



CHAPTER II

SRINAD'S AUTHENTIC TREATISE ON SOUL

*

INTRODUCTORY

Philosophers in their search of reality find the self as ultimate. Not only that but they find, either through speculation or through realisation, the self also as having the predominant position in the whole of reality. Dasgupta observes: "In the Upanisads however, the position is entirely changed, and the centre of interest there is not in a creator from outside, but in the self..... The whole quest is of the highest truth, and the true self of man is discovered as the greatest reality." ¹ Srinad concludes on the aim and purpose of scriptures: "The Jin and the self are essentially identical; there is no distinction and difference between them. In order to bring home the fact all the blissful scriptures are said." (S.E.p.659).

So seers and systems-builders, on such a basis of experience and reason, have considered self-knowledge as the first and final requisite of all philosophical knowledge. Srinad Rajchandra on realising its key-position wrote on a self a gospel, called "Ātmāsiddhi-śāstra", the Self-realisation. It has in the main this Upanisadic characteristic mentioned above. So Dr. Sukhlalji Sanghavi rightly calls it Srinad's Ātmapanisad ² 'Self Upanisad'. He writes: "Srinad Rajchandra, in this single small treatise, has shown the necessary complete essence regarding the self." ³ "His present

1. History of Indian Philosophy.

2-3. Prabuddha Jeevan, Vol.I : 17, p.159.

(The Self-Realisation) to the spiritual seeker is more valuable than the lot of literary books given by hundreds of scholars. From hundreds of years on, there are being written many Siddhi-granthas by different sects for expounding their own sect and system of thought. 'Sarvartha-siddhi' has been written not only by the Jaina-acaryas alone, but also by the non-jaina acaryas regarding their own sects. Vedant scriptures like 'Brahma Siddhi', and others are well-known; 'Naishkarmya Siddhi' 'Ishvar Siddhi' too are well-known. Sarvajna Siddhi is written in the Jaina, Buddha and many other schools. But when I compare all those 'siddhis' with Sri Rajchandra's Atmasiddhi, I find the vast difference between them regarding their inspiring view point (source), though there is similarity of the word 'Siddhi' among them. The above stated and other siddhis establish (expound) particular subject by argument and disprove according to their own system of thought the opponent's view by logic and dialectic. In fact, such darshanika siddhis are written on the strength of logic and dialectic, but there is hardly seen the mighty force of self-realisation or spiritual transcendence at the basis providing the backing; while the pattern of this Atmasiddhi is altogether a different one. It being the outcome of the experience from the very depths of his ~~his~~ own life, is not merely a logical conclusion, but it seems to me a realisation, a conviction arrived at from the very experience of the self Jiva-Siddhi (soul-exposition) has been expounded and written by many acaryas long before Srimalad. But in them there is hardly felt such a force as the said Atmasiddhi has.¹

"The thought that seems scattered in various ways in the Prakrit scriptures like the Acharanga, the Sutrakrtanga, the Uttaradhyayana and the

1. Prabuddha Jeevan, Vol.I:17, p.159.

Pravacarsa, the Saṅgasa, the thought that is expounded logically in the Candharvāda and which has been more supported in the spiritual books like that of Ācārya Haribhadra ^{or} Yashobhadra - the very thought in its completeness has been so naturally woven into this self-realization that the reader finds a key to the contemplation of the books of the past ācāryas. The arguments regarding the existence of the soul given by Shankarācārya and Vyāsa and others are seen in this Ātmasiddhi. But I do feel that Śrīmad has not composed it on mere scriptural reading. But he has stated the conviction reached through experience, which is the result of his search for the clear and deep conviction of the self as an ardent soul-seeker, the result of his sādhanā and penance he underwent. From one topic to the other, from the other ^{to} the third, and so on, in such a way ^{that} all (its) has been so harmoniously linked together that there is found nothing unnecessary, that there is left out nothing necessary, and it never goes astray. So the 'Self-Realization' of Śrīmad Rajachandra really turns out a scripture of metaphysical principles, a statute book. In the Self-Realization Śrīmad Rajachandra has discussed six topics, in the main, regarding the soul.....He has so powerfully and harmoniously established the ground, and has concluded so naturally and mildly and yet in so authentic a tone, that it turns out to be a completely coherent scripture". ¹ Śrīmad himself has stated in it : "all the six systems of philosophy are comprised within these six doctrines. Thinking then explicitly all doubts are dispelled."² (A.S. 126).

1. Ibid.

2. S.R. p. 555.

Śrinādi's treatise has maintained a thoroughly rational exposition of the topics in so simple and straightforward a style with precise and unique treatment of the subject that it turns out by itself a highly intelligible system of thought on self, rather a system of philosophy.

The six fundamental truths or principles regarding the soul (self):

He lays six fundamental truths regarding the self and gives a systematic argument for their validity. Rationally they have their own order : 1. There exists the soul. 2. The soul is eternal. 3. The soul is the agent (doer) of his acts. 4. The soul undergoes the results thereof. 5. The soul can be liberated, and there is the state of liberation. 6. There are means of liberation.

On reading these six fundamental, yet none the less final, truths we are reminded of the wisdom of Gautam Buddha, who laid four fundamental truths. In Buddha's exposition there is practical wisdom and a realistic approach, in Śrinādi's exposition there is metaphysical basis, insight into the ultimate reality and spiritual approach. So with substance and structure of its own, it has a grandeur of spiritualistic system of philosophy on realistic lines of thought. It has gripped the whole of philosophy from its centre, as we saw the self as ultimate in the field.

Let us see the topics, the six fundamental truths, one by one and try to realize their worth and validity, their significance and status in the system as a whole.

1. EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL.

Dr. D. M. Dutta and Dr. S.C. Chatterjee observe : "almost every work of the other schools states, for refutation, the materialistic views."¹ thought tried to meet the Cārvāka objection and made "Every system of Indian Cārvāka a touchstone of its theories."² Philosophy, as critical speculation, claims to live chiefly on free thought and the more it can satisfy the sceptic, the sounder can it hope to be."³ S'rinid too has stated the views of the sceptic. But for that he has some broader outlook and substantial reasons. In the philosophical search, he himself has gone through heart-searching experience. While sketching out his precise auto-biography, he writes : " I have had in that young age all those various thoughts of the kind that the great philosophers and the great sceptics have inculcated. I have cherished the thoughts of expansion, cherished by the supreme emperors, and the thoughts of renunciation, desirousness, cherished by the the selfless sages. I have extremely thought over the realization of (divinity) immortality and momentariness. In a small age I have thought over great thoughts."⁴ " In this body (life) I have undergone two important births, and lot of insignificant ones. In younger age my immature mind was haunted by great visions, God knows wherefrom they sprang. The desire for happiness was none the less limited, and that too was more or less of enjoyments of royal palaces and parks, female charms and fertile farms. The great vision was about the quest for the reality of all these around.

1. An introduction to Indian Philosophy. p. 57.

2.- 3. Ibid p. 69.

4. S.N. p. 203.

And once that vision took such a shape (form) that I became of the view that there there is nothing like rebirth, sin or sanctity that to live at ease and enjoy life is its ultimate goal. Hence, not bothering about anything else I brushed off all pious wishes. And faith or feeling for any religion disappeared. But after a lapse of time something happened so strange therefrom, which I expected not, nor was on my part then, any conscious effort for that; yet all of a sudden the change took place. I had a strange (wonderful) experience, which can hardly be found spelled in scriptures, and which is beyond the imagination of a materialist. Step by step it heightened and thereby at present it fondly utters, "None but Thyself, Thyself alone - Tūhi, Tūhi."¹

This shows that life presented him the problems, and in them he took living interest. And that is why as a system-builder he surveys them all. Elsewhere, while writing on the *Dravyasamgraha*, he notes : "The system of philosophy that are based on the principle and critique of reality and on that very basis preach the path of Salvation are six : 1. Bauddha 2. Sākhya 3. Nyāya. 4. Jain. 5. Mīmāṃsaka and 6. Vaiśeṣika. If Vaiśeṣika is comprised within the Nyāya Nyāya, then can the Cārvāka that stands for sceptical thought be considered the sixth."² "According to the above-stated order these systems are taken into consideration on the basis of the various thought-levels, so this very order is proper."³

1. S.R. p. 197.

2-3. S.R. p. 582.

Śrīmad first of all gives antithetical views on every fundamental truth and then tries to remove the doubts about it with a convincing argument. Śrīmad has expressed the antithetical views in a simple straightforward manner in the form a dialogue between the soul-seeker and his master.

The Disciple's Argument : His Nāstika Stand :

In the first step the disciple in his quest takes a stand of almost a nāstika. He represents the Cārvāka, the materialist, the empiricist and the sceptic.

Let us take the disciple's argument point by point.

(1) "They say of soul, but the soul is not seen. It never comes in sight. As an existing thing it must have some form. But no form of it is perceived by any of the senses. Nor any other experience of the soul is available. So there exists no soul as such. It is neither perceived nor known. Nor is it experienced in any way. So there is not at all the existence of the soul." (A.S. 45).

(2) And yet, as it is insisted upon that there is soul, then "the body itself must be the soul, or the senses or the breath. It is vain to believe it separate or distinct, as there is distinct sign or indication of it." (A.S.46).

(3) "If at all the soul is really an existing thing, why is it not known? If it exists, then it should be seen and known as pots or body and clothes. But it is neither seen nor known nor experienced in any way." (A.S.47).

(4) "So, to conclude, there is no soul, and vain are the attempts at salvation and futile are the means for it. Kindly show me the right remedy to remove the inner doubt." (A.S.48).

The disciple is not a confirmed sceptic. Though he represents Sceptic's views he is not propagating any 'ism'. He is a true seeker. Hence he requests for the right remedy of his inner doubts about soul's existence.

Here in his doubts about soul's existence are revealed various viewpoints. Let us explicitly take the points of the argument and see their implication. The disciple seems to base his quest on epistemological grounds.

His empirical viewpoint :

He starts with the commonsense approach to the problem. His quest at first is empirical. Sense-perception (Indriya Pratyaksha) is his criterion.

Against Upanisadic belief :

1) So he says that the soul is neither seen nor perceived by any of the senses. He wants to realize the soul by some form as well, for some Upanisads state soul having particular form like 'atom' 'thumb', 'rice' or 'paw' or as 'the extreme limit of all forms'. Scientists have tried to find the soul by dissection and various experiments but they failed, as it has no form as such. The germ-cells having almost every possible similarity of form, structure and surrounding develops to be highly different from one another, so the biologists conclude that there is something formless behind the simplest form and structure that takes initiative in selection and rejection from

the surrounding and its adaptation for development. In short, it is beyond any physical form or structure.

Against Sāṅkhya principle :

The Sāṅkhya assumes not only the proximity of the puruṣa to buddhi, but also the reflection (roopa through reflection) of puruṣa in buddhi. We cognise the conscious occurrence even as we see the face reflected in a mirror. Only in this way can consciousness have a vision of itself. We find that this view of 'chicchāyāpatti' is rejected by the pupil, as the pupil says no such form of the soul as original or reflected is seen.

Doubt in the Vedānt and the Jainism :

Thus not satisfied with sense perception (i.e. pratyakṣa Pramāṇa) he turns to anubhava pramāṇa, intuition, as Vedānta and Jainism, call it a matter of experience. But he finds no experience of the self as such, and concludes its non-existence. It is stated in the Jaina philosophy that the states of knowledge, perception and experience reveal the existence (presence) of the soul. The disciple tries to find it through all of them, but mistakes them! Thus he comes to the conclusion that neither by perception nor by experience the existence of the soul can be proved.

Against Naiyāyik's belief :

Some Naiyāyikas believe that the soul can be felt by mental perception. It is perceived as a knowing, feeling and doing agent. It has these qualities of knowing, feeling and doing. It is the cognitive and conative agent. But in disciple's opinion functions are done by the body, senses

and the breath, and no separate evidence for the non-material substance like soul is at hand. So the disciple takes a straight step to conclude that the soul may be nothing but the body or the senses or the breath.

Evolution of thought regarding the soul traced :

Here, some stage in the evolution of thought regarding the soul are represented in the argument of the disciple. It reminds us of the Tasc'ha-rivavāda and Bhutātavāda, illustrated in the Jain scripture Sutrakṛ-tāṅga of Mahāvīra : "From top to toe the body itself is the soul. It lasts so far as the body lasts and vanishes with the body.....So there is no soul separate or distinct from the body. Ask them, those who state them as separate, whether it is short or long, round or square..... black or white, red or pale, fragrant or pungent, sweet or bitter..... soft or rough.....heavy or light. Nobody can show the soul distinct from body as the sword from the scabbard....." "In the world there are five main elements (mahābhūta) only. All things up to trifle can be shown composed of them. They are earth, nature, light, air and space (Ākāśa) . All the things are composed by their coming together. But nobody has created or composed them. They are beginningless and imperishable.....They are free and eternal. By their coming together in the form of a body out of those five elements the soul has come into existence and it vanishes when the body vanishes. (In reality ~~and it is not distinct from the five elements~~ it is not distinct from the five elements). All things and beings, the whole world is composed of the five elements and those five elements are the means of the world - affairs." So they conclude "Caitanya-viśiṣṭa deha eva ātma. In their opinion consciousness being the by-product

of matter no soul is there apart from the body, and it is not in the least a non-material or spiritual substance.

The body is undoubtedly the means of activities and the source of energy. Yet it cannot know. The soul is conscious and is the knower. So body cannot be called the soul. So there must be something to account for knowledge and thereby stand as the soul. And for that the disciple forwards the case of senses. We perceive through the senses; so the senses are soul. There are beings with one, two, three, four or five senses and with the increase of senses they have increasing capacity of knowledge. More senses, wider the knowledge and higher the being. So it is natural that the one may happen to conclude that the senses are the forms of soul, that the soul is manifested in the senses. Living beings are also found generally classified according to the number of senses they possess. Senses are the natural evidence for the classification of living beings in general. Thus by the commonsense view one may take senses for the soul, and be led to believe them to be the soul.

But this is not so much convincing. There are states like dreaming and sleeping, when senses are not working, when they are at rest or inert, and yet life prevails and consciousness of those very states is experienced. The disciple gives the evidence of the breath, for there the breath survives the senses. It is ever continuous. The dead is breathless and living is ever-breathing. So breath being the final sign of life, it should rather be taken as soul.

Here the disciple takes a logical stand and tries the inference (anumāna pramāṇa). There is always an evident sign for every existing thing. It has some mark of an identity. So also the soul should have evident mark. Every living being is found with some activity or movement, with some sense for perception and with breath for life. So it is evident that the movement, sense-perception and breath are marks of animate beings. As no other mark except these three is seen, it is delusion and therefore, futile to believe the soul as a separate entity therefrom. In the Taittiriya Upanishad Varuna teaches Dhṛgu to realise self progressively :- "ādhiti Bhagavo brahmeti, tasmā etat praveśa, annam, prāṇam, cakṣuḥ, śrotram, vāca, vāca, iti," and the soul-seeker Dhṛgu is stated to believe :- "annam hi Brahmeti vyaśaṇāt, annādhyeva khalv iśāni bhūtāni jāyante, annena jātāni jivanti, annam prayanty, abhisamvśanti."¹ "Prāṇo brahmeti vyaśaṇāt prāṇa eva khalv iśāni bhūtāni jāyante, prāṇena jātāni jivanti, prāṇam prayanty abhisamvśanti."² There is also an other Upanishadic statement regarding prāṇa's universality : "Prāṇo va idam sarvaṃ bhūtaṃ yadidaṃ kin ca taṃ eva tat prapatsi."

(3) But here the disciple, though trying the three sources of knowledge the sense-perception, the intuition or experience, and the inference, fails to recognize soul, as he takes a positivist stand. And finally concludes like a positivist that if there be soul really an existing thing why can it not be known as pet and cloth, for all systems call it a substance having some qualities innate or accidental.

1-2. Dr. Radhakrishnan : Principal Upanishads, p. 554.

(4) Finding soul as non-existent he sees no justification for the means of liberation. Thus with a doubt about soul's existence he resorts to the first yet final source of knowledge, the testimony, 'Āpta Pramāṇa'; and requests his master to show him the right remedy to remove the inner doubt.

The reply and the refutations .

So the Master replies:

(1) It is by the body-infatuation, that the soul seemed same as the body; but both of them are distinct, and can be realised as such from their evident characteristics. (A.S.49)

It is by the body-infatuation that the soul seemed identical with the body, but both of them are as distinct as a sword and its sheath. (A.S.50)

(2) The seer of the sight, the knower of the form and the abiding experience that stands as ultimate is verily the soul. (A.S.51)

(3) Each of the senses has on its part knowledge of its own objects (scope or field of a subject matter). But the soul has the knowledge of the objects perceived by all the five senses. (A.S.52)

(4) The body cannot know the soul: Neither the senses, nor the breath (prāṇa) can know it. On the contrary they function only by the power and the presence (Satatā) of the soul. (A.S.53)

(5) In all the states the soul seems unique by itself as self-manifest and ever conscious - that verily is ever its distinctive mark (A.S.54)

(6) You know the body and the clothes, and therefore you believe them as really existent; while you don't believe in the existence of the knower himself. (But nothing can be known without the knower). Then what can be said of your knowledge ? (A.S.55)

(7) Supreme intelligence is found in the thin-bodied^{the} and fat are found with bare intelligence. If body were the soul no such contrary facts would have happened at all. (A.S.56)

(8) The sentient (chetan) and the non-sentient (jada) have absolutely distinct natures of their own. They can never be one. For all the three times both of them stand as distinct as ever. (A.S.57)

(9) The soul itself doubts its existence. The doubter himself is verily the soul. It is surpassingly surprising ! (A.S.58)

The self delusion: its roots: The Metaphysical explanation:

In the first point of the master's statement Srined takes us to the root of self-delusion and provides for it a metaphysical explanation. The self-delusion i.e. taking the self same as the body is a fact. It must have some 'substantial' background. The soul has been in bondage for the infinite past, and it has undergone infinite births. So it is ever with the body, one or the other. It has been always in the embodied state. So it has been suffering from the body-infatuation, which is the background for self-delusion. Srined notes on the first page of his memo-book "The Original (natural) form of the pure 'afatik' gem (crystal) escapes recognition and remains unrevealed, as the other colour (of the object nearby) is reflected therein, so also this pure and crystalline soul does not realize its own

nature under selfsame super-imposition (infatuation) caused by its association with the other. In a somewhat different form Jaina, Vedant, Sāṅkhya and others state the same." (S.R.p.769). "Vijñābhikṣu^{na} quotes a verse of Surya-purana to the effect 'as a pure crystal is observed by people to be red on account¹ of the superimposition of some red-coloured stuff so is the great puruṣa.' In the Būddha philosophy it is called ignorance i.e. 'avidyā', abiding in the consciousness in body-mind (nāma rūpa) organism of man, and ignorance is the root cause of rebirth. In Jainism it is called innate delusion i.e. 'Agrhita Mithyatva' caused by the beginningless association of the soul with the matter. In Vedanta it is called bhrānti or avidyā caused by the association of the self with māyā. In Sāṅkhya Yoga it is called 'avidyā' or 'aviveka' i.e. non-discrimination between the self and the notself and in the Nyāya Vaiśeṣika it is called mithyā jñāna i.e. illusion, caused by the association of the self with the matter.

The key to pierce through the self-delusion due to body-infatuation:

Now this self-delusion, bhrānti or avidyā is a type of ignorance. It can be removed by knowledge or 'vivekajñāna', discrimination which according to its name distinguishes between the two; the self and the notself, the soul and the body. How can one distinguish between the two ? By taking into consideration the distinctive characteristics of the two. Śrīmad states that the distinction of the two can be realised from their evident characteristics. Śrīmad appeals: "Think even for a moment of the soul that ever manifests itself with the characteristic consciousness.(chaitanya)."

1. Dr. Radhakrishnan: Indian Philosophy, Vol.2, p.267.

"In all the countless months, years and eons past and to come, what does not arise or set, that is the one luminous consciousness." ¹ (no¹eti nāstas¹eti esa sarvā eka avayam prabha). In all the six systems of philosophy the characteristic of soul is stated one way or other as consciousness. The differentia of soul (Jiva) is consciousness - 'Upayog lakṣaṇam'. ² In the Sutrakṛtāṅg too its characteristic is stated to be consciousness: 'Ātmanah upayoga lakṣaṇasya.' In ^aŚūdrha philosophy we can consider vijñāna i.e. consciousness the source of life for the body-mind (nāma rupa) organism, and can take it as soul in its momentary aspect. Yogācāra or Vijñānavādiṇa consider 'vijñāna' as real and the material world as unreal. Both Vaiśeṣika and Sautrāntikā believe mental and non-mental as real. Sūnyavādiṇa too accept the 'vijñāna' as an entity, but as everything being momentary, in their view, nothing remains as lasting or real. In Nyāya Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṃsā soul is not consciousness itself, but it is believed to have consciousness as an attribute, and every embodied soul has consciousness, a prominent attribute, no doubt. Soul in alone is an abode of consciousness. In Sāṅkhya Yoga consciousness is considered the very essence of soul. It is not merely a quality that may come and go. It is its very nature. In Vedānta consciousness is the quality of the soul, though the soul owes its existence to the Brahman the cosmic soul. Thus in every system of Indian Philosophy we find consciousness as an evident mark or characteristic of the soul; and if that mark is recognised, one would find soul distinct from the body, as the sword from the sheath.

1. Dr. Radhakrishnan: The Brahma Sutra, p. 123.

2. 'The Sarvartha Siddhi': 11,8.

The Empiricist is not on his own ground:

Now, by the second point, the master meets commonsense empiricist on his own ground and scores finality of soul's existence from his (empiricist's) very argument. On empiricist's empirical stand, it is argued that the soul never comes in sight and no form of it is ever known, nor any other experience as such is available for its evidence. To this the master retorts that the very seer of the sight, that the very knower of the form, is itself the soul. Soul is not the object of the sight. It is not the object of perception. "Vijñātāram are kena janiyat?" It is impossible to deny the seer-cum-knower (jñātā-dreṣṭā), when one himself claims seeing and knowing. Consciousness functions as 'jñāna-darśana', and it stands a proven fact now. In all acts of perception in all attempts at knowing and seeing, there must pre-exist the knower, the seer. No knower, no knowledge; no seer, no perceiving. And regarding the experience, the soul itself is the ultimate basis of all experiences. If one tries to negate oneself one can never for a moment do it. One can negate the senses, can negate the mind and breath by stopping them functioning, but still one would feel conscious of one's own self and that very consciousness prevailing is naturally the experience of the self which is ultimate.

Anubhavgamyatva of the self - views of the 'Sāḍ darśanas' stated:

According to Jainism self or soul manifests itself in knowing, perceiving and experiencing. It functions as jñāna-darśana-cāritra. Regarding soul every system (darśana) states that it is realized through experience, 'anubhavgamyatva'. According to Nyāya, internal perception provides evidence for the self. Soul is clearly felt existent in everpresent egoistic feeling

of 'I am'. Nobody ever feels or experiences his non-existence. According to Vaiśeṣika soul is perceived by 'antahkarana', an internal sense or organ. Sankhya maintains that the existence of the soul is a matter of everybody's experience. Feeling of one's existence is the most natural and indubitable experience of everyone. Soul is experienced as reflected in the antahakarana in every instance of perception. According to the Yoga philosophy the individual or the empirical soul is ever a matter of experience, in the sense of ego, that everyone always feels 'asmittā' however gross an experience may be, it is the experience of the self. According to Mīmāṃsā the soul is always experienced as the subject (the knower) of knowledge in every act of knowledge, or, in a sense there is always felt a prevailing sense of self-consciousness. In view of Sankara, "Every one is conscious of the existence of his own self and no one thinks 'I am not'. - Sarvo hy ātmāntītvam prayeti; na nāhaṁ asmitti."¹ "We cannot think away the self, for there is no consciousness or experience possible apart from it."² "Ātmanah avaprakāśatvam ko nivārayitum kramah?" Sankara holds that we can experience the soul if we strip it off of all contents of experience. For "Ya eva hi nirākarta tad eva tasya svarūpena."³ The experience that remains ultimate is verily the self itself, as Śrīmad states.

