Ample discussions and deliberations had already been made on consciousness by different psychologists at different times. Both the Eastern and Western psychologists of the past devoted a great deal of their times in the speculation on consciousness. It may appear to be redundant to try to discuss consciousness when voluminous works have been produced by expert psychologists on the topic. It is also doubtful how far such attempt can furnish new truths on the topic. Whatev er might be the result it is deemed necessary to have a brief discussion of consciousness by way of introduction before we start our discussion of Sāṅkhya-yoga consciousness.

Psychologists of the past and present attempted to define consciousness and had to face certain difficulties in the work. An adequate and all comprehensive definition has not been arrived at so far. Consciousness exists in a mind. A mind again is present in a body. But the mere presence of the mind in the body does not give rise to consciousness. It is with a stable and attentive mind that we can know our consciousness. Consciousness depends on mental action. Mental action again depends on the non-mental. The non-mental acts on the mind in the form of experience. To start with William James who tries to describe consciousness by saying that "consciousness is the name for a series of experiences run together by certain definite transitions and an objective reality is a series of
similar experiences knit together by different transitions.\(^1\)

Experience is the basis to be conscious. Consciousness consists of a definite order of transitions. Whereas the objective reality consists of experience of different transitions. From the description of consciousness by James it becomes clear that when changes occur in a consistent and regular order they cause consciousness in the mind. Again objective reality is apprehended when the changes occur in a different order. The notion of consciousness that arises according to this description gives primary importance on experience. It also brings to us one more idea that consciousness is dynamic in character. It implies the necessary mental activity in becoming conscious. To be conscious means to be aware of. It means to be reported, to be known. Consciousness is to be directly felt. It is to be known through its contrast with the objective reality. It envelopes and accompanies the objective reality.\(^2\) Consciousness is analysable but it cannot be deduced from anything else but itself. So it is not definable in the strict sense of the term.\(^3\) Consciousness is the basis of all experience. There is no difference between what represents and what is represented in consciousness. For there is no dualism of being represented and representing in experience per se. In the pure state of consciousness there is no self splitting into consciousness and what is conscious.

---
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of. It is obvious that consciousness cannot be split up. If the self splitting be granted that will not lead to consciousness. It is after all a unique mental phenomenon. Any kind of division of that mental state would mean simply its denial.

According to James there is a stream of consciousness. The stream has five characteristics: (1) it has a part of personal consciousness, (2) within the personal consciousness thought remains changing, (3) the thought is sensibly continuous, (4) it deals with objects independently, (5) it chooses object from among objects. Personality is inevitably necessary in consciousness. Each mind keeps its own thought to itself. It is not possible to convey one's thought to somebody else's consciousness. The preliminary thought is not this thought or that thought but somebody's thought. Psychology can study only that thought which belongs to some person. The imposition of personality to consciousness is very important for a clear interpretation of consciousness. Even the secondary personality which develops in abnormality forms a part of the main stream of consciousness. It undergoes a constant change. He again states that 'no state once gone can recur and be identical with what it was before'. The chain of consciousness is a sequence of different. There is no evidence that the same bodily sensation can be had by us twice. That the mind exists is proved through its constant change. It
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is this change that makes experience possible and life worth living.

