CHAPTER V

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE GOOD AND THE GODLY
Cultures all over, talk of men of heroism or exceptional merit. There are prophets, the sages, the men of letters, the poets, the great warriors and the great kings. All races talk of their great men, hero-worship them and at times emulate them for they are the men who have succeeded in accomplishing the goal of life as laid down by their respective traditions. The goal of life of a particular society is best preserved in the religious and moral traditions of that society. Hence to uncover the concept of good and the Godly man it is necessary to talk of the moral and religious norms that they successfully pursued.

The question of goodness versus wickedness is one of supreme importance for any society. But goodness and badness of society lies in making men and women good or bad. Whenever there is a self-conscious living together there is also a moral ideal which is a precondition of all social life. The good and Godly man in the Indian context must be the one who first and foremost pursues the dharma (moral and religious virtues), very much in the line of Rama, the hero of the epic Ramayana. Rama, the hero of the epic, is a man who devoted his whole life to the interest and service of others. He promised 'no fear' to all, even to his enemies whenever they approached him sincerely for protection, "I declare no fear to all who come to me sincerely for protection, even if Ravana comes."¹ He is an ideal example of an ideal son who sacrificed his happiness for fulfilling the promise of

¹. 'The Law of Dharma in Valmiki's Ramayana' By, Benjamin Khan
his father. His love and respect for his parents was so deep that he could forgive his father and renounce the throne and go into exile willingly in spite of the fact that the command of his father was unjust.

The Ramayana also highlights a distinction between the Godly man and the ordinary person especially with regard to the capacity of understanding or grasping the true nature of divinity. For instance, Hanuman who is a Godly person could immediately recognise divine nature in Ram the moment he saw him but Sugreeva who is not 'Godly' was not able to do so. To substantiate my point let me refer to a passage from the scene in 'Kiskinda Kand' of Ramayana.

Rama, in his desperate quest of Sita, was journeying southwards and crossed the frontiers of Kiskinda. Following Sita's trail by hearsay and hints, he and Lakshmana arrived on the frontiers of Kiskinda. Their entry was not unobserved. Sugreeva, the ruler of the monkey clan, along with Hanuman, were watching for intruders, they noticed Ram and Lakshmana from far off on the mountain path. Assuming the shape of a young scholar, Hanuman went down and remained hidden behind a tree on their path. When they approached, he observed them closely and reflected within himself. 'So noble looking! who are they? They are clad in tree bark, hair matted and knotted, ascetics. But they bear enormous bows on their shoulders. Ascetics armed like warriors or warriors clothed in ascetics'
Rama said, "No you are a man of learning and I am only a warrior and you should not touch my feet." Whereupon Hanuman said, "I assumed the scholar's form only for the purpose of coming before you", and thus he resumed his original form. He then left them, to return later accompanied by Sugreeva.

Rama, at the first sight of Sugreeva, felt an instinctive compassion and also felt that this was a momentous encounter, a turning point in his own life. Sugreeva, sensing his sympathetic attitude, seized this occasion to mention his difficulties in a general way. 'Through no fault of mine, I suffer exile and privations'.

'Have you lost your home and are you separated from your wife?' When this question was asked by Rama, Sugreeva, too overwhelmed to speak, remained silent. Whereupon Hanuman stood up and told the story of Sugreeva. Rama was moved by this story. He was filled with pity for Sugreeva and promised, 'I will help you. Tell me what you want.'

Sugreeva took Hanuman aside and asked, 'What do you think of his offer of help?' Hanuman replied, 'I have not the slightest doubt that this person can vanquish Vali. Though he has not revealed his true self yet, I sense his identity. He could be none other than Vishnu himself. I notice that he has the masks of the conch and the disc in his palm. None but Vishnu could have bent
the bow of Shiva and broken it, none but he could have set upon Thataka and her brood or revived Ahalya from his stony existence. More than all my inner voice tells me who he is. When I was young, my father Vayu Bhagavan commanded me, 'You shall dedicate your life to service of Vishnu.'

