

CHAPTER II- ATMAN AND ITS ATTRIBUTES IN DIFFERENT SCHOOLS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

In the last chapter I have given a very brief and short account of the Vedas and different schools of Indian Philosophy including Geeta, Charvak, Buddhism and Jainism. In this chapter as I have said in the beginning that the Moksha and nature of Atman are the two central problems of the all Indian schools of philosophy, in this chapter I will discuss the nature and the attributes of the Atman in different schools. I will begin with the four Vedas and the Upanishads etc. I will discuss in this chapter how different school of Indian philosophy, The Geeta, The Buddhism, Jaina has discussed what is Atman? And how it gets involved with Maya (the ignorance)? which is beginning less. I also will state that Atman and its moksha are the main problems of all the major religion of the world. As far as my knowledge goes so far as Christian and Muslim concept of Atman (rooh) differs widely from the Hindu concept of Atman. For example in Geeta we find that the Atman is neither born nor die Atman is eternal whereas in Christianity and Islam such a concept of Atman does not exist and immortality is a gift of god to those who follow the right path and all those who disobey there soul will be destroyed by throwing in to the hell fire. Christianity and Islam have taken for granted the existence of Atman nowhere in these two religions have discussed its nature expect that it is something pure entity which resides in man and it is a sin that pollutes and following through certain commandments given by God the soul becomes pure and attains the nearness of God. There is a concept of hell and heaven in these two religions and I will discuss how the concept of Atman in Hinduism, its nature and release differ from the other major religion of the world.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the Vedas and the Upanishads:-

I have discussed earlier the nature of the Vedas . Now, in the following pages I will discuss the nature and attributes of Atman and how the nature of soul is polluted ?discussed and described in four Vedas. There are four Vedas namely Rig-Veda, Sam-Veda, Yajur-Veda and Atharva- Veda. The Vedas form four parts. The Mantras, the Brahmannas, the Aryanyakas and the

Upanishads. The first part of the Vedas contains mantras to Vayu, Agni, Surya, Usha, Prathvi, Dyan, Mitra, Parjanya, Indra, Marut, Savitri etc.

Veda means Knowledge. There is a little Philosophy in the Pre-Upanishadic thought the mantras are recited in the prayers to natural forces the nature is personified and later change into real Gods. There is hardly any mention of the Atman or its attribute in the four Vedas. The concept of Purush or Atman was developed in the Upanishads not only the idea of purush fully developed in the Upanishads but we find. “The Upanishads developed this purush into Brahmann or Atman which is both eminent and transcendent.” (C.D. Sharma page 15)

The Upanishads are “the concluding portion as well as the cream of the Vedas and therefore rightly called Vedanta.”¹

Jadunath Sinha in this book history of the Indian philosophy says, “the monism adumbrated in Rig-veda is developed into idealistic monism in the Upanishads.”²

The word Upanishad literally means “secret teaching” (rahasya) or the teaching which was jealously guarded from the unworthy and was imparted, in private, only to pupils of tried character.

The total philosophy of Upanishads is absolutism. “Das Gupta in his history on Indian Philosophy tell us “the sum and substance of the Upanishad reading is involved in the equation of Atman is = Brahmann”.³ $1+1=1$

“They lay stress on the dynamic nature of the creative power of Brahmann. the stream self or Brahmann is consciousness and the only reality. Jiva or the empirical self is Brahmann limited by triple body the grass body, the sell body and the third casual body made of Sat, Rajas and Tamas guna. But it should be noted the Atman or the Brahmann is neither bound nor release, for the Brahmann or Atman Bondage and release do not exists, Brahmann and Atman are the only eternal reality which cannot be veiled or released by any other entity. Since it is non-existence, Bondage and release or imagined in the impirical self. They are the false creation of the maya. According to Vedas and Upanishads the attributes of Atman are Atman is one, nondual, undivided, inactive, calm, tentless, perfect, supreme being the wide of bonds and release, it is the transcendental witness it has neither birth nor death, nor

transmigration. It is tentless, partless, immutable and inactive. It is pure undifferentiated consciousness it is the Brahman".⁴

Some time the Atman is also called pure consciousness. Radhakrisnan quotes Yajanvalkya who answers that there are no Gods but one Atman the etymology of this world. Atman is obscure in the Rig-Veda x.16.3 it means breath or vital essence and gradually it acquired the meaning of soul or self.⁵

As in a dialogue narrated in the Chhandogya Upanishad between Indra and prajapati. "We find a development of the concept of the self from the waking or the bodily self through the dreaming or the empirical self and the self in deep dreamless sleep to the Absolute Self. The gods and the demons, the dialogue tells us, sent Indra and Virochana respectively, to Prajapati, to learn the teaching about the self. The teacher asked them to undergo penance for thirty-two years to qualify themselves to receive the teaching. After fulfilling the prescribed condition, both come to Prajapati who teaches them that the self is that which is seen when one looks into another's eye or into water or mirror. Virochana was satisfied and went away. But Indra began to think thus: How can the self be the reflection of the body? Or, how can it be identified with the body itself? If the body is well adorned and well dressed this self also is well adorned and well dressed. If the body is beautiful, this self also is beautiful; if the body is blind or lame or crippled, this self also is blind or lame or crippled; in fact if the body perishes, this self also should perish together with it. There is no good in this, begin dissatisfied, Indra approaches Prajapati again and tells him his doubts and difficulties. Prajapati now tells him that he who is seen in dreams roaming freely, i.e., the dreaming subject, is the self. Indra, again doubts thus: Though this self is not vitiated with the defects and faults of the body, though it cannot be said to be perishing along with the body, yet it appears as if this self feels afraid and terrified, as if it is being chased and struck, it appears to be conscious of pain and to be weeping. There is no good in this also. Indra again returns to Prajapati and tells him his doubts. This time Prajapati teaches him that the enjoyer of deep dreamless sleep is the self. But Indra feels his difficulties. The self, he thinks, in deep sleep reduces itself to mere abstraction. There are no objects to be felt, to be known, to be enjoyed. This self appears to be absolutely unconscious-knowing nothing, feeling nothing, willing nothing. It is a zero, a cipher. There is no good in this

too. And again he approaches Prajapati and tells him his doubts. The teacher is now very much pleased with the ability of the disciple. And now follows the real teaching: Dear Indra! The body is not the self, though they have a self. The dream-experiences are not the self, though they have a meaning only for the self. The self is not an abstract formal principle of deep sleep too. The eye, the body the mental states, the presentation continuum, the stream of consciousness-are all mere instruments and objects of the self. The self is the ground of waking, dream and sleep states and yet it transcends them all. The self is universal, immanent as well as transcendent. The whole universe lives and moves and breathes in it. It is immortal, self-luminous, self-proved and beyond doubts and denials, as the very principle which makes all doubts, denials and thoughts possible. It is the ultimate subject which can never become an object and which is to be necessarily presupposed by all knowledge.”⁶

“This dialogue brings out the essential nature of the self and has very important implications.”⁷

“The self, surely, cannot be identified with the body, senses or the internal organ, nor can it be regarded as a mere by-product of matter.”⁸

“Says Locke. ‘I can never catch myself’. Hume says, ‘whenever I try, I always stumble at some sense-impression or idea.’ ‘The so-called “Self” is only a stream of thought; declares William James, ‘the passing thought itself is the thinker.’”⁹

“Prajapati’s emphasis on the fact that the true self is the ultimate subject, the fundamental postulate of all knowledge, knower and known, the self-luminous and the self-proved pure consciousness which manifests itself as the subject and the object, as the self and the not-self, and which at once overreaches that division.”¹⁰

“Yajnavalkya’s declaration in the Brhadaranyaka that the self, the ultimate knower, can never be known as an object because it knows all objects, and yet it does not reduce itself to an abstraction because never is the knowledge of the knower destroyed, never is the sight of the seer destroyed; that when the sun has set, when the moon has set, and when the fire is extinguished, the self alone shines in its light.”¹¹

