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The concept of intellect and intuition finds place of great importance in the Indian philosophical thought. The problems concerning reason and intuition engage the attention of even the seers of the upanisads. The upanisadic seers seem to have a very close understanding and appreciation of the nature of intellect and intuition. They seem to be conscious of the limitations of intellect and of its finitude. Reason, according to them, cannot comprehend the real or the absolute.

The ideal of intellect is to discover the unity which comprehends both the subject and the object. There is such a unity is the working principle of logic and life. To find out its content is the aim of philosophic endeavour. But the enterprise is doomed to disappointment on account of the inherent incapacity of intellect to grasp the whole. Intellect with its symbols and shibboleths creeds and conventions is not by itself adequate to the grasp of the real "from which all speech with the mind turns away unable to reach it." Ultimate reality cannot be made into an objective representation which the intellect can grasp.
"How should he know him by whom he knows all this? How O Beloved, should he know himself the knower" objective knowledge of the subject is impossible. "It is unseen but seeing, unheard but hearing, unperceived but perceiving, unknown by knowing."1 Ātman is not non-existent, simply because it cannot be objectively represented. Though man's intellectual capacities are not adequate for its comprehension, still they will have no existence but for it. "That which one cannot think with the mind, but that by which they say the mind is made to think, know that alone to be the Brahman."2

Our intellectual categories can give descriptions of the empirical universe under the forms of space, time and cause, but the real is beyond these. While containing space, it is not spatial, while including time it transcends time. While it has a causally bound system of nature within it, it is not subject to the law of cause. The self existent Brahman is independent of time, space and cause Brahman is described as being free from the limitations of time. It is viewed as an eternity without beginning and end or as an instantaneous duration occupying no definite time of interval. He is independent of past and future. He is lord of all. Brahman is free from subjection to causality. There is no change in Brahman though all change is based on it. There is no second outside it, no other distinct from it.

Intuitive knowing is immediate and distinct from the discursive and mediate

1. S Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Vol. 1, P. 174
2. Ibid, P. 174
knowledge. It is more immediate than sensory intuition, for it overcomes the distinction between the knower and the known which subsists in sense intuition. It is the perfect knowledge, while all other knowledge is incomplete and imperfect in so far as it does not bring about an identification between subject and object. All other knowledge is indirect and has only symbolic or representative value. The only effective knowledge is that which penetrates into the very nature of things. But in lower forms of knowledge this penetration of the subject into the object is limited and partial. Scientific understanding assumes that an object can be known only if it is broken up into its simpler constituents. If anything organic is handled in this manner, its significance is lost. By employing intuitive consciousness we know the object with less distortion and more actuality. We get close to perceiving the thing as it is.

Knowledge presupposes unity or oneness of thought and being, a unity that transcends the differentiation of subject and object. Such knowledge is revealed in man's very existence. Knowledge is concealed in ignorance and when the ignorance is removed the knowledge manifests itself. Our thought, our life and our being are uplifted in simplicity and we are made one with truth. Though we cannot understand or describe we taste and we possess. We become new. When the beatific vision of Absolute Being has once dawned on the dazzled beholder, the savour of the phenomenal is gone for it is seen to be steeped in the noumenal.
If the real is misconceived as an object of knowledge, it cannot be known. Empirical object may be known by outer observation or inner introspection. But the self cannot divide itself into the knower and the known. Logical reasoning is incapable of comprehending the living unity of God and man, the absolute and the relative. Logical incapacity is not evidence of actual impossibility. Reality unites what discursive reason is incapable of holding together. Every atom of life is a witness to the oneness and duality of God and the world. Spiritual reality is not revealed in the way in which objects of the natural world or principles of logic are apprehended. Yajñāvalkya tells us that the self is its own light when the sun has set, when the moon has set, when the fire is put out, atmairasya jyotir bhavati. It is our deepest being behind the vestures of body, life, mind and intellect. Objectivity is not the criterion of reality, but the criterion is reality itself revealed in our very being.³

True knowledge is an integral creative activity of the spirit which does not know anything external at all. For it everything is its own life. Here there is identity, possession, absorption of the object at the deepest level. Truth in spiritual is neither the reflection nor the expression of any other reality. It is reality itself. Those who know the truth become the truth. Brahmavid brahmaiva bhabati. It is not a question of having an idea or a perception of the real. It is just the revelation of the real. It is the illumination of being and of life itself. It is satyam.

³ Robert A. McDermott (ed) Basic writings of S Radhakrishnan, P 155
Jñānam. Knowledge and being are the same thing, inseparable aspects of a single reality, no longer even distinguishable in that sphere where all is without duality.

Where there is duality, there one sees another, hears another. We have objective knowledge. While Vijnāna deals with world of duality, ananda implies the fundamental identity of subject and object, non-duality.

In the objective world where estrangement and limitations prevail, there are impenetrable entities, but in the knowledge where we have fullness and boldness of life nothing is external, but all is known from within. Intellect moves from object to object. Intellect is unable to comprehend them all, it retains their multiplicity. Intellectual knowledge is a scattered, broken, movement of the one undivided infinite life which is all possessing and ever satisfied. Intuitive knowing is unimprisoned by the divisions of space, successions of time or sequence of cause and effect. Our intellectual picture is a shadow cast by the integral knowledge which possesses the object truly and securely.

