

सम्परिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरम् इति बृहदारण्यकश्रुतिः (बृ. उ. ४।३।२१) च सुषुप्तेः साक्षात्त्वं निर्वक्ति।

'नाडीषु सुप्तो भवति' (छा. उ. ८।६।३), 'पुरीतति शेते' (बृ. उ. २।१।१९) इत्युभयत्र 'शेते' 'सुप्तः' इति पदद्वयं सुषुप्तिनिदेशकं भवति।

'प्राज्ञः कारणबद्धः-प्राज्ञस्तु बीजभावेनैव बद्धः। तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधमात्रमेव हि बीजं प्राज्ञत्वे निमित्तम्।' इति गौडपादकारिकायां शाङ्करभाष्ये जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः बीजभावत्वं प्राज्ञे वर्तते इति सूचितम्। (मा. का. शा. भा. १।११) 'प्राज्ञः कारणबद्धः-स्वप्नवर्जितककेवलैव निद्रया युत इति कारणात् कारणबद्धः।' (१।१४) इत्यपि तत्र कारिकाभाष्ये सुषुप्त्यधिपः कारणबद्धः इति निर्दिष्टः। 'सुखमहमस्वाप्सं न किञ्चिदवेदिषमिति कारणमात्रोपलभ्यः सुषुप्तिः।' इति कारणबद्धत्वं सुषुप्तेः पुनरपि उद्घुष्यते।

भारतीयदार्शनिकाः सर्वे अवस्थात्रयस्य विचारे ऐकमत्यं भजन्ते। जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिरूपावस्थात्रयविचारस्य इतरसिद्धान्तस्वीकारवत् तद्वत्ताप्रसिद्धिः श्रीशाङ्कराचार्य-तत्पूर्ववर्ति-तदवरवर्तिदार्शनिकैरस्वीकृता। जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तय एव अवस्थात्रयत्वेन प्रथन्ते। जाग्रत्स्वप्नभिन्ना अवस्था सुषुप्तिः। शुद्धा प्रज्ञा तावत् सुषुप्तावेव साक्षादनुभवितुं शक्यते। स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः बीजं भवति सुषुप्तिः अर्थात् सुषुप्तेरेव भवति जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः सञ्चारः। तत्त्वस्य अग्राहकत्वं यत्र तादृक्स्वरूपं सुषुप्तेः अस्ति। सर्वोपरमस्थानं सुषुप्तिः। सवासनान्तःकरणस्य कारणात्मनावस्थाने सति विश्रामस्थानं सुषुप्तिः। इति सुषुप्तिं प्रत्येके अभिप्रायाः अद्वैतवेदान्तपक्षपातिभिः श्रीशाङ्कराचार्यादिभिः उनीताः। सविकल्पकनिर्विकल्पकभेदेन सुषुप्तेः अपि भेदः वर्तते। सुषुप्तिसाक्षित्वेन वर्तमानः प्राज्ञः, स एव कारणबद्धः आनन्दभुक् च। स्वापस्य स्थानं तावत् पुरीतनाडी भवति। सुषुप्तौ जीवस्याद्वैतब्रह्मात्मकत्वं वर्तते। सुषुप्तौ न शून्यता। इत्याद्यनेकप्रकारा विचारणा उपनिषत्सु श्रीशाङ्करगौडपादमधुसूदनसरस्वतीप्रभृतिभिः कृता दृश्यते इत्यतः सुषुप्तिः इति कश्चन सिद्धान्तः अद्वैतवेदान्ते बहुप्राधान्येन सर्वैः स्वीकृतः इति विषये न सन्देहलेशावकाशः। विद्वद्वरशास्त्रचर्चा बह्वी दृश्यते यद्यपि तथापि सुषुप्तिविषये सामाजिकानाम् अस्माकमनुभवः 'सुखमहमस्वाप्सं न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्' इति।

Notes:

1. Karl H. Potter, ed., *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Advaita Vedanta up to Sankara and His Pupils*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi: १९८१, p. 7.
2. छान्दोग्योपनिषत् ६।१८।१९.
3. वेदान्तपरिभाषा, विषयपरिच्छेदः, पृ. १९२.
4. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, tr. *Burahmasutra*, p. 125
5. *Siddhantabindu*, Madhusudana Saraswathy, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1986, p. 19.

