

A STUDY OF DREAMS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF SRĪ RĀMĀNUJA

Dream in the Veda

It has been said that much of what passes for Indian Psychology is speculative and mystical and not experimental; that it is, more often than not, primitive and anthropomorphic and superstitious. It is certainly true to say that more speculation in psychology, as in everything else, is false. The question is whether there could be any speculation apart from experience; though it is true to say that the experience that we start with should be first tested and carefully studied. The facts alone are the final arbiters of any theory, and no theory that does not stand the test of experience can be considered to be true at all. The experience that is the test of all truth, the *vyavahāra* that is the final arbiter of any knowledge, is not the uneducated statement but statement that has been made after due understanding of experience, carefully sifted and analysed and synthesized. Scientific observation, thus, is the essence of any theory. Indian Psychologies of Dream are prompted by the

question regarding the autonomy of the psychical life. What is the special characteristic of dream-life? A question similar to this was addressed by Prof. Hollingworth to his study of the psychology of Thought from the stand-point of dream-life. This question is very significant, since it seeks to discover the special characteristic of dream-life. There are several views and no one formula seems to fit in with facts. In this paper, at the very start, let me dispel the illusion of one formula or explanation underlying most theories.

The Indian Psychology of Dreams naturally takes its start from the Vedic period. The first view that we glean regarding dreams is from the Rgveda. The dreams are manifestations of evil spirits, and they are said to be removed by the activity of spirits that dispense justice, of spirits of magic. The earnest devotee prays to Lord Varuna to protect him from the activities of evil spirits¹.

This is not the only view however. Dreams are said to be due to the manifold activities of the mind itself "Avaunt, thou master of mind, depart and vanish far away. Look on destruction far from hence. The live man's mind is manifold."² (Rg veda X. 16.) The suggestion that mind has manifold functions that it executes in all states, is valuable psychological insight. But there is the fear of being under the influence of dreams. However pleasant in parts, they were deemed to be placing the individual

¹ Yo me rājan yujyo vā sakhā vā, svapne bhayam bhīrave mahyamaha |
Steno vā yo dipśati no vṛko, tvam tasmād Varuṇa pāhyasmān ||

(Rg Veda II.28.10)

² Apohi manasapatepa krāma paraścara |
Paro nirṛtyā cakṣva bahudhā jīvato manaḥ ||

under the influence of external forces. "Even if, O child of Heaven, it makes a garland or chain of gold, the whole bad dream, whatever it be, to Trita Āptya, we consign. " (Rgveda VIII. 47.15). There is as yet not the consciousness that they are dream-creations of one's own making. It is just possible that such an idea did not find a place in their psychology. But that these dreams were held to be, in some sense, results of their own bad actions is clear, since the appeal is to the Lord of Rta, the Law-giver, and they also prayed to Him to transfer their evil dreams to those who deserve it, namely, the evil-doers.

This view finds full expression in the incantations of the Atharvaveda. Dreams are fashioned in sleep. Sleep thus becomes the embryo of dreams. It is the source, the *yoni* of all dreams. In other words, it is during the period of sleep, when all the senses are lulled, and when one is alone with one's psychic being, the buddhi or antaḥkaraṇa, there happens the influences of other psychic forces. It is the influence of psychic forces that leads to dream-consciousness or experience. As the Atharvaveda says, it is then that there happens within the individual stimulations of the vital forces, the lair of the asuras, as the expressive phrase runs.

1. □ Out of Yama's world best thou come hither: with mirth (?) dost thou, wise, make use of mortals; knowing, thou goest in alliance with the solitary one, fashioning sleep in the lair (yoni) of the Asura.
2. The all-vigorous bond saw thee in the beginning, in the one day before the birth of night; from thence, O sleep, didst thou come hither, hiding thy form from the physicians.
3. He of great kine (?) turned unto the gods away from the Asuras, seeking greatness; to that sleep the three-and-thirty ones, having attained the sky, imparted over-lordship.
4. Not the Fathers, and not the gods, know it, whose murmur goes about within here; in Trita Aptya did the men, the Ādityas taught by Varuṇa, set sleep.
5. Of whom the evil-doers shared the cruelty, the well doers, by non-sleep, (shared) the pure (puṇya) lifetime,-thou revelest in the shy with the highest relative; then wast born out of the mind of the practising fervour.
6. We know all thine attendants (?) in front; we know O sleep, who is thine overruler here; protect us here with the glory of the glorious one; go thou away far off with poisons " (A. V. XIX. 56. trans. Whitney).

One fact that has to be noted is that the word *svapna* meant two things, the state of sleep as well as what it contains, the dreams. Therefore in the whole Hymn above quoted, we have to understand sleep in its two-fold connotations.

The first verse tells us that sleep which simulates death, is a creation of Yama, the lord of death, and fashions sleep in the places of action, that is, creates rest and stoppage of action.

The second verse shows that the nature of sleep and dream could not be discovered by the physicians, and though outer symptoms are lacking, yet there is full activity of the mind in dream-sleep.

The third verse takes us further into the nature of the dream-sleep. He, who is possessed of powers instead of using the exteriorly-turned waking forces and sense-organs, now began to use the Gods, the creative energies within, seeking greatness, being more than these. The power that made these dream-creations is something over and above the psychic powers or forces interior to the individual.

The fourth verse describes the nature of the inward action of that Power that seeks greatness through them, about whom neither the fathers, nor the gods know. It is in the Trita *Āptya*, the men taught by Varuṇa, the lord of *Rta*, set sleep. This is indeed very abstruse since the *Ādityas* as the shining ones taught by Varuṇa, are said to have placed sleep in Trita *Āptya*. The symbolism implicit in this species of Gods needs further elucidation. They belong to the level of the highest inner state of deep sleep, of *suṣupti*. The other term referring to the gods called *Dvita* is related to the Trita god in some as yet un-understood symbolic manner.

The fifth verse is indeed very significant. The evil-doers were created to enjoy cruelty, and the well-doers the non-dream, and they reached the plane of consciousness which rightly belongs to the Highest, Such a highest state has occurred as a consequence of pure deeds and self control-practicing fervour means such self control and a life-time of *puṇya*.

The last verse clearly reveals that the over-ruler here is the Glorious one, the one who sought out the gods leaving the *asuras*, in order to manifest his Greatness.

