



A comparative Study of Literary representations of Spiritual and Intellectual Mysticisms

Vikhyath S Shetty

English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad, India

Received: 04 Jan 2025; Received in revised form: 06 Feb 2026; Accepted: 10 Feb 2026; Available online: 14 Feb 2026
©2026 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— *Mysticism is often understood as an altered state of consciousness associated primarily with religious traditions. In spite of characterizing their experiences as ineffable, mystics across traditions have persistently attempted to articulate such experiences, producing diverse textual and pedagogical forms. This paper examines two distinct modes of articulating mystical experience—spiritual and intellectual—through a comparative literary analysis of the accounts of Ramana Maharshi and Jiddu Krishnamurti. While both figures emerge from divergent spiritual trajectories, their writings reveal fundamentally different orientations toward experience and expression. Ramana Maharshi’s articulations are marked by pedagogical assurance, grounded in the authority of realization and directed toward guiding seekers. In contrast, Krishnamurti’s accounts reflect an ongoing, self-reflexive inquiry, where language functions less as instruction than as a means of understanding the experience for himself. Focusing on the selected texts of Ramana Maharshi and Jiddu Krishnamurthy the paper explores how each figure negotiates the tension between ineffability and expression. By Through the juxtaposition of these two distinct modes of articulation, the study aims to demonstrate the similarities beneath their experiences.*



Keywords— *Mystical Experience, Spiritual and Intellectual Mysticism, Ineffability and Language, Indian Mystical Literature, Comparative Literary Analysis*

I. INTRODUCTION

Often associated with religion, mysticism could be defined as an altered state of consciousness that a spiritual seeker experience. Although some day-to-day experiences could also involve such experiences, (which are heightened state of perception), visions, etc., this paper limits itself to the mysticism that is either hard-acquired or blessed with. The paper throws light on different shades of Indian mysticism, viz. spiritual and scientific mysticism with special references to Ramana Maharshi and J Krishnamurti respectively. However, the thesis also takes into consideration the accounts of the experiences of other mystics too, such as Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa, Paramahansa Yogananda and others. In this way, taking excerpts from various biographical texts and delving into the teachings of some stalwarts of mysticism, this paper attempts a survey and thereby examine how the indescribable experiences of altered state of consciousness

has been articulated. But before doing so, it is necessary to preface the discussion with a few clarifications: first, the intent or the rationale behind such a classification; and second, the proper distinction among them.

A brief examination of mystical experiences, accounts, and teachings would make it clear that there is no easy-watertight compartment in the way such experiences occur. So, for the sake of better-understanding and clarity, I have taken the liberty of classifying the experiences under the above-mentioned heads: spiritual and scientific. Spiritual mysticism considers enlightenment as the only end and, therefore, if necessary, does not shy away to violate religious presuppositions. Since it comes from the enlightened mystics, (in this case Sri Ramana Maharshi), it is often accepted by the society. The paper, in short, tries to juxtapose the spiritual and intellectual mysticisms: theory behind them, path prescribed for the realization, verbal

expressions of the experiences attained, and the way the ineffable is articulated within the linguistic bounds.

II. SPIRITUAL MYSTICISM

Having begun this study of mysticism based on the classifications of intellectual and spiritual mysticism, the latter belies its basis on various systems such as Yoga. However, not merely limiting itself to the ambit or pages of Shastras, we can find these practices testified from time to time by various enlightened beings. This section tries to shed some light on some such spiritual aspects of mysticism with special reference to the teachings of Bhagawan Sri Ramana Maharshi. Considerable emphasis has also been laid upon the experiences and teachings of enlightened beings like Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa, Paramahansa Yogananda. Although these Maharshis have accorded sufficient significance to the above-mentioned spiritual practices, they were very much open to the possibility of pursuing a newer path so long as it yielded the same result. Despite most of their teachings emphasizing on Jnana Yoga, Raja Yoga, Karma Yoga and Bhakti Yoga, Tantric and other paths can also be observed of getting validation in similar terms, albeit with some disclaimers. In fact, Sri Ramana Maharshi emphasized on the self-enquiry more than any other method, for he claimed that it is more straight, simpler and direct path towards self-realisation. Another significant thing is that in case of both Sri Ramana Maharshi as well as Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa, their experiences preceded their knowledge of Shastras and other scriptural texts. Therefore, their words are more experience-based rather than of merely Shastric. The self being the epicenter of their discussion, God, Guru, Jnana, Sat-chit-Ananda are some of the key concepts which acquire a considerable space too.