'How shall I know him? I asked. He answered 'You will find him wherever evil is rampant — seeking to destroy it. Also, when you meet him, you will be filled with love and will not be able to move away from his presence.' Now I feel held to the presence of our visitor by some unknown power. I have also no doubt who he is, but if you wish to test the power of his arrow, ask him to shoot at the trunk of one of these trees. If the shaft pierces and goes through, you may take it that he can send an arrow through Vali's heart.

They went back to Rama. Sugreeva requested Rama to give them proof of his archery. Rama said with a smile, 'yes, if it will help you. Show me the tree.' They took him along to where seven enormous trees stood in a row. Rama took out an arrow and shot it through not only the trunks of the seven trees but also through the seven worlds, and the seven seas, and all things in seven; and then it returned to its starting point in the quiver. Sugreeva was overwhelmed at this demonstration and bowed his head in humility, convinced now that he was in the presence of a saviour.
The Kiskinda Kand episode of Ramayana thus explains the quality of the good and Godly man vis-à-vis the ordinary persons. It clearly indicates that godly man is capable of discriminating what is good from what is evil without much difficulty. But an ordinary person may find it difficult to understand or grasp the nature of good and evil. Also what is interesting to note here is Hanuman's recognition of Ram as the avatar of Vishnu. While Sugreeva needs Ram to perform military feats, Hanuman is confident of Ram's power. This is because not only is Hanuman himself a godly person in comparison to Sugreeva, he is also god-like being the son of god, Vayu. Hence he shares this quality in common with Ram, that of being god-like.

A discussion of the concept of dharma in the ancient Indian tradition might be helpful here. Dharma is a comprehensive term, not only does it include the social, economical, moral and biological duties of men living in the society, but is far deeper in its meaning. To create mental and spiritual fellowship among men is the aim of dharma.

"Complete dharma includes kama(satisfaction of desire or pleasure) and artha(acquisition of wealth) which are the necessary conditions for the continuance of human life, Recognised and pursued within the framework of dharma, kama and artha have an
honourable place, but pursued independently of each other especially of dharma they become mortal evils. They lose their character of values and turn into lust."\(^1\) While the goal of life is the realisation of spiritual values, one can pursue these unless one is assisted by biological and economical values. In the *Ramayana*, we see the lust for properties or wealth in the case of Kaikeyi, and lust for sexual pleasure in the case of Ravana and his sister Supernakha end in destruction. The whole epic depicts the conflict between dharma on the one hand and, artha and kama on the other hand. Now artha, kama and dharma are based on three psychological dispositions of men. Artha caters to the instincts of acquisition, kama, to the sexual instinct. In terms of eudaemonism, artha refers to material perfection, kama aims at the perfection of senses and sensual desire, and dharma is the perfection of moral and spiritual elements in man so that it can further pursue moksa. Those who know dharma consider truth as the real dharma of life. Dharma is not a 'means to an end' but an 'end in itself'. A good moral life is not only the aspiration of the individuals but of the society as well.

A discussion on the Indian upanisadic thought at this juncture will substantiate this point further. The upanisadic thought, I find, is an attempt at a philosophical analysis of

---

the good and Godly man who aims at the knowledge of the ultimate reality. They describe reality as (Sat) but they also speak of Non-Being (Asat), as ultimate from which Being appeared. The law of morality is an invitation to become perfect as the Supreme Reality of God. Moksa literally means release from the bondage of the sensuous and the individual, the narrow and the finite. It is the result of self-enlargement and freedom. To live in goodness is to realise one's life in all. This ideal for which the moral nature of man cries can be attained only if the finite self transcends its narrow individuality and identifies itself with the whole. The path of deliverance is the path of soul growth. The reality in which we are to abide by transcending our individuality is the highest, and that is the reality asserted by the Upanisads.

