CHAPTER V
EMANCIPATION

(1)

So long we have dealt only on the speculative side of the Advaita Philosophy. But there is also a practical side as it seeks theoretically to comprehend and practically to assimilate the transcendental truth, which has been substantiated (being duly supported both by reason and intuition) on the basis of the scriptural authority. As it has been universally noted by our metaphysicians, the ultimate end of metaphysical enquiry is not merely in theoretical comprehension but in actual realisation of the truth - through which the individual realises the greatest benefit, namely, the freedom of the soul. This view has been maintained equally by all schools of Advaita philosophers. As the Advaitins hold the individual renounces the psychological ideality with this realisation, and becomes free eternally from all those entanglements that characterise our empirical life. Thus the supreme end is freedom or emancipation - which has equally been entertained as our ultimate destiny and goal in all the systems of our philosophy.

Emancipation philosophically connotes the liberation from the bond of Nature. The individual - after the freedom is attained, transcends the cosmic life and thus rises safely beyond the hold of Nature, so the eternal wheel of birth and death stops forever as soon as freedom is achieved and the emancipated -
being exists being immuned forever from all kinds of afflictions that befall us in our empirical life, and which none of us can avoid so long as he leads the empirical life within the fold of Nature. Thus, being free from all afflictions the liberated soul rests in absolute peace; and this peaceful existence continues through all eternity without having any possibility of its future discontinuance.

Thus freedom in our philosophy implies the transcendence to the supercosmic life followed by total extermination of all kinds of pain and sufferings. Due to this fact some of our metaphysicians have their definition of freedom as simply the complete destruction of all pain and afflictions which implies in turn the transcendence to the supercosmic life beyond the hold of Nature. Vedantists (Advaitins) acknowledge all those facts relating to the emancipated state of existence, but they insist on at the same time that freedom does not imply merely the total extermination of all sufferings though that follows as a natural corollary to the proposed transcendence that the liberated soul should realise in due course. Vedanta promises us indeed a brighter prospect as it holds that the transcendental life after the emancipation opens with absolute bliss and pure and all-expansive knowledge. Bliss and consciousness, as we have noted it in the very beginning, constitute the basic character of the being. And according to the Advaita philosophers bliss and consciousness are identical with
the being itself. Hence as the liberated soul realises its true nature having renounced the psychological identity, it realises therefore the absolute bliss and pure and absolute knowledge which are not differentiable from its own existence.

Now from the Advaita standpoint proposed transcendence is an accomplished fact. As our phenomenal life has been professed to be a false projection, a device of avidvā, so the being or the self exists in reality transcending the phenomenal life, though due to our deep-rooted ignorance we fail to comprehend that fact. So to an Advaitin the self in reality is neither a doer nor an享受er (Kartā and Bhokta) i.e. the self neither participates in any action nor enjoys the fruit of action - whether that comes in the shape of good or in the shape of evil.

The position of the self within the cosmic order has been therefore defined as that of the witness (saksin) - the detached consciousness at the background which remains nonrelated to and nonaffected by the passing episodes of this empirical life controlled by māyā. All these facts we have explained earlier, but here the point is viewed in the above light; the transcendence of soul is an accomplished fact, and if in the above light we admit transcendence as a fait accompli, there cannot be any bondage in reality. That there is no real bondage, that bondage is a delusion, has been stated indeed by the teachers on various occasions. But the fact is, if there is no bondage there can neither be the liberation. As these are relational terms - bondage and liberation -
the exclusion of one includes naturally the exclusion of another. Hence if bondage is accepted to be an illusion only, it ends ultimately in the denial of the possibility of liberation. As the transcendence is always an accomplished fact there is neither bondage nor liberation of the soul. On this ground Gaudapāda has denied for the soul the bondage and liberation as well as the desire for liberation.¹

Now from the esoteric standpoint all the teachers (Advaita) have accepted that fact. But, on empirical consideration, they have accepted bondage as if it is real, and have entertained the concept and possibility of liberation—just as we find it in other systems of our philosophy. Indeed in our empirical life few of us can really comprehend the transcendence of the soul, though it is a fact; and the phenomenal life, so far as our ordinary mind is concerned, is not an illusory projection devoid of truth. We take the phenomenal life as real and so long as we are guided by our practical reason we cannot deny it by any means. Besides, unless we can comprehend directly the true nature of the self which remains hidden to us all the time under the dark veil of the hypnotic ṛāva (avidyā), we are in bondage suffering all the time as we do from birth, death and decay, which none can avoid, so long as he exists.