Biographical Overview: Ramana Maharshi (1879-1950), was enlightened at a very early stage of his life in 1895, weeks after which he moved to Arunachal Mountain. He spent his early years abiding in the self-realised state paying no heed to his health. However, in a couple of years he was surrounded by devotees. Eventually, mostly from his reading of the books brought to him by the devotees, he found out that his experience has its correspondence in the 'Adwaita' Vedanta. His Ashram was opened in 1922 where he spent the rest of his life guiding his devotees with the flowers of his wisdom. Maharshi was one of the greatest of the enlightened beings for he had realized the 'Sahaja Samadhi', which could be considered higher to that of either savikalpa or Nirvikalpa Samadhi. Although Maharshi's writings are highly minimal, his teachings are available to us through the records of his conversations with his

devotees. Paul Brunton writes the following about episode of Maharshi's self-realisation:

He was sitting alone one day in his room when a sudden and inexplicable fear of death took hold of him. He became acutely aware that he was going to die, . . . and immediately began to prepare for the coming event. He stretched his body prone upon the floor, fixed his limbs in the rigidity of a corpse, closed his eyes and mouth, and finally held his breath. 'Well, then,' said I to myself, 'this body is dead. It will be carried stiff to the burning ground and then reduced to ashes. But with the death of the body, am I dead? Is the body I This body is now silent and stiff. But I continue to feel the full force of my Self apart from its condition.' Those are the words which the Maharishee used in describing the weird experience through which he passed. What happened next is difficult to understand though easy to describe. He seemed to fall into a profound conscious trance wherein he became merged into the very source of selfhood, the very essence of being. He understood quite clearly that the body was a thing apart and that the I remained untouched by death. The true self was very real, but it was so deep down in man's nature that hitherto he had ignored it" (Brunton, A Search, 283).

Maharshi's definition of Mind: Like Jiddu Krishnamurthi, Maharshi is also of the similar opinion that the mind is but the web of interwoven elements such as memory, knowledge, thoughts, intellect etc. Therefore, mind is all it perceives and processes. However, there is a primary thought which is 'I-thought'/ego that is the epicenter of all perception. Holding onto it if one pursues the question of self-enquiry, eventually thoughts vanish, mind gets destroyed, and the Self unveils itself. Illustrating the nature of the mind Maharshi says,

What is called 'mind' is a wondrous power residing in the Self. It causes all thoughts to arise. Apart from thoughts, there is no such thing as mind, . . . there is no independent entity called the world. In deep sleep there are no thoughts, and there is no world. In the states of waking and dream, there are thoughts, and there is a world also. Just as the spider emits the thread (of the web) out of itself and again withdraws it into itself, likewise the mind projects the world out of itself and again resolves it into itself. When the mind comes out of the Self, the world appears. Therefore, when the world appears (to be real), the Self does not appear; and when the Self appears (shines) the world does not appear. When one persistently inquiry into the nature of the mind, the mind will end leaving the Self (as the residue). What is referred to as the Self is the Atman. The mind always exists only in dependence on something gross; it cannot stay alone. It is the mind that is called the subtle body or the soul (jiva). (Maharshi, who question-8).

Ramana Maharshi and Self Enquiry: One of the methods that Maharshi used to suggest was the 'method of self-enquiry', for any other method according to him, though not inadequate, would merely be a roundabout procedure. Self-enquiry, or 'Atmavichara' as he would call it, is the process of asking oneself the question 'Who am I'. Mind is the major and the sole hindrance in one's way to self-realisation. Since mind is but the web of our thoughts interwoven, the seeker must find and disable the perception of such thoughts. So Maharshi says that it is the 'I'-thought which is the origin as well as the epicenter of all the other thoughts. Therefore, by tracing and holding onto that 'I'-thought, one can put an end to all the other thoughts. However, one cannot stick on to that 'I'-thought, for it is the primary thought. So, when one looks at this 'I'-thought/ego more closely, then, the ego vanishes and paves way for the self to get unveiled. If thoughts disturb one in such a pursuit, then, he must ask whom do those thoughts arise which brings him/her back to the ego/the primary thought. He considers this as the simpler, easier, and direct method, for unlike meditation here there is no subject-object bifurcation. It, in a way, goes in tandem with what is called 'Jnana Marga'. Talking about the same Maharshi says:

"There is the absolute Self, from which a spark proceeds as from fire. The spark is called the ego. In the case of an ignorant man it identifies itself simultaneously with an object as it rises. It cannot remain independent of such association with objects. This association is ajnana or ignorance, whose destruction is the objective of our efforts. If its objectifying tendency is killed it remains pure, and also merges into the source" (ibid).

Maharshi's place for other paths of self-realisation: Although Maharshi did not deny the possibility of achieving the self-realisation, yet another path he equally respected was 'Bhakti Marga' or the path of devotion. Such an absolute surrender to god would also lead to the revelation of the self. However, the Bhakti he supported here is of Satvik character. In other words, here the devotion is for the sake of devotion, for there arises no question of expectation. Samadhi and its varied types: Samadhi, in simple words, is mind's continuous communion with the self with absolute awareness. It is the state of consciousness which can also be called as sat-chit-Ananda, (a state with three attributes of absolute existence, absolute awareness and absolute bliss). It is the state where the distinction between the knower and the known, experiencer and the experience, the subject and the object is impossible. Sri Ramana Maharshi classifies the state of Samadhi into three major types based on the longevity of such an experience and the efforts required. They are: Savikalpa Samadhi, Kevala Nirvikalpa Samadhi and Sahaja Nirvikalpa Samadhi. Savikalpa Samadhi is that state of being where the seeker realizes the self, but could

hold on to it only with a lot of efforts. Whereas in the Kevala Nirvikalpa Samadhi, the seeker could hold on to the reality for a longer period of time. However, even this state is inferior to that of Sahaja Nirvikalpa Samadhi, for the seeker in the former has his mind in abeyance and has not destroyed it. Sahaja Nirvikalpa Samadhi is the supreme state of consciousness where the seeker is no more a seeker. Here he/she could simultaneously hold on to the reality and act in this world. They reach such a state only once they are free of their mental tendencies and has destroyed their mind. Distinguishing between the Kevala and Sahaja Samadhis Maharshi say the following:

Those that are in the kevala nirvikalpa state are not realised, they are still seekers. Those who are in the sahaja nirvikalpa state are like a light in a windless place, or the ocean without waves; that is, there is no movement in them. They cannot find anything which is different from themselves. For those who do not reach that state, everything appears to be different from themselves. (Godman Ch. 14).

Verbal expression of the experiences in the state of Samadhi/enlightenment: One of the striking analogies Maharshi draws to describe his experience in the realized state is the analogy of deep-sleep or the dreamless sleep. The Shastras classify human state of consciousness into 4 states— 'Jagritha', wakeful state, 'Swapna' dreaming, 'Sushupti' deep-sleep, and 'Thureeya' or Samadhi. This state of Thureeya is almost equal to that the bliss one would experience in his/her deep-sleep, the only difference being here the person is not aware of himself. Since Thureeya happens to be there always, Maharshi gives yet another metaphor of screen and the cinema. While the other states of being happens to be the cinema, Thureeya is the screen, since it remains unperturbed. Therefore 'Thureeya' is also 'Tureeyathita'.

Intellectual/Scientific Mysticism: As it has been already suggested, despite the supreme state of consciousness being the only end to achieve, different mystics came up with different pathways. scientific/intellectual mysticism is one such path. Although the entire Upanishadic literature is the effect of such questions and queries, J Krishnamurti, [hereafter JK], is the prominent, and perhaps the only modern, mystic who proposed this way. Even so, it cannot be considered as either as eccentric or as an alternative to the already-existing course, the reasons for which we will analyze in the later parts of this section. Before moving further, I would want you to have a clarity about the term 'intellectual' in the phrase 'intellectual mysticism' as it is used here. Since questioning happens to be the important tool used to understand why should we do what we do in order to be a self-realised, and for most of our actions, (or passive inactions), involve our observation, I chose to use this terminology. Only thus far this is applicable, for in the

final stages where thoughts, and the memory leading to such thoughts would be considered an obstacle. Besides, as we would learn as we proceed, he also accuses thoughts of being the root for all the problems. Even the term intelligence, as used by JK himself, has a broader connotation.