Reality is a fact, and facts are apprehended by intuition, whether perceptual or non-perceptual. The divine primordial reality is not a fact of the empirical world, and yet as the central spiritual fact we must have a direct apprehension of it. Our logical knowledge can give us indirect approximation to it but not a direct grasp of it.
The Upanisads asserts sometimes that thought gives us imperfect, partial pictures of reality and at other times that it is organically incapable of reaching reality. It deals with relations and cannot grasp the relationless absolute. But there is nothing on earth existing in space or time which is not an appearance of the absolute. No knowledge is entirely false, though none is entirely true. The nearest approach to truth is the conception of an organised whole, though it is not completely true on account of the relational character which however near to cancellation it may have come, is never absolutely abolished. It is the highest form of the absolute the mind of man can hit upon. Intellect in the sense of mere understanding, working with the limited categories of time, space and cause is inadequate. Intellect also fails though it takes us beyond understanding. It does not help us to attain reality, which is not merely an idea, but a spirit. An idea or reason is an imperfect fragment of reality which is more than idea. The real is neither true nor false. Our judgment about the real may be true or false, since they imply the dualism, between idea and reality. We have to pass beyond thought, beyond the clash of oppositions, beyond the antinomies that confront us when we work with the limited categories of abstract thinking. If we are to reach the real, thought must become perfected in intuition so that we catch the vision of the real.

According to the Upanisads there is a higher power which enables us to grasp this central spiritual reality. Spiritual things require to be spiritually
discerned. The Yoga method is a practical discipline pointing out the road to this realization. Man has the faculty of divine insight or mystic intuition, by which he transcends the distinctions of intellect and solves the riddles of reason. By this intuitive realization "the unheard becomes heard, the unperceived becomes perceived, the unknown becomes known." The problems raised by intellect solve themselves the moment we transcend reasoning and start to live the religious life. The Upaniṣads ask us therefore to lay aside our pride of intellect and self-consciousness, and approach facts with the fresh outlook of a child. "Let a Brahman renounce learning and become as a child." No man shall enter into the kingdom of God except when he first becomes a little child. The highest truth is to be felt by the simple and pure minded, and not proved to the sophisticated intellect. "Let him not seek after many words for that is mere weariness of tounge. Not by learning is the Ātman attained, not by genius and much knowledge of books." It is attained by the mystic in their moments of illumination. It is direct knowledge or immediate insight. In the mystic experience the soul finds itself is the presence of the highest. It is lost in awareness, contemplation and enjoyment of the ultimate reality. It does not know what it is and when it reaches it. There is nothing higher than it. Other things are all in it. This spiritual vision relieves us from all passion and suffering.

4. Chandogya Upaniṣad, VI. 13
5. Brhad -aranyaka Upaniṣad iii. 5
6. Katha Upaniṣad, ii 23
Plotinus says, in the vision of God, that which sees is not reason, but something greater than and prior to reason. Something presupposed by reason, as is the object of vision. All the aspirations of the human mind, its intellectual demands, its emotional desires and its volitional ideals are there realised. It is the supreme end of man's effort, the termination of personal life. “This is the supreme end of that, that is the supreme treasure of that, this is the supreme dwelling of that, this is the supreme joy of that.” It is on a level with perceptual existence; but unlike the latter, it is not objective and verifiable by others. It cannot, like inferential knowledge, be communicated to others. It is impossible to give a formal exposition of it. The mystic insight is inarticulate. As to a man born blind we cannot explain the beauty of a rainbow or the glory of a sun-set, even so to the non-mystic the vision of the mystic cannot be described. “God put it into my head, and I cannot put it into yours,” is the last word of the mystic experience. Simply because it is incommunicable, it does not become less valid than other forms of knowledge. We can describe this experience only by metaphors.

The Upaniṣads distinguish between aparā vidyā, lower knowledge and para vidyā or higher wisdom. While the former gives us knowledge of the Vedas and the sciences, the latter helps us to gain the knowledge of the imperishable. The first principle distinguishes itself. In the Brhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad the self

---

7. Brhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, iv. 3.32
is seen as the reality of reality. The reality of the world is the empirical, the true reality is the atman, the self which the empirical reality conceals. A distinction is made between the knower of the texts and the knower of the self in the Chandogya Upaniṣad. The Taittiriya Upaniṣad reduces the knowledge of the Vedas to an inferior position by assigning it to mano-maya (mind made) self which has to be surmounted before final truth is attained. The self is perceived, according to the Katha Upaniṣad not by logical reason but by spiritual contemplation, adhyatma yoga. The real is not attained by force of intellect or by much learning but is revealed to the aspirant whose will is at rest in Him. We realise God by the clarity of illumination Jñāna – Prasādena.⁸

The Brhad -Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad teaches that while those who put their trust in the intellect cannot attain to a knowledge of Brahman, yet there is an apprehension of His being by those who are childlike. Balya includes humility, receptivity or teachableness and an earnest search. The writer ask to give up the pride of learning, Pānditya. A self denial which includes up the pride of learning Pānditya. A self denial which includes our intellectual pride and power is demanded. Purity of intellect is different from congestion of it. To attain purity of vision, we require a childlike nature which we can get by tranquilling the senses, simplifying the heart, and cleaning the mind.