GOLEMAN'S CONCEPT OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Lisha C. R.

Psychology was a member of the philosophical family, toward the middle of the 19th century. It suffered from the illusion that it had become fully emancipated from philosophy. Like any other science, psychology is not disjoint from philosophy.

A simple definition of consciousness is awareness: awareness of the world, the body, and the self. 'Consciousness' is not often used in the contemporary literature, though it should be noted that it is originally derived from the Latin *con* (with) and *scire* (to know). Thus, 'consciousness' has etymological ties to one's ability to know and perceive, and should not be confused with conscience, which has the much more specific moral connotation of knowing when one has done or is doing something wrong. Through consciousness, one can have knowledge of the external world or one's own mental states.

Johnson- Laird said that 'no one really knows that consciousness is, what it does, or what function it serves.' It stood at the very center of traditional psychology until it was banished by behaviourism and reflexology.

Daniel Jay Goleman

Goleman was born in 1946 in Stockton, California, the son of Jewish college professors. He received a scholarship from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to attend Amherst College. The Amherst Independent Scholar program allowed him to transfer for his junior year to the University of California at Berkeley. He then returned to Amherst where he graduated *magna cum laude*. He then received a scholarship from the Ford Foundation to attend Harvard University where he received his phd studying under David C. McClelland. He studied in India using a pre-doctoral fellowship from Harvard and a post-doctoral grant from the Social Science Research Council. He wrote his first book based on travel in India and Sri Lanka and then returned as a visiting lecturer to Harvard where during the 1970 his topic of the psychology of consciousness was popular. McClelland recommended him for a job at *Psychology Today* from which he was recruited by *The New York Times* in 1984.

**CASTE AND GENDER PERSPECTIVES
ON THE IDEA OF PURE CONSCIOUSNESS
IN CLASSICAL INDIAN THOUGHT**

Dr. Sharmila R.

Consciousness and its manifestations, to begin with, was a subject of philosophy. With the branching out and development of psychology, consciousness became a subject of psychology and of late, it has become a subject of neuroscience. However, in western philosophy, we do not find any prominent thinker treating 'pure consciousness' as a self-existing ontological entity which transgresses the limits of the body. However, we see a parallel concept of soul in many western medieval thinkers as something akin to ultimate reality and transgressing the limits of the body.

Let us now come to the treatment of pure consciousness in Indian thought. Being the earliest record of literature available for scrutiny, the Rgveda is often portrayed as the first pillar of Indian Philosophy. However, it consists of allurements to various gods and does not seem to promulgate the idea of pure consciousness. But in the Upaniṣads we see the development of the concept of pure consciousness evolving. Pure consciousness is the essence of the 'Self'. In Chandogya Upaniṣad, both *Indra (Deva)* and *Virocana (Asura)* go to *Prajāpathi* seeking knowledge of the self. *Prajāpathi* advises that body itself is the 'Self' and both return satisfied. But doubt comes up in the mind of *Indra* and he returns to *Prajāpathi* and *Prajāpathi* progressively teaches *Indra* that the 'Dreaming Self' is the real Self, that the 'Self in Sleep' is the real self and that bodiless 'Spirit' is the Real Self. The idea is vividly explained in Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad. The 'Self in waking state i.e. *Viśva*' enjoys gross objects, In the dreaming state i.e. *Taijasa*', 'Self' enjoys subtle objects, in the state of sound sleep, there is no object, whether gross or subtle, and hence no subject. Hence in sound sleep, the subject-object duality is transcended and here, the self is in '*Prājña*' state. But even the state of sleep is only a shadow on the Supreme Bliss since the state of sleep is not enjoyed in sleep. Only the power of projection positive bliss is not enjoyed in sleep. The ultimate or fourth state is the unconsciousness remain in sleep. The ultimate or fourth state is the state of 'Pure Consciousness' and like in deep sleep, there is no subject-object duality, but unlike it there is enjoyment of positive bliss.