The general impression that the Upanisads require world-denial is not quite correct. "They insist on a spirit of detachment, Vairagya, which is not indifference to the world. It is not abandonment of objects but non-attachment to them." We do not raise ourselves above the world by contempt for the world, it is the spirit of equanimity which is insisted on. To be tranquil is to envy no man, to have no possessions that another can take from us, to fear none. When the ancient thinkers insist on samnyasa or relinquishment of home and possessions, to accept the three great renunciations, consecrated in the three

1. 'The Principal Upanisads' page, 106.3y, Dr. Radhakrishnan.
vows, namely, evangelical counsels of poverty, obedience and chastity, they point to self-denial as the root of the spiritual life.

What is important here to note is that the spirit of renunciation does not mean neglect of social duties. Samnyasa does not mean that we owe no duties to the world; we free ourselves only from ritualistic duties. Rare fruits of spirit ripen on the soil of detachment. There is a popular verse which makes out that one should give up attachment, but if one is not capable of it, let him cultivate attachment; not it should be attachment to all.

We should release ourselves from selfish likes and dislikes. The Divine cannot use our mind and body so long as we wish to use them for our own ends. Detachment is opposed to attachment, not to enjoyment. Enjoy through renunciation is the advice of the Isa Upanisad. Good and evil do not depend on the acts one does or does not, but on the frame of mind one has. The good man is he who concurs with the divine purpose, and the bad man is he who resists it. If one's mind is good, one's acts will be good. Our attempt should be not so much external conformity as inward cleansing. From goodness of being goodwill and good works flow. When the soul is at peace, the greatest sorrows are borne lightly. Life becomes more natural and confident.
in outer conditions do not disturb. We let our life flow of itself as the sea heaves or the flower blooms.

Work by itself does not give us liberation. It cleanse the mind, purifies the heart and produces the illumination which is the immediate condition of salvation. Contemplation is the way to cleanse one's mind and heart. It means rest, suspension of mental activity, withdrawal into the interior solitude in which the soul is absorbed in the fruitful silence of God. We cannot stop there; we must overflow with a love that communicates what it knows to others. Saints with abundant power and tireless energy work for the transfiguring of men and the changing of the course of secular history.

The virtues that are repeatedly emphasized and which are common in the ancient Indian traditions are namely, asceticism, liberalism, integrity, non-injury to life and truthfulness. What the Taittriya Upanisad gives as a list of students' duties, I also find emphasized in the village dormitory system of the Liangmai Naga tradition. The student should not be negligent of truth, virtues, welfare and propriety. He should perform only those acts which are irreproachable. In case of doubt concerning any act of conduct, the students should follow the practice of those Brahmins, in case of Liangmai Nagas the village elders, who are competent to judge, and are devoted, not harsh
lovers of virtues. In one passage all the virtues are brought together under the three da's which are heard in the voice of the thunder, namely, dama, or self-restraint, dana or self-sacrifice, and daya or compassion. Dama is self-control. We should reduce our wants and be prepared to suffer in the interest of truth. Austerity, chastity, solitude and silence are the ways to attain self-control.

The good are also made to practice tapas. Tapas is severe self-discipline undertaken for becoming exceptional. It is exercised with reference to the natural desires of the body and the distractions of the outer world. Strength is developed by resisting force. The power gained by resisting one temptation helps us in overcoming the next. To evade discipline is to empty life of its significance. Nothing is more tranquil than to be unshaken by the troublous motions of the flesh.

The ancient Indian thinkers were of the opinion that the seed within men and women is intended for the purpose of creating a body by which another soul may come into physical embodiment. When thus controlled brahmacarya helps creative work of every description. When the seed is wasted in sex excesses, the body becomes weak and crippled, the face lined, the eyes dull, hearing impaired and the brain inactive. If brahmacarya is practised, the physical body remains youthful and beautiful.
the brain keen and alert, the whole physical expression becomes
the image and likeness of the divine. The value of brahmacharya
is realised too by the Liangmai Naga elder when he forbids the
warriors from sexual intercourse for a considerable before un-
dertaking a warring mission.