It is through quietening the striving of the will and the empirical intellect

---

⁸ Robert A. Mcdermott (ed.) Basic Writings of S. Radhakrishnan, PP. 156-157
that the conditions are raised for the realisation of the supreme in the individual soul. Therefore having become calm, subdued, quite patiently enduring and collected, one sees the self just in the self.

Even as we have an intellectual discipline for the theoretical understanding of the world. We have a moral and spiritual discipline for the direct apprehension of truth. Even as we cannot understand the art of swimming by talking about it and can learn it only by getting into the water and practising swimming, so also no amount of theoretical knowledge can serve as a substitute for the practice of the life of spirit. We can know God only by becoming Godlike. To become Godlike is to become aware of the light in us, by returning consciously to the divine centre within us, where we have always been without our knowing it. Detachment (Vairagya) is the essential means for the attainment of wisdom (Jñāna). Only the pure in heart can see God.

Ethical preparation is insisted on. If we do not abstain from wrong doing, if we are not composed in our minds. We cannot attain to spiritual wisdom. Our moral being must be purged of all evil. The Svetāsvatara Upaniṣad tells us that "we should cleanse our natures to reach the goal, since even a mirror can reflect an image properly only if it is cleansed of its impurities. We must renounce selfish desire, surrender material possessions, become bereft of egotism. The path is sharp as the edge of a razor and hard to cross, difficult to tread."

Vidyā and avidyā are two ways of apprehending reality. Both are forms of relative knowledge and belong to the manifested universe. Knowledge formulated logically is not equivalent to a direct and immediate apprehension of the real. Whatever words we use, whatever concepts we employ, fall short of reality. The anubhava is beyond all manifestation and is complete in itself. Vidyā stresses the harmony and interconnections of elements which make up the world; avidyā the separateness, mutual independence and strife. Avidyā helps us to appreciate intellectually the intelligible ideas about the nature of the Divine ground and the nature of the direct experience of it in relation to other experiences. It indicates the means by which we can attain Brahman. Such a system theological doctrine points out that there is nothing intrinsically self-contradictory about the postulate of religion, viz the divine reality and that it is also empirically verifiable if only we are willing to submit to a discipline. The theological knowledge or Vidyā is different from the experience or anubhava of it. The experience is recorded as a pure and direct intellectual intuition in sruti, when we reflect on the experiences or their records and reduce them to a rational order we have smṛti. While the first is the domain of metaphysical principles, the second applies these principles to individual and social conduct. Vidyā is nearer the truth than avidyā.

But vidyā is also understood as Jñāna which is of the essential nature of
the Divine Reality. It is then eternal wisdom which is not the knowledge possessed by any individual. It is the wisdom hidden between the sheaths of ignorance, It is one with the supreme self, which is self evident and needs no proof, svataḥ-siddha, self-valid certainty.

Though intuitive wisdom is different from knowledge of the senses or anything we can achieve by logical reflection, it is not to be confused with occultism, obscurantism or extravagant emotion. It is not magical insight or heavenly vision, or special revelation obtained through supernatural powers. What we attain by vision, empirical or transempirical belongs to the objective world. It is a distinction within the objective world, between the physical and the super physical between what we reach by the five senses and a sixth sense. Wisdom is pure reason, capacity or fundamental truth. It is the possession of the soul or it is the soul that penetrates into its own ground and depth and becomes essential being. It springs from it of necessity when it mediates on itself. This wisdom is eternal, universal and necessary for Sarıkara. It cannot be destroyed though it may be obscured.

The Upaniṣads uses a term 'Sākṣat aparokṣā' to express truly the nature of the absolute knowledge. This is not an ordinary pratyakṣa or perception, because there is no duality of the knower and the known in Sakṣat aparokṣā. Its immediacy surpasses all mediacy of the senses. We can say that here the soul perceives the soul without anything to intervene between the two. But the
duality ceases to be here. It surpasses even intellectual intuition in this that here the distinction between the subject and the object stands to be nothing. To say truly, the term 'knowing' should not be used to the knowledge of the self, because all knowledge depend on this self-luminous light of consciousness, and act only through it. As Brahman is only chit or the pure consciousness, so nothing can be known except in and through Brahman. Yajnavalakya points out that the final source of all light or illuminations is the Ātman.

Munḍaka Upaniṣad says, 'two kinds of knowledge must be known, the higher and the lower. The lower knowledge is that which Rg, Śāma, Atharva Veda, ceremonial Grammar give but the higher knowledge is that by which the indestructable Brahma is apprehended. According to Upaniṣad the reality of God can only be apprehended in a conscious of joy that is beyond ordinary consciousness. In the Upaniṣad also intellect and reason are not ignored.

