Indian philosophy is essentially a philosophy of values. The values are classified into four groups by the Indian sages. They are Kāma (Psycho-physical values), Artha (Economic values), Dharma (Moral values) and Mokṣa (Spiritual values). It is this fourth value, Mokṣa, which is the highest value and the **summa bonum** of human life, according to all the systems of Indian philosophy except Carvaka. Primarily, all the systems of Indian philosophy aim at the exposition of the nature of Mokṣa and of the way to realise it.\(^1\) Except for some minor details like the translation of the purusārtha as spiritual values, we are in agreement with the above statements of Dr. A.K. Lad on the nature of Indian philosophy as in the eight traditional system. Rightly indeed, Das Gupta said that Mokṣa is "the pivot on which all the systems of Indian philosophy revolve".\(^2\) No wonder then why the philosophical systems in India are called mokṣa-sūtras.

In this chapter we shall try to have a clear idea of the concept of Mokṣa or mukti. In the first part certain general considerations have to be made on the concept of mukti itself setting it on the Upaniṣadic background. In the second part we shall closely observe the various sādhas which can give us a comprehensive view of this concept. In the final part we shall make some philosophical reflections basing ourselves on these texts thereby trying to have a fairly satisfactory view of the Gītā-concept of liberation.
A: SOME GENERAL REMARKS ON THE CONCEPT OF MUKTI

1. The term 'mukti'

This term is derived from the root muk–mucicati (muicicate) which means to let loose, to liberate, to release etc. Mukti would mean becoming free, liberation, deliverance etc. Another term with the same meaning as mukti and derived from the same root is moksa. And in our treatment both of these terms will be used equivalently. Both of these terms denote a negative meaning of liberation from the scmésfracakra and only connotes the positive meaning of the muksa, the ultimate destiny of man as union with the Supreme God.

2. The Upanisadic background

In Br.Up. (3:1:5) the word mukti occurs in the sense of final liberation. The meaning of the word is somewhat clear since it is Yajñavalkya's answer to Janaka's query as to how a sacrificer (yajamana) frees himself from death. According to K.K. Satri nowhere in the Vedic literature does this term occur in this sense. But the term 'moksa' occurs in Sv.Up. (3:16) where among the attributes of God it is said that God is "the cause of worldly existence, and of liberation, of continuance and of bondage." From the context it is clear that moksa here stands for final liberation. In Mait.Up. (6:30) moksa is used in the sense of liberation from the determination of the nature by the gunas. Here moksa is contrasted with 'bandha' (bondage). Hence the term has the meaning of final liberation. The other derivatives of muk are used more or less in this sense in Rg. Up. (6:8) and in the Sv. Up. (1:10; 2:15; 4:16; 5:13 and 6:13). Another term used in the sense of liberation in the eschatological sense, is 'amrta', that is, immortality.
numerous occasions this concept occurs in the Upaniṣadic literature.  

3. Different kinds of Mukti

Usually three kinds of mukti or mokṣa are distinguished in the Indian philosophical tradition. They are krama-mukti, jīvan-mukti and vidheha-mukti of which, according to R. V. Ramanada, Badari, Badarayana and Jaimini respectively are the chief advocates. "Krama-mukti may mean liberation from deity to deity in the celestial world or liberation from life to life in the terrestrial or stellar world." Chānd.Up. (4:15:5) seems to advocate krama-mukti when it describes the different situations to which a soul separated from the body is led to until he is led to Brahmā.

Jīvan-mukti is liberation before death. "Desirelessness, destruction of ignorance, realisation of the self may all be the meanings of Jīvan-mukti, and particularly the last; and when this is attained liberation is attained." Liberation at death is vidheha-mukti. In our study we are chiefly concerned with vidheha-mukti.