However it is in the emphasis on Dana or giving of gifts
that the upanisadic seer comes closer to the Liangmai Nagas.
Dana is negatively freedom from greed and positively assistance
to those in need. There is no hope of immortality by wealth (8,
U.II.4.2). Possessiveness is condemned. The Taittiriya upanisad
(I.II.2) regulates the art of giving. One should give with faith,
one should not give without faith, one should give liberally,
with modesty, with fear, with sympathy.

The act of giving gifts to the needy whether they be
strangers or friends is known as 'kalian pibo' amongst the Lia-
ngmai Naga. However the giving of a gift to the needy alone is
not enough to pursue a good life. The tradition stresses more
on sharing everything, both happiness and trials and tribulati-
ons with each other. With this view, the tribe considered the who-
le village to be one big joint family and help one another in
all possible ways. Thus when a member of the society was not ab-
le to finish his work load in time due to certain difficulties,
the whole village would come forward and help him finish the work. This sort of community help has come to be known as 'chakukubo'. For instance, if a hunter brought to the village a game, big or small, he would share it with the whole village by distributing small portion to every household. This act of his would be called 'madombo'. A family having gathered the highest amount of food grains in a year known as 'maliangbo' had to offer a mithun or a buffello to the whole villagers and feed each villagers at least once. Of course, the villagers must also give a helping hand to this family in return. Any family in the village, who has surplus food grains for the year must be also willing to share with those who do not have. In a traditional society, if one is extremely wealthy usually he would perform a great feast called 'Chakiyu-kariew Dungbo' or 'Zou Hubo' and this great feast would last for ten days or so. During this great feast the host family had to feed not only his villagers but also those strangers whosoever passing through the village.

So also the virtue of Daya or Karuna (compassion) is common to both the traditions i.e. Liangmai Nagas and upanisads. We should try to be at peace with all, abhor all cruelty and ill-will. Enmity means misunderstanding. A forgiving attitude frees the individual. We should grudge none, forgive all. So long as we remember an injustice, we have not forgiven either the person
or the action. If only we know that there is more suffering than wickedness in the world, we should be kindly. It is by compassion, which shrinks from no sacrifice, that we can overcome the ravages of selfishness. We must be patient. God himself is unimaginably patient. Tolerance, long suffering, patience are the fruits of spirit. Of course, the Liangmai Naga's fight against injustice is more in the line of Krishna's insistence to fight for justice, to Arjuna in the battle field. For example, it is more important for Liangtuang to be himself than to be a cog in the social machine; he must fulfill his capacities as a man of certain gifts, a warrior, not necessarily by inciting wars but at least by meeting the challenges of war when it arises. By doing so he enhances his control; he comes to be dictated not by circumstances, but becomes a master of them.

Somehow an impression prevails in academic circles that the Upanisads advocate a life of spiritual renunciation at the cost of bodily life and mind. A reference to Karl H. Potter here find useful. Potter claims that the difference between the concept of resignation and the concept of renunciation is that while the resigned man doubts his ability to master that which he is resigned to, the man who renounced is confident of his ability to gain that which he renounces but finds more mastery — greater freedom — in meeting the challenge of not exerting
his power to gain. "The man who renounces has faith in his powers, while the resigned man does not have faith. Doubts his capacity to effect all that he wishes. Faith, that is to say the faith born of the conviction that one is capable of mastering a challenge, is a necessary condition for renunciation; without faith, a refusal to exert one's power is called resignation, not renunciation.* And that which signifies lack of faith is doubt, that doubt born of an inadequate conception of self, a conception of self as broken off from others and from the world in which we live in some way that sets limits on man's capacities in general. This doubt is manifested inwardly as fear, the fear that one is at the mercy of some or all of one's environment since it is irradically other than oneself and thus incapable of being brought under control.