¹ Na nirodho na cetpatti-rakṣadho na ca sādhakah
Na numukṣaṇa vāi muktāśtyeva paramārthatā.
(Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā - Vaiśeṣika Prakaraṇa, SL 32)
within the fold of *māyā*. So, on practical considerations, bondage has been accepted and with bondage the concept and possibility of liberation have been entertained. As long as the individual remains ignorant and fails to comprehend the true nature of his being he is in bondage, and as soon as *avidya* is removed and the true nature of the being is revealed the freedom is attained, because it immediately puts an end to all those sufferings superimposed on the self.*

Now, viewed in the above light, liberation is simply the awakening of self-consciousness — which arises destroying the dark spell of ignorance. As we have analysed before, it is our ignorance or *avidya* which keeps us in bondage. When *avidya* dissolves one becomes liberated from limitations. So the teachers of the School (*Advaita*) propound their definition of freedom as simply the destruction of *avidya* (*avidya nivṛtti*). When *avidya* dissolves both of its functions, — the epistemological (*āvarana*) and the creative (*vikṣena*) — stop forever. The epistemological function (*āvarana*) is here more important. The creative function of *avidya* may continue for a length of time — as it is in the case of *jīvanmukta* (according to some of the teachers indeed)** but as the epistemological function of *avidya* stops, the truth hidden so long is revealed and the being is liberated from this life.

*Śvātmāṇāṃ kāraṇam bandhaneṣya  
Śvātmajñānaṁ tathānivṛttibha muktih  
(Saṅgītipadārākā - Chap.1/81.50)*

**According to Gītāśūdra, the creative function of *avidya* continues in the state of *jīvanmukti*. See, Tattvapradīpikā - Chap.IV, P.392,394. Bombay Ed.
The supreme end, to the Advaita Philosophers, is the realisation of absolute identity. As soon as avidya dissolves the false notion of duality is supplanted and the whole range of empirical appearance with its plurality and difference is rejected as false. The distinction of God and individual also vanishes at this state. Thus the individual realises the absolute identity - the identity which the self possesses in the fundamental state free from the touch of maya. For this realisation of absolute identity the Advaitins maintain the loss of finite personality in the emancipated state. But the loss of finite personality has been contested by the realists, because, the loss of finite personality implies to them the self-annihilation of the being. But from the Advaita standpoint the finite personality is but a self-imposed limitation of the Being which has been created or projected under the spell of avidya. So it must drop with the awakening of self-consciousness when avidya totally dissolves. And the loss of finite personality viewed in this light cannot affect the Being in any way. In fact to the Advaita Philosophers, the ultimate loss of finite personality is not self-annihilation (as it is supposed to be), but it is self-realisation.

Thus the Advaitins maintain the ultimate loss of the false difference between God and individual. Now the ultimate loss of difference between God and individual has been maintained also in the Bhedabheda Philosophy of Bhaskara. In fact this has been suggested...
in the Upanisad itself. To explain the transcendental state of existence after the emancipation the Upanisad illustrates the merging of the river current losing its distinguishing marks in the vast expanse of the ocean. So the ultimate loss of finite personality ending in absolute identity of God and individual has been supported by the teachers (Advaita) by the quotation of that particular text of the Upanisad. But the process of the realisation of identity is different in the Advaita Philosophy from Bhāskara’s procedure. The Upanisadic illustration of the merging of the river current is more suitable in Bhāskara’s procedure. To the Advaita Philosophers there is no question of merging because there is no difference in reality. The finite being is not a separate entity other than the Absolute. But it is the Absolute appearing as individual due to the hypnotic spell of Māyā. So the question of merger does not arise at all. Besides in Bhāskara’s procedure as well as according to the illustration of the Upanisad the individual unites with the Absolute dropping the limitation which separates it from the Absolute. But unity is not the ultimate end. Viewed so far from the Advaita standpoint Realisation of Unity presupposes the difference, whereas to the Advaita Philosophers difference does not exist in reality. According to the Advaita Philosophers:

