CHAPTER V


1. RELEASE

Moksa and its attainment

There is a lot of difference between 'end' 'destiny' and 'Goal'. The end is at the point where some thing drops out and the destiny is the point to which some extraneous power drags a thing. Goal is the point where one plans to go. The first belongs science, the second to religion, and the third it is that belongs to philosophy. Neither science nor religion sublates the position taken up in philosophy, while the philosopher's position sets aside the positions taken up by science and religion, in philosophy the point reached is ascertained and the method of reaching the point is planned according to a law governing the world. Neither the 'end' nor the 'destiny' calls for any inquiry it is the 'Goal' that comes within the sphere of a philosopher's rationalistic thinking.

All systems of Indian philosophy admit that the highest human endeavour finds its culmination in the attainment of liberation (Moksa). It is freedom from bondage. Moksa, according to Shankar is not a state to be newly attained, but it is the very nature of the jive, Moksa is a matter of direct realization of something which is existent from eternity, though it is hidden from our view. when the limitations are removed the soul is liberated. when a men realises his identity with that Braham which illuminizes the world of waking, dreaming and sleep states, he is released from all bonds.

2. One Fundamental Problems of Indian Philosophy by Radhakrishnan, p. 294.

Sankara says that this Moksa is nothing but Brahman. It is eternal in the true sense, i.e., eternal without undergoing any changes, omnipresent as ether, free from all modifications, absolutely self-sufficient, not composed of parts and of a self-luminous nature. Ignorance is responsible for man's separation from God. It veils from him his identity with the sole reality and presents the spectacle of a universe in which he plays his part taking it to be absolutely real when it is but a shadow of reality. It is the removal of that ignorance which constitutes liberation. When this ignorance is dispelled by the realization of Brahman the true soul stands self-revealed, even as gold shines when freed from the impurities which affected it, or as the stars shine in a cloudless night, when the day which ever-powers them disappears.  

2. Ibid., I.4.

2. Ibid., I.3-19.
ever free, but under the sway of primordial ignorance it wanders in worlds of sorrow having forgotten its home of bliss, when one is as firmly convinced of one's identity with Brahman as an ordinary man is convinced of his identity with the body, release follows whether one seeks it or not. Man has to alter totally his standpoint to wards himself and the world in order to become free. Final freedom does not, therefore, mean any actual change in the nature of the self.

Prof. M.Hiriyanna gives a familiar illustration. In a lunar eclipse, the moon is actually obscured by the shadow of the earth, and it remains eclipsed until this obscuration is removed by a change in the relative position of the heavenly bodies concerned, and the sun's light again fully falls on it. Here the change is real. In a solar eclipse, on the other hand nothing at all happens to the luminary, and it continues to be, during the eclipse, as it was before. It is only the position of the observer with reference to the sun and the moon which gives rise to a wrong notion of the eclipse perforce ceases to appear. Similarly in the present case also the identity of the self with Brahman is not to be attained, it is already there and has only to be realised in one's own experience.

1 F.Pashi VII.20 and Upadesa Shaheeri IV.6.

2 The essentials of Indian Philosophy P.169.
It is the concept of avidya which clarifies the essence of that position. On the attainment of freedom nothing happens to the world but only our views about it alter. The soul being engrossed by nescience identifies itself with the body and so on, and imagines itself to be affected by the experience of pain which is due to nescience. Thus the cause of pain is simply the error of false knowledge and with deliverance from error comes liberation from pain. Moksa is thus the disappearance of a false outlook and consequently becoming identical with the immortal Being. If release should mean the attainment of some state in a different region it ceases to be eternal, for according to the general region it ceases to be eternal, for according to the general rule Samyogada must end in viprayoga. It has been pointed out that the only existential Being is Brahman and that all human ills are caused by primal ignorance positing the world of variety. As such the eradication of nescience alone constitutes Moksa which is ever present though obscured by the encircling gloom, and it is knowledge alone that is the solvent of ignorance.

Jnana being of such prime importance in the scheme of advaita the question is raised as to the means by which it is secured. All valid knowledge of Brahman is the outcome of a right means of knowledge — pramanas. Now of the six means of knowledge, scriptural testimony is alone recognised by most of the Indian thinkers as the source from which the nature of the ultimate

1. S.V. 8.11.11-16.
2. Patachritta's commentary on Up. Veda 3.6.16.
3. V. 4.1.77.
reality is known. It is because each of the sense is limited in its sphere to that material element of which it is itself composed, and hence none of them can have the self for its object; and since the self is also totally different from anything that can be known objectively by means of the authoritative canons of knowledge, advaita has shown with considerable argumentation that the cause of the rise of that sum of knowledge which dispels ignorance - the one cause of every evil - lies in the great sentences of Sruti. So it is Sruti that proclaims the nature of ultimate reality. Puruṣa says that those who ignore the most direct means of knowledge, which is the holy text, and seek knowledge by other means, are verily in the position of a men trying to taste food with his eyes. This reality according to the advaita is no other than the unity of the individual soul and the universal self, or to express it more accurately, the non-duality of the self. The knowledge of this reality or the realisation of the truth puts an end to nescience. Transmigration and its woes being due to nescience, the only way to get rid of them is knowledge - which destroys nescience. But knowledge does not come to all. We have to prepare the ground, clear the mind and make our hearts pure for the reception of truth. Herein lies the use of ritual, the due performance of which purifies the

1. N.B., P.58.
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intellect and brings about the desire to know. It is the
ascertainment of truth that roots out error with its impressions.
Error which is of the nature of immediate experience, can be
removed only by true knowledge of the nature of immediate
experience, not by a mediate presentation. Hence it is the
intuitive perception of the highest reality effected by the
purified intellect that dispels the nescience and leads the soul
to final beatitude.

