj, the Western scholars have turned
the *anugam* process into an ism or "religion." Thus the term
Jainism invokes the dogma-based code of conduct. Other terms
with external influences that have crept into the usage to refer to
the Jin monks (jinver) are *nath, prabhu, basudev, tirth, siddh, mukt,
and buddh*.

Connotation of religion, omniscience or dogma
distracts from the *anugam* process. *Anugam* is not about
half-full glass (*agam*). It is about realizing the
(unrealized) potential by finding ways to fill that glass.
Put another way, *anugam* is neither *agam* nor *anukaran*,
nor is it the *anukaran* of the *agam*. Considering the
genesis of the thought and approach it is a misnomer to
call "Jainism" a religion. Certainly, it is not a church or
theistic.

Contents of Volume I

Representation and Quality of Perception

- I-1. What Is Of Interest?
- I-2. In Short, What Is Being About?
- I-3. Critical Contemplation
- I-4. Representation and Abstraction
- I-5. Why Look Back?
- I-6. An Ancient View of Being
- I-7. Processing Reality
- I-8. What Is In An Abstract?
- I-9. What Is in a Word?
- I-10. Defining Coordinates
- I-11. What Is Sensibility?
- I-12. Independence for Survival
- I-13. Is It Sustainable?
- I-14. Ascertaining Nature's Veracity
- I-15. What Is in a Name?
- I-16. Human Natures
- I-17. Contradiction Violates Reality
- I-18. Rationality of Self-Interest
- I-19. Tools for Representation
- I-20. Satprarupana