Consciousness is sensibly continuous and one. It is not broken into parts. It is not something joined together. It is a flow. It is 'a river' or 'a stream'. In talking of it we call it a stream of thought of subjective life. If the sensibility in consciousness would not be continuous the varieties of experiences would remain disconnected. One more point to be noted of consciousness is that it is made up of parts and the parts possess different degrees of movements. Language can express it when the thought is expressed in a sentence. There are resting places and places of flight in the stream of consciousness. The resting places are occupied by sensorial imaginations of some sort. They can be kept for an indefinite period before the mind. Further they can be contemplated upon for long periods without change. Again the places of flight are filled up with thoughts of relations static and dynamic. The resting places are the substantive portions and the places of flight are the transitive portions of the stream of thought. Consciousness operates when something substantial is presented to it. The operation of consciousness starts because of its inherent dynamism. Things may be of diverse nature but the consciousness they induce must be one. "However complex the object might be the thought of
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it is one undivided state of consciousness." 9 Otherwise
knowledge of objects would have been quite impossible and the
personal integrity would have been lost. One more characteristics
of consciousness is that it is selective in nature. "It is
always interested in one part of its object (thought) than in
another and welcomes and rejects or chooses all the while it
thinks." 10 The smooth and accurate form of mental activity
necessitates the selection and rejection of items on which the
mind will operate. The mind is viewed as the store house of
so many simultaneous possibilities. "Consciousness consists in
the comparison of these (possibilities) with each other, the
selection of some and the suppression of the rest by the
reinforcing and inhibiting agency of attention." 11

From the above view of William James it becomes clear
that consciousness depends on mutations and experiences. But
it is obvious that mere experience cannot constitute
consciousness. Being an empiricist he did not like to lay any
importance on the rationality of man in matters of consciousness.
He gave too much importance on mutation in consciousness. James
brought the idea of mutation so much so that he unhesitatingly
compared consciousness to 'a river' or 'a stream'. It therefore
appears to be an one sided view. It seems as if it is to be
supplemented by something else to make it a comprehensive and
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adequate view on consciousness.

C. Daly King too attempted to make an elaborate discussion of consciousness in his work "Psychology of Consciousness". To him "consciousness is the independent force field within which experience may take place conditionally upon the presence in that field of two entities (a) an experiencer and (b) phenomena called objects." 12 Consciousness is an independent force. Had the consciousness been dependent on something else, every conscious activity would depend upon the presence of that something. In practical life we notice that there is no such entity on which we are to depend to be conscious. There cannot be consciousness of the vacuum. It requires a subject to be conscious and something to be conscious of. Consciousness is not the accidental by product of human life. Rather it constitutes the chief objective of life. And the degree of completeness is the valid measure of normal life. Psychologists make divisions of consciousness into the subconscious, pre-conscious and unconscious. The main feature of consciousness is its self evidence. 13 Our normal life is coherent and consistent while the abnormal life is fragmentary and inconsistent. Consciousness is the best possible weapon to measure the normalcy or abnormality of life. Again the exercise of consciousness like the exercise of muscles is the way to increase the ability of consciousness. The increase of
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consciousness paves the path for self mastery and freedom from the environment.\textsuperscript{14} Mental growth implies the growth of consciousness. Life is a continuous struggle for adjustment and reconciliation with the ever changing circumstances of life. The success in the life struggle depends on the conscious manipulation of the ways and means in the struggle. When we say that the conscious is itself the subject of consciousness, it may lead to the confusion of the valid distinction between the subject and object. It may confuse the conscious with something that is conscious of.\textsuperscript{15} But in reality the subject of consciousness means the person who is conscious and the object of consciousness means the mental awareness of that very personality. If the subject and object of consciousness would have been quite distinct and different no consciousness could occur at all. In practical life we do not observe consciousness but we 'have it' or we 'are it'. The first thing in the case of consciousness is to admit one's own consciousness. There are two main types of consciousness - the waking and the sleeping. The sleeping state is present in the waking state in the form of unconscious or sub-conscious. Three elements are necessary to have a conscious situation - the conscious field or consciousness, the subject that works in the field and the object which are presented in consciousness.\textsuperscript{16}
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It appears from the above discussion that the notion of consciousness is a little more improved than the theory of consciousness as a mere stream. Daly Kind had accepted consciousness as a force. The view clarifies the confusion that may occur between the subject and object of consciousness. It further laid great stress on feeling side of consciousness. To be conscious one is to feel it oneself. Consciousness is quite an independent work of the mind. It also states that consciousness is the only weapon to adjust oneself with the changing circumstances of life. Even then we are not satisfied with the account given by Daly King. Because to be conscious means 'we have it' or 'we are it' according to him. But the exact meaning of 'we have it' or 'we are it' are not clearly explained. We want to have a universal notion of consciousness. That notion should never try to lead to any form of confusion. These eternal demands of human mind have not been fully satisfied by the theory.