- Intuition of Brahman -

When the desire to know has been awakened by the seven
antecedent conditions, such as discrimination of eternal from
the non-eternal, the renunciation of all desire to enjoy the
fruit of one’s actions, the acquirement of tranquillity, self
restraint, discontinuance of religious ceremonies, patience,
suffering concentration of the mind, faith and desire of final
release, one hears the highest truths from the Vedants, reflects
on them reasons about them and rejects all objections to them.
and thus being finally satisfied about them he has to contemplate
the supreme Brahman taught by the Upanisads. This contemplation-
deep meditation consisting in the repetition of the cognition of
Brahman (prapancha) serves as the means of the intuition of
Brahman. This is the view of Brahman-datta whose chief doctrine
is that upanisads like the Karmkanda of the Veda are essentially
injunctive in character, the injunction here being not about ritual,

1. Bhasati, p.50
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3. B.G. Bh., I - 1-1
but about meditation, variously termed prasamkhya, bhavana or upasana. The central teaching of the Upanisads is accordingly in to be found in junctive statements like 'tasya upasita'. With that intuition are destroyed the nescience and its products, and spirit stands forth, having attained the release that was its own essential nature and only seemed to be non-existent as it were like the chain round one's own neck which one forgets and keeps looking for. This prasamkhya has been held to be the means of the realisation of Brahman. The difference between Yoga and Sankhya, the systems which hold this view, lies only in this that according to Yoga system this prasamkhya takes its place just after Savana and in the system of Sankhya it is taken up after both Savana and Sâstra.

Now the upholders of this view have to cross two hurdles to establish it. The opponent says that the uninterrupted deep meditation called prasamkhya cannot be held to be a means of Brahman's intuition, because it is not vouched for by any authoritative evidence, and that deep meditation not being enumerated among the means of valid knowledge, the intuition of Brahman generated thereby cannot be valid knowledge. Consequently such an intuition cannot destroy the primal ignorance, the root cause of this multiform world. The followers of prasamkhya, doctrine reply that there is a scriptural statement that a person

3. S.L.C., F.49.
after devana perceives the partless Brahman by means of contemplation and the authors of the Sutras and the Bhagya have expressly proclaimed that unto death meditation has to be practised. \(^1\) And in the case of those persons who contemplate the small ether in the heart (deha) as identical with their own selves it is admitted that through deep meditation there is intuition of the Saguna Brahman that is contemplated. \(^2\) As regards the second objection their rejoinder is that the intuition of Brahman generated by deep uninterrupted meditation can safely be considered to be valid, because validity of cognition is based upon the non-contradiction of the meaning i.e. the object of cognition. It is not essential that cognition requires established means of knowledge as its base for validity. Such an assumption is not contrary to the system of advaita according to this section of advaitins. They say that God is said to be omniscient. There must be a Vrtti for him on the analogy of the Vrtti of the internal organ for the jiva. A Vrtti of jiva is therefore postulated and the postulation is valid. \(^4\) In support of their view they cite the view of Amalananda. The immediate cognition of Brahman generated by the contemplation of the

---

1. B.S.G.Bh. III-111-59 and IV-1-12.
2. Ibid., III-111-56. See also S.L.S. P.619.
4. S.L.S., P.621.
knowledge generated by Vedanta texts does not become delusive like the love-lorn man's intuition of the absent adored, because it is based upon the strong and unshaky means of knowledge i.e. the Vedanta texts. Thus the followers of Prasamkhya are of the opinion that it is deep meditation that leads to the intuition of Brahman whether it be preceded by reflection (Manana) or not.

Internal organ as the means:

Appayadiksita expounds the view of another school of advaitins without the mention of their names. But it is evident from the central idea of their doctrine that he is referring to vasapsati Misra and his followers.

According to this school too it is immediate knowledge alone that can remove the ignorance which is experienced as immediate, because, otherwise, it would be like the case of a man who continues to find sugar bitter, though told it is not so and though he himself knows it is not so. But the difference lies in the fact that according to this view Prasamkhya alone is not deemed to be sufficient to originate the intuition of Brahman as the view mentioned previously holds. This section of advaitins hold that immediate cognition requires the functioning of a sense organ, here the mind, the organ of internal sense, and this mental perception is made possible only by long continued contemplation, as in the lover's perception of the long lost...

1. Kalfoataru, P.56.
2. S.L.E., P.621.
3. Ibid., P.322.
5. Ibid., P.53.
demeel whom he constantly contemplates. The latter is, of course, a delusion but the intuition of Brahman cannot be delusive, for Brahman is taught by scripture which is free from defect and cannot mislead. Brahman is identical with the jiva whose existence cannot be doubted, hence there is no possibility of delusion. Thus they conclude that the intuition of Brahman has the internal organ as its means and that the deep contemplation is of service as an auxiliary to the mind. It is the internal organ, aided by the long continued nature contemplation of the sense of the great sentences like 'That thou art' that dispels all the limiting adjuncts of the individual soul, which are the product of nescience and manifests it in its true nature i.e. the universal self. Even in the scriptural text which declares that a man whose intellect has become pure through mental concentration perceives the supreme self, contemplation is accepted only as the cause of the mental concentration. Hence deep meditation is not of itself the instrument of the intuition of Brahman.

Only Vedavakyas are the means of intuition of Brahman:

The Vedavatra school, however, holds that the principal texts of the Vedanta are themselves the cause of the intuition of Brahman and that, though they work through the mind, the latter is not a sense organ or the direct cause of immediate apprehension. The followers of this school base their doctrine on the declaration of scripture that release is declared while

1. S.L.C., P.624 see also Bhavati, P.57.
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3. Ved. Pari., P.43
embodied (jiven mukti) on the rise of the intuition of Brahman immediately after instruction by the preceptor, that nothing other than instruction is accepted as a cause of the intuition, and that Brahman is knowable through the Upanisads alone.