The word 'intuition' has different senses in different systems of Indian Philosophy. The validity of intuitional knowledge has also been upheld by some school. Jaina holds that ordinary perceptions produced through sense organs are perception only for particular purpose due to their lack of clarity per excellence. Only those uncommon perceptions called avadhi, manahparyāya and Kevala which are produced without the help of external sense organs (indriya jñāna) are perceptions proper, due to their supreme clarity. Avadhi is the direct knowledge of things even at a distance of time or space. It is knowledge
by clairvoyance. *Manah paryaya* is a direct knowledge of the thoughts of others, as in telepathic knowledge of others mind. *Kevala* or perfect knowledge comprehends all substances and their modifications. It is omniscience unlimited by space, time or object. To the perfect consciousness the whole reality is obvious. This knowledge, which is independent of the senses, which can only be felt and not described, is possible only for purified souls free from bondage. Of these the first one may also be erroneous while the last two are not liable to any error.

According to Jaina, all truth is relative when compared with the absolute truth. All knowledge transcends the given and points beyond itself with a continuous advance towards fuller and fuller truth, the object itself loses its apparently given character. When we reach the absolute knowledge the distinction between subject and object is overcome. Only in the light of such an absolute standard could we correct the abstractions of the lower. We see that the several relatives are only stages in a continuous process which has the realization of the souls freedom for its determining ends.

But is there any way of comprehending the nature of this absolute? We cannot get an idea of the positive full-orbed reality by putting together our partial views. If we follow the spirit of Jaina logic, thought is bound up with the relative and cannot give us a knowledge of the absolute. If thought cannot grasp reality, is there any other power that can grasp the reality? A careful consideration of
Kevalajñāna or the knowledge possessed by the free will tell us that the Jaina theory by implication accepts the method of intuition and the philosophy of absolutism.

According to Jaina theory the highest kind of knowledge which combines all the characters manifested in experience is that possessed by the Kevalin or the liberated. It is full or perfect knowledge which is the soul's characteristic in its pure and undefined condition. This perfect knowledge which is the essence of the soul, manifests itself in different degrees in different kinds of beings on account of the influence of the external force of matter whose association or union has the effect of suppressing the clear knowledge of the soul.

It was Patañjali who set forth the philosophical view of intuition as a supra-normal insight, although the source of this is ancient. According to Patañjali, this supra-normal insight comes about only when one has mastered the moral, physical and mental disciplines set forth in the yoga sutra. According to Patañjali, when a yogin develops yoga proper, that is the stilling of the mind, to a high state called saṁyama, intuition arises. It arises by a stages. Actually what transpires is that consciousness is shining ever more brightly into an unconscious material world. It is as if the true self were a light or torch which when unobscured could illumine the entire universe and via that light, one could see into all aspects of reality. It is clear that from the above point, intuition is a supra-normal insight by which one gains knowledge of reality.
The Yoga holds that the knowledge gained through perception, inference and scriptural testimony is not absolutely valid, since it assumes with the sāmkhya, that empirical knowledge is the product of the erroneous confusion between purusa and buddhi. Truth of things as they are can be gained only through the practice of Yoga. Vyāsa quotes a verse to the effect: “By the scriptures, by inference and by the eager desire for practice incontemplation, in three ways he furthers his insight and gains the highest yoga.”

Yoga holds that through the control of the fluctuations of mind and continuous practice of concentration, the yoga school thinks that it is possible to master anything from the smallest atom to a thing of the greatest magnitude; that is the mind can grasp anything unimpeded. According to yoga school everything is made up of the three elements — sattva, rajas and tamas. When by leading a pure life of meditation and concentration, the rajas and tamas are kept in abeyance the defect of obscuration (āvarana doṣa) is removed, and due to the preponderance of sattva, mind attains a pellucid clarity and becomes like light. The yogin then gains undisturbed calm (adhyatma prasada), and when he is in the state be obtains as insight (prajñā) which is always true. A man endowed with that insight does not even a trace of misconception (viparyaya) and the insight does not operate according to the usual processes of sense.

---

10. Yoga-Bhāṣya, i. 48
perception. The yoga school says that this insight is different from the insight generated by scriptural and inferential knowledge.

"This is capable of having as its object even subtle (e.g. atoms) hidden (e.g. things not visible as when separated by wall) and remote things (e.g. things mile way or in the past or future) and it destroys mental 'hindrances' (kles'as) such as nescience etc."\textsuperscript{11}

The Hindu scriptures speak to us of men who, through dint of hard tapas acquired marvellous powers. The acquisition of these powers is subordinated to the chief end of samadhi in the Yoga system. Though the highest goal may not be attained, the lower stage are not without their value. Each stage brings its own reward. Control of the body through postures results in an indifference to the extremes of heat and cold. We obtain a full intuitive knowledge of whatever we concentrate on. Sarīyama or concentration, is the means by which we acquire a knowledge of supersensuous objects. Through it we know the inmost core of things and reach the great light of wisdom (Prajñāloka). By means of constraint on friendliness, compassion and joy, these qualities increase. If concentrate on muscular powers, we will have a giants strength. Heightened powers of the senses by which the yogi can see and hear at a distance, follow as a result of concentration. We can also acquire a direct knowledge of subliminal impressions, and through them of our past lives. As the result of