1. Yathā nādyah avandamānāḥ samuḍre
d asthma gacchanti nāma-rūpe vikāya
Tathā vidvāṁ nāma-rūpad vimuktaḥ
Paratparam puruṣaś ca upaśi divyaṁ.
(Mundakopanisad -3/2/3)
Philosophers, therefore, renunciation of the psychological ideality (which makes the difference) by the individual ends in the realisation of the supreme identity which was unrealised in the state of ignorance. The Upanisadic illustration of the merging of the river current has been accepted, therefore, as an illustration only to explain the ultimate loss of difference. Moreover viewed strictly from the metaphysical standpoint, Saṅkarites neither accept the theory of expansion which according to Bāskara's process is what the finite soul realises in emancipation. Viewed from the empirical standpoint the self realises indeed the expansion with the loss of the limiting adjuncts which makes it appear concentrated and contracted. But in reality, the concentrated appearance itself is an illusion. The concentration or expansion falls within our conceptual thinking. The self as transconceptual being excludes therefore the concentration and expansion. Besides the liberated soul has neither the experience of space and time which are the main basis of our conceptual thinking. So speaking properly, the liberated soul does not experience the expansion of its own being.

The freedom of the soul involves the realisation of absolute peace and tranquility along with the supreme bliss and harmony. The absolute identity proposed by the Saṅkarites includes all these facts. Discordancy and disharmony that break the peace of our life arise essentially out of difference. All our afflictions, pains and sufferings come out of the notion of difference
as it has been suggested in the Upanisad. The Upanisad says when the individual comprehends the identity, he forsakes all fear and hatred, desire and aversion. How can there be any grief or lust, says the Upanisad, when the individual realises the identity. Desire and aversion, fear and hatred, these are the main roots of our afflictions, and these are the disturbing elements of our life continually breaking, (as they actually do), the peace and harmony. When one can forsake these roots of afflictions, he enjoys the supreme bliss as there is nothing to afflict him. And this is possible, as the Upanisad says, through the realisation of identity only. Viewed from this standpoint the Advaita conception of Mukti is not only the highest but it presents us the real solution and promises us the real security for ever which none can doubt.

(II)
Vidhā-Mukti and Jīvan-Mukti

Sāṇkarites hold that emancipation of the soul does not necessarily involve the immediate destruction of the body. There may be the liberation in life and the five sheaths - (pañca-kosa), created by āvidyā, may continue after liberation is achieved.

1. Tatra ko mohana kah soka akatmanupāsya
taḥ
Ūpanisad - S.7.
So there are two types of emancipation known as Videhamukti and Jīvanmukti. In Videhamukti the material body with other sheaths ceases to exist with avidvā, and the empirical life ceases to continue as soon as the freedom is achieved. But in Jīvanmukti - all those sheaths remain intact though avidvā dissolves, and the liberated being leads the empirical life like ordinary individuals. Therefore to the Advaita Philosophers, mukti (freedom of the soul) is not necessarily the Videha - which means disembodied existence. But 'Videha' implies a certain stage of liberated existence - which can be attained ultimately by the Jīvanmukta when the five sheaths of avidvā drop after continuing for a length of time. The Videha is therefore the final state of liberated existence.

In fact, from the Advaita standpoint, liberation or emancipation involves the realisation of identity - the identity which is an accomplished fact. So the soul is liberated with the comprehension of identity. Hence as soon as self-consciousness awakens and the truth of identity is revealed supplanting the false notion of duality, the liberation is achieved. It does not matter whether the body drops or not, whether the empirical life continues or ceases to be. All the same the being is liberated.