According to this view, verbal knowledge may of itself be immediate though its content be not sensible. There is the well known story of the ten foolish men who started counting themselves after crossing a river. To their dismay one was found missing because they counted each time nine and the enumerator left himself out in each case. When a passer by started counting and came to the tenth man and said, Thou art the tenth. There was immediate realisation of the whole party being safe and sound though there is no sense apprehension over and above what existed already without producing the said realisation.

How is the intuition of Brahman itself destroyed?

This intuition is of the conditioned Brahman, not of the absolute, for there is still the distinction of subject and object. This knowledge of Brahman in the form of 'Vṛtti' is the destroyer of ignorance with all the its developments. So the question arises how it could be destroyed because there is no other destroyer. Kendana and his follower Vasaspati Mira

5. I. L.5., P.671.
6. Dharmi, P.304 also see B.Śaddhı, P.12.
hold that it is true that nothing further is needed to correct this final intuition. It destroys the entire world of duality and destroys itself with it, when the powder of the clearing nut is mixed with muddy water to precipitate the mud, that powder itself does not require another precipitant. Others, however, say that the removal of the Brahman-vṛtti after the removal of entire world is automatic just as the water, which removing the heat, removes itself too.

Others, however, cite here the example of fire which after removing by combustion what can be so removed, dies out and removes itself.

1. Brahman-jnana (Vṛtti) does not itself remove ignorance but in association with Chaitanya:

2. Appayadikāta states a view of certain Advaitins. According to this view Brahman-knowledge, which is of the nature of a vṛtti, is not what removes ignorance and the universe based thereon, for there is the rule that ignorance is removable by illumination, its removability by an inert vṛtti is not possible; what removes it is, rather, the luminosity of intelligence associated with that vṛtti. Though in its own nature, as the witness of that ignorance, it cannot remove that, yet as associated with the vṛtti of the nature of the impartible Brahman (Akhanda-kara) its capacity to remove that ignorance is intelligible. It is observed that the light of the sun reveals objects like grass and the like, but when it is

2. Ibid., p. 677.
associated with a burning glass it reduces them to ashes. This analogy is to be applied here in the case of Brahman. The luminosity of the impartite intelligence associated with the final vrtti (the intuition of Brahman) while rooting out the entire universe, is capable of removing that vrtti as well, just as fire associated with some one faggot, while burning up villages, cities etc. burns up that faggot too. Thus there is no unintelligibility whatsoever in the destruction of the vrtti called intuition.

Brahman knowledge directly removes the ignorance not its product the world.

Some other advaitins, who according to Brahmendra are the followers of Sanchapadika, hold that Brahman knowledge removes ignorance alone, since there is direct opposition only as between knowledge and ignorance. It is the cessation of ignorance that puts an end to the universe, Brahman effect exerts its direct influence upon nescience. The intuition of Brahman draws to an end along with the universe wherein it is included when its material cause ignorance disappears. Though the removal of the universe is not directly generated by knowledge, it is generated by the destruction of ignorance, yet the illusoriness of the universe is quite intelligible; for, it is recognised that illusoriness consists in removability by knowledge alone whether directly or indirectly.

1. C.Lc., P. 678.
2. Ibid., P. 679.
4. S.Lc., P. 680.
This doctrine is in conformity with the view of release in life (jīvamukti), because in the case of one who is released while embodied even after the rise of intuition of the truth the persistence of gross and subtle bodies is observed, though the released is free from the notion of superimposition. This persistence of the Prarabdha Karma and its effect like the elemental body presupposes the persistence of a trace of nescience, the material of the prarabdha Karma. If, like ignorance, the universe too were directly removable by the intuition of Brahman the stage of jīvamukti does not hold good. Sureswara says 'just as the trembling set-up by the fear of the snake persists for a time even after the snake has been negated, so the effect of delusion persists for a little while in the case of the self knower, though all delusion has been destroyed.'

1. Relation of Karma to knowledge:

All the advaitins, however, do not agree that knowledge is the sole means of self-realisation. They indeed grant that it is indispensable but they are generally of the opinion that it should be combined with karma for securing final release. It is the combination of Jnana and Karma for this purpose that is called Samucchaya. There are three schools of advaitins which advocate Samucchaya. The first is mentioned by the commentator of the Gītādīśa Vartika, Amardajnana as that of Brahmadatta.

2. N. idhi, IV.60.
He maintained that the Upanisads like the Krama Kanda of the Veda are essentially injunctive in character. The injunction here is not about ritual but it is about meditation, termed as Bhavana. Such an advocacy of action as what is ultimately signified by the Upanisads, evidently shows that Brahmadatta falls in line with the Mīmanāsakas and differs from the school of Sāṅkara which rejects that view. Brahmadatta, like Sāṅkara holds Krama to be binding till Brahman is realised. The difference between these two advaitins is that while according to Sāṅkara Upanisadic knowledge conveyed through the statements of Upanisads leads to the final release at once, it will not do so according to Brahmadatta until meditation on the object of that knowledge is successfully pursued. There is then an interval between acquisition of Upanisadic knowledge and release. In this interval the cunda, being yet in the realm of Sāṅkara should perform all the obligatory deeds. If he neglects it, he will become subject to the sorrows of birth and death once again.

The second view is that of Māndana:

According to Māndana Māndana is the chief exponent of this view which has been criticised by Īśvarā. Māndana agrees with Brahmadatta in so far as the criterion of Vedic interpretation and the final import of the Upanisads are concerned. Meditation on Brahman after the knowledge of its true nature, as taught by the Upanisads is won, is essential according to

2. Gānottama’s commentary on N. śīrdhi, P. 38.
Mandana and Brahmadatta. But according to Mandana meditation is not the means to Moksa as Brahmadatta holds. Both these views have been criticised briefly by Sankara and Suresvara. The main point of the refutation is in the function assigned to meditation. The need for meditation is admitted by all the Vedantins including the followers of Sankara. But they are of the opinion that the true nature of Brahman is knowable directly from the Upanisads, to which Vasempati Miara alone is an exception. According to them scriptural passages conveying informations about the true nature of Brahman, are the means of the Brahman-intuition, because Brahman is at bottom one with our immediate self. Upanisadic knowledge does not therefore stand in need of any corroborative assistance from meditation. But not all are qualified to grasp the teaching of Upanisads, so far such persons meditation serves as the means of securing the necessary qualification. Thus meditation is a contributory aid to the right apprehension of the meaning of the Mahavakyas.

