

abbot of the monastery and other Bonpos the false story of the landowner came to surface. Now, the people of nearby villages participate in the death rituals of the Bonpos and the Bonpo priests are also called on by the local people to perform the death rituals. Whenever religious functions are celebrated in the monastery all the local people are also invited to participate. Some of the professors of Dr. Yaswant Singh Parmar University of Horticulture, Solan are also invited to attend the function. These functions are an important part of the monastery's activities whose daily, monthly and annual timetable is marked by a regular series of rituals, performed by the monks. Additional rites are also performed on the demand of the local people.

The Bonpos are also propagating ideal ways for the local people to lead a happy and prosperous life. The latter have stopped meat-eating and taking alcohol and developed greater faith and devotion towards the Bonpos. Even the wives of local people are discouraging their husbands from taking alcohol. Thus, the Bonpos have contributed towards the spiritual development of the local society.

BIMALENDRA KUMAR  
Vishva Bharati  
Shantiniketan

### The Advaitic Ontology and its Epistemological Foundation

'Is-Ought' problem is very popular among the Moral philosophers specially in the West. They try to dilute the dichotomy between 'Is' and 'Ought' or the actual and the ideal as well as fact and value with the help of Hedonistic Ethics and Kantian Ethics.

Bradley among the critics of Western Ethics makes a very pertinent observation about the incompleteness of both these Ethics. Hedonistic Ethics is pleasure for the sake of pleasure which by and large rests on Psychological Hedonism. This is merely the statement of a fact and which through subterfuge is merely raised to the status of a moral ideal. Actually it presents the 'Is' without 'Ought'. So being one sided it is unable to preserve both 'Is' and 'Ought'.

Kantian ethics which is duty for the sake of duty is also one sided in the sense that it presents the 'Ought' without the 'Is'. This remains an ideal which has no moorings in actuality. This was also observed by W.H. Urban in 'Kant and Modern Axiology' when he says that in

Kant's philosophy, value predominates reality (*The Heritage of Kant*).

After making his observation on the incompleteness of both these ethics, Bradley attempts to solve this problem. Religious experience is suggested by him as a solution to the problem. But Bradley himself finds it inadequate because God in his philosophy is appearance, for God without a devotee has no meaning. If this is so, then God becomes relational and anything relational is appearance and not reality. Even in self-realization this gap between the 'Is' and the 'Ought' cannot be closed. Hence in his 'My Station and its Duties', Bradley concludes that even in self-realisation this dichotomy remains. This to him, remains a regret. Hence, there is asymptotic relation between the real and the ideal. For this reason, Bradley is seen to maintain in his Ethical Studies that morality is an endless process.

The problem which remains unsolved in Western philosophy finds a solution in the Advaitic philosophy of Sankara. In Sankara's philosophy, the Ultimate Reality – Brahman – is a complete unity of the actual and the ideal. And for this reason the Atman has been identified with Brahman and Brahman has been defined as *saccidananda*. It is a total, inseparable, inalienable unit of the ontological category called *sat* and the moral category called *ananda* and in between these two pervades a light, the *cit*, which is intelligibility supreme, not lighted by another light but such as is of the nature of self-luminosity. Atman of Advaita Vedanta is as of illumination at the higher level, as of value at the crest of things.

GAURI MUKERJEE  
University of Allahabad  
Allahabad

### *Bhakti and Prapatti as Expounded in Śrīvacanabhūṣaṇam*

In Śrīvaiṣṇavism, *bhakti* and *prapatti* are considered to be *upāyas*, the means to attain *upeya*, the goal, i.e., *mokṣa*. Piḷḷai Lokācārya (1205-1311 A.D.) wrote *Śrīvacanabhūṣaṇam* in which the theology and philosophy of the system are discussed with the authorities. Maṇavālamāmuni (1370-1443 A.D.) wrote a commentary upon the text in which he incorporates his own views along with the traditional belief for more clarity.

To the system the self is eternally as subservient and dependent imbued with the Lord. It does not have an independent status to