One of the prominent thinkers of mysticism who took on himself the burden of explaining scientifically the way to reach such an altered state of consciousness is Jiddu Krishnamurti. He emphasized on the complete freedom of the self, an utter unconditioning of the mind with the spear-sharp intellect. His science of self-realisation begins from the outermost aspects such as society, religion ETC. towards the inner aspects such as to mind, memory, thoughts and so forth. He firmly opined that the problems in the society exist not because the society is following a wrong-pattern, rather, for the very nature of the society to follow a pattern, (irrespective of its nature), itself. Such an opinion is more strong and clearer in his or her as far as the spiritual seeking is concerned. He not only dismisses all the existing as well as the possible religious, and traditional patterns, but also the idea of seeking itself, for any such attempt to seek, (such as god, or samadi, etc.), then, the mind would certainly preconceive one or the other state of consciousness. His idea of self-realisation is better-encapsulated in the following lines in the forward of his book 'As one is: To free the Mind from All Conditioning':

To stand alone is to be uncorrupted, innocent, free of all tradition, of dogma, of opinion, of what another says, and so on. Such a mind does not seek because there is nothing to seek; being free, such a mind is completely still without a want, without movement. But this state is not to be achieved; it isn't a thing that you buy through discipline; it doesn't come into being by giving up sex, or practicing a certain yoga. It comes into being only when there is understanding of the ways of the self, the 'me', which shows itself through the conscious mind in everyday activity, and also in the unconscious. What matters is to understand for oneself, not through the direction of others, the total content of consciousness, which is conditioned, which is the result of society, of religion, of various impacts, impressions, memories—to understand all that conditioning and be free of it (Krishnamurti. As one is 6).

So, for JK, any authority, external or internal, (for they are interrelated and the former is mere the manifestation of the latter), regulating one's life even to the slightest degree happens to be but a hindrance. And, everything that conditions, influences, provokes to compare, judge, or to know than to be, to concentrate than to be attentive, then, he should uncondition himself from them. So, in order to understand the conception of intellectual mysticism of Krishnamurthi, we have to take a look at some such binding

aspects. Consciousness, mind, memory, thought, time, desire, conflict, and such others are few such binding factors which, far from being exclusive, are mutually dependent and sometimes even overlap with each other.

The idea of Mind: Mind is not an ever-existing entity; it is, as even the psychologists would agree, the effect of one's experiences, thoughts, desires and so on. It is the effect of time and association, and the storehouse of memories and thoughts. As JK would write, "The mind is not merely the waking consciousness that is occupied with daily activities, but also the deep layers of the unconscious in which there is the whole residue of the past, of tradition, of racial instincts" (Ibid 11). There arises no problem so long as the mind remains what it is. All the problems arise when, and with, the mind beginning to act. We comprehend this when we get to know how the mind functions. But for the mind is the product as well as the storehouse of the above-mentioned factors, we cannot understand how it is an impediment to one's self-realisation sans knowing the factors and their functionalities better.

Conception of Time:

JK distinguishes between the external time and the internal time. While the external time refers to the actual time as it can be seen in the external world, internal time refers to the time as past and future; experience and becoming (Krishnamurti the ending ch. 2). While the past or experience involves all that we have gathered as individual and collective memory and self-earned and picked knowledge, future or becoming refers to the plans, set-goals, endless-pursuit, etc. So, he opines that It is this human turn, the turn which gave internal time the primary emphasis, is the root of all conflicts.

Memory, Thought and Experience: Internally, memory is time. There arises no conflict, say, so long as an individual glance at a car and enjoys the view. But if it joins his memory, conflict begins: it makes him compare the pleasure he obtained from it with that of others; accelerates the urge to repeat the same; creates the desire to own the car and, thus, he pursues pleasure knowingly, and also pain, albeit unknowingly. Once the experience is over, then, the seed of conflict is sown Because, that experience, which is now memory, juxtaposes itself with the rest of the memory and is processed into thought: such as the desire to own the car. This is how memory breeds thoughts, and thoughts, conflict.