Śaṅkara and all of his followers, except Manḍana Misra, entertain therefore the possibility of liberation in life (jīvanmukti). That the liberated being can exist with his body and lead the empirical life like ordinary individuals has been openly supported in their
opinion in the Bhagavad-Gītā. The Śthitaprajñā of
the Gītā has been identified by them, as a liberated
soul existing with his body and leading the empirical
life after the liberation. But Maṇḍana Mīra has
denied this possibility on the same ground with the
theistic philosophers (Vedānta). Maṇḍana says, so
long as the body exists the liberation is far from
achieved. So the Śthitaprajñā of the Gītā is not
actually the liberated soul. As Maṇḍana says,
Śthitaprajñā attains the supreme knowledge, so he can
forsake all his desires and aversions. But still he
cannot have the freedom as long as he exists with
the body. According to Maṇḍana Mīra, therefore,
Śthitaprajñā is Sādhaka - a spiritual-aspirant - who
has not yet attained the desired end (the freedom)
but still striving after it, though he has already
attached to some extent the supreme knowledge - that
will ultimately (after the destruction of the body)
lead him to that desired end for which he is earnestly
waiting. Following the tradition, Maṇḍana supports
his position by the quotation of the Brūtī. Accor-
ding to Maṇḍana's interpretation, the Brūtī says that
one who has attained the height of knowledge, the
supreme vision, will remain in bondage so long as his
body exists. And then after the destruction of the
body, as there is nothing to force him to remain in
bondage, he will realise the freedom. Curiously

1. Sarirakabhāṣya - IV.1.15; p.959. Brahmaśūtra
Sākara Bhāṣya - Bombay Ed.
2. Brahmaśiddhi - p.130, Madras Ed.
enough the same text, which Mandana has quoted in support of his position and has interpreted in the above manner, has been interpreted by Saṅkara differently. According to Saṅkara's interpretation, the Śrutī says that the body exists even after the liberation of the soul if the prārabdha (fruit-yielding karma) remains non-exhausted at that stage. So the liberated being may exist with his body. But as the root cause of bondage is already destroyed, and as the liberation is already achieved, so when the body drops the individual enters at once into the disembodied stage or the highest and ultimate stage of liberated existence. Thus according to Saṅkara the Śrutī professes the possibility of the liberation in life (jīvanmukti) whereas to Mandana the Śrutī has denied this possibility as it professes that the liberation is achieved only after the destruction of the body.

The author of the Jīvanmuktiviveka proved the possibility of the liberation in life. The view that the freedom of the soul is achieved only after the destruction of the body is not tenable indeed. The continuation or destruction of the body depends entirely on karma. If karma exhausts itself in its natural course - the body dissolves automatically. Liberated or not, the body drops as soon as the fruit-yielding karma (prārabdha) terminates at its natural course. Hence the destruction of the body depends on karma.

karma. Liberation on the other hand depends on knowledge. If karma remains nonexhausted at this stage - i.e. after the full awakening of transcendental knowledge - the body exists and the liberated being leads the empirical life. If, on the other hand, the fruit-yielding karma is already exhausted the body drops and the liberated being realises the Vedic karma cannot exhaust itself without yielding its full fruit which it has begun to yield with the birth of the present body. This is an acknowledged fact. So, even if the person is liberated, the body exists to enjoy the fruit of action and the empirical life shall continue as its result. Viewed in this light the liberation in life is possible indeed. So in the face of strong objections, Sāṅkara and his followers have entertained it, and Vācaspati though he has followed Maṇḍana in other matters, has rejected his view on the present one. In this matter Vācaspati entertains the possibility of jīvamukti. Sāṅkara offers two illustrations in substantiating the continuity of the emancipated life due to the prārabdha. Just as the perception of double moon (or any object) continues even after the realisation that it is erroneous perception, and just as the potter’s wheel revolves inertly for a length of time, so the empirical

---

   Vedāntakalpataru - IV.1.15, p.958, 959.
   Brahmaśūtra Sāṅkara Bhāṣya. Bombay Ed.
empirical life within the cosmic order designed by avidvā, continues for a length of time if the body exists to enjoy the fruits of karma. The theistic philosophers have raised the contention against the liberation in life on the ground that liberation implies the dawn of self-consciousness. Now, as avidvā is antagonistic to knowledge so avidvā must dissolve as soon as self-consciousness awakens. So the empirical phenomenon which is designed by avidvā (viewed from the Advaita standpoint of course), cannot continue to appear if the soul is actually liberated. To this Citsukhācārya's reply is that, due to prārabhā, avidvā does not dissolve in all its phases. The creative phase of avidvā remains intact. So the empirical life continues. This lingering phase of avidvā has been described as avidvālesa. Prakāśātmāt ā suggests another alternative with it in support of the continuity of the empirical life even when avidvā dissolves and the soul is liberated. According to Prakāśātmāt ā, avidvā may totally dissolve with all its phases. But if the prārabhā remains unexhausted the empirical life must continue and the empirical life continues owing to the persistence of root impressions (avidvā-samskāra).