William James made another attempt to discuss consciousness from the cosmical point of view in his work "varieties of religious experience". To him cosmic consciousness is the consciousness of the cosmos. It means the life and order of the universe. When the cosmic consciousness is accompanied by the human mind there occurs an intellectual enlightenment in it. This peculiar enlightenment of the human mind raises the man above the common level of existence. It altogether makes him a member of a new species. The sense of immortality and eternal life are the resultant notions that spring up from that peculiar enlightenment of mind. It also
makes the idea clear that man had had these notions already. 17
In the ordinary level of existence a man cannot show the
universal form of consciousness. But when once the man realises
the universal consciousness he no longer belongs to the common
world of existence. It elevates the human mind to understand
and appreciate the spirit present in the man class as well as
in all living beings. At this moment consciousness lies around
the man like a magnetic field. And in that magnetic field our
central energy of consciousness turns like a compass needle.
The present phase of consciousness turns into its successors.
The entire past store house of memories float beyond the margin.
It remains ready to come in. The entire mass of residual
powers, impulses and knowledges constitute the empirical self.
But the empirical self stretches continuously beyond it.
Conscious is strewn vaguely between what is actual and what is
only potential. 18 There occurs a flood of consciousness and
it spreads from the present to the future. But behind this kind
of conscious life there lies the empirical self that is made up
of impulses and passions. From the personal religious experience
there springs up mystical states of consciousness. The subject
of such consciousness denies expression. No adequate report of
such consciousness can be made in words. The nature and
quality of such consciousness is to be experienced directly. It
cannot be imparted to others. Therefore the mystical states
are the states of feeling rather than the states of intellect.
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Though they are states of feeling still they appear to the experiencer as states of knowledge. They are really deep in sight into the depths of truths. They remain un plundered by the discursive intellect. They are illuminations, revelations full of significance and importance. The quality of the religious experience is that it leads to mystic experience. This experience cannot be communicated to others. They appear as states of feeling but they bring a flood of light and truth of the universe to man having that peculiar experience.

Consciousness is the resultant of two components - namely, movement and inertia. Their resultant appears as a vibration or rhythmic movement. It is the most profound symbol of activity. The more the vibration is the more intensive is the consciousness. It is a faculty of persistency transformed into the inner being. Further James also discussed the ecstatic states from the medical point of view. To a medical mind it is nothing but 'suggested and hypnoid states' on the intellectual level. It is also called a hysteric and pathological state. Such conditions prevail in almost all cases of ecstasy. At the same time these states do not give any sort of knowledge form the consciousness that is aroused by the ecstatic states.
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From the discussion of consciousness by James it has become clear that cosmic consciousness does not arise in the human mind automatically. But when once it is aroused in the human mind, the man becomes able to understand and appreciate the spirit present in man and other living beings. Consciousness then begins to act like a magnetic field in the centre of which the human self exists like the compass needle. A peculiar type of enlightenment creeps into the human soul in the light of which the man becomes the possessor of new truth and new knowledge. Further the ecstatic state is one that comes to man as the result of religious experience. The nature of the ecstatic state is such that it cannot be communicated to others. Rather it is to be directly felt by practising religion. Such ecstatic states, he states, are like the hypnoid or hysterical states. And the consciousness that is aroused by the ecstatic states can bring to man a new kind of knowledge. Observing all these points we may find that consciousness obtains a spiritual and universal level. We also notice that the above discussion cannot make certain points clear to us. For example how the ecstatic states are aroused or what are the exact nature of qualifications necessary to have the ecstatic states have not been thoroughly pointed out. The descriptions given of the states are merely the theoretical and not the assertions of a man having the experiences directly by him. Therefore it may be stated that there is the chance of mingling the truths with assumptions. It also appears that comparing the ecstatic states with hypnoid states is a far fetching argument. The eternal demand of the human soul, a clear and complete comprehension
of consciousness is not fully understood with this view.