The third view is of much greater importance than the other two and is well known as that of Bhartṛprapace. Like Sankara, Bhartṛprapace upholds a monistic Ideal, but his conception of ultimate reality differs essentially from that of Sankara. His doctrine is variously described as Bhedabheda-Vada, Anaikante vada, Bhartṛprapace's conception of ultimate reality

1. B.C.S. Bh. I-1-4 also see N. Siddhi III.88,93,123-26.
2. B.C.S. Bh. IV-1-1 also see N. Siddhi III -126.
4. B.C.S. Bh. II-1-14 also see Ghanottam's commentary and A.J. Biston's note on N. Siddhi L.68,69 & 77.
is that of a unity in diversity. As Brahman, it is one but
as the universe, it is diverse, just as a tree or an ocean as
such is one, but is many as root, branch, leaves or weaves,
foam etc. Since in Dhruv prapancha's view diversity is as real
as unity, Karma remains obligatory always. But adherence to
Karma means the recognition of diversity alone and not that of
the unity underlying it. For realisation of the truth jnana is
essential so that Loksa is attained only by a combination of both.

Suresvara and Vacaspati argue against it thus: Bheda
and abheda advaita and advaita are so opposed in their nature
that a compromise between them is unthinkable. Even if we
grant that there is no self-contradiction in the conception it
would lead us in chaos in the end. The advaitin who aim at the
unity of the jiva and Brahman is speaking of a sphere beyond
caste distinctions, which pertain to the body. But the Bhedabheda
vadin who admits the unity of jiva and Brahman within Sansara
affirms the whole differentiated universe of jiva, since the
differentiated aspect of Brahman is equally real with the
undifferentiated. The jiva thus becomes everything including
all people of all castes. In this condition he cannot be subject
to vedic commands which make sense only for men of a particular
caste e.g. only Brahmins perform the Brhaspatisaye, only
Ksatriyas the Rajasuya sacrifice. Hence the school of the

1. N. Siddhi L.73, see also Bhavati, P.457.
Shedsbhedevedina under review is liable to self-contradiction, since they hold that jiva is fundamentally identical with Brahman which embraces all castes, and yet at the same time also hold that he should obey Vedic injunctions which make sense only as addressed to persons belonging to one particular caste. This refutes the views of those who maintain that self-realisation or release is to be obtained by works combined with knowledge.

Karma indirectly subserves release:

Now in post-Sankara Advaita two main schools, called Dhedvi and Viverana are at variance with each other with regard to the utility of the rituals in the attainment of release. The attainment of release is analogous to the attainment of a golden necklace worn round the neck, but forgotten. This is the indication of a scriptural passage which expressly declares that nothing else than knowledge can be instrumental to the attainment of the eternally existent Brahman. Because transmigratory and its doers are due to nescience, the only way to get rid of them is knowledge which destroys nescience. The mind must be prepared, the mind purified and the heart made pure for the reception of the truth. Here in lies the use of the ritual, and thus the use of Karma-samsthana in the attainment of Brahman is indirect.

1. N. Siddi, L.74, see also Chanottama's commentary on it.
Karma-anuvsthana generates the desire to know.

The fruit of actions in non-eternal, hence release can never be attained through ritual. But the due performance of ritual purifies the mind and brings about the desire to know. 1

This is the assertion of Bhamati school and its followers. They base their view on the scriptural statement that the Brahmins desire to know the self by the study of the Vedas, by sacrifice by penance and fasting. All these are comprised under rituals. Now the question arises that if a man practises sacrifices etc., for the sake of desire to know Brahman, it means that he has already a desire for Veda's knowledge, if on the other hand there is no such desire then there cannot result any desire for the desire to know, which (latter) is instrumental to the knowledge of Brahman. The question of the performance of the ritual for the desire to know Brahman does not arise. Hence on both the alternatives it is not meet to hold that sacrifices etc. are performed to generate the desire to know. The followers of Bhamati reply to this that Karma-anuvsthana is useful in generating the desire to know.

The case is like that of a person who has lost his appetite owing to intense indigestion and consequently has become very lean. He has a general inclination for food, but does not take it due to his distaste for it. In this case he has first to cure his distaste for food by the use of some medicine which should give him good appetite, and he takes the medicine and gets rid of

3. S.L.C., P.560-51, see also Bhamati, P.51-61.
the disease. So a person, who has a desire for turning towards
the attainment of Brahman, is not led by this general desire to
the activity in respect of study of the Upanisads which is the
means of knowing Brahman because of obstruction by the sins
accumulated in prior existence. He has first to remove the sins
by the performance of ritual. Thus Karma-musthama generates the
true desire to know the ultimate reality. According to the
grammatical formation of the word 'Vividisanti' it is evident
that the sense of 'san' affix holds a superior position to that
of the root. Thus this school concludes that the utility of
ritual is an generating the desire to know the reality and not in
the knowledge.

1. Karma-musthama generates the knowledge itself;

2. Those who follow the viverana school, however, say that it
is a general rule that the sense of a suffix is of greater force
than that of a stem, but there is a special rule that the sense
of the stem is of greater force than that of the suffix. And this
special rule is established in such worldly usage as 'He desires
to go on a horse, he desires to kill with a knife'. Here the
means such as horse and knife are understood to relate only to
the going and the killing; the object of desire signified by the
san-affix. Therefore, it is reasonable to hold that sacrifices etc
are directed to knowledge, that is signified by the stem in the
world 'vividisanti'.