4. Our Approach to the BG Concept of Mukti

In the BG the term 'mukti' does not occur. With the meaning of final liberation - eschatological liberation (UL) - once in the Gītā (5:29) the term 'mokṣa' occurs. Here it refers to Jīvan-mukti as it will be pointed out soon. Various derivatives of 'mokṣa' mostly in the senses of 'devoid of', 'freed from' etc. without referring necessarily to eschatological liberation, do occur in our scripture. Vinokṣaya in 16:5, 'mokṣayase' in 4:16; 7:1, 28 seem to refer to the final liberation. Referring to eschatological liberation the term 'amṛta' too occurs in 2:23; 13:12; 14:20 and 27.
We shall make a brief consideration of the concept of kramamukti and of jīvan-mukti according to BG, since our study will be chiefly concerned with videha-mukti in its ātyāntika sense, that is, in the sense of final liberation, or eschatological liberation which does not imply any rebirth. In 6:45 there seems to be a clear indication of kramamukti since the final liberation takes place only after continuous and progressive purification from sins. In 7:19 too, final liberation is described to be taking place after the purificatory processes of many births and deaths. Going to sverga in reward for one's actions(2:32 and 37) for temporary bliss after death could be interpreted in terms of kramamukti. This idea is implied in 6:41-42 since the dwelling place after death for good works is temporary leading to rebirth with greater aptitude for final liberation.

The BG acknowledges the possibility of jīvan-mukti as upheld by Śaṅkaracārya. For instance, the Brahma-sthitih with no bewilderment spoken of in 2:72 could be interpreted as jīvan-mukti since it is a state previous to death, and from this state one attains Brahmānirvāṇa at death. Śaṅkaracārya, commenting on this verse, emphasizes the two phases implied in this mukti, one before death and the other at death thereby pointing out an intimate connection between jīvanmukti and videhamukti. Commenting on this verse Radhakrishnan remarks: "Even while alive, the sage rests in Brahmān, and is released from the unrest of the world. The sage of steady wisdom lives a life of disinterested service." In 5:19 this Brahma-sthitih is explicitly mentioned as here on earth(ihai), further corroborates the view that it refers to jīvan-mukti. This "brahma-sthitih" could be compared to the same spoken of
identifying this state with the possession of eternal life. The mukta referred to in 5:28 is jīvanmukta. The characteristics mentioned especially of disinterested work in 4:20-30, the quality of permanent attitude of renunciation (nityasanyāsī) mentioned in 5:3, the qualities of the yogayukta (one trained in the way of works) of 5:7, or the description of the brahmabūta (one who became Brahmān) of 18:54 could be interpreted as characteristics of a jīvanmukta.

These three types of muktis are not mutually exclusive or contradictory. Neither the states of kramamukti nor of jīvanmukti is ultimate. The final mukti has to be without body. Jīvanmukti and videhamukti combined we have final mukti which will be expressed by us in the rest of our thesis by the following designations: ultimate liberation, eschatological liberation, final liberation, and in Sanskrit ātyantikamukti. So when we gave the title 'The Concept of Muktī in the BG' we meant this ultimate liberation or ātyantikamukti which is a combination of jīvanmukti and videhamukti towards which the kramamukti is tending. The BG expresses this idea of ultimate liberation through various concepts and images which we shall examine in the following section.

B: THE GĪTĀ TEXTS ON ULTIMATE LIBERATION (UL)

As we have hinted at earlier, liberation has both positive and negative aspects. In our scripture the emphasis by far is on the positive aspect. Our attention will be chiefly concentrated on the positive aspect. However, the few texts which refer to the other aspect must not be overlooked.
1. **The Negative Aspect of UL (Ultimate Liberation)**

In 4:16 the Lord says that the knowledge of karma-yoga would liberate (mokṣayasa) Arjuna from evil (asubhat). Both the acāryas Śāṅkara and Rāmacaṇḍa interpret asubhat as saṁsāra. The meaning seems to be that of getting out of the 'evil' that is the phenomenal existence. In 7:20 the liberation (mokṣaya) is from old age and death (jara-maraṇa) and in 9:26 liberation (mokṣayasa) is from the bondage of work (karma-bhandhanaṁ). In 18:60 liberation (mokṣayisyāmi) is from all sins (sarva pāpaḥbhayaḥ). In 4:36 there is a liberation, figuratively expressed as swimming across (samtarisyasi) from evil or stream of life (vṛjinam). It is obvious that all these instances are expressions of liberation from something that is binding, something that is not good (asubha), something that is transitory.

In 17:25 and 18:30 the derivatives of 'nuc' occur without mentioning from what or where this liberation is. In 14:20 and 18:71 liberation ('vimukto' and 'muktah' respectively) bring out both the negative and positive aspects. In 14:20 liberation at its base is one from the three guṇas, and in its more proximate results, it is from birth, death, old age and pain. And in its positive side, it consists of the possession of eternal life or immortality. In a sense, amṛtatvam (immortality) itself is a negative concept. In 18:71 the positive aspect of liberation is referred to as the possession of the worlds of the righteous (lokān... punyakarmaṁ). Here the mukti referred to is not UL but kṛṣṇa-mukti.