The next hymn where there is reference to the dreams is a magician's incantation to make dreams trouble the mind of the God-reviler, the mocker, of one who is not of us that is to say who is our foe. Therein Sleep is described as the □embryo of the wives of the gods, instrument of Yama□! , the excellent dreams being the progeny of the creative forces, namely, the gods. The evil dream is cast out and sent to those who are foes.

Embryo of the wives of the gods, instrument of Yama, excellent dream; evil (dream) that is mine, that do we send forth to him that hates us." (A.V.XIX. 57.3)~

The next verse that follows this is admittedly a difficult one for which Prot Whitney does not stand surety for correctness. His translation runs after amendations made by him thus:--

" Thee that are 'harsh' by name, mouth of the black-bird (śakuni)-- thee, O sleep, we thus know completely; do thou, O sleep, as a horse a halter, as a horse a girth, scatter him who is not of us, the God-reviler, the mocker."

The important part is 'the mouth of the blackbird *kṛṣṇaśakuni*'. The inner meaning of the blackbird is that it is a sign of omens too. The word *śakunam* indeed proves that the art of prediction took its cut from the signs of birds. The dark omen predicted by the dreams is a favourable interpretation of the passage. Further, sleep, like a horse that throws off its halter and releases itself from its girth, scatters the evil dreams. There is thus freedom granted to the dreamer to shake himself off from the limitations of his evil dreams and to enjoy good ones.

The fifth verse prays that the God-reviler, the mocker, one who is not of us, may wear the evil dreams, as if it were a necklace.

The last verse is again very abstruse and is a magical formula.

Our tentative study of the Vedic concept of sleep-dream shows that the distinctions between light sleep and deep sleep was made by the seers, and whilst deep sleep was almost like death, light sleep was the period of enjoyment of good and bad dreams. The creative power that works in dreams is the God's power, which seeks His greatness after abandoning the powers of *Prāṇa* or *asura*, and takes up the task of creating god-like creations in sleep. The magical formula in the fifty- seventh hymn of the Atharva-veda is the statement of the principle that *Mantra* can make the dreams pass over to others. But the power that must be made to do this is undoubtedly the Supreme Lord of *Ṛta*. He could be appealed to only through prayer and *mantric* incantation.

The human being is constantly under the control of the powers, external to him, internal to him and External experiences of objects as well as internal of the powers of the shining beings. *ādityas*, gods, manifested in dreams, are prophetic or pleasant, fear-striking and terrific and evil according to the Law of *Varuṇa*, who is the Moral Dispenser of Justice.

The psychological theory of dream gets an ethical justification here. There is realization of ends or the results of such desires as have been made in the waking state under the moral dispensation of the Lord. Moral causality thus is in the forefront. Secondly, the power of dream creation is relegated to the psychic powers independent of the individual. We are here in the land of theocracy. The reason is not far to seek. It is because these thinkers found themselves helpless. They could not get their own wills to create what they wished for. The dream refused to fall into their scheme of what is good, and man experiences both evil and good dreams, despite of himself. If he were to be the creator he would never dream a bad dream at all, as his

own prayer to Lord Varuṇa reveals. That no physician can cure the evil dreams, is another fact that makes him conceive of dreams, good as well as bad, as creations of forces other than himself. He is however aware that they come to him because of his evil mind and action, and prays therefore that in return to his being good, God would "scatter them to their foes, like the horse its halter, like the horse its girth."

The Dream-theory of Sri Rāmānuja is almost similar to the view propounded above.

II

Dream in the Upaniṣads

The above theory is accepted by the Upaniṣads, though, there is more elaboration. The question is whether it is the individual soul who creates, imagines, or God who creates through His greatness, mahima, His splendour and His justice.

In the upaniṣads we have many references to dreams. It is the stage known as the intermediate state. Sāndhyam ṛtīyam svapnasthānam (Brh Up. IV. 3.). In this stage Yājñavalkya says there is self-projection.

□ He projects for himself tanks, lotus-pools, streams, for he is the creator □ (IV. 3. 10); □ He makes many or God who creates is the stage known as forms for himself □ (13); "He goes wherever he pleases" (12); "It is his private pleasure-ground" (14)

In the Chāndogyaopaniṣad, (VIII. 10. 1.) it is mentioned that,

"He moves about happy in dream. He is the self

That is the Immortal, the fearless, that is Brahman."

In the praśnopaniṣad, (IV 5.) we have the statement that in dream or sleep God experiences greatness as we saw in Atharva-veda XIX. 56, 3.

There in sleep that God experiences greatness. Whatever object has been seen, he sees again, has been heard, he hears again. That which has been severally experienced in different places and regions, he severally experiences again and again. Both what has been seen and what has not been seen, both what has been heard and what has not been heard, both what has been experienced and what has not been experienced, both the real (*sat*) and the unreal (*asat*) he sees all. He sees it

himself being all."

This passage is crucial in the explanation of the theory of self-projection and self-creativity. It promises to explain all dreams, as if they were representations or reproductions of objects of the waking-state in the state of sleep with such additions as will display its greatness. But the last sentence clinches the whole description with the sentence " He sees it himself being all." This has more relevantly reference to the Supreme Being who is All, and not to one who imagines oneself to be god, and all. The explanation of the passage accordingly should be that though the imagery be those that have been once seen, heard and tasted and felt by the individual, their recurrences in his consciousness are nor by any means due to the activity of himself but due to the Divine Being, who is the Inner Ruler Immortal. The reality of the dream as well as its prognosticating or prophetic nature (non-existent or *asaṭ* nature) are due to the will of the Lord, who is the Master of all Reality and Power of creative *māyā*. The Kaivalyopaniṣad says however that the good and evil enjoyment is due to the individual's creation only, of his own world: Svapnesa jivaḥ sukhaduḥkhabhoktā svamāyayā kalpitaviśavaloke....." (Kaivalya Up. 13).