One understands this better under the premise of the relationship between the truth and reality: the deeper existence underlying the dichotomy of phenomena and noumenal. JK uses the term reality corresponding with phenomenon and truth with the noumenal. He dismisses the opinion that reality is what is and truth refers to the correct knowledge about it. Conversely, for him, Truth is what is

and reality is mere appearances. In other words, what is taken to be as reality is the mere projection of thoughts: therefore, whatever reality projected/created by thoughts need not be necessarily in correspondence with the noumenal. Rather, there is a greater probability that it could be illusion than actuality, albeit latter is not an utter impossibility (Krishnamurthi Limits 6). One of the major differences between the truth and reality is that the former is indivisible whereas the latter exists in the division: the division between the observer and the observed. So, the action of reality and the truth acting are two distinct phenomena. Reality is the unconscious self-construct whereas truth is the indivisible actuality. The former breeds conflict and desire, in turn germinating pleasure, pain, joy, sorrow, etc.

Violence: The violence that JK speaks of is not the violence that we usually understand by the term; it is mere the visible, superficial aspect of it. Violence, to him, exists in the very act of division, separation or categorization. To exemplify it with the better-tangible, surface level instance, the claim for any human identity such as of being Indian, Christian, Hindu, Muslim, rich etc. is a violent act, for it separates him from the rest of the humanity. Likewise, at the very deeper level, even the division of the self from the rest of the universe, observer from the observed, experiencer from the experienced, reality from the truth/actuality are acts of violence. Therefore, even nonviolence, says JK, is also a form of violence. To understand this, we need to understand that violence is germinated when the positive of 'what is' is disrupted in the form of resistance by the normative 'what should be' (Fiske 86). For instance, we desire for something and work accordingly with some plan of action – 'what should be'. While here desire is the first disruption, if we decide not to desire for anything, then, it would be the second layer of disruption. Or to put it in Fiske's words:

Krishnamurti implies that we approach the what is with a particular mind-set, one in which we seek pleasure or intend, desire or will particular ends. With such a mind we build ambitions, ideals, aims or objectives and reshape what is to what should be. The what should be is a function of our desires or our will. Our wills are replete with "I must" or "I must not," "I should" or "I should not," — all of which are independent of the factual what is. He equates will with desire, and views it as a resistance to the what is (87).

It is this violence which germinates conflict which in turn breeds desire, pleasure, pain, joys, sorrows, and so on. And it is this which obstructs the spiritual awakening: Awakening is not possible where there is violence. Only when one lives in 'what is' (being) as against 'what should be' (becoming), such an awakening is possible (Krishnamurthi Notebook 82). Similar expression pertaining to living in 'what is' could be observed in the

words of Jaggi Vasudev popularly known as 'Sadguru' in recent times:

I was not actively looking for inconsistencies or loopholes in anything I was taught. I just saw them. I have never looked for anything in my life. I just look. And that is what I am trying to teach people now: if you really want to know spirituality, don't look for anything. People think spirituality is about looking for God or truth or the ultimate. The problem is you have already defined what you are looking for. It is not the object of your search that is important; it is the faculty of looking. The ability to simply look without motive is missing in the world today. Everybody is a psychological creature, wanting to assign meaning to everything. Seeking is not about looking for something. It is about enhancing your perception, your very faculty of seeing (Subramanyam, 19).

Therefore, it is the time, which is memory, processed into thoughts, then to ideologies, institutions, the apparatuses to think, also of training to think in a particular pattern, in order to achieve a preconceived goal, ad infinitum is which conditions the individual in particular and the society in general. It is this which injects one with dreams and provides preconceptions about them; This is what he means when he says that the external world is but the creation of the internal thoughts. This is what he calls as 'reality' as against the 'truth', what Upanishadic teachings call as 'illusion/Maya', and what philosophers call as 'phenomenon' as opposed to noumenal.

From Violence to Silence: Like violence, the scope of silence is equally broader: it refers to the utter passive living attentive to the surrounding and in accordance with 'what is'. In a way it seems to be another name given to that state of awakening, for he describes it as indescribable, has no centre, neither time, nor space (Krishnamurthi Freedom 112-13).