When we take amṛtatvam as a negative concept we may include 2:15, 13:12, and 14:20 and 27 as expressive of the negative aspects of liberation.
2. The Positive Aspects of UL

The UL (Ultimate liberation) in the BG has to be understood with reference to the UR (Ultimate Reality) who is Purusottama Krsna. When the jivatman achieves 'unity with the UR', the total cause of everything, there is true UL. In this unity the jivatman will achieve absolute bliss, absolute truth, absolute love and absolute peace. This idea of achieving unity with the UR is expressed through various images and phrases.

a) Lord Krsna as the Focal Point of UL

One of the chief ways through which the BG describes the reality of the UL by various expressions which give the meaning of "Coming to Lord Krsna". Some of such expressions are the following: mameti(4:9; 11:53), mam yanti(7:23; 9:23), mamsapayanti(10:10), mamevaigasyai(8:7; 9:34; 18:65), mamsapaisyasi(9:28) mamsapetya(8:15; 16). The "prapnunvanti mam" of 12:4 and the "mam vişate" of 18:55 have a deeper meaning than "coming to the Lord". The first has the sense of possessing the Lord, and the second has that of getting deeply involved with the Lord.

Since Lord Krsna is not only the beginning of everything but also the ultimate destiny of everybody and everything (10:30, 32; 11:19) it is quite understandable why the UL implies man's coming to him.

A stronger expression to explain nature of the state of UL is that of "attaining the Lord's state of being". This idea is conveyed by the following expressions: "madbhavan agatah"(1:10) "madbhavan yati(8:5), madbhavyo' papadyate(13:18) and madbhavan so'dhigacchati(14:19). Here we do not discuss the question of the nature of the union between the jivatman and the paramatman in the state of UL. But the above expressions do imply that the jivatmans attain the nature of Lord Krsna.
What is of special interest for us to realize from the ideas of coming to Kṛṣṇa and attaining the Lord's being is that UL consists in union with Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is Purusottama and who is the UR.

b) **Brahman as the Focal Point of UL**

It would be too pedantic to find out the distinction between Lord Kṛṣṇa and the UR and Brahman as the UR. It is not because we are unaware of the text which considers Kṛṣṇa as the "support of Brahman" (14:27), and the one which holds that the "beginningless Brahman is ruled by" Lord Kṛṣṇa(13:12). It is rather because such fine distinctions are not relevant to our study once we have pointed out the basic 'monism' in the BG and the personalistic nature of the UR. The BG, however, in faithfulness to the Upanisadic thinking, upholds the concept of Brahman as the Absolute, though not as distinct or different from Lord Kṛṣṇa's nature.

In the BG Lord Kṛṣṇa as Brahman is also the focal point of UL. As the expression coming to Kṛṣṇa, so too there is the one of "coming to Brahman" in the BG to describe the nature of the state of UL. This idea is conveyed by such expressions as "yanti brahma"(4:31) "gacchanti brahma"(6:24) "brahma samādyate"(13:30) and "prapto brahma"(18:50). As can be noticed these expressions with reference to Brahman is parallel to what has been said about Lord Kṛṣṇa himself. As the UL consists in attaining the being of the Lord, so too it is in attaining the being of Brahman. And this idea is conveyed by the following expressions: "brahmabhūyāy kalpate"(14:26) and 18:53), "brahmabhūtām"(6:27 and 18:54). Another expression which focusses the attention on Brahman in describing the nature of UL is brahmanirvāṇam(2:72; 3:24-26). In the BG context
this expression in a general way would mean that in the US man has
to find his UL, the particular nature of which will be described
below. UL is described also as coming to the Supreme Person(param
purusah)(8:8,10,23; 15:4).

c) Other Expressions Indicative of the Nature of the UL

As we have seen, the UR in the BG is a person who is the source
of all Love, Peace and Bliss. Hence, union with this reality implies
that it is a state of love, bliss and peace. In the BG, this state
of UL is described as one of Supreme bliss (sukham) and peace (śānti).
The terms manifestative of bliss are the following: sukhamātyantikam
(6:21), sukham uttamam(6:27) and atyantām sukham(6:28). In verse 21
of this chapter it is stated that in this situation of UL one rejoices
in the ātman, due to the vision of the ātman through the ātman (ātmana
'tmanam pasyann ātmani tasyati). And the following are those expressive
of peace: param śāntim(4:39) śāntim naisthitikin(5:12) śāntim(5:20)
śāsvacchāntim(9:31) param śāntim(18:62).