But how could the individual create for himself anything so hopelessly miserable as these dreams, and then seek to transcend these by annihilating all? It may be that dreams of fear and evil are creations of ignorance. With an ignorance coupled with a state of utter loss of consciousness when one is helpless, can any one create anything? Some thinkers deem it possible, because, following the general principle enunciated by the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad*, they refer the *Taijasa* activity of the second plane to the individual soul and not to the universal Self. But such a reference, whilst, at first looks right and flattering to the individual, is not seen to be correct. The creators of dream, even according to modern psychologists, are not the individual's imaginative wills but some force, described as Elan Vital, Unconscious, libido or some other deep and primitive force that seeks to make man regress into animal life in dreams. This is not the individual's nature taken as such, but what in his biological adventure, he has gathered as the heritage of evolution, which it is his conscious aim to disgorge and transcend. Undoubtedly, this has its modern touch, the egoistic touch, but the explanations of the dreams, despite the fact that some dreams are explained by some recessive experiences or, by some deep and unexplained complexes and repressions, are on the whole as much speculative in their explanations as the ancient view that refers these to psychic forces or Force which is of the moral Lord-Self within the individual. Infinite capacity for a finite mind is the paradox that results from the theory which holds that dreams are individual self-creations.

The physiological aspect of dreams is dealt with in the minor *upaniṣads*. *The Paingalopaniṣad* says that the *Svapna*-state is that in which the senses are at rest, and wherein there is manifestation of the knower and the known along with the

affinities of (things enjoyed in) the waking state: Kāraṇoparame jāgrat-samskārtaprabodhavad grāhya-grāhaka rūpasphuraṇam svapnavasthā bhavati. (II. 12.)

This clearly supports the view that the contents of the dream-experiences are sensory, and are nothing new because they are already experienced. But nonexperienced features or correlations or suggestions might crop up in the dreams. These must be conceived to be due to the power of the inward Ruler Immortal, who dispenses moral deserts for each individual.

The *Śārīrakopaniṣad* lays stress on the fact that the senses, internal as well as external, are inactive, though the *antaḥkaraṇa* which consists of memory, affinities, selfness and *buddhi*, is active in dream-state :-Antaḥkaraṇa catuṣṭayaireva samyuktaḥ svapnaḥ(14)

This does not conflict with the view already enunciated. Though the organism which is utilised in dream experiences is identical with that used during waking state, the spirit that uses it, is not the individual self but its Inner Lord, who is also the Lord of all souls, *sarvaniyāntā*.

The *Śārvasāropaniṣad* declares that in dream the *ātman* experiences subtly through the fourteen organs (the five organs of knowledge and the five motor organs and the four fold *antaḥkaraṇa*) associated with the affinities of the waking-condition, sound, and other objects which are of the form of affinities, created for the time being, even in the absence of (gross) sound and others: Tadvāsānāsahitaiś caturdaśa karaṇaiḥ sabdādyabhāve'pi vāsānāmayāñchabdā-din yadopalabhate tadātmanah svapnam (4)

This view is clearly understandable as granting a physio-logical basis for the sensory reproduction of past experiences.

The *Varāhcopaniṣad* (II. 61) declares that "The moving about of *buddhi* in the subtle *nādis* constitute the dreaming state. In me without the act of moving about, there is no dreaming.":

Sūkṣmanāḍīṣu sañcāro buddeḥ svapnaḥ prajāyate |

Sañcārarahite mayi svapno na vidyate ||

This is a description of dream, not as the state of utter inaction and fatigue or rest, but as a state of dynamic movement or exploratory activity of the self in its cognitive experience, namely, *buddhi* exclusively,

The *Hamsopanīṣad* says that the dream occurs when the jīva moves on the pericarp of the heart-lotus, and when it enters the centre of the lotus, then there is deep sleep. This merely substantiates the view that it is during the period of the soul's moving out of its 'lair of deep sleep' that there happens dream. The intermediate state mentioned by the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* is recapitulated in terms of mystic description of the heart-lotus as the place of Īśvara, as is spoken of in the *Bhagavad gita*.

The *Maitryopanīṣad* propounds the view that "In the three a quarter of Brahma moves, a three quarter in the last. For the sake of experiencing the true and the false, the great Atman has a dual nature. Yea ! the great *Ātman* has dual nature."

The *Maṇḍūkya* affirms the greatness of Brahman in the *Svapna*-state. The state is entirely subjective, but it is not the individual subject who is the creator. That function indeed belongs to the Supreme. For in this dream state there is duality of subject and object.

The Kaṭopanīṣad states that "He who is awake in those who sleep.....That is the Bright, That is Brahman, That alone is Immortal. All worlds are contained in it and no one goes beyond:"

Ya yeṣa suptesu jāgarti kāmam kāmam puruṣo nirmimānaḥ Tadeva śukram tadbrahma tadevāmṛtaam ucyate ITasmin lokāḥ śritaḥ sarve tadu nātyeti kaścana! Etadvai tat.

This clinches the issue about the discussion between the individual and the Supreme Being as to who the creator is. As for the physiological state of the organism during sleep and the psychic apparatus in action during sleep and dream, there is nothing that prevents the individual experiencing directly the psychic external forces, and certainly there is nothing that prevents the individual soul from experiencing any experiences granted to it by its own inner and yet transcendent Ruler.

III

Dream in Śrī Rāmānuja's Philosophy

We shall see in the following pages that Śrī Rāmānuja holds the view that dream-state is a state intermediate, that it is the period of experiencing moral deserts, that the creations are by the Supreme Lord for the enjoyment of the individual soul as reward for such activities as are of minor importance, that it is that which leads to the deep sleep-state. The prophetic quality in dreams such as are mentioned in the

Chāndogyapaniṣad is due to the characteristic activity of the Supreme."

The intermediate states is described by the Brhadāranyakoniṣad(IV. iii. 1) thus " There are no chariots in that state, no horses, no roads; then he creates chariots, horse and roads. There are no blessings, happiness, joys and so on. For he is the creator."

To whom does this power to create belong? The *Vedānta sūtra* (III.ii.2) states the pūrvapakṣa that the individual soul is the creator (III.ii.2.). The next sūtra refutes it, and says that these dreams are due to *Māyā*, are created by the Lord through His *Māyā*. The supreme person, and not the individual soul, is the creator, for the individual is a creature and not a creator. He who is awake in those who sleep, He is the person who creates all. The dream is not illusory experience. It is a real experience. It has a meaning and an ethical purpose. The *Māyā* 'transforms' the experiences and makes them more or less pleasing to the individual. This transformation is not wrought by ignorance but by intelligence that is just and good. The theory of Mahimā, greatness, is identical with the theory propounded regarding *Māyā*. It is the activity of the Supreme Lord through His creative power of great wonder and power. It is not an illusion-causing power, though such indeed may be the power of a blinding excellence and transcendent effect. It is a phrase that expresses wonder, *āścaryavācī* conveying the sense of superior power. It is true that the individual might experience this *Māyā* in a two-fold manner, one being an experience of wonder, and another of illusion.