The disciple, in his first and second points, insists on senses as the source of knowledge. And taking senses as the source of knowledge, empiricism has given rise to sensationalism, phenomenism and the positivism. At the

1. S.B. 11.1

2. Dr. Radhakrishnan: Indian Philosophy, Vol.2, p.476.

3. Ibid, Sankara is quoted.

hands of sensationalism mind becomes passive and is reduced to a series of sense-impressions; so the subject becomes passive and momentary and loses its status of an initiator and controller. This paves the way for phenomenalism, and we are denied any access beyond it. Thus we lose both the realities, subjective as well as the objective. Buddhism is almost akin to these two ideas and maintains 'śūnyavāda' - practically metaphysical and epistemological nihilism. Positivism takes sense-perception as the only source of knowledge, as it gives the positive experience of the reality - only the external reality.

So the master states that each of the senses has knowledge of its own field, one cannot encroach upon an other's field of knowledge; while the soul has knowledge of all the fields of all the five senses. (A.C.52). This proves that there is something behind the senses as the source of knowledge and proves inadequacy of sensationalism and phenomenalism, senses being only the means of knowledge. For, in the next point the master already states that senses work under the sway of the self. Thus the master proves on the one hand the reality of the external world as the object of knowledge, and on the other hand the reality of the self as the subject of knowledge, while the senses function as the means of knowledge. Dasgupta puts, for the existence of the self, the similar argument of the Nyāya system thus: "It is said that each of the senses is associated with its own object, but there must exist some other entity in us which gathered together the different sense-cognition and produced the perception of the total object as distinguished from the separate sense-perceptions." Thus at the basis of the phenomenon of sense-

1. Indian Philosophy, p.298.

perception there is soul, the experience, nonetheless positive than the external sense-objects. And finally, "knowledge belongs to the self and not to the senses or the object, for even when the things (and senses) are destroyed knowledge remains."¹

Materialistic stand refuted: (a) epistemologically:

As the disciple, not finding any evidence for the soul, concludes that either the body, senses or the breath must be the soul, the master explains that they function only under the ^a sway of the soul. The explanation has double implications: one, epistemological; other metaphysical. Both are hinted at in the following observation by Radhakrishnan "Each function and faculty, the gross body and the vital breath, the senses and the internal organ, the empirical 'me' appear only on the basis of and in relation to the ātman. They all serve an end beyond themselves and depend on some deeper ground of existence."² Again, to make it clear: "The mind and the understanding are not self-sufficient. The activities of these organs demand in addition upalabdhī,³ which belongs to the ātman, whose very nature is eternal knowledge."

We considered above the epistemological aspect of the point. There it is maintained that the body, senses and the breath (the vital) function as the means of knowledge, and at their basis works the power of the soul, which is distinct from them all. All the Indian systems, except the Cārvāka, state the soul distinct from the body, senses and the breath, and in the phenomenon of knowledge consider as the factor either the presence or the power of the soul. So Śrīmad has used the word 'satatā' which means both the presence and the power.

1. Dasgupta: Indian Philosophy, p.300

2. Indian Philosophy, p.476.

3. Ibid, p.481.

(b) Metaphysically

In the metaphysical implication we can state to the effect that the body, the senses and the vital owe their formation and functioning to the soul. According to the ^ABuddha philosophy, in the chain of causation the six organs of cognition, the five senses and means depend for their existence on the body-mind organism (nama-rupa), which constitute the perceptible being of man.¹ This organism owes its existence and functioning to the consciousness (vijñāna). According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophies, soul is distinct from the body, senses and the mind, and in ignorance (i.e. aithyājñāna) is running the activity and undergoes rebirth. Though the soul is unconscious by nature it being the abode of consciousness is conscious in the state of bondage i.e. in its empirical state. Hence he is responsible for his lot, birth and activities therein run by himself.

The Sāṅkhya and the Yoga believe that 'prakṛti' is unconscious but active, and the body, senses and mind are manifestations of 'prakṛti' are quite distinct from the conscious self, but that these manifestations of 'prakṛti' are the result of union or combination of 'prakṛti' with the 'puruṣa'. Without 'puruṣa', prakṛti' alone cannot manifest as such. So presence of 'puruṣa' is a necessity in her evolution into the world. According to the Mīmāṃsā philosophy soul is distinct from the body, senses and the breath, and the soul gets embodied as the result of his actions, and they serve as the fruition of his actions of the past birth. The energy of the soul causes the movement of the body. According to the Vedānta, the soul is distinct from the body, senses and the breath, though they derive their existence from the

1. Dutta and Chatterjee: An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, p.125.

brahman. Soul in the state of illusion, though itself in fact the brahman, is the cause of the birth and thereby that of body, senses, and breath, the sheaths of the individual self or soul.

The appeal of the master "to know" the body, senses, and the breath as functioning by the presence of power of the soul has the broader import. It means to know that by experience and inference, as well as on testimony (authority of the master and scriptures). So it would be proper to substantiate the statement with inference ~~also~~ too. In Candharvāda we find the existence of the soul proved through inference. Accordingly it is a principle that there must be some agent behind the formation of some particular form having a beginning. Body has some particular form as the pot, so there must be some conscious agent like soul for its formation."¹ The means (Kāraṇa, the tools) too must have some agent or director (adhisthātā), so the senses being means or tools there must be some directing agent like the soul to make them function." According to Cārvāka the body is the means for enjoyment; then it implies some ^e enjoyer, and it is the soul.²

Soul's unique and over distinct characteristic mark :

The disciple when concludes that the soul is nothing else but the body, senses or the breath, on finding himself at a loss to have any

1. Dehāsatthi vidhātā patinīyatākārato ghāṭasēva, Akkhaṇaṃ ca

Kāraṇato dandatīnaṃ kulalo vva. St. 1367, Candharvad.

2. Bhottā dehādīnāṃ bhojjattānto nara vva bhāttasēva. St. 1569. Candharvad.

distinct mark of the soul available, the master states it distinct from them all and then shows its distinct mark. He states that "The soul ever seems distinct and separate in all its states by virtue of its ever self-luminous consciousness, which is its unique mark. By the law of its being it is ever shining." "Ātmanah svaprakāśatvan ko nivārayitum ā kasmah? The essential nature of the soul is self-luminosity." "Svayam jyotisvarūptvāt."¹

"In ordinary usage we regard mental states as subjective and physical states as objective. But from the metaphysical point of view both orders of phenomena, material and mental, are equally objective." "Na esa neti sthā."² It is distinct even from the ego sense (ahankāra). It is true self-consciousness (here ahankara) precedes activity, but it is not the self, since it is not antecedent to knowledge, as it is an object of knowledge. "Ahankarapurvakam api kartṛtvam nopalbhdhir bhavitum arhati, ahankarasyapi, upalabhyamāntvāt" (S.B. 11.3.40) By this witnessing characteristic of the soul we can know it as ultimate and in a sense as absolute.

Its root is the very nature of soul :

This has some metaphysical ground - "Even when the object of knowledge

~~is~~

1. Radhakrishnan, S.B. 1.3.32 Quoted in I.P. * Shāṅkara Bhāṣya

2. Dr. Radhakrishnan : Indian Philosophy, Vol. 2, p. 477.

alters, the knower does not alter; for he is in the past, present and future, as his essence is eternally present—'sarvadā vartamāna evabhāva-
-atvāt.' (S.B. 11.5.7). It is known to exist on account of its immediate
presentation —'aparokṣtvā ca pratyakṣaṁ pratyagūtaṁ prasīdhan'.

Consciousness of the soul has double aspect : it illuminates itself as well as others — 'eva-para-prakāśa'. Śrīmad calls this consciousness an self-evident mark of the soul.¹ By virtue of such an evident quality "how can one remain hidden from himself?"² In Candāharvāda there is stated the doubt of Gaṇṇa that there being no proof (pramāṇa) available for the soul's existence soul is not existing at all. And Śrī Mahāveerdeo refutes it by saying that for the self-evident soul, other proofs are unnecessary. Mahāveerdeo very logically states that as there is no proof that can refute the evident self-consciousness or self-luminosity, there is no problem of disproving it. The knowledge of the feeling of the egosense is evidently a matter of everyone's experience. It is not a product of logic, it being above mark (lingatva), nor it is a form of testimony. It is rooted in experience and there the distinctness of the self is felt very clearly. Descartes writes :
" I am not the assemblage of members called the human body; I am not a thin and perfect-rating air diffused through all these members, or wind, or faint flame, or vapour, or breath, or any of all the things I can imagine, for I supposed that all these were not, and without changing the supposition I find that I still feel assured of my existence."³

1. S. R. p. 394.

2. S.R. p. 436.

3. O'Neill Readings in Epistemology, p. 79.

Thus the soul is felt distinct from its surroundings and the empirical states, it undergoes. If we look to its peculiar nature then we would find out through our ordinary experience that the soul is conscious of its inner as well as outer activities. Soul as we have observed is distinct from the egoistic states that we feel. There it works as a witness. This is due to its *svaprahāṇatā*. But this function of witnessing is misunderstood by the Vedantins and has been taken as a distinct self within the self and is called the witnessing self and then it is identified as universal ~~was~~ soul or Brahman which they say underlies all beings.

This witnessing element of consciousness has metaphysical ground in the nature of the substance itself. The substance in its process of manifestation undergoes changes of states; formal changes, but remains the same substantially. The soul being conscious that permanent substantial element serves as a basis and functions as witness to the formal changes it undergoes. So in all the states it maintains its constant distinctness as a witness. And on this is accountable the distinctness felt or experienced through different states by the saints and seers. To quote St. Augustine : "Step by step was I led upwards, from bodies to the soul which perceives by means of the bodily senses; and thence to the soul's inward faculty which is the limit of the intelligence of animals; and thence again to the reasoning faculty to whose judgement

is referred the knowledge received by the bodily senses. And when this also within me found changeable it lifted itself up to its own intelligence and withdrew its thoughts from experience, abstracting itself from the contradictory throng of sense images that it might find what that light was wherein it was bathed, when it cried out that beyond all doubt the unchangeable is to be preferred to the changeable; whence also it knew that unchangeable; and thus with the flash of one trembling glance it arrived at that which is."¹

Positive ground of all knowledge :

And now by the next point the master reveals the positive ground of all objective knowledge. Knowledge is valid on the evidence of the knower itself. Without the knower the knowledge itself is groundless. Therefore, the master questions the very validity of knowledge itself, when the disciple denies the existence of the knowing self and accepts the objects of knowledge as existents. He questions the disciple : "You know the pot and the cloth and therefore you believe them to be existent and yet you don't recognise or believe in the knower, (thy own self within) then what should be said of your knowledge? (A.S. 55) Surely when the very basis of the knowledge is denied it cannot on its part claim any validity. Knower is the most positive factor in the phenomenon of knowledge. The knower himself functions or manifests as knowledge. "Ātmanah evaprakāśatvam ko nivārayitum kashah?" Ś'rīmad

1. Confessions VII, 23.

puts the fact thus : "It is impossible that any knower would know any object in his own absence. First there needs be his own presence, and in taking, leaving and non-attachm^{nt} knowing of anything he himself is verily the cause or basis. In the acceptance of another thing, in even the slightest knowledge of it, the thing which exists first and on the basis of which it (acceptance of knowledge) can happen, such a first and foremost the most precedent substance is the soul. It is impossible to know anything, if anybody wants to know it by removing the self i.e. without the self; it is only on its ultimateness that anything else can be known. That substance in which lies such a characteristic of an evident ^{immediate} ultimateness ^{of priority} (pragat urdhavate dharma) is called by Sri Tirthankara the soul."¹

"The very existence of understanding and its functions presupposes an intelligence, known as the self, which is different from them, which is self-established and which they subserve,"² "All means of knowledge (pramanas) exist only as dependent on self-experience, and since such experience is its own proof, there is no necessity for proving the existence of the self,"³ "It cannot be proved, since it is the basis of all proof and is established prior to all proof".⁴ *Atmā tu pramāṇādi vyavahar-āśrayatvāt prāg eva pramāṇādivyavahārāt mīddhyati.* (S.B. 11.3.7).

1. S.R. p. 360.

2. S.B. II, 3.7, 1.3.22.

3. Dr. Radhakrishnan : Indian Philosophy, p. 476.

4. Ibid, p. 477.

So we have to take it for granted. Prof. Ayer writes for the quest of certainty : "If the validity of every proof had to be proved in its turn, we should fall into infinite regress." If the soul, the source of all knowledge and ultimate ground of all validity is not recognized and not taken for granted no knowledge can claim validity and certainty or even relativity and valuation.

Belief and knowledge :

Here in this stanza (A.S. 55) S'rined has taken the point of belief together with knowledge : "You know the pot and the cloth, the body and the clothes and believe them to be existent and yet you do not believe their knower, thy own self within, then what can be said of your knowledge? On what grounds can it be called valid?" If in every act of knowledge and every conscious activity one feels the evident presence of one's own self - the conscious knower. And yet one, while believing in the objects of knowledge and in their existence and taking such knowledge to be true does not believe in the knower. So here some phenomenon or fact of mistaking something for something different is responsible. With knowledge it is all right; for it reveals the knower and its presence is evidently felt; but it is mistaken for the other. So the wrong belief pollutes the knowledge. A.J. Ayer writes : "There is nothing fallible about experience. What may be wrong is only one's identification of it. If an experience is mis-identified, one will be misled into thinking that some

state has been verified when it is not."¹ In Jainism 'right belief' or 'right faith' i.e. *samyag darsana* is given a prominent position, which is significant of this fact. Knowledge by itself is always right but the wrong belief makes it fallible. With right belief knowledge is right. So the master has questioned the disciple on the point of belief.

For doing away with the wrong belief, that twists or mistakes the knowledge or experience in its interpretation or identification, there requires discrimination (*viveka*). Hence the appeal to reason, and reason takes into consideration the characteristic marks (*lakṣaṇa*) of things for their distinction. In order to do away with the wrong belief i.e. of taking body for the soul, the master, having given an instance of supreme intelligence in thin-bodied and of dance being fat, argues that if the body were the soul such a contrary incident would not happen at all. (A.S. 56). And with the next point he posits the metaphysical principle-Self i.e. the conscious (*chetan*); and metaphysical principle, Self i.e. conscious (*chetan*) and the non-conscious (*Jada*) have evidently distinct nature, and they have never become one, but both of them maintain their distinction (duality) throughout all the three times. They are eternally distinct (A.S. 57). Belief can change one's views, attitudes and ends, but it cannot change the facts of reality. On taking body to be the soul, it does not turn out to be ^{the} soul. Reality is ever what it is, and therefore, it behoves us to know it well before dealing with it. It is

1. Problems of Knowledge.

from this basic view that the philosophical search has started and it is its significance in life here and beyond. So, now to come to our point. "The materialists identify the self with body or the senses. But consciousness and matter represent different kinds of reality and one cannot be reduced to the other."¹ Jainism maintains the existence of matter and soul as of contradictory nature : Soul is conscious, while matter is non-conscious, without consciousness. Matter can never know, soul can never cease knowing. According to Sāṅkhya-Yoga puruṣa and prakṛti are two opposite principles: by nature-puruṣa is intelligent, prakṛti is jada, non-intelligent. Nyaya-Vaiśeṣika hold that the soul has consciousness as an attribute, and non-soul substances i.e. material or physical atoms, space and time are without consciousness. Mīmāṃsā believes soul to be merely an atom of consciousness, while non-souls are never conscious. According to the Vedānta there are differences regarding the ultimate reality of the soul and the not-soul. But all, even Śaṅkara accept both of them as contradictory. Soul alone can know, while the not-soul (jada) or notself can never know. As Radhakrishnan observes, they are different kinds of reality, and one cannot be reduced to the other. In the Bāuddha philosophy, we can recognize the distinction between the Vijnāna and the nāma-rupa organism. Vijnāna is consciousness, and is the source of life; while nāma-rupa is not conscious and by itself is devoid of life. So we can say it is non-conscious (jada) by nature. In

1. Dr. Radhakrishnan : Indian Philosophy, p. 470.

Upanishads there are stated the sheaths (^{Kosa}kosha) of the self. They are 'anna', 'prana', 'manas'. They are not conscious but jada, that is why they are called sheaths of the self. S'rimad states that it is the principle of Jin that the jada (not-self) never becomes soul (Jiva), and soul never becomes not-self (Jada).¹ S'rimad states the difference of the two : "Notself manifests itself as the notself (jada) and the consciousness (soul) as the conscious. Neither changes itself leaving one's own nature."² "The thing ever manifests remaining confined to its own nature : Soul manifests as soul and not-soul (jada) as not-soul (jada). Soul mainly manifests as the consciousness, and not-soul as the non-conscious. The consciousness of the self never turns out inert or unconscious and inertness (jadaiva) of the not-soul never turns out as conscious. Such is the limitation of the thing (reality) The soul and the not-soul both together cannot manifest either as absolutely conscious or as the absolutely inert.....The absolute unity of the two 'dravyas' (substances) into one is impossible. If one dravya is formed by the union of the two, then the thing (ultimately real) shall give up its own nature. But it never happens that a thing gives up all in all its own nature."³ So this shows that

1. S.R. p. 299.

2. S.R. p. 297.

3. S. R. p. 311.

the consciousness or soul is never transformed into the jada, nor matter is transformed into the soul. They remain distinct as ever. Śrīmad makes it clear with instances while replying to Gandhiji. Gandhiji asks him if it is right that a man after death according to his own acts takes birth as animals, turns out a tree and even the stone. To this Śrīmad replies : "After death the soul gets a birth according to his actions (prārabdha), so he may become an animal, and may undergo a plight of suffering the fruition (consequences) of the actions by taking birth as the one-sensed earthen being, devoid of the rest of the senses. However, it is not that he turns out absolutely the stone or earth. It takes an earthen birth, an earthen form, but the soul remains potentially the very soul itself. There being non-manifestation of the other four senses, it is proper to call it earth-bodied soul. By the time, when the soul, having duly finished the fruition, frees itself from that karma, there remains only the mass of atoms in the form of the stone; but as the soul has left its contact it (stone) has no appetite instinct (ājāra sanjñā) i.e. it is not that the soul turns out all in all (absolutely) an unconscious (inert, jada) stone.....It does not transform itself into absolute earth or stone. Taking birth as an animal it does not become absolutely an animal. The body is the garment or dressing but not its own natural form."¹ So it is clear that even if the soul unites with the material unconscious body it remains in fact ever conscious, and the body too, on its part, remains ever as ~~sensuous~~ unconscious as the matter, though it seems as animated.

1. B.R. p. 426-27.

Sceptic stand refuted :

Finally, the sceptic is met on its own ground. The disciple doubts the very existence of the soul so the master expresses his wonder, saying that the doubter himself is verily the self. "Ya eva hi nirakartā tad eva tasya svarūpaṁ". To doubt one's own ~~sixteenth~~ existence is self-contradictory. One can, without being existent doubt at all; then how can he doubt himself? In order to doubt, one must first exist. Everyone has the keen feeling of *asmittā* an egoistic sense. Soul is the object of the notion of self - it is '*causat partynya viṣaya*'. Regarding the self, it is a fact that by its very nature its existence and consciousness go together, '*asttā eva bodhaḥ bodha eva asttā*'. It is by its very nature self-luminous - "*avyayamjyotiḥ svarūpatvāt*." So, like Descartes, Śaṅkara finds the basis of truth in the immediate self-certainty which is untouched by any of the doubts cast on other thing. "Everyone is conscious of the existence of his own self and no one thinks, I am not - *Sarvo hy atāstītvam pratyeti, na naḥmasmiti*". The basis of all proofs is the self-certainty. Sceptic can stand only if he gives up sceptic notion regarding his own existence. One must first of all exist in order either to doubt or deny any thing. So one's own existence is above doubt or denial by himself. In the discourse between the master and the disciple it is assumed as the fact of all philosophy that the soul is conscious, that the soul functions as a knower, so the problem is the search of the soul and its proper identification; so here there is no room of evading the search and identification under the pretext of the definition, for it is defined one way or the other. The problem in fact is not of merely defining the soul, but of the proper grasp of the soul, and thereby of arriving at its right identification. Hence the master caught hold of the soul as a doubter in the disciple and revealed its presence on the spot.

2. SOUL'S ETERNITY

The Problem of Soul's Eternity : Introductory.

In the concept of reality is implied the concept of existence. Reality, either ultimate or relative, abstract or concrete, potential or actual, whatever it may be, is never without existence. So the problem of reality involves the problem of existence; and existence is never without duration, long or short, momentary or eternal. Existence always conveys some time-sense. So next to the problem of existence of soul turns up a significant problem of its duration. And it has a special significance in our search for ultimate reality, and more so when we consider the self as such. Ultimate of the self has at the basis, metaphysically speaking, this time aspect of ever-lasting character. So, naturally, in his treatise on Soul, Srihinad takes next to the problem of soul's existence the problem of soul's eternity.

The disciple's argument.

The disciple is convinced of soul's existence. He proceeds further in his quest with another argument. He states :

- (1) "There springs up another doubt that the soul is not indestructible or eternal. It comes into existence with the union of the body and undergoes destruction at their disintegration. (A.S.60).
- (2) "Or, the things are transient, and are constantly changing at every moment. On such an experience too, we cannot realize the soul to be ever-lasting." (A.S. 61)

Partial view-points and piecemeal approaches proved futile and fatal.

Consciousness being the very characteristic mark of soul, even the sceptic cannot deny the existence of soul. But how it has come or it comes into existence and how long it lasts and wherein it is lost or to what it is reduced and how? Is it everlasting? Is it everchanging? For such metaphysical problems there is always a tendency of reducing something to something else and this type of reduction annihilates the very essence of things and nullify them completely. It is done not without basis, but the basis being partial, one cannot claim for the whole on its ground. But, one being blind of one's own view-point such practice prevails in the field. A thing can have and does have a thousand and one view points, but each by itself would not give us the complete and real idea of the whole thing, they being piece-meal in their approach can bring before us a partial picture of a thing. Viewpoints are right relatively, but by themselves alone they are misleading, futile and fatal. Perceptions by themselves, cannot give us any idea of a thing, but it is conception that makes them have their sense from particular aspect of a thing. It is in this sense that Kant stated that "Perceptions without conceptions are blind". Here in the ~~arguing~~ argument of the disciple we find the same type of blindness resulting from the various view-points of the materialist, the empiricist, the scientist and the monist. All of them in one way or the other either emphasise more or less a formal aspect of a thing and take it for the whole of a thing.