Product of Experience:

However, all these insights on the nature of human mind and unconditioning oneself in order to realise the supreme, is not the consequence of mere intellectual gymnastics. Rather, it seems to be the directed-effort to theorise, and thereby, rationalize the mystical experience he had in intellectual terms to the common folk. The intention behind could also be to enable them to attain the same. In relation with his theories around the transcendent, his self-documented-experiences, (recorded in 'Krishnamurthi's Notebook'), are not only in tune with them, but are also equally complicated and demands high imagination. Here I will quote three distinct excerpts from his notebook throwing light on different aspect of the experience:

"Suddenly, most unexpectedly that sacred benediction came upon us, the other felt it too, without our saying anything. As it several times filled a room, this time it seemed to cover

the mountainside across the wide, extending valley and beyond the mountains. It was everywhere. All space seemed to disappear; what was far, the wide gap, the distant snow-covered peaks and the person sitting on the bench faded away. There was not one or two or many but only this immensity. The brain had lost all its responses; it was only an instrument of observation, it was seeing, not as the brain belonging to a particular person, but as a brain which is not conditioned by time-space, as the essence of all brains. It was a quiet night and the whole process was not so intense. On waking this morning, there was an experiencing whose duration was perhaps a minute, an hour or timeless. An experiencing that is informed with time ceases to be experiencing; what has continuity ceases to be the experiencing. On waking there was in the very depths, in the measureless depth of the total mind, an intense flame alive and burning furiously, of attention, of awareness, of creation. The word G not the thing; the symbol G not the real. The fires that burn on the surface of life pass, die away, leaving sorrow and ashes and remembrance. These fires are called life but it's not life. It's decay. The fire of creation that is destruction is life. In it there is no beginning, no ending, neither tomorrow or yesterday. (Krishnamurthi Notebook 25-26).

Woke up this morning with a great deal of pain but at the same time there was a flash of a seeing that was revealing. Our eyes and brain register the outward things, trees, mountains, swift running streams; accumulate knowledge, technique and so on.

With that same eyes and brain, trained to observe, to choose, to condemn and justify, we turn inward, look inward, recognize objects, build up ideas, which are organized into reason. This inward look does not go very far, for it's still within the limitation of its own observation and reason. . . But there's an inward observation which is not the outward observation turned inward. The brain and the eye which observe only partially do not comprehend the total seeing. They must be alive completely but still; they must cease to choose and judge but be passively aware. Then the inward seeing is without the border of time-space. In this flash a new perception is born, (Notebook 26-27).

Now what followed is almost impossible to put down in words; words are such dead things, with definite set meaning and what took place was beyond all words and description. It was the centre of all creation; it was a purifying seriousness that cleansed the brain of every thought and feeling; its seriousness was as lightning which destroys and burns up; the profundity of it was not measurable, it was there immovable, impenetrable, a solidity that was as light as the heavens. It was in the eyes, in the breath. It was in the eyes and the eyes could see. The eyes that saw, that looked were wholly different from the

eyes of the organ and yet they were the same eyes. There was only seeing, the eyes that saw beyond time-space. There was impenetrable dignity and a peace that was the essence of all movement, action. No virtue touched it for it was beyond all virtue and sanctions of man. There was love that was utterly perishable and so it had the delicacy of all new things, vulnerable, destructible and yet it was beyond all this. It was there imperishable, unnamable, the unknowing. No thought could ever penetrate it; no action could ever touch it. It was "pure", untouched and so ever dyingly beautiful, (ibid 28-29).

The first excerpt presents an instance of what is known as extroversive or 'Panenhenic' experience; a type of experience which transcends the bounds of space and time, and presents the vast multiplicity of nature as transfigured by the supreme consciousness. The multiplicity, therefore, more than replicating its uniqueness, is indicative of the presence of greater reality behind it. One can observe the dimension of living, as much as the worldview, changing drastically. Vanishing of the distance and proximity along with the elimination of space, the dissolution of minute and hours, and beginning and end with the disappearance of time, immeasurable immensity, and unfathomable intensity make way for the aforementioned dimension of experience. Since any attempt to qualify the experience involves either spatial or temporal dependence, experience becomes ineffable. The description corresponds, at least thematically, with the paradoxical descriptions of the transcendent in 'Isha Upanishad'.