Further the individual self being bound, cannot do anything. It is through his growing sense of intelligence that he could, in some measure, reach up to creativity, till finally, on release from his body as well as all material connection, he becomes, though not master of *Māyā*, at least capable of creating something by the grace of the Lord. *It is fundamental to all creativity that he who creates must have divine intelligence, The unconscious can create nothing not even dreams.* It is said that the slighted dream protests more vigorously than the objects of the waking-state, but at least in waking state the individual is in exercise of his limited intelligence and consciousness, whereas in sleep he is unconscious. The dreams that occur to such an individual, according to Sri Rāmānuja, could only be there that the Lord wills him to experience through his own psychic apparatus (of which also He is the Lord). The individual's capacity being utterly limited, and the dream-experiencer being avowedly far beyond his awakened and waking capacities, it is necessary to affirm that the Supreme Lord alone can grant him such visions. Therefore dreams partake of the quality of visions and not of hallucinations. This is a very important difference. That some of these experiences might be such that have been reviewed by the individual, or so made to be reviewed by the Lord, is due to the important moral appeal and retributive nature of those dreams. But there are dreams of prophetic quality, dreams such as almost any Hindu knows, and about which there is sufficient literature in

almost all religions, which are said to convey the commands of God. The whole literature of Āṅgīrās is full of such experiences. It is true that these dreams require careful study. But one thing is certain, these dreams become true. Individual's dreams can never have, despite intense *sañcalpa* or volition or desire, this realising quality. As a matter of fact individual creative imagination has a de-realizing quality. That deep volitions could invade dreams is not unlikely, but that they should get realization is not due to intensity or to overtaking things by storm, but because their sources are adṛṣṭa, unknown, in the words of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika. If we ask what this unknown principle is, we find that it is a cloak to hide ignorance. Rightly Sri Rāmānuja says that the creator of reality being the Supreme Lord, the dream creations are creations of the Lord, granting pre-pleasure and hopes of realization. It is not wish-fulfillment, for indeed the individual soul is a beggar who wishes to ride. " That which depends on one's own wish can have no prophetic quality: and as ill-fortune is not desired, the dreamer would create for himself only such visions as would indicate good fortune. Hence, the creation which takes place in dreams can be the Lord's work only ".(Sri-Bhāṣya III. ii. 6.) Svapnādhyāyāvīdaśca svapnam śubhāśub ayossūcakam ācakāte. Sūcakatvam ca svasañ-kalpāyattasya nopapadyate; tathā cā śubhasyāniṣṭat vācchubhasya sūcakameva śṛṣṭvā paśyet. Atah svapne śṛṣṭir; iśvareṇaiva kṛṭa.

Thus the arguments for the dreams being creations of the individual being baseless, since much of what an individual deems to be his imaginations come to him with an objectivity and reality and transcendence not traceable to him, though they are expressed or presented in terms that he could personally more than any other understand, the creative activity of the Lord through His Mirya is clearly determined. Further, the state of his psychic life during dreams, precludes his creatorship since he is more a receiver of impressions than the maker of them. He might even be the hero, as he is intended to be, of his dreams, but that does not mean that he is the creator of himself. The dreams have the nature of being the fruits of the individual's actions; they are the results of his *karma* in his waking-state, the fruits that are daily dispensed, since they refer to minor deeds.

We can now sum up the Indian Dream psychology according to Sri Rāmānuja.

1. A finite, unintelligent or ignorant being, and asleep, can create nothing not even self-delusions and illusions. An infinite Being, absolutely intelligent and eternally awake, alone can create Reality that is Sat because it is *cit* and *ānanda*, the creative sign of Perfection and utter transcendence. (*Tait-Up Ānadavallī*). Reality is made or created by Īśvara only. None else except those whose intelligence is informed by the Lord and who have got rid of their material natures and bodies can ever create anything that is real.

2. In the universal function of creation as whole there is no place for the individual. (Sri-Bhāṣya vol. 1. 2,) The self-illusive power is one of ignorance. But it cannot be called creation or manifestation because its function is to hide, to veil, and not to manifest. The entire real creative activity, *jagadvyāpara* is of the Lord: as it is in Prakṛti or Nature, so it is in the case of dreams, which are creations within the individual.
3. All dreams are real, because they are not subjectively called by oneself. They have prophetic character as well as ethical justification, They evoke feelings of joy and sorrow and ecstasy and pleasure. Good dreams leave after-results of bodily fitness, whilst evil dreams leave one physically weak.
4. In so far as the individual becomes self-controlled and participates in the life of the Divine and leads a moral life of self-consecration and self-surrender to the Divine, he would get himself freed from evil dreams. And if his moral life increases in its intensity, the dreams themselves lead to real experiences. That is to say, the true dreams, dreams that are bridges to reality, occur. Such a man's dreams become true. Mind becomes the bridge to the supreme consciousness. When the dream is said to happen at twilight, the sandhya, between the waking and the deep sleep, between the jāgrat and the suṣupti, what is suggested is that it leads to the ultimate transcendence which is by way of making the consciousness in dream essentially receptive of the Divine Creative manifestation within oneself, a creative manifestation that is at once of joy and bliss, of reality, and prophetic of the future.
5. In the quiet recipient mind alone there happens, and can happen, true creation; it is then that it is the "pleasure ground" of the Lord. In that, Bliss is the Master. Dreams are true and objective and are essentially moral deserts of minor actions, good and bad.

This is the conclusion that Sri Rāmānuja arrives at. Without taking into consideration the mainly theological explanation of the dream-state given by Sri Rāmānuja and limiting our criticism to two fundamental postulates of the theory of dreams propounded by him, we find that:

(i) Not all dreams are of the prophetic type. It may be that the prophetic type of dream is the dream that would be really true and valuable for human conduct. It may be that we ought to demand of our dream-experience more and more conformity to this type. The fact that our normal experience does not conform to this one type is sufficient criticism against its complete acceptance.

(ii) The second type of dream is that of retributive nature. This retributive view might be held in one of two ways or even both, according to the intensity of

conscience at work in dream-states.