Ignorance vanishes and the Self shines in its own light as the ultimate subject. This is the '*Turiya*' state. Similar stand point is taken in *Vijñānavāda* Buddhism where Pure consciousness is treated as the Reality against the imperfect world of *Kāma*, *Rūpa* and *Arūpa* (matter, form and no-form) which result from discrimination. In *Sāṅkhya*, we see *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* with diametrically opposite characters. *Prakṛti* is akin to matter but *Puruṣa* is akin to Pure Consciousness. *Puruṣa* by itself is free and pure Consciousness but it enters in to bondage only when it wrongly identifies itself the internal organ of intellect. *Gaudapāda*, agreeing with *Vijñānavādin*s, maintains that the world is ultimately unreal and the ultimate reality is Pure Consciousness. In the Advaita of *Śaṅkara*, it is upheld that Brahman alone is true and that the material world is ultimately an illusion which disappears with gaining of true knowledge. This ultimate reality, i.e. *Ātman/Brahman* is Pure Consciousness (*jñāna-svarūpa*) or Consciousness of the Pure Self (*svarūpa-jñāna*) which is devoid of all attributes (*nirguṇa*) and all categories (*nirviśeṣa*).

Hence we can discern a common thread in all these thoughts. It is that Consciousness is ultimately real and is beyond the world of material objects which is subject to destruction. It is that which remains when all that is material is removed from the world. The very idea of Consciousness or Pure Consciousness in classical Indian philosophy is constructed or projected as the binary opposite of the 'everyday world' and the 'bodily existence'. The only available exception to this idea of consciousness comes from *Cārvaka* school which identifies Consciousness as a property of matter and the Soul as the conscious body. No original texts of *Cārvaka* school is available for scrutiny. The ideas of *Cārvaka* school has come down to the present times through its refutations available in texts written to refute the ideas of this School. Now let us look into the construction of this pure consciousness in classical Indian thought.

Its first character is that pure consciousness is the binary opposite of bodily attributes. Ample quotes to support the maligning of body are available in various Upaniṣads and quoting them are beyond the scope of this paper. (*Maitri*. III-4, *Subala*- IX -4 are conspicuous examples). If a person knows the self as 'I am this,' then wishing what, and for desire of what should he suffer the body? Says *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (IV-4-12). The body has also been depicted by the Upaniṣads as a noxious entity and as an obstruction to the 'Self realizing its true nature of pure consciousness (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka*

SRI BRAHMĀNANDA SWĀMI ŚIVAYOGI'S CONCEPT OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Dr. A. Girija

Srī Brahmānanda Swāmi Śivayogi is the founder of Ānandamata. He is a great philosopher and social reformer. The Philosophy of Swāmiji is as follows:

*ānanda eva vijayate
manḥsvasthata eva ānandaḥ /
manojaya eva mahājayaḥ
ahimsaiva paramo dharmah ||¹*

He was a free thinker. He was a Rājayogi. His teachings have the effect of reawakening.

Consciousness: Philosophical Perspective

Swāmi reminded the teachings of the Bhagavadgīta. The God is in the heart of every being.

Īśvaraḥ sarvabhūtānām hṛddeśe arjuna tiṣṭhati

We are not able to feel this as clearly as the day light. Hiranyakaśipu could not understand this idea when his son Prahlāda told him this. This ignorance of the great Truth made Hiraṇkaśipu a cruel *Asura*, proud of his strength and always sought physical pleasure and more power to achieve it. He was driven by this madness of pride and power because of ignorance or *māyā*.² He could not love his own son when his son tried to correct him. So Hiranyakaśipu was blinded by self-esteem. He considered himself to be the omnipotent. Prahlāda, his son was tortured for advising his father the great Truth that only God is omnipotent and omniscient. This did not change his opinion. The boy was subjected to cruel punishment for his difference in view and his courage in expressing it. This is the story of all those who disagree with those in power who are in the darkness of ignorance and are concerned only with power. They try to impose their opinion on others. The result is oppression and repression using physical violence. But

those who have seen the Truth and are out of the influence of *Māyā* are not intimidated by the cruelty of the wicked. The power in their hands is ephemeral as they themselves are. All that proud claim of false glory of power will be lost in a flash of a second; the moment of recognition of the Truth. This simple story helps us the meaning of the following lines.