\textsuperscript{11} K. Satehidananda Murty, Revelation and Reason in Advaita Vedanta, P. 135
sarhyama on a presented idea, knowledge of another's mind (paracittajñānam) arises. Through concentration on the three fold modifications which all objects constantly undergo, we acquire the power to know the past, present and the future. According to Patañjali, "he who discerns the distinction between the self and objective existence gains authority over all states of existence and omniscience. Before we gain full knowledge we sometimes have a kind of prior intuition of the truth, and this is called pratibhā."¹²

Prajñā knowledge is as clear as perception, but while perception is limited to certain gross things and gross qualities prajñā has no such limitations, penetrating into the subtlest things, the tanmatras, the gunas and perceiving clearly and vividly all their subtle conditions and qualities. As the potencies (samskāra) of the Prajñā wisdom grow in strength the potencies of ordinary knowledge are rooted out, and the Yogin continues to remain always in his Prajñā wisdom. It is a peculiarity of this prajñā that it leads a man towards liberation and cannot bind him to Saṃsāra. The final prajñās which lead to liberation are of seven kinds, namely 1) I have known the world, the object of suffering and misery, I have nothing more to of it. 2) The grounds and roots of Saṃsāra have been thoroughly uprooted, nothing more of it remains to be uprooted. 3) Removal has become a fact of direct cognition by inhibitive trance. 4) The means of knowledge in the shape of a discrimination of purusa from

¹². Yoga-Bhāṣya, iii 33, iii 37
prakṛti has been understood. The other three are not psychological but are
rather metaphysical processes associated with the situation. They are as follows
—— 5) The double purpose of Buddhi experience and emancipation (bhoga
and apāvarga) has been realized. 6) The strong gravitating tendency of the
disintegrated gunas drives them into prakṛti like heavy stone dropped from
high hill tops. 7) The buddhi disintegrated into its constituents the gunas become
merged in the prakṛti and remain the re forever. The purusa having passed
beyond the bondage of the gunas shines forth in its pure intelligence. It is thus a
state of pure intelligence.

The Nyāya and the vaisesīka schools also accept pratyakṣa or intuition is
the most important source of knowledge. Vātsayāna says, "When a man seeks
the knowledge of a certain thing, if he is told of it by trustworthy person and has
the verbal cognition of the thing, there is still a desire in his mind to ratify his
information by means of inference through particular indicative features, and
even after he has been able to get at the inferential knowledge of the thing, he
is still desirous of actually seeing the thing with his eyes; but when he has once
perceived the thing directly his desire are at rest and he does not seek for any
other kind of knowledge."13

‘Pratyakṣa’ meant sense perception. It soon come to cover all immediate
apprehension whether through the aid of the senses or not. Gangesa defines

13. Nyāya-Bhāṣya, I.1.3
Pratyakṣa as direct apprehension. It is knowledge whose instrumental cause is not knowledge. In pratyakṣa, knowledge is not an antecedent condition. God’s knowledge is direct, immediate and entire and is not instrumented by any other cognition.

Mind according to Nyāya is regarded as a separate sense and can come in contact with pleasure, pain, desire, antipathy and will. Dharmakirti recognises four kinds of perceptions: sense perception, mental perception (manovijñāna), self consciousness and Yogic intuition.

Sense perception is mediated by the senses. Mental perception (manovijñāna) is said to be similar to sense perception as belonging to the same series and arising at the next moment to sense perception. The internal perception of pleasure and pains is brought under the third variety, svasaṃvedana or self consciousness. We perceive the self through the perception of its states as pleasure or pain. It is direct intuition by which the self is revealed (ātmanah sākṣātkāri), free from intellectual interference and therefore from error. It is said to accompany all mental phenomena.

According to Dharmakirti, we perceive the four truth of Buddhism which are beyond the ordinary means of knowledge by means of Yogic intuition, which is free from all error and intellectual taint. By constant practice of meditation

14. Tattvacintamani, P. 552
a man may acquire supersensuous vision and can apprehended all objects near and far, past and future, remote and hidden. This highest kind of insight has the immediacy of intuition. What is a miracle for us is a natural power of the seers. What seems to our bewildered eyes immeasurably complicated and subtle is revealed to the seers sub specie simplicitatis. Everything is there transfigured. We have at the level the simplicity of sense perception of concrete objects and at the highest yogic intuition. The former is the simplicity of the natural man, of the once born type, the latter that of the spiritual man, of the twice-born type. "Yogic intuition apprehends reality as it is in its fulness and harmony."15

The yogins are believed to have the pratyakṣa of the most distant things beyond our senses; they can acquire this power by gradually increasing their powers of concentration and perceive the subtlest and most distant objects directly by their mind. Even we ourselves may at sometime have the notions of future events which come to be true, e.g. sometimes I may have the intuition that 'To-morrow my brother will come,' and this may happen to be true. This is called pratibhajña, which is also to be regarded as a pratyakṣa directly of the mind. This is of course different from the other form of perception called mānas pratyakṣa by which memories of past perceptions by other senses are associated with a percept visualized at the present moment, thus we see a

---

15 S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, P. 68
rose and perceive that it is fragrant; the fragrance is not perceived by the eye, but the mānas perceives it directly and associates the visual percept with it. According to Vedānta this acquired perception is only a case of inference. The pratibhā-pratyakṣa however is that which is with reference to the happening of a future event.