Empirical stand and materialistic and monistic conclusions :

In the first point of the argument the disciple takes an empirical

stand and arrives at a materialistic commonsense conclusion. He does accept the existence of the soul as the consciousness is felt at the basis while thinking deep over the evidences. (A.S.59). But he is doubtful about its everlasting existence. As consciousness is felt in living beings alone and that too during the life-time i.e. so to speak between birth and death, he comes to the conclusion that the soul comes into existence with the union of the body (dehayoga) and undergoes destruction with their dis-integration. Roughly speaking, there is no soul before birth and after death. Hence the soul is temporary. This being a commonsense conclusion, it is availed of by many thinkers and systems of thought from the dawn of philosophic thinking to the present day. Consciousness is so distinctly felt that its existence cannot be denied. It is ever so evidently felt, and never yet found by the senses! Its presence is felt, its person is not found. Its working is felt, its source is not found. Hence a recourse to the hypotheses. Consciousness is always felt abiding by life. No life, no consciousness. And life is felt more or less in organic bodies. But as bodies are substantially composed of matter, matter has been taken as a source of conscious soul. Soul is considered the product of matter or of some material principle. Thus soul is ultimately reduced to matter. By such reduction early Greek thinkers have come to materialistic world-hypotheses resulting in monism. They took something as the basic substance out of which the world or cosmos is composed. They tried to arrive at something ultimate as the substance of all substances, empirically found composed, and subject to dis-integration and destruction. Thales considered water to be the original or ultimate stuff, the material cause of all things. Anaximander considered

something boundless as ultimately real and is stated to believe it to be "undifferentiated matter." Anaximenes believed air (vapour or mist) to be the abiding substance underlying all things.

In early Indian philosophy, too, there is almost a similar trend of thought. Empirically, consciousness is not perceived but in our practical life it is felt in all living beings. So the soul is taken to be a principle of life. Hence the life-supporting elements like water, air, etc. are believed to be the sources of the soul. It is a common belief that on the union of the five great elements (*pañcamaṇḍbhūtāni*) the soul comes into the mundane existence and with their disintegration the soul vanishes or is reduced to those great elements. Carvakes believe that all living beings are produced from and on death are reduced to the *mahābhūtāni*. This notion may have the root perhaps in the Upanisads. There are occasional utterances in the Upanisads, of course emphasising the one root of the creation and the cosmos, e.g. in the Aitareya Upanisad we find : *esa brahmapanca mahā bhūtāni.*"¹ In *Bṛhad Aranyaka*, Yajñavalkya states : " *evam vā are idam mahad bhutam anantaṁ aparaṁ vijñānaghaṇa eva; etebhyo bhutebhyah samutthaya tāny evanuvinaśyati.*"² Dr. Radhakrishnan states : "In the Chāndogya Upanisad (vi, 11 3 and 4) fire, water and earth are said to constitute *jīvātman* or the individual soul, together with the principle of the infinite."³ In the Taittiriya Upanisad, Puruṣa ¹/₂, the individual soul is described thus : " *So vā esa puruṣo anna-roḍ-āyāh*". and its evolution is traced on a cosmic basis : " *tannāḍ vā etannāḍ atmanā ākasaḥ sambhutaḥ, ākāśāḍ vāyāḥ, vāyōr agniḥ, agner apah, adbhyaḥ prthivi, prthivya ośadhyah Ōśadhibhyo annaḥ, annāt puruṣaḥ*".⁴

1. Dr. Radhakrishnan : *Principal Upanisads*, p. 523. 2. *Ibid*, p. 200.
3. *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 1, p. 204. 4. *Principal Upanisads* p. 541.

Thus the first point in the disciple's argument touches a wider range of existence, because all living beings are conscious and unconsciousness implies the existence of soul.

Argument on the finer aspect of change and form:

Now, with the second point, the disciple supports his argument with the metaphysical aspect of existence in general, a formal aspect of a thing. Both the points touch the formal aspect, no doubt; but the first point touches the mundane of birth and rebirth i.e. ^{phenomenon} bhāva; creation and change, while the second point touches a more finer phenomenon of change occurring at every instant. He takes again the empirical stand, and makes the criterion of the truth about everything and for everyone. Things are transient and are constantly changing every moment. None can deny the fact.

Its empirical basis:

It is everybody's experience. Hence his appeal to our common experience; and more so because philosophic search for the ultimate reality begins on realising the transient nature of the things on earth. Hence, no philosopher can ignore or avoid its consideration. Things are, but they seem so frail, fleeting and frustrating that it poses a question of life and death, "to be or not to be." Our every day world of reality proves so really unreal that we turn to philosophy for something ultimately real. We wish to realise something original and really real behind this seeming reality of our empirical world. The disciple touches the point, where the shoe pinches.

The crucial point:

This is a crucial point in the philosophical thought. It is sometimes a turning point for better or for the worse in the quest of reality. It leads some to determin^{ism} or some to utter nihilism. Some turn out utterly pessimists, some hedonists. With some, it makes them feel all

philosophy a fruitless errand and they maintain their status quo position according to their aptitude either as a social reformer or educationist, humanist or scientist. Some utilise philosophy to rationalize their mundane missions, motives and means. Some seek solace in the substitutes of religion and philosophy. Dr. Radhakrishnan has rightly observed ^{the substitutes} /4/ in his "Idealist View of Life".

Urge of such experiences and experience in general :

Experience has a greater urge, deeper and wider than the reasoning, and in the quest of ultimate reality experience is undoubtedly the first and final ground. We begin and end our inquiry with experience. We are forced to take up the philosophic search (the search for the ultimate reality), on the instance of experience in our encounter with reality. And that experience is more or less an empirical one. It is a fact, an event in life. Whether one takes a stand of a positivist, a phenomenalist or a sensationalist, whether one takes a stand of a materialist or a spiritualist, it is all beside the point. It is not irrelevant, but it is not our first concern ~~at~~ in the quest. Our first concern is the experience itself. The disciple's point of appeal is rightly the experience. We experience the things to be transient, changing every instant. On the ground of such an experience of things in general, the disciple draws a commonsense ~~maxim~~ corollary that the soul too should be taken as transient, momentary.

The Master's Reply :

Now having noted the point of crux in the argument it would be proper to turn to the master's reply. The master proceeds very logically, step by step, keeping in view the very appeal of the fact of experience.

(1) "The body is only a composite adherence. It is by nature non-sentient, thoroughly material, and the object of perception. Hence, who is to experience the soul's genesis and destruction?" (A.S. 62).

(2) "One, on whose experience the knowledge of the genesis and destruction is available, must himself be distinct therefrom, otherwise, it is ever an impossibility." (A.S. 63).

(2) "It is a matter of common experience that the compounds (of elements) that are met with are all perceptible. Soul is not found composed of any such compounds. Hence it is obvious that the soul is everlasting and eternal". (A.S. 64)

(3) "No one can ever experience the sentient soul arising from matter and the matter from the soul" (A.S. 65).

"One that is never (not) created from any of the compounds cannot be reduced to anything else or be destroyed. Hence it (the soul) is ever and eternal". (A.S. 66).

(4) "Anger, etc. are the innate peculiar tendencies of the corpent and the like which are nothing but the inherent dispositions of the previous births. This evidence proves the soul to be eternal." (A.S. 67)

(5) "The soul is substantially (materially) eternal but it undergoes formal changes. As for instance, one can recall the experience of the three ages - childhood, youth, and age." (A.S.68)

(6) "One, who, having (realized) known the momentariness of things, states then so, is not himself momentary. Ascertain the fact by your own experience. Indeed one must outlive the moment in order to know and state the momentariness." (A.S. 69).

(7) "Nothing doth ever meet an utter destruction. If the soul undergoes destruction find out to what it is reduced." (A.S.70).

Impossibility of experience for Soul's genesis :

When the disciple on empirical grounds poses the problem and appeals on the strength of so called experience of soul's genesis and destruction, the master examines the possibility of such an experience and rules out the disciple's point. The actual situation for the experience of the genesis of the soul is the event of the union of the body or the body-composite (deha-yoga). In the situation itself there are two elements, the body and the soul - come to union anyhow. Now, the body is itself a composite of matter and a mere adherence. It being material it is devoid of consciousness. It is non-sentient. The body by itself can know nothing. It is having its own form, subject to perception. It is itself never subject in the event of experience but always an object of the knower. Hence, it is impossible that the body can supply us the knowledge of the experience of the soul's genesis

and destruction. (A.S. 62) The body cannot. Then who can? If not the body, then can the soul? No, the soul too cannot. If it cannot we cannot help concluding that such an experience of soul's genesis and destruction being an impossibility the disciple's notion is utterly wrong, and that it is a groundless hypothesis.

But why the soul himself cannot? Obviously, this is not a question of an ordinary experience, but of an experience of one's own birth and death, or more clearly of coming into existence and of undergoing destruction. One must pre-exist in order to experience or witness one's genesis, and one must outlive to experience one's death or destruction. In short, one must maintain one's distinctness in order to pre-exist and survive (A.S. 63). This is nothing but being above genesis and destruction and one that is above the both is eternal. Alright! the body by its very nature is absolutely unable to have and procure the experience of the soul's genesis and destruction, nor can the soul himself; but we cannot rule out the possibility of an experience as such, there being the other alternative - the experiencer must be distinctly a witness i.e. the third party. The seer must be separate from the scene. (A.S. 63). Hence an appeal to our common experience. But none has ever an experience of soul rising from the compounds and combinations the objects of our perception - even in the laboratories of science almost at the zenith in our scientific civilization, nor can anybody in future be able to have such an experience, for, ^{on} thinking of the conscious nature of the soul, the soul is ^{seems} above production. It is obviously a thing eternal, a self-existing reality.

The Vedantin view-point self-contradictory :

Vedantins, when account for the world, call it neither real nor unreal. It is not real because the world - a composite of souls (jivātma) and matter is not self-existent but has derived ^{itself} from the self, Brahman, and as it is derived from the self (brahman) it cannot be called unreal, for the self is real. So according to the Vedantins, from the sentient Brahman, self, both the sentient souls and the non-sentient matter have been derived. But it is impossible, for, soul is ever a non-composite thing and eternal. Nor can the matter be derived from the Brahman, the sentient one. If Brahman becomes matter, the souls too become so. Then all may be reduced to matter and the Vedant cannot stand as a spiritualistic system.

Truth of things, truth of all the truths :

On the contrary it is a metaphysical truth that the sentient cannot arise from the non-sentient i.e. matter, and vice versa. It is a matter of our experience (A.S. 65). Experience ~~in fact is nothing but realizing~~ cannot rule out the nature of things and reality at large. Experience in fact is nothing but realizing the reality as it is. It is a metaphysical truth that by their very nature the matter and the soul maintain their respective natures-matter remains always material and the soul ever remains sentient. Matter cannot leave its nature and turn out non-material i.e. sentient, nor can the soul ever be non-sentient and material. Were it so there would have been chaos or utter nihility. But reality is ever a reality. Hence, no one can ever experience the sentient soul arising from matter or vice versa. (A.S. 65). Positively, it is ever an experience of every one that

matter remains matter and the soul remains sentient. This is no metaphysical hypothesis or presupposition but a fact of experience, the truth of things, rather the truth of all ^{the} truths. It is in this sense that metaphysics is the science of sciences or the super-science. Now, it would be highly interesting to see the implication of such key-principles. It touches the whole of reality. Let us consider it with reference to creation of the world.

Considered in the light of Eastern and Western world-hypotheses :

It would be sufficient to examine two world-hypotheses, one Western, and one Eastern. So far the Western philosophy is concerned there is one hypothesis and it is that of evolution which is equally acceptable to the philosophers as well as the scientists; among philosophers too it is mostly acceptable to the realists as well as the idealists. It is recognised by them all as a truth that matter, life, mind and spirit are separate and distinct entities evolved out in course of the evolution of the world. It is generally accepted that the higher principles cannot be reduced to the lower-life cannot be reduced to matter, nor can spirit to mind or matter. Conversely it is also believed that matter cannot account for the creation of life, and life for the mind. Then what is that principle that is working at the basis in the nature of these things. Evidently we can forward our key-principle-Matter cannot give rise to the sentient soul, nor can the sentient soul be reduced to matter. But then there is duality. How can we account for the evolution. Surely never, we can, unless we take one of them and that too the sentient one i.e. soul as a dominant factor. Hence the soul, a conscious principle uniting with the indeterminate or formless

matter would be understood as turning out at to be the inorganic being like water, earth and vegetation, then, turning out to be organic beings with and without senses and mind progressively. There is similar approach in the Upanisadic world-hypothesis.

"Aum, brahvid āyoti param,....., satyam jñānam anantaṁ
brahma,....."

"tasmāi vā etasmāi ātmānā ākās'oṣasambuḥ, ākāśā vāyuh, vāyor agnih,
agnir āpah, āpibhyah pṛthivi, pṛthivyā oṣādhāḥ, oṣadhibhyo anna, annāt
puruṣaḥ."¹

There is another fundamental metaphysical principle, in fact, a truth, that a composite thing admits disintegration and therefore, it is subject to destruction but a non-composite thing admits no dis-integration, no decomposition, no division and therefore, it is above destruction and it being self-existent it is ever-existing, and eternal. Hence the soul being non-composite is above dis-integration and destruction, and therefore, it is everlasting and eternal. (A.S. 66).²

Soul's permanence validated by inference :

As a next step, in order to validate the argument, inference too is availed of, here. The serpent and the like are from their birth naturally

1. See Dr. Radhakrishnan's 'Principal Upanishad's p. 341 and its introduction

2. It would be proper to quote Plato's third argument from the Phaedo.

"Whatever is simple cannot be decomposed. The soul is by nature simple and indivisible; it can, therefore, neither be produced by composition, nor be destroyed by dis-integration."

not by temperament. It serves as an evidence of the acquired impressions still continued from the previous births. This proves the soul to be pre-
-sisting through the changes of birth and death. The soul is above physical birth and death, and remains the same ^{and} everlasting in all such mundane forms and changes. (A.S. 67). Psychology has insisted too much on heritage and the environment. It is more or less an external side, for the internal one the soul itself is accountable. (If the scientific inquiry takes into consideration the ancestors it needs not ignore the previous births) Subjective side is no less positive than the objective one. Here is admitted the reality of the change together with the reality of permanence or over-lastingness.

Change and permanence show together metaphysically in soul. :

It is within the changes that the permanence is shown. There must be something permanent that persists through all the changes of birth and death.

But how? That has been ever a problem with philosophers past and present, Eastern and Western. Some have maintained that change is all; some, that absolute permanence prevails everywhere. Here is the middle course. The middle course is not always a right one. It must have metaphysical grounds to do justice to the extremes, and it must have provide us a lasting solution of the problem. Here, in the next point (A.S. 68) of the master we find that. He states that the soul is both eternal (permanent) and changing. How? What metaphysical basis is there for its justification? The soul is substantially (materially) eternal and yet it undergoes formal changes. This is not an abstract principle,

but a matter of our general experience. For, one undergoes changes of the three obvious ages - childhood, youth and the oldage. (A.S.68). So the things that are real remain substantially the same, but formally change. This is the metaphysical principle that we, in fact live and believe. It is not with us a metaphysical theory, but a practice. We believe in more or less permanence of things while using them. Words remain words, and pen and paper what they are. Hence the philosopher or the scientist pens his points on the paper to convey his theory of change. The theory may be wrong but its conveying is a fact. If an absolute change were the fact, one would not trust and trouble himself in a any activity whatsoever, nor would it ever be of any avail. Modern science has made too great a fuss of the constant flux of reality. They say we bite off as much reality as we can chew. But were it all change, nothing but change, we would not have taken the trouble to chew or bite, for it would have been itself chewed and bitten off itself with the mouth open, but perhaps there won't have remained either the mouth or the man in the constant flux. Hence, talking such humbug is all nonsense, not even worth the censure. The principle in a sense opens our eyes to the reality of relativity and rapidity due to change but professing of utter change as the only reality is non-admittance of science and our scientific civilisation. If absolute change were the last word, then there is no justification either for the evolution or for the devolution, for there would be nothing existing to evolve or devolve. Science and philosophy, when dissatisfied with the world, tried to have a hold of reality in order to mend matters. It cannot admit determinism or mechanism,

for at the hands of determinism and mechanism, matters end either way; one cannot mend; Then, science and philosophy would be fruitless attempts and they can have no justification, proper.

Being and becoming :

With the concept of evolution and the advent of science, change has been given more attention in philosophy. So there are some concepts that demand universal attention in the field. With the concept of evolution change is acknowledged as becoming, which is properly justified when seen as the manifestation of the being as or as being.

Noumena and phenomena :

Secondly, if science sees the world as the phenomena it finds justification when taken as the manifestation of noumena. Thus, when taken both together in pair, ^{they} rightly represent the whole of reality, but by themselves alone neither can stand for reality at large. Emphasis on one or the other is immaterial, but neither can be ignored at the cost of the other. Science may pay more attention to the phenomenal side of the world, philosophy may to the noumenal. Psychology and religion may pay more attention to becoming with a view to the being. Thus can we have scope for progress, growth and the goal. Ideal is none-the-less real than the actual. Change and permanence manifestation and persistence, phenomenal and eternal - all go together in respective pairs.

Change and permanence in Indian Philosophy :

Now let us consider in general how in Indian philosophy different systems of thought have maintained the principles of change and permanence regarding

the soul in the rain and the universe at large.

1. Cārvāka :

As in the disciples' doubt stated, according to the Cārvākas the soul is not a self-existent thing, but has come into existence on the union of the body, composite of the great elements, mahābhūtāni. It was not before the birth and does not survive after the death. It is in a sense composed of the great elements + mahābhūtāni and vanishes with their disintegration. So it is temporary in this temporal world. Now this has been refuted by the master on the evidence of experience and on the metaphysical nature of things, that no sentient being like soul can ever be created from the non-sentient, and that the soul being non-composite is above destruction, ~~therefore~~ and therefore, eternal. According to Cārvākas the world or the universe is composed of the four great elements, and it is transient. But as we have seen, things remain substantially more or less the same, and undergo only formal changes. And as the master maintains in his last point nothing undergoes utter destruction. No doubt, it admits changes. So it (the Cārvāka) is in short never a philosophy but mere rationalising the status quo of hedonism.

2. Buddhism :

According to Buddha's preachings there is a principle of consciousness which we may call soul. He may not admit soul as a substance, but as we observed whatever that is having consciousness or that is conscious is nothing but the soul itself. According to him all things are changing, so also the consciousness (Vijñāna), but Vijñāna ever remains Vijñāna through the saṃskāra. The present consciousness inherited consciousness from the

past one. So one realizes that he has only emphasised the change and has ignored the substantial permanence. Yet he has to make for the omission, one way or other, in order to justify the birth and rebirth link and also the nirvāṇa which is nothing but an everlasting peace and freedom from all unhappiness. It would be worthwhile to consider the Buddhist doctrine of momentariness. It has sprung from his own teachings of impermanence. Here the change has been refined to its extreme. For that, the logical and epistemological answer on the criterion of experience would suffice. The disciple in his argument has maintained the same stand and stated the very doctrine of momentariness by stating the things transient and momentary, as they undergo changes every moment. The master crosses the point thus : "One who knows momentariness and states as such must have survived the moment. Ascertain it through experience. (A.S. 69). So the conscious principle that preaches and teaches it is himself not at all momentary. No doubt the soul and all manifest themselves every moment, according to the law of the nature of things, for if the thing does not manifest itself- it is not itself. 'To be or not to be' is never a question with the things; they must always 'be'. It is the law of their own nature, it is their very being, which they owe to nothing else outside. One may call it a becoming. So the master has maintained that the soul remains substantially the same but undergoes formal changes i.e., it manifests itself in different forms. It is becoming of the being, the soul. It should be called *Arthakriya* in its proper sense.

3. Jainism :

Jainism has given due place throughout the system to both these aspects of reality. In it change and permanence go hand in hand. The change represents both - the genesis as well as destruction, while permanence a continued persistence. Being (sat) is defined as utpād-dhruvya vyaya - yuktam. Being always bears these three together. No substance admits any change. It is without any genesis and destruction, it ever exists, it is existent once for all; permanence and change are due to formal manifestations (S.R. p. 587). No substance is without manifestations. It is always manifesting. The term change does not mean utter destruction, hence in the term change itself, permanence is implicit for the thing that changes must persist substantially to maintain the formal changes. Change itself is one phenomenon, it has two aspects - genesis and destruction. When a formal change occurs, one form vanishes as well as the other arises - both processes are the aspects of one phenomenon, change. This is in the very nature of things. So also it is with the soul. The soul is substantially eternal, it is ever-existent; but it manifests itself every instant and undergoes formal changes. As at the instance of light, the darkness vanishes; so also on enlightenment the ignorance or the delusion vanishes. The soul remaining substantially the same undergoes different states. While assuming one state it gives up the previous one. One state is ^{replaced} by the other. One and the same soul undergoes the different states like childhood and boyhood, adolescence and the youth, youth and age, birth and death. It remains the same through-out in all such manifestations. Thus Jainism by admitting both the aspects of reality i.e. change and permanence has done justification to metaphysical truths or facts like cause and effect,

reason and result, being and becoming, ideal and actual, potential and perfect.

Srinad has maintained here this Jain view-point in ~~large~~ his argument and has clearly established in general the two aspects of reality at large together with the soul's formal manifestations and substantial eternity in particular. He appeals to experience and ascertains the fact that the knower and revealer of knowledge of momentariness of things is himself not momentary (A.S. 69). Finally, he concludes with the metaphysical truth that nothing real undergoes utter destruction, and that there is nothing existing in reality to which or wherein the soul to undergo destruction can be reduced to or lose itself (A.S. 70). Srinad writes elsewhere, the essential truth of all reality. (1) "It is on experience the truth estab-^{is}-lish^{ed} that the original substance is without genesis as well as destruction. So states the supreme Lord". (S.R. p. 297 + 266). (2) "One that exists by itself, of its own accord, never perishes, and one that is non-existent never happens to be or to exist. Really existent for a moment exists ever for all the times. Change and difference are merely on observation of the states of things." (S.R. p. 297)

These are the truths that no philosopher or a system builder can ignore in toto. And that is why in other, systems like, the Nyāya-vaiśeṣika, Yoga-Sāṅkhya, Mīmāṃsā and the Vedānta, though absolute permanence of the self is maintained, they, in spite of themselves, are obliged to admit some or the other principle of change in the background under some pretext. However, they have pretended to be "Nityavēdin". Let us see how this fact prevails and pervades those systems.

4. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika

According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophies, the soul is an eternal substance devoid of consciousness. The consciousness is a quality, but is not existent by itself, it is always dependent on some substance. The soul alone bears it. How as the qualities determine the nature and character of a thing, Soul is conscious by nature. Consciousness is the characteristic of the soul. So far so good. But qualities are not active. There is action, a separate category existing. But it belongs to finite substance - a limited substance like manas. So with the mind i.e. manas, the soul is active. The soul is subject to the actions, only when it is in contact with the manas, mind. It is by the actions of 'manas' that the soul undergoes the states of birth and death. Thus the soul is shown subject to changes, of course mundane ones, to do justice to the reality of the world and the living beings on the moral basis of action and its fruition - 'as you sow, so you reap'. According to these philosophies there are cycles of creation and destruction of the world. Thus change is admitted. Yet atoms and souls are eternal. And for their eternity they give the same metaphysical reason that the non-composite simple substance can neither be created nor be destroyed.

No substance, soul or space or atom is shown having activity of self-manifestation. There are no self-modificational changes admitted. Nor are qualities natural and always with them. Hence substances by themselves are nothing but names - shadows without ^{distinctions} as such. Process of abstraction may give us proper and clear concepts, no doubt, but when carried to extreme it paves the way to nihilism, and metaphysics collapses. In order to understand the categories they are conceived as separate ^{by abstraction e.g.} substances and

quality. They cannot ~~be~~ be reduced to each other. Quality is a quality; substance, the substance. But as there can be no quality by itself without the substance, so also there can be no substance absolutely devoid of quality. Otherwise substances shall go on changing their nature and there shall prevail constant change and chaos, and permanence and eternity shall be found names without any justification. It is contrary to the philosophies themselves.