Man acquires merit not by denying the existence of the body and its appetites, but by refining them and bringing them under the control of his will. The mature or the cultured person is one who has distanced himself from nature but not broken away from it. Reason must always command the senses; it must encompass them. One who posits a sharp dichotomy between body and soul has a distorted view of life. Man is the very best, the finest, link between nature and culture. Dualities are not an attribute of the domain of nature, and god (brahma) and the

domain of the spirit are beyond them. It follows that "dualities are an attribute of human intelligence and, therefore, the basis for moral judgement. The only viable view of human life is one based on a balanced and harmonised relationship (santulan) between the body, the mind and the soul."  

Those who separate the spiritual from life generally concentrate more on the other-worldliness of the ancient thought. The good, they would say would belong to this life while the Godly will operate for the spiritual benefit of mankind. Are the two, that is, the good and the Godly operating in different hemispheres? I will try to answer this question with the special reference to katha upanisad.

Evidently, at the time of the upanisads, the sacrificial religion of the Brahmanas was popular. Desire for earthly and heavenly gain was the prominent motive of this religious tradition. In the katha upanisad, the author attempts to distinguish between Vajasravasa, the protagonist of an external ceremonialism, and Naciketas; the seeker of the spiritual wisdom. Vajasravasa, represents orthodox religion and is devoted to its outer forms. He performs the sacrifice and makes gifts which are unworthy. The formalism and the hypocrisy of the father disappoints the son. Naciketas reveal here, the utter inadequacy of a soulless ritualism. Though Naciketas admits that, true prayer and sacrifice are in-

1. 'Non-Renunciation, Themes and Interpretation of Hindu Culture' page. 90-91. By, T.N. Madan.
tended to bring the mind and will of the human being into harmony with the great universal purpose of God. For him, it should be done with a complete surrender or utter dedication. Thus, when his father gives away all his goods, he feels that this involves the giving away of the son and so he wished to know about himself.

Naciketas earnestly wishes to make himself an offering and thus purify his father's sacrifice. When his father replies to his query that, he (Naciketas) would be given to Yama, the god of death; Naciketas takes his father's word literally. Thus he tries to carry out in letter and spirit, his father's wishes. His father thought that Naciketas is so impertinent as to interfere with his doings but, in reality Naciketas honestly feels that if his father wants to give away everything he has, he should be honest and sincere enough to give away even his most valuable thing, that is, his own son. In other words, he (father) should be committed to his promise of giving away everything, including his own son. Here, Naciketas does not discard the old tradition but attempts to quicken it. There can be no quickening of the spirit until the body dies. Though Naciketas does not approve of the hollowness of the ritualistic practice of his father, as an ideal son, he voluntarily offered himself to the god of death in order to fulfil his father's wish. For him, carrying out the parents' wishes is the way of an ideal son and neglecting the wish or order of the parents is the worse form of conduct of a son.
Naciketas was thus sent by his father to Yama, in order to keep his promise. And after reaching Yama's abode, Naciketas had to wait for three nights without food, as Yama had gone out. When Yama returned he was touched by the sincerity and honesty of Naciketas and asked him to choose three boons in return (K.U.I.1.9.). For the first three boons, Naciketas asked Yama to make his (Naciketas') father not angry and recognise him when he is free from the grip of death. And for the second and the third boons he enquires about the condition of the liberated souls (K.U.I.1.12-13) and thus he request Yama to give him this knowledge (K.U.I.1.20). Yama granted the first boon but for the second and the third he wanted to find out first whether Naciketas deserved this knowledge or not. Therefore, Yama tries to lure Naciketas by requesting him to ask for some other boons which will enhance his worldly life. Naciketas cannot be however enticed by those worldly pleasures and confort as according to him, man is not to be contented with wealth or worldly pleasures (K.U.I.1.27). Because, the material guarantees of human security are fragile. It is an earth-bound philosophy that makes man the end and aim of life, that recognises no value of a transcendental character. What is the value of wealth or life, as they are impermanent? So long as death is in power we cannot enjoy wealth or life for the fear of death destroys
the rest for living. So Naciketas asks for self knowledge, or atma-vijnanam; which is beyond the power of death. He wanted to know what is the great beyond? What is there after liberation? What is the nature of eternal reality? What is man's relation to it and how can he reach it? Here, Naciketas is not raising the question of the post-mortem state. He is asking about the great departure or mahan samparaya, from which there is no return.