Heartman tried to discuss consciousness in his work "Philosophy of Unconscious" in a nutshell. According to him to think of consciousness it requires a higher consciousness. In the subjective level consciousness is affected by its own consciousness. In becoming conscious 'I am' is the passive subject. I do not admit that 'I' may be an active agent. 'I' is not only the passive spectator of the area of consciousness but 'I's consciousness forms a very small part of the whole area of consciousness. 'I' can be conscious of very little at a time. But gradually the awareness of the whole area appears.

In this our attention moves to other matters. And the earlier thoughts are left to fade away from our waking consciousness. This view of consciousness brings out certain new things.

Consciousness is a passive state of mind. It also pointed out that to understand consciousness a higher level of consciousness is necessary. But why and how the higher level is necessary has not been explained clearly by it.

Charles Fox, on the other hand, holds that the states of full consciousness give rise to events. And the voluntary action is accompanied by reflexive thought. It gives way to sub-conscious action. A psychologist thinks of an image as being stored up. This means that the present state of mind of
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the psychologist along with some other conditions will produce the consciousness of an image. The cognised object is apprehended by pure consciousness. It can be apprehended by a consciousness which includes the image of the object. A thing that produces knowledge is its object. So far as the brain is involved in the conscious process, every act of thought calls into play the whole cerebral mechanism. The brain activity is necessary in conscious process. It also calls for the entire cerebral mechanism. This view appears to be one sided in as much as it has laid sole importance on the physical side of consciousness. Mere physiology cannot give rise to consciousness.

Sigmund Freud for the first time discovered that the whole mind is not conscious. Rather it is the unconscious part of the mind which plays the major role in human life. He states that we know the unconscious through consciousness. The knowing of the unconscious is done through a transformation into the conscious. Transformation of this type is a common place example in psycho-analytic work. The conscious acts become distinctly connected when we interpolate the unconscious acts of our inference. We can prove the existence of the unconscious. We can allege that a small content is embraced by consciousness at a moment. "The conventional identification of the mental
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with the conscious is thoroughly unpractical. Through the medium of consciousness we become aware of only our own mental states. That the man possesses consciousness is a conclusion drawn by analogy from the deeds and words of the man. Such conclusion is drawn in order to make his behaviour intelligible to us. The assumption of consciousness in our fellowmen must rest on an inference. It cannot have the direct certainty as we can have of our own consciousness." 28 "Superficially the conscious and the unconscious appear to be different. But they are topographically separated records of the same content." 29 Freud's theory brought out the truth that the whole mind is not conscious. Rather the major portion of the mind is unconscious. The unconscious is more powerful than the conscious part. Conscious part of the mind gives us a very small information. But the unconscious is to be transformed into the conscious for its knowledge.

Psycho-analytic theory does not display whether the pre-conscious is already conscious or capable of becoming conscious. According to this theory the mind is a dynamic process. It moves from one idea to another and the first idea retains a part of its cathexis and only a small part undergoes displacement. Again the conscious memory too seems to depend on the pre-conscious. But this is to be clearly distinguished from the memory traces. For in the memory traces the experiences
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of the unconscious become fixed. And consciousness regards the whole sum of mental processes as belonging to the realm of the pre-conscious. A great part of the pre-conscious material originates in the unconscious. The pre-conscious has the characteristics of the derivatives of the unconscious. The unconscious is subject to a censorship before it can pass into consciousness. Another part of the pre-conscious can be conscious without any censorship. Again what belongs to consciousness is not always in consciousness. It can be temporarily latent. The entry into consciousness is circumscribed by certain dispositions of attention. The truth about repression is that it is not what is repressed but what remains alien to consciousness. Some of the impulses dominate our ego. The impulses are the strongest functional antithesis to what is repressed. Censorship lies between the pre-conscious and the conscious. To be conscious is not an act of perception. It is the result of a further advance of mental organisation. At the beginning of the psycho-analytic theory it was not possible to establish any intelligible connection between the ego object relation and the relationship of consciousness. The difference between the conscious and the unconscious is known to us. They are the records of the same content. The conscious idea consists of the concrete and verbal idea corresponding to it. The unconscious idea corresponds to the thing alone. To be conscious means the
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reinforcement of the contents of the thought system with new qualities.  