Dreams might be reactions, terrific and explosive, of waking conscious behaviour, as in the case of Lady Macbeth, Richard III, or even as in so many cases of murderers, where sweet sleep refuses to come in to drown the impressions and leaves them in night-mares. The dream nightmares are sufficient punishments for misbehaviour. What hallucinations are to waking life, that is nightmare to the dream life.

That the reactions are certainly not the autonomous compensations of the nervous system or individual's conscience, is certain. Explanations are not wanting in referring this to the social 'super-ego', and other such mythical entities. The *Karma* theory of retributive justice wherein there is not only a code of penalties for transgressions but also rewards for conformities and good behaviour, is capable of explaining the principle of retributive dream. The only rub is that the Dream penal Code is not available any where. We feel in our hearts the presence of the law. We perhaps have sufficient belief in God's justice and Goodness to feel that right shall have its rewards and wrongs their punishments; but the law of retributive action is the law that is beyond our understanding in so far as actual Connections between punishments and their causes are concerned. The theory that general happiness and m general deterioration of consciousness resultl from good or bad deeds is not acceptable at least in the sphere of dream interpretation.

Further, the moral theory of dream as deserts for minor mis-demeanours or good offices is quite welcome, only the language of recompense and retribution is speculative and appears to be unreal. It remains a mystery how *Caraka* was able to link up certain dreams with diseases of a particular kind and certain other dreams with successes and recovery. For that matter, the *Chāndogya's* interpretation of dream of woman as meaning success is also inexplicable. Perhaps the only truth behind these is that these theories are due to the 'consensus of opinion' at that date. Varying cultural environments lead to varieties of interpretations.

The eloquent tribute that Prof. C. G. Jung pays to Indian psychological insight bears reproduction here. "Our western air of superiority in the presence of Indian Understanding- is a part of our essential barbarism, for which any true perception of the quite extraordinary depth of those ideas and their amazing psychological accuracy is still but a remote possibility."³

Despite this, it is clear that the distinction between the inner creative power of the Divine and the individual is not clearly marked out by these thinkers. At any rate,

³ Psychological Types P.262.

we find that the symbolism⁴ underlying the several interpretations leaves much scope for future research. The general principle that no creation of the real experience ever happens without real power or creative power endowed with intelligence is absolutely correct. Illusions might be created by individuals, due to their individual defects of the organism, excitement, or due to really existing similarities in the objects enjoyed. The hallucinatory theory of dreams is not warranted by facts of the normal order. To explain the normal by means of the abnormal is a modern hobby; but the normal is a more complex phenomenon than what the one-sided theories originating from the sphere of the abnormal make it out to be,

Even granting that some dreams are no better than illusions, we might say that the dreams are real, because they have real causes. Physical stimuli, psychological stimuli, moral causes, psychical influences in the receptive state of dream are real and do actually produce results. Dreams possess causes and have certain definite ends: either to be defensive mechanisms, or to be the moral fields realizing happiness or sorrow for the individual. Anything that has a cause and a consequence or end is real. Dreams undoubtedly possess this characteristic. It may be contended that another criterion of reality might vitiate this view. But what else is the criterion of reality? It cannot be momentariness or non-eternity merely. Dreams are necessarily links between several planes of consciousness and possess diverse qualities or phenomena, namely, (1) facts of the presentative order, (2) of the representative order, (3) of the creative order and (4) of the physiological order. Therein lies the difficulty of giving a single interpretation for these phenomena. Sri Rāmānuja's view in so far as it focusses attention on the moral and the prophetic views, which clinch the issue between the individual and the Divine creationisms, is a contribution to the study of further possibilities of a truly creative consciousness. It is not ruled out certainly for an eternally vigilant consciousness, in its periods of intensive manifestation, to create for itself dreams, but then such a state might well cease to be a dream-state. The dream-state thus gets abolished finally.

IV

DREAM IN INDIAN MEDICAL SCHOOLS AND MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

So far I have shown that the theory of dreams of Sri Rāmānuja is an enlargement of the Vedic view. I shall now show that the theories put forward by the Indian physiological and medical schools converge towards the theory propounded already and also that modern theories are not so very advanced as they at first sight appear to be.

⁴ C.G.Jung: Psychology and Alchemy

The nature of dreams generally has been studied, not from the standpoint of view of psychology, but mostly from the stand-point of the theory of knowledge in the several schools. The study of dreams, however, is necessarily a question not merely as to what they are as processes of the mind, but also as to what the contents of such experiences are. The physiological and medical school of Indian thought, as found in the writings of Caraka, definitely studies dreams from the stand-point of how and why dreams occur.

The " learned know that dreams are of seven kinds,namely, seen, heard, felt, desired, imagined, prognosticating, and faultborn." says Caraka⁵.

Thus the dreams are of sensory-kind, of volitional kind and of the imaginative kind, and in addition to these we have the pathological dreams⁶. There is the authority of Ribot⁷ that there are dreams wherein taste as well as smell predominate. We know from our experience that there are dreams which clearly are of the gustatorial kind, as well as of the olfactory. This theory corresponds with the view that there are types of men whose perception is naturally of any one of the five or six kinds of sensations, That is, there are people who see songs, taste songs or smell songs, just as there are people who hear or taste or smell or feel a picture and so on. They are known as auditory, visual, olfactory, gustatory, and tactual types. Therefore it is, that some people have dreams wherein there are auditory or visual etc., images in prominence.⁸

The sensory, the volitional, and the imaginary are normal dreams. The abnormal are the pathological and the prophetic dreams. The pathological state might itself be capable of being the seat of prognosis. Prophetic dreams occur under peculiar physiological conditions not usually normal. The pathogenic types are due to dissociations of memory, and physiological diseases. The prophetic types of dreams are indeed the most significant part of dream-life. No theory of dream is acceptable unless it could in some definite manner explain the prophetic dreams. Pathological dreams could be explained perhaps as due to the " interference of the *nādis* (nerves) that carry the impressions of the external objects to the sensorium or the mind by the three faults of wind, bile and phlegm " (Caraka), They may be due to the chief cause,

⁵ Indriyasthāna V.42. cf.

⁶ W.Lotoslawski mentions another class of dreams in his *Pre Existence and Reincarnation* p.90. "Short of complete reminiscence, certain dreams may imply forgotten lives. Sometimes, people and places known from dreams are met later or in the waking state recognized."