2. V.l.c. P.655.
3. Viverana, P.662.
Now it is evident from the contention of the Viverana
school that the (chikarin) is liable to the performance of
rituals till the dawn of knowledge. But it is untenable, because
a Munkau is instructed to intuit the universal self by renuncia-
tion which consists in the abandonment of Karma. To this they
remark that as for the growth of rice both ploughing and
unploughing are requisite, since before the seed is sown there is
ploughing, after that there is no ploughing; so for the rise of
knowledge Karma and the renunciation thereof both are required.
There is practice of Karma till, on the purification of the mind
there arises a leaning towards the self, in the form of a desire
to know. After this renunciation takes place.

Sureswara says that the rituals, dedicated to the Lord
give rise to a leaning towards what is within through the power
of purity of mind. This their object being achieved, they draw to
an end like clouds at the end of the rainy season.

The difference of this view from that of the Dravati
school is that according to this Dravati subserve knowledge, even
though they are abandoned after securing the desire for knowledge,
yet they generate knowledge by securing the means, which lead up
to the fruit. The means are unhindered hearing (Dravama), reflection
(dravama) and contemplation. But on the view, however, of their
sub-survivence to the desire for knowledge, they achieve their
object even with securing an intense desire capable of generating
activity in respect of hearing etc. Thus there is no necessary
rule that they generate knowledge.

1. Bh. C. IV.3.
2. N. Aedhi, L-40 see also C.L.C., P.557.
3. Ibid., P.558.
Intent that the mind is dogged by rajas and tamas it is easily attracted by the bait of prospective pleasure and it finds itself thrown into the slaughter house of the world of sense objects, escape from which is no easy matter. But by the dedicated performance of ritualistic action the dirt of rajas and tamas may be rubbed away from the mind till it becomes like a clear, well polished crystal. Then it can see clearly, and is no longer attracted by the all consuming bait of desire and aversion generated by sense objects. All the stains then melt away, and the mind becomes like a clear mirror naturally intent on the inner self and reflecting its light.

The problem of injunction:

Nature and varieties of injunctions:

There are three varieties of Vedic injunctions namely:

(i) the originative injunction (Aparwavidhi),
(ii) the restrictive injunction (Miyama vidihi), and
(iii) the injunction of exclusive specification (Krismakhyo vidihi). Of these the first i.e. the originative, new, absolute or authoritative injunction is one that enjoins something which is not known from any other source. A restrictive injunction is one that restricts something to one out of several possible alternatives to the exclusion of all others. An injunction of exclusive specification is that where out of two known sources one is specified for choice to exclude

2. Tarkasara commentary on Bh.C.II.1
4. S.Chandrodya, p.34.
the other. In other words it can be said that it is an injunction, the purpose of which is to exclude one out of the two alternatives simultaneously known. Exclusion of others is the common characteristic of the restrictive injunction and the injunction of exclusive specifications; never the less they differ from each other in this that the former is applicable in the case of cutting one's self from the possibility of being neglected by others (Ayogavyavasechda), purporting to enjoin an optionally unknown means while the latter, in the case of cutting ones self exclusively from the connection of the other (Ayogavyavasechda) purporting to prohibit one of the two means at once known.

: Nature of Pravene-vidhi :

The scripture says that the self (Brahman) is to be heard, reasoned about and meditated on. It means that this vedic sentence apparently directs the seeker to an enquiry about the self. Now, the question arises whether there is any vidhi (injunction) here or not; if it be then what it is. Is it originative injunction, restrictive injunction or the injunction of exclusive specification?

: The view of Prakartha :

The author of the Prakartha says thus; there is an originative injunction here because of one's having no previous knowledge of any means to the intuitive perception of the absolute

2. Artha-Sangraha.
Brahman which is not perceivable by any secular means 'He who is desirous of heaven shall sacrifice' this vedic sentence enjoins the performance of a sacrifice with the object of attaining heaven which could not be known by any other means except this injunction. Hence it is an originative injunction that enjoins what is absolutely unknown. Similarly the vedic sentence 'The self is to be heard' etc. enjoins the hearing of the self with the object of attaining Brahman knowledge. That Brahman knowledge results from Sraavana etc. could not be known by any other means and as such it falls under what is called an originative injunction according to the 4thakartha.

The relation of a cause to its effect is generally established by their co-presence (Anvaya) and co-absence (Vyatisraka) but in the case of release and hearing of the Vedanta there is no evidence of co-presence and co-absence, for in ordinary experience, even for him, who has studied the Vedanta, that intuition does not arise for the most part, which for persons like Vasudeva may arise even in the womb, though they have not studied the Vedanta. Thus there is inconsistency both ways.

1 Vivarana View:

According to the Vivarana view it is a restrictive injunction because this injunction does not purport to intimate

1. Ibid., P.8.
2. Ibid., P.6.
3. Ibid., P.12.
that the study of the Vedanta is the means by which one can realise the true nature of the universal self, as it is already established by scripture. The upholders of this view maintain that it is a reinforcing rule that restricts the choice of means to the hearing of the Vedanta to the exclusion of all other possible alternatives, such as hearing of the dualistic scriptures, the discussion of Vedantic problems independently of the preceptor and the like which might be adopted through ignorance of the means of attaining Brahman-knowledge. Even without any injunction it is a well known fact that hearing (Bravara) involving in itself discussion of Vedantic problems, leads to self knowledge, as an inquiry is known from common experience to be the means of ascertaining the nature of a subject of discussion, and here the subject of discourse is self or Brahman. "He threshes corn" is a restrictive injunction which does not mean to teach that one has to thresh the corn for the purpose of unhusking it, since that is already established by positive and negative examples (Anvaya-Vyatireke). For, the unhusking of the corn can be effected in various ways. One can leave off threshing and adopt some other ways such as removing the husk of each single corn-grain by the nails of the fingers, and in that case threshing would not be resorted to, so this injunction simply intends to remove the possibility of neglecting

threshing by enjoining it. Thus it is quite clear that in one
restrictive injunction the purport of the sentence is nothing
but restriction which consists in restricting the means to one
possible alternative. Similarly is the meaning of the vedic
sentence, 'The self is to be heard' etc. Thus it is manifest
that the hearing, namely the study of the Vedanta is not in the
domain of originative injunction, since its result, Brahman,
intuition is established over and above the Vedanta passages.