“Mandukya Upanishad also we find a similar analysis of consciousness. We are told that the self in the waking state enjoys gross objects, it has the consciousness of the external world and is called ‘Vishva’. In the dreaming state it enjoys subtle objects, it has the consciousness of the internal world and creates its own imaginary objects and is called ‘Taijasa’. In the state of sound sleep there is no object, neither gross nor subtle, and hence no subject; the subject-object duality is transcended and here the self is called ‘Prajna’. In sleep we have absence of pain. We have neither desires nor dreams. We have the shadow of the supreme bliss. It is called shadow because we do not enjoy positive bliss. Ignorance persists in its negative aspect of concealment in this state, although its power of projection is arrested. Ignorance and unconsciousness remain in this state and therefore a higher positive state is necessary. This is the fourth state of the self, a state of pure consciousness where, like the deep sleep, there is no subject-object duality, but unlike it there is enjoyment of positive bliss. All ignorance vanishes here. The self shines in its own light as the ultimate subject without reducing itself to a mere abstract in. This is the true self, the foundation of all existence and the presupposition of all knowledge. It cannot be fully described for description are possible only in the empirical state of subject-object duality. It can be realized directly and intuitively. It is called ‘Turiya’, the Fourth, or ‘Amantra’, the Measureless. It is calm, non-dual blissful and all-consciousness where all plurality is merged. Aumakara with its part A-U-M, the waking, dreaming and sleeping states, is its symbol. This self is the common ground of all these states. It manifests itself in these three states and yet in its own nature it transcends them all.”¹²

“In the Katha Upanishad, the Atman is said to be the ultimate reality. The objects are the roads, the body is the chariot, the senses are the horses, the mind is the reins, the intellect is the charioteer, the ego is the enjoyer and the Atman is the Lord sitting in the chariot. The senses are further compared to good and bad horses. Plato in his Phaedrus has also compared them to the white and the black horses. The Katha further states that the senses are higher than the objects, the mind is higher than the senses, the intellect is higher than the mind, the subtle reason (mahat) is higher than the intellect, the Unmanifest (avyakta) is higher than the subtle reason, and the purusa (Atman) is higher than the Unmanifest, and there is nothing higher than the purusa which is the ultimate end, the highest reality. Objects, senses, mind, intellect,

reason- all exist for the self and serve its purpose. It is the self that is imminent in them and gives them life and meaning. But these cannot be identified with the self, for it transcends them all. This is the crux of the teaching imparted to Nachiketa by Yama. The self immortal, self-proved and self-luminous and can only be directly realized by transcending the empirical subject-object dully.”¹³

When all the objects extinguish the subject persists in its own life i.e., Atman some times in the Upanishads the Atman is called universal consciousness in the words of Hegel you can say Atman is both in itself and for itself though it is none of the limited things but it is in all things it is imminent as well as transcendental. The whole universe lives and breathes in it, in the Chhandogya Upanishad stated it is a blessing light which burns in the deep of personality it is the universal from which all creatures proceed.¹⁴ In the Veda the mantras are directed in prayers of the Gods in the Upanishads the position is entirely changed the centre of interest is not in the creator Gods, but in the self i.e. Atman is the only reality and everything else is for below it. There is no relation here of the worshipper and in the worship. No prayers or off god but in the Upanishad the whole quest is of the highest truth and the true self of man is discovered as the greatest reality. In this respect S.N. Dasgupta writes “The philosophical position seems to me to be a matter of great interest this change of the mind from the objective to the subjective does not carry with it in the Upanishads any elaborate philosophical discussion or certain analysis of mind. It comes their as a matter of direct perception and the convection with which the truth has been grasped it comes there a matter of direct perception and the convection with which the truth has been grasped cannot fail to impress”. The Upanishad contains the doctrine of all one and one is all i.e., Atman. Atman is the only central reality discussed in all the Upanishads. I have stated here the concept of Atman as discussed and described in Vedas in the next chapter I will discuss how this pure Atman which is supreme consciousness becomes dark.

I have discussed the term Atman as I found described in the various Upanishads. I have not tried to say a word about Brahmenn because this term is beyond the scope of my subject “A Critical analysis of concept of Moksha in all the schools of Indian Philosophy”. I have also discussed that Atman is undivided. The Atman is silence

and the only description that suits is Neti-Neti or even more that we cannot describe it by any positive contents

Now the question arises, How that which is one, that which is universal, that which is undivided becomes many? How that which is non empirical that which is unpolluted, that which is in the net of Karma and before Moksha that which goes from birth to birth, Yoni to Yoni. How Maya which is unreal only an appearance like the horn of the rabbit. Give rise to empirical self?

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of The

Geeta:- In the geeta soul is described as indestructible (avinashi), eternal (nitya), unborn (aja), undiminishing (avyaya), all pervasive (sarva-gata), immovable (achala), ancient (sanatan), unmanifest (avyakta), unthinkable (achintya) and immutable (avikarya). Body is limited by time and space produced and destroy. But the soul embodied in it is neither born nor destroyed nor limited by time and space. It is inconceivable, inexpressible, immutable and in dissoluble by the physical element. Its embodied existence only is perceived when its body is worn out it discards the old and assumes a fresh body. It transmigrates from one body to another, the body has birth & death but the soul is unborn and immortal.

य एनं वेत्ति हन्तारं यश्चैनं मन्यते हतम् ।

उभौ तौ न तिजानीतौ नायं हन्ति न हन्यते ॥

न जायते म्रियते वा कदाचि, त्रायं भूत्वां भविता वा न भूयः ।

अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणों, न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥

वेदाविनाशिनं नित्यं य एनमजमव्ययम् ।

कथं स पुरुषः पार्थ कं घतयति हन्ति कम् ॥

वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय, नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि ।

तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णा, न्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि देही ॥

नैनं छिन्दन्ति शस्त्राणि, नैनं दहति पावकः ।

न चैनं क्लेदयन्त्यापो न शोषयति मारुतः ॥

अच्छेद्योऽयमदाह्योऽयमक्लेद्योऽशोष्य एव च ।

नित्यः सर्वगतः स्थाणुरचलोऽयं सनातनः ॥¹⁵

“The Geeta says,”He whose mind is deluded by egoism thinks himself the doer of actions which are wrought by the qualities of prakrity”. “Quality move among qualities”. It is a confusion with the object that is responsible for the false view of individuality. The basis of distinction is then not self, while the self is the same in all, “dog or dog-eater”.¹⁶

The finite self is an immaterial spirit. It transcends Satva, Rajas and Tamas, which are products of prakriti. They are the basic springs of action, Satva produces pleasure, rajas produces pain & Tamas produces delusion. Emotion and passion are the modification of these three gunas. When the external and internal organs acts on their proper objects. The gunas act upon gunas. The gunas are actor or egoism (ahankar) is actor. It is the essence of “I”. It is the empirical ego, But the Atman, the transcendental ego, is the inactive witness or seer. Egoism is a modification of the gunas. It is empirical ego. The Atman is empirical self or pure spirit. It wrongly identifies itself with egoism and regards itself ajnan active agent.

In these paragraphs I have described the concept of soul or Atman as given in Shrimad Geeta. Here is a dialogue between Lord Krishna (tutor) and Arjuna in the reality of Atman. Arjuna hesitates to enter in to a conflict with his own kith & kins. The fear is that dare to killing. Here Lord Krishna teaches Arjuna about Atman which resides in human body and the eternity of the soul which resides in human body.