5. The Sankhya

The Sankhya system has none of these drawbacks, except the one. According to the Sankhya, consciousness is not merely an attribute of the substance - soul, but it is the very essence of the soul. But that consciousness is steady and constant having no chance either of self-modifications or of activity. It is 'kutaस्था नित्या'. But world of experience is full of change and activity. To account for them Sankhya states that the changes and activities belong to bodies, minds and intellect, which are the products of the prakṛti - the fine matter. Prakṛti is composite of three guṇas - Rajas, Tamas and the Sattva. These three are both permanent and changing. Metaphysically, they are permanent when they merely manifest themselves and do not interact among themselves, but they are changing on interaction. Thus the Sankhya has accepted this double aspect of reality only with respect to the prakṛti - the material principle, and not with respect to the soul, a spiritual principle. In order to save the soul from the mundane state, the soul is made absolutely aloof from change and thus has been robbed of its own self-modification and activity. Thus Sankhya has accounted for change and activity, pervading the world by considering merely the concrete and apparent cause of change and have ignored the finer and essential cause,

and the soul has been made merely a seer either enlightened or ignorant.

It is interesting to note that Purusa or the conscious soul is non-active but induces activity in the Prakṛti on their union or contact. And what is the result ? Mahat or buddhi i.e., intellect is produced. This intellect has special functions like ascertainment and decision, just conscious activities ! This is absurd, for no consciousness is ever a product of the non-conscious⁵ or the inert. The consciousness is never a composite thing.

6. The Vedānta:
6. The Vedānta emphasizes the absoluteness of the self at both the levels, individual as well as the cosmic level, on one hand; and makes self the source of all the universe, on the other hand.

As it is both the material as well as the formal cause of this transient world and yet by their sheer magic stroke of reason and imagination the self or the soul is above the transformations and change, as if all changes were superficial and transformations but the shadows.

For the evolution of the world, there is another principle like māyā which makes for all the changes and the activity. On the individual level the soul, when bewitched by avidyā or ignorance, is maintaining mundane transformations. But māyā or avidyā is anirvacanīya - is indescribable !

It is both real and unreal. Of course it is so, so far māyā has come out of the self it is real, but it being not self-existent and as have come out of the self it is unreal. But then this māyā is subject to origin and destruction and its existence being within the self itself, it is nothing else but the modification or change, be it formal or material is immaterial, but

past doubt, it is a modification or change. Hence, the self is subject to such modifications and is never 'kutantha nitya'.

Again to consider the same matter from a slightly different point of view. Vedantins call Brahman or self as the adhisthāna of the universe. Adhisthāna means the original thing or substance from which the universe is created, by which the universe subsists or maintains its existence, and lastly to which the universe is merged or reduced. So the Brahman is the material cause, the efficient cause, instrumental cause and also the formal cause. As the universe is subject to change Brahman being all this universe goes on changing inspite of its absoluteness 'Kutanthata.' Brahman will ^{do} so, inspite of the nityavedin Vedantins ! It is Brahman's lila - eternal freedom ! But here is one difficulty. No conscious being can lose itself wholly in anything, cannot lose its individuality, nor can it be reduced to anything else. Now how can these infinite souls which are sentient through and through lose their individuality into Brahman. It is impossible. Secondly the infinite matter of the universe too giving up all forms return to Brahman. If so, the matter becomes Brahman itself i.e. sentient; and if not, matter remaining matter, Brahman, on one hand, is sentient to admit all souls; and non-sentient, to admit all matter within. So Brahman is a composite being just like the human, or it is a composite thing just the universe itself at rest, when the sentient and the non-sentient lie side by side not intersecting, but absolutely separate. So the Vedantin hypothesis cannot maintain throughout the monistic line of thought and makes for duality under another name, pretensions - pretensions on the name of ultimate truth and reality. No system on test of metaphysical truths can stand as mere hypothesis.

Conclusions

Thus they any how admit a principle of change for the evolution of the world and try to maintain the world-hypothesis, on partial truths, on one or the other aspect of reality. Change and permanence no doubt are of the things and in the things, but they are none the less real. They are aspects of things and they go ^{together hand} in hand, lie side by side to each other; so nowhere can we ignore them in the whole of metaphysics throughout. It is because of their all pervading manifestations that the Gandhars^a got insight into the working of the whole universe and wrote the scriptures called 'dvādasāṅgī' only from the clue of three of words Upādā-vyaya - dhrauvya known as 'Tripodī' in Jainism.

3. SOUL, THE AGENT OF ITS ACTIONS

Introductory.

As with the existence of a thing is involved the question of its duration, so also with the existence and duration of a thing is involved the question of its activity. The thing exists and persists on the strength of its being what it is. In order to maintain its reality the thing must go on being what it is. Being is the essence of a thing. Truth of a thing lies in its being what it is, in its self-manifestations. So the thing, in a way, maintains its thinghood by this activity of being what it is, or by manifesting its nature. Nothing is ever devoid of such an activity.

Srimad writes: "All things (substances) are having their own activity, all things are seen ever with some or other manifestation of activity. The soul too is having its own activity. As it is having its activity it is in fact the agent."¹ No substance is ever without its own activity arthakriya. Activity is of two kinds: one, in the form of self-manifestation, second, in the form of movement. The soul and the matter have both the activities. Naturally then, the soul is the agent. So to continue Srimad's statement: "The soul is the agent in three ways as distinctly stated by the Lord Jin. From the absolute point of view, the soul by modification of its own nature is the agent of its own self-manifestation. (It maintains its own natural self-hood). Secondly, from the relational point of view, when conversant with the other things, the soul is the author of its sundane actions. Thirdly, as conventionally attributed, the soul is the maker or an architect of buildings, cities and the like".²

1. Srimad Rajchandra, p.394/493 2. Ibid.

Śrīmad has deep insight into the nature of things and reality at large, so he picks up the problems regarding the soul one by one according to their status, order and significance. So Śrīmad in his treatise now deals with the problem of activity and actions, belonging to the soul. Think of the universe without activity, think of the world without actions and activity, think of life of all beings human, subhuman and superhuman without actions and activity you will realise the significance and importance of actions and activity in life, in the world and in the universe. Then how great and important problem do they put before us ? Thinghood of a thing lies in its activity of being what it is. Greatness of man lies in his realisation outward and inward, through activity and actions.

It is not always that with the man dissatisfied with the world that the philosophical search begins. Sometimes it begins with the defeated and pessimistic; sometimes with the curious. Fate and fortune are often felt but seldom known before. So we doubt our deeds and doings, aims and actions. We take things and affairs as determined and destined or as a matter of chance or accident and leave the matter to fate or faith. But no religion on earth can allow us go our way. 'As you sow, so you reap' is the precept. Hence, the disciples plea.

The Argument of the disciples:

1. "The soul is not the author or the agent of his actions or deeds (karma). Actions themselves beget (are the agents of) the actions. Or else performing actions is the innate nature of the soul, or is the very characteristic of soul." (A.S.71)

2. "Or the soul is absolute (asang) but the nature binds; or God is their author, so the soul is free." (A.S.72)
3. "Therefore, the means to freedom (liberation) serve no purpose whatsoever; for, in fact, either there is no such authorship of actions on the part of the soul, or naturally, it can never be given up." (A.S.73)

Prevailing materialistic outlook amongst us:

Generally we live and move with some belief or faith in reality, that there is some order or justice in the universe. We use our judgement, will and worth. But sometimes we find that all is not right with the world. Multiple forces are at work in the world, and we are at a loss to understand the facts and events and find all our means and measures as gambler's hazard. We doubt the ^{ed} order and justice in the universe. We take life in the world as a great accidental affair and turn out opportunists and call us realists. We are good citizens, gentlemen at home and abroad, and bear an excellent moral character not because that we have a belief and a faith in order and justice of the universe, but because we are fond or fatigued members of the civilized society, because we are cultured ! We believe in science. So do we take the world as phenomenal. We bite off as much reality as we can chew, is our scientific pretext. Phenomenon begets phenomenon, and all is going well with the world. We are concerned with the means and not with the ends, with the present life and not with the past or the future. We need not bother about the beyond - the beginning and the end. We believe in evolution and in potentialities, but it is not our concern that the world should go on evolving. From matter or monkeys as we came on to be human, so shall we be

a spiritual race, why wait and worry, tarry and trouble ? Let us go on, have our routines and rest, plenty and pleasures. This is materialism. Let it be. Why worry about the other world ? A bird in hand is worth two in the bush. Present is enough, all in all. So do we on Charvak lines philosophize, rather rationalise our means and motives, be they fair or foul. Philosophy is a wishful thinking and religion a hobby horse ! You may say, grapes are sour. But remember, we jump to the Moon and the Mars. We cannot hazard idle speculations of philosophy. And yet we are nonetheless rational. Come on, only for the sake of argument, let us discuss. This is the modern mentality a rational temperament ! Philosophy and religion are no life, not for life and never a question of life and death. With us actions matter little, activities and achievements are everything.

Alright then to come to the point atleast for the sake of argument, be there order or disorder, evolution or accidents in the running of the universe, it seems obvious that actions beget actions. One phenomenon follows the other and so it goes on mechanically for better or for worse, for evolution or for devolution, for perfection or for destruction. Man is nothing but a wave in this vast ocean of cosmic affairs. And yet if you isolate the individual from this universe (on the democratic line of thought) then too it is obvious that man is the creature of his circumstances. Past actions are responsible for one's present to a particular time and place, situation and circumstances i.e. birth, worth and breeding. And as the cause, so the effect. Hence it is all determined, either at the individual or the at the cosmic level. It is all determined - call it transient as the Buddhist do, call it a trifle or mithya as the Vedantins do, it is never a matter of our concern; then why not enjoy ? Why worry about acts and facts ?

But actions and activities however mechanical and orderly be, they cannot originate without some conscious author or the agent. If so, there is some alternative principle at work. The soul is the author or the agent of the actions and activities. Past doubt, for the soul must always naturally be active to the core. No living being is seen inactive. It is always performing some actions, it is never at rest. So, going on performing actions is natural to the soul or it may be its innate characteristic. So it can never be given up. One goes on doing actions good or bad. The soul or living being without any activity is inconceivable. Ceasing to do any actions is nothing but ceasing to be. It may be in the nature of a soul to do this and not to do that, but it is not in its hands or in its nature not to be anything. It cannot of itself cease to be. It cannot help being, nor can it help manifesting its own nature. (A.S.71).

Vedantin's view

Even the Vedantins make some arrangement for actions. Apparently the self i.e. Brahman is inactive and absolute, and the matter being non-sentient cannot run activities of its own accord. Yet there exists world and it demands explanation, as philosophies start from the more or less reality of the world, in order to arrive at the ultimate reality. The world, as Shankar and Radhakrishnan have maintained, is related reality - ^{JK}vyāvahāra catta and not the pāramārthika one. It is by form composite of souls and matter. But how the world came to be as it is ? Because of Māyā. It runs on the principle of Māyā at the cosmic level and on the principle of avidyā at the individual level. But what is māyā or avidyā ? Whatever it may be its source is Brahman or the soul. Any how Brahman maintains the cosmic activity according to eternal freedom and will and the cosmic

manifestation is just a play - leela on its part. Therefore, so far the souls and ~~and~~ the Brahman is the Brahman, activities go on as if natural to them. There is no artifice or effort as such. (A.S.71).
Brahman is the efficient cause of the world .

Sankhya belief:

Now turning to the other system like the Sankhya and the Yoga, we find soul inactive or irresponsible for the actions. According to the Sankhya system the soul (purusa) is ever unrelated (asang) and so inactive. It never takes any part in the world affairs, though it is in the world. Then who is running all the activities ? None but the prakrti - nature or matter. It manifests the whole world in the presence of purusa. Soul is in the bondage of actions, because of the matter, of nature by its side. Prakrti by the side of the soul cannot remain silent, cannot control herself and is moved to action and the soul possessed by the prakrti must undergo the consequences and have to eat or enjoy the fruit of course here of ignorance and not of knowledge like the Adam, couples with the curious and active Eve.

Yoga's stands

According to the Yoga system God is supreme among the souls. Souls are free agents no doubt; but it is God who inspires them. Individual soul being imperfect and Prakrti being non-intelligent neither of them can bring order by themselves. So there is some principle that works, remaining as adrista i.e. works through inspiration. It is God. He remaining absolutely aloof, merely inspires them and directs the world to its proper goal and order. And with the Bhagavadgita, God is everything - essence and author, power

and potentiality. Individual soul has to carry out his destined duty.

Therefore, it is left to conclude that futile are the means to Liberation as they serve no purpose; for, either the soul is not the author of actions and stands in no way responsible for them, or else actions are natural to the soul and cannot be given up.

The Mantara Reply:

1. "If the sentient soul does not inspire or induce, then who is to authorize the actions? Matter (not-self) by nature being non-sentient ^{cannot} inspire or authorize. Think of their respective natures." (A.S.74)
2. "If the soul does not do any actions they do not originate, so, doing actions being a matter of will and act it is never an innate nature of the soul nor its everlasting characteristic (dharma)." (A.S.75)
3. "Were the soul absolutely aloof and contactless (asang) why could you not realize it so? It is asing absolutely aloof only from the absolute point of view, but that is only on self-realization." (A.S.76)
4. "There is no creator, like God as such. God by nature is pure at par. And if we consider him the inspirer of actions, God proves to be the original source of all faults and vices." (A.S.77)

5. "If the soul is in its true spirit it manifests its own nature and if it behaves as if devoid of spiritual sense (Self sense) then it is the author of actions. (A.S. 78).

Metaphysical inquiry :

When we think or consider the very nature of things it is never a matter of hypothesis but a fact of metaphysics. So the master makes a metaphysical inquiry as to the authorship of actions. Actions are a (matter of) fact; but it is not a fact out of itself or of its own accord. Actions want some agent, some author to originate. All philosophical systems and sciences do agree that the activities and actions are not without some source or support. They owe their origin and existence to things. Actions (Karma) are a mutual affair between the soul and the matter. Matter being non-sentient, inert, cannot by itself rise to actions; it needs someone to initiate; so the initiative rests with some sentient principle and it is the soul. Things cannot go beyond their nature. If we think of the nature of matter and soul we would realize that matter cannot initiate actions (Karma) more or less a conscious activity, hence it is the act of none but the soul - a sentient thing. Scientists realized that the evolution of the world however natural and orderly it may be, it is never mechanical, and matter cannot account for its move and motive. There must be some conscious principle at work - soul or spirit. Material monism is utterly a failure. Spiritual monism is doing nothing but far-fetching the point. Dualism cannot help maintaining the prominence of the

spiritual principle. Thereby it does justice to both realism and idealism, and prepares on these lines a meeting ground for both.

Soul a free Agent of actions :

Now it is certain that the soul is the agent of the actions. But then it is not natural to it? Is it not its innate characteristic? Not so. It is neither. It is the question of capacity, will and act. Soul has the capacity of doing actions but it is left to its choice to do or not and to do what particular actions and what not. It is a matter of will. The soul is free to decide and do. Having decided, it may further withhold the execution of the decision. Soul is not obliged to do actions from any outside authority. It is at liberty and may do, or may not do actions, out of its own accord. So doing actions (Karma) is neither its innate nature nor its everlasting characteristic. So no sentient or conscious principle, be it individual soul (as is called), or self i.e. Brahman (if it be at all) can be justified doing actions under pretext of nature or the like. So such notion like playfulness or 'Lolā' of Brahman or the pretext of welfare of the world (Loka - hitāya, Loka sangrahāya) or the like are untenable on the metaphysical ground.

In the Sankhya system the soul (purusa) is believed to be absolutely free from all relations-asanga. But were it so it would have been a matter of our everyday experience. We would have experienced ourselves within separate and distinct from body (senses and mind) as the sword from the sheath. But that is not the case. We may be so if we will, only on self-realization. But until, we attain to the status of

self-realization we are entangled with actions and subject to the laws of actions. So we cannot turn out irresponsible for our actions on the pretext that the soul is 'asang'. Actions are our own concern and we cannot be left or ignored, falsely believing it a matter of concern for the matter, prakrti. (A.S. 75).

Nor can it be left as a concern of God. God being a concern of the highest bidder in the field of speculative philosophy is mercilessly made so supreme as to lose all its reality and has been made a fond object of wishful thinking. God is the creator of the world. How mighty a mother! God is maintaining the world. How grand a father! We like to remain babes even in our prime youth and age. So far so good - rather right (~~satyam~~) (satyam) and charming (Sundaram) no doubt. But then? God is also the destroyer of the world of the cosmos!

We hate the murderer, more do we hate the war and the warrior, most shall we hate the atom-bomber - the destroyer of the continents. But we have no capacity to hate ~~murderer-warrior-warrior~~ God - in the form of Shiva, the destroyer of the whole Universe. We offer love and devotion to this cosmic destroyer. We call him the Bliss - incarnate - Shiva. Love can mend matters unto the end and beyond! God knows that children are fond and forgetful. But it is welcome that this God is of the speculative philosophy.

Then what is in fact a God for us. Nothing but by his very nature, a pure and perfect self. No, capital letter even to his name? No, one and all one can be 'gods' - pure and perfect souls, free, free, eternally free. Believe it or leave it. To be or not to be is the question.

Really, "aham brahmasmi". Certainly, "tat-tvamasi" - of course, on self-realization. It is left to us to realize the self within. But this is Vedant. Yes, of course it is the end of knowledge, final conclusion and end of philosophy! Know it and you need know nothing. "One that is sung is the same ever and everywhere; in every system of philosophy it is the final distinction, the essence, arrived at." (S.R.p. 221).

But, then, the soul ceases doing actions and is no more the agent or the author of any actions or activity. Not so, never. The soul maintains activity, it cannot give it up. In the state of self-realization by the sheer self-sense it naturally manifests its own sentient nature. It ever goes on being what it is! (A.S. 70)

And yet a warning, a red light - this is not a matter of make-believe but a matter of actual self-realization. It is not a matter of principle-theory, but of practice; otherwise, without ~~just~~ 'self-sense' or 'self-realization' one goes on doing definitely the actions that bind the soul. (A.S. 70).

To give a finishing touch to the problem and make it lively by the instance of contemporary life it would be worthwhile to quote something on the point, from Srimad's letter to Gadhiji.

"1. (2) Does it (the soul) do anything?

(2) In the state of enlightenment, in the state dawned at the real enlightenment of one's own nature, the soul is the author of the self-modifications i.e. of right knowledge, right conviction and naturally tranquil state. But in the state of ignorance it is the author of the

temperament like anger, conceit, deceit, greed etc; and on being subject to the results thereof incidentally becomes the (author) of cloth and pot, etc; it does not become the creator of the original matter in the pot or the cloth but he is merely their manufacturer ^{author} of their shape or form and structure.

The latter state is called the karma by the Jain, the Vedants calls it bhranti or delusion and mentions it by such similar words." (p. 425/530, S.R.).

" 2. (i) What is God? (ii) Is it true that he is the creator of the universe?

(i) I and you are the souls residing in the state of bondage of the actions. The natural state of the soul i.e. the state of pure self-manifestation without any actions - karmarahita is in fact, the Godhood. One who has almightiness of knowledge etc, is worthy to be called God, and that God is verily the natural state of the soul. That real state is not felt because of the accompanied (adjuncture) actions, but on discriminating it as distinctly different when the attention is turned to the self the almightiness of the soul in the form of Omniscience and the like is realized within the self itself. And surveying all other things nothing is realized (experienced) mightier than the self. Therefore, it is my decided opinion that God is the other name for the soul and that there is no other God in fact supreme as such. (p. 426, S.R.).

(ii) God is not the creator of the Universe, i.e. atoms, space (akasa) and such other things happen to be eternal; it is not possible that they

can be derived from other things. And if at all we consider them originated from God then it does not seem proper; for if we believe God to be sentient, then how can it give rise (birth) to the non-sentients, like atoms and space, as no production of non-sentient from the sentient is possible at all.

If God is accepted as non-sentient then it at once proves to be devoid of supremacy and almightiness, and also no rise of the sentient soul is possible therefrom. Now, if we consider God to be composite of the sentient and the non-sentient, then the world, the composite of the two, is attributed by another name God and it is just a make-believe. It is highly proper to call a world a world than to remain satisfied with such a make a believe as of naming the world by God. Perhaps, we may consider atom, space and the like as eternal and God merely the distributor of the fruits of actions, but that too cannot be justified." (p. 426, S.R.)

Again, to quote Sriniad, Godhood of the creator cannot be justified, for, it can be questioned thus : "What was the need to God of creating the world? And if created why did he place in it happiness and unhappiness? Having created, why did he place death in it? If world-creation is his playfulness or just a dramatic performance (leela), for showing whom did he perform this leela? If created, then, on what ground or basis of actions could he do that? It is never a question of basis or background of actions for him. He is not at all accountable for that and even to no body. It is will and his will is the action. He wishes and things must happen "Why had he no such wish before? Alright then it is a matter of God, his wishes and created thing. Then "what" is God, what are his wishes and what are the things by the very nature ? " If the soul and God both are sentient, on what grounds the soul remains a poor ignorant creature

subject to birth and death and God turns out supreme authority and above all limitations whatsoever?" What metaphysical background serves for their similarity and difference? Wishful thinking cannot stand the tests of metaphysical reality, nor can it over-ride reasoning. Hypothesis, be it a world-hypothesis, fails when contradicted by itself and within, and also when it does not meet the demands of reality, when it fails to explain reality. When it fails to explain reality on metaphysical grounds or fundamental truth of things then it serves no purpose and fails, rather forgets its own mission.

Metaphysically speaking things that are non-composite are self-existing and eternal. Self-existent things, when purified, turn out to be perfect. Non-composite things are either sentient or the non-sentient to the core. Composite things are subject to decay and destruction on disintegration, for what is united is to be divided. So composite things are never eternal and cannot maintain their status or existence always as it is. Only the non-composite things count as original and ultimate things. Now they being only two, the sentient and the non-sentient, the sentient surpasses the non-sentient verily by its conscious nature. So to conclude, the sentient principle - soul is non-composite, is eternal pure and perfect. Being self-existent it is self-sufficient and needs nothing. Additions are and adjuncts are nothing but impurity and burden. Wants and wishes are nothing but ignoring its own worth and absoluteness, purity and perfection. So doing actions, good or bad, are not justifiable on the part of either soul or God. In the manifestation of one's own nature (for the sentient-soul) lies one's status and worth, self-existence, self-sufficiency, eternity, freedom, purity and perfection and thereby

it reaches the height of knowledge and bliss.

Thus, by showing the soul a free and responsible agent of the action on metaphysical grounds, here is made a justification for ethics, religion, self-realization and liberation. Here do we find the real meaning of freedom and action and justification for evolution, unconscious and conscious.

4. THE SOUL SUBJECT TO CONSEQUENCES OF ITS ACTIONS.

Introductory :

In the preceding section we saw the three modes of actions on the part of the soul. Firstly, the soul manifests its own ~~act~~ nature. It is a natural activity of self-modifications. Secondly, the soul is the author of its mundane actions by vibhava. Thirdly, the soul is running some physical or material activities, the worldly actions. We also found the fact that the soul is free to do or not to do those actions. So it is a matter of will and choice, will on the part of the soul. For it is both a question of discrimination and discretion. One has to think of the pros and cons of the matter. One must think of actions whether they are worth-doing or not. But then it is to some extent a matter of their consequences or results, ~~seen~~ on one hand, and a matter of responsibility on the part of the doer, on the other hand. And yet there is some third factor - something either in the nature of things themselves or external obliging the agent to stand as responsible. Thus we come to the problem whether the agent is responsible for his actions and how, and also whether the actions are paying or not and how?

The disciple's argument :

1. You may call the soul to be the author of its actions but it is not subject to the consequences thereof - for, how can the non-sentient(material) actions have a sense of acknowledging the original author and of returning him the actual reward thereof? What sense can those non-sentient actions have, that they turn out to be the fruit-giver? (A.S. 79).