Psycho-analysis introduced the idea of censorship between the pre-conscious and the conscious. It is because of the censorship that a major portion of the unconscious is repressed. The repressed means what is alien to consciousness. It is this repressed portion of the mind that leads to abnormal manifestation of behaviour. It also admits that the conscious and the unconscious are related to the same thing. The fundamental premise of psycho-analysis was to make the division of mental life into the conscious and the unconscious. This division enabled psycho-analysis to understand the pathological cases. It does not accept consciousness as the essence of mental life. To this theory a state of consciousness is characteristically very transitory. An idea which is conscious at this moment may not be so the very next moment. Psycho-analysts have allocated to consciousness a function which is nearest to the internal world. The conscious is the only concrete subject matter of thought.

Psycho-analysis has brought to the psychological study a flood of new light. Though it started from medical practice still it discovered the concepts like conscious, unconscious, pre-conscious. It was a revolution in the field of psychology.
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Many of the prejudices and misconceptions of the human mind were removed after this theory came into existence. We have been able to learn a lot about consciousness through this theory. But this theory started with the idea of the unconscious. The discussion of consciousness is a casual one. The acceptance of Id, ego, superego are the new concepts introduced by this theory. Libido is the motivating force of mental activity according to this theory. It has rather in some way complicated our idea of consciousness. However, the western notion of consciousness induces a natural desire to have a synoptic discussion of consciousness by the Mimamsa and Vedanta philosophy of India.

The Mimamsa philosophy does not accept consciousness as the intrinsic quality of the self. According to this philosophy consciousness arises in the soul when it confronts the external world with the help of the sense organs. The liberated soul is disembodied and thus it possesses no consciousness but it retains the capacity to be conscious. When the sense organs come in contact with external objects there arises a bare wareness. When that bare wareness is interpreted with the help of past knowledge we understand the objects. In dreamless sleep and in liberation consciousness disappears because consciousness cannot occur at the absence of the necessary conditions for it. Prabhakara rejects the Sankhya conception of a dual element in consciousness consisting
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of transcendental intelligence (cit) and the material element (buddhi). He regards consciousness as a unique entity which in one flash represents both the knower and the known. Knowledge to him is a complete and independent unit in all its self revealing aspects. Prabhākara did not enquire what knowledge might be apart from its self revealing aspect. Kumārila, on the other hand, holds that jñāna is a movement produced by the activity of the self. It results from the consciousness (jñātatva) of objective things. Jñāna itself cannot be perceived. It is to be inferred as the movement necessary for producing consciousness of things. Movement to Kumārila was not a mere atomic vibration. It was a non-sensuous transcendent operation. The self is not revealed in the knowledge of the external objects. It is known in the mental perception of self consciousness. Kumārila also distinguishes knowledge as movement from knowledge as objective consciousness. Knowledge as movement is beyond sense perception and it can only be inferred.

Mimamsā philosophy expresses its idealistic tendency by accepting the unique character of knowledge. But this philosophy did not try to reply why knowledge cannot work independently possessing the unique character. We cannot make any absolute statement about the ultimate truth of knowledge and matter from this philosophy. The appearance is regarded as
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real. Nothing is regarded as the absolute basis of all appearances. Thus the Mīmāṃsā view cannot be considered as ultimately satisfactory. Hence I hope this view is to be supplemented by the Vedānta view of consciousness.

