

The concept of Soul in Buddhist Philosophy

Sudhangshu Mondal

Assistant Professor
Dept. of Philosophy
Netaji Mahavidyalaya
Arambagh, Hooghly

Abstract:

The historical religions that have their origins in India, including Sikhism, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism, all have nuanced and distinct perspectives on the concept of the soul. All of these religions have a foundation in scripture. Each tradition sought to identify its own position in relation to influential and established religious ideals while relating to those ideals in a shared cultural environment. The soul is one such concept. All religions agree on the fundamental ontological premise that life and death are distinguished by a vital and animating incorporeal component. The status of the soul in relation to physical life and death is a significant issue in Indian traditions. The law of karma, which states that an individual's actions have a residual force that continues to have an impact on them after this lifetime and is the driving force behind the birth-death cycle (samsara), comes into play as a result of this. In particular, the soul is never equated with this persistent force of karma in Indian mythology. The means by which the ultimate objective—liberation from this cycle—is attained are spiritual knowledge and practice, as defined by each tradition. I will attempt to explain Indian philosophy's concept of soul in this paper I shall try to explain the concept soul in Buddhist philosophy.

Keywords: Soul, Buddhist, Advaita, Charvaka and God

Date of Submission: 03-04-2023

Date of Acceptance: 15-04-2023

According to the Buddhist perspective, if there had been a true self, it would have possessed particular characteristics. Determination, unchanging nature, the shortfall of torment, and being unaffected by past occasions are instances of these. Since it would have known about itself, a genuine self would have been content. Nothing else would have changed or influenced it in any way. However, this description differs significantly from our self-experience. This suggests that the real self and the human self do not exist.

The erroneous belief that we possess a persistent self must be let go. A first step toward liberation is this kind of mental liberation. According to the Atman concept, the self is viewed as a spiritual being rather than a material one. Consequently, there is a significant Hinduism component that places an emphasis on asceticism and separation from the material world. As a result, one could say that the spiritual being known as the Atman has a human experience in this world rather than a spiritual one.

A person must therefore acknowledge their maya-bound status. He should consequently recognize his obliviousness and acknowledge that he doesn't have a place in this mayan world. He only has a relationship with his God, whom he loves so much and has numerous wonderful relationships with. He must love Him completely and selflessly knowing this. Because the nirakar brahma itself is an actionless dormant Divinity, the worshipper enters the absolute dormant state of the Divinity known as kaivalya moksha and remains there forever in a kind of completely passed out state.

The only Hindu school of thought that categorically denies the existence of Atman is the Charvaka School. According to the Charvaka, consciousness is merely the product of matter. Consciousness and life are inseparable. It is always found in close proximity to the body when it breaks down.

Charvaka's theory of soullessness is challenged by Advaita philosopher Samkara. The claim that life-movements, consciousness, memory, and the associated intellectual function are all part of the body because they can only be experienced in the body is the primary foundation of his argument. Sankara argues that life movements and other phenomena of a similar nature cannot be caused by the body because they do not always occur even when the body is present (like when someone dies).

The Buddhist term Anatman (Sanskrit) or Anatta (Pali) is used as an adjective in the Digha Nikaya Sutra. It implies that phenomena do not possess souls by definition. Only 22 nouns (forms, feelings, perception, experiences, consciousness, the eye, eye-consciousness, desires, mental formations, ear, nose, tongue, body, lusts, things unreal, etc.) are mentioned in the Digha Nikayas' 662 instances of the term "Anatta." "Light (dipam), and only refuge" is the uncompromised subjective Self (Atman). all mind blowing because of their

benevolence (anatta). There is no notice of the "Principle of anatta/anatman" anywhere in the sutras, rather than various famous (=profane, or =consensus, from which reality can "never be accumulated") books composed beyond Buddhist tenet. The term "anatta" is used in the sutra to describe the temporal and unreal nature of all composite, phenomenal, and temporal things, from the macrocosm to the microcosm. This includes matter in relation to the physical body, the entire cosmos, and any and all mental machinations that are of the nature of arising and passing. Anatta, on the other hand, is only used to distinguish things or phenomena that are not eternal from the Soul. Dukkha (suffering) and anicca (impermanent) are used interchangeably with anatta in the sutra. In many instances, the three terms are used together to provide a broad term that takes into account all possible distinctions; e.g. : Aggregates include anicca, dukkha, and anatta.