The Naiyāyikas have accepted this yoga or pratibhā as a pratyāśatti or contact. As this is not known ordinarily, it is accepted as an extraordinary contact by which the entire objective world may be comprehended in a single moment. "Ārṣajñāna, or the intuitive knowledge possessed by the sages through the force of meditation, is sometimes called pratibhā, though the latter term is more often applied to flashes of intuitive genius which ordinary man at times display."\(^{16}\)

In this case yogaja pratyakṣā pratibhā is eagerly manifested and hence, it is described as the wisdom of the supreme being. There are some cases where pratibhā is less manifested and hence they are called intuition. The knowledge of atoms, not being possible through ordinary perception, is possible through intuition or extraordinary perception. In the same way the knowledge of universal is possible through some other method. When a man perceives a particular jar, he will see the whole class of jar through the method called sāmānyalakṣaṇa. Again the knowledge through

\(^{16}\) Padārthadharmasamgraha of Prasastapāda, P. 258
Jñanalaksana is possible due to the manifestation of pratibha. Otherwise how can a man know other things at the perception of a particular object? When one perceives a sandal wood, as for example, at a distance, one can immediately know of its fragrance though it is not in contact with his sense organ. Therefore the knowledge of fragrance in this case is to some extent intuitive.

Visvanath in Nyāyapañcanān has brought out two fold character of yoga intuition, yogi who is eternally connected (yukta) and another who is yet to be connected (yunjana). The former is, by virtue of being aware of all things, described as the mirror of Eternal light, while the latter needs some contemplation for such awareness. In a Vaiseṣika-sūtra also these two stages of the vision of seers are described. One stage belongs to those who have adopted complete mastery over concentration. To them vision is ever present while another belongs to those who have no such mastery but have got some occasional glimpses of Pratibhā.

Some more suplementary points may be forwarded from Nyāya-vaiseṣika standpoint in favour of their acceptance of the doctrines of pratibhā inorder to illumine this aspect of knowledge. Both the Nyāya and Vaiseṣika systems believe in Ṣruti which is also the product of pratibha possessed by vedic seers. The vedic mantras are poetry as they are represented by the kavi or seers. It is a well known fact that both the system accept the subject matter of the vedas a
authentic. To believe in Śruti entails to rely on the output of pratibhā. Moreover, the believe in Jivanmukti or embodied Apavarga. That is to say, they believe in the existence of such a state where a man becomes free from suffering. In this position an individual can see the real nature of the objects being endowed with his pratibhā. An individual can be endowed with pratibhā if he can remove wrong cognition from his mind. Due to the removal of it the mind becomes free leading to the possession of pratibhā through which the real nature of the world is revealed to him.

Actually the process of having pratibhājñāna in the form of self knowledge is given in the Nyāyasūtra and Vātsayāna bhāsyā. It has been depicted that liberation or apavarga has to be attained through the absolute cessation of suffering which is again removed through the removal of birth. This removal of birth comes into being through the abstention from the work which is again possible after the attainment of the right cognition of the categories. Hence it is said by Gautama Duhkhajñāna — pravṛtti — dosamithyajñāna — namuttarottarapā ye tadantara payadapavargah. That is the intuitive cognition of the self leads an individual to the attainment of another type of supreme intuitive cognition called apavarga or nihsreyasa.

The same theory is accepted by Sridhara in his Nyāyakandali. To him, the right cognition of the categories removes the defect of the object through which they become the objects of attachment. Through the right cognition of the same
an individual can have an idea of the true nature of the objects, which leads him to the path of detachment towards the same. If there is detachment towards external objects, a man can realise the true nature of self. After this he develops a habit of renouncing actions contradictory to the prescription of the sruti, smṛti etc. This habit conjoins him with the matured self knowledge (Paripakvatam ajñāna), which may also be described as pratibhājñāna.

Prasātapāda an author of Vaiṣeṣika school has given a vivid description of pratibhājñāna in his ‘Padārthadharmanarājantra’. To him an individual can transcendentally perceive with the aid of merit arising from Yogic practice the internal space (antaratma), directions (dīk), time (kala), atom (paramanu), mind (manah) and the quality, action, universal, particular inhered in them, and in the inherence itself. One can have the direct apprehension of the essential nature of these (svarupadās’ānam) as they really are (avitatham). Moreover those who are transcendentally cojoined with their souls can have immediate apprehension of the objects having subtle character (suksma) hindered (vyavahita), existing in distant place.

Prasātapāda has accepted such intuition (pratibhā) as of two types — transcendental (rasa) and mundane (laukika). The former belong to that type of intuitive cognition which arises from the contact of mind and self and the particular merits generated through this. This type of intuitive cognition remains in the seers who have direct vision of an object existing in past, future and
present and of an object capable of not being known through ordinary sense organs. Due to this reason the whole vedic mantras are revealed to them. Sometimes in the mundane world such revelation is possible as a small girl generally says —— "my heart; i.e. intuition says that tomorrow my brother will come."17

When it coincides with the fact, it is called intuited cognition in the mundane level (laukika).