According to Vedānta the visible world is the world of appearance. It naturally leads us to think that there must be something real of which the world is the appearance. It is also not possible to establish any true relation between consciousness and the objects of consciousness. But there must be some form of connection between the objects and consciousness. Otherwise knowledge would have been impossible. We cannot also conceive of any relation subsisting between objects and consciousness. But even Vedānta also admits that for specific form of illumination of objects there takes place sense contact and particular mental states. At this question may be raised if it be possible to have such a contact in the case of illusory appearance why is it not possible in the case of reality? This question is answered by the Vedāntists by saying that the phenomenon of illumination is not to undergo any gradual change. Rather it is the work of one flash in removing darkness. It is not possible on the part of external reality to pass through a gradual process before consciousness can arise. The reality (sat) exists the same identical one and reveals the object as soon as its veil is removed by association with mental states. It is a light which directly and immediately illuminates everything that comes in contact with it. This revelatory process would have been a continuous process had there been no veil. In reality the truth is hidden by the veil of ajñāna.
nescience). This veil is removable by letting the light of consciousness to pass through the mental states. And when the veil is removed the object shines forth. "Consciousness in itself is the ever shining light of reality which is never generated but ever exists." Error of perception takes place not because of the defects of sense organs or because of the glaze of the objects. It takes place because it is generated by a wrong vṛtti. It is this wrong vṛtti that makes the manifestation illusory. The cause of error is non-cognition.39 It is held that as all illumination of knowledge is brought about by mental states, there is no pure consciousness apart from the mental states. This is not admitted by Vedānta. Because before the mental states begin to interpret reality, the reality must be there. This is called pure consciousness. If there would not exist the reality apart from the mental states the validity of knowledge would also cease. Therefore Vedānta admits a reality untouched by the mental states. But the self-luminous consciousness seems to assume different forms through diverse forms of connection. The pure consciousness is the essence, the basis and the ground of all phenomenal appearances of the objective world. Consciousness manifests itself through the mental states. Pure consciousness is one and is the basis of phenomena. It is the interpreter of phenomena by reflection through the mental states.40 There is no samyoga (contact) or
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samavāya (inherence) between phenomena and pure consciousness. The drk (perceiver) and the (drsyā) perceived have no identical reality. The forms of phenomena are illusory creations. ⁴¹

The above view brings to light several essential things for a clear understanding of what consciousness is. It reveals how the phenomenal existence is related to the noumenal reality in an understandable way. All phenomena are the appearances of one identical Brahman. It is the basis of all knowledge.

The mental states must have the reflection of pure consciousness for a clear understanding of the objects which are to be known through them. The objects having their basis in pure consciousness there arises no inconsistency in understanding the objects through the mental states. Even then this theory of Advaitavāda of Sankara is to be compared with that of Rāmānuja (the visistadvaitavāda).