न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ।

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Charvak :- “The Charvak does not believe in any spiritual values and is content with the worldly one’s of sensual pleasure (kama) and wealth (Artha).”¹⁷

“The Charvak rejects the authority of Vedas and the supremacy of Brahman therefore they are called nastik in Indian Philosophy. They are materialists, positivists, atheists and hedonists. They identify the soul with the body and deny pre-

existence, future life, law of karma, heaven and hell, bondage and release and the existence of god. They advait & the reality of gross matter.¹⁸

Surtras of Brahaspati say's :-

- 1- Earth, water, fire air the elements.
- 2- Bodies, senses and objects are the result of the different combination of elements.
- 3- Consciousness arises from matter like the intoxicating quality of wine arising from fermented yeast.
- 4- The soul is nothing but the conscious body.
- 5- Enjoyment is the only end of namely life.
- 6- Death alone is liberation.¹⁹

Charvaks denies the existence of soul separate from body. They say²⁰. "The Atman is body itself, which is characterized by such attributes as are implied in the expressions, I am stout, I am young, I am old, I am adult etc. we have no evidence of the separate existence of soul and body. We do not see self without a body. After death no intelligence remains. From this it follows that it is foolish to think that the soul is going to reap the rewards of its acts in a future state.

They deny the existence of any spiritual being called empirical self. Therefore the question of redemption or Moksha does not arise. The metaphysics of the Charvak limited to what we experience and therefore the Charvak deny the existence of any element which is spiritual and separate from body.

The Criticism of Buddhism, Jain and Shankar in this school.

Shankar rejects Charvak's doctrine of the origin of consciousness. Consciousness is not a quality of the body for the following reasons.

- 1- Consciousness does not exist in deep sleep, swoon and the like though the body exists. If it is a quality of the body, it must be a specific quality.
- 2- Color and other quality of the body are perceived by all persons but a person's consciousness can be perceived by him only. Therefore it is not a quality of the body.
- 3- Consciousness may exist in the disembodied soul after death of the body. Even this doubt disproves the Charvak's doctrine that consciousness is a property of the body.²¹

Some of the objections made by Shankar seems to me refuted by the Philosophy of the Sankhya, who advocate that mind i.e, Antahkaran, buddhi(intellect), and Manas give rise to consciousness.

With the denial of the existence god and soul as eternal the Charvaks believe that pleasure is the soul object of human life i.e. to say pleasure is good and good is pleasure. The strange thing is for Charvaks pleasure drowns in the pleasure of sex. In the west, The Greek and The British egoist who believe in hedonism for them pleasure is not sex. In India also the Buddhism and Jainism are nastiks both believe in moral Values. Radhakrishnan in his book Indian Philosophy calls Buddhism and Jainism as ethical. Whereas Charvak do not believe in ethical values for them pleasure from any way is good. They don't believe in any karma, birth and rebirth.

Since the Charvak do not believe in God, soul and any kind of immortality. The question of Moksha does not arise. Therefore I have not said anything about soul. How the soul becomes pollute or there is one universal soul and about the problem of Moksha in their case.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Jaina:- Jainism is one of the oldest non-vedic school of Indian philosophy. It does not believe in a supreme God. It believes in the eternal and independent existence of spirit and matter. Or more correctly the animate and the inanimate ,respectively called Jiva and Ajiva. But by spirit here we have to understand only the individual self

and not the supreme soul as in the Upanishads. Spirit is intrinsically manifold and like Hinduism, Jainism also believes in the theory of transmigration but there are two important distinctions. The Hindus generally speaking believe that it is God who allots, rewards and punishes to all beings according to their karmas. The Jainas on the other hand do not believe in a supreme God declare that karma operates by itself (like Buddhism). This belief as we shall see it strongly bears a likeness of Vedic doctrine of Mimamsa. Again while the Hindus take karma to be immaterial, the Jainas believe it to be but subtle particles of matter (Pudgal), which is one to Ajivas, finding their way in to the soul and soiling its pure nature.

Jiva in Jain philosophy is generally same as the Atman or Purusha in other pluralistic schools with this important difference that it is identified with life of which consciousness is said to be the essence. Like the monads theory of Leibnitz. Leibnitz was a pluralist his each monads mirrorises the whole world but like Plato's theory of ideas some monads are unconscious and the other form series of consciousness. The Jivas of Jainism are qualitatively alike and only quantitatively different and the whole universal is literally filled with them. The Jivas are first divided into those who are liberated and those who are bound. The bound souls are further divided into mobile (trisa) and immobile (sthavara). The latter live in the atoms of earth, water, fire and air and in the vegetable kingdom and have only one sense that of touch. The mobile souls are again classified as those who have two senses (worms), three senses (ants), four senses (wasps, bees etc.) and five senses (higher animals and men).

The souls in their empirical condition are divided into higher and lower classes according to the number of senses organs they are believed to possess.

Jiva is eternal and conscious matter. Consciousness is regarded as the essence of the souls (चैतन्य लक्षणो जीवः) Jiva is non material and different from body and senses. Alike light inside room is same as the size of room, they also believe in size of the jiva. Jiva's size is equal to size of body of Jiva. Jiva has no form but its take form and size according to body. For bigger size body size of Jiva is big and for smaller body size of Jiva is smaller. For Ant Jiva will be smaller in size and for elephant Jiva is bigger in size according to Jaina Jiva is a real knower (Gyata), a real agent (Karta) and real expedient (Bhokta)

The Ajiva as its name indicates is devoid of consciousness of life. It is regarded as five fold but it will do to mention here only three of them viz. matter (pudgal) time and space.

In the preceding paragraphs I have discussed the concept of jiva according to Jainism. Now in the succeeding paragraphs I will discuss how these jivas attract pudgal become heavy and inhabit the world of life and the world that has no life and then I will proceed how according to Jainas theory of moksha, these Jivas attain salvation or they become free from pudgal and at the end I will discuss how these Baddha(buond) jives become Mukta (liberated) and live in complete solitude.

I have discussed in his chapter Jaina's concept of soul according to Jaina the concept of Mukta and Baddha and then I have discussed the way and means by which the Jivass attain to salvation or Moksha.

Before we start bondage of Jiva, It is essential to know Ajiva according to Jainism. The category of Ajiva is divided into matter (Pudgal), space (Akasha), motion (Dharma). Rest (adharma) and time (kala). They are all without life and consciousness. According to Jainas karma is physical matter (Poudgalic) in nature. Like earth, water, fire, and air Pudgal is the physical basis of the world. The Jaina argues that everything in the world except soul and space is produced from matter. Matter is called Pudgal which means that which is liable to integration and disintegration. An atom is supposed to be the smallest part of matter which cannot be further divided. These atoms are supposed to house the souls. Matter is it's subtle form constitutes karma which infiltrates into the souls and binds them to Sansara(world). Sansara is nothing but the entanglement of Jiva in matter. Jiva and Pudgal are the sakriya dravyas(active matter) or efficient causes, which moves from place to place. The link of union between Jiva and Ajiva is karma. The cause of embodiment of soul is the presence in it of karmik matter. The natural perfections of the pure soul are sullied by different kinds of karma matter. Those which obscure right knowledge of details (Jnan) are called "Jnanvaraniya", those which obscure right perception (darshan) as in sleep are called "Darshanvaraniya", those which obscure the bliss nature of the soul and thus produce pleasure and pain are "Vedaniya" and those which obscure the right attitude of the soul towards faith and right conduct "Mohaniya". In addition to these four kinds of karma there are other

four kinds of karma which determine (i) The length of life in birth (ii) The peculiar body with its general and special qualities and faculties (iii) The nationality, caste, family, social standing ect. (iv) The in born energy of the soul by the obstruction of which it prevents the doing of a good action when there is a desire to do it. These are respectively called (i) ayasya karma (ii) nama karma (iii) gotra karma (iv) antarya karma. By our actions of mind, speech and body, we are continually producing certain subtle karmik matter which in the first instance is called Bhav karma, which transforms itself into dravya karma and pours itself into the soul and sticks there by coming into contact with the passion (kasaya) of the soul. These act like viscous substance in retaining the in pouring karma matter. This matter acts in eight different classes, as we have already noticed. This karma is the cause of bondage and sorrow.