Jayanta Bhatta in his Nyāyamañjari raised a question: what is the proof for the existence of a Yogic perception? To him the proof of such Yogic perception lies on the fact of the excellence in the understanding capacity of various beings (darsānatiṣaya eva pramāṇam). Jayanta Bhatta is of the opinion that the proof for the existence of the yogic perception is nothing but the excellence in the vision of the yogins. From our day to day experience it is known to us that the ordinary people require sufficient light to perceive an object that is in proximity to our eyes but cats can see in the dense darkness. From this it is proved that there is a variation in degree of the visions. This variations of the degree in vision depends on the excellence of the same which is called atiṣaya.

The gradual purification of mind through yoga is beautifully described
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by Jayanta Bhatta with the metaphor of Gold. Just as gold gradually shines more due to the purification of it through heat, the minds of the Yogins can have immediate apprehension of all knowables through the practice of Yoga.

Prasastapada mentions another kind of knowledge - ārsajñāna. It is the knowledge the seers, the promulgators of scriptural tradition (ām naya vidhata) and the divine sages have it in its perfection. But prasastapada says, sometimes even ordinary people have it, e.g. when a girl says, “My heart tells me that tomorrow my brother will come”, and it happens so.” By ārsajñāna the sage know the past, present and future and also supersensuous things such as merit and demerit etc.

According to Saṅkara Anubhava is the form of intuition differs from idealised fancy or imagination of unreal objection. It is the real experience of Brahman through identity. The Anubhava in the form of direct experience of intuition is the highest truth.

Saṅkara admits the reality of an intuitional consciousness is anubhava. In this state the distinctions of subject and object are superseded and the truth of the supreme self realised. It is the ineffable experience beyond thought and speech, which transforms our whole life and yeilds the certainty of divine presence. Anubhava is the state of consciousness which brings out when the individual strips himself of all finite conditions, including his intelligence. It is
sākṣatkāra or direct perception, which is manifested when the abidya is destroyed and the individual knows that the Ātman and the Jiva are one. It is also called Saṁyagjñāna (perfect knowledge) or Saṁyagdars'ana (perfect intuition). While Saṁyagjñāna insist on the reflective preparation necessary for it, Saṁyagdars'ana points to the immediacy of intuition, where the ultimate reality is the object of direct apprehension as well as meditation. Saṁkara explains that it is possible for us to meditate on unreal objects but not to experience them; so that his anubhava is different from idealised fancy.

Psychologically, anubhava is of the nature of perception. Anubhava is direct awareness of reality. Anubhava is not consciousness of this or that thing, but it is to know and see in oneself the being of all beings, the ground and the abyss. As direct experience or anubhava in the Nyāya sense of the word is the sole means of knowledge of the external world, anubhava of non-dual experience is the innermost experience on which whatever we know and believe of the supersensual world depends. The object of intuition is not a private fancy or a subjective abstraction in the mind of the knower. It is a real object, which is unaffected by our apprehension or non-apprehension of it, though its reality of a higher kind than that of particular objects of space and time which are involved in a perpetual flux and cannot therefore be regarded strictly as real.

Kant spoke of an intellectual intuition to indicate the mode of consciousness by which a knowledge of things in themselves might be obtained.
in a non-logical way. According to Fichte, intellectual intuition enables us to get at self-consciousness, which is the basis of all knowledge in his philosophy. Schelling employs the same term to denote the consciousness of the absolute, the identity between subject and object. But according to Sarṅkara the object of intuition is not the many things in themselves of Kant, or the self of Fichte, or the neutrum of Schelling, but the Ātman or the universal consciousness. As for Plotinus, so for Sarṅkara, the absolute is not presented as an object, but is an immediate contact which is above knowledge. Since the intuitional knowledge is not contradicted by anything else, it is the highest truth.

Anubhava is not the immediacy of an uninterpreted sensation, where the existence and the content of what is apprehended are not separated. It has kinship with artistic insight rather than animal perception. It is immediacy which is higher and not lower than mediate reflective knowledge.

According to Sarṅkara anubhava of Brahman means the realisation of oneself as Brahman. That Brahman is oneself is not known except from scripture, and as soon as the individual self knows that he is in fact Brahman, he becomes Brahman, and immediately he is liberated. There is no interval between the knowing of Brahman and liberation.

According to Sarṅkara, anubhava is the assured conviction, the clear undoubted awareness that one is Brahman, which is generated by Vedānta
Vākyas. A man, who has realised this is unaffected by agency, pleasure and pain, he continues to live, but for him his body and the world are dead, as a slough is for a snake.

According to Saṅkara psychology, perception takes place when mind ‘takes on’ the form of an object. If the perceiving mind and the perceived object are distinct and apart, there can be no perception. Perception takes place only when mind and an object are present in the same locus. The object has no reality other than the percipient. When mind comes into contact with an object through the senses, it goes out through the senses, reaches the object and becomes one with it, either by perceiving it or by taking on the same form as that of the object. Mind is able to assume the form of an object in the same way in which light is able to manifest an object by perceiving it and assuming its form.