The third excerpt is striking with its imageries. The adjectives JK uses, knowingly or otherwise, are mostly apophatic: the words such as 'imperishable', 'unnamable', 'impenetrable', 'unknowing', 'untouched' and others only negative terms used to speak the 'unspeakable'. Even the words such as 'beyond' 'immensity' would only point at the infinitude of the experience. The incapacity of action, thought, virtue or any such perceivable aspect to either touch or to penetrate the infinitude of the experience reveal at once the sheer contrast between the magnanimity of the experience as against the minusculed nature of the worldliness. Thus, the experience, if at all communicates something, demands high imagination. Such is the nature of the experience, which is often described by the most as 'ineffable'.

Besides the already-illustrated infinity, ineffability and unbound spatiotemporality of the mystical experience, these excerpts are also indicative of various other aspects: At some places, like that of the second excerpt, JK juxtaposes the real, (thought-constructed), world and the actual world of truth the mystic experiences. Possibly for it is written in the hindsight, JK tries to deduce cogently the reasons for the difficulty to the common-folk to achieve such a realized

state. It is in this process of deduction, he professes for attention over concentration, or more broadly, passive awareness over active participation. Therefore, the senses and the brain were merely registering with neither reaction nor responses to the things experienced.

Yet another unique feature that we encounter in his description of such experience is the amalgamation of contradictory elements. He sometimes describes the experience as ecstatic while other times as painful. The benediction which he describes as revealing also at once happens to be painful. Hence, the coexistence of the contradictory elements is one of the features of this experience.

Therefore, the theories proposed by JK happens to be intellectual only so far as they come under the grasping capacity. Instead, limiting him to be a mere intellectual, or mistaking the term 'intellectual' in the ordinary sense, would be highly deceptive. Hence, despite the enigma at the deeper levels of his conceptual framework, there is a clarity in his intellectual argument, (such as what questions should be posed and to what intensity), about the questions to be asked and direction the argument should be led towards.

III. SYNTHESIS

Despite the outward seeming differences between the mystical paths proposed by the two, (Ramana Maharshi and JK), one can observe certain similarities underlying the essence of their teaching. To elaborate, although the discrepancy in the means prescribed to realise the supreme consciousness is more than merely tangible, in terms of the firm understanding of the end of pursuit and about the problems at hand to be addressed in the course, there exist some similarities: The Need to destroy the mind and the evasive ego; unconditioning oneself from preconceived belief systems etc. However, the ideas of JK sometimes seem to be enigmatic in contrast to that of Bhagwan Ramana Maharshi for the following reasons: (1), according to JK the destruction of mind and absolute detachment etc. are the means through which one achieves realization, whereas for Ramana they are the byproducts one achieves in his way to realization; and (2), Bhagwan Ramana Maharshi, though has his own path to prescribe, accepts the validity of other paths whereas, JK outrightly dismisses all the existing paths.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brunton, P. (1997). *A search in secret India*. Samuel Weiser.
- [2] Brunton, P. (2000). *The Maharshi and his message*. Sri Ramanasramam.
- [3] Fisk, L. J. (1994). Jiddu Krishnamurti: Violence as resistance to factuality. *Peace Research*, 26(2), 85–102.

- [4] Godman, D. (1985). *Be as you are: The teachings of Sri Ramana Maharshi*. Penguin Arkana.
- [5] Krishnamurti, J. (1969). *Freedom from the known*. Rider.
- [6] Krishnamurti, J. (1976). *Krishnamurti's notebook*. Rider.
- [7] Krishnamurti, J. (2007). *As one is: To free the mind from all conditioning*. Krishnamurti Foundation of America.
- [8] Krishnamurti, J., & Bohm, D. (1985). *The ending of time: Where philosophy and physics meet*. Gollancz.
- [9] Krishnamurti, J., & Bohm, D. (1999). *The limits of thought: Discussions* (R. McCoy, Ed.). Routledge.
- [10] Maharshi, S. R. (1985). *Who am I? (Nan Yar?)*. Sri Ramanasramam.
- [11] Subramaniam, A. (2010). *Sadhguru: More than a life*. Penguin Books India.