Moreover, the section which treats of the repetition
of the mental functions of knowing, meditating etc. furnishes
an evidence for the fact that the passages enjoining the study of
Vedanta are of the nature of restrictive injunction. The
repetition of the mental acts like hearing, contemplating and
meditating shows that all these mental acts are to be practised
until their result is accomplished, since they have a visible
purpose. When they are practised repeatedly they terminate in the
intuition of Brahman just as the action of beating the rice corn
is prescribed to be made until the rice grains are free from
their husks, because it subserves a seen purpose, so all these
mental acts connected with the realisation of Brahman are
prescribed to be practised repeatedly until they terminate in
intuition. Now, when these passages have a visible result, it is
out of the way to hold that hearing etc. are the objects of
originative injunction. The actions prescribed by the scriptural
passages of the nature of originative injunction have an
invisible entity as their product and in consequence of this

1. S.L.G., p. 15.

2. B.S.Sh.Bh. IV.1.1.
such actions have never been enjoined to be practised repeatedly in the 'Agniṣayana' in the words 'Having filled it with all the/herbs, he pounds it' pounding is prescribed for the purpose of purification of the mortar and thus has no visible result; therefore it is not required to be performed repeatedly. Therefore, this is certainly a restrictive injunction.

The view of some other followers of Vivarana:

2

Appayadikita mentions a certain school of advaitins which partly accepts the Vivarana viewpoint. This school adopts the theory of restrictive injunction to explain the nature of the Upanisadic sentence - 'the self is to be heard etc'. It holds that indirect knowledge is derived from words before they are reasoned out and when they are accompanied by reasoning etc., they lead to realisation. The fact that the hearing of the Vedas is the cause of the realisation of Brahman is not absolutely unknown clearly shows that the injunction regarding the hearing of the self must be a restrictive one.

The difference of the view of the Vivarana-saṅga-dasīn from that of Vivarana itself is only this that the latter is firmly of the opinion that the study of the Upanisadic passages results in the realisation of Brahman without being aided by anything else, because Brahman, the object of hearing (Sravana) itself is an

1. C. L. S., p. 16.
2. Ibid., p. 30.
immediate being. The viverana maintains that hearing (a sabda) cannot be the cause of an immediate cognition (seksatkara) although its object is an immediate one, it can result in the realization of Brahman only if it be aided by contemplation and meditation. Hearing (Sravana) though resulting in indirect knowledge of the self is not a case of apramavidhi, for, even without any injunction it is known that the word is the cause of scriptural knowledge and an enquiry is the cause of ascertaining the nature of a subject of discourse.

Some other advaitins who, being influenced by the Bhamati school, partly follow the Viverana maintain that the hearing (the study) of Vedanta cannot give rise to Brahman intuition even though it is aided by contemplation and meditation, but it is mind by which Brahman can be realised or intuited. In support of their view they quote the scriptural passage: 'By the mind alone is it to be perceived.' Further they establish this view by the help of Sankara's statement that the instrument for seeing the self is the mind purified by the sacred teaching, the perceivers instruction, calmness, equanimity etc. 'Thus according to this view mind, not the word, is instrumental to the realization of Brahman and hence the choice is restricted to hearing in reference to an indirect knowledge of the self. The difference between the previous

1. Ibid., p.30.
2. Ibid., p.13.
3. Ibid., p.326 see also Bhamati, p.595, Br.Up., IV-IV.19 and Bh., G., Ch., Bh., IL.21.
view and the present one lies in the fact that the former takes Sreavana as necessary and Manana as an auxiliary means while the later takes the Manana as a necessary and Sreavana as an auxiliary means to the knowledge of the self.

There is another section of advaitins which is not satisfied with the previous view that there is a restrictive injunction in respect of Manana. It holds that hearing (study of Vedanta) is ultimately meant to lead to immediate knowledge of the self as is indicated by the word 'Drastavya'. Only for the sake of immediate knowledge of Brahman is there a restrictive injunction in respect of hearing (study). The study of Vedanta (hearing) of itself has no power to result in direct knowledge, but it acts as a concurrent agent (Seukarin) to the mind that is instrumental in winning direct knowledge. Hearing of the self helps the mind in attaining direct knowledge of it, just as the study of the science of music helps the ears in realizing the seven notes.

1. The view of Sarvejnaatman:

According to the author of Sankasa Sariraka 'hearing' (Sreavana, the study of Vedanta) consists of a special mental vrtti of the nature of a thinking consideration of the principles, by the help of which we reach the decision that all the Vedanta passages have the non-dual Brahman for their main purport. Such a

3. S.L., Ff.33-34.
vrtti cannot give rise to mediate or immediate knowledge of Brahman, because Brahman intuition results from the means of valid knowledge such as the verbal authority. This sraeva (hearing) is other than knowledge of Brahman, for in that case an injunction will be out of place, since knowledge of an already existent thing like Brahman cannot be enjoined. This Sursaeva concludes that the restrictive character of the injunction in the case of hearing of the self is proved not because it lays down that self-knowledge results from hearing Upanisadic texts alone but because it removes human impediments such as natural clinging to duality and previous misconceptions. The text "The self is to be seen" does not indicate the result of hearing, namely the knowledge of Brahman, but is simply recommendatory i.e. Brahman is a proper object of hearing. Sursaeva stresses stress upon the fact that Brahman - intuition does not arise from Vicara (thinking consideration) which is an extraneous cause, nor does the vicara stand as a subservient to the intuition of Brahman. It is because in that case the validity of Brahman knowledge will be dependent on other extraneous things which is not admissible in this system. According to the adaitins, who follow Kumarila in this respect, validity of knowledge does not require to be produced or revealed by any factor other than those which enter into the original cognition itself.