Mind has no form, but assumes whatever form is presented to it by the senses. All perception need not be sense generated. Perception means direct cognition. There is direct cognition of pleasure and pain. This is possible because pleasure or pain is a mental mode and knowledge of it is also a mental mode.

The cognition of the self is immediate, because it is always directly in contact with the mind which limits it. So, too, the knowledge of Brahman is immediate. Because Brahman is not different from oneself and direct cognition of Brahman is not different from oneself and a direct self, though the erroneous
view of self is removed by correct apprehension. As vidyāranya said: "anubhava means a particular mode of the mind which has for its result the intuition of Brahman."¹⁸

This is explained by Sarṅkara and Suresvara by means of an example. When I stand in a row of persons and told that I am the tenth in the row, I directly apprehend myself as the tenth because the percipient (myself) and the object of knowledge (the tenth man) are identical, and the mental mode in the form of the object and the object are in opposition. Similarly when I, who already have an awareness of myself, and told that I am Brahman, there is identity between the knower and what is to be known. This is direct cognition, which is not at all supernormal, for at all times one has an awareness of oneself.

For Sarṅkara intuition or Aparokṣānubhuti may be defined as Brahman-consciousness. The Upaniṣad says that to know Brahman is to become Brahman. It is a state of deep communication of Ātman and Brahman. Aparokṣānubhuti is devoid of any conceptual element when there arises Brahman-consciousness, world consciousness disappears. Brahman consciousness does not suffer any contradiction. Since the subject object dualism is transcended. In this transcendent consciousness, it is wrong to describe it as consciousness of Brahman. It is Brahman consciousness, the fundamental principle of all existence. In this pure consciousness all duality is lost.
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According to Sankara 'Vastutantram' is the criterion of all knowledge but the means of knowledge are varied. The various means of knowledge are powerful and valid in their own respective fields. The one means of knowledge does not contradict another means of knowledge, for it only tells us about those things that cannot be known by any other means. The metaphysics can attain its content only on the right use of the means of knowledge. Sarīkara makes clear distinction between reason and intuition as two different faculties having different scopes and functions. The one dealing with the relative and conditioned and the other with the absolute and unconditioned. Reason therefore, is incompetent to pronounce any judgment upon the affirmations of intuition (anubhava). For Sarīkara anubhava is super logical. Reason by its very nature realizes its incompetency to grasp reality. Sarīkara maintains that neither sense knowledge nor the thought constructions or reason can enable us to grasp reality as there are constant changes and denials in the reports of the senses and reality refuses to be in such changes. Reason is not the final arbiter of truth. There is a super logical way of apprehending truth by intuition (anubhava).

Sarīkara's intuition is not something mysterious but self luminous and with its emergence all duality and darkness disappears. Self or reality shines forth resplendent in its own light. A direct insight into reality is possible only through perception, whether it is external or internal. Sarīkara however excludes sensuous perception (pratyakṣa) from knowledge of the absolute reality ——
Brahman or Ātman. Sensuous perception is according to Śaṅkara useless and irrelevant for a reality which is beyond spatio-temporal determinations. Śaṅkara holds that Brahman although it is of the nature of an already existent reality, cannot be the object of perception and the other means of knowledge. Sense organs, the basis of all perception, cannot grasp the reality, because by their very nature reveal the external things and not Brahman or ultimate reality. Anubhava is the pramana which alone can enable us to have direct access to Brahman or the Absolute reality.

The anubhava of Śaṅkara resembles Spinoza’s scientia intuitiva which is over and above the knowledge of imaginatio (imagination) and reason (ratio). Intuitive knowledge is the knowledge of the existence of the individual things in so far as they reside in God. It is the perception of God in all things and all things in God. To the man possessing intuitive knowledge all things appear in a new perspective. They are perfectly transformed. Intuitive knowledge is knowing God as God knows himself. The anubhava is the divine eye (Divya Chakṣu). It is the consciousness that sees the whole variety of being as residing in the one and as emanating from that one. The man becomes Brahman when such an anubhava takes place. Śaṅkara speaks of such an anubhava as svatmabhava identification with all.

Anubhava consists according to Śaṅkara, in a complete and adequate apprehension of reality. The man who knows reality by such an intuition
(anubhava) becomes reality (Brahmavida Brahmaiva Bhavati). Brahman or reality is nothing but this integral experience. This experience is all embracing and all comprehending. It sees the self in everything and everything in the self. It realizes the presence of God in everything and everything in God. This is the knowledge of the real as real knows itself. Man can possess such an experience (anubhava) only when man becomes one with the real. This knowledge of the real alone constitutes the real knowledge. Sarvākara declares that the goal of all knowledge is anubhava or direct apprehension.

In the light of the discussion given above we now seek to understand the problem of the relation between intellect and intuition as developed by F. H. Bradley (1846–1924), Henry Bergson (1859 – 1941) and Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan (1888–1975).