After testing Naciketas and knowing his fitness for receiving Brahma-knowledge; Yama explains the great secret to him;

"(Yama said): Different is the good, and different indeed is the pleasant. These two with different purposes, bind a man. Of these two, it is well for him who takes hold of the good; but he who chooses the pleasant, fails of his aim."¹

Yama explained to Naciketas that the highest good of man is not pleasure but moral goodness. So also most of the heroes of the Liangmai Nagas' exhibit the renunciation of the pleasant in preferring a life full of pain and sometimes violent death. The good is in all cases chosen even when as in the case of the eldest son of a great warrior named Manu: Hu-ngennang, is involved a tragic end for him and his kith and kin. To substantiate my point let me quote a passage from the story of 'Manu, Hu-ngennang the Warrior':

¹. Katha Upanisad; I.2.1).
"...for soon came the night when his (Hu-ngennang) enemies in great numbers, came and attacked his house. Meanwhile his eldest son who was as brave as Hu-ngennang was courting a girl. That fateful night he was in his girl friend's house. Before going to sleep in her place, he asked the girl to at once wake him up if during the night she heard of any threat to his father's house. 'As the eldest son, I must protect my parents, younger brothers and sisters. If you fail to wake me up I will leave you forever'. Soon it was midnight; being young he slept soundly. Suddenly there was a big uproar. Some villagers had come to beckon the eldest son as his father's house was being attacked! The poor girl was in dilemma: if she woke her lover and sent him to do his duty of protecting his family, he would surely be killed. But then if she did not obey his instruction she would lose him forever. 'I must do my duty which is to faithfully obey him', thinking so, she shook him awake. He took up his dao, and rushed towards his house yelling 'Hu-ngennang! Hu-ngennang! your son is coming!' 'He could be heard all over the village. There were too many raiders around the house but the brave lad managed to kill a great many till he met his own end right at the door-step, when the hidden enemy struck a deadly blow ..."  

That is why it is said that while the evil go to hell, the final destination of the good is heaven. Thus the good and the pleasant is in the world for man to choose whichever he likes. The wise man would however discriminate between these two and choose the  

1. 'The Liangmai Nagas Legends and Stories' (Hu-ngennang the Warrior); Page 39-40. By, Sujata Miri.
good over pleasant. But the simple minded, ignorant and ordinary person would prefer the pleasant for the sake of worldly well-being. In other words, the ignorant and the ordinary person is concerned with the pleasant and adopts a materialist view of life or worldly well-being (yoga ksema) alone; while the wise or good and the Godly person would always opt for wisdom with the good (vidya) over worldly pleasures. The ignorant person is filled with selfish desires and attracted by worldly possessions becomes subject to the law of karma which leads him from birth to birth and so he is under the control of Yama.

Verse 24 of the katha upanisad also insist that, saving wisdom cannot be obtained without the moral qualification:

"Not he who has not desisted from evil ways, not he who is not tranquil, not he who has not a concentrated mind, not even whose mind is not composed can reach this (self) through right knowledge."  

