

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

protect by itself and to make efforts for its own emancipation (*pāratantriyam*). The self before the Lord could be metaphorically inferred as servant (*dāsa*) to Him, the Master. It, as *śeṣa*, should feel that its essence is for the sake of *Śeṣi's* enjoyment in which it becomes the object to be enjoyed by Him (*svarūpayāthātmyābhāvam*). When the self follows the *upāya*, it should completely surrender to the wish of the Lord (*Paragataśvīkāram*). It should think that the Lord Himself is the *upāya* which is already a fulfilled one and accompanied by its existence (*siddhōpāya*).

Śrīvacanabhūṣaṇam verifies that, since the self has to follow the *upāya* without destroying its *svabhāva*, the *bhakti* form is not suitable. To substantiate it, Piḷḷai Lokācārya and Maṇavālamāmuni systematically analysed, the demerits of *bhakti*: (i) It destroys the *svabhāva*: since *bhakti* induces egotism in the self, the self would not have the chance to attain a spiritual abode but it will collapse the nature of the self itself. (ii) It creates a danger: since *bhakti* is practised out of self effort, it dangerously destroys the self's *pāratantriyam*. (iii) It creates fearfulness: since the devotee knows the danger of the other *upāyas*, he fearfully requests the Lord not to avoid him by granting other *upāyas* because due to its egoistic content, it drags the self away from the Lord's Abode. (iv) It generates suffering. The other *upāyas* due to their demerits cause suffering to the devotee. (v) It stimulates egotism. If a drop of liquor is poured into pure water, it becomes impure. Similarly, though *bhakti* in one sense seems to be perfect, it becomes impure because of its egotistical tendencies. (vi) *Upeya* is not equal to *upāya*. Certain island people usually exchanged rubies for shells because they used to wear only the latter as jewellery. But this did not make the two equal. In the same manner, though the Lord satisfies in *bhakti* and grants the *upeya*, the *upāya* is not valued as equal to it. (vii) It maintains its lower status. Even if the ruby for shell is acceptable, the devotee has nothing to reciprocate for the Lord's Grace. Since the devotee's whole being is the property of God, he as a dependent has to prostrate before Him. Out of ignorance the devotee assumes that the Lord's property is his own and tries to offer the same even to Him. So the truth value behind *bhakti* is lower and meaningless.

By evaluating the *upāyas*, Piḷḷai Lokācārya and Maṇavālamāmuni confirmed that *prapatti* is aptly correlated to the *svābhāva*, *pāratantriyam* and *svarūpayāthātmyābhāvam* of the self. This is because in it there is no trace of egotism. It is so simple because in it the responsibility hails not on the part of the devotee but on the part of the Lord, where the Lord gets eternal pleasure by initiating,

activating and inviting the self to His spiritual domain.

The views derived from the discussion above could be a desideratum to the current problems faced by the individual with respect to his worldly affairs. If an individual practises *prapatti*, it is well and good; if not, by abrogating egotism, he will be standing as *stithaprajñā*, the man of steadfast character, whose mental balance will not be disturbed against the opposites of success or failure, good or bad, etc., and he will discharge his duties with the sense of 'duty for deity sake' instead of 'duty for duty sake'. If it is so, the restrictions among the individuals to understand each other could be minimised and through this the societal differences would be amicably settled.

J. RANGASWAMI
Tamil University
Thanjavur