⁷ *Psychology of Emotions* p.142

⁸ It is also possible that people of any one of the above types might experience other types of imagery as compensations in dream state. That is one the reasons why dreams appear as uncommon and novel.

as asserted by the modern thinkers and psycho-analysts who have revolutionized our ideas of dream life, namely, dissociation. This dissociation is a common enough phenomenon as William Brown has affirmed in his Science and personality, as could be seen in the very ordinary acts of classification and regulation of daily work. We dissociate as well as associate our experiences in order to establish order and efficiency in our life. Without some sort of planned grouping, it is impossible to be mentally or even physically efficient. To emphasize dissociation and not to take into account association is wrong. What exactly happens in dreams is that some tendencies which are fundamental to life, like self-preservation and self-perpetuation which in waking as self and sex, have the power to attach consciousness appear themselves to their respective experiences of the waking-life and to appear always in that specific grouping. This is the association and the dissociation that happen in regard to specific interests. Thus attachment becomes more firm through exercise. Finally there is no life or being for the interest apart from its amplified experiences, nor for the experiencer apart from the nucleus of interest. This is the meaning of specificity in William McDougall's phraseology, of instincts in animals, and of interests in humanbeings. This specificity is generally useful for the preservation of human life and action. Each of our actions is individual, that is, the end each seeks is different indeed from those of others,

But when is dissociation, or association its correlative, pathogenic? It is when there happens obstruction of a serious nature incapable of being faced by the individual that the dissociation which was helpful in organizing life, becomes a serious menace to the unity of the organism. The struggle for unity or for self it is that disjuncts interests, seeks reorganization of life's several experiences on the basis of new wants and for the sake of meeting new situations, Either we plan our life afresh or we perish. When, however, it is found that the individual is incapable of making this adjustment of his mental life, by breaking the groupings in order to bring about a new order, there happens what is called *mania* (monoideism), melancholia and depressive insanity, hallucination and other diseases. The source of this incapacity lies in the emotional life of the individual. Every instinct or interest has, as it were, a quantity of energy for its fulfilment. McDougall made this point rather clear when he said that every instinct has its specific emotion. When Professors James and Lange stated their much criticized, and perhaps even abandoned, theory of emotions, that we run and then are afraid,--the truth which they attempted to establish was that fear is the psychological state of the body, whereas its counterpart was the motor act of running away, that they are one and the same thing viewed, of course, from two not mutually irreconcilable standpoints. So we find that the energy of performance when impeded, finds its dissociation (or association) emphasized in the mental sphere. But as has been pointed out by Prof. Holiingworth, in his Psychology of Thought⁹, This

⁹ Studied via dream experiences.

dissociation or association, which he calls 'redintegration', is not something exclusively of the dream-state. The very fact that such 'redintegrations' do normally occur even in the waking-state, where also the life-interests dominantly seek to play their roles and achieve or realize their goals, shows that the processes, said to be specially of the Unconscious, are not such. Of course, there is possible the explanation that what we knew of reality in the waking-state is just a segment, the central umbra of consciousness, the others shading off into the subconscious and the unconscious. Such indeed is the explanation of most of our biological theories. Consciousness is the smallest fragment of the Unconscious that has become conscious due to life-interests finding no other way of meeting new situations. Consciousness, it has been said by one great writer, is a consequence of interference, or rather it is consciousness of interference.

We shall not be able to canvas the above theories in all their details at this place. Suffice it to say, that the theory is not specially of the dream-consciousness. Because dream-consciousness is also a state of unconsciousness or an 'intermediate' stage between deep sleep and the waking, the theory of the so-called Unconscious cannot be said to avail. Further the Unconscious is not such an unconscious, because we know something about it. Obviously, that is the reason why the Unconscious is said to be dynamic Unconscious, that is, an Unconscious that is seeking to become conscious, an unintelligent that is seeking to become or parade as conscious intelligence. Indian thinkers have already come across a theory like this. It is not a new discovery. It is the *prakṛti* of *Sāṃkhya*, the *Māyā* of Vedānta of Śaṅkara, the Ignorance of Buddhism.

The new point about this theory is that it speaks of the experiences of the past or the constellations of interests that have been in some manner relinquished in waking-life as undergoing 'transformation.' What is this transformation about? Into what does it transform itself! These two questions are important. The transformation occurs on account of two facts. Every sensory stimulus does get its reaction or response from the body. When the body is awake, or rather, when the sense-organs are alert, then there is correct reception of the outer stimulus, If on the other hand, the sense organs are asleep, that is to say, when they are either closed or inattentive, as in the 'Intermediate State' or the twilight of consciousness, we have the reflex activity of the sense-organs taken up by the brain-centres directly. There happens *confusion*¹⁰, *vikāra*, transfiguration, constellating or grouping of past similar experiences around it, and, thus, we have the primitive formations of symbols of new types, distinct indeed from the ordinary analogous substitutions of the waking-life¹¹.

¹⁰ "Desire, confusion, anxiety and recollection of sense objects, these are the four kalas that belong to the dreaming state". *Lalitā-sahasranāma*

¹¹ Cf. A.N.Whitehead : *Symbolism* and C.Spearman: *Creative Mind*.

As already said, symbols are the life and soul of all thinking, but in dream the symbols are not merely the life and soul, they are the stage also of their entire drama.

The principle of transformation is a well-understood fact in Indian Psychology. Objects of the waking consciousness recur in dream state; nothing that was not in the waking occurs in the dream-state. The presentative theory of dreams which holds that there is no dream without some outer or inner stimulus of the sensory kind which, so to say, starts the process of dreaming, is held by the Nyāya thinkers. This is said to be the reason for the *particularity* that is the characteristic of dreams. It is possible to think in general terms or in terms of generality, but it is impossible to dream in terms of generality. All impressions are particular and represent general ideas. That is the meaning of the word 'symbol', and however much these symbols might be made to stand for a class of objects or impressions of experiences, they are particular and refuse to be converted into general ideas. The function of these transformations or correlative references or symbolic substitutions is suggestion. And suggestion though it is importantly dealt with in Aesthetics under the concept of *dhvani*, is indeed all in the dream-land. A faint or sharp and intense gleam of light affecting the closed eye in sleep kindles, so to say, the images of Moon in the bright half of the month, and assumes colours and fantastic forms that dreams only can conjure up. A faint rustle or a whistle perhaps calls up the imaginary train, or of thoughts and impressions of the beloved, and so on, according to the predominant mood or state of mind that is anxious to catch at something to feed upon and enjoy or be afraid of and wild in terror. In this sense, the dream-state is very near artistic life. Whereas the control on the artist's mind is conscious and deliberate, possessed of the dominant idea which he seeks to paint or chistle or carve, the dream-state at least has not that conscious aim. Gonzalo R. Lafora says " Dreams, like artistic creations, are attempts of the Unconscious mind to dominate and to overcome the conscious, that is to say, they are attempts at returning to the the primitive life in which the individual satisfied his desires without regard to the interests of the species."¹²□