2. By positing God to be the fruit-giver, the soul can be obliged to stand responsible for the consequences of its own actions, (A.S. 60).

3. Without God (as a supreme ruler of the world) there cannot be any order in the Universe, nor can there be any abodes (like heaven and hell) for the fruition (of the actions) (A.S.61).

Enjoyment and suffering are obvious facts :

There is enough of misery-mental, physical and external (ādhi, vyādhi and upādhi) all over the world throughout the life. Yet life is sweet, sometime surpassingly sweet. It has its joys as well as sorrows. This is the matter of experience. It is a proven fact beyond doubt that we on one hand enjoy, on the other hand suffer. Then it is nothing but a commonsense conclusion that we are subject to happiness as well as unhappiness - we are bhaktā - both the enjoyer and the sufferer. It is a fact of our life, our experience. We know it very well. We need no philosophy for that.

Their justification :

Experience and life are far deeper and keener with us, that we need no description, we want explanation. We know 'the what' well, but we want to know 'how and why' of it. That is why we turn to philosophy. Sometimes innocent children suffer. Gandhi and Jesus are shot and crucified - kindness is met with utter cruelty. With some noble persons life is all terror - trouble, toil and tears. With innocent farmers ruin is life and death. Sometimes it rains cats and dogs and the farmer is robbed of his bread, his right of prayerful toil. So in life we feel

as if happiness and miseries were only accidental. Religion and philosophy justify them as the returns of the past actions of the soul.

But how can it happen ? Ethics we observe, nature would not. Actions are non-sentient, non-intelligent. How can they have a sincere sense of returns and rewards ? How can they rise to the occasion and return the due reward to the right person ? Philosophies like the Buddha and the Jain have made too much of miseries. They are kind to find out where the shoe pinches. They have made too much of actions that they ultimately turn out to be the philosophies of action and non-action. The Sāṅkhya, the Yoga and the Mīmāṃsā all lay emphasis one way or other on the actions. The Sāṅkhya and the Gita emphasises the 'niskama karmayoga', the Yoga, the aṣṭāṅga karma yoga, the Mīmāṃsā, mainly the rituals. We may perhaps be ready to accept their precepts, for all these philosophies promise liberation - freedom from all the miseries whatsoever. But before practising the precept it would be worthwhile to understand how the non-sentient actions are able to return the rewards to the right person properly, promptly, perfectly. Ethics must be justified on the basis of metaphysics. (A.S. 79).

So actions by themselves are unable to be fruit yielding. May be that some philosophers might have realized the inability of the non-sentient actions and so they might have thought proper of some agent who may direct the actions to fruition and thereby return the rewards thereof on one hand, and on the other oblige their doer to remain responsible for the actions by undergoing their consequences.

Nyāya - Vaiśeṣika Explanation :

According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophies, God is atleast the moral governor of the world and impartial dispenser of the rewards of our actions. According to the Yoga God is a supreme ruler of the world, it is he who guides the soul and matter (puruṣa and prakṛti) to maintain the world and keep it in order. But then God himself loses his Godhood. He becomes subject to actions, to kṛmī and upakṛmī. As he has to look after the cosmic affairs and he being the initiator is responsible for the actions and their consequences. When the soul runs activities on only individual level, so as to speak on a small scale basis, he has to stand responsible for the consequences, then why not the wholesale dealer who works on a cosmic scale and on Universal basis ? One may argue, God being impartial and non-attached is free from the bondage of actions, as the soul-seeker is liberated on enlightenment and non-attachment. But then both being sentient, the soul and God in their purity stand on equal level, and enjoy equal status; and then God's supremacy cannot be maintained, and he loses the so-called supremacy of Godhood. (A.S. 60).

But without God there would be chaos everywhere. No God, no world-order and then there shall be no abodes for fruition, like these of Heaven and Hell, no earth and birth. Hence, action^{and} fruition, rewards and responsibility, ethics and religion are all false and futile. (A.S. 61).

So the problem prevails : How the soul's actions happen to return the rewards to the right agent keeping him properly responsible without God as an impartial dispenser ?

Master's explanation :

1. Subjective-actions (bhavakarma) being soul-activity are sentient and therefore, the soul-strength being active incurs the fine matter as bondage with and within itself. (A.S. 82).
2. The poison and the nectar being non-sentient know nothing of their functions, yet the soul by ~~us~~ eating them naturally undergoes their effects. In the same way actions good or bad do justice naturally to the doer by returning the reward thereof. So action and fruition are facts universally prevailing by their own right (A.S. 83).
3. One is poor, and other the prince. Such distinctions and the like (in the status) are in fact consequences not without causes and they must be nothing else, but good or bad actions. This proves that the souls are naturally bound to suffer for their ~~earliest~~ actions. (A.S. 84).
4. This does not require God as dispenser of the fruits of the actions. Actions by their very nature fructify and fade away on their fruition. (A.S. 85).
5. For the fruition of the various actions there are in fact particular places existing by the nature of things themselves. This is indeed a truth too deep, said in short (A.S. 86).

Here, the master explains a process, working and the nature of the actions. Actions are of two kinds; they are both material and sentient.

How do the actions happen to be sentient ? They are naturally so. Actions on the part of the soul are its own activities. Now actions as the soul - activity are naturally sentient. So the soul - strength being active in its approach to the world incurs fine matter as bondage with and within itself. This fine matter turns out in fact a bondage of actions (karma-bandhan^a). It is material. It remains with the soul as the body. It is just germinal and develops to fructify and ^{after} fructification departs as ordinary material.

Every living being is the composite of the sentient and the non-sentient i.e. of soul and matter. So the interaction between them is natural and a fact of our usual experience. When the interaction between the two is natural no agent or catalyser is needed in their activities, actions and consequences. There are instances. The poison does not know that it has the power of taking away life of the living being ⁱⁿ yet, any soul who takes a poison suffers the consequences thereof - undergoes death. Now suppose a child unknowingly takes a poison or a woman out of anguish takes a poison, then, if there were God - a kind fellow, would he direct the poison to take life in the case ? Not at all, never. Judges are not kind, never can afford to be kind, justice is always blind and impartial, one may plead; but mistake and folly are no sins, ~~and~~ death as the penalty thereof is not justifiable. Interaction is so natural that no mediator or the go-between agent is necessary, nor in his insertion justifiable within the order of things. Mimamsa, Jain and Bauddha, the realistic system³ do not admit God as the dispenser of the reward. Cause and consequences, ~~remain~~ ^{reason} and result work by the nature of things themselves. They are not hypotheses.

They are facts of our experience. They are natural, neither accidental nor God-miraged.

Differences from the very birth are not accidental, they are the results of some causes, they are the consequences of actions done in the past birth. As you sow, so you reap. Even the scripture like the Bhagwad Gita which states God as the supreme ruler clearly mentions "Tasmāni eva adhikārante; mā taleṣu kadaśana." You are the master of yourself while (performing) doing the actions, you are at liberty to do this and not to do that; you have every right in the matter, your status is of a free agent. But having done them, you have no right whatsoever as to avoid or escape consequences. You can neither mend nor end them. You have to undergo the consequences for better or for worse, without fail. Even ^{an} appeal to God is of ^{no} any avail. Arrow while on the bow in your hand was at your command, but when left loose it goes its destined direction. So also it is with the law of actions. All religions and systems of philosophy have generally accepted the fact that each and every soul has to get the fruits of his actions good or bad. No system of philosophy has mentioned the contrary. And for the fruitions are mentioned the places like heaven and hell, which are in fact, not created by God but naturally exist. If from a little seed the giant Banyan tree grows out, cannot from the fine matter of bondage the actions may result ⁱⁿ princely status and heavenly riches? If the atomic energy has strength of commanding disintegration and destruction on one hand and winning over time and distance and making vegetable growth rapid, on the other hand cannot the spiritual capacity of soul by its strength, command the situations on earth and beyond? It is a question

of degree. Hypothesis of God as creator and controller too is based on this observance of spiritual strength. But this is not the affair of the isolated or absolute soul, it cannot be its concern, this being a matter of interaction and production thereof. So no God is needed nor is he justified for fruit-dispensing.

So to conclude the matter purely metaphysically it would be worthwhile to quote Srīmad : "Soul is subject to the fruits of its actions. Whatever activities or actions ^{they all} are, ~~are~~ fruitful and not futile. It is an obvious fact of experience that whatever is done is returning the fruits thereof. On taking the poison we suffer from the poisonous effect; on taking the sugar we enjoy its sweetness, by touching the fire we get the burn and from ice the cold, without fail; so also the soul undergoes the effects of passions or passionless soul-modifications. Soul being the agent of those actions or activities he stands responsible for their consequences as the bhoktā. (S.R. p.394).

5. SOUL'S LIBERATION

*

Liberation a result of internal research

Liberation is not a matter of hypothesis but a result of research. The research is not external but internal, not the material but the spiritual. It is not a matter of otherworldliness but of this world, nor is it a matter of ignoring or negligence of life. It is a matter of real life. It is not a negative aspect of life but a positive one. The search has the root in the experience of the reality of the world. Griedad gives some idea of this spiritual search or research: "In spite of utter dislike for the misery all the souls cannot but inevitably undergo the experience of it, then that misery must have some cause at the root. From such a basis springs out the thought series of a thinker and from that, it seems that the natures of soul, actions, other world, the liberation and the like might have been realized." (S.R. 450/646).

Thus on the inevitable experience of the miseries the thinkers might have realized the existence of the soul, that undergoes the experiences and survives. Miseries come and go, but the suffering soul within as a seer, separate from the scenes survives and persists throughout the changes. But, then the soul being sentient might have escaped such bitter experiences anyhow, but in spite of himself he could not. Then, there must be some cause for that. He must be responsible for the rewards that he receives. As you sow, so you reap, so runs the popular proverb. So the actions are accountable on one's part for the rewards good or bad. For actions there are particular places to fructify and fruition; therefore as are the birth and the world

beyond. But actions are miserable and they naturally being a matter of one's will, why not refrain from them and achieve liberation from their consequences? Having put off actions, they might have realised more or less freedom from miseries, they might have realised what complete freedom means. Every living being is in a sense the composite of the soul and the body. Yet the soul seems to be the author and agent, the master of himself. On feeling the adjuncts of the material body he seeks and finds out the way to be free from the burden. Actions good or bad were the matter of interaction between the soul and the matter and their integration - a source of misery. So they finally decided that the actionless state is the state without misery. And as they found the soul non-composite, self-existent and self-sufficient they dared to do without body and put off actions that incur the interaction and integration with the matter. Thus they happen^{ed} to realise the living of the soul pure, and^{by} perfectly giving up the dilution of oneness with the body - the composite of matter and thereby enjoyed their own and real life of the soul, blissful by nature here and everywhere.

Erinad even at the age of sixteen states in a very convincing manner about the insight, approach and spirit of the enlightened philosophers, regarding this problem of the miseries of the world and real happiness: "All the animals from the smallest insect to the wild elephant, men, gods and demons - all these beings have a natural desire to achieve happiness and joy. So they are all busy and industrious about it; but without the rise of the sense of discrimination (viveka) they happen to be deluded therein. They attribute the various kinds of happiness to the mundane existence

(samasa). By extremely ^{thorough} observation (or investigation) it has been proved that that type of attribution is futile. The few daring men, who have removed that false attribution, on the strength (power) of the light of discrimination have been saying to attain the wonderful but altogether a different object. The happiness that is wrought with danger is never a genuine happiness but ^{is} in fact a misery. The happiness of a thing, in the achievement of which lies great misery (agony) and in enjoying it lies more misery ahead and at the end it results into great agony, infinite distress and infinite danger, is merely the so called happiness and not in the least real. So the men of discrimination (do not show any liking for it) are not at all lured by it....." (p.32-33 S.R.). "Thinking over discriminately, we realise the fact that where there is fear and danger, there is utter sorrow, and where there is sorrow there is no happiness at all any where there is no happiness its absolute negligence is proper on our part....." (S.R.p.33).

Supremacy of Liberation

In this mundane existence (samasa) there is extreme and overflowing infinite misery. That misery is of three kinds: mental (ādhi), physical vyādhī), and external (upādhi). "One and all philosophers have been preaching us to be free from those miseries (agonies). The common essence of all the systems of philosophy is this: Renunciation, tranquility, control over passions, mercy, peace, forgiveness, forbearance, humility (aprabhuta), respect towards teachers and elders, discrimination, non-greed, celibacy (brahmacharya), right conviction (faith), and right knowledge to be adopted all; and anger, greed, pride (māna), deceit, liking and disliking, passion, violence, sorrow, ignorance, delusion, all these to be given up....."

"What is the purpose of following all these topics or what is its result ? Let us, now, decide it finally. All the preachers have been saying that its result is nothing but attainment of liberation and the purpose is freedom from miseries or cessation of sufferings. And for that very reason in every system the liberation ^{is} commonly called supreme and incomparable. In the *Sutrakṛtāṅga*... it is said, 'nirvāṇasattha jaha sarvadharmā' - in all religions liberation is said to be supreme. In essence, liberation means to be free from mundane miseries, and as a result thereof to realise the incomparable things like enlight^{en}ment i.e. knowledge and conviction, etc., wherein lies the constant abiding of the perfect bliss and joy, and wherein there is complete non-existence of the birth and death troubles, complete destruction of danger and sorrow." (S.R.p.33).

Now with this introductory importance of the matter, let us go to the argument proper. The disciple doubts the existence of liberation.

Disciple's doubt about liberations

1. "The soul is the author and enjoyer of its action, let it be; but for it there is no liberation as such. Infinite time passed away and yet there prevails at present the fault." (A.S.87)
2. "If one does good actions he enjoys the fruits thereof in the heavenly birth or the like and if one does bad deeds he undergoes the results thereof in the hell or the like, but nowhere can the soul be without actions." (A.S.88)

Infinite past and probability deplored:

The disciple is convinced of the fact that the soul is the author and the enjoyer of his actions. But he doubts its liberation. In his view, if liberation were a possibility it should have occurred in so endless a time like the infinite past. But it has not happened yet; so it is an utter impossibility. Here, the disciple takes the commonsense view of things. Infinite past is endless time and there is every chance for the possible to occur as a fact; and if it does not occur how can it be called ^a possibility, in truth? There is time-criterion. There is history. Now if there is no record of any fact occurred in infinite past, how can its possibility be accepted for the future? Time-infinity is so endless a span that it exhausts all the possibilities. Liberation has not happened yet, and on the contrary there prevails the root of bondage, the faults like ignorance and delusion, the cause of all bondage. So liberation (on the part) of the soul is ever an impossibility. (A.S. 87).

Activities and places viewed:

Rather it seems to be an eternal order that the soul either does good or bad deeds and suffers the consequences thereof in heaven or hell. Either on earth or on heaven and hell there can be found no liberated soul, for the places are verily the places for fruition of the actions. So nowhere, be it earth, hell or heaven can the soul happen to exist as liberated, nowhere can be met actionless soul - all these places being places for fruition. So with the soul this is the ordeal to pass through over and every where. Do actions, and enjoy their fruits, sweets or bitter. Do actions either good or bad. Do good actions and go to heaven, do bad

actions and go to hell. This seems a status quo eternally existing. On earth, in hell or heaven, no living being can exist without some actions - good or bad, one or the other. So liberation is not a matter of experience and never a possibility. (A.S. 88).

Looking to the cosmic affairs, evolution and devolution are natural, and the cycle of time goes on for ever with the seasons. No energies and activities exhaust and end; they only change the forms and go on ever functioning. Cosmic activity cannot come to a stand still. It is unthinkable.

Views of various systems for support:

Even the philosophical systems and religions that have emphasised too much the point of liberation, are not calling the liberation a final word. For them, liberation is not eternal. Then liberation is a sojourn in the cycles of time. So liberation is no liberation, but in a sense a preparation for or energising the actions. For, how can it be otherwise? Earth, heaven and hell all are come out of actions, and for actions; and nowhere actionless soul or being is found. No living being can afford being actionless, then obviously liberation is not at all possible. Liberation is another name for rest, rather recreation at the most. All desire liberation as the state of freedom from all miseries, but all of them do not maintain liberation through out as it is.

According to the Buddhist philosophy nirvana (liberation) is a complete cessation of suffering but that cessation seems to be suicidal as there is no soul as a substance to exist permanently and consciousness being a momentary consciousness by itself cannot persist in Shunyata, as things are taken as momentary. For consciousness there remains neither the object nor

the subject to be known, then it at once ceases to be consciousness. It is a cognitive nirvāṇa - thus śhūnyata is suicidal. But that is not in the nature of things. Metaphysically speaking, nothing can give up its nature. So śhūnyata is not a real liberation. For such liberation i.e. cessation of suffering cannot be ^{justified suicidal} ~~justified~~ on cessation of knowledge (śhūnyata).

According to the Nyaya Vaisheshika philosophies, the soul in liberation is devoid of consciousness, so knows nothing and is free from all sufferings ! Soul in liberation is another name for the stone. Soul is a pure substance without consciousness. None on ^{earth} would desire such liberation with more joy than that for ^{death} ~~earth~~, rather one would ^{death} ~~prefer~~ to liberation as there is rebirth and the renewed life ahead. But with liberation, complete cessation of consciousness - eternally stony life ! Thanks to the Vaisheshika doctrine, that God recreates the world after its destruction; and the liberated souls get consciousness again to maintain the living as being on earth !

In the Sāṅkhya-Yoga system liberation is cessation of miseries on isolation of the soul i.e. 'puruṣa' from the 'prakṛti' - matter. Soul is undoubtedly conscious to the core throughout birth, death, life and liberation. So far so good, but there is God, a missionary, who returns the liberated to the world to liberate others. But then you are Yogins and need not worry !

With the Vedānta, the soul on liberation loses itself in the Brahman. If it is possible substantially, it is the loss of one's individuality, a spiritual death or loss of freedom; or else the liberated would be taking

greater responsibility as Brahman of running cosmic actions ! So no actionless state, no liberation proper. The wheel came to a full circle !

The Master's reply:

1. "As you realised on proof (pramana) the good and bad deeds to be fruitful; so also, Oh you, wise, acknowledge their cessation duly fruitful, and therefore the liberation too." (A.S.89)
2. "The time infinite passed in fact with affinity for the good or bad actions; but now on doing away with that tendency i.e. affinity for good or bad actions, there shall duly develop the liberation, genuine nature of the self." (A.S. 90)
3. "Once for all the extreme separation of the self from the union with the body and the like is the state of the liberated self, liberation, the eternal status of the self, enjoyment of one's own everlasting infinite bliss." (A.S.91)

Master's Metaphysical explanations:

The master proceeds in his argument on metaphysical basis. The disciple observed that the actions are always fruitful, good actions result in good reward and the bad ones in bad; but he maintains that as the soul has been with the actions for the infinite past, same may repeat in future. The status quo is over the ordeal for the infinite future.

Hence, liberation is never a possibility. So the master maintains the corollary of the metaphysical principle: As actions are fruitful, so is their cessation. And that very cessation of actions results in liberation, for liberation is the actionless state.

It is argued by the disciple that on earth no being is found actionless, in heaven by the nature of things as was said, there the souls enjoy the rewards of good actions, and in hell that of bad actions, so in those three places nowhere can be found the actionless soul. It cannot be denied. But from that it cannot be concluded that there is no other place as such where can be found the actionless souls or the liberated souls. On the contrary it can be well maintained that so far as one has ^{not} attained the actionless state he cannot rise up higher than heaven to a place, where actionless souls reach and retire eternally. So it is natural that the soul with actions cannot come across the place of liberation; but it is not proper for him to conclude that there is no place as such; nor can he conclude that liberation is an impossibility as it has not occurred yet, though the infinite time has passed away, because there is infinite time i.e. infinite future till at hand. Secondly history cannot rule out metaphysics. Infinite time passed in doing good or bad actions, but it so happened, because of the will of the soul. Now the soul if itself wills to stop doing actions it can do by its own will. Time cannot come in the way. It is by ^{its own} will that the soul pulled on the performing of the actions, now the soul can put it off, if it wills. It is of its own accord that the soul performed the actions and because it was at liberty to do what it liked, that it stood responsible for its own actions and underwent the consequences. So in fact it is not the matter of time but a matter of one's own will either to go on doing actions, good or bad or to put off. If it

puts off doing actions, there results no bondage, and as there is no bondage the soul stands liberated. Ethics of actions and bondage has metaphysical background of the nature of things⁵, like the soul and matter interacting on each other. It is no rule or moral code enforced by the outside authority - the cosmic ruler. Liberation is not something without. Soul's actionless state i.e. its pure and natural state is liberation. So on putting off performing the action, the soul turns out liberation incarnate + liberated. So liberation is nothing but the realisation of soul's own natural state.

It is in a sense self-purification. According to Srimad, liberation is complete self-realisation. It is in a sense search or research of one's own ultimate reality. Every living being is a composite of the soul and the body, the body being a composite matter. We can say that a living being is a composite of the soul and matter. Now it is the soul itself that feels and functions as a living being; the matter being non-sentient, neither knows or feels anything. Now this composite form is subject to change, disintegration and destruction on one hand, and allows interaction between the soul and the matter on the other. And the soul being a conscious principle must suffer from interaction, disintegration and destruction of the united state. But so far interaction is concerned it would be worthwhile to understand the causal chain and then find out the way to escape from the chain. Without going deep into the details at this stage, it would suffice to note that looking to the life of this composite living^{being}/actions seem to be the dominating factor. Now these actions are of two types, subjective and the objective or material. The subjective actions,

by their very nature take the initiative and incur the bondage, while the material actions are in a sense responsive as resulting in bondage as the consequences of subjective actions. Material actions, as bondage, do limit the powers of the self, do bind the soul, do stimulate the interaction, and do delude the soul; but the initiative rests with the will of the soul. So if the soul by the sense of discrimination remains merely the seer and do not inculcate the affinity for actions, then the tendency of doing actions becomes weaker and weaker and so the bondage too weaker and weaker as the time passes, and then at the end the soul will be able to do away with the tendency and shall free itself from the bondage. It shall stand as pure, self-existent, perfect and extremely separate from the body etc. It will realise the self as ultimately real, the end of the spiritual research.

Status of the liberated:

The master has very precisely described the state of liberation but he has done full justice to the status of the liberated soul. Liberation here is maintained as the natural state of the soul (A.S.90). This point is the very basis for all the detailed description of the status of the liberated. Liberation being the natural state of the self, it never admits of any integration, compositeness or union with the other. It being self-existent stands as self-sufficient by itself and remains separate, absolutely aloof from the body etc. Srinad writes, "One who naturally maintains absolute unrelatedness (samgatva) from all the other substances, absolute from all the places, ^{who} one is absolutely above time and absolutely devoid of

6. MEANS OF SOUL'S LIBERATION

*

Trying situation

On one hand, there is stark reality facing us. In spite of our efforts, individual and collective miseries loom large in life. Physical sufferings are lessened to a greater extent, but mental unhappiness grows on multiplying, day by day. In our lives fear and uncertainty prevail, and more, for men the technical researches are so dangerous and destructive that they may wipe off the whole human race and its civilisation. Science and politics are too delicate and touchy to be trusted. On the other hand religion and philosophy profess of superhuman bliss and are ready to remedy the wrongs and ^{ills} lies on individual and collective basis. For the individual there is liberation, for the race there is spiritual evolution to be effected; There are means and methods; plans and programmes, precepts and practices. But these religions and philosophies are so detailed and different, so contradictory and confusing, so hostile and critical of one another that one is at a loss to find out the true from the false. Individuals and society are puzzled, perplexed and baffled. Miseries are multiplying on one hand, and these doctors differ on the other hand.