*asato mā sadgamaya
tamaso mā jyotirgamaya
mṛtyormā amṛtam gamaya*

The influence of the ignorance on young generation has been creating unrest and terror in different parts of the world. Today it has become the major threat to peace and hindrance to development.³ Every enlightened teacher and ruler in every country has to unite to lead the people from the darkness to the light. Otherwise the final revelation of the truth may be in the form of Narasimha.

Brahmānanda Swāmi wanted to recognise this great truth. He wanted to get rid of the influence of *Māyā* with *Aṣṭāṅgayogayama niyama āsana prāṇāyāma pratyāhāra Dhāraṇā dhyāna samādhiḥ*

The first vibration on the lips of the new born for he mother's milk is similar to the first impulse of energy in the lotus to open its bud at the touch of the Sun's ray.

The Sahasrārapadma (the crest Jewel, the sixth sense) whatever one calls it opens up to enjoy the glory of lasting peace and happiness through self-realization. Higher levels of consciousness and full development of one's innate abilities which are described in ancient texts as *aṇimādi aṣṭasidhi* resulting in the transformation into the next level of evolution of man into superman.

*Bhidhyate hṛdayagranthiḥ cchidyante sarva samśaya
kṣīyante cāśya karmāni.*

Only self realization can bring lasting peace. Man's capacity to escape from his own weakness caused by *Kāma, Krodha, Lobha, Moha* etc., controlling his sense and mind with his intelligence and true knowledge of his self, is to be utilised by early education and daily practice of Yoga.

INQUIRY OF SUBJECTIVITY IN ADVAITA VEDĀNTA: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL APPROACH

Prof. Sreekala M. Nair

One among the brightest stars in the galaxy of world philosophers, Śaṅkara even today, continues to attract the best minds in Academic Philosophy world over. We can agree or disagree with him, but cannot possibly dispose him off and his writings, without countering them, for they stand as formidable positions, difficult to transgress or even bypass. Often thinkers speak of Śaṅkara as a milestone in Indian philosophy, so much so that we speak of pre Śaṅkara and post Śaṅkara periods in Indian philosophical exegesis. Besides for formalizing the Advaita system, he is also remembered for initiating the interpretative tradition that contributed significantly for the growth and evolution of the school of Vedānta.

Historians were perpetually intrigued and troubled with the multifaceted nature of his personality, some even argued that it is impossible for a single individual to hold these divergent traits. For the traditionalists however, Śaṅkara was one who portrayed mutually contradicting personal traits, but all of them finely interwoven, without one demeaning the other. To borrow the words of R. Balasubramanian, a veteran Advaitin of contemporary times, 'He is at once a hard core traditionalist and an amazing down-to-earth realist, a great mystic and a radical, a fascinating idealist and a constructive religious reformer, an uncompromising intellectual and an ardent devotee'.¹ Even though Śaṅkara was forthcoming with innovative ideas that indeed paved the foundation for Advaita system, he claimed no originality, instead he chose to present himself as a mere spokesman of the Upanisadic thought. Granting that the basic ideas in Advaita are not Śaṅkara's inventions, as he himself admits, his originality lies employing the hermeneutics of *Prasthātraya* to establish his chosen position, namely Advaita Vedānta, thus, initiating the commentarial tradition, which later on became a format for all those who intended to advocate new philosophical thinking in Vedāntic tradition.

Śaṅkara's commitment to the tradition is notable and significant and can be elicited from his assertion, *asampradāyavid murkhavadupekṣanīyah*. The in-depth analysis he undertakes of human experience and consciousness is clearly dictated by his commitment to tradition or *sampradāya*. Srinivasa Rao in the volume *Parampara*, exploring the philosophical contributions of Prof. R. Balasubramanian, addresses the issue of subscribing to tradition and its relevance in Advaita system of thought. He says, 'It would be too crude and unacademic to dismiss the appeal to, and the defence of *parampara* or *sampradāya* as a simple exercise in orthodoxy. By that standard, Śaṅkara, who repeatedly invokes the support of the knower of the tradition, (*sampradāyavidah*) would have to be regarded as someone very hopelessly orthodox. There is no work in Indian philosophy I know of where *sampradāya* is mentioned, but mentioned without respect. Therefore, the far too readily done identification of 'tradition' with plain orthodoxy may hold good in the case of certain phases of Western culture, but it fails to apply in the case of India, its history and its culture'.² The supreme position that *Śruti* is endowed with in the system also well depicts Śaṅkara's commitment to the tradition. He would leave out no occasion to reiterate the significance of the interrelation between what I would term as the *T-trio*, the *teacher*, *text* and the *tradition*.³