As cognition leaves behind an impression, so avidvā also produces its impression. Hence there is no inconsistency if it is admitted that the body exists and the empirical life continues.

1. Sārīrakabḥāṣya - IV.1.15, p-958, Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya, Bombay Ed.
2. Tattvopradīpikā - p-393-394, Bombay Ed.
continues even after the destruction of avidya which is necessary for realising the freedom of the soul.

Now, according to Śaṅkara's illustrations of the inert revolving of the potter's wheel and the perception of double moon, both of these two views - noted earlier - can be accepted. The first illustration confirms Vīva- ranācārya's suggestion as it implies that even if the cause is non-existing the effect may continue due to the momentum imparted by it. The second illustration again confirms Čitsukhačārya's opinion. The perception of illusory object continues sometimes due to the defect of visual organ. So though the fundamental cause of erroneous apprehension i.e. avidya does not exist when the individual realises that the double moon does not exist in reality, still the optical defect which is one of the main supplementary causes, remains in force and this causes the perception of double moon. In Čitsukhačārya's opinion also the creative function of avidya remains intact though the epistemological function ceases. The main function of avidya is the screening of consciousness. By screening our consciousness avidya projects the appearance and makes it appear as real. In case of ḫīvanmukti the main function of avidya stops. But the creative function remains intact. So the empirical life created or projected by avidya continues. But viewed properly, Vīvaranācārya's suggestion is more plausible. Avidya is opposed to knowledge; so avidya cannot exist after the awakening of self-consciousness. Avidya dissolves therefore, but the empi-
empirical life can continue due to the root impressions or due to long adaptation. Śaṅkara also says in his illustration of the perception of double moon that the perception continues due to the *śaṃskāra*.

As the empirical life continues due to long adaptation only, therefore, in the state of jīvamukti one cannot have any interest in this life. Jīvamukta forsakes pleasure and pain, desire and aversion. He becomes totally indifferent to the worldly concerns. Good or evil, pleasure or pain, gain or loss, nothing can affect him for a moment. He exists merely as a witness of all these facts without being least interested in them. This state of absolute poise has been described in the Gītā. As the Gītā says this is the state of absolute renunciation. In fact, in the state of jīvamukti, the active consciousness goes on with the realisation of transcendence. The whole field of consciousness in the liberated soul is active just as it is active in the ordinary life. But the very ground of active consciousness becomes loosened inasmuch as the liberated soul remains at the detached background and although the psychic dealings are recorded they are not interpreted and assimilated as it is done in the ordinary life. So the liberated soul cannot feel the ordinary stir of life though he leads the empirical life.

1. Bādhakṣenapi tu mithyājñānaṁ dvicandrojñānavat-śaṃskāravālavat kāmicitkālamenuvartata eva.
   Sūtrakābhāṣya - IV.1.16.P-959,
   Brahma-sūtra Saṅkarabhāṣya - Bombay Ed.

   See also Saṅkara’s Commentary (Bhagavad-Gītā - II.56)
as before. A man after liberation, therefore, remains absolutely noninterested in and indifferent to the incidents of the empirical phase of life though he witnesses every thing - every bit of it - just like an ordinary person. Thus liberation in life (jivanmukti) connotes philosophically the knowledge of the transcendental implying the dropping of the active consciousness; but it does not imply any change in the expression of the dynamic consciousness though with clear understanding it loses its meaning and importance.

Thus in jivanmukti a person can lead the empirical life without feeling any interest in it. He remains nonattached to all the worldly concerns. And this nonattachment is spontaneous and natural. This is called Anandavasna which is different from Vividhisamsanvasa. In latter case the non-attachment and renunciation of all earthly possessions are practised by the spiritual-aspirant (sadhaka) with a view to making himself fit for the higher realisation. But in the former case, nonattachment and renunciation are the effect of clear understanding so they are natural and spontaneous in this case.