Situation surveyed and the search tracks

Śrīmad has thought over this situation and has put the problem in general. He writes: "The souls troubled and tired of the infinite kinds of physical and mental sufferings, though wishing intensely to be free from them by many ways cannot be free yet - what is the reason thereof? Such a problem faces many souls, but the rare may find its right solution. So far

the root cause of the misery is not (properly) rightly known; whatever great effort for eliminating the misery may be done the misery cannot be destroyed; and inspite of disliking, disfavour and disregard whatsoever towards it the very misery must be suffered. On trying to put off that misery by the improper remedy, and trying it with the unbearable utmost efforts, when that misery prevails, that spiritual seeker is perplexed and remains puzzled as to its right cause or right remedy. He is at a loss to find out why the misery does not end ? In no way and never the misery has been wished for, and even in the dream not the least affinity has been shown towards it, yet the misery rears up of itself, and whatever efforts, I try, turn out futile, and am obliged to undergo the experience of the misery - what is the cause thereof?

Is it
" Is it so that no one can end misery ? Is to be miserable really the nature of soul ? Is it so that there is the creator of the world who might have considered it proper to do so ? Is it the matter of destiny or is it the result of some past faults of mine ? Such and the like-fancies and guesses do the embodied souls with mind go on hazarding, and those without mind undergo unconsciously the suffering, and unconsciously go on desiring for its end.

" In this world it is the conscious or unconscious desire of each and every living being that anyhow there should be no suffering at all and let there be happiness ever in every way and always. ' For that the efforts are, yet why does it not end ? Such a question occurred in the past to too many thinkers, occurs in the present and shall occur in the future. But

from those infinitely infite thinkers only the infinite thinkers got the right solution thereof, and got liberation from the sufferings. In the present too, those who get the right solution thereof, do get the same result and in future too whatever thinkers happen to have the right solution of it shall, without doubt, get the very result.

" If the physical suffering would have vanished merely by medicines, mental miseries by money and other wants, and external unions and relations leave mind quite unaffected, then the means that are tried by each and every one shall all be successful; but when it did not happen so then to the thinkers it occurred that there must be altogether a different (means) remedy for the cessation of sufferings, ^{that} our usual means are false, false, and futile are all the efforts, and therefore, if the root-cause of the misery is rightly known and duly remedied accordingly then and by that way alone shall cease the suffering, otherwise it shall never cease.

" Now from among those thinkers, who rose up with a real desire to find out the right root-cause of misery, only the rare got the right solution thereof, and lot of them, though without having any right solution thereof, owing to illusion believed that they had arrived at a right solution and preached it to the people, and people on their part followed them too. This is the main cause of the birth of different sects and systems.

" Most of the thinkers came to believe that religion is the means to end the misery. But in grasping the nature of religion there happened to be a great difference among them. Many lapsed from their 'Original

these aim and attempt, and for and many being nervous in the matter turned out sceptic, pessimistic or hedonists, and the like, " (S.B. p-576-77). Indeed, grapes are sour or sweet. It depended on the success or failure of the pursuit. Philosophy is an adventure. So the disciple takes a safety measure. He wants liberation, no doubt; but he fears; for he is at a loss to find out the true from the false means. So he proceeds in his argument to arrive at the right means.

The perplexity :

1. "May there be the liberation, but not so unfailing means thereof. How can the actions of infinite past be put off at present ? (A.S. 92).
2. Or else, there are many sects, and systems of philosophy and they show different means of liberation. How it is impossible to discriminate the right one therefrom. (A.S. 93).
3. In what caste, sex or garb the liberation can be had ? That cannot be decided. Many sectarian differences are itself a sign of something wrong with the sects themselves. (A.S. 94).
4. So it seems that there cannot be had right means of liberation. Hence how can the knowing of soul and all be helpful, or of any avail ? (A.S. 95).
5. By your five replies I am thoroughly satisfied with full solution of the problems; but now, if, I realize the right means of liberation, indeed, how fortunate and favoured am I ! (A.S.96).

Importance of the means :

Liberation is in fact a matter of realization. It is abstract and beyond. It is, in a sense, the end. Its possibility depends upon the right means. If the means are proper and above contradiction, one can certainly hope for the end. So, for attaining the end, it is the means that matter. As the means, so the end. On taking care of the means, the end is always a success, sure and certain. So the problem of means is of no less importance than the end itself.

Right means rare, and the task terribly great :

But the disciple doubts that there can hardly be any uncontradictory means. Secondly there is a great task of doing away with the actions of the infinite past. There may be infinite actions accumulated from the infinite past. How can they be extinguished within this short life ? Doing actions from the infinite time has been a time-old habit with the soul, how can it be given up all of a sudden ? The root-cause of actions might have grown so strong in such an infinite time that how can one have so mighty a means to cut it off and root it out ? The disciple has a keen time-sense, so he properly considers the time factor. To achieve the end, not only the means matter, but also other elements, like time, tendency, habit, root and growth: all should be duly considered.

Again about the means he is more cautious. Contradictions from the outside can be avoided or ignored; but contradictions within the field are a serious drawback. Sects and systems differ among themselves. Even the 'sad darsanas' which have the same root differ a great deal.

One Vedantin poet, saint ' Akha ' criticises harshly the sectarian strife. "The six darshan^s have different sects, and they get kicked mutually among themselves. One proposes and propounds; other disposes and levels down and thus tries to establish in vain his supremacy over the other," and he warns himself: " Akha, it is the dark deep well, none died having done away with the sectarian strife." In such warfare of opinions among the philosophers who will consider them trust-worthy and accept them as impartial authorities? Doctors differ and the patients suffer. Gandhiji when faced with a problem of selecting the right religion asked S'rinned Rajchandra, "If a particular religion is stated to be the best can the proof thereof be demanded?" S'rinned replied promptly: "If the evidence or proof is not demanded (for the truth of the statement) and is professed to be the best without any evidence thereof, then good and bad, religion and hedonism all will stand th as best. It is on proof alone that the best or non-best (second-best th worst) is ascertained as such."¹

But such a discrimination needs broad outlook and sharp intelligence. Indeed a difficult task for a common-sense man ! It requires zeal and aptitude for the field. It requires inner call and the capacity.

Eligibility for Liberation : opinions differ :

Thirdly, there is the difficulty about the standard of eligibility for liberation. In different sects and systems it is maintained that a particular caste or sex is eligible for liberation. e.g. Mimāṃsā holds that a brahmin alone is fit to perform certain rituals, to read and recite

1. (S.R. p. 428).

certain 2 Vedas. The Digambara Jains, inspite of some obvious evidences from the scriptures, maintain as a matter of principle that women cannot achieve liberation. Fair sex is too delicate to destroy all the actions within this birth. Liberation is never a female's task. Men alone can do that. It is after all a manly undertaking. Some Jains believe contrary to the Vedic belief that the Brahmins are lower by caste and those who are worthy of liberation seldom take birth in the Brahmin families.

It is generally maintained in all religions that renunciation is highly necessary for the path of liberation. Hence, came the differences of the garts. The house holders cannot attain liberation; they must renounce. The Svetambara sadhus cannot be liberated, so say the Digambaras, on the pretext that theirs is not the complete renunciation. As they keep clothes, they maintain attachment in clothes and body.

So one would be puzzled to decide for himself as to what path and practices he should follow. So many differences are a sign of some fault within the system themselves. There should be universal principle for liberation without any distinctions as such for liberation is beyond and above all the worldly differences and distinctions. (A.S. 94).

So to conclude, there are no real means of liberation and the knowledge about soul and its eternity, about its initiative and responsibility for the actions, is all futile and is of no avail. They are mental gymnastics, or the hobby horses. But, on the other hand, the disciple has deep faith in the master and he being tired of miseries of the



infinite past has taken this spiritual errand, and with a hope he requests the master to show him the right means - a fortune for him on for ever !

The Master brings to light the path of liberation :

1. " As you are convinced within, of the five replies about the facts regarding the soul, so shall you naturally be convinced of the means of liberation, keep patience." (A.S.97)
2. " An action-mindedness or underlying innate affinity for actions (karmabhāva) is utter ignorance (delusion) and the spirit of liberation or free - spiritedness is, in fact, the abode of the self, the (self-abode). Ignorance is just like darkness and it vanishes at once by the light of the enlightenment." (A.S.98).
3. " Maintaining the causes of bondage is the path of bondage; and the self-poised state, that removes the affinity for actions is the path of liberation - the end of birth and rebirths." (A.S. 99).
4. " Attachment, hatred and ignorance are the prominent roots of actions the bondage-knots; the means to destroy them all is the very path of liberation. " (A.S. 100).
5. "The soul is ever-existing, (sat, being) sentient, and pure - distinct from all phantoms or visionary forms and states. The way to realize its pure absolute state is the path of liberation (A.S. 101).
6. "Actions are of infinite kinds; among them eight are main, and among those eight the Mohiniya i.e. the Self-deluding is prominent. So, I give the lesson to cut it off thoroughly. (A.S. 102).

The lesson :

7. " The self-deluding karma is of two kinds namely the Faith-deluding^u and the Conduct - deluding. Enlightenment and non-attachment are respectively the never-failing means to cut them off. (A.S. 103).
8. " Anger, etc. incur the bondage; and forgiveness, etc. cut it off. This is obviously a matter of everybody's experience. What is to be doubted therein ? (A.S. 104).
9. " Giving up one's whimsical notions and blind pursuit of sects and systems of philosophy, one who follows this path, shall (shortly be liberated ~~would have none or fewer births~~) have few rebirths. (A.S. 105).
10. " You have passed very thoughtfully the six arguments on the six fundamental (principles) truths; then, you do take it finally granted that unity and ~~antithytheses~~ entirety thereof certainly pave the path of liberation. (A.S. 106).
11. " If the said path is taken, there are no distinctions of caste, sex or garb. One, who pursues it, (the path) attains Freedom, same for all without any distinctions. (A.S. 107).
12. " One who has suppressed the passions, who hopes only for liberation, who has utter dejection for birth and rebirth and inner compassion, is worthy to be called the aspirant (Jijnāsu) of Self-knowledge. (A.S. 108).
13. " If such an aspirant happen to have true teacher's preachings, then surely shall he attain right faith and vision, and consequently he shall lead the life of self purification. (A.S. 109).

14. " He once for all gives up blind pursuit of the sects and systems, and lives up to the Master's word, view and aim; and thereby attains pure enlightened faith, above all differences and distinctions or preferences. (A.S. 110).
15. " If there is experience of one's own self (soul) the soul-centred attention or the abiding conviction of the self within, and the self-inclined tendency of the soul, it is the absolute Right Faith. (Sanskrit) (A.S. 111).
16. " The Right Faith, then, (having developed) on growing deep and intense destroys the self-delusion, and soon shoots forth the Right Conduct which reaches its zenith in the status of complete non-attachment. (A.S. 112).
17. " Complete and continued knowledge of one's own absolute self-nature is in fact the Absolute knowledge, a liberation, in spite of the body above the bodily states. (A.S. 113).
18. " The dream, be it of millions of years vanishes at once on waking; similarly the delusion of the infinite past, beginningless time, ends at once ~~now~~ on enlightenment. (A.S. 114).
19. " On giving up the body - infatuation you are no more the agent nor the enjoyer of actions. This is the secret essence of religion. (A.S. 115).
20. " By that very religion the liberation is attained. Thyself is verily the liberation, thyself the infinite vision, infinite knowledge and the transcendent absolute self. (A.S. 116).
21. " Thou art pure, enlightened, sentient whole, self-luminous and the home of happiness. It is a sufficient say, what more can be said? Think over it and thou shalt realise. (A.S. 117)

22. " The absolute view of all the enlightened arrives at, and finds retirement, in this final conclusion. Having so, the Master, resumed the 'manana' (repose) ⁱⁿ the natural *caśādhī*. (A.S.118).

Introductory :

The disciple posed the five problems and the master gave a satisfactory solution for all of them. He grasped it thoroughly. Now for the sixth problem the right means of the Soul's liberation, he finds some great difficulties. His approach is systematic. He first looks to the task. It seems gigantic, objectively as well as subjectively. The soul is bound from the infinite past and for the infinite past the soul has been continuously incurring actions (karma). So these accumulated actions of the endless past seem so huge a ^tlog that they cannot be put off in a short spanned life of a man, nor can the tendency of doing actions can ever be given up, for it has been deeply rooted in the nature of the soul from the endless past. Secondly, he turns to the means and methods for liberation. But he is at a loss to find out the right ones from the false; for, the sects and systems are quarrelling among themselves and show different means and methods. So arriving at its discrimination is difficult. and Thirdly, if liberation is possible and means and methods right, there still stands the problem of qualifications and eligibility. One must be qualified for liberation. One must be worthy for that. Liberation is the supreme status; so with all sects and systems qualifications count. But they differ widely in the matter. Hence, the disciple is perplexed.

The Problem considered metaphysically and epistemologically :

The master takes the problem point by point. First he considers

the problem metaphysically and states precisely the whole of the path in general. He goes to the very ^{root} of the facts and reveals the right nature of things - things in their reality.

We feel and experience the bondage. The bondage functions in the form of actions accumulated (Karma). We have affinity for the actions. We are in a sense action-minded, we behave as if one with the actions.

The State of delusion or bhranti :

We are action-charged; so much so, that we have lost our identity. We are deluded regarding our form and faith. We are not in our true spirits, we are not in our own form. We are baffled in our faith and form, belief and behaviour. We are not true to our own self. We are not what we really are. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ We know not our own being at the core. We are ignorant of our own real self. We are suffering from self delusion. We are possessed by karma-bhava, and we feel oneness with it. It is utter ignorance, through delusion.

It is by nature self ignorance, lack of knowledge about one's real self. We do not know our real nature; and therefore we believe ourselves being something else, something different ^{other} than actually what we are. So we are given up to something else. We are lost in it. It is in a sense trespassing - going beyond one's own field, 'bhranti'. It is mistaking the self both in knowledge and in action, both by knowledge and by action. It is a double delusion, delusion in knowledge as well as in action. It is a mistake rather a blunder both in knowledge and in action. It is a root-mistake, the mistake that causes all the rest to occur and extend.

The root-cause of all delusion ?

About this mistake Śrīmad draws our first and foremost attention. He writes : " After the rise of thought (of course philosophical) the great man like Vardhamāna Śvētā contemplated often and often ^{over} how to extinguish these births and deaths that the soul undergoes yet, and does not come to an end even after the infinitely infinite cycles of birth and death in all the four (gatis) forms of beings from the infinite past and what is that mistake that the soul has been doing, that it results so far till now from the the endless past ? " Thus on his oft-repeated ^{ed} efforts with extreme concentration and increasing enlightenment in his continued contemplation Bhagavan found out the mistake which is incidentally stated oft and often at places in (Jaināgama) the Jain scriptures so that the seeker may be aware of it and may finally give it up. Looking to the mistakes by the soul they seem to amount more, too far than the infinite but the germinal mistake of them all should be ~~thorough~~ thought over first by the soul at the outset (of his spiritual search and strife) so that on contemplating over that root-mistake ^{eschewed} all the ^{eschewed} rest are ~~eschewed~~ and by giving it up all the rest are automatically omitted, nullified (S.R. p. 399).

The Root-mistake contemplated over and shown clearly :

This notions-mindedness (karma bhava) is by nature nothing but ignorance, ^{of} delusion. There is no right discrimination the self from the actions. The soul takes itself to be some or other form of the actions. It feels oneness with it. It cannot distinguish itself from the feeling of oneness with the actions or the bondage state. This is utter delusion, ignorance.

material. It is distinct from the soul. Therefore, to bondage is, ~~this then as one is ignorance, delusion.~~ ^{as the} bondage in its essence lies in karmabhava soul's feeling of oneness with the manifestations of actions accumulated. And this feeling of oneness is to ignorance or delusion. According to Brinad this mistake is hinted at and explained more or less by all the schools of Indian philosophy of course, somewhat differently but no less definitely. The Vedānta, as he observes, calls it 'bhrānti', and Jains call it Mithyatva or Karmabhāva - action-mindedness.

Brinad clearly states that very fact thus : " In the dream-like state of ignorance this soul takes or believes other things (substances - dravya) that are not really itself, to be same as its own self and that very belief is saṃsāra (the birth cycle or mundane existence), that verily is the ignorance (delusion), that verily is the cause of the hellish and heavenly births (gati), that verily is the birth and death and that verily is the body and its iniquities (vikāra), that verily is the cause of the notions like son and father, friend and foe. And on these cessation or removal of it (ignorance) there prevails naturally the liberation.¹ In short : "If the soul ^{inculcated} ~~inculcates~~ the notion or sense of oneness with other substances, it incurs the mundane state subject to birth-cycles, and if it resorts to its own self and takes its own self as the self itself, then the mundane state subject to birth cycle ceases to be."²

1. S.R. p. 436/537.

2. S.R.P. 436/539.

The Mistake explained in the light of liberation :

For, liberation in fact by its very nature is nothing else but the pure natural state of the self. Śrīmad clearly states it "To arrive at a natural state of the self is called liberation by the Vitarāga - the non-attached." ³

"Soul is not devoid of its natural state, but only it is not aware of it. And to be fully and really aware of it is arriving at a natural state of the self i.e. self-realization."⁴ Soul is never devoid of its nature but it has mistaken it and had not realised it so far. One can never be devoid of one's own nature. One's own nature can never be given up. It is always there, ever abiding by its own self. One may be conscious or aware of it, ^{or} one may have thorough ignorance or mistaking of it but it is there ever and eternal. So there is only the matter of mistaking or ignorance. And that mistaking of the self or the self-ignorance is to be given up.

Śrīmad writes : "There being delusion in the form of mistaking of the self (mithyātva, false identification by knowledge as well as by action) arriving at the supreme state of the self in reality is not taking place." This 'mithyātva' or delusion is a form of mis-take, and that mis-take can be removed on arriving at a right knowledge of

3-4. S. R. p. 469/609.

the self i.e. on self enlightenment, and in fact, as Srīmad puts it with a full emphasis at his command. "The enlightened (jñāni) is liberated on the very instant of the departure of delusion (mistake) from knowledge". This delusion or ignorance is, as Srīmad calls it, like darkness and it vanishes on enlightenment - self knowledge. Ignorance cannot stand against the light of knowledge. This ^{self-}ignorance cannot stand against the light of knowledge. This ignorance or delusion is merely a mis-take, and the mis-take is removed by arriving at a right knowledge of the self. And arriving at a right knowledge of the self is not so difficult as it is believed. It should only be sought with right earnest and proper approach. Srīmad puts it very logically the problem of knowing the self. "The Tirthankars and others have oft and often preached and pointed out the path, but as the soul wants to remain baffled and misled so, no (means can mend the matter) remedy rendered can work at all. It is repeatedly and expressly said that if the soul rightly understands there naturally stands the liberation and at on hand, otherwise even the infinite means and methods are of no avail. And to understand rightly is not at all so difficult, for only the natural state of the self alone is to be understood, and nothing else. And that is not the matter of any other's hand so that, he may perhaps (hide) keep it secret or let not know so that it may not be understood. But, how can it ever be possible that one can remain hidden from one's own self?" ¹

Now in our quest we by a circular route realized the plain and

1. S.R. p. 436/537.

obvious fact of all the philosophical search that action-mindedness or infatuation of the actions i.e. Karmabhāva is the cause of bondage, and that ~~this~~ action-mindedness is by its nature a egoistic tendency resulted from self-delusion the consequences of self-ignorance. On removing the self-~~ing~~ ignorance the self is realised as it is and that self-realisation is naturally the liberation.

Problems recapitulated :

Thus in arriving at the right knowledge of bondage and liberation in their reality we arrive at a natural and practice ^{cal} solution of the problems, facing us in the task of achieving our liberation. The problems facing us in the last stage of our spiritual quest are, as we observed, mainly three. Firstly, the task is gigantic as the actions of the infinite past are to be nullified and the time-old tendency of doing actions to be put off. Secondly, from the different means and paths of liberation pleaded and preached by various ~~and~~ sects and schools, the right ones are to be distinguished. Thirdly, among the various varying qualifications the proper, adequate and appropriate are to be apprehended and to be attained.

The key to their solution :

Now looking to the first we found that bondage of the infinite past is caused by egoistic action-mindedness which is ~~the~~ in fact utter self-ignorance. So what we have to do is to end up this ~~ignorance~~. Self-ignorance is like darkness which vanishes at once by the light of enlightenment. Ignorance by its very nature is such

that it cannot stand against enlightenment. However, dense and deep-rooted it be, it must quit on enlightenment. Though of infinite past it vanishes at once on ⁱⁿ showing out of an enlightenment. Enlightenment admits no ignorance. Now for the enlightenment qualifications count, no doubt, but they are not external; for, one has to know one's own self and that too a natural one; so no obstacles, and nor any artifice can stand in the way. How can one ever remain hidden from one's own self? Artifice needs efforts and attempts. Natural is ever effortless, it is only to be observed, to be recognised. Mis-taking is to be given up. One has to realise one's own self. One has to remain what it really is. Thus, the method and the means are straight and simple, easy and obvious, sure and certain.

As we have observed, Śrīmaṇi considers mis-taking of the self, i.e. self-delusion or self-ignorance the root-cause of mundane existence-samsara.¹ He emphatically concludes "If the soul inculcates the notion or sense of oneness with other substances it incurs the mundane state subject to birth-cycle; and if it resorts to its own self and takes its own self as the self itself, then the mundane state subject to birth-cycle ceases to be². This principle of bondage ^{and} liberation is more or less common and conclusive of almost all the six schools of philosophy.

The Bauddha view :

Viewing the Bauddha philosophy, in the twelve links in the chain of suffering, we find that ignorance about truth i.e. 'avidyā' is the root-cause of birth and rebirth, and therefore of suffering. This ignorance

1. S.R. p. 436/537. 2. S.R. p. 436/539.

is nothing but wrong views about the self and the world. So we must have right views i.e. knowledge. Broadly speaking, ignorance is the cause of mundane existence or bondage, and knowledge of truth leads to liberation. If we look to the 'aṣṭāṅgika mārga' - the eight-phased path, on one hand we find right view first and foremost to do away with ignorance about the self and truths about reality ; and, on the other hand, we find last but not the least important 'samyaḥ samādhi' - the self-poised state.

The Nyāya view:

The Nyāya philosophy in its scheme and structure is largely a system of knowledge but it makes it clear that ignorance being cause of all sufferings it aims at giving knowledge ^{of} realities for the realisation of liberation - Apavarga, the summum bonum of our life wherein one is absolutely free from all pains and sufferings. In order to ^{achieve} ~~realise~~ apavarga i.e. liberation one must have 'tattva-jñāna', knowledge of realities - the self and all other object so that he may be free from 'mithya jñāna' and realise himself distinct from the body, senses and the mind.

The Vaiśeṣika view:

The Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy does not differ in its aim with the Nyāya. Both of them aim at liberation of the individual soul from sufferings. Both believe ignorance to be the root cause of all sufferings. In their view liberation means complete and thorough destruction of all sufferings. It can be attained by knowledge of reality - 'tattvajñāna', which puts off ignorance.

The Sāṃkhya view:

About the Sāṃkhya, Prof. D.H. Dutta writes: "The word 'sāṃkhya' means perfect knowledge (samyaḥ-jñāna), and philosophy in which we have such

knowledge is justly named 'Sankhya'.....

"It may very well be characterized as the 'sankhya' in the sense of a pure metaphysical knowledge of the self.¹ "Like the Nyaya Vaishenika system the Sankhya aims at the knowledge of reality for the practical purpose of putting an end to all pains and sufferings.² According to Sankhya there are only two realities: soul and the matter (purusa and prakrti).