This view is not altogether warranted, since it speaks about the dream as if it were entirely an escape-phenomenon, an escape from our moral and cultural life to the primitive self sufficient egotistic life of self-satisfaction. It is enough to call this position as not true to all facts. Animals are as much gregarious as ourselves; and as for primitive men, studies into primitive culture, do not reveal that egoistic thrust, at any rate, to the extent that Lafora claims for them. Studies of Frazer, of Bartlett and others clearly show that the social life of the primitives has certainly not an abnormal stress on the egoistic, and in spite of the system of taboos and totems which social life amongst them has enforced, they are not people who suffer from dreams to the same extent as modern men suffer from. Dreams in the primitive society are few. They

¹² *Don Juan and other Psychological Studies, P. 173*

are dreaded. They have made the dreamers be considered as equal to the witches. Dream is a deep disease and not a common ailment. The reason is not far to seek; the symbolic reintegration in the life of the primitive is un-developed or under-developed, just as in the case of infants, Dreams involve high suggestibility, correlative [frenzy] as it were, that makes them phenomena of a different order than what Psycho-analysis on the basis of any one fundamental instinct like sex (Freud), or superiority neurosis(Adler), or as actions of a racial or Universal libido (Jung) can explain. The importance of dream-study lies in its showing its efficient and abnormal correlative synthesis. Psychic defects tend to exaggerate the neurosis set up by the suggestibility of correlations between experiences and objects that usually do not tend to be grouped or analogued.

The state of dream in which such frenzied correlations happen is not the deep sleep, despite Du Prel who holds that deep sleep alone can give us an intimate cue into the dream life of the self.

Now, therefore, one conclusion at last emerges, that sensory stimuli undergo transformations in the dream-state when the outer reception through the sense-organs is not available. The nervous system responds as a whole in the reception of the stimuli, even though otherwise non-active.

The second question that we addressed ourselves to was into what does a stimulus transform itself? Certainly into images. The content of the dream-experiences is not different from the experiences of our waking state. That is, the images appear to be just what we have already experienced.' The visual, auditional, gustatory, and tactual impressions convert themselves into images, and all our experiences appear to be representations of our waking life. No new and unknown things, that is to say, images of things that we have not seen ever occur. In other words, as the representative view of dreams holds we do not get new knowledge through dreams. The past unrolls itself before us in our dreams. But this is not altogether true, since we know that we do perceive new correlations worked out by the active explorative symbolic action of the mind, and it is affirmed by very many investigators that they do get at new knowledge in dreams. Also dreams that are prophetic are new, and do not depend upon man's unconscious volitions. Man unfortunately can create nothing without knowledge: and the ability to create without knowledge is the basic principle of Unconscious activity. The view that Bergson upholds that there is no sleep-state at all, that we only get limited views of reality through the selves of senses, and that in dream we are nearer the care of the ubiquitous reality, and are, on the whole, in closer touch with the outer reality, is, assuming it to be true, incapable of being justified on the basis of the inner symbolic references and transformations that happen to reality in our dream-life. The senses are said to be externally active in the waking state, and

interiorly active in the dream state according to Udayana and writers of the Nyāya school, because the objects in the dream-state appear as if they are external to the individual just as in waking experiences. This position is utilised by certain other thinkers to say that the objectivity that we do find in dream is not real objectivity, but a subjective positing, a placing outside so to say, and as such unreal or subjective creations. This view it is that is upheld by the Vijñānavādins; and added to their theory of perpetual momentariness, it means that they have characteristic shiftings of correlations, and as such they are momentary, not merely in the sense that they cease on our waking up, but also in the sense that they are, even within dreams, not of any duration.

The upshot of the whole discussion is that in dreams we have sensory images, and the Contents of the experiences do not go beyond what we know. Representations of past experiences happen, and no objects other than what we know appear, though there might happen new correlations. Bergson's view of dream is unacceptable, since the dream-state is a state of recollection. Though there is a type of activity that apparently is free from the limitations of the waking consciousness and the constraints of external objects, the dream-state suffers from limitations, indeed, more serious than the previous, in so far as it is not a conscious-state of life. That it possesses a rationality of its own, that the associative processes in the dream-state are governed by certain fundamental interests need not be gainsaid, but that that it reveals the creative activity of the individual as such, is not substantiated. Therefore Mrs. Arnold Forster's view that in dreams there is reasoning or a rationale might well be accepted; we find that only when we retrace or carefully recollect the dream. The dream-poetry of Coleridge, the dream-novel writing of R. L. Stevenson, are recollective visions, and as Mrs. Arnold Forster herself affirms, there is an objectivity of the dream which it is difficult to refer to the individual's intelligent or creative action. The phenomena of induced drowsiness cannot be called dreams.

Further, "If it is sometimes hard to believe that the actors who took part in these dreams come, not from without but from within our own consciousness, the belief is even harder in the case of dreams which seem to give back to us for a little while the presence of those whom we have loved and who are parted from us. They come to us in 'clear and solemn vision'-we do not question how they come; their presence seems for the moment as real as the comfort that they bring."

The theory of two selves is interesting. She calls the other self the guide, the infallible helper of her dreaming consciousness, once we accept him and take shelter under his wings. The status of *Antaryāmin* in Indian Dream psychology comes readily to mind. The individual in sleep seeks rest in the heart-lotus, where dwells the Lord within. The Inner Ruler Immortal has His home in the heart of all creatures. As the *Hamsopanishad* says the soul moves in the pericarp of the heart-lotus in the intermediate state of dream prior to sinking into the centre of the lotus. The function

of experiencing, cognizing and enjoying is yet with the individual, deprived though he is from the volitional or active motor functions. The cognizing function continues yet in a very subdued state in the third state, but no longer does the individual experience his experiences, past or present. It is in the second state, as the *Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad* says, the individual revels in emotional experiences. The prāṇic forces help actively perceiving experiences but without their motor concomitants. This state cannot be said to be comparable to the ideational state of exploratory imagination, the trying out of alternatives on paper or by diagrammatic representations, prior to action. Dream may be a child state of "the enchanted tower", but it is not the state of primitive regression, except in pathological cases of frustration or exaggerated self-egoism or shock.