2. S. Harirak, L.63.
3. Ibid., L.18, see also Ved.ervibhava, p. 294.
The author of *Vartika*, Narayana Sarasvati, and his followers are of the opinion that the text 'The self is to be heard' is an exclusive injunction to prevent distraction by other activities. For him who is engaged in the hearing (study) of the Vedanta for the sake of the intuition of Brahman there is contingency of his being occupied off and on with other activities which are undesirable in the pursuit of release, just as for a person who is engaged in the works of 'Cerasa' and Shrute for the sake of medical knowledge there would at intervals be the contingency of engaging in other activities; hence the vedic text of the nature of an exclusive injunction serves the purpose of preventing such distractions. For there are numerous scriptural passages which expressly declare that exclusive attention or dedication is the means to release. Thus it is a Parasankhya Vichii to prevent distraction by other activities.

'Five five-nailed animals may be eaten', the injunction involved in this sentence has not the purpose of establishing the eating of five five-nailed animals since that is established by man's natural appetite or inclination, not does it fall under the domain of the restrictive injunction as the eating of these five species of animals with five nails as well as other species with

1. B.S., Ch.,Hi. with nine-commentaries ed. by Ananta Krishna Shastri, Cal., 1933.
2. Ch.,Up. II.23-9 and Minel, IL.2-6.
five nails is simultaneously known and so there is no optionally unknown element here to constitute what is called a restrictive injunction. It is, therefore, an injunction of restrictive specification purporting to exclude the eating of five nailed animals other than the five particular varieties mentioned. Similarly the injunction - 'The self is to be heard etc.' purports to exclude or prohibit the study of all courses other than that of the Vedanta for the attainment of Brahman knowledge. In the absence of such an injunction one engaged in the study of the Vedanta for the attainment of Brahman knowledge might have at intervals taken to some other courses through natural propensities. Hence the injunction regarding the 'hearing of the self' falls under the category of what is called the injunction of exclusive specification (Parasambhya Vidhi).

The View of Suresvara:

Suresvara's assertion is that it is an action alone that is the subject of an injunction. Right knowledge is outside the range of action, so it cannot be the subject of any injunction. Right knowledge of the nature of self which eradicates ignorance of the self (which is the seed of all evil) and which is hence the cause of liberation is conditioned by the nature of reality and not fashioned by the will of men. And even if the existence of an injunction be admitted, it quite certainly cannot be an originative one (Apurvavidhi). It can either be a restrictive or an exclusive injunction. It should be noted in this context:

1. Arthasastra and see S.L.o., P.39.
2. N.Sidhi, P.50.
that in the opinion of Āryasvātī the negative or exclusive injunction has no
injunctive force at all, and amounts to a prohibition (Nesadhī). If the
injunction 'He should not eat five nailed animals' were interpreted as a negative
injunction it would mean 'We do not prescribe eating of the five nailed
animals at all but if a man must eat then let him eat the five
five nailed animals only, as to eat anything else would be
definitely sinful. We cannot meditate on the highest self until and
unless the not self has been excluded from view, thus it is evident
that Braham knowledge presupposes as its antecedent the negation
or exclusion of the not self from view. Thus Āryasvātī concludes that
the injunction 'He should meditate only on the self' can only
be a restrictive or negative one only, for separation from the not
self is the ground for self-realisation.1

The View of Vvccapati and his followers:

The followers of Śaṅkara School do not agree with the view
that 'hearing', 'Contemplation' and 'meditation' are in the domain
of an injunction either originative or restrictive or exclusive.
Their assertion is that hearing, contemplation and meditation
which are prescribed to be performed for self-realisation are
simply the knowledge of the self, as generated by revelation
and the instruction of the preceptor. And thus they cannot be
treated as thinking consideration of the purport of scriptural

1. Ibid. T.33 See also S. L. S. P. 40.
passages; hence in respect of them there is no injunction whatsoever. 1 Vasastri states in his Ismati that becoming one with Brahman is manifested by the removal of nescience alone; that the removal of nescience results from the right knowledge of the upanisadic passages bearing upon Brahman, which (knowledge) culminating in realisation, contemplation or meditation generates impressions which are auxiliary to the mind in producing an intimation of Brahman, is established by other means of knowledge, so it is absurd to hold that the text 'contemplate but as the self' is an injunction. 2 Knowledge is dependent on an object and a means of knowledge and an injunction in such a case is a futile as the sharpness of a razor on a piece of stone. This view is in accord with the view of Shankara who expressly declares that the purport of those sentences which, at any rate, have the appearance of injunctions, such as 'the self is to be seen', 'to be heard about is to divert men from the objects of natural activity. For when a person sets intent on external things, and is anxious to attain the objects of his desire and to eschew the objects of his aversion such texts as have the appearance of injunctions direct him from the objects of natural activity and turn the stream of his thoughts on the highest self. 4 Hence the vedic sentences

1. Ibid. p. 41.
2. Ismati. p. 115.
4. Ibid., p. 114.
regarding the realisation and hearing etc., of Brahman are
explanatory (Arthavada) to the injunction regarding the study
of the Veda and not themselves injunctive in any way. Such is
the opinion of Bhamati and its followers.