“The process of bondage and extrication from it are thus picturised. There is first of all the influx asrave of karma into the soul which results in bondage.”²²

“The karmas are certain sorts of infra-atomic particle of matter (karma-vargana). The influx of these karma particle into the soul is called asrave in Jainism”.²³

- (i) The concept of souls according to Vedant as we have already stated as universal- empirical in the previous chapter.
- (ii) The Jainism do not believe in any universal soul as we find in the philosophy of Vedant we have. I also not given any imperical souls as any separate imperical why self but believe in manyless of souls. Even in animal trees ,stone, water ect. The concept of jivatma and pudyal how atma altracts pudyal in kaivalya all souls are in soitued. Criticism of jainas concepts of many souls. According to Shankar and ramanuj.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the Buddha - I will discuss the concept of non existence of soul, non existence of supreme god. The concept of karma and the means by which men can enter in to nothingness (nihilism).

“Gautam (later known as Buddha) founded an ethical culture known as Buddhism in west. The term however, covers a great variety of beliefs, which may be roughly divided into two great groups (1) Early Buddhism, presented in the Pali canon of the three baskets (Tripitakas) preserved in Ceylon, Burma and Siam characterized by complete rejection of all metaphysical conception and (2) advanced Buddhism, as exhibited in the Sanskrit scriptures of Nepal and the colossal literatures founded upon them in china and Tibet resulting from the assimilation of transcendental ideas with the primitive teaching. The teaching of Gautam was necessarily closely to the general ideas of his age like the Brahmannical philosophy; it assumed the process of transmigration and the doctrine of karma and aimed at providing a way of deliverance from liability of rebirth. Like the higher Brahmannism it recognized the gods of popular religion within the limits of the same process but it boldly stripped the great Bramha himself of his attribute of self existence and asserted that he, too, would cease to be”.²⁴

Buddha taught his four noble truths (i) Dukkha (sanskrit dukkha) generally but misleadingly translated as “suffering” as it implies broader sense of dissatisfaction with existence in the phenomenal world (2) the origination of dukkha in tanha (desire or craving) (3) the cessation of dukkha and finally (4) the way leading to that cessation by following the eight fold path. Although the word dukkha in common parlance means suffering, its use by the Buddha was meant to include both pleasure and pain, both happiness and suffering. There are three aspects of this conception, dukkha as suffering in the ordinary sense, dukkha arising out of the impermanence of things, even of a state of pleasure and dukkha in the sense of five aggregates meaning that the “I” constituted by any individual is nothing but a totality of five aggregates, i.e. form, feeling, conception, disposition and consciousness. In brief, whatever is non- eternal, i.e. whatever is subjects to the law of casualty is characterized by dukkha for the Buddha, this is the human situation. One who recognizes the nature of dukkha also know its cause. Dukkha arises out of craving (tanha ,Sanskrit trishna). Craving arises out of sensation (vedana) and sensation arises out of contact (sparsh), so that a human being is faced with a series of conditions leading back to ignorance (Ajiva,Avidya) – a series in which the rise of each succeeding member depends upon and originates from the preceding one (pratitya samutpad, literally dependent origination).

“According to Benjamin Walker who writes in his book an encyclopedic survey of Hinduism, Hindu world ,”another cardinal teaching of Buddha and one that was to be interpreted in its own way by the Mahayana school, was his doctrine concerning the atta (pali for the Sanskrit Atman). The soul or ego. Buddha taught that the soul does not exist. In other words he postulated for man a condition of anatta (Sanskrit anAtman) or non soulsness. What is called the soul is in reality a physical and mental aggregate of five anica (Sanskrit anitya) evanescent or impermanent condition called khanda (Sanskrit skandha) namely (1) rupa, form or the physical body (2) vedana, feelings (3) sanjna (pali,sanna), idea or understanding (4) sankhara (samskara) , will and (5) vijnana (pali vinnana) or pure consciousness”.²⁵

The human personality, this soul of many skandhas, was bound within a process that Buddha likened to a wheel which he called bhava chakra, existence wheel by this analogy he taught that the soul was only a name for the constituent elements of experience and was the result produced by a simulating manifestation of these elements.

According to Radhakrishnan, he says, “The system of early Buddhism is one of the most originals which the history of philosophy presents. In its fundamental idea and essential spirit it approximates remarkably to the advanced scientific thought of nineteenth century. He further says, “the pessimistic philosophy of Schopenhauer and Hartmann is only “little more than Buddhism vulgarized.”²⁶

There are different views of scholars about Buddhism some says Buddhism denies Atman or soul and some says Buddha’s nirvan and soul in monism is same there is only difference of name. Therefore it is necessary here to mention how the concepts of Atman in Buddhism has been interpreted by Radhakrishnan, J. N. Sinha, S. N. Dasgupta , C. D. Sharma, Hiriyanna.

C. D. Sharma says in his book Bhartiya Darshan Alochan and Anushilan, Buddha’s philosophy is spiritual monism or Non-materialism. According to Buddha Nirvan is highest reality which is beyond the range of senses (metaphysical), beyond the range of intelligence and unutterable and can be known by self realization or right knowledge only. Cessation of suffering is possible through right knowledge.²⁷

C.D. Sharma concludes his view with the help of a dialogue between Buddha and Anand. Buddha says, "If I, Anand, when the wandering monk Vachchhgotta asked me: "Is there the ego?, had answered: "The ego is", then that, Ananda, would have confirmed the doctrine of the Samanas and Brahmannas, who believe in permanence. If I, Ananda, when the wandering monk Vachchhgotta asked me: "Is there the ego?, had answered: "The ego is not", then that, Ananda, would have confirmed the doctrine of the Samanas and Brahmannas, who believe in annihilation". Buddha's view in this regard is true Atman cannot be known by intelligence.

Buddha clearly tells us what the self is not, though he does not give any clear account of what it is. It is, however, wrong to think that there is no self at all according to Buddha. If Buddha avoids the negation of the existence of the ego, he does so in order not to shock a weak-minded hearer. Through the shirking of the question as to the existence or nonexistence of the ego is heard the answer to which the premises of the Buddhist teaching tended, the ego is not. We cannot agree with this view that Buddha deliberately disguised the truth. Were Oldenberg correct, then nirvana would mean annihilation, which Buddha repudiates. Nirvana is not a lapse into a void, but only a negation of the flux and a positive return of the self to itself. The logical conclusion from this would be that something is, though it is not the empirical self. This is also in agreement with Buddha's statement that the self is neither the same as nor entirely different from the skandhas. He who holds that there is no soul is a man with false notions. Buddha emphasizes the fact that we transcend experience when we make assertions about the permanent soul behind phenomena. Buddha is silent about the Atman enunciated in the Upanishads. He neither affirms nor denies its existence. Buddha contents himself with a description of psychical phenomena, and does not venture to put forth any theory of the soul. To posit a soul seemed to Buddha to step beyond the descriptive standpoint. What we know is the phenomenal self. Buddha knows that there is something else. He is never willing to admit that the soul is only a combination of elements, but he refuses to speculate on what else it may be.