According to Rāmānuja the Brahman contains the Prakṛti and the individual souls in him. He is the only reality, cit and acit are the essential parts of him. The conscious and the unconscious have no independent reality apart from Brahman. At the moment of pralaya the cit and acit take shelter in the Brahman. "The consciousness of the soul is not accidental to it, it is not dependent on its connection with the body. Consciousness is not the essence but an eternal quality of the soul and it remains the same under all conditions." In dreamless sleep and in liberation, a disembodied state, the soul remains
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conscious of itself as 'I am'. The soul is identified by Ramanuja with what we mean by 'I' or the ego (Aham). Bondage of the soul occurs as it is embodied. As the result of karmaphala the soul is associated with a particular body. At the embodied state the consciousness of the soul is limited by the organs of knowledge and the body it possesses. According to Ramanuja the soul is infinitely small but it illuminates or renders conscious every part of the body in which it exists. The soul identifies itself with the body and regards itself as the self. Egoism means this kind of identification of the self with the not-self. Avidya means the base propensity for identification. Sometimes again karma is identified by Ramanuja with ignorance. Liberation of the soul does not mean the identification of it with God. The liberated soul obtains pure consciousness untouched by imperfections and becomes in this respect similar to God (Brahmaprakara). The highest satisfaction of religious emotion demands self purification and self surrender and not self effacement. The Brahman of Ramanuja is different from that of Sankara. According to Ramanuja it contains the cit and acit. The individual soul is expressed through 'I' or ego. The individual self obtains a particular body due to karmaphala.
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Further he accepts that the cit and acit, soul and matter constitute the body of the Brahman. Sometimes the cit is taken for the supreme spirit as the conscious cause and the acit is taken as the unconscious matter or effect. There is always the third entity Isvara. From the Brahman springs up Sankarshana the individual soul (jiva) and from Sankarshana, Pradyumna, the mind (manas) and from Pradyumna, Aniruddha or the ego (Ahankāra). Brahman is here called Vasudeva and is not without qualities as Sankara holds. It rather possesses jñāna (knowledge), Sakti (energy), Bala (strength), Asvarya (supreme power), Virya (vigour) and Tesas (energy) as his qualities. Rāmānuja's Brahman is not nirguna. Intelligence, power and mercy are the qualities ascribed to him. To Sankara intelligence is not a quality of Brahman but Brahman himself is intelligence, pure thought and pure being. Neither the world nor the individual soul will cease to exist. Rāmānuja holds that they pass through different stages as avyākta and vyākta. Thus Rāmānuja's theory brings certain basic features of consciousness. It is not an accidental quality of the self. It is not the essence but the eternal quality of Brahman. For the arousal of consciousness it does not depend on any condition. In liberation the soul obtains pure consciousness which is free from all imperfections. Rāmānuja's view of visistadvaitavāda is a more humanising theory that tells us how to lead a good life.
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Pure consciousness cannot be defined in the absence of any counter reality to it. Sat, cit, ananda are the qualities used to describe it. The ultimate unity of consciousness must be an indefinable universal. According to Rāmānuja the transcendental cannot be had in experience. Experience means only bits of fleeting states of consciousness. By consciousness he means the human consciousness of psychological observation. He does not mean the ultimate consciousness of metaphysical speculation. Consciousness in Sāmkhya-yoga is pure awareness. It is free from any form of attachment. It is not something that possesses the qualities sat, cit and ananda. Consciousness is not the ultimate reality of all things and beings as advocated by the Vedānta school of thought. Consciousness is rather reflected on the unconscious through the medium of buddhi. Thus Sāmkhya-yoga consciousness deserves a special consideration.

Consciousness is the mental ability to be aware. No mental work is possible in the absence of consciousness. This ability distinguishes the animates from the inanimates. Among the animates it is the human beings who use it in a conspicuous manner. No mental progress of man, no scientific and philosophical development can be thought of without presupposing the existence of consciousness. We human beings think, feel and will and we all do these consciously. Consciousness is a
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common topic of the psychologists. But there is a gulf of difference between the western and Indian views of consciousness. In Indian philosophy mind is an internal sense organ. But in Western psychology consciousness is a quality of the mind. Mind is that which thinks, feels and wills. The western thinkers discuss consciousness considering it as a quality of the mind. The views of James, Charles Fox, Freud etc. are based on such a view of the mind. But to Vedanta Brahman is sat, cit and ananda. Brahman is cause of all things and beings and hence things and beings can have consciousness. Again Sānkhyā-yoga accepts a view which makes the conscious Purusa completely distinct and different from the unconscious Prakṛti. But the active Prakṛti cannot start its activity so long as the consciousness of Purusa is not reflected on it.

This is in a nut shell a discussion on the general nature of consciousness. I propose to discuss Sānkhyā-yoga consciousness in the chapter to follow.