1 Release while embodied:

When the true nature of the self is realised one attains
moksa, which as we have seen, is not merely knowing Brahman
but being Brahman. The purita is explicit that this realisation
of Brahman enables one to attain freedom from the bonds of Samsara
here and now. A person who has attained this stage is a jivan-
mukti or a 'free-man' although he may continue to be associated
with his several physical and mental faculties. There is for him
the persistence of the body until the fruition of the residual
Prarabdha Karma. There is no denying the fact that the knowledge
of truth destroys menscence that is the material cause of all
Karma without exception, but it does not remove Prarabdha Karma
since it is itself the fruit of that Karma. It is to be noted in
this context that Karma is divided into three classes: the Karma
at present being earned, the Karma earned in the past awaiting
fructification, and that part of the past Karma which has already
begun to fructify. The last of these is called prarabdha. It is
due to the prarabdha Karma that a jivan mukta is in life, and yet
out of life. The persistence of the body even after the destruction

3. V.P. Sangraha, P.362.
of nescience is intelligible on the analogy of the potter's wheel rotating for some time till the momentum is spent even after the propelling rod is removed. According to the logicians the effect continues to remain some time after its material cause has been destroyed. Then the threads of which the cloth is an effect are destroyed, still, for a few seconds, the cloth continues to appear. Similarly the body of jnana may persist for sometime after the past Karma which caused it has been destroyed. In the words of Appaya Diksita it is the trace of nescience, by the persistence of which there is release while embodied. Some adwaitins hold that the trace of nescience is the element of the projective energy of the primal nescience. Primal ignorance is endowed with obscurative and projective energies. The intuition of Brahman destroys the obscuring energy of the ignorance; the projective energy, which is the cause of the persistence of Prameh Karma and the body, is dispelled by that pure intelligence from which the veil of ignorance is removed by intuition.

Others say that the trace of nescience is the impression left behind by nescience. It is comparable to the smell of garlic which persists in the vessel even after it has been cleansed. The trace of nescience itself is but primal nescience itself. The persistence of it is like a burnt cloth which retains its

1. P. Ishil VI.54.
2. S.l.S., P.682.
3. Ibid., and Kr.m.y.a., P.682.
4. Ibid., P.682.
configuration, Vidyaranya opines that liberation during life does not depend on any special rule of life; its main characteristic is the establishment of the soul in the knowledge of Brahman. In the story of the ten persons, the tenth man who may have been crying and beating his head in sorrow, stops lamenting on realising that the tenth is not dead, but the wounds caused by his beating his head will take time to heal. On realising that the tenth is alive, he rejoices and forgets the pain of his wound. In the same way jivan mukti makes one forget any injury resulting from the fructifying Karmas.

The view of Madhav Miira:

Madhava's view in the matter of jivan mukti exhibits a striking contrast in many respects. In discussing the question of the destruction of Karma by the realisation of Brahman, Madhava holds that two views can possibly be put forward, one view being that Brahman realisation brings about the total annihilation of all Karmas, the fructified as well as the unfructified, and that it is immediately followed by the falling off of the body which is complete liberation from embodied existence, and the other view being that, in some cases, even after realising Brahman the body, in which realisation is achieved is not destroyed immediately, but persists for some time as a result of a trace of nescience in the form of Prasabda Karma. This latter condition is

1. Ibid., p. 682.
3. Dr. Siddhi, p. 130.
described as liberation in the living state, the former view, 
Mandana admits, is more logical and accords with sruti and smrti, 
but he shows his definite preference for the latter view and 
elaborately explains and maintains it. In his opinion the doctrine 
of jivan-mukti can be harmonised with sruti and smrti in a more 
satisfactory manner than the doctrine of Sadyoumkti. The script-
ural text 2 'For him there is only delay' should be taken to convey 
only the limit of 'deshapata' with reference to the delay 
(Chitragva) which must necessarily be recognised in the case of a 
jivan-mukta's body and physical environment have really been 
sloughed off through his realisation though they have not yet 
perished and they bear the same relation to him as a cast off 
slough to a snake to which it once belonged. 3 A jivan mukta comes 
by Kayvalya on the destruction of his present body in which he 
realises himself to be Brahman. While, thus, maintaining the 
latter of the two views regarding mukti and accepting jivanmukti, 
Mandana sets his face wholly against Sankara's view that the force 
of Prasadbha cannot be impeded and must be allowed to spend 
itself out through 'Shora' like the force of a darted arrow and 
that jivan muktas like Vasishtha and Narada should be recognised 
as having had several reincarnations through the working of their 
Prasadbha. From Mandana's observations regarding jivanmukti it 
inevitably follows that the texts dealing with 'dhikarikas should 
not be taken to refer to jivamuktas in the strict sense, that the

1. Ibid., P.2. 130-31. 
Adhikarikas are Sadhakas of an advanced type; that a jivanmukta is absolutely free from the possibility of reincarnations and attains Kaivalya on the destruction of the body.  

It should be noted that among post Sankara Advaitins, Vacaspati Misra, who follows Mandana in many respects has chosen to deviate from Mandana and follows Sankara in respect of jivanmukti. Vimuktatman the author of Istrasidhi, who prefers to follow Sankara and Suresvara in many respects has chosen to adopt Mandana's view regarding Jivanmukti.

Jivanmukti is mere Arthavada:

Sarvajnatman, the author of Sankeesa Sariraka maintains that there cannot be the persistence even of a trace of ignorance on the rise of the intuition of Brahman, because they are opposed to each other as darkness and light are. The sacred teaching about release while embodied is only for the purpose of glorifying the injunction to study and thus is intended to inspire others; for there is no purpose in the sacred teaching setting forth release while embodied, Therefore, for him who has performed contemplation, there is, by the mere rise of the intuition of Brahman, the removal of ignorance with all its effects and impressions.

1. S.L.C., P.683.
2. Bhurati, P.958.
3. Is.vidhi, P.77.
5. S.Shrirasaka IV.33 & IL.217.