"The important postulate of the Buddha is that which is changing is sorrow, and whatever is sorrow is not self the point at which Buddhism parted from the

Upanishad lies in the experiences of the self.” “The true self was with the Upanishads a matter of transcendental experience as it were, for they said that it could not be described in terms of anything, but could only be pointed out as “there,” behind all the changing mental categories. The Buddha looked into the mind and saw that it did not exist. But how was it that the existence of this self was so widely spoken of as demonstrated in experience? To this the reply of the Buddha was that what people perceived there when they said that they perceived the self was but the mental experiences either individually or together. The ignorant ordinary man did not know the noble truths and was not trained in the way of wise men, and considered himself to be endowed with form (rupa) or found the forms in his self or the self in the forms. He experienced the thought (of the moment) as it were the self or experienced himself as being endowed with thought, or the thought in the self or the self in the thought. It is these kinds of experiences that he considered as the perception of the self.²⁸

Buddha’s teaching was a protest against the over-elaborate ceremonialism that, in one sense, had given rise to the Upanishadic doctrine itself. The Upanishadic doctrine was, as we know intended for only a select few. The characteristic feature of Buddha’s teaching, on the other hand, was that it admitted no esoteric truths, and was meant for all who were not satisfied with leading life of natural inclinations. While Brahmannism relied overmuch on the instruction given by others, Buddhism laid particular stress on self-reliance and self-effort in knowing the ultimate truth. The disciple was asked to think for himself, and to accept others, opinions only after he had been fully convinced of their soundness. “Waning out” of his lower nature, of the lust and hate in him, is all that is meant by liberation or nirvana, a word with which we have already become familiar in connection with Jainism. It is not the annihilation of the self, but only the extinguishing of selfhood in the ordinary acceptance of the term. Early Buddhism is thus a gospel of hope, and not a gospel of despair as it is commonly represented to be.

Buddha also differed widely from the concept of soul as found in the Upanishads his concepts of Universal momentariness indicates that according to Buddha there is no permanent universal self. There is only suffering which reflects in changing.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Sankhya - The best description of the emergence of empirical self I find in the Philosophy of Sankhya yoga. The Sankhya description of empirical self according to C. D. Sharma “Sankhya believes that bondage and liberation alike are only phenomenal. The bondage of the Purusha is a fiction. It is only ego, the product of prakriti which is bound and consequently. It is only the ego which is liberated. Purusha in its complete isolation, is untouched by bondage and liberation. If Purusha were really bound, it could not have obtained liberation even after hundred births, for real bondage can never be destroyed. Ishvara Krishna frankly says: Purusha therefore is really neither bound nor it is liberated nor does it transmigrate. Bondage, liberation and transmigration belongs to prakriti (empirical self) in its manifold forms”. Prakriti finds itself in its seven forms. There is nothing finer and subtler than Prakriti, she is to say that she never reappears before that Purusha who has once seen her in her true color”. ^{CD Sharma 163} Purusha is free and pure consciousness. It is inactive, indifferent and possesses no attributes. Really speaking, it is above time and space merit and demerit, bondage and liberation. It is only when it mistakes its reaction in the Buddhi (intellect) for itself and identifies itself wrongly with the internal organ, the intellect, the ego (I) and the mind that is said to be bound. It is the ego and not the Purusha which is bound. But it should be noted the empirical self is to be distinguished from the true or transcendental self namely Purusha “

How this is according to Shankara is a product of “Maya” I will discuss in the next paragraph.

The reality i.e. Atman as we have defined earlier is Anand how in the empirical state becomes Bhokta (enjoyer), Kartra (doer) and Gyata (knower) comes under the rules of suffering. The supreme and the indefinable become definable as all the Hindu schools of philosophy have described it. The ParaBrahman becomes AparBrahman (Ishwar). C.D. Sharma in his book critical survey of Indian Philosophy writes “ The individual self stands self proved and is always immediately felt and known, One is absolutely certain about the existence of one’s own self and there can be neither doubt nor denial regarding its existence. The individual self is the highest thing we know and it is the nearest approach to the absolute, though it is not itself The absolute. In fact the individual self is a mixture of the real and the

unreal, a knot of the existence and non existence, a coupling of the true and the false. It is a product of ignorance or avidhya".²⁹

In this previous chapter I have tried to discuss the immergence of the empirical self. I have also said that the best description I find in the Sankhya system of Philosophy. According to C.D. Sharma the empirical self "is a mixture of the real and the unreal, a knot of the existence and non existence, a coupling of the true and the false. It is a product of ignorance or avidhya." I have also discussed that according to Shankar, it is a product of Maya. In the following chapters I will discuss the concept of soul and the concept of the empirical self. I have used a word soul to signify that which is Pure, unbound for me the empirical self is that self, which passes through the series of birth and rebirth.

Sankhya a Sanskrit word means reflection, stands for the method of approach to the ultimate fact of philosophy through knowledge.

Sankhya has accepted two real separate substance (dualism) Prakriti & Purusha or matter and spirit as ultimately real and also admits, like it, a plurality of selves which it usually terms purusha. Purusha is conscious and Prakriti is Jad (unconscious) prakriti is root cause of the world of objects, it is not evaluation of any other matter. As the uncaused root cause, as the first principle of the universe it is called Pradhan. It is said in sankhya karika root (Mula) prakriti is without change. It is called root cause because it is root and also cause (productive). Sankhya gives five proofs for the existence of prakriti which are as follows.³⁰

- (i) All individual things in this world are limited, dependent, conditional and finite. The finite cannot be the cause of the universe. Logically we have to proceed from the finite to the infinite, from the limited to the unlimited, from the peros to the aperos, from the temporary to the permanent, from the many to the one. And it is this infinite, unlimited eternal and all-pervading Prakriti which is the source of this universe (Bhedanam parimanat).
- (ii) All worldly things possess certain common characteristics by which they are capable of producing pleasure, pain and indifference. Hence there must be a common source composed of three Gunas, from which all worldly things arise (Samanvayat).

- (iii) All effects arise from the activity of the potent cause. Evolution means the manifestation of the hitherto implicit as the explicit. The activity which generates evolution must be inherent in the world-cause. And this cause is Prakriti. (karyatah Pravrttescha).
- (iv) The effect differs from the cause and hence the limited effect cannot be regarded as its own cause. The effect is the explicit and the cause is the implicit state of the same process. The effects, thereof, point to a world-cause where they are potentially contained (Karnakaryavibhagat).
- (v) The unity of the universe points to a single cause. And this cause is Prakriti. (Avibhagat vishvarupyasya).

Prakriti is one and complex, and its complexity is the result of its being constitute of three factors each of which is described as a Guna. By the word Guna here we should not understand what it is commonly taken to mean viz a "Quality". It means here rather a component factor or a constituent of Prakriti. Prakriti and gunas not only co-exists but also cohere. This intrinsic interdependents of the Gunas excludes the possibility of the breaking up of Prakriti by their separation.

The three gunas are Sattva, Rrajas and Tamas. Each of them stands for a distinct aspect of physical reality, roughly, Sattva signifies whatever is pure and fine, Rajas, whatever is active and Tamas, what is stolid and offer resistance. C.D. Sharma defining Sattva says the" Sattva literally means real or existent and is responsible for the manifestation of objects in consciousness. It is called goodness and produces pleasure. It is slight and bright, buoyant (laghu) and illuminating (prakashaka). Luminosity of light, power of reflection, upward, Movement, pleasure, happiness contentment, bliss are all due to it. Its colour is white. Rajas, which literally means founlness, is the principle of motion, it produces pain. Restless activity, feverish effort and wild stimulation are its results. It is mobile (Chala) and stimulating (Upastambhaka). Its colour is red. Tamas, which literally means darkness, is the principle of inertia. It produces apathy and indifference. Ignorance, sloth, confusion, bewilderment, passivity and negativity are its results. It is heavy (guru) and enveloping (varanaka) and as such is opposed to sattva. It is also opposed to Rajas as it arrests activity. Its colour is dark. These three gunas which constitute Prakriti

are never separate. They conflict and yet co-operate with one another and are always found intermingled. They are compared to the oil, the wick and the flame of a lamp, which, though opposed, yet co-operate to produce the light of a lamp. They are imperceptible and are inferred from their effects. All things are composed of these three gunas and their differences are due to the different combinations of these unas. the nature of a thing is determined by the preponderance of a particular guna. Things are called good, bad indifferent; intelligent, active or slothful; pure impure or natural, on account of the predominance of sattva, rajas or tamas respectively. when these gunas are held in a state of equilibrium, that state is called Prakriti. Evolution of worldly objects does not take place at this state. ³¹

Now I will discuss what purush is & its attribute according to Sankhya.