Another way of describing the nature of UL in the BG is by the
use of the prefixes 'para' or 'param' indicating transcendence, and by
the superlative 'uttama' with the word 'gati'(6:45; 17:18; 8:15; 8:21;
9:32; 13:18). 'Gati' usually indicates movement with the meanings of
gait, procession and the like, and the consequence of movement giving
thus the meaning of fate, and transmigration. 'Gati' also means situation,
and mode of existence. Taking into account of the various shades of
the meanings of 'gati' we may say that "parāgati" or "uttamāgati" can
signify the reality of UL in a fairly satisfactory way. Another word
used with the prefix 'para' is 'sidhi'(attainment - as the result of
much endeavour - 8:15; 12:10; 14:1). Both 'paragati' and 'parasidhi' connote the idea of 'ultimate goal'.

The BG describes the nature of the UL with the term 'padam' which connotes a spatial dimension. The word has various meanings like foot, stride, place, position, abode and receptacle. In 2:51 the padam is 'anaranayam' (sorrowless or evilless), in 16:5 it is 'avyayam' (changeless, or destructionless) and in 18:56 it is both 'aasnavaam' (eternal) and 'avyayam'. The expressions to signify the UL, 'param sthanam' and (5:5 and 8:28), and 'paramam dhamma' too have this spatial sense since both 'sthanaam' and 'dhamma' denote locality.

The UL either as an experience or as a state or as a 'place' is truly ultimate so that there can be no return from it. This idea of finality or ultimacy is expressed in the following texts: 5:17; 8:15, 16, 21; 13:23; 15:4 and 6. These texts deny the possibility of rebirth by such expressions as "gacchante apunaravartam" (5:17) and "punarjana na' pravruthah" (8:15).

C: PHILOSOPHICAL REFLECTIONS ON UL IN THE BG

We have seen that according to the BG, UL consists chiefly in coming to or attaining to the nature of the Ultimate Person (Param purusa) who is both Brahman and Lord Krishna himself. We have not reflected on the precise nature of this 'union' with the Lord. UL is also a situation of supreme peace and bliss. This state of supreme attainment (sidhi) is a 'place' (sthanaam) from which there is no return to the world. In what sense is it a padam or sthanam?

In this section we shall try to elucidate the implications of the various expressions descriptive of the nature of UL in the BG. In the
In the first part we shall make a brief comparative study of the views of Śaṅkaracārya and Rāmānuja in such a way that it would help us to concentrate on the central issue involved in the concept of UL. In the second part of this section our attention will be focussed on the question of the nature of the union between the jīvātman and paramātman in the state of UL. In the final part we shall discuss other metaphors or symbols used in the RG to explain the nature of UL.

1. Śaṅka, Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja on UL

a) Śaṅkara's View

As has been pointed out elsewhere, one of the fundamental views of Śaṅkara's Vedānta is that the jīvātman and paramātman are identical in the sense that there is no duality between them. For Śaṅkara, as to some extent for the Śāṅkhyas and Madhyamikas philosophies, bondage is due to the false identification of the self with the non-self. The Ācārya calls this false identification "adhyāsa". "The bondage of the atman is not real. It is real for all practical purposes, including morality and religion but in the ultimate analysis it is false (nitya)."

If bondage is unreal what about liberation? Deussen briefly explains Śaṅkara's idea of bondage and liberation: "... since the identity of the soul with Brahma has always subsisted and has only been hidden from it by an illusion, liberation is nothing else but the awakening of the consciousness that our own Self is identical with Brahma." This will explain why the Ācārya insists that liberation is achieved through jhāna alone. As Dr. Lad says, the "change in the realisation of liberation is only epistemic, and not ontological". In the light of these considerations we can understand the following
description of liberation given by Śaṅkarācārya, after citing various Śruti passages in support of his view:

All which passages establish the fact that so-called release differs from all the fruits of action, and is an eternally and essentially disembodied state.... But this (mokṣa) is eternal in the true sense, i.e. eternal without undergoing any changes (kutasthānitya), omnipresent as ether, free from all modifications, absolutely self-sufficient, not composed of parts, of self-luminous nature. That bodyless entity in fact, to which merit and demerit with their consequences and threefold time do not apply, is called release.17

b) Rāmānuja's view of UL

As in the case of Śaṅkarācārya, Rāmānuja's doctrine of UL too is directly dependent on his metaphysics. Rāmānuja briefly puts the fundamental elements of his Viśiṣṭādvaita as follows:

There are three ultimate entities - God, individual souls and matter. Intelligent individual soul is essentially different from non-intelligent matter; and God, who is the Supreme Soul, is essentially different from individual souls. The difference between the three entities is intrinsic, eternal and natural.18

According to Rāmānuja, unlike Śaṅkara, the bondage of the soul is not illusion but real. The cause of bondage is embodiment and this in turn is caused by karma. The jīvātmās were bound from eternity by karmic substance. Hence, liberation consists primarily of freeing oneself from karma and from embodiment. If so, jīvamukti is an impossibility.

For Śaṅkara the question does not arise whether the liberated souls keep their individuality with individual consciousness or not,
since according to him, there is no ontological difference between the jīvātman and the paramātman. But for Rāmānuja this question is of capital importance. He affirms categorically the individuality of the liberated souls as follows: "To maintain that the consciousness of the 'I' does not persist in the state of final release is again altogether inappropriate. It in fact amounts to the doctrine - only expressed in somewhat different words - that final release is the annihilation of the Self. The 'I' is not a mere attribute of the Self.... but it constitutes the very nature of the Self."¹⁹

Rāmānuja, as the other Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas, believe in the five stages of liberation as mentioned in the Bhāgavat Purāṇa(3:29:13), namely, Sālokya(living in the world of Brahm with him) Sārṣṭi(to enjoy the aisvāryas like Brahm), Śāśīpya(living in proximity), Sārūpya(enjoying the likeness) and Śāyujya(being united). The liberated souls though quantitatively(quantity taken numerically) many, are the same qualitatively. Besides, Rāmānuja holds that mokṣa is the result both of one's own effort and of God's grace.

The BG metaphysics, taken in itself, has nothing to do with māyāvād in its illusionistic form. The 'monism' of the BG is such that it reconciles the problem of one and many in a realistic way. Besides, the BG does not hold an absolute identity between the jīvātman and paramātman to the exclusion of non-identity totally. In fact, the BG seems to hold the view of plurality of souls. Hence it seems to us that the BG concept of liberation is nearer to the view of Rāmānuja-Ācārya than that of Śaṅkara-Ācārya.
2. The Nature of Jīvātman-Paramātman Unity

The state of UL is something intimately connected with the UR; either looked upon as Lord Kṛṣṇa himself or as Brahman. We have pointed out that the BG conveys the idea of 'union' with such expressions as 'coming to the Lord' and 'attaining to the nature of the Lord'. We used the term 'union' in a general way without distinguishing the different kinds of unions possible. From the point of view of Śaṅkaravedānta no union occurs in UL since there is only one reality. If Brahman is ontologically the same as Jīvātman there is no question of union. This is one extreme position of understanding this 'union'. According to Rāmānuja, though this union is sārūpya and sayujya, the Jīvātman retains the ego-consciousness. What does our sacred book say?

Verse 14:2 seems to give us the clue. "Having resorted to this wisdom and become of like nature to Me (mama ādhibhūtān āgataḥ), they are not born at the time of creation; nor are they disturbed at the time of dissolution". Here the term to be discussed is 'sādharanyam'. Śaṅkarācārya understands sādharanyam as svarūpata contrasting it with saūnādharānā. Rāmānuja renders "nāma sādharanyam" by "natacAYam" in the sense of similarity. Criticizing Śaṅkarācārya’s view Rāmānuja says:

The idea behind such an assumption is that the Self and the Highest Reality are identical; for in that case release would be a mere realisation of the true nature of the Self. 14:2 emphatically goes against Śaṅkara’s position; for the Jñānis have only 'Sādharaya' and not 'Tadātmya'. Śaṅkara notices this, and adds that Sādharaya here means not Saūnādharānā, a mere similarity
of qualities but svarūpata-identity. The perversion is too obvious to need any comment, for Sādharmya can never mean Svarūpata. Rāmānuja whose doctrine is not at stake, faithfully renders "Natsamya". 22

Rādhākrishna too opposes the interpretation of this verse by Śaṅkara. He says:

The saved soul grows into the likeness of the Divine and assumes an unchangeable being, eternally conscious of the Supreme Lord who assumes varied cosmic forms. It is not svarūpata or identity but only samandhārṇa or similarity of quality. He becomes one in nature with what he seeks, attains saṃśravasūkti.