According to the Sankhya system it is ignorance to believe the self to be body, senses, mind or the intellect. One must distinguish the self from all these. It is because of ignorance that one confuses self with them. Ignorance is *aviveka* - nondiscrimination between the self and not-self. Thereby it identifies the self with the not-self. It is the cause of all troubles and miseries. So in order to have liberation from all the mundane miseries one must have *vivekajnana* or discrimination. By discrimination - *vivekajnana* - one realises the self as it is and is liberated.

The Yoga view:

Like the Sankhya, the Yoga system too maintains that '*vivekajnana*', discrimination, is necessary for liberation, because the self has wrongly identified itself with the body, mind and the ego. Self should be known and realised distinct from all of them and for that self-knowledge is highly necessary. In order to arrive at an un mistaken self-knowledge the system prescribes the Yoga practices. Yoga system, on one hand, provides detailed knowledge of the organs of apprehension so as to draw our attention to the absolute distinction as is of the self from them all, and on the

other hand provides a practical path to arrive at utter and actual self-distinction from all the mistaken or false self-identification. So that full nature of the self can shine out.

Mimamsa's view:

According to the Mimamsa philosophy, soul is bound to this world through the body, senses and the mind. If it is to be liberated, this bondage should be utterly destroyed. In order to destroy that bondage one should perform his obligatory duties with non-attachment. Disinterested duties are not at all binding. But that spirit of disinterestedness or non-attachment, while performing one's task ^{ca}rouses on enlightenment i.e. knowledge of the self. Liberation in its reality is nothing but simply the natural manifestation (or form) of the self-swātmasphūranarūp¹.

Shankar's view:

According to Shankara Vedanta, the soul is bound because of ignorance of the self for the endless past. Under the effect of this self-ignorance the soul identifies itself with the body and the mind and remains associated with it. So it is in fact the bondage. The self identification with the body-mind compact is egoistic. This ego is self-delusion. Thereby the notself is mistaken as self and the self is mistaken as the notself i.e. as the body-mind compact. In order to remove this ego, ignorance about the self should be removed. The self-ignorance disappears on enlightenment. By the enlightenment ^{ca}the self realises its true nature and stands as liberated.

1. Dr.S.Radhakrishnan: *Prakarna Panchika*, p.157.

Viśiṣṭādvaita's view:

According to the Viśiṣṭādvaita, the soul, as a result of action (karma), is associated with the body. Being embodied ^{it} he suffers from bondage. ^{9†} He identifies himself with the body. ^{it} Through himself being the self, ^{it} he identifies himself with the body that is not-self. This is self-ignorance, avidyā. "Sarvatra-gocarat ca aham buddhir avidyāiva" - This self-ignorance maintains the ego and the ego incurs bondage through actions. In order to remove this 'avidyā' real knowledge of the self is required. Real knowledge is a matter of realisation and not merely a matter of scriptural study. Thereby the soul realises the godhead within and finds ^{it} himself liberated.

Thus to recapitulate in conclusion, bondage of the self is maintained by the egoistic tendencies or karmabhāva which is the result of aviveka, avidyā or bhraṇti i.e. self-delusion or mistaking of the self as the notself or the notself as the self, a kind of wrong self-identification due to self-ignorance, ajñāna. On enlightenment ^{en} self-ignorance vanishes and self is realised in its true form pure and perfect. So, there is no possibility of self-delusion or mistaking and the self stands ultimately distinct in its natural self state, "Svātmaśūbhra rūpaḥ." And it is liberation. To quote Sureshvarācārya: "The existence of the Ātman in its natural state (Svarupa) is spoken of by the wise as liberation (nishreyasa) and the contact of the Ātman with any other condition is the result of ajñāna." (Vārtika).¹

As we have observed, there is more or less a general agreement among the systems of philosophy that bondage functions as a result of actions

1. Dr. Radhakrishnan: Indian Philosophy, p.465.

good or bad, and that the actions are an egoistic tendency owing to the self-realisation - a natural state of the self pure and perfect. But different systems of philosophy preach differently the path ⁴ for liberation. Hence, there must be metaphysical and rational justification for the path; and also there must be propriety of its practicality, as it is a matter of one or other kind of living rather of being and becoming. As for the path of liberation Srimal does not bother about sectarian paths, preached by different systems. But he mentions and maintains a metaphysically basic principle in general and states clear straight to the solution.

The Path:

Like Gautama Buddha he puts it rationally: "Maintaining the causes of bondage is the path of bondage and the self-poised state that removes the causes thereof, is the path of liberation." (A.3.99). So to put it in a manner of four noble truths: There is bondage. There are causes of bondage. It is possible to put an end to bondage i.e. there is liberation. And there is a path that leads to liberation. In life there are two paths: one of bondage, and another of liberation. The state of delusion, i.e. self-ignorance, leads to bondage and the enlightened state leads to liberation. As the cause, so the result. As the means, so the end.

The Path traced from ^aview-point of actions:

Having stated the path in general on the basis of a metaphysical principle of cause and effect, he proceeds further in the direction. Bondage functions as a result of actions. And there are three main sources of actions: self-ignorance, attachment and hatred. He notes, in his

new-book, his conclusions arrived at by his spiritual search.

"For soul, the main causes of bondage are two: attachment and hatred. On elimination of attachment, hatred is automatically extinguished. Attachment has the prominence. It is owing to the attachment that the soul undergoes a tendency of self-identification with the mundane compact state.

"That verily is the karma in the main. With the decline of the attachment and hatred there is a comparative decline in the bondage; and with their keenness bondage is keen and intense. And on the elimination of attachment and hatred there follows the extinction of bondage.

"The chief cause of attachment and hatred is wrong belief i.e. a wrong view of mistaking. By the right knowledge belief turns out to be right and thereby the wrong belief or mistaking [✓] panishes. And that soul ^{the} shines out with the right conduct, which is a state of non-attachment. And the non-attached is liberated after death." (S.R. p.619/6).

Thus, as Srimal concludes, attachment, hatred and self-ignorance are the chief knots of bondage and the way of their extinction is verily the path of liberation.

Broad basis and wide application of the path

Srimal in his interpretation of a Jain doctrine very emphatically states: "The reason of stating the self-realised (siddha) or the liberated by fifteen kinds (types) is to show that whatever the garb, sex or place be one whose attachment, hatred and self-ignorance are extinguished surely attains bliss (liberation)." (S.R.p.729/13). And on this approach of path we find unanimous agreement of almost all the other systems of philosophy, though they may insist on particular garb ^b or sex.

Point of agreement in the Buddha system

Gautama Buddha points out that, "there are two kinds of action, one that is done under the influence of attachment, hatred and infatuation, (raga, dvesha, moha) another that is done without these. It is only the first that strengthens our desire to cling to the world and generates the seeds of karma causing rebirth. The second kind of action, done with perfect insight into the real nature of the universe and without attachment does not create a karma producing rebirth."¹ "In short, all that is born of attachment is misery."²

In the twelve links of the chain of suffering, we find mental clinging to objects the cause of birth and that mental clinging is due to thirst or desire for objects which we see functioning in the form of attachment and hatred. And this thirst or desire for objects in the last resort is the outcome of ignorance - avidya. Thus, we find self-ignorance and attachment to be the main cause of bondage.

Accord in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika

According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophies one must have true knowledge (tattvajñāna) to attain liberation. For, owing to mithyājñāna, passions and impulses rouse the soul to actions, which incur bondage. On enlightenment passions and impulses, we may call them tendencies of attachment and hatred, are pacified and extinguished. So doing away with the ignorance, attachment and hatred is the path of liberation.

1. Dutta and Chatterjee: An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, p.126.

2. Ibid, p.121.

Accord with the Sāṅkhya-Yoga:

Bondage according to the Sāṅkhya system is *supādḥika*. Bondage arises because of the conjunction of 'prakṛti' with 'puruṣa'. This bondage is due to self-delusion, wrong knowledge or 'viparyaya'. Now this 'viparyaya' includes in it, on one hand, 'avidyā' or self-ignorance and ego; on the other hand, *ragadveṣa* i.e. attachment and hatred. So we can ^{say} include that self-ignorance, attachment and hatred being the causes of bondage their extinction by discrimination and non-attachment is the path of liberation.

According to the Yoga system *avidyā*, ignorance of true nature of things and particularly the self, causes bondage through attachment. So far there is 'avidyā', desires cannot be put off. Desires rouse the self to action - *karma*. So we have to attain self-knowledge or *vivekākhyāti*, which is discriminative. By its presence the self remains ^{de} attached. The enlightened and the detached soul is not subject to bondage. Thus, Yoga, the path of discrimination and detachment and non-attachment, is also the path of liberation. Therein through self-centred inward concentration is attained on one hand the detachment from all the objects of the world and on the other hand self-realisation resulting in the *kaivalya*.

Accord with the ¹² Hinayana views:

According to the Hinayana system liberation i.e. 'apavarga' is the supreme bliss, *nibhreyas*. It is achieved by complete extinction of all desires for, or attachment to, any of the object of the world other than the self itself. Karma or actions are responsible for the order of the world. As the karma, so the birth. Good actions result in heavenly state, and bad in the hellish or the like. These actions if ~~caused~~ dictated by desire for

enjoyment i.e. desire spring out of attachment towards any object of the world, they lead to rebirth. So liberation or complete extinction of birth and rebirth is attained by doing away with all attachment. Actions done without any attachment are not binding at all. But desire or the attachment prevails, if one has no knowledge of the self. So one by self-knowledge and non-attachment puts an end to good or bad karmas and consequently stops rebirth and attains ever a self-poised state.

According to the Vedanta system the self identifies itself with the body and incur bondage. This wrong self-identification is just a mistaking. It is 'adhyāsa'. In the words of Śrīmad, it is 'dehādhyāsa' - body infatuation. To remove this self-identification, self-realisation is required. But only the qualified can attain the state of self-realisation. One must have 'nityānitya vastu - viveka' i.e. discrimination 'bhoga-virāga' i.e. non-attachment, detachment and ardent desire for liberation. From these we can conclude that self-ignorance, attachment and corollarily hatred are the roots of bondage which are to be destroyed, and the way by which they can be destroyed is the path of liberation.

The negative and positive aspects of Liberation: their justifications

Liberation has two aspects: one negative, other positive. On one hand, it is removal and prevention of bondage; on the other hand, it is self-realisation. Self-realisation is nothing but arriving at a natural state of the self pure and perfect by itself. Śrīmad writes: "To arrive at a natural state of the self is called liberation by the Vitarāga - the non-attached."¹

1. S.R. p.469/609.

Sureśvaracārya too observes as a fact that "the existence of the Ātman in its natural state (Svarupa) is spoken of by the wise as liberation (niśreyasa) and the contact of the Ātman with any other condition is the result of ajnana." This positive aspect has a metaphysical basis in the very nature of the self or ātman. Śrīmad very precisely maintains it here (A.S.101) in a conclusive manner. He describes its natural state, so that one may straightly arrive at self-realisation, for, as Śrīmad reveals, the soul is never devoid of its natural state (sāhajanarupa) but he is not aware of it.

The positive aspect explained and illustrated:

He describes the ātman as sat, caitanya-maya, sarvabhāsaravit. "Utpādyaya-dhruvaya-yukto^{sat}". So, accordingly the soul admits manifestation, change and permanence. Even the Buddhists who deny permanence of any object have to make for it under the pretext of chain of saṃskāra and takes the self as a stream of consciousness or a series of cognitions. On the other hand, the Vedānta in spite of its belief in the kūtasthānitya absolutely unchanging self, maintains the mundane states of the self under the category of the 'vyāvahārika sat'. The Jain system therefore rightly maintains that the self is substantially eternal, it is ever-existing, but formally it undergoes changes. According to Jainism utpādyaya and dhruvaya i.e. change and permanence are due to formal manifestations of things. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems, on one hand, maintain that the self is indestructible and eternal, but on the other hand, make room for the change under the categories of activity, rebirth and inherence. They being rational and realistic cannot ignore the reality of world full of change, activity and reactions.

1. See Panchatīkya 10,11 translated by Śrīmad, p.597/766. S.H.

The Sāṅkhya-Yoga systems on their ethical stand maintain the law or order of the karma responsible for the rebirth and rebirth chain the soul undergoes in the mundane state. Thus we realise "sat" to be the first and foremost metaphysical truth about self universally accepted in one way or other by almost all the systems. The self is ever and everywhere "sat". If that quality of "sat" of the self is ignored to that extent prevails the self-ignorance.

Next comes the quality of the soul which is its special and essential characteristic, Chaitanyata. The self is chaitanyasaya. It is essentially conscious through and through. It is its very nature. Without this consciousness of the self there can be no knowledge nor any validity of knowledge. So those who do not realise or do not believe in consciousness being the essential nature or quality of the self cannot help making a room for consciousness as attributed to the soul in the metaphysical structure and epistemology of the system. Non-existence of consciousness is not at all tenable. Even the materialists and sceptics accept it. However irrationally the materialists trace the origin of consciousness, be it to the 'panca mahābhūtāni' or the gross matter they admit in fact, the existence of consciousness as a metaphysical reality. The fact that one may or may not be successful to trace or may wrongly trace the origin of consciousness cannot do away with the consciousness which is existing in fact, as a foolproof reality. Even hypothetical and conceptional reduction of consciousness to matter cannot in the least change the fact of consciousness.

The Naiyayikas, in order to maintain liberation as an absolute state, utterly free from pain and suffering, have far-fetched the point of consciousness and have stated the consciousness to be an accidental attribute

attached to the self, ultimately devoid of consciousness in the state of liberation. Thus liberation for which the whole of the system is said to be established turns out an utter suicide of the self. They have wrongly identified theogistic notions or egoistic manifestations with consciousness. Egoistic tendencies are a result of illusioned, ignorant or mistaking consciousness, but it does not happen that with the extinction of ignorance, mistake or illusion the consciousness of the self is extinguished. So far self is an existing self and the whole of the remaining cosmos is, let us suppose, dispersed and destroyed the consciousness of the self thereby shall not suffer the least as a knower or the seer. Bulk of the objects of knowledge has no concern with manifestation and perfection of consciousness of the self.

Consciousness is either the natural characteristic of a substance or else it is itself a substance and there can be no other soul as such different, distinct and separate therefrom. The Sāṅkhya-Yoga, the Jain and the Vedānta systems consider consciousness as the natural characteristic, the very essence of the self.

The negative aspect traced and supported:

According to Śrīmad the Self is "sat" and conscious by nature and it can be realised on enlightenment^{on} through the experience of the self. Saints and seers speak of their spiritual experiences and sometimes they describe their right or wrong, pure or impure, perfect or imperfect spiritual experiences. After all, self-realisation being the matter of experience their statements if right and rightly understood serve the milestones in the spiritual search for the soul-seekers. So Śrīmad on his own authority states the self in its reality as 'sarvabhāsarahita' which can be seen confirmed by almost all the

systems, if rightly interpreted. The self is pure and perfect by itself. It is distinct from all the seeming semblances, illusions and images found, felt, or framed out of imagination or super-imposition. When they undergo the Yoga practices they see some visions and call them soul. Some identify it with breath, some with light or some with activity. But the soul is beyond the scope of such notions, fancies and visions. So by negating them all one reaches the absolute state of the self. Brinad gives a metaphysical explanation and instruction on the matter, so that we can realise the self as absolute; and that verily is the path of liberation. He writes: "By arriving at the final discrimination of each and everything the self should be made completely free ^{from} from, so says the Nirgrantha. Due to the reflection of other colour in the pure 'sphatika' the original form of it remains unnoticed, similarly the pure and spotless self, under the super-imposition out of the union with others does not realise its own real nature. Somewhat differently is stated this fact by the Jain, the Vedanta, the Sāṅkhya, the Yoga and others."

If we rightly interpret the Cārvāka stands of materialism, scepticism, positivism and empiricism to be a result of their failure due to improper approach, means and methods, we will be able to conclude therefrom that as soul cannot be grasped that way, as they succumb to illusion it must be beyond and above all those states that they explore or arrive at.

Buddha's negative outlook and approach

Buddha perhaps wanted to make men realise that soul is not so easy to be grasped as they think and believe. One must first of all get rid of all

the notions about the self and must realise the stark reality of the world full of misery and unhappiness in the world without, so that one may turn within, where to be free from illusion and super-imposition of the body he might have showed the path of 'śūnyatā'. This 'śūnyatā' if rightly realised one would get rid of all the "ābhāsa" and find the self absolute by itself, in its natural state as it is.

The Vedānta's process of 'neti neti' :

To purify all the wrong notions about the self and make the disciple grasp the Kaivalyadāśha, absolute state of the self, there is a similar doctrine of "neti neti" in the Vedānta.

The Nyāya's daring approach:

The Nyāya in order to do away with the egoistic consciousness of the self goes to the extent of maintaining the self above the stream of consciousness and ventured to call consciousness an accidental attribute of the self and thus tries to establish anyhow the absolute state of the self.

The Sāṅkhya-Yoga's stand:

Sāṅkhya speaks of the 'puruṣa' i.e. self, to be merely an abiding principle wherein the form of 'prakṛti' get reflected. Otherwise, the 'puruṣa' by himself is absolutely free. It is because of the egoistic notions that the self is entangled with the forms of the prakṛti. Substantially the puruṣa is absolutely distinct from the prakṛti. In the Yoga the doctrine of the nirvikalpa samādhi clearly states the self in reality^{above} and beyond all the "vikalpas" resulting from ajñāna.

The significance of the characteristics:

So now we would be able to realise implication and significance in practice of these three characteristics of the self that Śrīmad has stated. The self is "Sat, chaitanyamaya and sarvabhāsarūhita". The characteristic "Sat" shows ^{that} the self is substantially ever-existing through admitting formal changes and substantial manifestations. Thus it is both being and becoming. It is self-existent, self-supporting, self-sufficient and naturally perfect and pure by itself. But even were it not chaitanyamaya however pure, perfect and ever-existent it might be it would not have been able to know and realise happiness and bliss at all. There would ^{have} been no life here and hereafter, transient, transcendent or eternal. Evolution would have been an impossibility or mechanical edifice and meaningless mathematical structure. It is to this consciousness that the universe owes its form and functioning. This consciousness of the self maintains ultimacy of the self in both cognitive and creative spheres of the universe. But for consciousness bondage and liberation would have lost all meaning and motive, neither would have been felt, feared or favoured. Third characteristic maintains the substantial or metaphysical purity of the self without which liberation and perfection would not have been natural and everlasting. It is on this metaphysical basis of the thing in reality that self-realisation is naturally a success simple, sure, straight and final. Liberation is not a philosopher's utopia but a fact resulting from the ultimate reality of things that go to make the world. The soul stands beyond all abhāsa, illusions, and that is why knowledge is knowledge, valid, pure and perfect, eternal and omniscient. Both ultimacy and absoluteness of the self are owing to this unassumed purity of the self 'sarvabhāsarūhitatā'.

Conclusion on both aspects:

three

So now taking all these characteristics together we would come to the final conclusion as to what should be the proper path of liberation resulting from the nature of self in reality. Self being "Sat" is able self-reliantly to go on manifesting eternally without any outside help. It being thoroughly conscious is the source of knowledge and happiness. Feeling of happiness can reside only in the self and eternal bliss lies in the self alone. Finally, it being conscious and beyond all illusions can eternally stand as absolute and be approached from within and through no other agency than itself; itself. Leaving the self to itself or by adopting the means and method that make us realize the absolute self in the absolute state of the self - pure, perfect, omniscient and infinitely blissful is the path of liberation. So now we will realize the unique importance and infinite significance of Srinad's conclusion that "the path of liberation rightly grasped is natural, easy and accessible - sahaj, sara and sugam."
 "Kaivalyam svarupa-pratishtha va citshaktiriti."

The path from the view-point of actions explained:

But to attain the Kaivalya or an absolute state of the self one has to do away with the karmas, actions, that bind the self. How can the actions of the infinite past can be put off is the problem. They are, no doubt, of infinite types, but among them eight are prominent, and among those eight the prominent one in the 'bhaniya karmas' that deludes faith or belief and conduct (A.S. 102). It is the root action of all. So the task before the seer is to put off these two faith-deluding and conduct-deluding bhaniya karmas. First can be removed on enlightenment and the second by the non-attachment, they being their respective antidotes. Srinad has stated

previously self-ignorance, attachment and hatred (rāga, dveṣha and ajñāna) as the three knots or roots of actions. This self-ignorance (ajñāna) falls under the category of 'darsana mohaniya' i.e. belief - or - faith-deluding karma, and attachment and hatred under the category of the conduct-deluding i.e. the cāritra mohaniya. We have also observed how almost all the systems one way or other consider more or less the three to be the main causes of bondage. In almost all the systems moha, ajñāna, bhṛānti, avidyā, aviveka or the like are considered as the cause of bondage, resulting in birth and rebirth cycle which is full of miseries and unhappiness. They have two aspects, they have double functioning. They function in both the belief and action. So here we have two kinds of mohaniya karma - one belief^d-deluding and the other the conduct-deluding. First is destroyed by the enlightenment^{on} (bodha) and the second by the non-attachment, vitarāgata. Here, enlightenment^{on} suggests that mere scriptural knowledge will not do. By itself it cannot serve purpose. One must have insight into the reality, one must be able to realise himself ^{distinct} from the egoistic notions about the self, one must take himself to be the self. Sriśaṅkara writes: "The enlightened seers have told to think over^{on} what in fact is the real enlightenment, and thinking over it many a times to give up one's notions (kalpanā) about the self." He writes in plain terms for giving up such notions (kalpanā): "By watching whatever types of darkness^{can} we ^{may} see, we won't be able to have any as such that in fact, be the form of light; in the same way no notion or imagination of a being who is suffering from the darkness of ignorance seems to be sat," nor can it be nearer to sat". Sat is not a delusion but absolutely different from the delusion, beyond and above the delusion; so one who is finally bent upon having the

sat, should first once for all firmly conclude that he in fact knows nothing at all, and then should he take a refuge under the enlightened; then surely shall he have ^{the} path (of liberation)" (S.S. p.267-68/211). Dr. Radhakrishnan¹ writes about enlightenment: "A mere intellectual understanding of reality is not enough. The end of all knowledge is spiritual realisation 'anubhāvavāsanā eva vidyā-phalaṃ.", and gives a reference from the Śāṅkar Bhāṣya: "pratyakṣavagman cedeṣa phalaṃ, tat - tvaṃ - asity ananāryātmavapratipattau satyan ananāryātmavivāyavṛtteḥ." Enlightenment gets off the self-ignorance. So also non-attachment destroys the conduct-delusion. It is obvious that anger can be removed by forgiveness, pride by gentleness, cunning by straightforwardness and greed by contentment. It is a matter of every one's experience. So the means are above doubt.

Thus the path shown is the path of practice and experience. So now one should not bother about sectarian ways and views. Giving up one's prejudice, insistence and notions regarding the sects and systems, if one follows the said path surely shall he reach the goal, liberation. (A.S.105). Here, in these six replies of the master lies the solution of the six main problems of philosophy. The six doctrines dealt and discussed with details here, if grasped and adopted adequately prove to be the real path of liberation (A.S.106). Śrīśaṅkara writes about these six doctrines regarding the self: "These six doctrines are described as absolutely true without doubt by the great seers. The discerning display of these six doctrines is rendered so that the soul can realise its own self. The seers have displayed the preaching of these six doctrines with a view that the soul may get rid of

1. S.S. Introduction. p.30.

the egoistic and possessive instincts (aham bhāva, mamatvabhāva) resulting out of the dreamlike self-ignorant state from the infinite past. If the soul realises that its natural state is really distinct from the dreamlike state, and behaves as such, then having been naturally awakened attains right belief, and having attained the right belief attains liberation the natural state of the self." (S.S. p.395/493).