As the permanent soul, anatta only refers to the absence of any or all of the psycho-physical (nama-rupa) attributes, also known as khandhas (skandhas, aggregates). The five aggregates that make up a being—aggregates of shifting material and mental forces—are the primary causes of suffering. The five khandhas' nature is summarized by Buddha in Majjima Nikaya as follows: All corporeal phenomena, internal and external, present or future, gross or subtle, high or low, near or far, fall under the category of corporeality. The class of sentiments incorporates all sentiments, and the class of discernments incorporates all insights; Every mental formation is included in the group of formations; The collection of cognizance includes all cognizance.

The Pali word for "no soul" is natthatta, rather than "no soul." The Samyutta Nikaya 4.400 notices this. In this section, nihilistic heresy (ucchedavada) was compared to Gautama Buddha's question about whether there "was no-soul (natthatta)." A common theme in both Vedanta and Buddhist sutra is the rejection of the psycho-physical characteristics of the mere empirical self as belonging to the Soul or being confused with it. The Buddhist model for phenomena is "Na me so atta," which means "this or those are not my soul." This is Gautama the Buddha's most typical expression in the Nikayas, where "na me so atta" refers to Anatta or Anatman. The sutra says that being a nihilist is to believe that there was "noSoul" (natthatta).

In one way, Buddhism discusses soul reincarnation and transmigration through karma. The idea that a soul, also known as anatta, can change bodies was rejected by Buddha. Instead, he asserted that a series of events links each life to the one before it. Our current way of life is influenced by the circumstances of our previous lives. Although this may make it appear as though we have no control over our lives, this is not the case. Our present existence is shaped by the actions we have taken in the past, but our free will is only influenced. That is to say, we continue to be in control of our own destiny. This method merely asserts that actions' ideas, impressions, feelings, and streams of consciousness will last into the next life.

There is no spirit in the afterlife. Buddha compared this transmigration to the flames on a candle. Both candles lose their original flame when they are lit from another candle's flame. It only suggests that the first candle's flame set off the second candle, similar to how actions in a previous life set off the next. In the same way that a candle does not actually transfer its flame to the next candle, the previous life does not actually transfer anything (a soul) to the next life. Similar to this, an individual's desires and feelings are not the result of something being transported within the body.

Buddhism differs from atheism (Skt. In guaranteeing a profound nature, Nastika, or Pali natthika) That is unquantifiable, boundless, and undetectable in any capacity that should be visible. which means that empirical science cannot prove or refute the claim that he has "Gone to That [Brahman]" (tathatta). It is to the Atman as something separate from oneself (nama-rupa/khandhas; the mere self is equivalent to anatta), i.e., anything phenomenal and formal (Skt. Nonbeing" (asat, natthiti, "the everything is at last not") and "name and appearance" (pali nama-rupa, and savinnana-kaya) are both existential antinomies and blasphemies of annihilationism, separately. It has been incorrectly stated that certification of the Atman is sassatavada, or "eternalism," rather than the aforementioned. However, the Atman is never mentioned in the Pali term sasastavada; Instead, it refers to the Atman's function as a karmin in samsara who is subject to the whims of becoming (bhava), or kammavada; such as the sutta phrase "atta ca so loka ca," which means "the Atman and the world are one" or "Being" (sat, atthiti; views of sabbamatthi, which translates to "the entirety," and sabbamekattan, which translates to "the entire is one's Soul," both of which are heresies of perpetualism. Sasastavada is the erroneous belief that merit is the highest level of achievement for either this life or the next, and that one is sassata-bound forever within samsara. Both of these concepts are heresies of perpetualism. According to the sutta, Bhava, or becoming, agencyship, is the heretical antinomy to nihilism (vibhava, or = ucchedavada), not the Atman. The Atman is not referred to in the sutta as "forever" or "eternal being." The Atman "has never been an agent" and "has never become anything" (bhava). Both the bhava (sassatavada) and the vibhava (ucchedavada) antinomies lead to illogical positions that the Vedantic or Buddhist Atman would find untenable. These positions are derived from the bhava antinomies. The concept of "eternalism" as "Atman" is, however, the erroneous secondary argument used by the noAtman commentarialists to support their position on anatta and imply that there is no Atman.