Certainly the grammatical sense of the word argues for similarity rather than for identity. Besides, the second line of the verse gives a clue for this interpretation. If there has been absolute identity what was the necessity of saying about rebirth at creation and destruction at pralaya? This line seems to presuppose the assumption of non-identity in mūkti.

There are other texts too which seem to support the non-identity view. "He who sees Me everywhere and sees all in Me, I am not lost to him nor he is lost to Me." (6:23) This verse occurs in the context of the description of the state of UL. In 6:28 it is said of a man who has experienced infinite bliss (atyzatam sukhām) due to the divine touch (brahmasamsāpāsanam). And the yogavaitṭata of 29 also stands for the liberated man. Undoubtedly the statement in 6:30 refers to the situation of UL even as in 6:29. How can it be said that the Lord is not lost to the liberated man and the liberated man is not lost to the Lord if there was no non-identity? After citing Chād.Up. 8:12:1-3, 24 where
the individuality of the liberated soul is upheld. Saenier comments on 6:30 thus: "So too in the Gītā even in the state of liberation which transcends matter and all that depends on it, persons continue to exist and the relationship between them is not lost." Radhakrishnan too interprets this unity as a personalistic unity. He says: "It is personal mysticism as distinct from impersonal one that is stressed in these tender and impressive words: 'I am not lost to him nor is he lost to me'.

The following verse where the liberated man is said to dwell in the Lord (vartate) though he may be dwelling anywhere else (sarvathā vartamaṇaḥ), further corroborates the theory of non-identity. Here the liberated man could be a jīvamukta, but mukta all the same. He dwells in the Lord, without getting absorbed in the Lord without individuality. Zachner explains this text in terms of parā-bhakti. He says: "This is the higher bhakti, that love of God which had only been dimly sensed before but which is brought to perfection because it is an eternal love and can only be fully savoured when man is fully 'integrated'". For Zachner this text too is a clear example of personalistic unity in love which he calls "participation in a timeless mode of existence".

When we deal with the question of bhakti as a goal we will be elaborating this theme of parābhakti which is a personalistic identity in love at the stage of liberation. It is in 18:54 the term 'parā-bhakti' occurs. What is to be noted here is that this bhakti is such that it continues timelessly even after liberation according to 18:54 6:30-31. According to Zachner, in the Brahmānirvāṇa of the Gītā "love
is not abolished as it is in the Buddhist scheme of things". For,
Brahmanirvāna rests in Kṛṣṇa, the God of Love (6:15), and He supports
(14:27) and rules (13:12) Brahman. Indeed, Brahman cannot be consi-
dered as distinct from the Lord (11:37-40; 12:1-3; 14:3-4) or independent
of Him. In 7:26 the Lord speaks of the bhakti (bhajante mām) that
persists even after liberation (dvaudvaroahānirvānā). From these
texts what is clear is that the union that takes place between the
jīvatma and paramātma does not exclude the possibility of a love-
relationship.

How then shall we understand the expressions which convey the
idea of attaining the nature of Kṛṣṇa or Brahman as "madbhavam āgatāh"
(4:10), "madbhavam so'adhigacchati" (14:19), "brahmabhūyāy" (14:26)?
Pointing out the Venkatanātha’s criticism of Śaṅkara in defence of the
Śaṅkaravedāntic view of the state of UL, as unfair and prejudiced,
Maṅfar says:

An ordinary schoolboy knows the difference between the two when
he says that the triangles are completely similar, and that they
are identical. Venkatanātha says that the Scriptures themselves
force such a meaning. The words 'Madbhavam Adhigacchati' also
support Śaṅkara more than they do Śaṅkara. Madbhavā does imply
a shade of difference which Śaṅkara and his followers purposely
ignores. Nowhere in the Bhagavadgītā does Kṛṣṇa speak of such a
complete identity of the liberated and the Lord.

Certainly divinization of the soul in UL is accepted both in the
BG and in the NT. And the fact of divinization allows us the use of
the above expressions like "madbhavam āgatāh" and "brahmabhūyāy".
Grammatically the expressions can be understood metaphorically as when
we say that the son has attained the nature of his father due to
great similarity. By themselves these expressions do not signify
complete identity.