“Purusa is not complex but simple; it is not dynamic but static, knowing neither change of place nor change of form. It is passive while Prakriti is ever active, which means that it is to be identified more with feeling or the affective side of the mind than with any other. It cannot consequently either know or will anything in the familiar sense, unless it is assisted by the internal organ and its various subsidiaries. In itself, it is only an “enjoyer” (bhokta), and not an “agent (karta) a mere looker on or “witness” (saksin), as it is described; and, though it is of the very essence of sentience, all its psychic life is due to its association with the evolutes of Prakriti like the internal organ in which, as pointed out above, the sattva element predominates. That which constitutes the activity of the subject, as commonly known to us, is due to the physical element which enters into its make-up. Like Prakriti, however, it is supposed to be omnipresent; but the revelation of its presence during the transmigrating state (samsara), for the reason just stated, never takes place outside the physical limitations like the body, with which it happens to be associated at the time.” ³²

“The other real substance is Purusha. Both the substance are copresent & co-eternal realities. Purusha, the principle of pure consciousness. Purusha is the soul, the self, the spirit, the subject, the knower. It is neither body nor senses nor brain nor mind (manas), nor ego (ahankar), nor intellect (buddhi). It is not a substance which possesses the quality of consciousness. Consciousness is its essence. It is itself pure and transcendental Consciousness. It is the ultimate knower which is the

foundation of all knowledge. It is the pure subject and as such can never become an object of knowledge. It is the silent witness, the emancipated alone, the neutral seer, the peaceful eternal. It is beyond time and space, beyond change and activity. It is self-luminous and self-proved. It is uncaused, eternal and allpervading. It is the indubitable real, the postulate of knowledge, and all doubts and denials pre-suppose its existence. It is called nistraigunya, udasina, akarta, kevala, madhyastha, saksi, drasta, sadaprakashasvarupa, and Jnata.³³

Sankhya gives the following five proofs for the existences of the purusha.

- 1- All compound objects exist for the sake of the Purusa. The body, the senses, the mind and the intellect are all means to realize the end of the Purusa. The three gunas, the Prakrti, the subtle body- all are said to serve the purpose of the self. Evolution is teleological or purposive. Prakrti evolves itself in order to serve the Purusa's end. This proof is teleological (sanghatpararthatvat).
- 2- All objects are composed of the three gunas and therefore logically presuppose the existence of the Purusa who is the witness of these gunas and is himself beyond them. The three gunas imply the conception of a nistraigunya-that which is beyond them. This proof is logical (trigunadiviparyayat).
- 3- There must be a transcendental synthetic unity of pure Consciousness to co-ordinate all experiences. All knowledge necessarily presupposes the existence of the self. The self is the foundation (adhithana), the fundamental postulate of all empirical knowledge. All affirmations and all negations equally presuppose it. Without it, experience would not become experience. This proof is ontological (adhithanat).
- 4- Non-intelligent Prakrti cannot experience its products. So there must be an intelligent principle to experience the worldly products of Prakrti. Prakrti is the enjoyed (bhogya) and so here must be an enjoyer (bhokta). All objects of the world have the characteristics of producing pleasure, pain and bewilderment. But pleasure, pain and bewilderment have meaning only when there is a conscious principle to experience

them. Hence Purusa must exist. This argument is ethical (bhoktrbhavat).

- 5- There are persons who try to attain release from the sufferings of the world. The desire for liberation and emancipation implies the existence of a person who can try for and obtain liberation. Aspiration presupposes the aspirant. This proof is mystical or religious (kaivalyartham pravrtteh).

“Prakriti and purusa virtually act as one; and we shall therefore take it for granted that, in some way, they co-operates. It is, indeed, a matter of ordinary experience that there is no spirit without a body or a body which functions as a living organism without spirit. This complex of nature and spirit-or perhaps, we should say, a compound of them-is not ultimate, according to the doctrine. It is only the empirical self, and is to be distinguished from the true or transcendental self, viz. Purusa; but from the practical or every day standpoint, the distinction is of little consequence. The Prakriti element that most intimately enters into this combination is the internal organ. There are other elements too, like the sensory organs, but they are all in one sense or another subsidiary to it. The coming together of these is the necessary presupposition of all experience, for spirit without nature is inoperative and nature without spirit is blind, in the resulting union, each finds its complement; and the defects of both are made good as when a blind man and a cripple, it is stated, safely traverse a considerable distance, through co-operation, although neither by himself is capable of doing so. And we may point out, by the way, that consciousness is not explained here to be a product of matter as in materialism. Matter is merely the medium for spirit to manifest itself, not its source.”³⁴

How this transcendental Purusha which is pure consciousness gets involved which prakriti and hence there is empirical self.

“The sankhya philosophy as explained it now admits two principles souls and prakriti the root principle of matter. Souls are many like the Jaina philosophys but they are without parts and qualities they do not contract or expand according as they occupy a smaller or a larger body, but are always all-pervasive, and are not contained in the bodies in which they are manifested. But the relation between body or rather the

mind associated with it and soul is such that whatever mental phenomena happen in the mind are interpreted as the experience of its soul. The souls are many, and had it not been so (the samkhya argues) with the birth of one all would have been born and with the death of one all would have died.”

“The exact nature of soul is however very difficult of comprehension, and yet it is exactly this which one must thoroughly grasp in order to understand the Samkhya philosophy. Unlike the jaina soul possessing anantajnana, anantadarsana, ananatasukha, and ananatviryya, the Samkhya soul is described as being devoid of any and every characteristic; but its nature is absolute pure consciousness (cit). the Samkhya view differs from the Vedanta, firstly in this that it does not consider the soul to be of the nature of pure intelligence and bliss (ananda). Bliss with Samkhya is but another name for pleasure and as such it belongs to prakrti and does not constitute the nature of soul; secondly, according to Vedanta the individual soul (jiva) are but illusory manifestations of one soul or pure consciousness the Brahmann, but according to Samkhya they are all real and many.”³⁵

Pure consciousness Jiva gets involved with Prakriti so the suffering starts and we have two principles. The principle of law of karma and the principle of birth & rebirth therefore this empirical self revert back in to Purush and Patanjali has suggested how the impirical self reverts back and I will discuss this problem in some other chapters.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Yoga - Yoga accepts metaphysics and epistemology of Sankhya as it is and them adds in Sankhya, there is not any mention, how to get rid of cycle of births & rebirths? How Purusha can separate it from Prakriti, is supplement by Yoga philosophy. It does not believe in Jivanmukti. It provides us a method named Ashtaang Yog which I will discuss in coming chapters.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Vaisheshika - In this chapter I will try to capture the concept of Atman, its nature and scope as indicated by the Vaishashika school of philosophy once again my topic of research is “A critical study of concept of Moksha in different school of Indian Philosophy” and moksha refers to the existence of Atman, its nature, its attribute and

why the Atman which is considered by the school as eternal and free becomes bound and how by what method it is released from the bondage. The method by which it releases I will discuss in the next chapter.

The Vaishashik are like jain believers in the manyness of Atman the basic literature of the vaishashike which I consider as follow:-

The Vaishashik has believed in seven substances eternal and indestructible. They are as follows (i) substance (dravya) (ii) quality (guna) (iii) action (karma) (iv) generality (samanya) (v) particularity (vishesh) (vi) inherence (samvaya) (vii) non-being (abhava). These are called padarth (matter) which by various combination bring this world. That is in it into existence.