The initiate who is to be "shown the way to Immortality (amata)"⁷, in which liberation of the spirit/mind (cittavimutta;) is discussed, forms the philosophical foundation of Buddhism. "Seen any of these

forms, feelings, this body in whole or in part, to be my Self/Atman, to be that which I am by nature," the common fool (Greek: because he "saw any of these forms, feelings, this body in whole or part, to be my Self/Atman, to be that which I am by nature," epistrophe) must first be educated away from his previous ignorance-based (avijja) materialistic tendencies. Teaching with a negative approach consisted of the following: prone to continuous change; Therefore, claiming that such things "are mine, these are what I am, that these are my Soul"⁸ is inappropriate. The one scripture passage in which a layperson asks Gautama what the meaning of anatta is, according to the following: The venerated Radha plunked down once in Savatthi and asked of the Favored Ruler Buddha: " The reverend said, "Anatta, anatta." Just this Radha, the Soul (anatta) is not form, the Soul (anatta) is not sensation, the Soul (anatta) is not perception, the Soul (anatta) is not assemblage, and the Soul (anatta) is not consciousness. The Nikayas teach that anatta has only relative value because it directly promotes subjective awakening, or illumination. As a result, birth has ended, the Brahman life has fulfilled, and what needs to be done has been completed. There are others as well. It doesn't say or recommend only that the Soul (atta, Atman) has no reality, yet that particular things (five sums), with which the unschooled man (fool = puthujjana, as is continually gathered in extraordinary texts, a pragmatist) perceives himself, are not the Soul (anatta). As a consequence of this, one ought to grow dissatisfied with them, separate themselves from them, and experience freedom. The Soul as such is not negated by this principle of the much-maligned and misunderstood term anatta; rather, it denies Selfhood to the things that make up the non-self (anatta), accordingly exhibiting that they are without any trace of any extreme worth and ought to be dismissed.

In fact, the Atman (Soul) doctrine is bolstered and supported in the most logical manner possible—through objective negation—rather than its nullification. The following are rumors: Another error, given that the soul neither possesses nor is of the nature of the persona, or "human," nor the carrier of human personal identity, is that "no Indian school of thought has ever regarded the human soul as a permanent substance." While referring to the observational persona, this is absolutely clear (simple self aggregates=pancakhanda rather than the Individual, soul, and Atman). The Atman cannot be understood as a thinking substance, phenomenon, or eternal soul, as is certain and logically indisputable.

It is vital to keep thoroughly to the prospect of the soul as a vivifying and basic rule while looking at Indian practices overall, for the significant ramifications of the term from Western dated traditions, including the never-ending status of the soul and its collaboration in an immortal endlessness, which are usually seen as a helpful importance of soul in the contemporary Western setting, are not found in Indian traditions. In Indian religions, the concept of the soul as a life force has unique meanings. For example, the Indian practices' evaluate of the individuated state in their dreams of profound freedom is a huge qualification among Western and old style Indian customs. In Indian religions, the individuated state that acts and thus generates karma is called ordinary bodily embodiment. Spiritual liberation is defined as the cessation of karma and, as a result, release from the cycle of birth and rebirth. As a result, the individuated state in which one generates karma dissolves when spiritual liberation is achieved. The dissolution of the body and the individuated state of the life-force, also known as the soul, are both referred to in this context. There is no philosophically developed idea of an individual, personified soul that lives on forever in an afterlife in Indian religions. The issue of how karma's residual force can influence subsequent lives is addressed in Indian traditions. We will discuss each tradition in relation to the issue in the sections that come after. When they imagine spiritual liberation—liberation from karma and the cycle of birth and rebirth—they dissolve the individuation that is typical of everyday embodiment. This is where they agree.

In Buddhism and transcendentalism, the critical rule of anatta is that all physical and mental consubstantial and transitory objectivity must be evaluated as anatta. All of them are either simplex compounds (matter, helium) or complex mental compounds. Followers, what do you think would happen if a group of sticks, grasses, branches, and leaves were carried into the Jeta grove and used however they pleased or burned? According to Buddhism, "an-atta is meant not-Subject (=object [phenomena]), those things." What are these people doing with us, burning us, and stealing our identities? No, Master, absolutely not. Additionally, in what capacity or manner? Lord, because neither that nor the place where our Soul resides is our Soul! Get rid of anything that doesn't reflect who you are for the benefit of your followers. Once you do, you will experience happiness and well-being for the rest of your life. What are your deficiencies? Devotees, structure is not who you are, nor are sensations, insights, experiences, or awareness.

Bibliography:

- [1]. Hostie, R. (1957). Religion and the psychology of Jung. New York: Sheed and Ward.
- [2]. Lorenz, H. (2003, October 23). Ancient Theories of Soul
- [3]. Stumpf, Samuel Enoch, Philosophy: History and Problems, 2nd Ed., Macraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1977.
- [4]. Sakellariou, George (Ed.), Proceedings of the congress, Publishing House of French Institute, Athens,1957.
- [5]. Popper, Karl R., Eccles, John C., The Self and Its Brain, Routledge, New York, 1977
- [6]. James, George G.M., Stolen Legacy, Philosophical Library, New York, 1954.
- [7]. Cornford, F.M., From Religion to Philosophy, Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1957.