Now, there are passive and active states in jivanmukti. According to the yogic terminology the passive state is called 'asamprajnata'. In this state, the liberated soul exists in the supernatural state detached altogether from the psychic phase of consciousness. Therefore, in this state there is no
physical or mental activity — though the body and mind exist intact. The second state i.e., the active state is called *sampradāya*. In this state the jīvanmukta exists in the plane of mind. So in this state he leads outwardly the active life just like an ordinary individual.

Though jīvanmukta may lead the active life like an ordinary person, yet there is no obligatory duty, nor is there any restriction in this state. The jīvanmukta can act as he likes. Of good or evil, virtue or sin, there is little difference to the emancipated spirit. So the liberated person can act as a free being. There is neither any obligation nor any restriction to direct him to a particular course of action — which may not be according to his own liking. But it must be noted here, that at the height of knowledge — a man attains the pitch of perfection — moral, ethical and spiritual. So at this stage a person naturally recoils from evil deeds — though he attaches little importance to it as he remains completely indifferent to its effect. Besides, the will that such an emancipated spirit can be expected to possess is exercised not with a view to the acquisition of an unrealised object of desire, because there is nothing unattained or unattainable to him. It is the semblance of the will that he still possesses. Therefore, all his actions are naturally directed to the realisation of good and well-being of the inhabitants of this world — his fellow creatures. It would be a great mistake — if it is thought that the liberated soul loses all sense of discrimination and choice between good and evil, though these relative values, as it has been said before, have no ultimate validity so far as the liberated soul is concerned. Choice and activity of a man in this state are naturally directed to the good and shun the evil ways, because they have lost the *raison d'être*. The evil is chosen by a person because he cannot resist the temptation of self-aggrandisement even
though it involves injury to society or the state. But the free soul has no personal interest. Therefore, though he has transcended the region of moral jurisdiction and even the commission of an immoral act will have no power to contaminate him, yet no occasion for such impious activity arises, simply because he has no desire for self-aggrandisement. All his desires and wants have been fulfilled (śānta-kāma) and there is nothing to be attained further either on this side or on the other side of the empirical life. As the liberated soul lives not for himself but for others, naturally his activities will be enlisted in the service of humanity and also of the higher worlds. Another fact should be noted here—and that is though jīvanmukta has no personal interest for exerting himself to action, still each action done in this stage is perfect. Nobody can find any fault in his work. In fact, according to the philosophy of Karma, greater the noninterestedness, action becomes more and more perfect.

Thus jīvanmukta leads the empirical life and participates in action for the good and wellbeing of the world as a whole. But actions done in this stage die out without yielding the fruit as there is no interest of the agent in performing those actions. This has been said, that all those actions done previously, (except indeed the prarabdha— which has begun to yield its fruits in due course) or subse-

-ently-
subsequently do not affect the soul after he has attained enlightenment. So, there is no chance of rebirth or bondage after the liberation is achieved, though the emancipated being may have to lead the empirical life and participate in action just like an ordinary individual. Bondage in fact is due to desire and attachment. As the liberated soul forsakes all desires and is free of all attachments, so there cannot be any chance of bondage after the liberation. And this is the important fact which we should consider in support of the possibility of liberation in life. With the dawn of self-consciousness one naturally forsakes all desires and attachments to the worldly concerns because it reveals to him true nature of this phenomenon - which is false ultimately. So, if there is knowledge - one forsakes all desires and attachments and thus the liberation is achieved inspite of the fact that the body exists and the active life continues as before.

From the Advaita standpoint, the truth is identity. Difference is false and it is created by our thought. Now, in the state of जीवांक्ति, the individual realises this fact as he has the immediate vision of truth. Difference confronted in the place of thought loses the colour of truth imposed on it.

---

Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya.
Bombay Ed.
So difference is rejected as soon as it is presented. Due to this fact it has been said that the liberated being does not experience both identity and difference, but experiences the identity only. As the difference is rejected as soon as it is presented, there is no experience of difference in reality. The parallel of it we find in the case of Īśvāra. As the Advaitins hold there is much difference between God and individual though the personality of God is equally a creation of avidyā. Avidyā does not envelop the consciousness of God. So ignorance (ajñā) which keeps us blind throughout our empirical life - so that we fail to comprehend the nature of truth and the nature of this appearance - cannot blind the vision of God. God knows everything. He can discriminate between the real and unreal. So Īśvāra is called Tattwangā. Therefore, God does not fall in error identifying the plurality and difference as real - though the empirical objects with their plurality and difference appear before Him. For the same reason the Īvānmukta also escapes the error. As he has the full vision of truth, he rejects the difference and accepts identity as the supreme truth. Speaking properly, therefore, differences appear but Īvānmukta perceives the identity only and rejects the difference.