We have said that there is a guide in the state of dream, the friend who helpfully takes us into the tower of wonders, the 'ivory tower' of poets to which they go for refuge from the bustle and hustle of active life. Of Moral life there is no evidence, but there is quiet and joy. As *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* said, It is a pleasure-house of toys, chariots, horses and what not. But there are also the evil dreams which we have to experience, since of such is our active life in the world made, Moral life makes dreams happy, immoral life brings about dreams that are of fear, terror and misery. Fear is at the root of most dreams that are unhappy. Fear is at the root of moral delinquency, and the conquest of fear it is that conquers dreams that are evil. In this conquest trust in the Lord, as in the case of Yoga which counsels *Īśvarapraṇidhāna*, is absolutely necessary. The sustaining hand of a guide in the distress of mere emotional outbursting of inner life at the mercy of outer forces, psychic and physical, as well as inner force, of habitual nature, it is that thwarts evil. What *citta vṛtti-nirodha* achieves in *Yoga*, that is what is also sought to be achieved by devotion to the Divine Lord. The quiet resigned attitude of the individual finite soul towards the fruits of karma dispensed in waking life as well as in dream-life of the form of joys in waking life and pleasant recreations in dream-life, leads finally to the transcendence which grants utter felicity.

A higher consciousness that knows more and not less, a power within us that is superior to us, which whilst individually in each is transcendent in all, that alone can explain the prophetic dream. Dream in its fullest significant sense can only be this, according to some thinkers. It is not the so-called

dream that is not different from the day dream, or the imaginations, but the prophetic, dream that makes the future true, that is significant of the dream life. Secondly, if wish fulfilment is said to be that which is achieved in dreams, as compensations for failures or successes during the waking-state, more or less intense reflexions of waking experiences and their psychic retro activities, then it is not true in regard to all experiences. Sometimes, or rather, more often than not, we find that we

dream not at our will, but at the dictation of some other self.¹³ No doubt the dictation might come from the pathological state moving in its own manner, or it might be from the physical or physiological condition at a particular moment. All the evidence that we have shows that dreams, even wish-fulfillments, are not to be had at our will; they are not made to order. Mrs. Arnold Forster though holding the view that dreams could be created by her, finally says that she even was not able to get dreams when she wanted them. In this case, dreams like mystic inspirations or inventions, as Prof Montmasson has shown in his *Inventions and the Unconscious* do not wait on our will; rather we have to wait anxiously for their coming.

Viśiṣṭādvaita as pointed out earlier holds that the Divine Lord in every individual does all. In dream-state He Who is awake when all are asleep, Who is the master of creation, never devoid of intelligence, and Who has fullest *Vikāsa* grants such dreams as the individual can understand and appreciate in terms of his own experiences. This is the reason why the contents of all dream-experiences are within each individual. The intimations of new things also are possible because the Lord within is transcendent to all individuals. The experiences through having peripheral stimulations undergo transformations according to the deserts of their actions. The moral view taken up by *Viśiṣṭādvaita* is in keeping with the Vedic view which says that Varuna knows all that happens in the secret places of the heart and dispenses justice, The power of projecting the subjective facts outside is impossible to the individual *antaḥkaraṇa*, *buddhi* or memory, since in the state of dream, despite their activity, they are receptive and not self-active.

The illusive power is not so much the power to illude as it is to grant the individual enjoyment that he could understand and wish to possess. It is the granting of what he wishes to have that gives pleasure, the deprivation of what he wishes to have causes misery. Frustration is the lot of all. But even to achieve for the good acts one does, however slight they might be, deserts that are pleasure-giving, is to enable the individual to strive to do more good. The impossible (?) theory of *karma* that posits that one present birth is consequence of our past activities, wherein the nature of the relationship between the act and its desert is not clearly indicated as in the Penal Codes of our human making, is in some manner mitigated by the *karma*-theory of dreams wherein we get our pleasurable deserts in our sleep.

Caraka and other writers on *Svapna-śāstra* give us indications of a good dream and good life;¹⁴ and there is a famous passage of the *Chāndogya* which says

¹³ Buddhism holds that dreams might be due to clairvoyant influences. *Compendium of Philosophy*, S.Z.Aung p.48

¹⁴ Caraka-samhitā Chapter XII Indirasthāna; cf. Rāmāyaṇa Sundarakānda: ch.xxviii 9-24. Trijata's Dreams to success to Rāma and disaster to Rāvaṇa: The descriptions are identical lending colour to the view that Caraka copied from the Rāmāyaṇa.

that if one sees a woman in dreams success he there may recognise(V. 2. 9), Confucianism posits that dreams of snakes forebode daughters, though it is found that this is not true. On the other hand, certain experiences show that they forebode abortion. The dream of Mahā Viṣṇu for Sri Kṛṣṇadevarāya meant, according to certain of his astrologers and interpreters of dreams, "acquisition of more women" (Amuktamālyada. I-18). The interpretation of dreams is as difficult as it could be. But the Psycho- analysis of Freud has not made the task easier. Here is another case of new mythology, but it does good in so far as we are forgetting old ones!

Our individual wills operate undoubtedly in dream in a negative manner, a purely biological manner, of keeping watch over the body. The entire physiological system though at rest is aware indeed of itself. We know that when an unknown danger occurs we are awakened at once. But this does not warrant a complete statement of absolute creative activity of the self in dream. The psychological truth is that we are aware of our sleep-state, that is, that we were asleep, and that we slept soundly. But no more.

Dreams thus form a very interesting study of our mental life, its receptivity to outer forces, psychic (that is even of other higher powers perhaps) and physical, though the normal dream is of the ethical type, due to the granting of pleasure or pain as deserts for our minor good activities by the Lord within. The more the dreamer becomes moral, receptive and capable of self-control, the more true would his dreams become, that is, they more and more conform to the prophetic type of communion with the Divine. One's dreams get realised in a truer sense than one's wishes are said to get realised in the doctrine of *Sāṅkalpa-siddhi*.