Before we try to give our view on the question of this relation­
ship we shall briefly consider other expressions conveying the idea
of this 'union' between the jīvātman and paramātman in UL. It is
a state of supreme "śānti" and "sukham". The word 'śānti' comes from
the root śānt( to appease to alleviate, to toil, to exert oneself)
which implies a situation of tranquility, of non-struggle or non­
conflict. It is a situation of effortlessness or strugglelessness
due to the fact of fullness to capacity. The biblical concept of
peace also has a similar meaning. Śānti is therefore not a sterile,
contentless concept. So, "param śānti" of UL would mean that by
coming to the UR the jīvātman would possess to its full capacity that
through which it can fully realize itself, without the possession of
which it would be always in struggle. By 'possessing' the UR which
contains the total value of being, and so of truth, goodness and bliss,
it is natural that the jīvātman would be at rest, at peace. Similarly
by 'possessing' the UR which is bliss itself (āसःदन) the jīvātman
is bound to experience "param suciham". These two concepts will explain
why the state of UL is also called "param siddhi".

The above considerations can shed light on the terms like padam,
gati, śānānam and chābhas with the qualifications 'param' and 'parvam'
giving the transcendental sense. Some of the terms denote the spatial
sense. A Vaishnavite may easily be tempted to say that these concepts
indicate the reality of Vaikuntha. We cannot deny the legitimacy of
such a concept once we realize that it is natural for human reasoning to think in spatio-temporal terms. If jīvamukti is not contradictory, it is equally not contradictory to speak of a *spatial ambience* for the liberated jīvātmās without at the time being constrained by them.

3. Our Views on the Jīvātmā-Paramātmā Unity

All the expressions used by the BG to convey the idea of the state of UL have to be explained with reference to the jīvātmā-paramātmā unity. Indeed, the crux of the problem of UL is here. It is a situation of param puram śānti, param suktam or param siddhi because it is a situation where one 'possesses' that reality which possesses the total value of being, outside of which there is nothing else. It would however be too presumptuous of our part to pretend to give a satisfactory solution to the problem of the nature of this unity a problem which caused so many controversies among the great Ācāryas and among their followers.

The first remark we would like to make in this connection is that conceptual language is very inadequate to speak meaningfully of this 'union'. We have already said that the UL in the BG 'possesses' the total value of being, may it is identical with Being itself. If so how does the question of 'union' arise? Could there be something else outside the sphere of being to be united with Being as such? This question of an Advaitin is bound to baffle anybody. All the same as we have seen, the BG does speak of a 'relationship' or 'union' between the jīvātmā and paramātmā which cannot be interpreted as absolute identity. The present question at its depth is identical
with the question of the Jīvātman-paramātman 'relationship' which we have already discussed in the chapter on the Gītā-concept of man. But here too we leave the question whether Kevaladvaitic interpretation of these concepts are valid or not, out of consideration.

In dealing with the problems like the present one, it is of capital importance to remind ourselves continually of the symbolic and mystical way of expressing them. Besides when we realize that the Upanisad is of mystical and poetic nature, an approach to it as though to a dry philosophical treatise would be misleading. Thus, basing our arguments on the strict and precise meanings of the concepts like ānādharvya or brahmabūta would be doing injustice to the nature of our Sacred Text. From a strict philosophical point of view any statement about being as such, i.e. the Supreme Being would be inaccurate as the Upanisadic sages very well knew it and taught us to indicate Brahman through "neti neti". However, man being a "finite-infinite" his symbolic expressions about the Upanishad need not be totally false as the history of religious experiences would bear this out.

We cannot accept the theory that in Upanishad the Jīvātman will totally lose its individual identity like the air in a jar does when the limiting adjunct of the air, viz. the jar is destroyed. And we saw that the liberated ātman persisting in parā-bhakti. Our line of approach to this problem would be by a brief analysis of the question of love-relationship. And this brief analysis would be dependent on our study of the concept 'person' where we pointed out that the inner core of personhood consists in its interpersonal relatedness.

We have pointed out in the first chapter of this part that the Upanishad
of the BG is personal and that this Divine Person is a God of Love. And the way of the BG too is person, and he is at his best when in his karma, jñāna and bhakti come together though in varying degrees. Hence, taking the analogy of love-relationship between human persons to explain the bhakti-relationship between jīvātmā and paramātmā is not altogether farfetched. Indeed, we have the warrant for it in the Upanisadic literature as well as in our own Sacred Book.