We dealt with the task, tendency and the time problems; we dealt with the means and method in general. Now there remains the problem regarding the qualifications. Who can be called qualified for enlightenment leading to liberation? What qualifications are necessary for the soul-seeker? Who can be called worthy of enlightenment? What qualities should he possess? Śrīmad states that if the aforesaid path is to be followed no distinctions of caste, garb or sex are to be considered. One who pursues it attains liberation, wherein lies no such distinctions. (A.S.107). Liberation is beyond such mundane distinctions, so also its path. But who can pursue the path? Not all and everyone. Those who have the inner call, those who are the real soul-seekers can pursue the path of self-realisation. What are, then, their special qualities? They are 'Shama, Samvaga, Asthā, Anukampa'. Those who have these qualities i.e. whose passions are controlled, toned down, rarefied; whose only wish is liberation, who have deep and earnest desire only for liberation; who are tired heart and soul of the mundane tour of birth and rebirth, and who have inner compassion - self compassion; who pity the soul engrossed in dreamlike mundane state of self-delusion are really the soul-seekers (A.S.108). One who has these qualities is really a Jijnāsu. He is worthy of the teachings of the enlightened master. He is qualified for enlightenment.

Our goal is liberation, no doubt. But liberation is the perfect self-realisation, and for self-realisation, self-knowledge is the pre-requisite condition. So the self-knowledge or the real enlightenment is a key to liberation. Therefore the seeker must have deep desire for self knowledge - *jijnāsa* or *brahmajijnāsa*. So here are given the characteristics of a *jijnāsu* - the self-seeker. In the Vedānta philosophy too *jijnāsa* i.e. *brahmajijnāsa* is given a great significance and prominence, for "Knowledge of brahman results immediately in realisation - *brahma-vit brahmaiva bhavati*."¹

According to Śrīmad as we have observed, the self-seeker possesses these qualities *Sama*, *śamvega* ^{nirveda} and *anukampā*. He has defined them in his characteristic way. "Quieting of the passions like anger, abating of the rising passions, mastery self-restraint over passions or receding of the tendencies of the infinite past is 'Sama' no desire or aspiration of any kind except that of being liberated is 'Śamvega'.

"From the moment of coming to the senses that it is under self-delusion, that the soul took the bondage - tour of birth and rebirth for the infinite past, suffice it so far, stop now, and never a step further, Oh I soul, such an inner urge is 'nirveda'."

"And through all these a sense of oneness and self-equality with one and all is 'anukampā' - sympathy." (S.R.p.226/135).

These qualities of a soul-seeker i.e. *jijnāsu* have a justification both rational as well as metaphysical in the scheme of things.

1. B.S. (Radhakrishnan) p.227.

Attachment, hatred and self-ignorance are undoubtedly the facts of life. Mundane life is *vyāvahārika* i.e. relational and not *pāramārthika* i.e. ultimate. The world (*jagat*) is '*vyāvahārika sat*' a ^{relational} relational reality and not an ultimate reality. It has resulted from the beginningless union of the self and the notself mainly the matter. The self and the matter maintain the mutual contact, mutual relation, a *vyavahara* between them. The self in this state of *vyavahara* is called to be in the state of bondage. This *vyavahara* is run in self-ignorance with attachment and hatred. So they are main knots or roots of bondage. Now if we want to ^cget off the bondage, we must give up attachment and hatred. Attachment and hatred function in the various forms of passions - *kaṣāyas*. So one who has subdued these passions is naturally a talented soul and in a sense qualified so far. 'Sama' is considered one of the qualities of the soul-seeker i.e. *jijnāsu*.

The second quality of a *jijnāsu* is '*sauvega*' keen, earnest and deep desire for liberation alone. One must feel acutely the pangs of bondage and should seek freedom from bondage. He feels never at home with the state of bondage. In the state of bondage one acutely suffers from dependence and limitations, imperfection and impurity, all the time. However engrossed in worldly enjoyments, one would feel dependence, limitations and imperfection of the means and materials. Union is wrought with separation. What is composed is subject to decomposition. In short, the forms of '*vyāvahārika sat*' are not ultimate and everlasting. So the free-spirited soul cannot be at home with these fragile forms, dependent and limited, impure and imperfect state of the self. Dependence in his view is never a happiness. He does not see any happiness in the forms of '*vyāvahārika sat*', as they

are wrought with dependence, imperfection, impurity and are transient. No unconscious thing has happened within it. Happiness or its feeling lies only in the conscious principle, the self. So one should remain satisfied with the self and should not run after other things devoid of happiness. Hunting after happiness is just losing the abiding happiness within. Hence a 'jijnāsu' would seek nothing but the self, and wish nothing but the self-realisation = liberation from bondage. Secondly, as every situation of dealing with the world within and without i.e. with any form of the 'vyāvahārika sat' is wrought with ādhi, vyādhi or upādhi = the three fold agony, the 'jijnāsu' does not desire them at all, but would seek the state which is beyond or above them all. Mokṣa or liberation as we have observed is the state of the self; so one would not like to remain engrossed in the state of vyāvahārika existent. One would naturally like to separate himself from the situation and to be himself. He would no more like to be under self-delusion and the results thereof like āśambhāva and mānatvabhāva 'I = mineness'. He would not admit them at all. He would go on denying and discerning them. He will not assume or admit such false identification of the self. He will take the 'neti neti' stand, against all the forms of āśambhāva (egoistic tendencies) and mānatvabhāva that drag him into the world of delusion or vyāvahārika sat. Thus he is no more under the influence of self-ignorance. He wants to know himself, as it is - above all the 'ābhāsa' (Sarvabhāsa-rahitā). He is not prepared to take part in the drama of the world. He is now tired of playing on the stage of the world of illusion. He wants to retire now once for all. This negative stand, 'Hirveda', saves him from self-ignorance and prepares him for enlightenment. He is worthy of the light of self-knowledge as he has shut the doors of the dark den of delusion and has turned his back to it.

Now springs out of them all the inner sympathy. Under the influence of self-delusion there prevailed the same distinction for soul all over the world. But as the aspects of self-delusion are removed no distinctions as such can stand and there prevails a sense of equality and oneness as attachment and hatred and the passions springing therefrom are controlled, checked and ^{or turned} toned down, all are taken as members of universal brotherhood and their pains are sincerely shared sympathetically. Thus narrowness and selfish means and motives are given up, and there remains no cause for maintaining the mundane status. One is overcome with a spirit of commonwealth strife for liberation and wants to lead them all kindly to the light. Thus attachment, hatred and ignorance in the form of Caritra mohaniya and Darsan mohaniya - conduct delusion and faith delusion - are betrayed, denounced and in principles and practice are parted with partially by the jijnāsu, on the strength of his śama, saṁvara, nirveda and anukampa.

Necessity of the Master's teachings:

So far we surveyed the task, tendency and the time problems, means and the method in general, and also considered the path and the necessary qualifications of the spiritual aspirant - soul-seeker. Now the process, in general. Before going to the actual process, it would be worthwhile to understand the limitations of qualifications. However worthy of enlightenment one may be, one cannot, in general, by himself get enlightened. It is only the enlightened seers that can make him realize the self or lead him to the path of enlightenment. Śrīmad writes about it: "It can naturally be understood that the enlightenment can be had from the enlightened seers

One would ^{not} get enlightenment by himself however he endeavours, if in self-conceited way for the endless time; while the obedient to the enlightened may attain the absolute knowledge (kavalajñāna = perfect omniscient knowledge) within ¹satamuhurta¹ (48 minutes)." By watching whatever types of darkness we may, we won't be able to have any as such that in fact be the form of light; in the same way no notion or imagination of a being who is suffering from the darkness of self-ignorance seems to be 'Sat', nor can it be nearer to 'Sat'. 'Sat' is not a delusion but absolutely different from the delusion, beyond, and above the delusion; therefore, one who is finally bent upon having the 'sat', should first once for all firmly conclude that he in fact knows nothing at all, and then should take a refuge under the enlightened; then surely shall he have a path of liberation." (S.R. p.267/211).

"There is no doubt in that that the path of liberation is secret and inaccessible. It seems often so, that without the guidance of the enlightened teacher, by one's own talents it is impossible to be sought out. On seeing the surroundings and circumstances of the world it seems that without such company and refuge of the enlightened the supportless enlightenment can hardly keep itself stable and steady. " (S.R. 466/647).

"Now it is proper to come to a decision that none but the enlightened, who has got the self realised distinct and actual, is able to state the self in its reality, and that without knowing the self through him there is no other means for liberation. Without knowing the self through such an authentic enlightened seer the soul-seeker should once for all give up the notion that he by himself knows the self." (S.R. p.372/449).

1. S.R. p.262/200.

"The soul has acquired knowledge about the self keeping in view the ideology of the world, and not the ideology of the enlightened. One who is enlightened by the ideology of the enlightened attains the right faith (samyag darsana)." (S.R. p.329/358).

So, in short, there is every necessity of the enlightened seer. If the qualified spiritual aspirant gets the preachings of the enlightened, the aspirant gets the right faith (samyak) - right belief or right view and follows path of the inner search - a path of the self-purification.

The path as self-purification

Śrīmad has stated clearly that "liberation is self purification" (A.S.123). Soul is to be freed from all the unions and from all the forms of related reality - Vyāvahārika sat, and its absolute reality is to be achieved. So now the path of inner search, self-purification, both ways: in faith as well as in conduct. For that he has first to have a pure faith (suddha samakit) - belief and conviction of the absolute self - self in its absolutely natural state. For that he has to give up all bias and prejudices or insistence for the sects and systems and has to adopt and follow the true-teacher's precept. He has to accept the enlightened teacher's view point and has to follow it. For, as Śrīmad states: "The great souls that got the supreme peace (param śānti) in the form of the liberation have all of them got it through one and the same path, are getting in the present, verily by it, and shall get it in future by the same. In that path there are no sectarian differences, no lack of straight-forwardness, no distinctions, no intoxication, no recognitions and rejections. That path is straight, it is the path of samādhi, it is steady and naturally the path of peace. It is

existent in all the times and without grasping its essence none was liberated in the past, none is liberated in the present, nor shall be liberated in the future." (S.N.p.182/54).

"Lord Jin has preached rituals and sermons in thousands of ways with a view to lead only to that alone; and if for that path are followed those sermons and rituals they are fruitful; otherwise, all are fruitless, if that path is forgotten or forsaken Giving up bias and beliefs regarding any religion whatsoever the path to be sought with undivided spirit on having the right union (samyaṅ yoga) is verily that one

"That more to be told ? That path is within the self. The self-realised soul, the nirgrantha Ātma, when considering the worthiness of the spiritual aspirant shall give automatically, the self-hood (ātmatva); and then and then alone shall one have the path of liberation and then and then alone those sectarian bias and belief shall finally be nullified.

"None has got liberation by maintaining the sectarian bias and difference. Those, who thoughtfully gave up the sectarian differences, having got the inward spiritual tendency, have got in due course, are getting and shall ever get the eternal liberation." (S.N.pp.182/183). On metaphysical grounds Śrimeś has maintained in short that the self is not realised in its natural form because of the self-delusion. Now that the delusion functions doubly. It deludes faith or belief and conduct. By the teachings of the enlightened one becomes able to remove the delusion. The qualified spiritual/ ^{aspirant} on the preaching of the enlightened gets the right vision and he henceforth leads the

life of self-purification, spiritual search. In life either worldly or spiritual, vision, insight, faith and belief play a leading role. Before enlightenment the spiritual aspirant carries out his spiritual search instinctively and not with insight. After that on having the enlightened master's guidance he goes on with faith and belief in the master. With firm faith in the teachings of the master he purges himself ~~to~~ the sectarian beliefs and attains the right belief - whereby ^{to} he happens to realise the self in its natural state which admits no sectarian differences and distinctions, which stands above them all. He attains pure tight belief - suddha samakhi. (A.S. 110).

He has purified the belief with faith in the enlightened. Now he goes on to purify the conduct, a deeper and more intense process of self-purification. On experiencing the self he has got spiritual insight, rather he leads now the spiritual life, as he has become himself. He is now no more interested in the vyāvahārika life but leads a pāramārthika one, yet he cannot give up the former altogether. However, he, being himself, leads mainly the spiritual life. So he tries to remain in his natural state, but there still remains the effect of the bondage and past actions. So all the time he cannot remain in a self-poised state, but he loses not the sight of his goal. He keeps in view his real self-identity. His spiritual insight is keen. But sometimes he may, when engrossed too much, lose the sight of the goal, but there remains the abiding belief within ^{in his own} his spiritual reality. In his belief no egoistic tendency can stand. Now all his tendencies are spiritual and inward because of the enlightenment. He feels every inch a self. He has once for all an inner conviction "vorily I am the self, aham brahmāsmi." His conviction is rooted in experience of the self.

His faith is now no more indirect. Though he is not fully and completely what he is, so far he is under conduct delusion. Yet he leads a spiritual life. He tries to maintain the self-poised state, the state of experiencing the self-poised state, the state of experiencing the self; and if he cannot remain in that state he keeps next view his spiritual self-identity, the pure and perfect egoless state of the self; and even he may lose sight of it, his belief prevails. Experience, aim and belief - 'anubhava, lakṣaṇa, pratīti' one, two or all prevail through out the life. The spiritual aspirant has transcended in life. He has given up the mundane life for the spiritual, vyāvahārika for the paramārthika. (A.S. 111).

He is following the process of self-purification. His right belief or faith worked on his living. The right belief growing stronger becomes wide, intense and thorough; so the delusion regarding the self, which had a spell over the conviction and conduct, over tendency and practice, over instinct and insight is being removed now - the conduct delusion gives way and the spiritual conduct shines out. The soul in fact is now becoming himself and turns out a Vitarāga, the non-attached-the seer. He attains the status of the Vitarāga. He has almost finished the process of self-purification and there shines out his absolute knowledge, keval jñāna. (A.S. 112.).

The Keval jñāna - absolute knowledge :

What is that Keval jñāna ? "Complete and continued knowledge of one's own self nature is termed as the absolute knowledge - ^{a liberation in} the embodied state. (A.S. 113).

Śrimeś has taken great pains in thinking over 'Keval jñāna'. He notes down his final conclusion regarding it.

"Keval jñāna (Absolute knowledge)

Single knowledge.

Absolute pure knowledge without contact or touch of all foreign substantial manifestations (anyathāva)

Instantaneous knowledge of every aspect of all the substances, places, times and essential or substantial manifestation (bhāva).

It is self-natured in its reality.

It is essentially self-realized, (ava-tattva-bhūta).

It is unobscured.

It is beyond distinctions and differences separation or dissection (abheda).

It is delusionless (nirvikalpa).

It is the best & illuminator of all the entities (bhāva)"¹

Śrīmad, giving more prominence to purity of the self than to the omniscience an objective aspect of knowledge writes : "Extreme purity of knowledge is called 'Keval jñāna, 'absolute knowledge, by the enlightened; and in that knowledge mainly are stated the self-realisation and self-tranquillity (atma-samadhi)....."

"When the soul resorts to the state of extremely pure knowledge it is called 'Keval Jñāna', absolute knowledge in the main. On the extinction of all the kinds of attachment and hatred the state of extremely pure knowledge duly shines out, in that state whatever can ^{be} known ^{is} absolute knowledge, keval jñāna; and it being beyond doubt should not be doubted....."

1. S.R. p. 627/8.

"Arriving at a knowledge of the cosmos should not in main purport be taken as 'keval jñāna'. In order to draw closer attention (omniscience) cosmic knowledge is stated together with it, and it does not mean that it is a fairy tale, but it should not be sided with prejudice.....(25) write yet again in precise. 'all the delusions having been uprooted extinguished from the soul, when the soul abides by the extreme crystal-like (sphatikavat) purity of the self it is in fact a keval jñāna, and it is described in the Jain scriptures often as the cosmic knowledge only with a view that the worldly souls on realising its grandeur may pursue the spiritual path."

"When the soul functions in the absolutely enlightened state de facto as the self i.e. the soul, when remains thoroughly and absolutely in the enlightened state of the self, can be called, in fact, actually having the 'kevaljñāna'. Such is the purport with Sri Tirthankara.¹

In short, this process of self-realisation or arriving at the state of absolute knowledge is both positive as well as negative. Śrīmad has stated that the soul is (ast' Chaitanyavāt and sarva-ābhāsa-rahita) ever-existing, sentient (conscious by nature) pure & distinct from all phantoms or visionary forms and states. The means and method to realise its pure absolute state is the path of liberation." (A.S. 101). Here is mainly the positive aspect. To understand it clearly it would be worthwhile to quote Śrīmad: "Absolutely self-realized (anāvasthita) pure consciousness (soul) is liberation."

1. S.R. p. 498/679; S.R. p. 364/431.

"Having a contact with that self-nature (svabhava) (pure consciousness) is the path of liberation.

The path, where it begins is the form of faith is the Right faith (Sam-
-yag-darshana).

In the form of partial conduct it is the fifth stage.

In the form of the pan-conduct it is the sixth stage.

By in-cessant untired effort resorting to the pan-conduct is the seventh stage.

Unique self-enlightenment (self-consciousness) is the eighth stage,¹ and so on up to the thirteenth, the stage of kevalajñāna. Thus, on one hand, there is the positive process of self-realization through intenser conduct of the self. For, to quote Śrīmad, knowledge (jñāna) is the essential characteristic (avata bhūta) dharma of the soul. Soul being single undivided complete substance, its power of knowledge is fully complete."² So it is to be resorted to in the process as mentioned above through the "paramārtha samakīrti" - absolute faith based on experience of the self.

Now, on the other hand, there is the negative process of removing the attachment and hatred - a process of self-purification, for "attachment and hatred bar and eclipse (pratibandhaka), the soul's power of knowledge."³

But these processes are not purely separate, they interact upon one another. "Attachment and hatred bar and eclipse soul's power of knowledge".

1. p. 624 - 25 / 25.

2. S.R. p. 625.

3. S.R. p. 625.

"The main cause of attachment and hatred is the wrong faith (mithyātva or a - saṃyag - darsana).

"By right knowledge (enlightenment), right faith is formed and then shines out the right conduct."¹ This truth of interaction between the processes of realization and purification, of positive and negative aspects, is in the background of jñāna-vāda like 'dr̥ṣṭi-dr̥ṣṭi-vāda' and 'dr̥ṣṭi-dr̥ṣṭi - vāda' and principles like "pramāṇa - siddhiḥ prakāśārthi; anāśānāṃ naya - siddhiḥ" and its reverse. These are facts from life. Insight leads life and life breeds insight.

1. S.S. p. 619/6

7. CONCLUSION

While concluding the *Atma-siddhi* Śrīmad writes: "All the six systems of philosophy are comprised within these six principles, thinking explicitly over them, all the doubts are dispelled and destroyed, and none can ever arise." (A.S.128).

Sri Brahmacārijī Govardhananāji explains it in his '*Ātmasiddhi Vivarana*' as follows: The main six systems of philosophy known as such in the world are comprised in these six principles. Where those system-founders on account of their dogmatism has ceased to progress, the disciple has been made to doubt and having shown him the mistake therein i.e. in that thought-system, he is led further, and is also indicated side by side that on taking them relatively from particular aspects of reality they too are right. It is a necessity to think over explicitly both the doubts of the disciple and the doubt dispelling convincing explanations of the Master, so that the six systems can be understood as they are and there remains no occasion for any doubt whatsoever regarding the six principles. The doubtless conviction of the six principles is verily the '*Saṁskṛita*', for right apprehension of the ultimate reality as it is verily the *Saṁskṛita*. If thought over properly there results the doubtless grasp thereof.

We have in general tried on the spot to see those mistakes and the relative view-points that remove them and take the thought in right direction. However, it will be worthwhile to conclude here touching only few points over them precisely keeping in view the spiritual approach of Śrīmad.

Srinad has started from the very origin of philosophical thought. When we doubt we ask for how and why about the matter till then taken as granted. So he starts with sceptic's stand. We have in the first section of this chapter shown how sceptic's stand arguments are turned against him by the master and how he has been led aright. In the first chapter also, we have seen how the sceptic under the refuge of various isms like positivism, phenomenism etc. can be led with a proper stand straight to the goal of self-realisation. Srinad's greatness as a seer lies in his approach which is always direct, simple and straight, easy to follow even from the lowest level so that even a common-sense man can pick^{it}/up without any efforts. He reminds us of one of the Upanisadic approach, when he writes: "If in the beginning there happens to be the self-identification with the body, then don't mind but let it be; step by step it should be transferred to the vital (prana), then to senses, then to the 'sankalpa-vikalpa' (mental manifestations) and afterwards in tranquil state of knowledge the self-identification should be resorted to. Having thus resum^{ed} the real self-identification^{one} should achieve the absolute state, thoroughly supportless from outside." (S.R.p.800). Even the fellow on deathbed can do it within seconds step by step if he is bold and bent upon to turn tide of crisis at his side.

As for the Keanikavāda of the Buddha, we have tried in the first chapter under phenomenism to lead it aright. Considering Buddha's own teachings of four noble truths, we find them in a better light and broader basis in Srinad's six principles. Srinad's Ātmavāddhi opens with a bonafiditary stanza thus:

"An real self, I have know,
 So suffered I eternal pain;
 I bow to Him, my master true,
 Who preached and broke external chain."¹

The soul suffered miseries for the infinite past. He found the self-ignorance was the cause thereof. The chain of external pain broke by the preaching of the master, who brought home to him the real self. Śrīmad's path of Sanyas-jñāna-darśana-cārtrāṇi comprises the fourth noble truth in the form of the 'astāṅgika mārga'.

The Nyaya takes an epistemological rather logical approach and tries to have a view of totality with liberation as the final goal. Among these sixteen topics that it deals except first two the pramāṇa and the prameya all the rest are more or less pertaining to the system of logic, which are comprised in the nyāyavāda approach (in broadest sense) of Śrīmad, and practically in his method of argument they are judiciously used together with the pramāṇas. Now looking to the prameyas- mainly twelve, all are properly used in his treatise on Soul of course, according to their relevant importance.

The Sāṅkhya maintains two ultimate realities Puruṣa and Prakṛti that unite themselves to form the world. Now if we take Prakṛti as ex-natural manifestations of the soul and the matter, then it is obvious that by viveka one can know the self separate from the prakṛti i.e., vibhāva and on enlightenment

1. Sri Brahmacariji Govardhandasji: Self-Realisation, Translation of the Atmasiddhi.

can realize the self as pure and attain liberation. Yoga's astāṅga yoga spiritually
/ can be well comprised in his adhyātma yoga or the means like thought and
meditation (vicara and dhyana).

According to the Advaita Vedanta there are two realities the self and the māyā or prakṛti, but māyā is formed by the self and can be dispelled by the self. This is really in accord with Śrīmad's absolute point of view. Really speaking it is only because of the Self's vibhava (ex-natural tendency) that his temporal manifestations are prevailing which go to form the world - the saṃsāra. And it being his ex-natural tendency can be called his 'leak^{plausibility}' an over-flow. He may cease his vibhava i.e. leak and the māyā vanishes and his own world ceases to be. Matter is immaterial as such. The world i.e. saṃsāra is the world of vyāvahāra from the relational point when of view, and/vyāvahāra i.e. ex-natural tendency is curtailed or no more prolonged saṃsāra for the self automatically ceases to be. His world vanishes, and he stands as absolute. "The whole saṃsāra rises by abhāvaviklāpa; on looking inwardly the self, it vanishes immediately." (S.R.p.659).

"It is the case that is said and sung everywhere, in all the systems (darsanas), verily the same distinction prevails. Merely the methods of explanation and exposition differ wherein ^{by} ^{lies} ~~Syadvade~~ is the wisdom proper. (S.R.p.211/107).