Self as the Supreme Entity Worthy of Inquiry

If philosophy is essentially inquiry, *Anvīkṣikī*, as it is called in the Indian context, Advaita system can undoubtedly be termed as one, which has undertaken inquiry on a topic that indeed tops in the list of things that are worthy of inquiry, namely the self. One should not miss sight of how Śaṅkara tactfully employs a method by which he first sets out an inquiry to determine that entity, which is worthy of inquiry, and to determine this he resorts to the wisdom rendered by *Śruti*. Note that identifying the metaphysical self as that which is most worthy of inquiry does not amount to demeaning the knowledge of the empirical. The position is somewhat like this:

CONSCIOUSNESS: NYĀYA-VAIŚEŚIKA PERSPECTIVES

Dr. K. G. Kumary

The concept of consciousness is innate in the Vedas. Vedas are the earliest works of Indian thought. The Vedic thoughts especially the pre-Upanisadic thinking can disclose the mystery of the concept of consciousness. We cannot find much of strictly metaphysical speculations in the Vedas except the concept of an imminent and universal reality, which is emerging as the basic unitary principle underlying the forces of the universe. This stream of thought contains latent potentialities of giving rise to the fundamental philosophical problems later on.

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika speaks of many souls, which according to them belong to the category of *dravya* or substances. To the same category also belong seven other substances with equal ontological status: earth, water, fire, air, *ākāśa*, time, space, and *manas* - the last meaning the internal sense organs. The doctrine treats all *dravyas* alike; and even the self, it regards as one object among other possessing properties, exhibiting relations, and knowable like them.¹ But what is the relation of the soul to consciousness?

First, in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy, consciousness is nothing but knowledge or awareness (*jñāna*) in its essentially empirical sense i.e. without the mystical suggestion of the idealists.

Secondly, far from constituting the essence of the soul, consciousness is one of the many qualities or attributes of the soul like desire and volition - qualities from which the existence of the soul is inferred.

Thirdly, even as a quality or attribute, consciousness has a somewhat secondary status. It is not an eternal quality (*nitya guṇa*) but a purely temporal quality (*janya-guṇa*) i.e. produced only under certain specific conditions. This means that the soul is supposed to acquire consciousness only under certain specific conditions; if these are not fulfilled, it cannot have any consciousness at all. By its inherent nature, the soul is thus unconscious or without consciousness. Consciousness is an accidental quality or attribute produced in a soul only when it is conjoined with certain other things.

The Nyāya System advocates a theory of consciousness that is different from the interpretations of the other systems of Indian philosophy. We observe a realistic concept of consciousness in Nyāya system. According to Nyāya, consciousness is a stream of awareness. Consciousness is an accidental property of the soul. The individual soul is the substratum of the quality of consciousness. Consciousness is not essential property of the soul. Here Nyāya differs from the other systems of Indian Philosophy. Nyāya regards the soul as a real knower, a real enjoyer and a real active agent and an eternal substance. But the soul is not transcendental consciousness. Nyāya admits that consciousness results through the self's connection with the mind and body. Consciousness is an accidental attribute of the self, the accident being its relation to the body.²

Consciousness has been considered as an essential attribute of the soul in other systems, and it is said that without consciousness, the soul cannot be distinguished from matter. Nyāya clearly asserts that the stream of consciousness is separate from the self and it is just embedded on the self. The self is the witness, but not involved in the stream of consciousness. Consciousness cannot subsist without a certain locus. Therefore, the self is not consciousness as such, but a substance having consciousness as its attributes. The soul that is