To express the relationship between the jīvātmā and paramātmā the Sr.Up. gives the analogy of the love-embrace in sex-union between man and his beloved wife. It says: "As a man when in the embrace of his beloved wife knows nothing without or within, so the person when in the embrace of the intelligent self knows nothing without or within" (4:3:21). Commenting on this passage Radhakrishnan says:

The analogy of man and wife is given to show that it is not a state of unconsciousness.... In sex intercourse when it is rightly conceived, we have an act of pure delight which is not mere physical satisfaction but a psycho-spiritual communion.... The mystic union of the finite and the divine is compared in this passage to the self-oblivion of earthly lovers where each is the other. It is a fuller identity than the mere sympathetic understanding of two individuals.

If the core of personality consists in interrelatedness, this is best expressed in the legitimate sex intercourse between the lover and the beloved. In no other human relationship where the body, emotions and the cognitive faculties are so deeply involved as here. Yet the strength and depth of this unity depends on the bipolar differences and the individuality of the lover and the beloved. In Freud's materialistic and male-dominated scheme of sex-relationship
the feminine element had very little place. For him, one might say, a woman is a castrated man in search for his lost organ. Erich Fromm rightly puts it as follows: "What Freud, paradoxically enough, ignores, is the psycho-biological aspect of sexuality, the masculine-feminine polarity, and the desire to bridge this polarity by union. This curious error was probably facilitated by Freud's extreme patriarchalism, which led him to the assumption that sexuality per se is masculine, and thus made him ignore the specific females sexuality." This author then points out how "There is masculinity and femininity in character as well as in sexual function".

Apart from the consideration of this particular expression of love-relationship, viz. the sexual union, a general view of love can further enlighten our understanding of the nature of the state of life. According to Fromm man by his self-awareness due to his ability for self-reflection experiences his "separateness" from the mechanical flow of the world-process. He can at once flow with the current of life and can observe it as an onlooker from the bank. This experience of separateness causes great anxiety and fear. According to Fromm this anxiety has to be resolved not by inducing various kinds of orgiastic states to make the world outside disappear temporarily, nor by uncritical conformity with the group, class etc., but by the union effected by matured love. Mature love is contrasted with symbiotic unions in which the individuality of the 'other' is not respected often by masochistic submission or by sadistic aggression. The author says:

In contrast to symbiotic union, mature love is union under
the condition of preserving one's integrity, one's individuality. Love is an active power in man; a power which breaks through the walls which separate man from his fellow men, which unites him with others; love makes him overcome the sense of isolation and separateness, yet it permits him to be himself, to retain his integrity. In love the paradox occurs that two beings become one and yet remain two.

This author considers care, responsibility, respect and knowledge as the four characteristics of genuine love. For our purpose his analysis of respect and knowledge is of special interest. According to him respect implies that the other person should grow and unfold as he is without the intention of any exploitation. He says:

If I love the other person, I feel one with him or her, but with him as he is, not as I need him to be as an object for my use. It is clear that respect is possible only if I have achieved independence; if I can stand walk without needing crutches, without having to dominate and exploit anyone else.

From this brief analysis of love according to Fromm, what is quite obvious is that love is a union, a personalistic union in which the partners do not lose their identity or individuality. The more genuine and deeper the union, the more will be the emphasis and respect for each other's individuality. To this point another one too is to be added, namely the personalistic knowledge resulting from love-union, something which can give a deeper insight into the question of jñāna and bhakti at UL. Fromm says: "Love is active penetration of the other person, in which my desire to know is stilled by union. In the act of fusion I know you, I know myself, I know everybody - and
I 'know' nothing. I know in the only way knowledge of that which is alive is possible for man - by experience of union - not by knowledge our thought can give. \[37\]

The God of the BG is a God of love. And this God promises a love-knowledge union with him in UL. It is a genuine union with the UN it is quite natural that it is a state of \textit{param śānti, param sukham}. It is a state beyond which there is nothing more to be desired or longed for, and so it is rightly called "\textit{param sidhi}" and "\textit{param gati}". But it is a union between the human soul which is an end in itself and the paramātman who is called as Puruṣottama with perfect knowledge and perfect love. The most perfect analogy for this personalistic union between the jīvātman and paramātman in UL is the Upaniṣadic one of the love-embrace between the lover and the beloved in sex intercourse. If the Lord himself has declared that he is the "ordinate(dharma-virudha) sexual love(kāma) in contingent beings" (7:11) this analogy is not too far-fetched. The problems involved in speaking of a Personalistic Absolute of perfect knowledge and perfect love will be dealt with later on. What we have tried here is to explain the meaning and intelligibility of the personalistic union in UL declared by the BG in quite clear terms.