No one can realise the truth without illumination, and no one can have illumination without thorough cleansing of one's moral being. The classical division of spiritual life into purgation, illumination and union gives the first place to ethical preparation, which is essential for the higher degree of spiritual life. Moral disorder prevents us from fixing our gaze on the

1. Katha Upanisad, I.2.2.
2. Katha Upanisad, I.2.5.
3. Katha Upanisad, I.2.24
Until our mind and heart are effectively purged, we can have no clear vision of God. The Liangmai Naga religious tradition does not emphasize on seeking God directly. For they believe that good deed alone can find God. According to them, man was created by Tingwang, God the Almighty to look after the welfare of His creations and beautify it. So, first and foremost duty of man is to do good to others but not to seek salvation for himself. Therefore, it is his moral responsibility to rectify his past misdeeds and try his best to bring back peace and harmony on earth which has been destroyed by his wrong acts. Undoubtedly, God's grace, whether of the Almighty God or of the gods of the pantheon, is up to the divine forces themselves but as far as the seeker goes he must practice morality in order to grasp grace and profit by it. The verse quoted above from katha upanisad concedes that although the spiritual and ethical are not organically connected, however, if we wish to attain the spiritual, we cannot bypass the ethical.

Those who consider the pursuit of the good as complete and self-sufficient in itself tend to regard religion as nothing, but ethics illustrated by stories and reinforced by liturgical and homilatic arts. Widespread opinion flourished in the eighteenth century, under the influence of the Aufklärung or enlightenment — namely, that though religion as traditionally understood
was outmoded and would eventually pass into the history of bygone ages, it did contain one element of value. That moral element it contain was, indeed, the essence of religion. The rest, being excresence, was eminently expendable. If only popular religions could be shorn of the superstious accretions that encumbered them, they would be found to contain a moral core that was worth preserving. For instance, R.S. Braithwaite thinks that religious statements are used primarily as moral assertions and therefore function in the same way, that is, they announce a proposed way of behaviour or policy of action. Adulterated as they are by the various fables and other paraphernalia that attend them, their character as moral utterances may be obscured; nevertheless, their fundamental nature is ethical. As ethical assertion may be hidden beneath a smoke screen of incense or smothered under layer upon layer of ancient fables; but in the end the only question a philosopher can properly ask of religious man are of a nature such as 'What kind of conduct is the ritual calculated to discourage?' and 'What action is the myth intended to promote?' In this view, religious people for one reason or another associated the moral intent with various myths, liturgies, and ritual acts, but they need by no means assign any meaning to the ritual and myth other than that which is reducible to the ethical assertions they presumptively contain.
In sharp contrast, though within God oriented religions we may find certain differences, nonetheless, the basic criteria of religiosity is generally determined by a person's righteousness and his devotion to a particular deity or deities he adheres to. However, for an atheist who considers Humanism to be his religion the determining factor of his religiosity would be his good deeds and his devotion to the ideal (i.e. love for humanity), he believes and works accordingly. This implies that albeit, the concept of good man, may be found in both the religions (i.e. God oriented religion and the religion which has nothing to do with God) but there may not be any earnest reference to the 'Godly man' in a religion which has no room for God or gods.

I started discussing this chapter with reference to men of great merit recognised as such by different traditions. And as illustration I refered to Ram the hero of Ramayana who represented the ideal man who is both a good and a godly person in the ancient Indian tradition. Also I discussed the perfect man with reference to the upanisads, specially the katha upanisad to show that the pursuit of a virtuous life is a necessary condition of achieving the ideal of perfection. The Liangmai Naga tradition similarly confirms the leading of a good life
is a necessary requirement for achieving the designation of the Godly. I have also recognised that for being good it is not essential to accept the concept of the Godly. While for being Godly you have to first and foremost be good. There may be mythologies regarding the 'arrogant' or 'bad' behaviour of gods, but for a man to be Godly, demands that he exhibits in his behaviour all the good features of Godliness and recognised by his tradition.

I have however to differentiate the concept of the good and the concept of the Godly from that of the ideal or the exceptional man especially in the Liangmai Naga tradition. And this I propose to do in the next chapter i.e. in the conclusion.

************