In fact, from the Advaita viewpoint, the experience of identity and difference together is a
fact which is simply impossible. The experience of difference is error which is supplanted by the knowledge revealing the truth of identity. Now, erroneous perception is not really the experience in its true sense, so far as it has been maintained by the Advaita philosophers. It is called ज्ञानाभास or pseudo-knowledge. With the dawn of self-realisation all these facts are revealed; so as soon as difference is presented it courts contradiction as it is in the case of God.

But is there any inconsistency if difference appears after the comprehension of identity? Difference is false, and like all other false appearances difference also appears when the truth of identity remains concealed. So it is supposed that difference cannot appear if the identity is known. But the fact is, as it has been suggested by the teachers, the presentation of difference involves the activity of thought; and the self-consciousness which reveals the truth of identity does not necessarily involve the suppression of thought activity, because the psychological organism persists due to the residual forces.

Noting the difference between the tattvānā and dhyātā — the author of the Pañcadasaī says that the activity of thought is arrested in the latter case. In deep meditation thought remains totally subdued with its different phase of activity. But in the former case

1. Vi varan a - p.1240-1245, Brahmāutra Dhānaka Bhāgva P.II. Calcutta Sanskrit Series.
the activity of thought remains intact and it continues as usual. But as the individual is conscious at this stage of the falsity of the world of diversity and difference, it matters little if it need not dissolve or disappear actually. So there is nothing inconsistent if it is acknowledged that the appearance of duality and difference continues after the dawn of transcendental knowledge. Realisation of the transcendental nature of reality has robbed it of its deceptive force. If it continues it stands disenchanted and exposed with its ugliness.

(III)

KRAMA MUKTI

We have noted before the two types of liberation. But besides Vïdeha-Mukti and Jîvan-Mukti, Sankarites entertain the possibility of Krama-Mukti. Krama-Mukti does not imply the liberation in its true sense - which, according to the Sankarites, means the complete transcendence beyond the fold of mâyâ. The Krama-Mukti involves, viewed properly, the psychic flowering of spiritual consciousness through different stages. In Krama-Mukti there is not the direct realisation of the absolute identity - which we find in other two cases i.e. in Vîdeha-Mukti as well as in Jîvan-Mukti. So the individual exists in touch with mâyâ.

1. Upamadrêtah bhrâjan dhyâtas eva satttvavo vedita.
Na buddhim marovâm drstah ghata-tattvasya vedita.
(Dhyânadîpa - SI.91)
though he rises over the lower Prakṛti and dominates over it.

In Krama-Nukti, there is the removal of the atomacy of consciousness and there is gradual assimilation of the extensive being in its own self. The individual in Krama-Nukti may pass through many stages of knowledge and power. But finally the march is ended with the realisation of identity with Isvara (ahamkara). Therefore, though the finite personality opposing the identity is not lost completely, it keeps its march steady up to the realisation of identity and finally comes to realise the finer stretches of consciousness.

To the Advaita Philosophers the four types of emancipation (known as Sāvaiya, Sālokya, Sārūnya and Sarāti) entertained by the Vaiṣṇava Philosophers, involve the different phases of this psychic flowering of spiritual consciousness. From the Advaitin viewpoint, none of those states imply liberation in its true sense. In all those states one remains within the fold of māyā. So the liberation which means complete transcendence is not really achieved. All these four types mentioned above are but different stages of psychic flowering.

The Advaitins deny any difference in the liberated state of existence. Liberation means self-realisation and the self involves absolute sameness of the being.

-Hence-

Sārīraka bhāṣya - III.4.52, p.926. See also Bhāmaṭi - III.4.52, p.926,927. 
Brahma Sūtra Sākara Bhāṣya, Bombay Ed.
Hence all those changes that one should experience in relation to his self while passing through those states are not at all possible if the liberation of the soul is really achieved.