The reader of this philosophy sometimes taken a back why this school of philosophy has named itself Vaisheshik (particularity) beyond this seven padarth which I have indicated above there is another spiritual, eternal padarth which we can call the Atman (soul) as the school is called Vaisheshik therefore every Atman is Vishesh and many. The Vaisheshika recognize the existence of many souls and the reality of the world. In Vaisheshika philosophy we find the concept of the soul is richer and fuller than in any earlier system. Feeling and will as well as thought are recognized as its function. The selves are many, and, although they are all-pervading, their capacity to know, feel and will is ordinarily manifested through the physical organism with which each of them is associated for the time being. Every self has its own distinctive "manas", which keeps company with it till it becomes free. It is atomic, but, unlike other atomic entities recognized in the system, it does not give rise to any new products.

"Vaisheshika Systems are attached directly to the soul, as has been indicated above, but only in the form of dispositions. For no psychological process is possible for the soul that finds itself in an isolated condition. It is only in consequence of the soul's union with the organ of thought (manas) that its faculties are capable of activity. Both souls and the organ of thought are eternal substances; but the soul is all-pervading, i.e. not bound down to time and space, while the organ of thought is an atom. The latter is the intermediary between the soul and the senses, since urged by the soul it betakes itself on each occasion to that sense through which the soul desires to

perceive or to act (for the capacities of walking, speaking, etc., are according to the Indian view, comprised under the idea of the senses; a distinction is therefore made between the senses of perception and action). Thus the organ of thought continues to move as long as it is actuated by a process of perception or a bodily activity. If it rests motionless in the soul, the union of the latter with the senses ends, and no perception or act or experience is possible.”³⁶

“The Vaisesika theory of the soul is practically identical with that of the Nyaya, though a direct perception of the self where the self is both the perceiver and the perceived is not admitted. In its natural state the self is devoid of intelligence, as in pralaya. It has cognitions of things when I is connected with the body. Consciousness is sustained by the Atman, though it is not an essential or inalienable characteristic of it. By means of manas the soul knows not only external things but also its own qualities. Though the soul is all-pervading, its life of knowing, feeling and activity resides only where the body is. The plurality of souls is inferred from differences in status, the variety of conditions. The scriptural injunctions assume the distinctness of souls. Each soul undergoes the consequences of its own deeds. Though each soul is supposed to be distinguished by a peculiarity (visesa), it is impossible for us to know what it is. The differences among souls are due to their connections with bodies. Even in rebirth the manas accompanies the soul and gives it individuality. A distinction is made between the individual soul and the supreme soul, jiva and isvara. The two are similar but not identical.

Giving the small introduction to Vaishashik concept of Atman and how these eternal substance become empirical self due to ignorance in the coming chapters.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Nyay:- According to Nyay school of philosophy Atman is doer, knower & enjoyer. These are the attributes of Atman. Nyay philosophy takes Atman as a substance. In every living body there is an Atman. Atman is eternal & all pervasive. Therefore like Jain Nyay also believe in the plurality of Atman but no where I read that these Atmans are embodied in trees & stones as Jainas advocate, now the question arises that if Atman is unconscious (jad) that now they are feeling, willing, etc. As Atman considers substance, it should be unconscious by its nature. But about

consciousness of Atman they argued that “since consciousness, pleasure, pains, willing etc could not belong to our body or the senses there must be some entity to which they belonged & the self is the entity to which consciousness emotion etc. adhere when they are produces as a result of collocation. But though Atman is thus disconnected from the body, because it is with the help of collocation of bodily limbs etc. that action in the self can be manifested or produced. It is unconscious in itself and acquires consciousness as a result of suitable collocations Geeta believe in the eternity of soul if we have to say what is Indian philosophy I would say Indian philosophy is philosophy of soul or Atman. Every school believes in its eternity & individually it is only Shankar school of philosophy we read in moksha merges in to the brimh loses its identity and indin dulitt. and become brimh 1+1=1.

Nyay a philosophy believes in law of karma anal so in birth & rebirths. Atman remains eternal even it moves in the cycle of life & death. Atman is partless matter therefore it is indestructible. Its union with body is birth and its separation with body is death.

Atmans are infinite. Everybody has its own Atman separate from Atman of other person. Atman is all pervasive but it experiences in the body only it has not been the case then with the experience of one person all has experience and with the bondage or salvation of one person all would be in bondage or salvation.

Mind is the source of knowledge for Atman. Mind & sense organs are the tools of knowledge for Atman because mind cannot operate without sense organs. Body is the agent by which Atman enjoys pain & pleasure. Body is matter and Atman is conscious body cannot operate without Atman. Body is under Atman and is the tool to fulfill its requirements.

Atman is free but its freedom is limited. Atman can do actions but it depends on god for its results. Its freedom is can under the law of karma.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Mimansa:- Poorva Mimansa school of India philosophy is a pluralist realist. It endorses the reality of the world as well as that of the individual souls. The soul is accepted as an eternal and infinite substance. “knowledge (jnan) which illuminates

all thing is regarded only as a quality belonging to soul just as there are other qualities of material objects".³⁷

Causation is viewed merely as the collocation of conditions. The genesis of consciousness is an accidental attribute of the soul.

The Mimamsa philosophy believes there is a soul which survives even after death of the body and enjoys the fruits of the rituals in heaven. There is a power of potency which preserve the effects of the rituals performed in the soul yielding fruits after death.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Advait Vedanta:- The concepts of soul according to Shankar (advait vedant) in this respect I want to draw attention in the last chapter I in the beginning of this chapter I have described concept of soul according to Upanishads. In this chapter I will discuss the concept of soul according to Shankar specially in Brimhasutra.

The advait vedant can be described is one verse. ब्रह्म सत्यं जनन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मेव ना परा । Here the Brahman is described as absolute. The main idea of advait vedant philosophy is that the ultimate and absolute truth is the "self" which is "one" though appearing as many indifferent individuals.

"Shankar has used Brahmann and Atman in same meaning which is pure consciousness (Jnanswaroop) or consciousness of the pure self. (Swaroop jnan) which is devoid of all attribute and all categories of the intellect (nirvishesh).³⁸

According to Shankar Atman has ontological reality and Jiva has empirical reality. Atman is self evident. Brahmann is associated with its potency (Shakti). Shankar has used the word maya or avidya. In one meaning maya is described as potency of Ishwar. Ishwar is qualified Brahman (saguna or savishesha or aparabrahamaa). Maya is basis of samsar. Maya and Avidya as the objective and subjective conditions of "vyavaharika" (practical) experience are regarded as the cause of our knowledge of the physical world.

Says Vachaspati Mishra in Bhamti "A nirvacya a vidya advitaya sacivasya prabhavato virarta yasyaite arilatejob avanayah".

“Brahmann in cooperation with its companion the indescribable ignorance or avidya, is the immutable cause of the physical world”.

The word maya, avidya, adhyasa, adhyaropa, a nirvachaniya, vivarta, bhranti, bhrama, namarupa, avyakta, aksara, Bijashakti, mulaprakriti etc. are recklessly used in vedanta as very nearly synonymous. Shankar gives following characteristics of Maya as Jada, bhavrupa, shakti, anadi, buvrupa, sadasadanirvachniya, vivarta, adhyas & ashraya or visaya.

Maya is described as “MA” meant it is and “YA” means it is not. It is described as illusion but it is not pure illusion. It is not only absence of knowledge. It is also positive wrong knowledge. It is false or mithya. But is not a nonentity like a hare’s horn, Child of Barron women, it is positive (bhavrapa). It is potency (Shakti). It is also called super imposition (adhyas). A shell is mistaken as silver. Here the shell is the ground on which the silver is super imposed. When right knowledge arises this error (Bhram) vanishes. Similarly Brahman is ground on which the world appears through maya. When right knowledge dawns and the essential unity of the Jiva with the ParmAtman is realized maya or avidya vanishes.

It is said by Shankar.

ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव न अपरः ।

Means Brahman is alone real the world is unreal, and the jiva or the individual soul is no different from Brahman. Here satya or real is described as which is eternal which remain unchanged in past, Present & future. It is said in shruti – “सत्यं ज्ञानं मनन्तं ब्रह्म”. The word mithya or unreal is described as, which any time exists or none exists, here exists meaning appearance. Appearance of imaginary thing in middle is non existence as in beginning & end. Guadapad explain it in mandykya karika, as आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ।

Nrasinha Sarasvati says in his book “Vedant Dindim” :-

यदत्यादौ यदस्थन्ते य न्मध्य भाति तत्स्वयं । ब्रह्मेवैक मिदं सत्यमिति वेदान्त डिण्डिम ।
॥ यन्नादौ यद् नास्त्यन्ते – तन्मध्ये भातमस्थसत् । अतो मिथ्या जनत सर्वमिति
वेदान्त डिण्डिम ! ॥

Means which is in beginning, which is in end and appears in Middle also that is only bramha it is satya or real. It is dindim ghosh of vedant. Which is not in beginning, not in end, though appears (unreal it is dinadim ghosh of vedant) in middle is a sat or mithya (unreal) it is dindim ghosh of vedant.

Atman is self evident (svatah siddha) it is pure consciousness. It is self luminous.

Jiva through ignorance is regarded as tinged with the false notion of the “I” and “mine” which arise when mind through senses comes in to contact with the fleeting sensation or idea.

“The manduk (III, I, I) declares that ‘one bird (jiva) eats the sweet fruit, while the other (Ishvara) merely looks on’. Jiva enjoys (pibati), while Ishvara makes him enjoy (payayati). One is the enjoyer, the other is the ruler”. Kanopnishad says that both of these enjoys. But ultimately there is no different at all between Jiva & Brahman at a certain stage”.³⁹

As Hirianna writes “The indivial self is not illusory, it is Brahmann itself appearing through media or limiting adjuncts (upadhi) like the internal organ (Antah karan) which, we may state by the way are all elements pertaining to the physical world and such are illusory”. He further says, “When this fact is realized in one’s own experience. What is denied is not the jiva as a spiritual entity, but only certain aspects of it”.⁴⁰

Interpreting Shankar’s view Benjamin Walker in his encyclopedia of Hindu world says “Ignorance is responsible for samsara, the continuous cycle of birth-death-rebirth, which lost as long as we remain in the toils of the great illusion. The only way to end the bonds is by realizing the transcendently supreme fact that Brahmann is all, and that we too are Brahmann. ParamAtman (The supreme Soul) and Jivatma (The individual soul are identical).

Jiva due to avidya (Wrong knowledge) is enjoyer and doer. He acts because of avidya. Jiva consider himself enjoyer, doer & knower because of avidya and gets bandhan & moksha, Jiva is conscious self in the body. It has three attributes explained as sthool shareer, karan shareer & ling sharer, sthool shareer is made of five maters (Panch Bhoot), knowledge organ and pran. Ling Sharreer is made of five sense organ, five action organ, five pran, manas & Buddhi (intellect). Merits and demerits are collectd in ling shareer, when jiva takes birth in different bodies. Ling shareer goes with it. Karan shareer is made because of wrong knowledge. Jiva is conscious ruler of the body and holds pran.

Shankar has rejected the concept of sin & promoted concept of ignorance according to Christian and Muslims sin is disobedience to the god and rebellion against god but since Hinduism believes in law of karma. Same action can be merit or demerit depends on person & circumstances, it is explain by swadharma in Geeta. Modern Indian thinker Vivekananda also follow Shankar's theory of avidya (false knowledge) and reject the word sin.

When I am describing the attributes of Brahmann I also mean these are also attribute of soul because according to Shankar or Brahman sutra. Brahman & soul or identical but the question rises how this pure consciousness comes in touch with avidya and changes in to imperial being perhaps no philosophy and no religion can answer this question how pure and undefined becomes defined and come. Under the law of karma & births-rebirths, I shall deal with this question when I come to the concept of moksha in Hinduism. One thing must be understood that in all the religion, major and minor, the goal is moksha (salvation).

What is jagat (world) which Shankar calls mithya (false) and what he means by the word mithya. In the western philosophy especially in the imperialism they not believe in the real existence of outside world the idea is real then anything else exiting in the external world. When Shankar calls jagat mithya perhaps by this Shankar means it is the creation of the empirical Igo or the creation of maya and when maya is destroyed the creation of maya is also get destroyed.

The concept of Atman and its attribute in the philosophy of the

Vishisht advait :- Ramanuj in his school of philosophy concentrated his attention on the relation of god, souls and brahman. “The whole world as the visesana (adjective) of God is non-substantial (adravya) from the standpoint of Isvara though it contains dravya and adravya as elements and qualities. A visesana may be a substance like jnana. While substances serve as the material cause, non-substances cannot do so. The substances are prakrti or matter, kala or time, suddhasattava or pure matter, dharma-bhutajnana or attributive consciousness, jiva or the individual soul, and isvara or God. While the first three are unconscious (jada) , god and the soul are conscious (ajada), and jnana has the features of both. It is unlike unconscious substances since it can manifest itself and external objects. Knowledge however, is never for itself, but is always for another, the self knowledge is a unique adjunct of the self, and is called dharma-bhutajnana. The self knows this or that object when the jnana issues forth through this or that sense and comes into contact with an object. It is assumed that subjects and objects exist independently and are brought into relation with each other by means of knowledge.⁴¹

“According to Ramanuj though the individual soul is an attribute or mode of god and forms part of his both yet it is also a spiritual substance in itself and is absolutely real”. According to himself is not self luminous knowledge, as Shankar says, but only the object of it.⁴² We do not say, “I am consciousness” but only “I am conscious”.

REFERENCES FOR THIS CHAPTER

1. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, page 17
2. Jadunath Sinha, History of the Indian philosophy, vol. 1, Page 4
3. Surendranath Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, Volume-I ,Page 45
4. Jadunath Sinha, History of the Indian philosophy, vol. 1 Page 93
5. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Volume-I, page151
6. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 20
7. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 21
8. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 21
9. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 21
10. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 22
11. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 22
12. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 23
13. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page- 23
14. Chandogya Upanishad 191.
15. Shrimad Geeta adhyay 2, Shlok-24
16. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Volume-I ,page 550
17. Hiryanana, The essential of Indian philosophy, Page-58
18. Jadunath Sinha, History of the Indian philosophy , vol. 1 Page-229
19. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page-41
20. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Volume-I, Page 280
21. Jadunath Sinha, History of the Indian philosophy , vol. 1 page- 258
22. Hiryanana, The essential of Indian philosophy, Page- 70
23. Surendranath Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, Volume-I, Page-192
24. Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, Vol.II, edited by
J. M. Baldwin, mackmilan & co., page 231 & 232.
25. Benjamin walker, An Encyclopedic Survey of Indian philosophy, Hindu World, vol.1 page 183.
26. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Volume-I , Page 342.
27. C. D. Sharma, Bhartiya Darshan Alochan and Anushilan, page - 47
28. Surendranath Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, Volume-I, page 110-111
29. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page 19
30. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy,Page 153-154.

31. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy ,page 154
32. Hiriyanna, The essential of Indian philosophy, Page-115
33. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, page 155
34. Hiriyanna, The essential of Indian philosophy, Page-116
35. Surendranath Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, Volume-I, page-238.
36. Enclopedia Religon & Ethics- Vaisheshik
37. Surendranath Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, Volume-I , Page 367
38. Surendranath Dasgupta, A history of Indian philosophy, Volume-I , Page 434.
39. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy,Page 282
40. Hiriyanna, The essential of Indian philosophy Hiriyanna Page 157
41. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Volume-II, Page- 679
42. Chandradhar Sharma, A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Page-350